CHAPTER ONE

DETERMINATION
The Use of the Emphatic and Absolute States

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 DETERMINATION IN ARAMAIC
An Overview

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

---

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


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

4 Akkadian also possesses a third state, termed status absolutus (Von Soden 1995: §62c). Yet, this form should not be confused with the Aramaic st.abs., inasmuch as the term ‘absolutus’ used to denote the Akkadian form refers essentially to the fact that it is uninflected, in contrast to the status rectus and status constructus (which correspond formally to the st.abs. and st.cst. in Aramaic). Interestingly, however, though the Akkadian status absolutus and the Aramaic st.abs. refer to different formal categories, they also display some functional commonalities (cf. D:5.2).
structure referred to as the ‘construct relation’. The st.cst. and the construct relation are employed prominently for the expression of the genitive and will be discussed in chapter 3. The first two, the st.emph. and st.abs., are intimately connected with the notion of determination.

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

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

---

5 Cf. FG1 (183-188, esp. 187).


7 Segert (1975: §6.3.3.1.1).
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st.abs. was largely driven back, its use being confined to certain specific contexts, and the uses of the st.cst. were severely curtailed as well. As a result of this, other methods to express determination and indetermination emerged.9

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

1.2 STATUS QUÆSTIONIS

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

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

---


10 Dalman (1905: 188).
'the determined form which originally was employed apparently correctly (as in the dialects of Western Aramaic) does not function properly any more’ in the Aramaic of TO/TJ, whereby he obviously meant that determination no longer respects the classical norm set by Old and Official Aramaic, a linguistic feature which, Kutscher claimed, TO and TJ, while fundamentally Western in origin, share with Eastern Aramaic.11

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

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

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

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{13} Kaddari (1963a: 235-241).

\textsuperscript{14} Fassberg (1990: 136).

\textsuperscript{15} Epstein (1960: 117).

\textsuperscript{16} Müller-Kessler (2001: 188).

\textsuperscript{17} Lambdin & Huehnergard (unpublished: 44).
1.3 THE NOTION OF DETERMINATION
ADOPTED IN THIS STUDY

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

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

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

---

\(^{18}\) The notion of determination adopted in this study is largely based on our traditional understanding of determination in Hebrew and Aramaic, cf. Bauer & Leander (1927: §88); WoC (§13); JM (§137); Muraoka & Porten (2003: §46). Its formulation, however, is framed by Functional Grammar (FG1: 127ff., 183ff.).
2. Genericity:
Nouns are used generically when they are intended to refer to a whole class or species. They can occur both in the plural (e.g. I.28.1 ‘the Philistines’) and in the singular (e.g. I.2.8 ‘the poor, the needy’). In the former case the class is treated as a unity; in the latter a representative of the class is singled out to represent the whole.19

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

1.4 THE POSITION ADOPTED IN THIS STUDY

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

1. Determination in TJ appears to function according to a largely consistent linguistic system. In other words, in the main the use of the st.emph. and st.abs. appears to be the effect of rules rather than the product of some arbitrary process;

2. The apparent irregularity of use of the st.emph. and st.abs. is a consequence of the fact that the linguistic system governing their use is dependent on two distinct (sub)systems:
   a) A linguistic system in which the distinction between st.emph. and st.abs. is fully maintained and carried out;
   b) A linguistic system in which the distinction between the two is neutralized to the advantage of the st.emph., that by and large proves to exert both functions;

3. Though these two systems are coexistent in the linguistic system of the Aramaic of TJS, they are not intermingled. In other words, they are not interchangeable, and a close scrutiny of our corpus formulation, however, is framed by Functional Grammar (FG1: 127ff., 183ff.).

19 As shall be seen later on, the genitivus materiae and related constructions follow rules of their own in terms of determination, due to specific patterns of interaction between the A-term and B-term of the genitive relation. As a result, the B-term of these constructions, though generic in meaning and therefore semantically determinate, is not systematically in the st.emph. (cf. D:3.2.2.1).
reveals that each of them is used under distinct circumstances.\textsuperscript{20}

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

\section{2. \textsc{Status Empathaticus and Status Absolutus} in \textsc{Targum Jonathan to Samuel}}

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

\subsection{2.1 Nouns in the Plural}

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

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

\textsuperscript{21} Lambdin & Huehnergard (unpublished: 44) have reached a similar conclusion independently with regard to the Aramaic of TO. This was unknown to me at the time Kuty (2005) was submitted for publication.
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illustrate this state of affairs:22

1. Indeterminate nouns:
   - With numeral: I.2.1 ‘three sons and two daughters’, I.13.17 ‘three companies’, II.9.10 ‘fourteen sons and twenty servants’, II.15.16 ‘ten women’;
   - Accompanied by a noun in apposition: II.2.7 ‘warrior men’, II.20.3 ‘women concubines’;
   - With modifier ‘all’: II.5.11 ‘all the cattle’, II.10.5 ‘all the instruments made of’ fir wood’, II.22.3 ‘all robbers’, II.22.30 ‘all strong cities’;
   - As the B-term of a construct relation: I.16.21 ‘a bearer of weapons’.24

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


24 Instances of indeterminate plural nouns in the st.abs. can be mentioned ad libitum, e.g. II.5.11 ‘and Hiram the king of Tyre sent messengers unto David, and wood of cedars and carpenters who were trained to cut wood and artisans who where trained in the building of walls’. Instances of Topic Introduction/Maintenance are particularly suitable for illustrating this principle, i.e. instances where a noun (or, strictly speaking, its referent) is introduced into the discourse for the first time and is therefore semantically indeterminate, to be mentioned again later as a part of the story, this time as a determinate term because its referent is deemed available to the addressee (cf. W:4.2.1.1.1), e.g. I.6.10 ‘and they took two cows’, continued in I.6.12 ‘and the cows went straight’; I.25.5 ‘and David sent ten young men, and David said to the young men’, I.19.14 ‘and Saul sent messengers’, continued in the next verse I.19.15 ‘and Saul sent the messengers (again)’; II.6.17 ‘and David brought up holocausts before the Lord and offerings of holy things’, continued in the next verse II.6.18 ‘and David finished bringing up the holocausts and the offerings of holy things’.
2. Determinate nouns:

- Absolute use: I.12.21 ‘the idols’, I.31.8 ‘the handmaids’, II.6.22 ‘the handmaids’, II.15.31 ‘the rebels’;
- With numeral: I.6.18 ‘the five lords’, II.18.24 ‘the two gates’, II.23.22 ‘the three warriors’;
- With modifier ‘all’: I.10.18 ‘all the kingdoms’, II.10.19 ‘all the kings’;
- As the B-term of a construct relation: I.17.22 ‘the keeper of the baggage’, II.1.20 ‘the daughters of the uncircumcised ones’.

There are only a few exceptions to what may be termed the ‘plural factor’. In some instances, the awkward use of the status in TJS has a parallel in BH with its occasional obscure (lack of) use of the article.

Finally, instances involving both determinate and indeterminate items will fully clarify the point, e.g. II.13.18 ‘thus the virgin daughters of the king wore tunics’.

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

- Construction n°1: I.22.4BH ‘all the days that David was in the stronghold’ [‘all the days that David was hiding in the stronghold’], I.25.7BH ‘all the days that they were in Carmel’ [‘all the days that we were with them keeping the sheep’].
- Construction n°2: I.20.31BH ‘all the days that the son of Jesse lives’ [‘all the days that he dwelt in the field of the Philistines’], I.27.11BH ‘all the days that he lives’ [‘all the days that they live in the land’]; the only exception encountered in our corpus is I.1.28BH ‘all the days that he lives’.

