CHAPTER THREE

GENITIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 GENITIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN ARAMAIC
An Overview

As is well known, Aramaic possesses two main devices to express the genitive relation. The first one, traditionally known as the construct relation (אֱלֶמֶנֶּת, or st.abs.), is synthetic in nature and involves a morphophonological modification of the first term of the relation (referred to as the construct state, or st.cst.) provided its phonological shape permits such; the second term, on the other hand, remains unaffected in this regard. A typical example is II.8.9 'the army of Hadadezer' (compare st.abs. מְרֹאֶה). The second device is an analytic construction involving the use of a particle that has assumed various forms in the course of the development of Aramaic, but that appears as proclitic -ד in TJ. A typical instance is I.28.19 'the army of Israel' and, given the specific form of the particle as employed in our corpus, the resulting construction can conveniently be labelled d-relation. A further refinement is needed,

1 An abridged version of this chapter is due to appear in Aramaic Studies as 'Genitive Constructions in Targum Jonathan to Samuel'.

2 The use of the preposition -ד in the expression of the genitive, whether on its own (as in I.16.18 'a son of Jesse', I.14.16 'the watchmen of Saul') or in combination with the relative particle -ה (as in I.24.5 'the cloak of Saul', lit. 'the cloak that is Saul’s', I.24.6 'the hem of Saul', lit. 'the hem that is Saul’s'), runs parallel to the Vorlage (compare I.16.18BH בּוּ דֶּש ו I.14.16BH בּוּ דֶּש הָאֵל מְלָכָא and I.24.5BH בּוּ דֶּש ו I.14.16BH בּוּ דֶּש הָאֵל מְלָכָא respectively, cf. JM: §130e), and will therefore not be considered in this study (cf. Muraoka & Porten 2003: §60). In the same vein, the construction of the type 'the name of the man', found in later types of Aramaic (cf. Hopkins 1997a; 1997b), will not be discussed here as it is not encountered in our corpus. Finally, for a general treatment of genitive constructions in the Semitic languages, cf. Brockelmann (1913: 229-266); Pennacchietti (1968); Lipiński (1997: 497-504) and Diem (1986).

3 On the semantic contents of genitive constructions, cf. Folmer (1995: 259-325); Muraoka & Porten (2003: §61). This matter has also been discussed extensively with reference to Classical Hebrew, e.g. JM (§§129d-h); WoC (143-154); Kroeze (1991; 1993; 1997).
however, as the first term of the \(d\)-relation is found to take on various forms, too. Essentially, when the first term is determined, it can quite normally occur in the st.emph., as in the example above, but it is also liable to bear a proleptic suffix pronoun, i.e. a pronominal suffix that refers cataphorically to the second term of the relation, as in II.13.3 `the brother of David’ (or, more literally, `his brother of David’).

For the sake of convenience, in the following these two subtypes will be termed \textit{bare d-relation} and \textit{proleptic d-relation} respectively. Moreover, following common practice, the two members of the genitive relation will be referred to as A-term and B-term respectively, whether we are dealing with a construct relation or a \(d\)-relation.

All in all, Aramaic has three basic ways to express the genitive: the construct relation, the bare \(d\)-relation and the proleptic \(d\)-relation. The examples below with the noun ‘name’ will illustrate the point:

- Construct relation: I.25.3 `the name of the man’;
- Bare \(d\)-relation: I.20.42 `the name of the Lord’;
- Proleptic \(d\)-relation: II.5.20 `the name of the place’.

### 1.2 STATUS QUAESTIONIS

As only a casual glance at the extent Aramaic literature will reveal, these three constructions are neither distributed nor used in the same way in the various Aramaic dialects.\(^4\) Though the occurrence and interactions of the three constructions in some Aramaic idioms have already caused much ink to flow, with regard to the Aramaic of TJ specifically the question of the morphosyntax of the genitive has not been touched upon. To this day, the only studies that are most directly relevant to our purpose are investigations of the genitive constructions in the Aramaic of TO. In his study of the syntax of TO, Kaddari devoted one section to the use of the construct and \(d\)-relations in TO, and attempted to determine various factors that would condition the use of one or the other.\(^5\) A few years later, Kaddari readdressed the question of the genitive relation from the wider perspective of ‘Imperial Aramaic’, which, in accordance with his view on the diachronic development of

\(^4\) The distribution and syntax of the genitive constructions in Aramaic at large will be discussed extensively in the ‘wider perspective’ at the close of this chapter (G:6.3).
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Aramaic, comprised the Aramaic of Daniel, Qumran and TO as well. Kaddari correctly identified several factors that have a bearing on the selection of the genitive construction in TO, such as the influence of various semantic parameters (i.e. names of man, place, God etc.) and of the (in)definiteness of the terms involved. As Folmer has pointed out, however, unfortunately his largely quantitative approach and his insistence on formal criteria prevented him from drawing as much as he could have on his own insights. Finally, Lambdin & Huehnergard’s introductory textbook on the Aramaic of TO offers precious contributions to our understanding of the working of genitive constructions in TO, which, in view of the tight linguistic affinity of the Aramaic of TO and TJ, are often of direct application to the Aramaic of TJ. The most significant of these contributions will be pointed out in due course.

