



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 FIVE

WORD ORDER: THE VERBAL CLAUSE

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 WORD ORDER AND THE VERBAL CLAUSE

In the linguistic literature, discussions on the word order of the verbal clause usually revolve around the relative placement of the verb, the subject and, in the case of transitive clauses, the object.¹ This approach produces a sixfold typology, according to which languages can theoretically be classified as VSO, VOS, SVO, SOV, OVS and OSV, depending on their most typical (viz. unmarked) way to linearize these three basic constituents. Besides, discussions of word order also recognize the existence of special positions in the clause, in acknowledgement of the fact that under particular circumstances a constituent can occur in a different position in the clause from what the basic word-order pattern of the language would have led one to expect. The number and positioning of these special slots vary from language to language, but it has been claimed that at least one such special position is universal, i.e. possessed by *all* languages in the world: the initial position (P_1). On that account, the basic structure of a language of, e.g., the SVO type, is really P_1 SVO, which explains that at times clauses of the type OSV may be encountered in actual linguistic productions, the underlying notion being that in such cases the object has been placed in that special initial position. Inasmuch as all languages are expected to possess one or more such positions in their basic word-order pattern(s), the questions arise, for each individual language, as to (1) how many positions there are, (2) where they are situated in the pattern(s), (3) by what constituent(s) each of them can be filled and (4) under what condition(s). Needless to say, the recognition of the existence of these special positions has allowed a considerable refinement of the discussion on word-order patterns.

¹ For a general treatment of the word order of the verbal clause in the Semitic languages, cf. Brockelmann (1913: 432ff.), Lipiński (1997: 487-491).

1.2 STATUS QUAESTIONIS

The question of word order in the Aramaic of TO and TJ has seldom been studied in the relevant literature.² In his treatment of the syntax of TO, Kaddari³ provided a rather summary treatment of the relative order of V, S and O in the Aramaic of TO. He observed that the usual sequence of verb and object is VO (also when the verb is an infinitive) and that the usual sequence of verb, subject and object is VSO. Kaddari acknowledged that these are the usual Semitic patterns. He also noted the presence of OV, SVO and VOS sequences in TO, but specified that as a rule these deviations from the usual V(S)O pattern run parallel to the Vorlage; in the few cases where they do not they usually reflect some emphasis.

As regards the Aramaic of TO and TJ specifically, however, the question of word order has never undergone any investigation. One of the most probable reasons for the fact that overall the word-order patterns of TO and TJ have so little been studied so far is that, for TJS at least, the word order of the Vorlage is for a very large part followed very closely:⁴ the impression may have been raised that, in the main, a discussion of word order-patterns encountered in TJ would come down to a discussion of word-order patterns of BH. Other grammatical aspects with regard to which BH and TO/TJ differ more markedly will then probably have claimed more of the scholars' attention.

1.3 WORD ORDER

MASORETIC TEXT AND TARGUM JONATHAN TO SAMUEL

If it is true that the bulk of TJS is a faithful translation of the Vorlage, it is certainly not entirely so. Essentially, the state of affairs witnessed in TJS with regard to word order can be outlined as follows:

A. For a very large part, TJS does not expand on the Vorlage; it translates word for word, so that the word order of the Vorlage is

² Word-order patterns in Aramaic at large will be discussed extensively in the 'wider perspective' at the close of this chapter (W:7.2).

³ Kaddari (1963a: 246-251).

⁴ This was already noted with regard to the relative placement of numeral and modified noun (cf. N:2.2.1).

strictly followed. The use of the *nota accusativi*, prepositions and pronominal suffixes is then absolutely identical in both languages.⁵ This statement remains valid in the case of minor departures from the Vorlage. Essentially, frequently TJS renders one (group of) word(s) with another, equivalent (group of) word(s). The substitution can bear on one and the same constituent,⁶ or involve a group of words that overlaps constituent boundaries.⁷ In all these cases, however, there are no significant differences of word order between BH and TJS, even though in some cases the clause structure may not be exactly the same.⁸ Consequently, in all the instances discussed so far the Vorlage and TJS match each other (almost) perfectly.⁹ Seen from the angle of TJS, it is

⁵ E.g. I.6.2 'במה נשלחנו למקומו' [with what shall we send it to its place?], II.14.32 'ואשלח אתך אל המלך' [and I will send you to the king], II.11.6 'וישלח יואב את אוריה אל דוד' [and Joab sent Uriah unto David] and 'ואב ית אוריה לות דוד'.

⁶ E.g. II.9.7 'ואחייב לך ית כל אחסנת שאול' [and I will restore to you all the inheritance of Saul] and 'והשבתי לך את כל שדה שאול' [and I will restore to you all the land of Saul].

⁷ Differences in the government of verbs between BH and Aramaic are cases in point. E.g.:

1. A verb introducing its object with the *nota accusativi* (direct transitive) or a preposition (indirect transitive) in the Vorlage may be rendered with another verb governing its object differently in TJS, e.g. I.2.28 'ואתרעיתי ביה' [and I took delight in him] and 'ובחר אתו' [and I chose him], I.28.15 'ומימרא דיוי רחיק יתו' [and the Memra of the Lord has rejected me] and 'ואלהים סר מעלי' [and God has turned aside from me], II.16.11 'הנחו לו' [leave him alone] and 'שבוקו מניה'.
2. A BH construction may be rendered with a structurally simpler Aramaic one, e.g. when an intransitive verb whose object is a preposition with suffix pronoun in the Vorlage is rendered with a transitive verb with an objective suffix pronoun in TJS, to the effect that a distinct constituent is lost in the Aramaic version, e.g. I.4.19 'בעתודה חבלהא' [her pains agitated her] and 'her pains came upon her'. In the same vein, the preposition קדם is regularly substituted for the prepositional compound באוני in phrases of the type קדם למלא (lit.) 'to speak before' and דבר באוני (lit.) 'to speak in the ears of', as in I.18.23 'וידברו עבדי שאול באוני דוד' [and the servants of Saul spoke to David] and 'ומלילו עבדי שאול קדם דוד'.

⁸ Instances like I.5.10 'כבוא ארון' [when the ark of the Lord arrived] illustrate the point. Basically, a BH infinitive phrase (viz. an Inf.C. introduced by a preposition and followed by its subject in the genitive) of the Vorlage is rendered with a phrase involving a finite verb (viz. a finite verb introduced by a conjunction and followed by its subject in the nominative) in TJS. In spite of this major change of clause structure, the word order remains rigorously identical, each element of the construction in BH being rendered with an equivalent element in TJS.

⁹ This can be seen especially in cases in which the Vorlage itself displays word-order patterns unfamiliar by its own standards; deviations that, however,

therefore impossible to establish whether the word-order patterns encountered in TJS are also indigenous to that particular Aramaic dialect,¹⁰ or if they are simply the product of a Hebrew influence. Because of that, in those, unfortunately frequent cases hardly anything can be said of the word-order patterns characteristic of the Aramaic of TJS.

B. The only distinct differences in word order between the Vorlage and TJS involve expansions on the Vorlage. With the exception of three lengthy passages that display ample expansion (I.2.1-10; II.22; II.23.1-8), the bulk of the expansions in TJS involve the insertion of one or more words in the Aramaic version, with or without a literal rendering of the rest of the predication involved. Not all such expansions bring about differences in word order, however, inasmuch as the target of expansion may very well be an individual constituent, e.g. BH יהוה 'the Lord', which in certain contexts is regularly rendered with מִמְרָא דִּי 'the Memra of the Lord' in TJS, e.g. ושאל דויד במימרא דִּי 'and David asked by the Memra of the Lord' [וישאל דוד ביהוה]. In such cases, the ordering of the constituents within the predication as a whole remains usually unaltered. In the final analysis, the only instances that are significant for this study are those that involve the insertion of *clausal constituents* that are absent from the Vorlage. At times, (parts of) a predication is (are) inserted, and this may even take place in several predications in a row.¹¹ More often, however, a single constituent is inserted, which can be necessitated by TJS' own grammatical constraints. A case in point is the rendering of *yīqtol/w^eqatalī* forms (without distinct nominal subject) in the Vorlage with *qātel* in TJS. TJS then not infrequently inserts an independent

are faithfully followed by TJS. The instances below are cases in point: I.2.8 מקים מעפרא 'he raises up the poor from the dust, from the dunghill he exalts the needy one' [מקים מעפר דל מאשפת ירים אביון], II.22.14 'the Lord thundered from the Heavens' [מקים מעפר דל מאשפת ירים אביון], II.22.20 'and he brought me forth to an open place' [וירעם מן שמים יהוה], II.22.34 'and upon my stronghold he establishes me' [ויעצא למרחב אחי], II.23.3 'and upon my high places he sets me' [אלהא 'the God of Israel spoke unto me' [אלהי ישראל לי דבר].

¹⁰ In which case there would be a rather felicitous match between BH and the Aramaic of TJ, inasmuch as translating the Vorlage literally in Aramaic would not produce unusual, i.e. 'un-Aramaic' constructions.

¹¹ E.g. I.2.25 אם יחוב גבר לגבר הלא ייתי לקדם דינא וישמע מליהון ויפלי ביניהון ואם קדם יוי יחוב גברא ממון יבעי 'if a man will sin against a man, will he not come before the judge, and he will hear their words, and he will decide between them? And if the man will sin before the Lord, from whom (*lit.*) will he seek and it will be forgiven to him?' [אם יחטא איש לאיש ופללו אלהים ואם ליהוה יחטא איש מי יתפלל לו].

personal pronoun to function as the subject (e.g. I.1.8 למה את בכי' 'why are you crying?' [למה תבכי]).

The study of the placement of these constituents inserted in the Aramaic version can provide valuable insights into the word-order patterns characteristic of the Aramaic of TJS, but then again it also has to be realized that these insights are of limited value, insofar as one cannot always ascertain that the Targumist was not, deliberately or not, under the influence of the word-order patterns characteristic of the Vorlage when he modelled the Aramaic version of the passages in question.

1.4 APPROACH ADOPTED IN THIS STUDY

1.4.1 CORPUS OF THIS STUDY

Be that as it may, in the following an attempt will be made to account for the word order in the verbal clause as evidenced in those passages in TJS that do not perfectly parallel the Vorlage, usually as a result of the insertion of one (or several) constituent(s) in the Aramaic version, more rarely as a result of a different linearization of constituents common to both the Vorlage and TJS. The investigation has been carried out on the basis of the three lengthy expansive pericopes encountered in TJS (I.2.1-10; II.22; II.23.1-8). For the rest of TJS, which is much less markedly expansive, a sample of sixteen chapters, eight in either book of Samuel (I.1-8 and II.1-8) has been scrutinized as well. In the following discussion, the term 'corpus' will be used to refer to those selected portions of the entire text of TJS and, as a shorthand, the expression 'unparallel portions of our corpus' will be used to refer to those portions of our corpus that do not perfectly parallel the Vorlage.

1.4.2 METHOD

1.4.2.1 Scope of the Investigation

In common with some other studies of Aramaic syntax, the present analysis will concentrate on the positioning of the *nuclear* constituents of the verbal clause, i.e. on those constituents which, aside from the

verb itself, are obligatory to make a complete verbal predication: the subject and, in the case of transitive verbs, the object.

The idea of nuclear constituents raises at once the question of the fundamental distinction between nuclear and non-nuclear constituents, i.e. between the constituents that are necessary to make a complete predication and those that can be dispensed with. Various terms are encountered in the relevant literature to refer to these two types of constituents, e.g. obligatory vs. optional constituents, objects vs. adverbials. In this connection, FG¹² explains the matter as follows. Essentially, FG makes a distinction between *arguments* and *satellites*, the former being ‘those terms which are required by some predicate [= verb] in order to form a complete nuclear predication’,¹³ the latter being those that are not. In other words, arguments are those constituents that are required by the valence of the verb of the predication, satellites are those constituents that are not.¹⁴ Thus the constituent ‘in Amsterdam’ would be an argument in ‘John lives in Amsterdam’, but a satellite in ‘John bought a car in Amsterdam’, as that constituent is essential to the integrity of the SoA designated by the predication in the former case, but not in the latter. According to FG, ‘a satellite can be left out without affecting the grammaticality or the meaning of the remaining construction, whereas leaving out an argument will either render the remainder ungrammatical or change its semantics’.¹⁵

In contrast to some other studies, however, the fact that all nuclear

¹² FG1 (86-90).

¹³ FG1 (86).

¹⁴ In his recent detailed study of the word-order patterns of the BH verbal clause, Groß, together with Dependency Grammar, has followed the same line of reasoning (1996: 19-43, esp. 19-24).

¹⁵ FG1 (89). Thus though ‘John lives’ does certainly form a complete and grammatical predication in its own right, it does not convey the same meaning as ‘John lives in Amsterdam’: whereas the latter predication expresses the fact that John resides somewhere, if the constituent ‘in Amsterdam’ is left out the meaning of residence can no longer be conveyed, the predication then becoming a plain affirmation of the fact that ‘John is alive’. This demonstrates that ‘in Amsterdam’ has argument status in that predication. In contrast, ‘John bought a car’ and ‘John bought a car in Amsterdam’ still convey the same meaning, viz. John’s buying a car, the only difference being that the latter specifies where the buying took place. The dispensable character of ‘in Amsterdam’ shows that it is a satellite in that predication. To conclude, FG’s discussion, it must be added, makes also clear that the difference between argument and satellite is not always as straightforward as in the instance above. In practice, this entails that subjective judgements on the part of the analyst cannot always be left out of the analysis.

constituents of the predication will also be considered entails that *prepositional* objects will have to be included in this survey, inasmuch as prepositional objects can also be arguments (in the FG sense) of verbs, viz. the primary object of an intransitive verb ('Peter waited *for me*'), or the secondary object of a ditransitive verb ('I gave a book *to Peter*'). Accordingly, with regard to the Vorlage and TJS a distinction will be made between the direct object (O^d, viz. an object either without explicit object marking, or introduced by the *nota accusativi* אֶת/יָהּ) and the prepositional object (O^p, viz. an object introduced by a preposition).¹⁶

1.4.2.2 Word Order and Functional Grammar

In the preceding chapters, the theoretical framework of Functional Grammar has been employed to various degrees to assist us in understanding the syntax and morphosyntax of the Aramaic of TJS. Here again, FG proves both a useful and adequate methodological framework on which to base our discussion of the word-order patterns encountered in the unparallel portions of our corpus. One important field of research within FG is that of *language universals*, i.e. 'any object or property which is posited as being present in the grammars of all languages'.¹⁷ And in matters of word order specifically FG has

¹⁶ Obviously, when pronominal O^d can take up the form of a suffix directly appended to the verb (קָטַלְיָהּ 'he killed him'), which, moreover, can be considered a manifestation of the Principle of Increasing Complexity (cf. W:5). On a more fundamental note, the distinction between O^d and O^p is essentially formal. Thus the notion of O^p does not only reflect prepositional phrases such as 'to the village' in 'Lisa is going to the village', but also covers what traditional grammar terms the 'indirect object', which is as a rule introduced by the preposition לְ in TJS. Overall, the notions of S, O^d and O^p therefore correspond to the arguments referred to as Sy1, Sy2 and Sy3-6 respectively by Groß (1996: 31ff.) with reference to BH. However, one should also note that in the Aramaic of TJS, as in other Aramaic dialects, the semantic 'direct object' (viz. the semantic category traditionally associated with the accusative case in the Indo-European languages) is often expressed with a O^p introduced by the preposition לְ when the verb is a participle, e.g. I.1.6 וּמִצְחָבָא לָהּ עֲרִתָּהּ [וּכְעִסְתָּהּ צִרְתָּהּ]. This use of לְ as *nota accusativi* is not normally encountered in BH until later stages of the language, where it is often considered to have originated under Aramaic influence (cf. WoC 183-185, JM §125k and the literature cited there). Finally, though this study will focus on the arguments, viz. nuclear constituents, of the verbal clause, in a few select cases satellites (i.e. non-nuclear constituents) that have a tangible impact on the word-order patterns of the predication will be included in the discussion (cf. W:4.2.1.3 and W:6.1.2.1).

¹⁷ Trask (1993: 293).

formulated a number of fundamental principles, some of which are of direct application to our corpus and provide a valid framework for the analysis of the word-order patterns found there. The principles of FG that will be used to frame the discussion are four in number: the fundamental impossibility for languages to have a with ‘free’ word order (W:2), the Principle of Functional Stability (W:3), the Principle of Pragmatic Highlighting (W:4) and the Principle of Increasing Complexity (W:5).¹⁸

2. PRINCIPLE N°1 ‘FREE WORD ORDER’ LANGUAGES

*There are no free word order languages.*¹⁹

One fundamental postulate of FG is that there are no such things as ‘free word order languages’, i.e. languages in which the constituents of the clause can be freely arrayed in whatever possible way without any consequence for the meaning conveyed by the clause as a whole. As Dik explains, a ‘true free word order language would be a language in which, for a given set of constituents, all possible permutations of these constituents would not only be grammatical, but also communicatively equivalent to each other. Such languages do not exist, because:

- There are no languages which do not exclude at least certain sequences of constituents at some level; and
- Even where different sequences exist side by side, there will usually be some significant difference between them (for example, a difference in the pragmatic functions of the constituent)’.²⁰

Obvious though this statement may seem, it is of paramount importance for the present study, in that it founds and justifies the study of word order as a grammatical phenomenon in the first place. It is also particularly significant for our purpose because in the relevant literature

¹⁸ The ensuing discussion of these four principles is based on FG1 and FG2. I am also indebted to Buth (1987) and Rosenbaum (1997) for parts of the exposition.