26 Cases of a plural determinate noun modified by an attributive adjective or participle (e.g. יָיִשׁ ‘the good kings’) are not encountered in our corpus, but a few instances are found in other parts of TJFP, e.g. Jos 23.15 ‘all the good things’, Jos 24.17 ‘those great signs’, Jdg 5.24 ‘the good women’.
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e.g. I.17.43 ‘that you come to me with staves’ [בעים], I.18.8 ‘they have given to David ten thousands [אלפים], and to me they have given (the) thousands [אלפים]’, I.28.6 ‘neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by teachers’ [אלפים], I.30.17 ‘who rode upon camels’ [מסך ומסכת], I.22.22 ‘from the blood of the killed, from the fat of the warriors’ [מסכת ומסכת], II.1.23 ‘(they were) swifter than the eagles, more powerful than the lions’ [ממעט ומעמות], II.16.6 ‘(and he was pelting) with stones’ [ממעט ומעמות].

Such instances aptly remind us that determination in Hebrew is not without problems of its own. In addition, the notion of determination may not have been exactly identical in Hebrew and Aramaic, which might explain certain discrepancies between the two. One should therefore be extremely cautious in assessing what is and is not ‘regular’.

As a result, the number of problematic instances drops drastically. These include I.2.32 ‘(because of) the sins (that you have sinned ...’ [/], I.5.9 ‘(and they were stricken) with haemorrhoids’ [מימוס], I.8.12 ‘farm laborers’ [/], I.8.12 ‘craftsmen’ [/], I.10.5 ‘(you will meet) a band of teachers’ [שבב], I.21.16 ‘lacking of mad men’ [מעמות], I.22.7 ‘(will he appoint) chiefs of thousands and chiefs of hundreds?’ [מעמות], II.7.2 ‘with panels of cedars’ [/], II.13.6 ‘two dumplings’ [מעמות].

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


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

30 Interestingly, among the exceptions one will note that a few nouns in the pl. are consistent in their use of the st.emph., whether semantically determinate or indeterminate, e.g. `the stones’, `the teachers’, `the water(s)’. With only a few exceptions (II.5.20, II.18.17), with these nouns the st.emph. appears to be the rule. The same seems to apply to gentilicia. TJS features only two instances involving a plural gentilic adjective in a semantically indeterminate context, both of which feature the st.emph.: I.18.25/II.3.14 `foreskins of Philistines’. On the other hand one will note one unique instance of st.abs. in a semantically determinate context: II.20.14 `all the Berites’. Finally, it is noteworthy that the bulk of the exceptions feature semantically indeterminate items being rendered by formally determinate nouns rather than the opposite: this is therefore consonant with the notion that it is the st.emph. that encroaches on the territory of the
In the final analysis, plurality, a morphosyntactic parameter, appears to guarantee the observance of the classical distinction, and one may note in passing that this fact alone is sufficient to invalidate the claim that st.emph. and st.abs. do not work properly anymore in TJ.

2.2 NOUNS IN THE SINGULAR

2.2.1 TYPE A AND TYPE B

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

- **Type A**: Nouns that occur in the st.abs., e.g. יֵלָד ‘child’,\(^{31}\) as in I.1.5 מָחָרִים וַיַּחְפֶּשׁ מִמֶּה הָלָד ‘from before the Lord a child was withheld from her’;
- **Type B**: Nouns that occur in the st.emph., e.g. אִשָּׁה ‘woman’, as in I.28.7 בֵּמוֹל אִשָּׁה וְדִוָּו ‘seek for me a woman who knows...’\(^{32}\)

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

- Semantically determinate nouns occur in the st.emph.;
- Semantically indeterminate nouns occur in the st.abs. or st.emph. according as they belong to Type A or Type B.\(^{33}\)

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

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

\(^{33}\) In the plural, as we have seen, all nouns maintain the classical distinction between st.abs. and st.emph. (cf. D:2.1).
As already suggested (D:1.4), the foremost conclusion that can be drawn from this bipartite distribution and from the very existence of Type B is that the Aramaic of TJS displays a preference for the st.emph., allowing it to encroach on the domains that were traditionally the prerogatives of the st.abs. As a result of this, the rest of this chapter will focus on the behaviour of semantically indeterminate nouns, which likewise appear without the article in the Vorlage.

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

### 2.2.2 Formally Feminine Nouns

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

Typical instances include: I.2.13 ‘every man who offered a sacrifice’, I.7.9 ‘and he offered it up as a burnt offering’, I.24.4 ‘and there was a cave there’, I.25.25 ‘and stupidity is with him’, I.28.7 ‘seek for me a woman who knows...’, I.30.12 ‘and they gave to him a cake of figs’, II.3.7 ‘and Saul had a concubine’, II.4.8 ‘and the Lord has worked vengeance’, II.6.8 ‘the Lord made a break on Uzzah’, II.11.14 ‘and David wrote a letter’, II.12.3 ‘and it was like a daughter to him’, II.13.2 ‘she was a virgin’, II.17.9 ‘there has been a slaughter among the people ...’, II.18.25 ‘there is news in his mouth’.

---

34 It must be noted that nouns referred to as ‘formally masculine’ include not only semantically masculine nouns (e.g. יָּרֵץ ‘king’), but also semantically feminine nouns without formal feminine marker (e.g. יָּרֵץ ‘sword’).
‘and they piled up a rampart against the city’, II.20.19
‘we are at peace in good faith with Israel’, II.20.19
‘you are seeking to destroy a city (that is a great capital and a mother in Israel)’, II.22.10
‘a cloud covered the way before him’, II.22.27
‘Jacob who was walking in purity’, II.23.21
‘and in the hand of the Egyptian was a spear’. Such a state of affairs strongly suggests that feminine nouns as a whole belong to Type B.\(^{35}\)

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

---

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

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

\(^{37}\) On the combination of nouns with the numeral (גָּם), cf. N:2.1.

\(^{38}\) On contamination, cf. D:2.2.3.
2.2.3 FORMALLY MASCULINE NOUNS

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

a) Some formally masculine nouns are very poorly attested in TJS, many of them occurring only once or twice in the whole corpus. Thus the nouns רֵדֶר ‘exile’ and קוֹנֹר ‘son-in-law’ occur only once each in a semantically indeterminate context: the former in the st.abs., II.14.14 ‘so as not to scatter from him an exile’; and the latter in the st.emph., I.18.18 ‘I should be son-in-law to the king’. In such cases, the sheer paucity of the evidence precludes any definite statement on the nouns’ classification as either Type;

b) Other formally masculine nouns are more amply attested, but it turns out to be difficult to find ‘pure breeds’, i.e. nouns that occur systematically either in the st.abs. or in the st.emph. when semantically indeterminate. Thus the noun עָבֶד ‘treachery, deception’ occurs twice in our corpus in a semantically indeterminate context: once in the st.abs., I.15.29 ‘before whom there is no deception’; once in the st.emph., II.18.13 ‘otherwise I would have done treachery against my own life’. Such a state of affairs should not come as a surprise, however: inasmuch as two determination systems rooted in two widely different principles co-exist side by side in the Aramaic of TJS a certain amount of confusion — actually interference, or contamination — is inevitable. But inevitable though this contamination may be, the ambiguity it causes can make the evidence inconclusive.