1.3 METHODOLOGY

Classical Hebrew had one basic construction to express the genitive relation: the construct relation. The fact that the Aramaic of TJ, like many other Aramaic dialects, had as many as three different genitive constructions, entails that in each case that a genitive relation was to be expressed a choice had to be made between the three constructions. The discussion below will attempt to work out the various principles that may have conditioned the selection of those constructions in the Aramaic of TJS. In contrast to Kaddari’s approach, this study will be mostly qualitative, and will aim at providing a meaningful picture of the parameters at work in the selection process and of the way they interact.

Probably the best way to explain the methodology employed in the present study to investigate the functioning of the genitive relation in TJS is to forestall the systematic exposition of the analysis by presenting the reader with some of the conclusions it has allowed me to reach. Essentially, the method results from the following basic observations:
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1.3.1 PROLEPTIC $d$-RELATION

The first point that a study of TJS brings to the fore is the fact that the proleptic $d$-relation makes up only 1.5% of all genitive relations encountered in TJS, and that conversely the two other constructions, the construct relation and the bare $d$-relation, are used in 98.5% of all cases of genitive.\(^9\) Owing to its scarcity of use, the proleptic $d$-relation is therefore but a marginal phenomenon in TJS,\(^10\) so that the study of the genitive relation in our corpus boils largely down to studying the contradistinctive uses of the construct relation and bare $d$-relation. Because of that, the proleptic $d$-relation will be provisionally left out of the analysis and discussed in a separate section at the close of this chapter (G:3). Pending that treatment, in the following discussion the term ‘$d$-relation’ is therefore to be understood as referring to the bare $d$-relation only, unless explicit reference is made to the proleptic $d$-relation.

1.3.2 CONSTRUCT AND BARE $d$-RELATIONS

Concerning the two other constructions, the construct and bare $d$-relations, two further observations can be made:

1. The first observation is **quantitative**: of all genitive constructions encountered in TJS, 71.5% are construct relations and 28.5% are $d$-relations (27% bare and 1.5% proleptic).\(^11\) All in all, in TJS the construct relation largely outnumbers the $d$-relation.

2. The second observation is **qualitative**: as a rule, the use of the $d$-relation in TJS turns out to be motivated, i.e. specific reasons justifying the use of the $d$-relation can be worked out in most instances in which it is found. In contrast, very often the use of the construct relation cannot be explained that way.

\(^9\) According to my count, TJS features in total 2157 genitive constructions, of which only 31 (i.e. 1.44%) are proleptic $d$-relations.

\(^10\) Lambdin & Huehnergard (unpublished: 24) make the same observation regarding TO.

\(^11\) Of the 2157 genitive constructions evinced by TJS, 1542 (= 71.49%) are construct relations and 615 (= 28.51%) are $d$-relations. As we have seen, 31 of those $d$-relations are proleptic (i.e. only 5% of all $d$-relations, and 1.44% of all genitive constructions in TJS), which leaves us with 584 bare $d$-relations (i.e. 95% of all $d$-relations, and 27.07% of all genitive constructions in TJS).
In view of these two observations, and on the basis of our knowledge of the history and development of Aramaic, it therefore seems fair to suggest that *the construct relation is the genitive relation by default in the Aramaic of TJS*. This entails that, as a rule, when a genitive construction is needed the construct relation will be resorted to, unless there are valid reasons to prefer the $d$-relation. Taking these two observations as a starting-point, our method therefore consists in answering two questions:

1. What are the factors that condition the use of the $d$-relation in TJS?
   
   Inasmuch as the $d$-relation in TJS (1) has no direct equivalent in the Hebrew original and (2) is motivated, we have to identify the factors that trigger its use in TJS.

2. Why is the $d$-relation not used where we would have expected it?
   
   Inevitably, there are exceptions to the above, i.e. cases where the construct relation is encountered whereas our conclusions would have led us to expect the $d$-relation. These exceptions will have to be explained, i.e. our working hypothesis will have to be accommodated so as to account for those cases of construct relation.