¹⁹ FG1 (394).

²⁰ FG1 (394). Pragmatic functions in FG cover, among others, such notions as topicality and focality, which will be discussed in W:4.

various Aramaic dialects have at one point or another been claimed to have a free word order.²¹

3. PRINCIPLE N°2

PRINCIPLE OF FUNCTIONAL STABILITY

3.1 DEFINITION

*Constituents with the same functional specification
are preferably placed in the same position.*²²

The first principle above suggested that language-universally the ordering of constituents within clauses is to a certain extent *principled*, i.e. languages are characterized by a variable number of principles according to which constituents are arranged and ordered on the basis of their grammatical properties.

This leads FG to posit another general principle: the fact that, in one and the same language, constituents with the same functional load have the propensity to fill the same position in clauses of the same type.²³ In turn, this consistency in the placing and ordering of constituents within clauses allows FG to posit that all languages possess at least one *basic functional pattern*, i.e. a template predicting the natural, unmarked

²¹ Cf. *inter alia* Bauer & Leander (1927: §101); Rosenthal (1995: §183) on BA; Nöldeke (1898: §324) on Classical Syriac; Nöldeke (1875: §282) on Mandaic; Kutscher (1971: 275) and, most recently, Kaufman (1997: 127) on the Eastern LA dialects in general. That these dialects display a much greater variety of word-ordering patterns than, e.g. OA is beyond any doubt. Importantly, however, what FG suggests is that the apparent freedom of word order observed in these dialects is essentially the result of a difference of *organization* in the linguistic system of those dialects. Languages differ in the way they convey the functional load of the components of a clause. Cross-linguistically, linguistic mechanisms frequently employed to that effect include (among others) the use of specific intonation patterns (prosodic contour), word order variation, and morphological markers. Languages that resort predominantly to word order variation can therefore be expected to display a greater variety of word-order patterns than other languages that make use of other means to achieve the same end, and it is probably in that light that apparent free word order languages such as BA should be understood.

²² FG1 (403).

²³ Cf. Rosenbaum (1997: 218): ‘every language tends to develop a consistent, habitual pattern for the arrangement of constituents with the same function’.

position of the nuclear constituents towards one another in the clause. As was seen at the beginning of this chapter, verbal clauses are usually analysed in terms of verb (V), subject (S) and — in the case of transitive verbs — object (O), and this entails that theoretically six basic patterns can be encountered across languages: VSO, VOS, SVO, SOV, OVS, OSV. Considering the approach adopted in the present study, a distinction will also be made between direct object (O^d) and prepositional object (O^p). Aside from the verb, three arguments will therefore be distinguished: S, O^d and O^p, obviously depending on the type of verbs.²⁴ Incidentally, this also raises the number of theoretical permutations of the nuclear constituents of the clause to 24.

3.2 PRINCIPLE OF FUNCTIONAL STABILITY AND TARGUM JONATHAN TO SAMUEL

The Principle of Functional Stability predicts that all languages possess at least one basic functional pattern specifying the linear ordering of constituents within the clause on the basis of their functional properties. I propose to discuss the basic functional pattern of the verbal clause in the unparallel portions of our corpus in two steps: we shall first discuss the relative placement of the verb and its object(s) (i.e. V, O^d and/or O^p), and then the relative placement of S and V and its possible object(s).²⁵

3.2.1 RELATIVE PLACEMENT OF THE VERB AND ITS OBJECT(S)

Our corpus is unequivocal: O^d and O^p always come after the verb, and when a predication contains both a O^d and a O^p they always occur in

²⁴ Inasmuch as verbs can be intransitive, monotransitive or ditransitive. In the case of causatives (*afel*) one should even entertain the possibility of tritransitive verbs, i.e. verbs with three arguments in addition to the subject (e.g. ‘John let Peter give the book to Bill’). Within FG, however, such causative structures are considered the product of *derivations* from basic ditransitive structures (‘Peter gave the book to Bill’), and do not therefore constitute a valency type in themselves. It is a postulate of FG that in natural languages the maximum quantitative valency of basic verbs is three arguments (including the subject), and that of derived verbs four (cf. FG1: 79).

²⁵ The sections below focus on the relative placement of V, S, O^d and O^p. The activation, if any, of special positions in these clauses will be discussed in W:4.

that order. In other words, the relative placement of the verb and its object(s) is: V-O^d-O^p.

1. The fact that O^d follows V comes out clearly from the following cases:

- a) TJS features an O^d where the Vorlage has none, e.g. I.2.28 לאסקא קרבן 'to bring up sacrifice' [לעלות (lit.) 'to bring up'], I.7.6 ושפכו לבהון 'and they poured out their heart' [וישפכו 'and they poured out'], II.22.17 והוית נמר נפשי 'he sent his prophet' [ישלח 'he sent'], II.22.24 ואשתמרתי 'and I kept myself (from my iniquity)'] II.22.42 בען סעיד 'they were seeking help' [ישען 'they were looking']; also the instances involving the noun קרב 'battle', e.g. I.4.9 ותגיון קרבא 'and you will wage battle' [ונלחמתם].
- b) TJS inserts a verb before a noun already present in the Vorlage, thereby turning it into an O^d, e.g. I.7.10 לאנחא קרבא 'to wage battle' [למלחמה 'for war'], II.3.12 עבד ארעא '(he who) made the earth' [למי ארץ 'whose is the earth'], II.6.1 (ואוסיף עוד דויד) למכנש ית כל בחירי ישראל (lit.) 'and David gathered every chosen man in Israel' [ויסף עוד דוד 'and David gathered every chosen man in Israel'], II.22.12 חשרת מים 'bringing down mighty waters' [מחית מין תקיפין 'a mass of water'].
- c) TJS inserts both a transitive verb and its O^d, e.g. I.2.1 (פלשתאי) דעתידין (the Philistines who are) דייתון ית ארונא 'to bring the ark (on a new cart)', I.2.3 לשלמא פורענות חוביכון '(and also to you he is) to repay the revenge of your sins', I.2.5 ואתנשיאו ית מסכינותהון 'and they forgot their poverty', I.2.25 וישמע מליהון 'and he will hear their words', II.5.11 שלח רגויה '(carpenters who were trained) to cut wood', II.22.9 שלח רגויה 'he sent his anger', II.23.1 ממליל אלין '(I am) speaking these things', II.23.7 למדן ית עלמא 'to judge the world'.

2. The placement of O^p after V can be seen in circumstances similar to those witnessed with O^d above:

- a) TJS features an O^p where the Vorlage has none, e.g. I.2.14 וקבע ליה בכיורא 'and he put (it) in the pan' [והכה בכיור 'and he struck (it) in the pan'],²⁶ I.2.15 אף עד לא יתסקן תרביא למדבחא 'even before the fat pieces

²⁶ The function of the O^p is uncertain in this instance. It might be the direct object (semantically speaking, i.e. the equivalent of the accusative case in the Indo-European languages) of the verb, hence explicitly 'he put *it*', in contrast to the Vorlage in which it is left unspecified. But it might also be seen as a case of *dativus ethicus*, i.e. 'he put (it) for himself', in which case it would be better understood as a satellite.

were brought to the altar' גם בטרם יקטרן את החלב] 'even before they had burnt the fat pieces',²⁷ I.2.16 'יסבון מנך (בעל כרחך) 'they will take from you (against your will)' [לקחתי (בחזקה) 'I will take (by force)'], II.1.23 'they were not separated from their people' לא אתפרשו מעמיהון 'they were not separated'].

- b) TJS inserts a verb before a prepositional phrase already present in the Vorlage, thereby turning it into an O^p, e.g. I.2.12 למדחל מן קדם יי 'to fear from before the Lord' 'they did not know) to fear from before the Lord' את יהוה] '(they did not know) the Lord',²⁸ I.2.27 'משעבדין לבית פרעה (when they were in Egypt) and enslaved to the house of Pharaoh' לבית פרעה] '(when they were in Egypt) to the house of Pharaoh', I.2.28 'לשמשא קדמי (to wear the ephod) to serve before me' לפני] '(to carry the ephod) before me', II.7.2 'ביתא דמטלל בכיורי ארויא 'a house that is covered with panels of cedars' בית ארויא] 'a house of cedars', II.7.22 'ככל דשמענא אמרו 'according to everything that we have heard, they said to us' 'according to everything we have heard with our ears',²⁹ II.22.42 'ומצלן קדם יי 'and they were praying before the Lord' אל יהוה] 'unto the Lord'].
- c) TJS inserts both a verb and an O^p, e.g. I.2.3 'למשלט בישראל 'to rule over Israel', I.2.5 'דתמלי מעם גלותהא (Jerusalem ...) is to be filled with her exiled people', I.2.10 'לאבאשא לעמיהא 'to do harm to his people', I.2.25 'הלא ייתון לקדם דינא 'will he not come before the judge?', I.2.29 'דפקידית לקרבא קדמי בבית מקדשי 'that I appointed to offer before me in my temple' אשר צויתי מעון] 'that I appointed (to) my residence', II.22.3 'דיתבא על מתברא 'to overpower my ennemies', II.22.5 'מתגברין עליהון (the strong who) prevail over them', II.22.28 'לאבאשא לי 'to do harm to me', II.23.7 'למתב על כרסי דינא 'to sit on the thrones of judgement'.

3. Finally, when both O^d and O^p are featured after the verb in one and the same predication, their relative placement is O^dO^p:

- a) TJS inserts an O^d in a sequence VO^p already present in the Vorlage: I.3.7 'למדע אלפן מן קדם יי (and Samuel had not yet learned) to know

²⁷ Note further that the active verb with O^d of the Vorlage is turned into a passive verb with S in TJS.

²⁸ In this case, one will note that the Vorlage already features a O^d, but that this O^d is turned into a O^p upon the insertion of the Inf.C.

²⁹ In this instance, the preposition קדם 'before' is also substituted for the prepositional compound באזי 'in the ears of'.

instruction from before the Lord’ [טרם ידע את יהוה] ‘and (Samuel) did not yet know the Lord’],³⁰ II.7.6 ‘I have not made my Shekinah reside in a house’ [לא ישבתי בבית] ‘I have not dwelt in a house’].³¹

- b) TJS inserts a sequence VO^d before an O^p already present in the Vorlage: I.2.1 (אתפתח פומי) ‘(my mouth has opened) to speak great things against my enemies’ [רחב פי] ‘(my mouth is wide open) over my enemies’].³²
- c) TJS features a sequence O^dO^p where the Vorlage has none, e.g. II.7.5 (lit.) ‘(will you build before me a house) to make my Shekinah dwell in it?’ [לשבתי] ‘for my dwelling’].³³
- d) TJS features a complete sequence VO^dO^p not present in the Vorlage, e.g. I.2.8 ‘he has established Gehenna for the wicked ones’, I.2.10 ‘to do harm to his people’, I.2.32 ‘I will bring prosperity over Israel’, II.22.3 ‘he shields me from my enemies’, II.22.26 ‘(therefore you did much) doing kindness to his seed’, II.22.27 ‘(Pharaoh and the Egyptians who) plotted plots against your people’, II.22.27 ‘you chose his sons from all nations’, II.22.27 ‘you set apart his seed from every blemish’.

As some of the examples above show, this applies equally to clauses with a finite verb, participial clauses and infinitive clauses. Finally, it should be noted that, contrary to what one might at first expect, cases in which O^d or O^p in TJS corresponds to an objective suffix pronoun in the Vorlage³⁴ cannot be considered valid illustrations of the post-verbal

³⁰ In this case, as in I.2.12 above, one will note that the Vorlage already features a O^d, but that this O^d is turned into a O^p upon the insertion of the Inf.C.

³¹ In this case, the intransitive verb ישב in the Vorlage is replaced by the transitive (causative) verb אשרי in TJS.

³² In this case, the O^p already present in the Vorlage becomes the object of the inserted Inf.C. rather than that of the verb of the main clause.

³³ In this case, as above, the intransitive verb ישב in the Vorlage is replaced by the transitive (causative) verb אשרי in TJS.

³⁴ I.e. cases in which TJS expands a suffix pronoun attached to a verb into an independent O^d or O^p, e.g. I.7.3 ‘and serve before him’ [ועבדה] ‘and serve him’], I.8.8 ‘and they have forsaken service of me’ [ושבקו פלחני] ‘and they have forsaken me’], I.8.20 ‘and our king will take vengeance for us’ [ושפטנו מלכנו] ‘and our king will take vengeance for us’], II.22.43 ‘I stamped them’ [בעטית בהן] ‘I crushed them’]. This phenomenon is

placement of O^d and O^p in TJS, inasmuch as they turn out not to follow the verb as the result of word-ordering patterns characteristic of TJS, but rather out of conformity with the placement of the suffix pronoun that, by its very nature, comes immediately after its verb.³⁵

3.2.2 RELATIVE PLACEMENT OF SUBJECT, VERB AND OBJECT(S)

The relative placement of V and S is not without difficulties. With two exceptions that will be discussed later on (cf. W:6), in our corpus the regular sequence turns out to be VS. When the clause further features an O^d and/or an O^p, the evidence of our corpus indicates that they come after S.³⁶ Consequently, this suggests that the basic functional pattern of the unparallel portions of TJS is V-S-O^d-O^p. In addition, the verb can be immediately preceded by the negative particle *לֹא*. Finally, the predication itself can be a subordinate clause, whether complete

particularly common with verbs rendered in Aramaic with a participle, in which case the suffix pronoun of the Vorlage is rendered almost invariably with a O^p introduced by *ל-* in TJS, e.g. I.1.6 *וּמַצְהִיבָא לָהּ עֲרִתָּהּ* ‘and her rival provoked her’ [וּכְעִסְתָּהּ צִרְתָּהּ], I.1.7 *כִּין מַרְגִּיזָא לָהּ* ‘thus she was angering her’ [כִּן תַּכְעִסְתָּהּ], II.8.2 *וּמִשַׁח לְהוֹן* ‘and (he) measured them’ [וּמִדְדֵם].

³⁵ Thus I.14.37 *וְלֹא עֲנָהּ* ‘and he did not receive his prayer’ [וְלֹא קִבִּיל צְלוּתָהּ ‘and he did not answer him’] might raise the impression that we have here an argument in favour of the VO^d sequence in TJS, inasmuch as TJS features a noun absent from the Vorlage. That the placement of the O^d צְלוּתָהּ is not the liberty of TJS, but really reflects the necessary placement of a suffix immediately after its verb is shown by I.7.9 *וּקִבִּיל צְלוּתָהּ יְיָ* ‘and the Lord received his prayer’ [וַיַּעֲנֵהוּ יְהוָה], where the positioning of O^d between V and S would otherwise be difficult to explain (cf. W:3.2.2 below); and by I.8.18 *וְלֹא יַעֲנֵה יְהוָה אֲתָכֶם* ‘and the Lord will receive your prayer’ [וְלֹא יַעֲנֵה יְהוָה אֲתָכֶם], where the O^d צְלוּתְכֶם follows S because it corresponds to the constituent אֲתָכֶם in the Vorlage.

³⁶ Sometimes, however, a simple verb in the Vorlage can be expanded into a phrase featuring a verb and an object in Aramaic, e.g. BH *נָלַחַם* ‘to fight’, regularly rendered with the verbal phrase *אָגִיחַ קִרְבָּא* ‘to wage battle’ in TJS. In such a case, the verb and the object appear to make up an indissoluble whole, to the effect that the position of the object is not free and that they cannot be separated by any other element, including the subject, e.g. I.4.10 *וְאֲגִיחוּ קִרְבָּא פִלְשְׁתִּינֵי* ‘and the Philistines waged battle’ [וַיִּלָּחֲמוּ פִלְשְׁתִּינֵי]. Such instances should not be seen as counterexamples to the basic functional pattern VSO^{d/p}, featuring an otherwise hardly evidenced pattern VO^dS, but rather considered the effect of the set character of idiomatic structures (cf. also D:3.3, esp. footnote n.84). Obviously, when the combination of verb and object is not featured as an idiom, then the object is treated as any other object of the clause, e.g. I.8.20 *וְיִגִּיחַ יְהוָה קִרְבָּנָא* ‘and he will fight our battles’ [וְיִלָּחֲמֵם אֶת מִלְחֲמֹתֵנָּם] (contrast ‘John kicked *the* bucket’ and ‘John kicked *a* bucket’).