For these reasons, the state of affairs of the masc.sg. in TJS is often not straightforward, and in not a few cases it has proven difficult to assign masculine nouns to Type A or Type B. Extending the analysis to the whole of TJ would no doubt contribute to dispelling the ambiguity, but
this is beyond the scope of the present study. In view of the material that we have at our disposal in our corpus, in many cases the question of the classification of formally masculine nouns as either Type is therefore bound to remain uncertain.\textsuperscript{39}

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

a) The classification results from an analysis of formally masc.sg. nouns occurring in a semantically indeterminate context in TJS. When in doubt as to the state of determination of a given item, the Vorlage was where possible consulted to settle the matter;\textsuperscript{40}

b) Instances where the use of the st.abs. or st.emph. with a semantically indeterminate item in TJS can be presumed to be the product of some specific factor or linguistic context are not taken into consideration. The classification of a noun is therefore based solely on the instances where the use of the st.abs. or st.emph. can be taken to be a reflection of the Type of the noun rather than the manifestation of some other contingency. On the other hand, instances where a factor, established by other means, is ignored double in import and are obviously counted as part of the admissible evidence;

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{40} I am aware that resorting to the Vorlage in case of doubt is not the ideal solution. But insofar as in many cases the Aramaic of TJS can be shown to follow the BH original closely, referring to the Vorlage, in addition to being the last resort, is not out of place.
status congruous with the Type (st.abs. for Type A, st.emph. for Type B);\(^{41}\)

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

1. Type A:

- ‘god’: I.17.46 ‘there is a god in Israel’, II.7.24 ‘you were for them for god’;
- ‘man’ (Lat. homo): I.2.33 ‘and a man I shall not cut off for you’, I.30.2 ‘and they did not kill a man’;
- ‘place’: I.15.12 ‘he set up ... a place to divide up the spoil’, I.27.5 ‘let them give to me a place’;
- ‘commoner’: I.24.15 ‘(after whom are you pursuing? ...) after a commoner’, II.3.39 ‘and this day I, a commoner, am anointed for kingship’;
- ‘child’: I.1.5 ‘from before the Lord a child was withheld from her’, II.6.23 ‘she had no child’;
- ‘part, share, portion’: I.1.1 (lit.) ‘the man was dividing a share’, II.20.1 ‘there is no portion for us in David’;
- ‘hand’ (fem.): I.19.9 ‘and David was playing by hand’, II.23.6 ‘until it is impossible to approach them by hand’;
- ‘food’: I.22.13 ‘by giving to him food and a sword’,\(^{43}\) II.9.10 ‘and it will be food for the son of...’

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

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

\(^{43}\) This instance presents us with a very apposite illustration of the two Types of nouns, נון (Type A) occurring in the st.abs. and רְמָה (Type B) in the st.emph.
your master’;

- ‘people’: I.12.22 ‘to make you ... into a people’, II.7.23 ‘to save for him a people’;
- ‘covenant, oath’: I.1.11 ‘and she swore an oath’, I.20.16 ‘and Jonathan cut a covenant’;
- ‘name’: II.7.23 ‘and to make for him a name’, II.23.22 ‘and he had a name among the three warriors’;
- ‘peace’: I.20.7 ‘there is peace to your servant’, II.18.32 ‘is there peace to the young man?’.

2. Type B:

- ‘stone’ (fem.): I.17.49 ‘he took from there a stone’, II.17.13 ‘until we will not leave there a stone’;
- ‘guilt’: I.6.3 ‘you will bring .. a (lit.) offering of guilt’, I.6.8 ‘and the vessels of gold that you are returning ... (as) an offering of guilt’;
- ‘house’: II.5.11 ‘and they built a house for David’, II.7.6 ‘I have not made my Shekinah reside in a house’;
- ‘man’ (Lat. vir): I.9.16 ‘I will send to you a man’, I.17.4 ‘and a man from among them came forth’;
- ‘sin, guilt, debt’: I.20.8 ‘if there is sin in me’, I.28.10 ‘if harm happens to you’;
- ‘strength, army’: I.2.9 ‘who(ever) in whom there is

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

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

46 Theoretically, the form כָּן could be read as the st.abs. of the feminine noun כָּן, to the effect that there would be no case for classifying this item as Type B. However, it is significant that (1) when there is a Vorlage all instances of the form כָּן in a semantically indeterminate context in TJS render BH כְּּהֶב, and that (2) conversely, in all cases where BH כְּּהֶב is rendered in TJS with an inflected form of כְּּהֶב, an unambiguously masculine form is encountered, not a feminine (thus I.3.13, I.3.14, I.20.1, II.3.8, II.22.24). This suggests that the cases of כָּן discussed above should be read as the st.emph. sg. of the masculine noun כְּּהֶב rather than the st.abs. sg. of the feminine noun כָּן.
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*strength*, I.28.20 ‘there was no *strength* in him’;
- ‘sword’: I.17.45 ‘you are coming against me with a *sword*’, I.17.50 ‘and there was no *sword* in the hand of David’;
- ‘day’: I.2.34 ‘in one *day* the two of them will be killed’, I.27.1 ‘perhaps I will be given over one *day* in the hand of Saul’;
- ‘bread, food’: I.30.11 ‘and they gave him *bread*’, II.3.35 ‘(if) I should taste *bread* or anything else’;
- ‘altar’: I.14.35 ‘to build an *altar* before the Lord’, II.24.18 ‘erect before the Lord an *altar*’;
- ‘death’: II.24.13 ‘and that there be three days death in your land’, II.24.15 ‘and the Lord gave *death* in Israel’;
- ‘king’: I.8.5 ‘appoint for us *a king*’, I.8.10 ‘the people that asked of him *a king*’;
- ‘gift, present’: I.30.26 ‘*a present* for you from the spoil of ...’, II.19.43 ‘(lit.) if he portioned out *(any) gift* to us’;
- ‘young man’: I.25.14 ‘*a young man* told Abigail’, II.17.18 ‘*a young man* saw them’;
- ‘dust’: II.15.32 ‘and *dust* was cast upon his head’, II.16.13 ‘and throwing *dust*’;
- ‘redemption, delivery, victory’: I.11.9 ‘tomorrow you will have *deliverance*’, I.19.5 ‘and the Lord worked a great *victory* for all Israel’;

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

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

49 In many cases the noun *לִכְדָּא* refers specifically to the king of Israel, i.e. to one particular individual, as in I.13.14 ‘*a king* whom I have set over my people’ and the Lord commanded him to be king over his people’. In those cases, BH regularly features the st.abs. *לִכְדָּא*. Though the present study treats these cases of *לִכְדָּא* as semantically indeterminate (‘*a king*’), one cannot exclude that a semantically determinate reading ‘*the king*’ was intended, inasmuch as *לִכְדָּא* refers to an entity thought to be unique in the addressee’s knowledge of the world (cf. D:1.3).
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- ‘piece (of bread)’: I.2.36, ‘to eat a piece of bread’, I.28.22, ‘and let me set before you a piece of bread’;
- ‘word, thing’ as in I.3.11, ‘behold I am doing a thing in Israel’, I.21.3, ‘the king commanded me a word’.

3. FACTORS

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

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

3.1 MORPHOLOGICAL FACTORS

3.1.1 ADJECTIVES AND PARTICIPLES USED SUBSTANTIALLY

When used on their own with the value of a substantive, adjectives and participles respect the classical distinction, e.g. I.2.32, ‘there will not be an old (man) in your house’, I.16.1, ‘there is revealed ... one fitting ... to be the king’, I.18.23, ‘is it a small (thing) in your eyes?’, I.23.17, ‘I will be second to you’, I.26.20, ‘a weak (man)’, II.3.29, ‘one leprous’, II.3.38, ‘one powerful (one) has fallen this day’, II.4.10, ‘like
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one bringing good news’, II.12.11  ‘behold I am raising up evil’, II.15.19  ‘and if you are an exile’, II.18.32  ‘all who have risen up against you for evil’. 