### 1.3.3 Outline of the Method

The basic observations formulated above have led me to develop a *functional* model of the mechanics underlying the selection of genitive constructions in TJS. This model can be conveniently outlined as follows:

a) The genitive construction by default is the construct relation, and is therefore the construction that we can expect when none of the considerations to be expounded in the course of this chapter are involved. Thus in I.11.11 the BH construct phrase אֲחַר הָעֲבוֹדָה ‘the morning watch’ (lit. ‘the watch of the morning’) is translated in TJS with the construct phrase מַעֲשֶׂהּ מְאֹרָה. The reason why the construct relation is used in TJS is that, for reasons to be explained in the course of the analysis, neither the semantics nor the morphosyntactic properties of the nouns אֲחַר and מַעֲשֶׂהּ trigger the selection of the $d$-relation. No factors in favour of the $d$-relation being involved in this genitive relation, the use of the construct relation is therefore unchallenged.

b) Certain parameters to be discussed below display a preference for...
the $d$-relation. When such parameters obtain, this preference is as a rule given free expression and the $d$-relation is selected. Thus in II.1.22 the BH construct relation הָאָרֶץ הָאָרֶץ ‘the sword of Saul’ is rendered in TJS with the $d$-relation הָאָרֶץ הָאָרֶץ. The reason is that in TJS nouns denoting human entities display a strong preference for the $d$-relation when they are used as B-terms (semantic parameter). Since the A-term הָאָרֶץ ‘sword’ happens to be neutral with regard to genitive constructions, the preference of the B-term הָאָרֶץ for the $d$-relation can be given free expression, and the $d$-relation is selected.

c) Finally, sometimes yet other parameters in favour of the construct relation obtain simultaneously. When this happens, linguistic tension inevitably arises. One of the two (sets of) parameters will then necessarily have to give way and integrate into the construction imposed by the other. Thus in I.14.50 the BH construct phrase הָאָרֶץ הָאָרֶץ ‘the wife of Saul’ is translated in TJS with the construct phrase הָאָרֶץ הָאָרֶץ. The reason we have a construct phrase here contrary to what example $b$ above would have led us to expect is twofold:

1. The A-term הָאָרֶץ (st.cst. of הָאָרֶץ) is a noun that, by virtue of its very semantics, is in favour of the construct relation (semantic parameter);

2. Its preference for the construct relation turns out to be stronger than the preference of the B-term הָאָרֶץ for the $d$-relation: the linguistic conflict is therefore resolved to its advantage.

In most cases, a closer examination of these linguistic clashes brings definite patterns to the fore, on the basis of which it is possible to rank these parameters in terms of their relative resilience. In other cases, however, no clear picture emerges. We then find ourselves in the troubled waters of linguistic ambiguity,\footnote{Cf. FG1 (32), where it is argued that ‘linguistic insecurity’ typically arises in borderline cases, to the effect that usage may be hesitant with those items or constructions.} for the description of which the notion of ‘arbitrariness’ has regularly been evoked for want of a better explanation, but in which other, less tangible factors are likely to be at work.

On the whole, the functional model developed in the present study therefore understands the expression of the genitive relation in TJS as the product of interactions between various principles. In the main, these principles appear to function at two different levels: semantic and morphosyntactic. In concrete terms, this means that the nouns
involved in a genitive relation can influence the selection of a construction either by virtue of their own semantics, i.e. the entities (or types of entities) they refer to, or by way of some of their morphosyntactic properties (e.g. the grammatical class to which they belong, their number, gender etc.) as reflected in their actual form. Besides, the last example discussed demonstrates aptly that if our model is to be efficient it must not only account for the various factors that condition the selection of the genitive construction, but also establish precedence, i.e. be in a position to predict which principle dominates or is overruled in the case of conflict.

2. THE PARAMETERS

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This being said, we are now equipped to discuss the parameters at work and their interplay. The discussion will unfold as follows: owing to the methodology adopted in this study, the interactions will be analysed from the standpoint of the parameters in favour of the $d$-relation. Each of these parameters will be analysed in turn, and for each of them the potential areas of conflict with parameters in favour of the construct relation will be systematically considered.

Two general remarks can be made about the parameters in favour of the $d$-relation:

1. With one minor exception (cf. G:2.5.2), they are all semantic in nature, i.e their preference for the $d$-relation is the effect of the inherent, lexical meaning of the terms involved;

2. One of the parameters — the genitive of matter — bears on the genitive relation as a whole. Again with one minor exception (cf. G:2.4.2.1.1), all others bear on one term only of the genitive relation: the B-term.