(‘she knew *that he had come*’) or relative (‘she knew the man *who had come*’), and in both cases it is as a rule introduced by the particle -7:

I.2.1 יתעבדן להון נסין וגבורן ‘signs and mighty deeds will be done for them’³⁷

I.2.1 תימר כנשתא דישראל ‘the assembly of Israel will say’

I.2.2 (ואמרת דעתיד ד) יסק הוא וכל חילותיה על ירושלם ‘(and she said that) he and all his armies will come up against Jerusalem’

I.2.2 יפלון פגרי משריתיה ‘the corpses of his camp will fall’

I.2.2 יודון כל עממא אומיא ולישנא ‘all the nations, peoples and language (groups) will give thanks’

I.2.8 גלן עובדי בני אנשא ‘the deeds of the sons of man are revealed’

I.2.21 על דכרנה דחנה קדם יי ‘the memory of Hannah went in before the Lord’ [פקד יהוה את חנה] ‘the Lord visited Hannah’

I.4.21 ודמית חמוהא ודאתקטיל בעלה ‘and because her father-in-law was dead and her husband had been killed’ [ואל חמיה ואישיה] ‘and because of her father-in-law and her husband’]

II.22.9 משיציא מזופתיה כנומרין דנור דלקא ‘his wrath was destroying like coals of burning fire’

II.22.10 ואתגלי יקריה ‘and his glory was revealed’

II.22.13 מבחקין שמי שמיא ‘(from the visage of his splendour) the heavens of heavens were shining forth’

II.22.47 מתידיב לנא תקוף ופרקן ‘(and blessed is the Strong One, from whom) strength is given to us and salvation’³⁸

II.23.4 דייחות מטרא על ארעא ‘(who hopes ...) that rain will fall on the earth’

In quite a few other cases, the subject also occurs before the verb. However, these instances should not be seen as counterexamples to the above, suggesting a SV pattern, but are better explained as cases in which S has been brought to P₁, one of the special positions of the clause, to which we now turn.³⁹

³⁷ On the placement of the O^p להון, cf. W:5.2.2/5.2.3.

³⁸ On the placement of the O^p לנא, cf. W:5.2.2/5.2.3.

³⁹ Contexts in which it seems legitimate to posit a basic functional pattern SV will be discussed later on (cf. W:6).

4. PRINCIPLE N°3

PRINCIPLE OF PRAGMATIC HIGHLIGHTING

4.1 DEFINITION

As has already been noted, discussions on word order posit that in addition to the four basic slots intended to host verb, subject, direct object and prepositional object, which make up the backbone of the basic functional pattern of the verbal clause, there are special positions that are optionally open to host constituents fulfilling a specific function in the clause. FG formulates this notion as follows:

Constituents with special pragmatic functionality (New Topic, Given Topic, Completive Focus, Contrastive Focus ...) are preferably placed in ‘special positions’, including, at least, the clause-initial position.⁴⁰

As the name given to this principle suggests, in FG the linguistic functions that trigger the placement of constituents in these special positions are known as the ‘pragmatic functions’, and include such functions as Topic and Focus, well-known from other linguistic frameworks.

4.2 PRINCIPLE OF PRAGMATIC HIGHLIGHTING AND TARGUM JONATHAN TO SAMUEL

4.2.1 THE INITIAL POSITION (P_1)

FG further specifies the final part of the statement above by adding the following principle:

*There is a universally relevant clause-initial position P_1 ,
used for special purposes, including the placement
of constituents with Topic or Focus function.⁴¹*

⁴⁰ FG1 (403).

⁴¹ FG1 (408).

The Initial Position P_1 is claimed to be universal from a cross-linguistic perspective, and our corpus makes no exception to that claim. According to this more specific principle, the basic functional pattern VSO^{dOp} in our corpus becomes P_1-VSO^{dOp} .⁴² As will be seen in the following sections, P_1 appears to be used abundantly in the unparallel portions of our corpus, and the pragmatic functionalities of the constituents it is used to highlight are varied. Essentially, constituents encountered in P_1 fulfil the pragmatic functions of Topic, Setting and Focus.⁴³

⁴² The basic functional pattern of the verbal clause in the unparallel portions of our corpus is therefore identical to that of the BH verbal clause (cf. JM §§155kff.; Rosenbaum 1997: 20ff.; Van der Merwe *et al* 1999: §46). Groß (1996) reaches similar conclusions with reference to BH, but tackles the question of word order from an altogether different angle:

1. Groß considers the clauses beginning with *waw* immediately followed by a verb form as specific constructions fulfilling a special function in the discourse (e.g. *wayyiqtol* and *w'qatal*, which indicate a progression between the clause in which they occur and the clause that precedes them, cf. *ibid.*: 97). One of the essential characteristics of these constructions is that P_1 (*Vorfeld*) is *obligatorily empty* (as will be seen in W:4.2.2.3, the conjunction *waw* stands in a distinct, extra-clausal position of the basic functional pattern).
2. In turn, this allows him to conclude that the use of P_1 is otherwise the rule in BH, and that the unmarked pattern of BH is therefore $(waw)P_1VSO$. As a result, in practice V is usually *not* the initial element of the clause (Groß 1996: 136-138; see also 181, 198, 206).

It should be noted that Groß' conclusions on the word order of the verbal clause in BH are not markedly different from those proposed by other scholars. His basic distinction between clauses that begin with verb forms of the types *wayyiqtol/w'qatal* (*w-VSO*) and those that do not (*w-P₁VSO*) acknowledge a well-recognized fact of BH syntax, namely that clauses of the former type indicate a progression in the discourse, whereas clauses of the latter type precisely indicate an absence of progression in the discourse and necessarily involve the P_1 -placement of a non-verbal constituent of the clause (JM §§166a-b). Stating that P_1 -filling is obligatory in the latter type of clauses, Groß then goes on to suggest that in those clauses the P_1 -placement of a constituent does not necessarily bring about markedness: whether the resulting pattern $(waw)P_1VSO$ should be seen as marked or not depends on the nature and function of the constituent that is placed in P_1 . We shall come back to this when the individual pragmatic functions have been discussed (cf. footnote n.82 below).

⁴³ The understanding of the pragmatic functions adopted in this study is based on the work of FG, and is largely derived from FG1 (309-338) and FG2 (379-407). Some other scholars have applied the FG framework to languages of their own interest, and the methodology adopted in this study relies on their work as well (essentially Buth 1987 and 1995 on BA; Rosenbaum 1997 on BH). Groß' study of the use of P_1 in BH follows a slightly different approach, and will be briefly discussed later on in this chapter (cf. footnote n.82 below). Only the most salient features of FG will be exposed in this study. For a more comprehensive treatment of FG, the

4.2.1.1 Topic and Topicality⁴⁴

4.2.1.1.1 Definitions

As Dik explains,⁴⁵ a discourse taken in the wide sense of any kind of coherent text (a story, a monologue, a dialogue, a lecture, etc.) is ‘about’ certain entities. For those entities about which a certain discourse imparts information FG uses the term Discourse Topic (D-Topic). One discourse may have different D-Topics, some more central to the discourse than others, and D-Topics may also be hierarchically organized. The notion of D-Topic should therefore be interpreted relatively to the stretch of discourse (book, chapter, section, paragraph, and ultimately the individual clause) under consideration.⁴⁶

In an abstract sense we may think of the discourse as containing a ‘topic store’ that is empty at the beginning of the discourse and is gradually filled with D-Topics as these are introduced into the discourse. Some D-Topics will be short-lived and disappear quickly, others will be more pervasive and kept alive all through the discourse.

1. If a discourse is to be about a certain D-Topic, that D-Topic will, at some point, have to be introduced for the first time, e.g. ‘last week, John gave *a party*’. Such a first presentation of a D-Topic will be called a New Topic (NewTop); once the entity in question has been introduced, it can then be considered a Given Topic (GivTop).

2. Sometimes, given a certain GivTop we may go on to talk about another D-Topic related to it ‘as if’ it had been introduced before. For example, once we have introduced John’s party as a D-Topic, we may go on to talk about ‘the music’ as if it were a GivTop, e.g.: ‘John gave a party last week, but *the music* was awful’. This is warranted on the basis of the common knowledge that usually some music is played at parties, and that the music may be important for the atmosphere. In other words, the entity ‘music’ can reasonably be considered to be

reader is referred to the aforementioned texts. In the discussion below specific reference to these texts will be made when appropriate. Finally, the section below focusses on the use of P₁. The activation, if any, of other special positions in the clause will be provisionally disregarded and will be the object of a separate discussion (cf. W:4.2.2).

⁴⁴ FG1 (313-326); Rosenbaum (1997: 26-41).

⁴⁵ FG1 (313-315).

⁴⁶ For example, this doctoral dissertation is ‘about’ the syntax of the Aramaic of TJS, this chapter is ‘about’ word order and this section is ‘about’ the pragmatic function of Topic.

inferred from the GivTop ‘party’. The entity ‘music’ will be termed a Sub-Topic (SubTop) of the GivTop entity ‘party’.⁴⁷

As the above suggests, languages develop specific linguistic strategies to fulfil these three tasks, which may be termed D-Topic *Introduction* (NewTop), *Maintenance* (GivTop) and *Inference* (SubTop) respectively. These strategies vary from language to language, and operate at various linguistic levels (morphology, prosody, word order, etc.). Considering the topic of this chapter, however, we will be concerned with the way pragmatic considerations affect or otherwise involve word order.⁴⁸ In this connection, P₁-placement appears to be an important Topic marking strategy in the Aramaic of TJS. The instances in the unparallel portions of our corpus where Topic function assignment is observed are listed below.⁴⁹

4.2.1.1.2 New Topic

I.3.3 וקלא אשתמע מהיכלא דיוי ‘and a voice was heard from the temple of the Lord’⁵⁰

4.2.1.1.3 Given Topic

I.2.8 ארי קדם יוי גלן עובדי בני אנשא ‘before the Lord the deeds of the sons of men are revealed’

II.22.3 אלהי דאתרעי בי קרבני לדחלתיה ‘My God, who takes delight in me, has

⁴⁷ The FG framework further distinguishes a fourth type of Topic: the Resumed Topic, or ResTop. Inasmuch as instances of P₁-placement of ResTop entities are not encountered in the unparallel portions of our corpus, the notion of ResTop will not be dealt with in our discussion.

⁴⁸ Cf. Rosenbaum (1997: 30).

⁴⁹ TJS as a whole features many instances of Topic function assignment. Many of these, however, run parallel to the Vorlage, insofar as P₁-placement is an active Topic marking strategy in BH as well (cf. Van der Merwe *et al* 1999: §47). In agreement with the methodology adopted in this chapter (i.e. focussing on the unparallel portions of our corpus), however, the instances listed below feature only those cases that do not parallel the Vorlage.

⁵⁰ The entity ‘voice’ actually refers to God, who is about to speak to Samuel. Though the Lord can be considered to be the one central, overarching D-Topic of the whole discourse (cf. W:4.2.1.1.3, esp. footnote n.51 below), assigning the NewTop function to His ‘voice’ allows Him to be introduced as an active participant in the ensuing passage.

drawn me near to fear of him’

II.22.3 דמן קדמוהי מתיהיב לי תקוף ופרקן ‘*from before whom [lit. him] strength is given to me and redemption*’

II.22.47 דמן קדמוהי מתיהיב לנא תקוף ופרקן ‘(and blessed is the Strong One), *from whom [lit. him] strength is given to us and salvation*’

II.23.3 דבר צור ישראל ‘*the powerful one of Israel (...) said*’ [אמר ... אמר ‘the rock of Israel spoke’]⁵¹

4.2.1.1.4 SubTopic

I.2.1 ועל ידוהי יתעבדן להון נסין וגבורן ‘and *by his hands* signs and mighty deeds will be done for them’⁵²

I.2.3 ועל כל עובדוהי מתיח דינא ‘and *upon all his works* judgement is extended’

I.4.4/II.6.2 דשכינתיה שריא עיל מן כרוביא ‘(the Lord of Hosts) *whose Shekinah* resides above the Cherubim’ [שב הכרובים] ‘(who) resides (between) the Cherubim’]

II.22.3 דעל מומריה אנא רחין בעדן עקא ‘in that I trust *his Memra* in times of distress’⁵³

⁵¹ As we can gather from these instances, in the unparallel portions of our corpus constituents with God as referent are regularly assigned the GivTop function and placed in P₁. This is consistent with the discourse as a whole, inasmuch as the discourse is intended as praise to God, His unicity, faithfulness to those who follow His ways and wrath against those who do not. God can be regarded as the one overarching D-Topic, i.e. the D-Topic *par excellence* of the whole discourse, which makes constituents referring to Him prime candidates for GivTop function assignment and P₁-placement.

⁵² This predication is a part of the Song of Hannah bearing on her son Samuel. Samuel having been introduced into the discourse two predications before, one can go on to speak more specifically about his hands, in this case as a way to refer figuratively to his actions.

⁵³ In I.4.4, II.6.2 and II.22.3 we witness the same phenomenon as we observed with GivTops referring to God. God is the D-Topic *par excellence* of the discourse, and SubTops can be derived from his D-Topical status when the need is felt to refer more specifically to one of his aspects.

4.2.1.2 Focus and Focality⁵⁴

P₁-placement appears to be an important strategy to mark constituents with Focus function in the unparallel portions of our corpus. Within the present study, we will distinguish two main types of Focus, depending on the context they operate in: interaction-internal Focus and discourse-internal Focus.⁵⁵

4.2.1.2.1 Interaction-Internal Focus

4.2.1.2.1.1 *Definition*

According to the FG framework, the primary function of any verbal interaction is to impart information. Let us suppose a verbal interaction involving two individuals, who in turn play the role of Speaker (Spk) and Addressee (Ad).⁵⁶ At any stage in the verbal interaction, both Spk and Ad have a vast amount of *pragmatic information*, which is understood as ‘the full body of knowledge, beliefs, assumptions, opinions, and feelings available to an individual at any point in the interaction’.⁵⁷ The pragmatic information consists of three main components: general information,⁵⁸ situational information⁵⁹ and contextual information.⁶⁰

⁵⁴ Cf. FG1 (326-338); Rosenbaum (1997: 62-97).

⁵⁵ These two terms have been coined for the present study. Though I am using a terminology slightly different from that of FG, the types of Focus that will be considered here are essentially identical to those exposed by FG. The terminology adopted here is concerned with the inherent linguistic organization of the Focus function and is taken to better reflect the nature of the corpus we are dealing with.

⁵⁶ The FG model of verbal interaction is rather subtle and refined. The short account provided in this study is not meant to do full justice to its complexity. Rather, only the most important features of the model will be dealt with here. The discussion below is derived, often *verbatim*, from FG1: 8-12, to which the reader is referred for more details. Rosenbaum (1997: 12ff., 62ff.) also provides a useful summary of the model.

⁵⁷ FG1: 10. Dik stresses that ‘the term “information” is not meant to be restricted to cognitive knowledge, but includes any possible item which is somehow present in the mental world of individuals, including their preconceptions and prejudices’ (FG1: 10).

⁵⁸ Long-term information concerning the world, its natural and cultural features, and other possible or imaginary worlds, e.g. the fact that the Earth revolves around the Sun, that there is a country called the Netherlands (etc.).

Dik goes on: ‘The pragmatic information of S[*pk*] and A[*d*] will normally have a great deal in common [...], but there will also be information which is only available to S[*pk*], or only to A[*d*]. The actual point of the verbal interaction is typically located in this non-shared information [...]. We can now say that *the primary function of verbal interaction is for S[*pk*] to effect changes in the pragmatic information of A[*d*]*’.⁶¹ The changes to be effected pertain precisely to the dimension of focality:⁶² ‘the focal information will thus concern the changes that S[*pk*] wishes to bring about in the pragmatic information of A[*d*]. Such changes may take different forms: S[*pk*] may wish to ADD pieces of information to A[*d*]’s pragmatic information, or he may wish to REPLACE some piece of information X which he assumes A[*d*] possesses by some piece of information Y which he possesses himself’.⁶³

The last part of FG’s statement above further introduces two main types of interaction-internal Focus, depending on the communicative point of the Focus function: ‘information gap’ and ‘contrast’. In the unparallel portions of our corpus, the ‘information gap’ type of Focus bears on certain specific cases that, in view of the questions they raise with respect to word order, are better treated in a separate section of this chapter (W:6.1.2.1). We will therefore postpone the discussion of the ‘information gap’ Focus to that point and for now we will concentrate on the contrastive Focus.

⁵⁹ Information derived from what the participants perceive or otherwise experience in the situation in which the interaction takes place, e.g. ‘do you see the man with the red coat over there?’.

⁶⁰ Information derived from the linguistic expressions which are exchanged before or after any given point in the verbal interaction. Thus if in the course of a verbal interaction Spk and Ad are speaking about a common friend John, and Spk mentions a party organized by John (e.g. ‘last week, John organized *a party*’), one can assume that the entity ‘party’ will be present in Ad’s pragmatic information once it has been mentioned in the interaction. As was seen above, the entity ‘party’ would then be considered a D-Topic in that interaction (cf. W:4.2.1.1.1).