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

Finally, particularly notable here is the nominal pattern qāṭīl, whose

50 As a rule, the adjectives פּ and פּ, when used on their own to express ‘good thing, goodness, good’ and ‘evil thing, badness, wickedness, evil’ respectively, tend to follow the Vorlage closely. Thus one usually encounters פּ and פּ where the Vorlage has פּ and פּ and פּ where the Vorlage has פּ and פּ and פּ when the Vorlage has פּ and פּ. Examples include I.24.18  ‘for you have repaid me good [servant] and I have repaid you evil [servant]’, II.19.36  ‘do I know between good [man] and bad [man]?’. Cases where TJS substitutes a relative clause for the BH phrase definite article הָ and adjective, as for BH הָ (e.g. I.15.9, I.15.19, I.27.1, I.29.6, II.12.9), form a regular category of exceptions. Other cases of discrepancy between TJS and the Vorlage are encountered: I.16.23, I.24.20, I.25.21, I.25.21, I.25.26, I.25.28, II.14.17, II.16.12. The question remains as to whether these discrepancies originate in a different notion of determination on the part of the Targumist. Finally, a few instances involving a semantically determinate element can be mentioned: I.2.8  ‘he raises up the poor ... he exalts the needy’, I.14.2  ‘like the woman ... mourning over the dead one’ (genericity); I.12.20  ‘you have brought about all this evil’, I.13.17  ‘and the destroyer went forth’, I.14.49  ‘the name of the elder ... the name of the younger’, I.16.11  ‘the youngest is still left’, II.12.2-3  ‘the rich (man) had sheep ... and the poor (man) had nothing ...’ (cognitive availability).

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

52 It is uncertain whether the pael ptc. belongs here, i.e. whether in some cases at least it should be read as ‘servant’ rather than ‘one who serves’ (e.g. I.1.11  ‘and I will hand over him, who will be serving/a servant before the Lord’). If that should be the case, then evidence suggests that the noun פּ would have to be classified as Type A. The question would then remain of to what extent the verbal stem is relevant for classifying the Type of participles used substantivally, i.e. whether the fact that פּ can be classified as Type B and פּ as Type A should be taken as an indication that participles of the simple stem (peal) and participles of the derived stems behave differently when promoted to the status of ordinary nouns.
nouns were originally Peal participles. As a rule, nouns of that pattern (e.g. ‘priest’, ‘young, child, suckling’, ‘redeemer, deliverer’, ‘dying (person)’, ‘witness’, ‘one having flow’, ‘fugitive’) appear to respect the distinction and should therefore be classified as Type A, e.g. as in II.10.11 ‘and you will be a deliverer for me’, II.22.42 ‘and there was no deliverer for them’, as in I.2.28 ‘and the child was young’, as in II.22.3 ‘and the child was young’, as in II.14.14 ‘the death of a dying person’, as in (indeter.) I.2.28 ‘and I took delight in him ... to be priest’ vs. (deter.) I.21.5 ‘and the priest answered David’.

3.1.2 INFINITIVES USED SUBSTANTIALLY

Infinitive forms used substantivally appear to form a consistent, though peculiar, category of nouns. The instances encountered in TJS suggest that they occur in the st.abs. not only when semantically indeterminate, as in II.15.14 ‘there will be no escape for us’; but also when unambiguously semantically determinate, as in I.4.6 ‘this sound of the great shouting’ (with agreement in determination of the accompanying attributive adjective, cf. D:3.2.1.2.1), I.18.19 ‘the being given of Merab’, II.16.2 ‘the drinking of those grown weak’. However, when infinitives are used as ordinary rather than verbal nouns, they prove to be like any other noun, in that they belong to one of the two Types and behave accordingly. Thus ‘feast, banquet’ (as against ‘to drink, the drinking’) turns out to be of Type B, e.g. I.25.36 ‘and behold he had a feast in his house’, II.3.20 ‘and I took delight in him ... to be priest’ vs. (deter.) I.21.5 ‘and the priest answered David’.

53 Dalman (1905: 282).

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

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

Certain nouns borrowed from foreign languages always occur in the st.abs., even when semantically determinate, e.g. הָעַלָּל פּוֹרֶשׁ הַכִּפְרוֹן ‘belt for sword’ as in II.21.16 ‘and he was girded with a new belt’, world as in I.2.8 ‘he established the world for them’, II.22.16 ‘the foundations of the world’, רָעָב מְדִינָה ... פְּסוֹל as in I.14.2 ‘and Saul dwelt ... beneath the pomegranate tree which is in Migron’, פַּהֲרִים ‘ravine, forenoon’ (?) as in II.2.29 ‘and they went all the afternoon’. In actual fact, these nouns are not in the st.abs. stricto sensu. They know no accidence in Aramaic; they know but one form — the one in which they were borrowed — which, lacking the typical ending of the st.emph., looks by default like the st.abs.

3.2 SYNTACTIC AND MORPHOSYNTACTIC FACTORS

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

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

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

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

59 This echoes their difference in terms of Type classification (cf. D:2.2.1).
3.2.1 ADJECTIVES / PARTICIPLES AND DETERMINATION

3.2.1.1 Adjectives / Participles in Predicative Function

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

- Adjective: II.7.22 ‘you are great’, II.6.22 ‘I will be small’ (with crasis of adjective and pronoun), II.13.15 ‘greater was the hate ...’;
- Active ptc.: I.18.9 ‘and Saul was lying in wait for David’, I.29.9 ‘I know’ (with crasis of participle and pronoun), II.6.2 ‘whose Shekinah resides above the Cherubim’, II.11.5 ‘I am pregnant’;
- Passive ptc.: I.14.28 ‘cursed be the man who ...’, II.6.16 ‘evil is determined by him’, II.5.12 ‘his kingdom was exalted’.

In this context it should be emphasized that a participle or adjective does not need to be at the core of the predication to function predicatively, e.g. I.10.5 ‘and you will meet a band of teachers going down ...’, II.6.16 ‘and she saw King David dancing and praising’, II.11.2 ‘he saw a woman washing herself’, II.18.10 ‘I have seen Absalom suspended in the terebinth’, II.18.24 ‘and behold a man was running by himself’.

---

60 As already underlined, this factor obtains with adjectives and participles only. In contrast, nouns used predicatively know no such constraint and occur in the st.abs. or st.emph. according to their Type, e.g. (Type A) I.17.33 ‘you are a child’; (Type B) II.13.2 ‘she is a virgin’. II.14.5 ‘I am a widow’, II.5.17 ‘they anointed David to be king over Israel’.