In the main, the $d$-relation appears to be preferred when:

- The genitive relation as a whole is a genitive of matter (G:2.5); or
- The B-term refers to human entities (G:2.2), God (G:2.3), ethnic entities or certain geographic locations (G:2.4).\(^\text{13}\) Anthroponyms,

\(^{13}\) Nouns referring to God, ethnic entities and geographic locations will be
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viz. nouns referring to human entities, provide a fitting starting-point, for they interact with most of the parameters in favour of the construct relation and therefore serve their presentation well.

2.2 ANTHROPONYMS

B-Terms referring to Human Entities

2.2.1 ANTHROPONYMS AND THE d-RELATION

As only a cursory glance will demonstrate, the Aramaic of TJS displays a strong preference for the d-relation when the B-term is an anthroponym. Under this heading I understand two types of nouns:

2. Common nouns such as ‘אָנָשׁ’ (Lat. homo), ‘נָבי’ (Lat. vir), ‘father’, ‘servant’, ‘king’.

Finally, the interrogative pronoun ‘מי’ also belongs here, inasmuch as by its very meaning it typically stands for a human being. Typical instances include:


Due to the number of human participants in the story of Samuel and referred to as ‘hieronyms’, ‘ethnonyms’ and ‘toponyms’ respectively. For the sake of systematicity, the label ‘anthroponym’ has been coined so as to refer to nouns denoting human entities. Likewise, within the hieronyms the label ‘theonym’ will be used to refer to the Name of God יי specifically.
the frequency of their occurrence therein, such examples are numerous in our corpus, and exceptions only marginal. Finally, the pertinence of the analysis is amply demonstrated by extending the scrutiny to the whole of TJFP.

2.2.2 PARAMETERS IN FAVOUR OF THE CONSTRUCT RELATION

All instances adduced above involved no opposition to the selection of the $d$-relation. But competing factors very often interfere, and a close scrutiny of our corpus reveals that the human property of the $B$-term systematically gives way when parameters favouring the construct relation obtain.

It is appropriate at this point to study these parameters with some care. Parameters favouring the construct relation fall under two headings: semantic and morphosyntactic.

2.2.2.1 Semantic Parameters

Semantic parameters can be said to be involved when a noun favours either genitive construction by virtue of its (range of) meaning. All semantic parameters in favour of the construct relation have in common that their sphere of influence is exclusively limited to $A$-terms. In the main, the following (classes of) nouns have been found to favour the construct relation with anthroponymic $B$-terms:

14 Out of the 2157 genitive relations encountered in TJS, 656 involve an anthroponymic $B$-term, i.e. 30.41%.

15 The only unambiguous exceptions (i.e. instances featuring the construct relation without the action of some of the parameters to be discussed below in G:2.2.2) found in TJS are: II.2.16 פֶּתַי אָבִי ‘the side of his fellow’ (possibly due to the $B$-term’s grammatical function of reciprocal pronoun), II.3.8 לְעָשֵׂה ‘the guilt of the woman’, II.3.10 כִּלָּחֶם דָּוִד ‘the throne of David’ and II.8.12 נִירֵי חָוֵד ‘the spoil of Hadadezer’ (compare I.30.20 נִירֵי חָוֵד ‘the spoil of David’).

16 It is worthy of notice that there does not seem to be any semantic parameter in favour of the construct relation bearing on the $B$-term or, to put it differently, the putative existence of such parameters has not been found to offer explanatory power. Interestingly, Williams (2001: 29, 31) reaches a similar conclusion with regard to Syriac.
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1. Nouns referring to *stative* state of affairs,\(^\text{17}\) whether permanent (e.g. qualities) or transitory, e.g. מָמוּת ‘affliction, misery’, as in I.1.11 ‘the affliction of your handmaid’; מֵעְצָרָתָה ‘dominion, authority, overlordship’, as in I.1.11 ‘the dominion of man’; כְּפָלָה ‘shame(fulness)’, as in II.20.30, פָּשָׁת ‘the shame of your mother’; רֹב ‘evil’, as in I.25.39, בֶּשָׂש דָּבָר ‘the evil of Nabal’; שלֹא ‘peace, health, well-being’, as in II.11.7 שלֹא לִבְנֵי ‘the well-being of Joab’; חסֶם ‘wisdom’, as in 1Kgs 5.10 חסֶם שלמה ‘the wisdom of Salomon’.\(^\text{18}\)

In contrast, nouns referring to *fientive* SoAs, though not much more widely attested, do not appear to favour the construct relation, to the effect that the \(d\)-relation is normally selected. In TJS, nouns of this category are usually Inf.C. and verbal nouns, e.g.:

- Inf.C.: I.18.19 מֵאָבָא וּדָמָא ‘the being given of Merab’; II.16.2 מַשֵּׁר ‘the drinking of the one who has grown weary’;\(^\text{19}\)
- Verbal nouns: RUNNING as in II.18.27 רַבֶּה יְדֵה ‘the running of the first one’, II.18.27 רַבֶּה אִישָּׁה ‘the running of Ahimaaz’; מִשְׁפָּד ‘aid, support, assistance’ as in I.18.28 מִשְׁפָּד דָּוִד ‘the aid of David’;\(^\text{20}\) מֶתֶּה מַתָּה ‘death’ as in II.14.14 מֶתֶּה מַתָּה ‘the death of a dying one’.