⁶¹ Emphasis mine (cf. FG1: 10).

⁶² FG1 (326): ‘the focal information in a linguistic expression is that information which is relatively the most important or salient in the given communicative setting, and considered by S[*pk*] to be most essential for A[*d*] to integrate into his pragmatic information’.

⁶³ FG1 (326).

4.2.1.2.1.2 *Interaction-Internal: Contrastive Focus*

The contrastive type of Focus presupposes, as its name indicates, a contrast between two (or more) elements. As an interaction-internal type of Focus, it involves a contrast bearing on some elements of the pragmatic informations of Spk and Ad, i.e. a contrast between the focal constituent and alternative pieces of information, the information presented by Spk being opposed to other, similar information which Spk presupposes to be entertained by Ad.⁶⁴

The contrastive Focus operating within the context of a verbal interaction is further divided into different subcategories, of which two are attested in our corpus: the *expanding* Focus and the *replacing* Focus.⁶⁵

a) Expanding Focus:

In the case of the expanding Focus, Spk presumes that Ad possesses a correct piece of information X, but that X is not complete. Spk knows that there is at least one piece of information Y which it is also relevant for Ad to know. Schematically:

(1) Ad presupposes: ‘John bought apples’

(2) Spk corrects:

‘John not only bought *apples*, he also bought *bananas*’

‘Yes, but he also bought *bananas*’

In the unparallel portions of our corpus, one certain case of expanding Focus is encountered:

I.2.3 ואף לכן עתיד לשלמא פורענות חוביכון ‘*and also to you* he is to repay the revenge of your sins’⁶⁶

⁶⁴ For that reason, that type of Focus is also termed ‘counter-presuppositional’ in the FG framework (cf. FG1: 332-335).

⁶⁵ FG further distinguishes the following counter-presuppositional types of Focus: rejecting Focus, restricting Focus and selecting Focus (cf FG1: 330-335).

⁶⁶ In this passage, Hannah (Spk) is addressing the Chaldeans (Ad) in her prophecy. Hannah’s pragmatic information includes the notion that God rewards the righteous and punishes the sinner. The scope of the Focus in this verse is the constituent לכן ‘to you’ (i.e. the Chaldeans), placed in P₁, and the contrastive element between Hannah’s and the Chaldeans’ pragmatic information is that in contrast to what Hannah presumes the Chaldeans might expect, according to Hannah the Chaldeans too belong to the unrighteous who will ultimately be punished.

b) Replacing Focus:

In the case of the replacing Focus, Spk presumes that Ad possesses some incorrect piece of information X, which is to be replaced by some correct piece of information Y. Schematically:

- (1) Ad presupposes: ‘John bought apples’
- (2) Spk corrects: ‘No, he bought *bananas*’⁶⁷

In the unparallel portions of our corpus, one unambiguous case of replacing Focus is encountered:

I.2.2 וְסֵם יִתְעַבֵּד בּוֹ ‘but *a great sign* will be worked on him’⁶⁸

4.2.1.2.2 Discourse-Internal: Contrastive Focus

The discourse-internal type of Focus is contrastive (as against ‘information gap’) in nature. In contrast to interaction-internal focality, the element placed in Focus here is contrasted to some other element within the discourse itself rather than to some element inside Ad’s pragmatic information.⁶⁹ The point is then not to alter Ad’s pragmatic

⁶⁷ In theory, the Focus function can bear on any part of the predication, e.g.:

- ‘John went to the movies’ — ‘No, he went to *the pub*’ (Focus on constituent);
- ‘John bought a book’ — ‘No, he *sold* a book’ (Focus on predicate [Verb]);
- ‘John went to the movies’ — ‘No, he *stayed at his friend’s place*’ (Focus on predicate [Verb + constituent]).

Inasmuch as the present study is concerned with the ordering of the constituents within the verbal clause, we will concentrate on those cases of Focus that bear on individual constituents.

⁶⁸ The assignment of the Focus function to the constituent ‘a great sign’ reflects Spk’s opinion that this great sign is contrary to what Ad might have expected on the basis of his pragmatic information. Whereas the preceding predication might have led Ad to envision a dire fate for Jerusalem, Spk heralds that, on the contrary, a great sign will be worked on the invader: his armies will be decimated, which in turn will trigger a climactic glorification of the Lord: I.2.2 ‘therefore all the nations, peoples, and language (groups) will give thanks and say: “there is none who is holy except the Lord, for there is none apart from you”, and your people will say: “there is none who is strong except our God”’.

⁶⁹ As Rosenbaum (1997: 70) puts it: in this type of focality, ‘the Focus is occasioned not by the opposition between [Spk’s and Ad’s] pragmatic information, rather by the *relationship(s) of contrast* internal to the predication proper’. What is referred to as ‘discourse-internal Focus’ in this study comes close to what FG calls ‘Parallel Focus’ (cf. FG1: 331-332). For his part, Rosenbaum prefers the label ‘Comparing Focus’.

information the way counter-presuppositional focality does, but rather to draw Ad's attention to the fact that, in Spk's view, two (or more) elements within the discourse are in some way markedly different to one another. The following instances encountered in the unparallel portions of our corpus will illustrate the point:

I.2.2 ועמך יִמְרוֹן 'and *your people* will say: (there is no one who is strong except our God)',⁷⁰

I.4.8 ולעמיה עבד פִּרְשָׁן 'but for his people he did wonders',⁷¹

4.2.1.3 Setting and Contextualization⁷²

In the preceding sections we have seen that a discourse, understood in a wide sense as a stretch of coherent text, is 'about' certain entities (topical dimension), labelled D-Topics, and that it imparts information about them (focal dimension). This process of imparting information about D-Topics does not happen *in abstracto*, however, but rather takes place in a given context. In general, this context is provided by the discourse itself, in the sense that each contribution to the discourse is made sense of in the light of what precedes in the discourse.⁷³ As a result, languages develop specific strategies intended to *contextualize* each contribution with reference to the larger stretch of discourse in which it obtains, as a means to maintain and enhance discourse cohesion. One of these strategies consists in specifying the spatial and/or temporal circumstances in which a given situation unfolds, and then in employing that spatial and/or temporal framework to orient Ad in relating the

⁷⁰ The constituent עמך 'your people' is contrasted to the constituent כל עממיה אומיה 'all the nations, people and language groups' encountered earlier in the same verse (I.2.2 'therefore all the nations, peoples and language groups will give thanks and say: "there is not one who is holy except the Lord"'). Hannah first describes the predicted reaction of all nations of the earth on the Lord's great sign worked against Sennacherib, and then moves on to describe the reaction of the Lord's people specifically. Assigning the Focus function to the constituent עמך 'your people' allows to underscore the change of actors within the discourse. (Precisely the same state of affairs is encountered in II.22.32.)

⁷¹ The constituent לעמיה 'and for his people' is contrasted to the constituent יה מִשְׂרָא 'the Egyptians' in the preceding predication: whereas the Lord struck down the Egyptians with every plague, for his people he did wonders in the wilderness.

⁷² Cf. FG2 (396-398); Rosenbaum (1997: 41-44).

⁷³ As Dik explains, 'each subsequent contribution to the discourse must be anchored in the setting as built up in the preceding discourse' (FG2: 396-397).

reported situation to the rest of the discourse. Consider the following example:

- (1) Bill came home *in the evening* and found the house empty.
- (2) He found a note awaiting him *in the bedroom*.

Both clauses contain a constituent, ‘in the evening’ and ‘in the bedroom’, which has been assigned the semantic function of Time or Location respectively.⁷⁴ In the example below, the two clauses, though featuring precisely the same components, also display one significant difference:

- (1) *In the evening*, Bill came home and found the house empty.
- (2) *In the bedroom*, he found a note awaiting him.

Aside from the obvious difference in word order, one notices that the Time and Location constituents are no longer used for the sole purpose of specifying temporal and spatial coordinates. In addition to their semantic function, they now also fulfil a specific pragmatic task, which is to assist Ad in relating the predications in which they occur (‘Bill came home and found the house empty’ and ‘he found a note waiting for him’) to the larger discourse. In concrete terms, they are now also employed to specify a context, into which Ad is invited to set the reported situations. Within the framework of FG, this contextualizing function is captured by the assignment of the pragmatic function of *Setting* to the relevant constituents. As Buth explains, Setting is not the same as Topic or Focus; rather, it ‘presents the framework within which the Topic is stated and commented upon’,⁷⁵ i.e. the framework within which a Topic is introduced, maintained (etc.) and information is imparted about it (Focus).

Constituents with the semantic functions of Location and Time are prime candidates for the fulfilment of contextualization, as spatial and temporal coordinates belong to the most crucial components of deixis. As a result, within the framework of FG the assignment of the Setting function is restricted to constituents with one of these two semantic functions.⁷⁶ As Buth has argued, however, spatial and temporal

⁷⁴ I.e. the semantic role they play in the predication is to specify the time at which, or the place in which, the reported situation obtains (cf. FG1: 243).

⁷⁵ Buth (1987: 51).

⁷⁶ Dik: ‘I here restrict the notion of “setting” to the time and place coordinates

specifications are not the only means by which Ad's awareness can be oriented with reference to the discourse, and he noted that the pragmatic function of 'Setting should also include a "logical" framework (e.g. "concerning the proposal")'.⁷⁷ This broadening of the definition of Setting proves both legitimate and useful for the study of the word order in the unparallel portions of our corpus.⁷⁸

P₁-placement appears to be a productive strategy to mark a constituent with Setting in the Aramaic of TJS. The instances in the unparallel portions of our corpus where Setting function assignment is observed are listed below:

I.2.1 בְּיוֹמוֹהִי יִתְפָּרֶקֶן מִיַּד דְּפִלְשְׁתַּאי 'in his days they will be saved from the hand of the Philistines'

defined explicitly or implicitly in the discourse' (FG2: 397).

⁷⁷ Buth (1987: 51).

⁷⁸ In 1995, however, Buth further expanded the notion of contextualization by redefining the constituent upon which the contextualizing function is brought to bear as 'a constituent of a clause that has received special marking (either by word order, a special particle, or intonation, depending on the language) *in order to signal the intended perspective for relating the clause to the larger context*' (Buth 1995: 84; emphasis mine). Following this broadening of the definition, Time and Location constituents would no longer be the only semantic elements available for the assignment of the contextualizing function. To make his point, Buth provided *inter alia* the following instance:

- (1) 'He hit it *with a bat*'
- (2) 'Then *with the bat* he hit it'

and stated that the constituent 'with the bat', which has been assigned the semantic function of Instrument (that 'specifies the tool with which some action is carried out', cf. FG1: 230) in sentence n°2 could be analyzed as contextualizing the ensuing predication just as much as the constituents 'in the evening' and 'in the bedroom' discussed before. Finally, this broadening of the Setting function also led Buth to rename it with the broader label *Contextualizing Constituent* (C.C.).

Buth's expansion of the Setting function into that of C.C. is certainly interesting and worth further investigation. Yet, it has not been found useful for the present study, and has therefore not been adopted here. In addition, another difficulty with Buth's notion of C.C. is that Buth also equates the notions of C.C. and Topic, stating that the purpose of a C.C./Topic 'is to help the listener understand how and on what basis some sentences are grouped together' (1995: 84). In my view, such an equation between Topic and C.C. is unacceptable. In 1987, in contrast, Buth emphasized that Setting should not be confused with either Topic or Focus. Rather, the Setting 'presents the framework within which the Topic is stated and commented upon' (1987: 51), i.e. Setting defines a context within which a D-Topic is introduced, maintained, resumed (etc.) and information is imparted about it (Focus). In the present study, the pragmatic functions of Setting and Topic will be kept strictly separate, and will be understood in terms of the notions of contextualization and 'aboutness' respectively.

- I.2.2 על סנחריב מלכא דאתור אתביאת ואמרת *'concerning Sennacherib the king of Assyria she prophesied and said'*
- I.2.2 תמן יפלון פגרי משריתיה *'there the corpses of his camp will fall'*
- I.2.3 על נבוכדנצר מלכא דבבל אתנביאת ואמרת *'concerning Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon she prophesied and said'*
- I.2.4 על מלכות יון אתנביאת ואמרת *'concerning the kingdom of Greece she prophesied and said'*
- I.2.5 על בנהי דהמן אתנביאת ואמרת *'concerning the sons of Haman she prophesied and said'*⁷⁹
- I.2.8 מלרע אתקין גיהם לרשיעא *'below he has established the Gehenna for the wicked ones'*
- I.2.32 בתר כן אתי טבתא על ישראל *'after that I will bring prosperity over Israel'*
- I.6.6 בתר כן שלחונון *'afterwards they sent them away'* [וישלחום]⁸⁰
- II.3.8 מכען הויתי גבר הדיוט לשארא דבית יהודה *'from now on have I become a common man for the remnant of the house of Judah?'*
- II.22.32 על נסא ופרקנא דתעביד למשיך ... יודון כל עממא אומיא ולישניא *'on account of the sign and salvation that you work for your anointed one (...), all the nations, peoples and language groups will give thanks'*
- II.22.47 על נסא ופרקנא דעברתא לעמך אודיו *'on account of the sign and salvation that you have done for your people, they gave thanks'*
- II.23.2 ברוח נבואה קדם יי אנא ממליל אלין *'in a spirit of prophecy before the Lord I am speaking these things'*

To conclude our discussion of the Setting function, two final remarks are in order:

1. Constituents that are assigned the Setting function are typically satellites, not arguments, i.e. they are no nuclear constituents of

⁷⁹ These four examples further illustrate an interesting point, which Buth (1995: 84) refers to impressionistically as 'eclipse structure'. Essentially, Buth noted that various pragmatic functions can converge on one and the same constituent when circumstances dictate. Thus in the four instances under discussion, the constituents 'concerning Sennacherib the king of Assyria', 'concerning Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon', 'concerning the kingdom of Greece' and 'concerning the sons of Haman' are at once NewTop and Setting, i.e. they introduce new D-Topics into the discourse and use them as contextualizers in one move. Likewise, the constituent 'by his hands' in I.2.1 ועל ידוהי יתעבדן להון נסין וגבורין *'and by his hands signs and mighty deeds will be done for them'* displays a conflation of the SubTop and Setting functions: the entity 'hands' is first inferred from the GivTop Samuel, and then used to perspectivize the ensuing predication.

⁸⁰ In this case TJS inserts a Setting constituent in a predication already present in the Vorlage, thereby activating P_i in that clause.

the clause, inasmuch as theoretically they could be dispensed with without affecting the integrity of the SoA denoted by the predication. Constituents with the Setting function therefore form an exception to the methodology adopted in this study, according to which only the nuclear constituents of the predication are considered.

2. According to the FG framework the pragmatic function of Setting can be either intra-clausal or extra-clausal.⁸¹ In the Aramaic of TJS, however, the Setting function always bears on *intra-clausal* constituents, which comes out clearly from the two following observations:

- (1) Setting constituents are not detached from the clause (as a *casus pendens*), but rather retain the grammatical elements (i.e. essentially prepositions: -ב, -ל, על) that indicate their semantic function in the clause;
- (2) Setting constituents are not echoed in the clause proper by means of some resumptive element.⁸²

⁸¹ Cf. FG2 (398). For the distinction between intra-clausal and extra-clausal pragmatic functions, cf. W:4.2.2.1.

⁸² BH functions in essentially the same way, i.e. P_1 is available for constituents with Topic, Focus or Setting function. As was seen earlier, however, according to Groß the P_1 -placement of a constituent does not necessarily bring about markedness, inasmuch as the filling of P_1 is obligatory in the BH verbal clause (cf. footnote n.42 above). Essentially, in Groß' view the (un)markedness of the (waw) P_1 VSO pattern depends on the nature and function of the constituent that is placed into P_1 : to put it in FG terms the pattern will be marked if the constituent has been assigned the Focus function (*Fokus/Rhema* in Groß' terminology), and unmarked if it has been assigned the Topic or Setting function (Groß 1996: 136-138). Regarding the Topic function specifically, Groß actually speaks of *Subject*, but likewise acknowledges (*ibid.*: 63) the insight of FG that S is a prime candidate for Topic function assignment (FG1: 254ff.): the Subject can therefore be considered to have been placed into P_1 in its capacity as GivTop. Consequently, the frequent P_1 -placement of S in clauses in which P_1 has to be filled does not come as a surprise. Finally, Setting constituents offer a suitable alternative, inasmuch as they allow one to contextualize the statement in which the Topic is commented upon. Groß' conclusion that when a clause features both S and a Setting constituent it is usually the latter that is placed into P_1 (unless S is focal, *ibid.*: 181, 199) is very interesting, inasmuch as it contributes to our understanding of the mechanics of P_1 -placement in BH, by establishing a hierarchy among the pragmatic functions for P_1 -availability.