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

3.2.1.2.1 Introduction
Determination Agreement in Noun Phrases

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

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

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

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

62 Not many exceptions to this principle have been found in TJS. One may note II.12.3 אָבָא רוּבֵג ‘one small lamb’, II.12.30 אָבָא רוּבֵג ‘a precious (lit. good) stone’ (which, however, various variant readings render as II.12.3 אָבָא רוּבֵג and II.12.30 אָבָא רוּבֵג ‘a precious (lit. good) stone’ respectively). One may note in passing that this principle is understandably of wider application. To mention but one typical instance, the demonstrative adjectives אֵשׁ יִשָּׂרָאֵל accompany both semantically and formally determinate noun phrases, e.g. I.6.9 ‘this great evil’, I.14.45 ‘this great victory’. Only one exception is encountered in TJS: I.17.12 רְעֵב אֲמָר ‘the son of that Ephraimite’, which is probably better to be explained as a Hebraism (יִשָּׂרֵאֵל אֹבֵן).
the use of the st.abs. with semantically indeterminate nouns or, to put it another way, the presence of an attributive adjective/participle significantly curtails the use of the st.emph. with semantically indeterminate nouns. Nonetheless, one also notes that formally masculine and feminine nouns do not respond to this factor in exactly the same way.

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


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

Obviously, with semantically determinate noun phrases the st.emph. is the rule, e.g. I.19.22 ‘the great cistern’, I.25.25 ‘this evil man’, I.30.16 ‘all the great booty’, II.11.15 ‘the hard(est) combat’, II.12.4 ‘the rich man’, II.13.16 ‘this great evil’, II.16.9 ‘this dead dog’. Only a few exceptions are found in our corpus, e.g. I.12.23 ‘a great victory’, I.6.6 ‘the appointed place’. But nothing indicates that this exceptional behaviour is due to the presence of the participle.

63 Obviously, with semantically determinate noun phrases the st.emph. is the rule, e.g. I.19.22 ‘the great cistern’, I.25.25 ‘this evil man’, I.30.16 ‘all the great booty’, II.11.15 ‘the hard(est) combat’, II.12.4 ‘the rich man’, II.13.16 ‘this great evil’, II.16.9 ‘this dead dog’. Only a few exceptions are found in our corpus, e.g. I.12.23 ‘a great victory’, I.6.6 ‘the appointed place’. But nothing indicates that this exceptional behaviour is due to the presence of the participle.

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

a) With adjectives:

b) With participles: I.1.13 ἀνὴρ ἐξηράντης ‘a drunken woman’, I.3.1 ἀνὴρ ἐξηράντης ἐξήραντα ‘(a) revealed prophecy’, II.22.9 ἀνὴρ ἐξηράντης ‘a burning fire’.

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

3.2.1.2.3 Adjectival / Participial Phrases

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

65 This particular instance might also have been influenced by the immediately following phrase ἐξ ἀντίπατου ‘from before the Lord’ (cf. D:3.3.3).
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I.1.15 ‘a woman anguished of spirit’, I.2.18 ‘a young man girt with a sleeved tunic of linen’, II.14.27 ‘a woman beautiful of appearance’, where the noun is formally determinate and the phrase indeterminate respectively; and I.13.14 ‘a man doing his good pleasure’, where the reverse takes place.

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


67 Similarly, the autonomy between noun and phrase is manifest in II.24.9 נְאֹת לָמְצָא וְלָמְצֵא מַעְלָה (lit.) ‘800000 men warriors drawing the sword’, where the noun phrase דָּם (cf. below) is formally sg. (because of the preceding numeral, cf. N:3) and the participial phrase is formally pl. (in agreement with the semantic number of the whole noun phrase). Obviously, however, noun and phrase do not always disagree in determination and/or number, e.g. I.2.3 ‘an all-knowing god’ (where, however, the use of the st.emph. with the noun דָּם is unusual, inasmuch as it belongs to Type A), I.13.19 ‘a craftsman making armor’, I.16.18 ‘a man waging battle’.


69 Finally, it would appear that nouns in apposition have the same behavioural properties as attributive adjectives and participles. Thus when the modifier is a bare noun the st.abs. is preferred, e.g. I.4.20 ‘you have born a son, a male’, I.24.3 (lit.) ‘30.000 men young (people)’, I.30.17 (lit.) ‘400 men, young (people)’, II.1.13 (lit.) ‘a man, a stranger’, II.3.8 (lit.) ‘a man, a commoner’, II.8.4 (lit.) ‘and he, even (if he is) a man warrior’. These instances also illustrate that the determination agreement between noun and modifier (cf. D:3.2.1.2.1) is observed, as with bare attributive adjectives and participles. On the other hand, when the apposition is a complex noun phrase both noun and phrase are autonomous in terms of determination, e.g. I.16.20 ‘one kid, child of a goat’, where formally the noun and the appositional phrase are determinate and indeterminate
3.2.2 GENITIVE CONSTRUCTIONS AND DETERMINATION

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

3.2.2.1 D-Relation and Determination

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


- Determinate: II.18.29 ‘the servant of the king’, II.7.27 ‘the heart of your servant’, I.14.51 ‘the father of Saul’

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

70 I.e. ‘Status Pronominalis’, a traditional label referring to nouns featuring a suffix pronoun.

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

72 Examples of this agreement principle are countless. Leaving out the instances involving an infinitival A-term (cf. D:3.1.2), on the whole only seven exceptions have been found in our corpus, among which five involve a genitivus materiae
The agreement in determination between the two terms of a *d*-relation was already noted by Kaddari with regard to TO.\(^{73}\) Kaddari also noted an influence of the B-term on the A-term in terms of determination, namely that the A-term is determinate (i.e. in the st.emph.) when the B-term is for some reason determinate, and that the A-term is not determinate if the B-term is not itself determinate.\(^{74}\) Though it is certainly true that *d*-relations involving an indeterminate A-term and a determinate B-term (of the type ‘a brother of David’) are hardly attested in our corpus,\(^{75}\) I believe that Kaddari’s statement is not entirely accurate. Indeed, the linguistic evidence suggests that when an influence in determination is exerted by one of the terms of the *d*-relation upon the other, it usually goes the other way round, i.e. from the A-term to the B-term.\(^{76}\) This observation is mainly derived from the genitive of matter and partitive genitive (cf. G:2.5), in which this influence can be spotted in contrastive pairs of the type I.2.36 פליסת שלם ‘a coin of silver’, II.5.20 פליסת שלם ‘a vessel of clay’, I.16.1 נגיס דמים ‘a skin of wine’ vs. I.1.24 נגיס דמים ‘one measure of flour’, I.9.8 נגיס דמים ‘one zuz of silver’, I.17.6 נגיס דמים ‘a javelin of bronze’, I.19.13 נגיס דמים ‘a goatskin’. In all these cases the A-term is in the st.abs. or st.emph., whether by virtue of its Type or through the influence of some factor, and the formal determination of the A-term is taken over by the B-term.\(^{77}\) This influence comes out most clearly in the cases where the B-term belongs to Type B and occurs nonetheless in the st.abs. so as to conform to the A-term, (four with indeterminate A-term and determinate B-term: I.17.17 פליסת שלם ‘loaves of bread’, I.17.18 פליסת שלם ‘cheeses of milk’, II.21.16 פליסת שלם ‘selas of bronze’; one with determinate A-term and indeterminate B-term II.6.19 פליסת שלם ‘cake of bread’, one a partitive genitive (II.21.19 פליסת שלם ‘the wood of his spear’), and finally II.14.14 פליסת שלם ‘the death of a dying (person)’.\(^{77}\)

\(^{73}\) Kaddari (1963a: 241-245).

\(^{74}\) Kaddari (1963a: 243, 244, 245).