2. Nouns denoting verbal (i.e. wordy) contents. This group of nouns actually refers to some informational contents that can be thought of as consisting of words, e.g. מֹשֶׁר ‘word, command’, as in I.2.25 מֹשֶׁר ‘the word of their father’, I.19.6 מֹשֶׁר יִהוּדָה ‘the word of Jonathan’; מִשְׁמַע ‘counsel, plan, thought’, as in II.3.37 מִשְׁמַע מֶלֶךְ ‘the plan of the king’; מִשְׁמַע ‘news, message’, as in II.4.4 מִשְׁמַע מֶלֶךְ ‘the news of Saul’

\(^\text{17}\) The notion of state of affairs (SoA) is derived from FG, and will be discussed more thoroughly in our study of the verbal system of TJS (cf. V:1.3.1). For the time being, the notion of SoA can be understood as synonymous with situation and Sachverhalt in their plain English and German meaning respectively. Likewise, the difference between fientivity and stativity as understood in the present study will be discussed in V:1.3.2.

\(^\text{18}\) The noun מָר ‘anger’ is an exception, inasmuch as it usually occurs with the \(d\)-relation in TJS, e.g. I.20.30 מֵאָמָר יִדְעָה ‘the anger of Saul’, II.11.20 מֵאָמָר יִדְעָה ‘the anger of the king’. Interestingly, the same applies to TO (Lambdin & Huehnergard, unpublished: 23). Besides, II.22.9 רָוָא ‘the haughtiness of Pharaoh’ is also exceptional, insofar as it features the proleptic \(d\)-relation (cf. G:3).

\(^\text{19}\) I.9.15 מִשְׁמַע ‘the coming of Saul’, featuring a construct relation despite the anthroponymic B-term, is the only exception encountered in TJS.

\(^\text{20}\) But note the exceptional I.20.13 מִשְׁמַע ‘the aid of my father’, which features the proleptic \(d\)-relation (cf. G:3).
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and Jonathan'; II.7.20 'request', as in II.20.9 'the request of your servant'; II.23.1 'the prophecy of David'; II.23.1 'utterance', as in II.23.1 'the utterance of the man'.

The noun פָּהֵם 'word, decree' is ambiguous, inasmuch as it occurs five times with the construct relation and six times with the $d$-relation in TJS, e.g. I.21.9 'the word of the king' vs. II.24.4 'the word of the king'. Finally, with the noun מִלָּה 'counsel' the $d$-relation is consistently encountered in TJS, e.g. II.15.31 'the counsel of Ahithophel', II.17.14 'the counsel of Hushai'.

3. Terms of kinship 'son', 'daughter' and אָהָב (st.cst. אָהֲבָה) 'wife', as in I.17.58 'whose son' (lit. 'the son of whom'), I.20.27 'the son of Jesse', II.6.23 'the daughter of Saul', I.25.44 'the wife of David'.

It should be noted that the nouns אָב 'father', אָם 'mother', אֵל 'brother', אָהָב 'sister' and אֲבָע 'uncle' occur systematically with the proleptic $d$-relation and therefore do not belong here.

4. Terms pertaining to landed property, typically 'inheritance' (in the sense of 'field, estate') and 'field', e.g. II.14.30 'the field of Joab', I.6.14 'the field of Joshua' (not a single exception found in TJS).

Mention must also be made of occasional instances involving the nouns 'plain', 'territory, border', 'way, road', 'land' and nouns denoting the four cardinal directions (such as צְפָה 'east', דָּרוֹת 'south'). These nouns, which are referred to as 'terms of

---

21 In the Aramaic of TO, the use of the construct relation nonetheless appears to be the rule (Lambdin & Huehnergard, unpublished: 23). In addition, המָרֶשֶׁת is sometimes used to express 'thing, situation' (cf. BH חָכָם), which probably explains the use of the construct relation with עֵשֶׁב 'matter, thing' in II.18.5 'the matter of Absalom'.

22 A possible explanation for this use of the $d$-relation might be that it is not so much the (wordy) content of any individual counsel as the very act/process of counselling (fientive SoA) that is referred to in these genitive constructions.