4.2.2 EXTRA-CLAUSAL SPECIAL POSITIONS

4.2.2.1 Introduction

The initial formulation of the Principle of Pragmatic Highlighting above gave way to yet other special positions within the basic functional pattern. Essentially, FG recognizes two different types of special positions in the clause: those that belong to the clause proper (intra-clausal special positions), and those that do not (extra-clausal special positions). Accordingly, pragmatic functions are shared between those where the constituent on which they bear remains an integral constituent of the clause ('intra-clausal pragmatic functions'), and those where, on the contrary, the relevant constituent stands outside the clause ('extra-clausal pragmatic functions').

The Aramaic of TJS knows only one intra-clausal special position, P_1 , which, as we have seen, is open to constituents with the pragmatic functions of Topic, Focus and Setting. Like many languages, however, the Aramaic of TJS knows other, extra-clausal positions as well. Two of these positions are available to constituents with the functions of Theme and Vocative;⁸³ another, specific position is intended for the placement of certain Discourse Particles. Taking into account these three additional extra-clausal positions, the basic functional pattern of the clause becomes:

$(P_{Voc}), P_{dp}, P_0, P_1$ -VSO, (P_{Voc})

1. VSO
2. Special positions:
 - a) Intra-clausal:
 - P_1 : Initial position reserved for Topic, Focus and Setting constituents; the dash connecting P_1 to the Basic Functional Pattern VSO in the diagram above indicates that this position is internal to the predication.
 - b) Extra-clausal (the commas featured in the pattern above indicate

⁸³ Expositions of the FG framework usually feature yet another extra-clausal pragmatic function (Tail) and its corresponding extra-clausal special position, both of which actually mirror the function fulfilled by, and the special position assigned to the Theme function (cf. FG2: 401-403). Inasmuch as no clear cases of Tail function assignment have been encountered in the unparallel portions of our corpus, the function of Tail will not be further considered in this study.

that these positions are external to the predication proper):⁸⁴

- P₀: Position reserved for Theme constituents
- P_{dp}: Position reserved for Discourse Particles
- (P_{voc}): Position reserved for Vocative constituents; the parentheses indicate that it can precede, interrupt or follow the predication.⁸⁵

The discussion below will outline the nature of these additional pragmatic functions, illustrate the use of the corresponding positions, and will also explain how the linearization of some of these positions in the Basic Functional Pattern has been reached.

4.2.2.2 Theme and Extraposition (P₀)⁸⁶

The special position P₀, which is located before the actual predication (i.e. immediately before P₁), is reserved for the placement of Theme constituents. Functionally, according to FG a ‘constituent with Theme function specifies an ensemble of entities with respect to which the following clause is going to present some relevant information’.⁸⁷ If we consider the following clause:

‘As for John, he did not find the music that unpleasant’.

the Theme function can be said to reflect ‘the following strategy of S[*pk*]:

- (i) here is something [*John*] with respect to which I am going to produce some information;
- (ii) and here is what I want to say about it [*he did not find the music that unpleasant*].

Thus, a Theme constituent orients A[d] with respect to the discourse topics in relation to which the content of the ensuing clause is to be

⁸⁴ Following Rosenbaum (1997: 135-136).

⁸⁵ Following Rosenbaum (1997: 135-136).

⁸⁶ Cf. FG2 (389-395); Rosenbaum (1997: 44-60).

⁸⁷ FG2 (389).

interpreted'.⁸⁸

Admittedly, this definition is not very different from that of Topic which, as we have seen, specifies constituents that (a stretch of) the discourse is 'about'. And indeed, Dik admits that the difference between Topic and Theme may at times be very slight.⁸⁹ Buth and Rosenbaum echo that statement, advancing the view that Topic and Theme are functionally equivalent, the distinction being essentially one of syntax, i.e. Topic is intra-clausal and Theme extra-clausal.⁹⁰

One of the most prominent features of the Theme function is that the semantic role played by the Theme constituent in the clause itself may, depending on the languages, be carried out vicariously by some resumptive element (as a rule a personal or demonstrative pronoun coreferential with the Theme). In a language such as English, the absence of a resumptive element is uncommon.⁹¹ Hence, in the sentence above the role played by John in the actual predication is fulfilled by a resumptive personal pronoun:

'As for John, *he* did not find the music that unpleasant'

The same is true of the Aramaic of TJS, inasmuch as constituents with Theme function are resumed within the predication by means of some

⁸⁸ FG2 (389). The BH inventory of pragmatic functions also includes the Theme function (cf. Khan 1988; JM §156; Rosenbaum 1997: 44-60). Theme structures are variously known as '*casus pendens*', 'extraposition', 'left-dislocation' (etc.), depending on the linguistic frameworks referred to. For a detailed treatment of Theme constructions in the Semitic languages, cf. Khan (1988).

⁸⁹ FG2 (395).

⁹⁰ Buth (1987: 47): 'Although FG distinguishes Theme and Topic as two different pragmatic functions, they differ more in syntax than pragmatics. A Theme can be thought of as a marked Topic [...] which is outside of the predication, while a Topic is included in a predication'. Rosenbaum (1997: 45): 'The crucial difference [between Topic and Theme] is syntactic, rather than pragmatic: Theme is a marked Topic which appears outside of the predication, a Topic is included in the predication [...]. On the pragmatic level, Theme is equivalent to a marked Topic'.

⁹¹ Cf. Rosenbaum (1997: 46). This holds true for BH (cf. JM §156; Rosenbaum 1997: 47). Obviously, resumption obtains only when the referent of the constituent plays a semantic role in the predication. E.g. in English, in the clause 'as for Paris, the Eiffel Tower is beautiful' we should not expect the constituent 'Paris' to be resumed in the predication proper, as it does not play a semantic role in that predication. In contrast, in the clause 'as for Paris, I visited *it* when I was a child', we find a resumptive pronominal element, because the constituent 'Paris' plays a semantic role in that predication.

resumptive element:

I.2.4 'and those of the house of the Hasmonean, who were weak — mighty deeds will be done for them' ... יתעבדן להון גבורן ...

The presence of a resumptive element in the predication is therefore one of the surest indicators that we are indeed dealing with a Theme (as against Topic) constituent. For that very reason, however, the task of recognizing Theme constituents is particularly delicate when the constituent entertained as a candidate is at the same time the syntactic Subject of the predication. As Aramaic regularly dispenses with the expression of the Subject in verbal clauses (i.e. the Subject is subsumed into the verb form itself, e.g. אמר '[he] said'), one cannot always ascertain whether one is dealing with a Theme constituent in P_0 or with a Topic constituent in P_1 . Thus the constituent יי 'the Lord' in I.2.10 יי עביד פרענות 'the Lord will exact just revenge from Gog ...' could be read as:

- Topical: '*The Lord*_[GivTop] will exact just revenge from Gog ...'; or as
- Thematic: '*As for the Lord*_[Theme], *He*_[Resumptive element] will exact just revenge from Gog ...'.

The same is true of any D-Topic constituent that, fulfilling the syntactic function of Subject in a verbal predication, also occurs clause-initially. Sometimes, syntactic parallelism may tip the scales in favour of either possibility.⁹² But the fact remains that there is no easy solution to that problem. No doubt other linguistic parameters such as prosody and intonation patterns might shed some light on the matter. But for lack of

⁹² I.2.5 'those who were filled up on bread and growing in wealth and abounding in money, have become poor'; I.2.5 מרדכי 'Mordecai and Esther, who were needy, became rich and forgot their poverty' and I.2.5 'So Jerusalem, which was like a barren woman, is to be filled with her exiled people' are cases in point. The constituents 'those who ...', 'Mordecai and Esther ...' and 'Jerusalem ...' could indeed be read either as Topics or as Themes. The following predication I.2.5 'and Rome, which was filled with great numbers of people, her armies will cease to be', however, undisputably features a Thematic structure (which can be seen from the resumption *her* armies'). The fact that all four predications form a unit within the discourse (each predication featuring an entity and then predicting the Lord's actions towards it) may be taken as suggestive, by virtue of syntactic parallelism, that the constituents 'those who ...', 'Mordecai and Esther ...' and 'Jerusalem ...' in the three preceding predications are also to be read as Themes rather than Topics.

knowledge of how the Targumic text was actually uttered this question is bound to remain unanswered. In the final analysis, the only unambiguous instances of Theme structures evidenced by our corpus are:

- I.2.1 ואף הימן ... הוא וארבעת עשר בנוהי למהוי אמרין בשירא 'and also *Heman* (the son of Joel, the son of my son Samuel who is to arise) — *he* and *his* fourteen sons are to be speaking in song'⁹³
- I.2.4 ורבית חשמונאי דהוו חלשין ... יתעבדן להון גבורן 'and those of the house of the *Hasmonean*, who were weak — mighty deeds will be done for *them*'
- I.2.5 ורומי דמליא סגי עממיא יסופון משריתהא 'and *Rome*, which was filled with great numbers of people — *her* armies will cease to be'
- I.2.8 וצדיקיא עבדי רעותיה שכליל להון חבל 'and the just ones, those doing his good pleasure — he has established the world for *them*'
- II.22.26 אברהם ... בכין אסניתא למעבד חסדא עם זרעיה 'Abraham (who was found pious before you) — therefore you did much kindness to *his* seed'
- II.22.26 יצחק ... בכין אשלימתא מימר רעותך עמיה 'Isaac (who was blameless before you) — therefore you made perfect the word of your good pleasure with *him*'
- II.22.27 יעקב ... בחרתא בנוהי מכל עממיא אפרישתא זרעיה מכל פסולא 'Jacob (who was walking in purity before you) — you chose *his* sons from all the nations, you set apart *his* seed from every blemish'
- II.22.27 פרעה ומצראי ... בלבילתנן כמחשבתהון 'And Pharaoh and the Egyptians (who plotted against your people) — you mixed *them* up like *their* plans'

4.2.2.3 Discourse Particles (P_{dp})

The Functional Pattern of the Aramaic of TJS also includes P_{dp}, a special position reserved for the placement of discourse particles (DP), mostly conjunctions and adverbials that can be best understood as discourse connectors.⁹⁴ Among the DP's encountered in the untranslated passages

⁹³ In this particular case, the predication proper is a nominal rather than verbal clause. This, however, is irrelevant to the argument, as the point here is to discuss the double relationship of extraposition/resumption between Theme constituents in P₀ and the ensuing predications, whatever the nature of the latter may be.

⁹⁴ The notion of 'discourse particle' is borrowed from Rosenbaum (1997: 22-23). The basic functional pattern of BH also features a special position for conjunctions

of TJS are: ו- ‘and’, ארי ‘for’, כין ‘so, thus’, בכין ‘therefore’, על כין ‘therefore’, אף ‘also’.⁹⁵ The conjunction ו- can likewise combine with other particles to give rise to complex particles, e.g. ואף ‘and also’, ובכין ‘and therefore’. Considering the frequency of use of the coordinating conjunction ו- in BH and Aramaic, examples involving it abound in the passages under discussion. Among many others:

- I.2.10 ויתין תוקפא למלכיה ‘and he will give power to his king’
- II.22.29 ויחזיני בעלמא ‘and he shows me the world’
- II.23.4 וייטב לכון ‘and it will be good for you’
- II.23.8 ומתביב על ידי מורניתיה תמני מאה קטילין בזמן חדא ‘and he cuts down with his spear eight hundred killed in one time’

Examples with other DP’s include:

- I.2.1 ארי חדיתי בפרקנך ‘for I rejoice in your saving power’
- I.2.1 בכין תקיף לבי בחולקא ‘therefore my heart is strong in the portion (that the Lord has given to me)’
- I.2.1 בכין תימר כנשתא דישראל ‘therefore the assembly of Israel will say’
- I.2.2 בכין יודון כל עממא אומיא ולישניא ‘therefore all the nations, peoples and language (groups) will give thanks’
- II.22.8 ארי תקיף רגזיה ‘for his anger was strong’
- II.22.9 בכין שלח רגזיה כאישא בערא ‘then he sent his anger like a burning fire’

A careful analysis of our corpus shows that when a predication features both a DP and a constituent with pragmatic functionality in P_1 , the DP always precedes the highlighted constituent, which allows us to posit that P_{dp} precedes P_1 in the Functional Pattern of the verbal clause. Examples include:

- I.2.1 ועל ידוהי יתעבדן להון נסין וגבורין (lit.) ‘and_[DP] by his hands_[SubTop] will be done for them signs and mighty deeds’
- I.2.2 ונס סגי יתעביד ביה ‘and_[DP] a great sign_[Foc] will be worked on him’
- I.2.2 ועמך יימרין ‘and_[DP] your people_[Foc] will say’
- I.2.8 ארי קדמי יי גלן עובדי בני אנשא ‘for_[DP] before the Lord_[GivTop] the deeds of the sons of men are revealed’
- II.22.3 ואף מיד כל חטופין פריק יתי ‘and also_[DP] from the hand of all robbers_[Foc] he saved me’ [מחמס תשעני ‘from violence you save me’]
- II.22.32 בכין על נסא ופרקנא ... יודון כל עממא אומיא ולישניא ‘therefore_[DP] on account

(cf. Groß 1996: 139-140; Rosenbaum 1997: 22-23).

⁹⁵ One will note that the DP אף is likewise the linguistic means by which the Aramaic of the passages under discussion expresses the expanding Focus (cf. W:4.2.1.2.1.2).

of the sign and redemption_[Setting] ... all the nations, peoples and language groups will give thanks'

II.22.47 'therefore_[DP] on account of the sign and the salvation_[Setting] ... they gave thanks and said'

Similarly, on the basis of the position of the conjunction *וְאֵף* 'and also' in:

I.2.1 'and also_[DP] Heman, the son of Joel, the son of my son Samuel (...)_[Theme] — he and his fourteen sons (are to be speaking...)',

it appears that when a clause includes both a DP and a Theme constituent, the DP comes *before* the Theme constituent, which suggests that P_{dp} precedes P₀ as well in the Functional Pattern.⁹⁶ In the same vein,

I.2.5 'So_[DP] Jerusalem (...)_[Theme?] — it is to be filled with her exiled people',

whose constituent 'Jerusalem ...' is arguably a Theme,⁹⁷ confirms the relative placement of the DP and of the Theme constituent.⁹⁸

⁹⁶ The fact that the predication under discussion is a nominal rather than verbal clause is immaterial. The point argued here bears on extra-clausal positions — those of DP's and Theme constituents — and the contents of the ensuing predication proper are therefore irrelevant to the argument.

⁹⁷ Cf. W:4.2.2.2, footnote n.92 above.

⁹⁸ Other instances involving the DP *וְ* and a Theme constituent confirm this view: I.2.4 'and those of the house of the Hasmonean ...', I.2.5 'and Rome ...', I.2.8 'and the just ones...', II.22.23 'and his statutes ...'. Finally, II.22.26 'Abraham, who was found pious before you — therefore you did much kindness to his seed' and II.22.26 'Isaac, who was blameless in fear of you — therefore you made perfect the word of your good pleasure with him', in which the DP *בְּכֵן* 'therefore' follows the Theme constituent, are only apparent exceptions. In those cases, the predication that follows the Theme and the DP is presented as a direct consequence of some circumstance stated in the Theme itself. Thus in II.22.26, the fact that God did much kindness to Abraham's seed (predication proper) is presented as a consequence of Abraham's being found pious before him (Theme constituent). The DP *בְּכֵן* 'therefore' really introduces a causal link between the predication and the Theme rather than between the clause as a whole and the rest of the discourse, and could therefore not stand in any other position than between Theme and predication.

4.2.2.4 Vocative and Attention-Getting (P_{voc})

According to FG's simplified model of verbal interaction, a communication situation typically involves two individuals, who in turn play the role of Speaker (Spk) and Addressee (Ad). We have also seen that the primary function of verbal interaction is for Spk to effect changes in the pragmatic information of Ad (cf. W:4.2.1.2.1.1).

In order for the verbal interaction to obtain in the first place, however, it is necessary that Ad's attention be available to Spk. Accordingly, languages develop linguistic strategies intended to allow Spk to catch the attention of Ad.⁹⁹ In FG, one of these strategies is captured by the pragmatic function of the *Vocative*, which allows Spk to signal explicitly that the utterance is intended for Ad.¹⁰⁰ Consider the following examples:

- (1) '*John*, our guests have arrived'.
- (2) 'I really believe you're wrong, *Bill* !'.
- (3) 'I don't think, *Peter*, that this is the right decision'.

As can be seen from the examples above, Spk refers to Ad by means of a specific constituent.¹⁰¹ This constituent is then assigned the Vocative function at the pragmatic layer of the underlying clause structure. In terms of word order, the immediate linguistic manifestation of Vocative assignment is that the relevant constituent is extra-clausal: it is not a part of the predication itself.¹⁰² In practice, the placement of the Vocative is quite variable, inasmuch as it can precede, follow, or even interrupt

⁹⁹ FG (FG2: 385) also uses the term 'attention-getting devices', after Ochs-Keenan & Schieffelin (1976: 355-357).