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

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

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

The present study brings another tendency to the fore: in construct relations, if the A-term is a plural noun or participle the B-term, if it is sg., is systematically formally determinate. In other words, if the B-term is a singular common noun without pronominal suffix it occurs in the st.emph., irrespective of its actual semantic determination. By its very nature this tendency concerns indeterminate nouns, and as indeterminate fem. sg. nouns naturally tend to occur in the st.emph. it bears more specifically on masc. nouns. As was noted above, the Type of many of these nouns is uncertain; what is significant, however, is that with only a few exceptions the B-term of these construct relations is always in the st.emph. Instances include I.6.4 ‘(five) haemorrhoids of gold’, I.6.4 ‘(five) mice of gold’, I.10.27 ‘men of wickedness’, II.1.24 ‘ornaments of gold’, II.8.10 ‘vessels of silver’, II.12.24 ‘vessels of gold’, II.12.31 ‘vessels of bronze’, II.14.2 ‘axes of iron’, II.22.11 ‘wings of wind’; (with active participle as A-term) I.10.26 ‘fearers of sin’, II.24.9 ‘drawers of sword’.

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

Plural adjectives might not be subjected to this rule, e.g. I.26.16 ‘men deserving killing’. Instances of this type are not sufficiently attested in TJS to permit any definite conclusions.

As expected, if the B-term is plural the classical distinction between the status is maintained, e.g. I.14.32 ‘calves’ (lit. ‘sons of oxen’), II.1.24 ‘garments of coloured stuff’, II.22.5 ‘a company of sinners’, II.23.7 ‘wood of spear’. One may note a few exceptions: I.2.10 ‘the armies of the violent nations’, I.10.5 ‘the armies of teachers’, II.7.2 ‘pannels of cedar’, II.18.1 ‘chiefs of thousands’ (as against the regular I.8.12 with identical meaning).

Exceptions are rare. One may note II.8.2/II.8.6 ‘bearers of tribute’, II.22.6 ‘weapons of killing’, II.22.41 ‘those who turn back their neck’ (lit. ‘turners-back of neck’). Obviously, this principle is irrelevant when the
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3.2.3 REPETITIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

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

3.3 LEXICAL FACTORS

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

---

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

\(^{83}\) The only unambiguous exception encountered in TJS is II.21.1 ‘year after year’.

\(^{84}\) Similarly, in the English expression ‘to kick the bucket’ the direct object must be formally determinate, i.e. provided with the definite article, for the expression to have its idiomatic reading ‘to die’. The clause ‘John kicked a bucket’, though certainly not ungrammatical, can only be interpreted literally (FG1: 103-104).
the lexicon more than on grammatical structures. But inasmuch as on account of their idiomatic character the st.abs. or st.emph. is encountered irrespective of the noun’s actual semantic determination they deserve to be noted here.

3.3.1 Word Pairs and Enumerations

The st.abs. is preferred in various word pairs (falling usually under the scope of hendiadys) featuring semantically indeterminate nouns, even when either or both of the nouns involved belong to Type B. Examples include I.24.12 ‘guilt and corruption’, I.28.3 ‘fictions and necromantic apparitions’, II.2.6 ‘goodness and truth’, II.14.7 ‘name and remainder’, II.15.4 ‘judgement and quarrel’, II.8.15 ‘judgement (of truth) and righteousness’ [משמא וחרות], II.22.47 ‘strength and salvation’.

This is also the case with enumerations, e.g. I.27.9 ‘man and woman’, I.22.19 ‘and ox and ass and sheep’, I.15.3 ‘from man unto woman’, I.22.19 ‘from camel unto ass’, I.22.19 ‘from youth and unto suckling’.

3.3.2 Prepositional Phrases with Adverbial Character

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

- ‘in peace’, as in II.3.21 ‘ואל בשלום, בשולם’, I.1.17 ‘in peace!’;
- ‘in security’, as in I.12.11 ‘וזיכהו לשלום’, I.17.11 ‘in security’;
- ‘in truth’, as in II.17.11 ‘חיינו עליך, בני ישראל’, I.26.4 ‘Saul had really come’;
- ‘for multitude’, as in II.17.11 ‘כחת את מעה, ימים רבים’, I.26.4 ‘for multitude’;
- ‘in carelessness’, as in I.14.45 ‘in carelessness he acted this day’;

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

85
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- ‘with joy’, as in II.6.12 and he brought up the ark of the Lord ... ‘with joy’;
- ‘with delight’, as in II.24.23 ‘may the Lord your god accept your offering with good pleasure’;
- ‘in secret’, as in I.18.22 ‘speak with David in secret’; 86
- ‘in haste’, as in II.17.18 ‘and the two of them went quickly’ and I.21.9 ‘the word of the king was in haste’. 87

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

3.3.3 PREPOSITIONAL PHRASE וְמִקְדֵּם לַהֲדוֹר כָּרָת ‘from before the Lord’

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

- Indeterminate: I.10.26 ‘fear from before the Lord’, I.16.15 ‘הָאָדָם וְמַעֲשַׂה מִקְדֵּם לַהֲדוֹר כָּרָת ‘a spirit of evil from before the Lord’, I.26.12 ‘פָּתַח בְּשָׁם מִקְדֵּם יָדִי יְהוָה’

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

87 Sometimes the st.emph. is found with those phrases, e.g. בלעם ‘in peace’ (as in II.19.31 ‘אַחַ֛י בְּלֵבָ֖ם בָּשָׁם מַעֲשַׂה ‘my master the king has come in peace’), בְּבָחֵד ‘in truth’ (as in II.14.5 בְּחַפַּרְשַׁעְעַה אֶלָּא שֶׁיִּשָּׂא לְחַפַּרְשַׁעְעַה ‘in truth I am a widow woman’). In other phrases, the st.emph. is the rule, e.g. בְּבָחֵד, ‘forever’, בְּבָחֵד, ‘from of old’, as in II.7.26 ‘וַיַּעַל לְהָלֶךָ בֹּהוֹלָ כָּרָת ‘a spirit of evil from before the Lord’ and יֵחָזֵק הָאָדָם וְיִשָּׁחְצֵרָה ‘your name will be great forever’ (only exceptions in TJS: I.15.29/I.27.12). The questions remain as to whether nouns such as בָּשָׁם מַעֲשַׂה constitute exceptions to the adverbial phrases under discussion, or whether the use of the st.emph. is merely a reflection of their own Type.

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

89 For another potential factor bearing on prepositional phrases, cf. D:3.4(1).
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‘a heavy sleep from before the Lord’,\textsuperscript{90} II.9.3 ‘good from before the Lord’;

- Determinate: I.10.6 ‘the spirit of prophecy from before the Lord’, I.16.14 ‘the spirit of power from before the Lord’, I.16.23 ‘the spirit of evil from before the Lord’ (contrast with I.16.15 above), II.7.4 ‘the word of prophecy from before the Lord’.\textsuperscript{91}

3.3.4 MISCELLANEOUS EXPRESSIONS

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

a) The nouns אשה (lit.) ‘handmaid-hood’ and ממלא ‘kingship’ in the prepositional phrases:
   - e.g. I.18.27 ‘and Saul gave to him Michal his daughter for a wife’;
   - e.g. I.25.41 ‘behold your handmaid (has become) a handmaid’;
   - e.g. II.23.1 ‘the man who was raised to kingship’;\textsuperscript{92}

b) The noun בינה ‘will, pleasure’ in the expression (lit.) ‘to have pleasure in’, e.g. I.2.25 ‘for it was good pleasure before the Lord to kill them’, I.15.22 ‘is there delight before the Lord in holocausts and holy offerings?’, I.18.25 ‘the king has no pleasure in bridal presents’;

c) The noun באה ‘wish, request’ in the expression באה ‘please, by

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

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

\textsuperscript{92} The use of the st.abs. with these three items has already been noted by Van Staalduine-Sulman (2002: 390-391).
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request, as in I.15.32 ‘please, my master, death is bitter’;

d) The nouns לְפַסְתָּה הָדוֹדְתָּר וְרֹאָה in the prepositional phrase ‘by the edge of the sword’, as in II.15.14 ‘and (lest) he strike the city by the edge of the sword’.