23 For a similar phenomenon in TO, cf. Lambdin & Huehnergard (unpublished: 23).

24 Cf. G:3. Likewise, nouns such as אָן 'son-in-law' and אָבִיה 'concubine' do not belong here and therefore select the $d$-relation typical for anthroponymic B-terms, e.g. I.22.14 'the son-in-law of the king', II.3.7 'the concubine of my father'.
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topography’ in this study, make up a set of parameters in favour of the construct relation typically encountered with *toponymic* B-terms (cf. G:2.4), but which occasionally occur with sg. anthroponymic B-terms as well, e.g. II.18.18 ‘the plain of the king’, Jos 12.4 ‘the border of Og’; I.27.10 ‘the south of the (territory occupied by the) Jerachmeelite’, I.27.10 ‘the south of the (territory occupied by the) Shalmaite’, Jdg 10.8 ‘the land of the Amorite’, and (with figurative use of the noun) 1Kgs 15.26 ‘the way of his father’, 1Kgs 16.26 ‘the way of Jeroboam’, 1Kgs 22.53 ‘the way of his mother’, 2Kgs 22.2 ‘the way of David’.

5. Some collective nouns, such as ‘family’ and ‘camp, army’, e.g. I.10.21 ‘the family of Matar’; I.18.18 ‘the family of my father’; II.8.9 ‘the army of Hadadezer’. Not all collectives appear to enforce the construct relation, however. Thus with the noun ‘(military) force, army’, whose meaning is closely related to that of ‘family’, the use of the *d*-relation is systematic, e.g. I.12.9 ‘the army of Hazor’, II.10.16 ‘the army of Hadadezer’, and the rest of TJFP confirms this tendency. Finally, note also I.17.15 ‘the sheep of his father’.

6. A few miscellaneous nouns such as ‘house’, ‘name’, ‘life’ (figurative sense). This list is not meant to be exhaustive; these three items merely occur frequently enough in TJS to enable patterns to be determined. Examples include: I.10.18 ‘the house of the seer’, I.14.49 ‘the name of the younger one’, I.25.3 ‘the soul of Jonathan’, I.14.49 ‘the name of the younger one’, I.25.3 ‘the soul of Jonathan’, I.14.49 ‘the name of the younger one’, I.25.3 ‘the soul of Jonathan’.

---

25 With a sg. gentilic adjective: cf. footnote n.37 below.

26 Understood as nouns that in the sg. denote *a collection of entities*, e.g. ‘a family’, and in the pl. *a collection of collections of entities*, e.g. ‘families’ (cf. FG1: 137-42).

27 One exception can be noted: 2Kgs 9.17 ‘the company of Jehu’, which is the only exception involving the noun ‘family’ encountered in the whole of TJFP.

28 E.g. Jdg 4.7 ‘the army of Jabin’, 2Kgs 5.1 ‘the army of the king of Aram’.

29 When the noun *מָמָא* has its basic meaning of ‘soul’, it does not appear to favour the construct relation, so that the *d*-relation is standard, e.g. I.18.1 ‘the soul of Jonathan’, II.5.8 ‘the soul of David’.
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‘the name of the man’, II.2.10 ‘the house of Saul’, II.11.8
‘the house of the king’, Jdg 18.25 ‘the life of your
household’ (lit. ‘men of your house’), 1Kgs 1.12 ‘the life of
your son’. 30

7. Finally, two nouns denoting body parts, יד ‘hand’ and ראש ‘head’,
belong here in part. Their behaviour in terms of genitive constructions
is not without problems, however, so they are better left for a separate
treatment (cf. G:2.6).

When the A-term of a genitive construction belongs to one of these
semantic categories, the construct relation is usual and, conversely,
when the A-term is a noun that does not belong to one of these categories
the d-relation can be expected.

2.2.2.2 Morphosyntactic Parameter: Grammatical Number

In addition to semantic parameters, morphosyntactic considerations
can also play a decisive role in the selection of a genitive construction
with anthroponymic B-terms. In TJS, one such parameter appears to be
influential: grammatical number.

So far, all instances discussed involved singular nouns only, whether
A-term or B-term. But the present study shows that in TJS when the
A-term and/or B-term is a plural noun the construct relation is preferred.
The extent to which this preference materializes varies according as the
plural noun is the A-term or the B-term.