¹⁰⁰ As Moutaouakil (1989: 140) explains, 'Vocative is the function associated with a constituent referring to the entity addressed in a given discourse setting'. The pragmatic function of Vocative was first developed within the FG framework by Moutaouakil, with special reference to Arabic (Rosenbaum 1997: 117). His findings, as those of others, were subsequently integrated into the theory of FG as the 'Address' function (FG2: 385). Owing to its widespread use in Semitic philology, however, the label 'Vocative' has been retained in the present study.

¹⁰¹ Such constituents 'often consist of proper names, possibly accompanied by titles, functions, or references to the relation between S[pk] and A[d]. Personal pronouns of the second person can also be used in [Vocative] function' (FG2: 385).

¹⁰² This entails that if Ad is actively involved in the SoA denoted by the predication (i.e. it fulfils a semantic function such as Agent or Goal in the predication), it will have to be referred to by a distinct intra-clausal constituent, e.g. 'you' in (2). But this does not have to be the case: the function of the Vocative function is to draw Ad's attention on some SoA, whether Ad be involved in it or not, as in (1) and (3).

the predication, as illustrated by the examples above.¹⁰³

There are not many instances of the Vocative in the unparallel portions of our corpus. The few that we have, however, bear witness to the variability of placement of the Vocative, and are useful for establishing the positioning variants of the Vocative in the Functional Pattern:

- Before the predication:

I.2.3 אתון כסדאי וכל עממיא דעתידין למשלט בישראל לא תסגון למללא רברבן רברבן ‘*You Chaldeans and all the people who are to rule in Israel, do not say many boastful things!*’

- Interrupting the predication:

II.22.50 על כין אודי קדמך יי בעממיא ‘therefore I will give thanks before you, Lord, among the nations’

- Following the predication:

II.23.4 טוביכון צדיקיא ‘blessed are you, *the just ones!*’¹⁰⁴

One will note that on the basis of the first example it is not possible to establish whether the Vocative, when occurring before the predication, is placed in P_0 (which would mean that the presence of a Vocative there would be incompatible with that of a Theme constituent) or in a clause-initial position P_{voc} distinct of P_0 . A distinct Vocative slot P_{voc} has therefore been featured clause-initially in the Basic Functional Pattern, so as to leave that option open.

¹⁰³ As Rosenbaum (1997: 117) explains, this versatility is due to the fact that ‘the illocutionary force of the Vocative is different from that of the predication to which it is associated’.

¹⁰⁴ Due to the scarcity of the evidence involving Vocatives, II.23.4 has been mentioned here in order to illustrate the post-predication positioning of the Vocative, even though the clause under discussion is not a verbal clause.

5. PRINCIPLE N°4

PRINCIPLE OF INCREASING COMPLEXITY

5.1 DEFINITION

*There is a preference for ordering constituents in an order of increasing complexity.*¹⁰⁵

Another principle defined by FG that plays an important role in word order issues in the Aramaic of TJS is the Principle of Increasing Complexity, also known as the ‘Heaviness Principle’.¹⁰⁶ According to that principle, cross-linguistically languages display a preference to order constituents according to their structural complexity, or ‘heaviness’. This complexity or heaviness is specified by FG as follows:¹⁰⁷

- (1) Clitic < pronoun < noun phrase < adpositional phrase¹⁰⁸ < subordinate clause;
- (2) For any category X: X < X co X;¹⁰⁹
- (3) For any categories X and Y: X < X [sub Y].¹¹⁰

As Dik explains, this principle ‘is intended to account for the fact that in most languages there are situations in which we find constituents either earlier or later in the sequence than would be expected on the basis of their functional profiles’.¹¹¹ Rosenbaum illustrates this observation with the following examples borrowed from French:¹¹²

¹⁰⁵ FG1 (404).

¹⁰⁶ Rosenbaum (1997: 20), referring to Hawkins (1983) and Croft (1990).

¹⁰⁷ FG1 (1997: 411).

¹⁰⁸ I.e. a phrase featuring a preposition or a postposition.

¹⁰⁹ Co = coordinating element.

¹¹⁰ Sub = subordinating element.

¹¹¹ FG1 (1997: 412). In the same vein: ‘[The Principle of Increasing Complexity] may counteract certain other principles, in particular [the Principle of Functional Stability]: although constituents with the same functional “profile” prefer to be placed in the same position, this preference may be overridden by differences in internal complexity between such constituents’ (FG1: 404).

¹¹² Rosenbaum (1997: 139), adapting Dik (1981: 189ff.).

- (1) ‘Jean a donné le livre à Bill’.¹¹³
- (2a) ‘Jean l’a donné à Bill’.¹¹⁴
- (2b) ‘Jean *lui* a donné le livre’.¹¹⁵
- (3) ‘Jean a donné à Bill *le livre qu’il avait demandé*’.¹¹⁶

(1) reflects the basic functional pattern of French, according to which the Subject (‘Jean’) comes first and is followed by the verb (‘a donné’), the direct object (‘le livre’) and the indirect object (‘à Bill’) in that order.¹¹⁷ In (2a), we can see that the direct object, now a clitic pronominal element, is placed earlier in the clause, *before* the verb. (2b) features the same phenomenon, but with the indirect object. Finally, in (3) the direct object, now a noun phrase accompanied by a relative (i.e. subordinate) clause, is placed later in the clause, *after* the indirect object. As we can see from these examples, in French the heaviness or complexity of a constituent has a substantial impact on its placement in the linear order of the clause, clitic elements being ‘lighter’ than noun phrases, and bare noun phrases being ‘lighter’ than noun phrases accompanied by a subordinate clause. As will be seen below, the Principle of Increasing Complexity is also at work in the unparallel portions of our corpus.¹¹⁸

5.2 PRINCIPLE OF INCREASING COMPLEXITY AND TARGUM JONATHAN TO SAMUEL

In the Aramaic of TJS, the Principle of Increasing Complexity manifests in one of three ways: cliticizing, anticipating and delaying of constituents.

¹¹³ In English: “Jean has given the book to Bill”.

¹¹⁴ In English: “Jean has given it to Bill”.

¹¹⁵ In English: “Jean has given the book to him”.

¹¹⁶ In English: ‘Jean has given to Bill the book that he had requested’.

¹¹⁷ In this context, ‘indirect object’ and ‘direct object’ are understood as non-subject arguments introduced or not (respectively) by a preposition. Incidentally, this functional pattern already reflects the principle under discussion, in that adpositional (i.e., in this case, *prepositional*) noun phrases follow non-adpositional noun phrases.

¹¹⁸ It is also an active grammatical device in BH, and is often referred to as *Pronominalregel* (cf. Groß 1996: 261ff. and the literature cited there; see also 270-271 where Groß briefly assesses FG’s Principle of Increasing Complexity).

5.2.1 CLITICIZING: THE OBJECT PRONOMINAL SUFFIX

The first manifestation of the Principle of Increasing Complexity in the Aramaic of TJS is intimately connected to morphology: the fact that the object, when pronominal, can be directly appended as a clitic (i.e. cliticized) to the verb, thereby coming to stand between the verb and any nominal subject. The unparallel passages of our corpus feature two such examples: one in which a pronominal suffix is inserted (II.6.6 ארי מרגנדי תוריא ‘because the oxen swayed it’ [כי שמטו הבקר ‘for the oxen shook it’]), and one in which a pronominal O^p of the Vorlage is rendered with a suffixed pronominal O^d in TJS (I.4.19 ארי בעתוהא חבלהא ‘because her pains agitated her’ [כי נהפכו עליה צריה ‘because her pains came upon her’]).

This phenomenon is usually reckoned as a matter of morphology rather than syntax, for the reason that in Aramaic (and BH) pronominal objects cannot stand on their own in the clause but have to be suffixed, if not to the verb then to the *nota accusativi*. Nonetheless, structurally the very necessity of suffixation and the possibility that this suffixation can bear on the verb (the pronominal element then, as it were, hopping back over the Subject) can be seen as a consequence of the lightness of pronominal elements, and therefore as a manifestation of the Principle of Increasing Complexity.

5.2.2 ANTICIPATING LIGHT CONSTITUENTS

Aside from the cliticization seen above, the anticipation of light constituents can also be observed from the fact that the pronominal O^p frequently hops back in the clause and comes to stand immediately after the verb, thereby standing before the nominal subject:

I.1.5 ומן קדם יי אתמנע מנה ולד ‘and from before the Lord a child had been withheld *from her*’ [ויהיה סגר רחמה ‘and the Lord had shut up her womb’]

I.1.8 ולמה ירע לבבך ‘and why is your heart sad *to you?*’ [ולמה ירע לבבך]

I.1.11 מגלא גלי קדמך סגופ אמתך ‘indeed the affliction of your handmaid was uncovered *before you*’ [אם ראה תראה בעני אמתך ‘if indeed you will see the affliction of your handmaid’]

I.2.1 דיהב לי יי ‘(therefore my heart is strong in the portion) that the Lord has given *to me*’

I.2.1 דמני לי יי ‘(therefore my horn is exalted in the gift) that the Lord

has appointed *for me*'

I.2.4 יתעבדן להון גבורין 'mighty deeds will be done *for them*'

I.5.7 שויא עליהון מחתא 'the stroke was equally *upon them*' [כן 'it was so'],

or, when there is no nominal subject, before the nominal O^d:

II.1.21 דיעבדון מנה חלתא 'that they might make *from it* the dough offering'

II.1.24 ומוביל לכן תפנוקין 'and (who was) bringing delicacies *to you*'

II.23.4 עבדתון לכון עובדין טבין 'you have done *for yourselves* good deeds'¹¹⁹

5.2.3 DELAYING HEAVY CONSTITUENTS

Conversely, FG's heaviness hierarchies dictate that heavy constituents tend to occur later in the clause than what would be their natural position as specified by their functional load. The following examples illustrate the point:

II.23.1 לממני בחיך בסיס תשבחתיה דישראל 'to appoint in your life_[Loc] *the sweet one of the praises of Israel*_[Od]' (a heavy O^d follows a Location constituent)

II.23.4 הא כאכרא דמבסר בשני בצרתא דייהות משרא על ארעא 'behold like a farmer who hopes during years of scarcity_[Time] *that rain will fall on the earth*_[Od]' (a heavy O^d — a subordinate clause — follows a Time constituent)

Sometimes, the anticipation of light constituents and the delaying of heavy constituents work hand in hand, strengthening the effect of one another. In the three instances below, a light (viz. pronominal) O_p precedes a heavy (viz. coordinate) S:

I.2.1 ועל ידוהי יתעבדן להון נסין וגבורין (lit.) 'and by his hands will be done for them_[Op] signs and mighty deeds_[S]'

II.22.3 דמן קדמוהי מתידיב לי תקוף ופרקן 'from before whom is given to me_[Op] strength and salvation_[S]'

II.22.47 דמן קדמוהי מתידיב לנא תקוף ופרקן 'from before whom is given to us_[Op] strength and salvation_[S]'

¹¹⁹ As was seen above, cases in which TJS expands a suffix pronoun attached to a verb into an independent O^p (e.g. I.1.6 ומצחבא לה ערתה 'and her rival provoked her' [וכעסתה צרתה], cf. W:3.2.1, esp. footnote n.34 above) cannot be included in the discussion, inasmuch as the O^p, which now stands between the verb and its subject, can be shown to have been placed there so as to match the (necessary) placement of the suffix pronoun immediately after its verb in the Vorlage.

In the following instance, a light (viz. pronominal) O_p precedes a heavy O_d (a noun accompanied by a complex apposition):

II.23.3 אָמַר לְמַעַל לִי מֶלֶכָּהּ הוּא מְשִׁיחָא עֲתִיד דִּיקוּם וּיְשֻׁלֹּם בְּדַחֲלָתָא דִּיּוּי ' (he) said to appoint for me_[Op] the king, that is the Messiah to come who will arise and rule by fear of the Lord_[Od] '

To conclude, two remarks are in order:

1. It must be emphasized that the Principle of Increasing Complexity affects only the S, O_d and O_p slots of the Functional Pattern. In other words, the special positions (P_1 , P_0 , P_{Voc}) are not subject to that principle, so constituents of any complexity can be hosted there:¹²⁰

• In P_1 :

I.2.2 'concerning Sennacherib, the king of Assyria_[Setting], she prophesied and said'

I.2.3 'concerning Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon_[Setting], she prophesied and said'

II.22.3 'my God, who takes delight in me_[GivTop], has drawn me near to fear of him'

• In P_0 and P_{Voc} :

I.2.3 'you Chaldeans and all the peoples who are to rule in Israel_[Voc], do not say many boastful things!'

I.2.4 'and those of the house of the Hasmonean, who were weak_[Theme] — mighty deeds will be done for them'

I.2.5 'and Rome, which was filled with great numbers of people_[Theme] — her army will cease to be'

I.2.8 'and the just ones, those doing his good pleasure_[Theme] — he has established the world for them'

2. Our corpus features many more instances of these three applications of the Principle of Increasing Complexity. These, however, run perfectly parallel to the Vorlage, for the simple reason that this Principle is an active grammatical device in BH as well. As a result, these additional

¹²⁰ Rosenbaum (1997: 20) noted the same with reference to the Hebrew of Isaiah 40-55.

instances cannot serve the discussion.¹²¹ Though frequent, however, the application of that Principle is not systematic in BH, which entails that sometimes light or heavy constituents can maintain their functionally justified position in the clause rather than hop backward or forward by virtue of their lightness or heaviness. As has been noted on various occasions in this chapter, however, the word-order patterns of TJS remain largely dependent on those of the Vorlage. In this case, the dependency can be noticed from the fact that when the Principle fails to manifest in the Vorlage, as a rule it does so in TJS as well. E.g.:

I.1.27 ויחב יי לי ית בעותי 'and the Lord has granted me my request' [ויתן
יְהוָה לִי אֶת שְׁאִלְתִּי]¹²²

II.22.25 ואחֵיב יי לי כזכותי 'and the Lord returned to me according to my
righteousness' [וישב יְהוָה לִי כצדקתי]

II.22.48 דעביד פורענותא לי 'who was making vengeance for me' [הגתן נקמת לי]
lit. 'who gave me vengeance']

6. SPECIAL CASES

As was stated above, as a rule the co-occurrence of V and S produces the sequence VS in the unparallel portions of our corpus. In two specific contexts, however, it appears legitimate to posit an SV sequence as the unmarked functional pattern of the verbal clause.

¹²¹ The following examples will illustrate the point:

- Cliticization of pronominal objects: I.4.3 למא תברנא יי 'why has the Lord shattered us?' [למה נגפנו יהוה], II.3.27 ואפנייה יואב 'and Joab took him aside' [וישהו יואב], II.5.25 [כאשר צוהו יהוה] 'as the Lord had commanded him' כמא דפקדיה יי;
- Anticipation of light constituents: I.1.23 ואמר לה אלקנה 'and Elkanah said to her' [ואמר לה אלקנה], II.3.13 קים אני אגזר עמך 'I will cut a covenant with you' [אני אכרת אתך ברית], II.7.11 [והגיד לך יהוה] 'and the Lord told you' וחיי לך יי;
- Delaying of heavy constituents: II.22.1 ושבח דויד בנבואה קדם יי ית פתגמי תשבחתא הדא 'and David gave praise in prophecy before the Lord *the words of this praise*' [David spoke to the Lord the words of this song].

¹²² In this particular case, the Principle is only partially applied, inasmuch as the light O_p hops back over O_d , but not over S. In any event, TJS faithfully follows the word order of the Vorlage.

6.1 PARTICIPLES AND PRONOMINAL SUBJECT

6.1.1 BASIC FUNCTIONAL PATTERN

When the verb of the predication is a (active or passive) participle and the subject an independent personal pronoun, the relative placement of verb and subject is always SV. This can be established from two different sets of circumstances:

1. TJS renders a verb form of the 1st or 2nd person in the Vorlage with *qātel*, and expresses its subject by inserting an independent personal pronoun. The pronominal subject always precedes the *qātel* form:

I.1.8 למה תבכי? 'why are you crying?' [למה תבכי]

I.1.14 עד מתי תשתכרין? 'how long will you be demented?' [עד מתי תשתכרין]
long will you be drunken?']

I.2.29 למה תבעטון? 'why are you kicking?' [למה תבעטון]

II.1.3 אי מזה תבוא? 'where are you coming from?' [אי מזה תבוא]

II.3.8 ומכען את מסער 'and as of now you are visiting (upon me the guilt of the woman this day)' [ומכען]

II.6.22 דאת אמרא 'of whom you speak' [דאת אמרא]

II.22.3 אנה רחין 'I trust him' [אנה רחין]

II.22.4 אנה מצלי קדם יי 'I am praying before the Lord' [אנה מצלי קדם יי]
'I am calling on the Lord']

II.22.7 אנה מצלי קדם יי 'I was praying before the Lord' [אנה מצלי קדם יי]
'I was calling on the Lord']

II.22.7 אנה מתחנן 'I was entreating' [אנה מתחנן]

2. TJS inserts a complete predication involving *qātel* and a pronominal subject. The pronominal subject precedes the *qātel* form:

II.22.5 היא מסכנא לממח 'she is endangered to (the point of) dying'

II.23.2 אנה מליל אלן 'I am speaking these things' [אנה מליל אלן]

II.23.2 אנה סדר 'I am ordering' [אנה סדר]

II.23.8 הוא מתקן במני זינא 'he is prepared with armoured equipment'¹²³

¹²³The only exceptions encountered in our corpus involve cases of crasis between *qātel* and its pronominal subject, in which case the subject obviously follows, e.g. II.1.10 ידענא 'I know', II.3.12 מקיימנא 'I am establishing', II.3.25 ידעת 'you know' [ידעת].