Nouns such as לְפַסְתָּה and רֹאָה belong to Type B, and the same applies in all likelihood to the five nouns בֵּית רֹאָה, מַלְאָך, אָחָה, אָבֹד, אָבֹד inasmuch as they are formally feminine. This makes the relevance of these idiomatic constructions all the more significant. The fossilized character of the use of the st.abs. is probably to be explained on account of the high degree of conservatism associated with idiomatic expressions.

3.4 OTHER FACTORS

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

93 Other cases involve nouns whose Type cannot be ascertained due to the lack of evidence, e.g. the noun לְפַסְתָּה ‘heart’ in the expression לְפַסְתָּה תַּעֲשֶׂהוּ ‘to pay attention’ (e.g. II.18.3 ‘they will not pay attention to us’), the noun יְהוּדָה ‘justice, law, judgement’ as the direct object of the verbs תַּעֲשֶׂה and תַּעֲשֶׂה ‘to make judgement and to bring’ in the expressions תַּעֲשֶׂה וְיְהוּדָה ‘to make judgement and to bring judgement’ (e.g. I.24.16 תַּעֲשֶׂה וְיְהוּדָה ‘and (may he) make judgement between me and you’, II.15.2 תַּעֲשֶׂה וְיְהוּדָה ‘every man who had judgement to bring’). Pending a more comprehensive analysis, the nature of these phrases is bound to remain inconclusive. Conversely, one will note the following idiom, involving the st.emph.: אֶלָּא קָרַב ‘to wage battle’, e.g. I.17.32 אֶלָּא קָרַב ‘and he will wage battle with this Philistine’, II.12.29 אֶלָּא קָרַב ‘and he waged battle against it’ (only one instance with st.abs. in TJS: I.4.9 אֶלָּא קָרַב ‘and wage battle ’).
study has not permitted to establish due to the lack or equivocal character of the evidence.

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

1. A few prepositional phrases feature a fem. noun in the st.abs. Though not adverbial in character strictly speaking (cf. D:3.3.2), these phrases have in common the fact that they are used in combination with verbs implying (oral) expression, thereby providing a context for the ‘expression act’ denoted by the verb: I.1.15 ‘I have told the sorrow of my soul in prayer before the Lord’, I.7.6 ‘and they poured out their heart in repentance’, II.22.1 ‘and David gave praise in prophecy before the Lord’, II.22.4 ‘David said in praise’.

2. When used together with the modifier כול ‘all, every’, semantically indeterminate fem. nouns appear to favour the st.abs., e.g. I.4.8 כול שפחת ‘with every plague’, I.26.24 כול שפחת ‘all distress’, II.4.9 כול שפחת ‘every grief’, II.23.5 כול תבל ‘every kingdom’.

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

95 Theoretically, the form כול might just as well be read as the st.emph. of the masculine noun כול (with identical meaning). However, it is significant that (1) the form כול in the two instances under discussion renders the BH feminine noun כול, and that (2) conversely, when an inflected form of BH כול is rendered in TJFP (and TO) with a form of כול, an unambiguously feminine form is encountered, not a masculine (thus I.10.19: cf. also Jdg 10.14 and, in TO, Gen 35.3, 42.21 (2x), Deut 31.17, 31.31). This is suggestive that the cases of כול discussed above should be read as the st.abs. sg. of the feminine noun כול rather than the st.emph. sg. of the masculine noun כול.

96 Other parts of TJFP provide additional evidence, e.g. Jos 11.14 כול מה עשה כל נפשם ‘they did not leave any breath’, 1 Kgs 1.29 כול מה עשה כל נפשם ‘(the Lord who) saved my soul from all distress’, 1Kgs 7.14 כול מה עשה כל נפשם ‘to work every work in brass’; but also feature a few counterexamples, probably due to the preference of formally feminine nouns for the st.emph. (Type B): e.g. Jdg 21.11 כול מה עשה כל נפשם ‘you shall destroy ... every woman who has lain by man’, 1Kgs 8.38 כול מה עשה כל נפשם ‘every prayer and every request’, 1Kgs 10.20 כול מה עשה ‘for any kingdom’. The behaviour of masc. nouns is not clear-cut either, not in the least because their Type classification is far from straightforward. Whatever their Type, however, one will note that the st.abs. is generally encountered: I.13.21 כול מה עשה...
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3. When used in combination with the negatives לא (absolute negation) and לא (or its temporal variants etc., as an expression of absence or inexistence), fem. nouns seem to favour the st.abs.: I.3.1 ‘there was no revealed prophecy’, I.12.21 ‘and there is no profit in them’, I.21.12 ‘let there be no yield on you’, II.18.22 ‘no (good) news is being given to you’, II.20.1 ‘there is no inheritance for us in the son of Jesse’.97

4. In construct relations involving a singular noun, participle or adjective as A-term, the B-term, if it is a fem. sg. indeterminate noun, will occur in the st.abs.99 The instances attested in our corpus are: I.2.1/II.23.2 ‘a spirit of prophecy’, I.13.1 (lit.) ‘son of a year’, I.22.2 (lit.) ‘lord of a claim’, II.2.25 (lit.) ‘the top of a hill’, II.20.3 (lit.) ‘a house of guard’, II.22.3 ‘in time of distress’.100

‘every kind of iron’, I.18.5 ‘in every place that Saul sent him’, II.6.14 ‘with all power’ (Type A), II.13.9 ‘every person’ (Type A), II.15.2 ‘every man who ...’ (Type B), II.22.4 ‘at all times’. Only four instances in the st.emph. are found in TJS, two of which involve the noun bar ‘male’ (cf. D:4): I.11.2 ‘every right eye’ (involving a d-relation), II.15.4 ‘every man who’ (compare II.15.2 above), II.20.13 ‘every man’ and II.22.27 ‘every blemish’.

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

98 Here again the behaviour of masc. nouns is ambiguous. Thus the following instances feature the st.emph.: I.9.2 ‘there was no man from the sons of Israel’, I.17.39 ‘there is no experience in them’, I.17.50 ‘there was no sword in the hand of David’, I.26.18 ‘there is no guilt in my hand’, I.30.4 ‘there was no strength in them’. However, the presence of a negative marker might be the reason behind the use of the st.abs. in a few instances involving a noun of Type B: I.21.2 ‘there is no man with you’, II.22.27 ‘she does not have strength to give birth’.

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

100 The only exception is II.5.24 כּל חוּם ‘the sound of a cry’. Finally, here too the behaviour of masculine nouns is ambivalent, many occurring in the st.emph., e.g. I.11.16 ‘a daughter of wickedness’, I.6.3 ‘you will bring .. a (lit.) offering of guilt’, I.16.18 ‘a warrior of army’, I.18.13 ‘chief of a thousand’. What is significant, however, is the fact that some nouns whose
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No doubt that a more comprehensive study of TJFP would cast a fresh light on these points.