2.2.2.2.1 Grammatical Number of the A-Term

The influence of the grammatical number of the A-term on the selection
of a genitive construction is one of the most significant aspects that the
present study brings to the fore. In practical terms, when the A-term is
in the plural the Aramaic of TJS displays an overwhelming preference

30 The only exception found in our corpus is I.25.9 וּעֲנַיָּה ‘the name of David’,
and the rest of TJFP features one more exception: 1Kgs 21.8 וּעֲנַיָּה ‘the name of
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for the construct relation.\textsuperscript{31}

This principle applies first and foremost to the various types of nouns discussed so far (G:2.2.2.1), as they then favour the construct relation for both semantic and morphosyntactic reasons, e.g. I.26.19־ב את ה ‘the sons of man’, I.30.5־ינא ויהו ‘the wives of David’, II.13.18־פאתא את ‘the daughters of the king’, II.20.17־תק לא ‘the words of your handmaid’. But aside from these nouns virtually all nouns are affected irrespective of their semantics, so that it can be safely claimed that the preference of anthroponymic B-terms for the $d$-relation is neutralized by the plurality of the A-term. Examples include: I.7.13־ימים שלמה ‘the days of Samuel’, I.16.15־עבדי שלמה ‘the servants of Saul’, I.19.20־ער משלמה ‘the messengers of Saul’, I.25.9־מלכי יהודה ‘the young men of David’, I.25.40־עבדי יהוד ‘the servants of David’, II.11.24־עבדי מלכה ‘the servants of the king’, II.19.43–44_* uda Malka * ‘the property of the king’, II.20.7־עבדי יהוד ‘the men of Joab’, II.21.13־עדות יהוד ‘the bones of Jonathan’.

Instances substantiating this claim are numerous in our corpus, as well as in the whole of TJFP, and exceptions are so few in number as to be negligible.\textsuperscript{32}

2.2.2.2.2 Grammatical number of the B-Term

The grammatical number of the B-term also appears to exert an influence on the selection of genitive constructions. Though the paucity of the evidence makes its influence much less noticeable than that of the

\textsuperscript{31} Lambdin & Huehnergard (unpublished: 23) have reached a similar conclusion independently with regard to the Aramaic of TO.

\textsuperscript{32} The only exceptions involving anthroponymic B-terms found in TJS are I.2.5־’étze Haman ‘the sons of Haman’, I.21.6־מין וסר לא ‘the vessels of the young men’, II.16.21־פלש ערב ‘the concubines of your father’ and II.16.22־פלש ערב ‘the concubines of his father’. Curiously, in TJS most instances involving a plural A-term colliding with a B-term in favour of the $d$-relation feature a masculine A-term. Concerning anthroponymic B-terms specifically, the only cases involving a fem. pl. A-term are I.21.5־לѝם לא ‘the (lit.) uncleannesses of (the) woman’ and II.13.18־לתא לא ‘the daughters of the king’, which conform to the plural parameter (a few other instances are encountered, but in all of them the B-term is also plural: the influence of the plurality of the A-term on the selection of the construct relation can therefore not be properly assessed, cf. G:2.2.2.2.2). The paucity of construct relations involving an anthroponymic B-term and a fem. pl. A-term appears to be nothing more than a coincidence, however, and counterexamples featuring the $d$-relation are just as few in number (the only two exceptions found in our corpus are II.16.21 and II.16.22 mentioned above). Fem. pl. A-terms are also used together with other types of B-terms, and will be pointed out as encountered.
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A-term, the construct relation turns out to be preferred when the B-term is plural.

In many cases, the extent of this influence cannot be accurately assessed because some other parameter in favour of the construct relation is also applicable, e.g.:

- A-term refers to a stative SoA: II.1.26 ‘the love of two wives’, II.4.5 ‘the sleep of kings’;
- A-term denotes landed property: II.23.13 ‘the plain of the warriors’;
- A-term is a collective: I.2.36 ‘the watch of the priests’, I.17.20 ‘the camp of the wagers of the war’, I.19.20 ‘the band of teachers’;
- A-term is one of the miscellaneous nouns: II.7.9 ‘the name of the great ones’, II.19.6 ‘the life of your wives’;
- A-term is plural: I.1.1 ‘the students of the prophets’, II.21.13 ‘the bones of the hanged (ones)’.