6.1.2 USE OF P₁

What is critical for suggesting a word-order pattern SVO (rather than the common VSO pattern with S placed in P₁) in those passages is that in some of them the special position P₁ is activated and hosts a constituent other than S. In these cases, the constituents placed in P₁ have been assigned the pragmatic function of Focus or Setting. The cases involving the Focus function likewise display a type of focality that we have not discussed so far: the ‘information gap’ Focus.

6.1.2.1 Interaction-Internal: ‘Information Gap’ Focus

As was seen above (W:4.2.1.2), in the present study two main types of focality are distinguished, depending on the context in which they operate: interaction-internal and discourse-internal. Another distinction was introduced on the basis of the communicative point of focality: contrast and information gap. As its name indicates, contrastive focality involves a contrast between two (or more) entities, situated either within the discourse (discourse-internal) or within the pragmatic informations of Spk and Ad respectively (interaction-internal). The type of focality we are to discuss here is known as ‘information gap’ in FG. It is interaction-internal in nature and, as its name indicates, it involves a *gap* in the pragmatic information of one of the parties involved in the verbal interaction. ‘Information gap’ focality in FG actually covers two complementary types of Focus:

- *Questioning* Focus: Spk has an information gap for which he presumes Ad has a piece of information X. Spk then asks a question (whether a ‘Yes/No’ question or a question involving a question-word);
- *Completive* Focus: Spk (now: the answerer) has a specific piece of information X for which he presumes Ad has an information gap. Spk will fill in Ad’s information gap with X.

The clearest case of this is found in answers to questions involving a question word, e.g.:

- (1) ‘*Whom* did John see?’ (questioning Focus)
- (2) ‘John saw *his brother*’ (completive Focus)¹²⁴

¹²⁴ Inasmuch as in this chapter we are dealing with the placement of *constituents* in the predication, the scope of the Focus in this instance is an individual constituent.

In this pair of question/answer, the participants (1) and (2) share some common pragmatic information: ‘John saw X’. As Rosenbaum explains, ‘(1) does not know the identity of X, though he anticipates that (2) does [...] and will give it to him if he requests it. Thus, the identity of X is the “difference in pragmatic information” between participants (1) and (2),’¹²⁵ i.e. the focal domain of both expressions.

Our corpus evinces several instances of questioning Focus, all of which bear on an interrogative pronoun or adverb placed in P₁:

I.1.8 למה תבכי? ‘why are you crying?’ [למה תבכי]

I.1.14 עד מתי תשתכרין? ‘how long will you be demented?’ [עד מתי תשתכרין]
long will you be drunken?]

I.2.29 למה תבעטן? ‘why are you kicking?’ [למה תבעטן]

II.1.3 אי מזה תבוא? ‘where are you coming from?’ [אי מזה תבוא]¹²⁶

6.1.2.2 Setting

A few other instances feature a constituent with Setting function:

II.3.8 ומכען את מסער ‘and as of now you are visiting (upon me the guilt of the woman this day)’ [ומכען ‘and you visit’]

II.22.7 ואל אלהי אקרה ‘and before my God I was entreating’ [ואל אלהי אקרה]
‘and to my God I cry’]

In concrete terms, we see that another constituent with pragmatic functionality (Focus or Setting) can be placed before the Subject. Two options are then open to us:

1. Maintain a strict VSO pattern for those passages, and posit a second special position P₂, situated between P₁ and V, which would then produce a pattern P₁P₂VSO.¹²⁷ In these cases, P₂ would be

It goes without saying, however, that the scope of the focus can extend beyond constituent boundaries, e.g.:

(1) ‘*What* did Mary do next?’ (questioning Focus)

(2) ‘*She went to the movies*’ (completive Focus).

¹²⁵ Rosenbaum (1997: 68).

¹²⁶ As can be gathered from those instances, the Focus function has been assigned to satellites, viz. non-nuclear constituents of the predication — Cause, Time and Location. ‘Information gap’ focality therefore constitutes another exception to our methodology that only arguments, i.e. nuclear constituents of the predication, come into consideration.

¹²⁷ Akin to Buth’s conclusions concerning BA (cf. W:7.2 below).

- systematically filled by the Subject and P_1 would be available for constituents with Setting or Focus function;
2. Posit the existence of a SV pattern, hence P_1 SVO.

The evidence encountered in our corpus tips the scales in favour of the second option. Aside from the passages above, no cases involving the placement of *two* pragmatically loaded constituents before the verb are attested in our corpus.¹²⁸ If the existence of P_2 were entertained, then one would have to explain on pragmatic grounds (1) why it is available to the Subject only, (2) why and under which circumstances the Subject is to be placed in this putative P_2 , and above all (3) why P_2 is not made use of in the other unparallel portions of our corpus. In view of these facts, Occam's razor dictates that the second option is not only the more plausible, but also the more economic. What is more, it is further suggested by another set of instances deviating from the strict P_1 VSO pattern, to which we now turn.

6.2 INSERTION OF A VERB IN A NOMINAL CLAUSE OF THE VORLAGE

In quite a few cases, TJS inserts a verb in a noun clause of the Vorlage, thereby converting it into a verbal clause. What is interesting in these cases, however, is the fact that the verb is then systematically inserted after, rather than before, what is to become its subject:

- I.1.24 וְהַנֶּעֱר נֶעַר 'and the boy was a young child' [וְהַנֶּעֱר נֶעַר 'and the boy was young']
- I.4.12/II.1.2 וְעָפָר רָמוּ בְרִישָׁה 'and dust was thrown on his head' [וְעָפָר רָמוּ בְרִישָׁה 'and earth was upon his head']
- I.6.4 אֲרִי מַחֲתָא חֲדָא שׁוּיָא לְכָלכּוֹן 'for one stroke is equally on all of you' [אֲרִי מַחֲתָא חֲדָא שׁוּיָא לְכָלכּוֹן 'for one plague is on them all']
- II.1.16 חֹבֶת קַמּוּלַךְ תְּהִי בְרִישַׁךְ 'may the sin of your killing be upon your head' [דְּמִיךְ עַל רִאשְׁךְ 'may your blood be upon your head']
- II.8.16 וַיּוֹאֵב ... מִמֶּנָּה עַל חֵילָא 'and Joab (...) was appointed over the army' [וַיּוֹאֵב ... עַל הַצִּבָּא 'and Joab (...) was on the army']

¹²⁸ With the exception of a few instances whose unusual word order can be assigned to stylistic effects (or, to put it more adequately, to defamiliarization, cf. Rosenbaum 1997: 149ff.), e.g. II.23.2 אֲנָא סָדֵר וּפְתִיגְמִי קִדְשִׁיהּ בְּפִמִּי 'and the words of his holiness in my mouth I am ordering'.

- II.8.16 מִמְנָא עַל דּוֹכְרִינְיָ 'and Jehoshaphat (...) was appointed over the records' [מִזְכִּיר 'and Jehoshaphat (...) was recorder']
- II.8.18 מִמְנָא עַל קְשִׁתָּיָא וְעַל קַלְעִיָּא 'and Benaiah (...) was appointed over the archers and the slingers' [וְחִכְרֵי וְחַפְלָתִי 'and Benaiah (...) was (over) both the Cherethite and the Pelethite']
- II.22.23 אֲרִי כָל דִּינֻהֵי גֻלְן לְקַבְלִי 'because all his judgements are revealed before me' [כִּי כָל מִשְׁפָּטוֹ לִנְגִדִי 'for all his judgements are before me']

In the Vorlage, some of these nominal clauses begin with the conjunction *waw* followed by its subject, and by BH standards it may be argued that they are temporal or circumstantial. In view of the overall dependency of the word-order patterns of TJS on those of the Vorlage, one cannot exclude the possibility that in the Aramaic rendition the insertion of the verb (which, incidentally, does not have to be a participle in these cases) after rather than before the Subject may be due to the influence of the Vorlage, i.e. an attempt on the part of the Targumist to imitate an essential syntactic principle of BH whereby clauses of these types must be introduced by *waw* immediately followed by a non-verbal element.¹²⁹ If that should be so, then there would be no case for positing a SV pattern in these instances: the SV sequence could be explained as the result of an imitation of the Vorlage by TJS, and the fact that the nominal clauses in the Vorlage begin with their subject would be seen as purely coincidental. Nonetheless, the fact remains that not all of the clauses above are temporal; some of them are main clauses, others are causal, both of which types have the VSO pattern as their normal word order.¹³⁰ Positing a SVO functional pattern for these clauses therefore appears legitimate, which in turn suggests that the SV sequence encountered in the clauses rendering BH temporal or circumstantial clauses may not be merely the product of the influence of the Vorlage.¹³¹

¹²⁹ In contrast to foregrounded clauses, introduced by *waw* immediately followed by a verbal element, cf. JM §166. JM refers to that non-verbal element impressionistically as a *buffer word*, so as to underscore the purely syntactic function of the sequence <*waw* + non-verb> in the clauses of these types.

¹³⁰ Cf. JM (§§155k, 155m); Groß (1996: 126-127); Muraoka (1985a: 28ff.).

¹³¹ I.1.3 'and there the two sons of Eli, Hophni and Phinehas, were serving before the Lord' [וְשָׁם שְׁנֵי בְנֵי עֲלִי חֹפְנִי וְפִינְחָס כֹּהֲנִים לַיהוָה] is even more peculiar, inasmuch as the nominal clause in the Vorlage already makes use of P₁ in order to host the Setting constituent שָׁם: the placement of the verb after the Subject in the Aramaic rendition therefore has the effect that now two constituents, instead of one, come before the verb. Yet, this instance cannot be taken as another

7. CONCLUSIONS

7.1 SUMMARY

Before we attempt to situate within the larger context of Aramaic the word-order patterns encountered in the verbal clause in the unparallel portions of our corpus, it may be useful to take note of the following facts:

1. A study of the word-order patterns found in TJS is of limited value. As we have seen all along in this chapter, in a great many cases TJS follows the word-order patterns of the Vorlage very closely. On the whole, the only instances that may have any significance for our purpose are those that involve the insertion of clausal constituents that are absent from the Vorlage, but here again we have also noted that even the insertion of constituents in the Aramaic translation does not guarantee the emergence of genuine, indigenous Aramaic structures.
2. With this caveat, the word-order patterns coming to the fore in the unparallel portions of our corpus do not differ markedly from those observed in the parallel portions of our corpus (i.e. those portions in which the influence of the Vorlage can be presumed). In both,
 - a) VSO (VSO^dO^p) appears to be the basic functional pattern;
 - b) Three special positions — one intra-clausal (P_1) and two extra-clausal (P_0 and P_{voc}) — are featured in the basic functional pattern, and are used extensively for the placement of pragmatically loaded constituents. As a result, the basic functional pattern in both can be outlined as:
 $(P_{voc}), P_{dp}, P_0, P_1 VSO^dO^p, (P_{voc})$;
 - c) The Principle of Increasing Complexity is an active grammatical device.

3. However, both also display a few differences. The most salient are:

argument suggesting that the verb must come after the Subject. Indeed, in this particular case the unusual pattern can be explained by the fact that the verb *משמשין* is not actually *inserted* in the clause, but is rather substituted for the BH noun *כהנים*. The fact that *משמשין* takes up the same position in the Aramaic clause as the noun *כהנים* in the Hebrew clause is therefore precisely what we should expect. On the nature of *משמשין*, cf. D:3.1.1, esp. footnote n.52.

- If it is certainly true that P_1 is used equally extensively in the parallel and unparallel portions of our corpus, one notes that the constituents that can be hosted in P_1 are not exactly the same in both. Essentially, in the parallel portions P_1 is less used for the hosting of Setting constituents than in the unparallel portions. One important reason for that is in all likelihood the fact that BH syntax regularly uses a specific construction for the indication of Setting constituents with the semantic function of Time: *wayehi/wehaya* + Time constituent + *w-...*: the Time constituent is therefore no longer an integral constituent of the predication.¹³² As a rule, TJS imitates the BH construction whenever it occurs in the Vorlage,¹³³ but does not feature it in the unparallel portions of our corpus. This suggests that this structure is not indigenous to the Aramaic of TJS.
- According to Rosenbaum, the BH of Isaiah 40-55 also features a special position for the placement of DP's. Rosenbaum locates this slot between P_0 and P_1 in the basic functional pattern; in the unparallel portions of our corpus, in contrast, it is the very first slot of the pattern, standing even before P_0 .
- When the verb is a participle and the subject a personal pronoun, the unmarked sequence in the Vorlage is VS;¹³⁴ in contrast, in the unparallel portions we have seen that it is systematically SV.

¹³² Following on Groß' observation that P_1 is necessarily empty in clauses of the type *wayyiqtol/w^eqataltí*, it is worth noting that the BH Setting construction under discussion is a very neat way to circumvent the inaccessibility of P_1 in that type of clause: placing the Setting constituent in a distinct predication *before* (and bearing on) the predication actually beginning with *wayyiqtol/w^eqataltí* indeed allows one to provide it with a Setting constituent while complying with the necessity of an empty P_1 .

¹³³ E.g. I.4.18^{BH} וַיְהִי כְּהִזְכִּירוֹ אֶת אֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים וַיִּפֹּל 'and when he made mention of the ark of the Lord, he fell ...' [וַיְהִי כְּאִדְכָּרוֹתֶיהָ יֵת אֲרוֹנָא דִּי וַיִּפֹּל ^{TJ}] (see also Lambdin and Huehnergard: unpublished: 29).

¹³⁴ JM (§154fd); Muraoka (1985a: 6-28, esp. 26-28).

7.2 Wider Perspective

Before we proceed to compare the word-order patterns encountered in the unparallel portions of our corpus with other Aramaic dialects, it must be emphasized that the comparison itself entails difficulties of its own for a variety of reasons. First, it turns out that word order issues have attracted less attention than other aspects of Aramaic syntax. With a few exceptions, the scholarly literature is very often succinct, sometimes even completely silent on the subject.¹³⁵ Second, more than with other syntactic questions the type of results produced by studies of word order turn out to depend crucially on the methodological framework underlying the study. As already noted, the past few decades have witnessed much progress in general linguistic theory, especially in the field of syntax, to such an extent that studies antedating these developments do not always contribute as much as they could to our understanding of the word-order patterns found in Aramaic. Other, more recent studies of word order acknowledge and make use of those developments, but here too the results reached depend much on the methodological choices of the analyst.¹³⁶ With these two caveats in mind, we can now attempt to confront the findings of our analysis of TJS to other Aramaic dialects.

The Aramaic of the earliest period is usually reckoned VSO, a pattern inherited from North-West Semitic.¹³⁷ In FG terminology, it would be more accurately described as a V1 language, i.e. a language whose basic

¹³⁵ That state of affairs was also deplored by Cook (1986a: 222-224).

¹³⁶ A case in point is the import of pragmatic functions in questions of word order. Several studies, e.g., discuss fronting, or P₁-placement, in terms of contextualization (Setting in FG) and emphasis/contrast (Focus in FG), but mostly do not deal with the dimension of Topicality. The question remains of to what extent this omission affects the results obtained. Another example is the notion, frequently met in the relevant literature but adamantly disputed by modern linguistic theories such as FG, that some languages may have a 'free' word order.

¹³⁷ Degen (1969: 121); Segert (1975: 422); Folmer (1995: 521); Kaufman (1997: 127); Martínez Borobio (2003: 147). Hug, on the contrary, claims that the position of V is free (Hug 1993: 127), and many of the examples he adduces indeed feature V either before or after S, O^d and O^p. Nonetheless, it should be kept in mind that the linguistic material that he deals with does not belong to the earliest testimonies of Aramaic. At any rate, it would certainly be interesting to re-evaluate his data from a functional perspective. On Samalian specifically, cf. Dion (1974: 280-293); Tropper (1993: 245-250).

functional pattern is VSO and in which V is in actual fact most frequently the first element of the clause.¹³⁸ The basic functional pattern of the OA inscriptions also features one initial, intra-clausal position before the verb, used for the placement of pragmatically loaded constituents, hence P₁VSO;¹³⁹ and the Principle of Increasing Complexity appears to be an active grammatical device as well.¹⁴⁰ In contrast to the straightforwardness of the state of affairs witnessed in OA, the situation in IA is most intricate, a complexity that finds echo in the views of scholars on the matter and that has led some of them to conclude that word order in IA is basically free. All in all, word-order patterns vary wildly from corpus to corpus. The main points can be summarized as follows:

1. In infinitive clauses, both sequences VO and OV are attested, depending on the corpora.¹⁴¹ The existence of the OV sequence in the Aramaic of that period is usually explained as the product of Old Persian influence.¹⁴²
2. In clauses with a finite verb, the only constant found in the basic (i.e. unmarked) functional patterns across the corpora is that S usually precedes O; V, for its part, can be featured anywhere in the pattern depending on the corpora, hence the possible sequences VSO, SVO and SOV.¹⁴³ VSO represents a continuation of OA usage; and SVO can be explained as a natural development of VSO into SVO by regular placement of S into P₁.¹⁴⁴ SOV, for its part, is usually reckoned the product of Akkadian influence.¹⁴⁵ The OSV sequence (in which O precedes S, in apparent contradiction to the constant noted above) may be considered the result of Focus

¹³⁸ Cf. Buth (1987: 106-107). For the typological differences between V1, V2 and V3 languages, cf. footnotes n.173 and 184 below.