4. SPECIAL CASE

THE NOUN יֵּרָא ‘man’

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

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

- Modified by a bare adjective (e.g. II.13.3 יָשָׁם יֵּרָא ‘a wise man’) or participle (e.g. I.21.15 יָשָׁם יֵּרָא ‘a mad man’);
- Involved in an enumeration, e.g. I.27.9 יֵּרָא יָשָׁם ‘man and woman’;
- Involved in a repetitive construction, e.g. I.2.25 יֵּרָא יָשָׁם ‘if a man sins against a man’;
- Modified by יָשָׁם ‘all, every’: I.15.23 יָשָׁם יֵּרָא דֶּפֶר ‘every man who rebels’, II.15.2 יָשָׁם יֵּרָא יָשָׁם ‘every man who had a judgement’.

classification as Type B has been posited do occur in the st.abs. in this context, e.g. II.20.8 יָשָׁם יֵּרָא ‘a sword belt’.

101 Exceptions are not many. One may note I.21.2 יָשָׁם יֵּרָא ‘and there is no man with you’ (on this particular instance, cf. D:3.4(3)), II.10.6 יָשָׁם יֵּרָא ‘one thousand men’ (for the use of the sg. with the numeral, cf. N:3), II.19.8 יָשָׁם יֵּרָא ‘if a man lodges with you’.

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

103 As we saw, the evidence involving the noun modifier יָשָׁם is ambiguous in TJS, to the effect that its influence on determination was reckoned among the potential factors. However, it is very significant that the noun יֵּרָא, whose classification as Type B is hardly open to discussion, is regularly in the st.abs. as in the examples mentioned. On the whole, only two counterexamples have been encountered in TJS: II.15.4 יָשָׁם יֵּרָא יָשָׁם ‘every man who has a judgement’ (contrast with II.15.2 יָשָׁם יֵּרָא יָשָׁם with identical meaning) and II.20.13 יָשָׁם יֵּרָא ‘every man crossed
In certain other contexts, however, the noun נָּ֣רָה does not behave like other nouns. Regarding determination, this is particularly noticeable in two types of circumstances:\(^{104}\)

1. When the noun נָּ֣רָה ‘man’ is involved in distributive constructions\(^{105}\) it always occurs in the st.abs., e.g. I.10.11 ‘and the people said, each man to his fellow’, I.14.34 נַּחַלָּה כֹּלֵּ֥י נָ֣רָה פְּרִיֹּת ‘and all the people brought near, each man his ox’, I.26.23 יִ֖וּדּ הָֽבָּ֣ר לְפָ֣כְרוֹת ‘and may the Lord return to each man his righteousness and his truth’, II.2.27 ‘the people would have gone up, each man from after his brother’, II.13.29 וחָ֖רָ֣ב אֶפְּֽקְרָ֣א נָ֣ר ‘and each rode upon his mule’, II.19.9 ‘and Israel fled, each man to his city’.

2. In contrast to other nouns of Type B, when the noun נָּ֣רָה is sg., indeterminate and modified by an adjectival or participial phrase (as against bare adjectives and participles) standing in apposition to it (cf. D:3.2.1.2.3), it displays a clear tendency to occur in the st.abs., e.g. I.13.14 נָּ֣רָ֣ה תָּ֥בְוֹד תֹּ֖שְׁוָה ‘a man doing his good pleasure’, II.12.5/II.16.7 נָּ֣רָ֣ה תָּ֥בְוֹד תֹּ֖שְׁוָה ‘a man waging battles’, II.23.20 נָּ֣רָ֣ה תָּ֥בְוֹד תֹּ֖שְׁוָה ‘a man fearing sins’\(^{106}\)

\(^{104}\) For specific patterns of behaviour of the noun נָּ֣רָה with regard to grammatical number, cf. N:3.

\(^{105}\) As against repetitive constructions, cf. D:3.2.3.

\(^{106}\) In contrast to other nouns of Type B, e.g. I.2.18 ‘a young man girt with a sleeved tunic of linen’, II.14.27 ‘a woman beautiful in appearance’ (etc.). In cases such as I.22.2 ‘every man anguished of spirit’, I.22.2 ‘every man bitter of soul’ the use of the st.abs. might further have been prompted by the presence of the modifier (lit.) ‘3000 men, chosen of Israel’ and I.16.18 ‘a man handsome in his appearance’.
5. CONCLUSIONS

5.1 SUMMARY

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

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

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

5.2 WIDER PERSPECTIVE

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

- Repetitive constructions: I.1.7 רְשֵׁיעָה רְשֵׁיעָה דָּק ‘year by year’, II.14.26

107 Thus in Mandaic the st.abs. almost never occurs with plural nouns (Nöeldeke 1875: 305), whereas in Classical Syriac the st.abs.pl. is encountered only in certain contexts, e.g. with numerals, but not without a severe competition on the part of the st.emph. (Nöeldeke 1899: §202D). Cf. also Greenfield (1978a: 40): ‘[t]he Western dialects preserved the distinction between malkin and malkayyā‘kings : the kings’, malkān and malkātā‘queens : the queens’; but Eastern Aramaic knew only malkē and malkātā.

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

109 Not infrequently, a comparison between TJS and the Peshitta of Samuel proves to yield little result, as in many of the passages where factors have been found to be at work in TJS the two corpora render the Vorlage differently.
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‘from time to time’;110

- Predicative use of adjectives and participles: I.14.28 - לֹא אָבֵד הַגּוֹיִם - ‘cursed be the man who ...’, II.7.22 - יָכְבָּר נַעַר - ‘you are great’, II.11.5 - יָפְתוּ נַעַר - ‘I am pregnant’;111

- Prepositional phrases with adverbial character: I.27.12 - לְדַי - ‘forever’;112

- With certain loanwords, e.g. I.2.8 - הַרְדָּע - ‘the world’;113

- After the noun modifier -ל: II.4.9 - לָדְיָה - ‘every grief’;114

- With the negatives ו and הד -ל.115,116

---

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

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

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


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

116 Interestingly, some of these grammatical contexts have also been found to promote the use of the st.abs. in IA (Muraoka & Porten 2003: §46) and the use of
On the whole, determination in TJ therefore appears to result from a combination of two different systems: one that shares with Western LA the respect for the distinction between st.emph. and st.abs., and one that partakes of Eastern LA as regards the critical position granted to the st.emph. and some of the limitations set upon its use. Obviously, the question arises as to how such an unusual state of affairs may have come into being. More specifically: how did these two systems originate, and by what process could two so widely different concepts of determination come to coexist, each with its own domain of use, in one and the same Aramaic dialect? The final conclusions of this study will attempt to account for that rather unusual situation (C:2.2). For the time being, though no one can afford to be dogmatic in that area a few remarks can be ventured on some of the linguistic factors that may have played a role in the process.

5.3 DETERMINATION AND THE ARAMAIC OF TARGUM JONATHAN TO SAMUEL

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

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

117  This view was suggested to me by Prof. Dr. H. Gzella (Leiden University).
and st.emph. were formally distinct, as both involved the use of markedly
different endings (viz. masc. pl. -ūl -ayyā, fem. pl. -ānl -ālā). Confusion
might therefore have been less likely to arise in the pl. than in the sg.,
where e.g. the ending -ā had to do double duty, with regard to both
gender and status (viz. הָאִיל st.abs. fem. ‘a queen’ or st.emph. masc. ‘the
king’). Inasmuch as the ending -ā was markedly feminine, the
systematic use of the st.emph. with fem.sg. nouns (הָאִיל ‘the/a queen’),
no doubt under the influence of Eastern Aramaic usage,\textsuperscript{118} might have
been prompted by the need to dispel the ambiguity. But no such resort
was available for masc. sg. nouns., which may explain why they present
us with such a confusing picture.

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