¹³⁹ The same has been claimed for Samalian, cf. Segert (1975: 422); Buth (1987: 373-381, esp. 381); Tropper (1993: 250-253).

¹⁴⁰ Degen (1969: 121-122); Buth (1987: 350-373).

¹⁴¹ Folmer (1995: 536-542); Muraoka & Porten (2003: §78cl).

¹⁴² Cf. Kaufman (1974: 133). This possibility is recognized by Folmer (1995: 536, 543).

¹⁴³ Cf. Folmer (1995: 533-534); Muraoka & Porten (2003: §§78bff., 78cff.).

¹⁴⁴ Cf. Buth (1987: 106ff.).

¹⁴⁵ Cf. Kutscher (1970a: 362); Muraoka (1974: 439); Kaufman (1974: 132-133); Kaufman (1982: 154); Muraoka (1983-1984: 103); Folmer (1995: 521-522, 533-534); Muraoka & Porten (2003: §78c).

- function assignment to O,¹⁴⁶ i.e. of the placement of O in P₁.¹⁴⁷ Finally, O^p usually follows O^d, unless O^p is pronominal, in which case the Principle of Increasing Complexity applies.¹⁴⁸
3. Special positions in the basic functional pattern are reserved for the placement of constituents with pragmatic functionality: P_{dp},¹⁴⁹ P_o,¹⁵⁰ and P₁.¹⁵¹ at least, but there might be others.¹⁵²
 4. The Principle of Increasing Complexity also appears to be an active grammatical device.¹⁵³
 5. In clauses involving a participle and a pronominal subject, the pronominal subject usually follows the participle.¹⁵⁴

Spanning both IA and MA, BA displays the same variation, inasmuch as it attests to the six possible options VSO, SVO, SOV, VOS, OVS and OSV.¹⁵⁵ And just as IA of which it is a continuation, its word order has been claimed to be free.¹⁵⁶ In contrast, Buth, following the lead of Cook,¹⁵⁷ has claimed that neither IA in general nor BA in particular

¹⁴⁶ Folmer (1995: 534, 543). Muraoka & Porten (2003: §78cc), however, emphasize that not all instances of relative placement OV can be explained in functional opposition to an unmarked VO order. On the other hand, cases of ‘categorical negation’ of O (Muraoka & Porten 2003: §78cd) would, in FG terms, fall under the scope of focality, which would account for the fronting (i.e. P₁-placement) of O.

¹⁴⁷ Inasmuch as Folmer (1995: 534) also considers the possibility that OSV might, by that process of focalization, derive not only from an SOV pattern, but also from what she refers to as an ‘SVO/VSO’ pattern, she appears to consider the possibility of the existence of a *second* initial position before the verb in the basic functional pattern of the relevant corpora. This, in turn, would then connect her views to those of Buth (cf. below).

¹⁴⁸ Folmer (1995: 586).

¹⁴⁹ Muraoka & Porten (2003: §§78cp, cq).

¹⁵⁰ Muraoka & Porten (2003: §79).

¹⁵¹ Folmer (1995: 587); Muraoka & Porten (2003: §§78cd, cr).

¹⁵² Cf. Buth’s views below.

¹⁵³ Folmer (1995: 585-587); Muraoka & Porten (2003: §78bb).

¹⁵⁴ Muraoka & Porten (2003: §§77bo, bp).

¹⁵⁵ Cf. Bauer & Leander (1927: §§101a-i). Clauses involving a participle and a pronominal subject evince both VS and SV patterns. According to Buth (1987: 242-244), SV is the unmarked sequence.

¹⁵⁶ Bauer & Leander (1927: §§99a-c, 100p, 101a).

¹⁵⁷ Cook (1986b).

have a free word order. Buth's views on the word order of BA are so different from the views exposed above with regard to OA and IA that they deserve to be singled out for treatment. Essentially, Buth has attempted to demonstrate that all the variations encountered in BA ultimately go back to a unique VSO pattern, from which the five other sequences can be derived either by the fronting of non-verbal constituents or by the 'postposing' (i.e. placing into the clause-final position) of the verb (especially in clauses of the SOV type). The fact that the verb could be postposed led Buth to posit a special position P_2 at the end of the clause, reserved for the placement of V in these constructions. More importantly, however, the fact that a pattern such as OSV might be accounted for by the fronting of O and S has led Buth to posit the existence of *multiple* initial positions rather than only one (P_1). He denotes these additional initial positions by means of P_n , and the basic intra-clausal pattern of BA then becomes $P_1P_nVSOP_2$.¹⁵⁸ Finally, Buth claims that word order in IA worked in essentially the same way.¹⁵⁹ Buth's views offer at least two advantages:

1. The idea that the word order of BA is essentially VSO provides a straightforward explanation for the numerous instances of VSO encountered in BA. Functionally, it is indeed easier to explain the SVO, SOV (...) patterns as derived from a basic VSO pattern than the other way round;
2. More importantly, claiming a basically VSO pattern for BA and IA allows Buth to maintain the continuity of word order all the way from OA to MA (and Western LA): henceforth, Aramaic, until the MA period at least, is universally VSO; i.e. IA and BA no longer constitute a break.

In my opinion, Buth's work is a monument of ingenuity; his views are appealing and, from a theoretical viewpoint, really compelling. But from a practical standpoint, I do also believe that they suffer from several drawbacks. First, as Folmer has pointed out, Buth restricted his

¹⁵⁸ BA also knows extra-clausal positions, including at least one position for Theme constituents (P_0) and one position for 'conjunctions (i.e. discourse relators)' (Buth 1987: 173), i.e. P_{dp} . Interestingly, P_{dp} is featured at the very beginning of the basic functional pattern of the verbal clause in BA, immediately before P_0 , as in the unparallel passages of our corpus. For a complete outline of the basic functional pattern of the verbal clause in BA, cf. Buth (1987: 483).

¹⁵⁹ Buth (1987: 411, 429).

analysis of IA to only a few corpora.¹⁶⁰ Limiting the scope of the analysis in such a way inevitably limits the value of its results. But more significantly, the very tenet of Buth's approach raises an important question. As was indicated above, suggesting a unified VSO pattern for IA provides a neat and attractive picture of word order in 'pre-Late' Aramaic. But a possible difficulty that emerges when one follows that line of reasoning is the fact that certain word-order patterns evidenced in IA appear to have been the product of linguistic influences extraneous to Aramaic. E.g. SOV, which Buth would analyse as the basic VSO pattern with either fronting of S and O or postposing of V, is generally believed to be of Akkadian provenance, where it actually reflects the basic functional pattern of the verbal clause.¹⁶¹ Supposing that the Akkadian hypothesis is correct, it is hard to imagine how and, above all, why SOV, the unmarked pattern in Akkadian, would have been suddenly reinterpreted as a heavily marked construction upon its entry into Aramaic. To put it another way, it seems rather odd that the SOV pattern would have emerged in Aramaic under Akkadian influence, but completely disconnected from the function it fulfils in Akkadian (viz. that of unmarked pattern), and actually provided with the opposite function in Aramaic (viz. that of pragmatically marked pattern). On the contrary, it would make more sense to posit that the range of use of the SOV pattern was taken over, at least in part, together with the pattern itself. As a result, there are no valid reasons to posit *a priori* that SOV was a marked pattern in the IA corpora that evince it as their dominant word order, and doing so raises the impression that the data is made to fit the theory rather than the other way round. In the final analysis, and in spite of the criticism above, Buth's conclusions are not untenable, but it should be borne in mind that their validity depends crucially on one's views on the origin of the 'non-VSO' patterns in Aramaic.

Word order in QA has not been described as systematically as that of either IA or BA. The indications encountered in the relevant literature suggest that QA, insofar as general statements can be ventured, is a V1 language as well, i.e. a (P₁)VSO language with VSO as statistically dominant word order.¹⁶² P₁ appears to be used for the placement of pragmatically

¹⁶⁰ Folmer (1995: 522).

¹⁶¹ Von Soden (1995: §130).

¹⁶² Cf. Cook (1986a: 223); Buth (1987: 500ff.).

loaded constituents, among which prominently the subject,¹⁶³ and the Principle of Increasing Complexity also appears to be at work there.¹⁶⁴

The linguistic descriptions of the word-order patterns of Nabatean and Palmyrene are even sparser. Nabatean appears to be a V1 language too, inasmuch as the word order is generally VSO.¹⁶⁵ For Palmyrene, Cantineau states that the word order is ‘rather free’,¹⁶⁶ but provides only five instances of verbal clause to illustrate his point. The scantiness of the evidence therefore precludes any definite statement. In all five cases, however, the verb comes before its subject, but the position of O^d and O^p is quite varied, for which P₁-placement appears to be at least partly responsible.¹⁶⁷

Studies of the word-order patterns of the Western LA dialects are few and summary. Schulthess claims that the word order of the verbal clause in CPA is just as free as in the nominal clause.¹⁶⁸ Vilsker states that the verb usually comes first in SA, but that the subject can also precede it, which is suggestive of P₁-placement.¹⁶⁹ As regards JPA, Levy states that word order in Neofiti is ‘rather flexible, especially in the

¹⁶³ In agreement with Kutscher (1958: 33), Muraoka (1972a: 35) indeed notes, with regard to GenApoc, that cases of SV are numerous, though far less common than VS, a view confirmed most recently by Schattner-Rieser in her treatment of QA as a whole (2004: 134-135). Kutscher has also noted that in GenApoc the usual sequence of Verb and Object is VO (Kutscher 1958: 33-34). Muraoka also claims, however, that not all instances of fronting (i.e. P₁-placement) evince any emphasis on the preverbal element. Finally, Buth (1987: 501) has also claimed that column 2 of GenApoc reflects the P₁P₂ VSO pattern that he identified for IA and BA.

¹⁶⁴ TgJob also features instances of the (S)OV pattern that cannot be explained as the product of pragmatic highlighting (cf. Muraoka 1974: 439-441). Such a feature does not fail to evoke the difficulties observed in TgJob with regard to determination (cf. D:1.1, footnote n.8), which, Muraoka noted, may point out to an ultimately Eastern origin of TgJob (Muraoka 1974: 441-443).

¹⁶⁵ Cf. Cantineau (1930: 111).

¹⁶⁶ Cf. Cantineau (1935: 147).

¹⁶⁷ In one of the five examples mentioned by Cantineau both O^d and O^p come before the verb, which is reminiscent of Buth’s views on IA and BA. But the evidence adduced by Cantineau does not allow us to determine whether this is an isolated case or if the possibility of multiple initial positions should be entertained in Palmyrene (which could then be taken as an argument in support of Buth’s views). Be that as it may, another difficulty is the fact that these five examples are apparently taken from votive inscriptions: the fact that a highly formulaic register may be involved should certainly be taken heed of in any linguistic analysis.

¹⁶⁸ Schulthess (1924: 92).

¹⁶⁹ Vilsker (1981: 83-84).

declarative sentences. The subject may either precede or follow the verb. Modifiers and other elements in the sentence may be moved for emphasis, or as is more frequently the case, to follow the order of the Hebrew'.¹⁷⁰ Golomb likewise notes that in Neofiti SVO is the dominant word order in the verbal clause in expanded passages.¹⁷¹ Finally, Cook has studied word order in the unparallel portions of PsJ, and notes that the patterns VS and VO largely prevail. But he adds that this might be due to the narrative register of the passages he analysed.¹⁷² Be that as it may, on the basis of this summary information it would seem that SA and PsJ are V1 and Neofiti V2.¹⁷³

As for Eastern LA, word order has often been claimed to be 'free'.¹⁷⁴ In JBA, Schlesinger notes that the verb usually precedes its subject, but that clausal constituents (including the subject) can occur before the verb for a variety of reasons that FG would describe as pragmatic.¹⁷⁵ All this, of course, is suggestive of a VSO language, though the available information does not allow us to determine whether we are dealing with a V1 or V2 language, i.e. whether the statistically dominant word order is VSO or SVO. Nöldeke, who has studied the word-order patterns in Syriac and Mandaic, claims that word order is 'very free' in Syriac.¹⁷⁶ Nöldeke's notes suggest that the subject sometimes precedes, sometimes follows, sometimes even interrupts the predicate; he adds that in narrative clauses the verb is preferably placed before the subject, but that this is by no means an absolute rule. P₁-placement appears to be used for the marking of Topic and Focus constituents.¹⁷⁷ As for the object, it occurs most frequently after the verb, but also often before it.¹⁷⁸ Nöldeke's remarks on Mandaic go the same way. According to him, there is hardly

¹⁷⁰ Levy (1974: 213).

¹⁷¹ Golomb (1983: 183).

¹⁷² Cook (1986a: 223-224).

¹⁷³ Both V1 and V2 languages are languages whose basic functional pattern is (P₁)VSO. In V1 languages, V is in actual fact most frequently the first element of the clause; in contrast, in V2 languages the statistically dominant pattern is SVO as a result of P₁-placement of S (cf. Buth 1987: 106ff.).

¹⁷⁴ Cf. Kutscher (1971: 275); Kaufman (1997: 127); Cook (1986a: 223).

¹⁷⁵ Schlesinger (1928: §90).

¹⁷⁶ Nöldeke (1898: 248).

¹⁷⁷ Nöldeke (1898: 248).

¹⁷⁸ Nöldeke (1898: 250).

any other Semitic language in which word order is as free as it is in Mandaic.¹⁷⁹ The subject is preferably placed before the verb. The sequence VS is also encountered, but most frequently with a *qtal* form of the verb, which appears to echo Nöldeke's remarks on the placement of the verb in narrative clauses in Syriac.¹⁸⁰ The object occurs more frequently after the verb, but also often before it.¹⁸¹ Finally, the placement of adverbials is so free that it cannot really be captured by any rules whatsoever.¹⁸² Macuch's notes on word order in Mandaic parallel those of Nöldeke.¹⁸³ To be sure, these statements suggest a considerable flexibility of the word-order patterns of the Eastern LA dialects. As was noted above, however, the notion that this flexibility reflects a free word order runs contrary to modern linguistic theory, and it would certainly be interesting to see to what extent contemporary linguistic approaches could shed light on the word-order patterns of the Eastern LA dialects. This, however, is beyond the scope of the present study.

7.3 WORD ORDER AND THE ARAMAIC OF TARGUM JONATHAN TO SAMUEL

Bearing in mind the pervasive influence of the Vorlage on the word-order patterns of TJS, the Aramaic of the unparallel portions of our corpus appears to be of the VSO type. Further, it allows only one special, intra-clausal position (P_1) at the beginning of the basic functional pattern. Interestingly, the striking flexibility of word order evinced by the Eastern LA dialects is also unknown in our corpus. In all those respects, the Aramaic of the passages under discussion is closer to the standard set by OA and continued in MA (with the exception of BA) and Western LA, than to IA (incl. BA) and Eastern LA. However, the evidence does not allow us to conclude whether the Aramaic of our corpus should be

¹⁷⁹ Nöldeke (1875: 422).

¹⁸⁰ Nöldeke (1875: 423).

¹⁸¹ Nöldeke (1875: 427).

¹⁸² Nöldeke (1875: 428).

¹⁸³ Cf. Macuch (1965: 443): 'The order of words in the [classical Mandaic] verbal sentence is free to a great extent. The word to be emphasized is usually put at the beginning. This rule is still observed, but actually the most usual position of the subject is before the verb and that of the object after it'.

considered a V1 or a V2 language. To be sure, VS is much more frequent than SV, but then again the influence of the Vorlage is so pervasive that it cannot be excluded in this regard either. Moreover, the cases of insertion of a finite verb into BH nominal clauses, which systematically feature the (P₁)SVO sequence, even suggest an underlying SVO pattern for those passages.¹⁸⁴ But it should also be noted that the precise nature of the relation of these cases of verb insertion to the rest of the corpus, which is VSO, is not clear. Finally, the Principle of Increasing Complexity is an active grammatical device in the Aramaic of the passages under discussion as well as in other Aramaic dialects.

¹⁸⁴ SVO languages are referred to as V3 in FG terminology (cf. Buth 1987: 110-112). Besides, this also echoes Kaufman's statement that Semitic languages display a general tendency to develop from VSO into SVO (Kaufman 1997: 127).