But other cases feature no other factor favouring the construct relation and thereby make the influence of the plurality of the B-term noticeable, e.g.: I.2.17 ‘the sin of the young men’, I.14.30 ‘the spoil of its enemies’, I.22.19 ‘the city of priests’, I.1.22 ‘the blood of the killed’, I.1.22 ‘the blood of the killed’, II.7.14 ‘the fat of the warriors’, II.7.14 ‘the chastisement of the sons of men’, II.23.17 ‘the blood of the men’. With the A-term referring to a fientive SoA: I.25.36 ‘the feast of kings’, II.3.33 ‘the death of wicked men’, II.11.1 ‘the going forth of the kings’, II.16.2 ‘the eating of the young men’, II.24.25 ‘the prayers of the dwellers of

33 The extent to which the collectives ‘watch’ and ‘band’ favour the construct relation is difficult to assess, inasmuch as they never co-occur with a singular anthroponymic B-term in TJS. Be that as it may, the fact that they are collective in meaning can make the evidence inconclusive. On the other hand, one should note II.10.7 ‘the whole army of warriors’, which is all the more striking because the A-term is a collective and the B-term is plural. As we have seen (cf. G:2.2.2.1(5)), however, within the whole of TJFP the noun חכם does never occur in the construct relation with an anthroponymic B-term, whether sg. or pl. In view of this instance, the question remains whether within the framework of our functional approach the noun חכם should be considered a parameter in favour of the d-relation bearing on the A-term (cf. G:2.4.2.1.1).

34 In this category we find a few instances involving a (formally) fem. pl. A-term, e.g. I.2.9 ‘the bodies of his servants’, II.6.20 ‘the handmaids of his servants’, II.23.8 ‘the names of the men’.
Chapter Three: GENITIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

the land’.35

*Gentilicia*, though ethnonymic by their very meaning, refer to human entities and therefore belong here. Unfortunately, they do not contribute much to our understanding of the influence of the plurality of the B-term. With one exception, I.3.3 ‘the court of the Levites’, which adequately illustrates the phenomenon under discussion, all instances encountered in our corpus feature either the erratic A-term יָד ‘hand’, e.g. I.17.37 vs. II.3.18 ‘the hand of the Philistines’ (cf. G:2.6), or a parameter in favour of the construct relation, e.g.:  
- the A-term is a collective: I.4.6 ‘the camp of the Jews’, I.14.11 ‘the garrison of the Philistines’;
- the A-term is the noun מבנה פלשתא ‘the house of the Hasmoneans’;
- the A-term is plural: I.5.8 ‘the chiefs of the Philistines’, I.17.23 ‘the battle lines of the Philistines’, I.29.9 ‘the chiefs of the Philistines’.36

As a result, not much can be said on the relation between the use of the construct relation and the plurality of the B-term in these cases.37

35 Counterexamples with the *d*-relation are not plenty. One may note I.17.7 ‘the beam of weavers’, I.21.6 ‘the vessels of the young men’. Concerning II.10.7 ‘the army of warriors’, cf. footnote n.33 above. In I.2.13 ‘the custom of the priests’ the use of the *d*-relation might be due to the inability of the Greek loanword יִשְׂרָאֵל to undergo the morphophonological modification of the st.cst. (cf. D:3.1.3 for a related phenomenon). Other instances involving nouns denoting body parts as A-terms will be discussed later on (cf. G:2.6). Finally, one also finds plural B-terms in otherwise uncommon uses of the *d*-relation, e.g. I.17.46 ‘the bird of the heavens’, II.21.20 ‘a man of stature’ (cf. G:5).

36 Here too we find a few fem. pl. A-terms, e.g. II.1.20 מּוֹרֵס פלְשַׁתָּא ‘the daughters of the Philistines’, II.3.14 שְׁמוֹת פלְשַׁתָּא ‘foreskins of the Philistines’.

37 It must be noted that in the singular a gentilic adjective used substantivally denotes a particular individual and as such behaves like any other sg. anthroponym, i.e. the *d*-relation is selected (e.g. Jos 12.2 מלך אָמָר ‘the king of the Amorite’, Jdg 19.11 ‘the city of the Jebusite’) unless an opposing parameter dictates otherwise (e.g. I.17.11 פַּרְשָׂי ‘the words of the Philistine’, I.27.10 פַּרְשָׂי ‘the south of the Jerachmeelite’, I.30.29 פַּרְשָׂי ‘the cities of the Jerachmeelite’).
2.3 **Hieronyms**

**B-Terms referring to God**

In addition to anthroponyms, the Aramaic of TJS also displays a preference for the \( d \)-relation when the B-term refers to God. This applies primarily to the theonym \( \text{יְהֹהֵנָם} \) ‘the Lord’, the equivalent in TJ of the Tetragrammaton \( יהוה \). But compounds of the theonym such as \( \text{יְהוָה} \text{לָוֹד} \) ‘Lord of Hosts’ also belong here, and so does the common noun \( \text{כָּלָה} \) אָלִים ‘god’.

1. The theonym \( \text{יְהוָה} \) is by far the most frequently encountered hieronym in TJS. In contrast to the anthroponyms, however, when used as a B-term it never gives way to opposing principles in our corpus, so that the \( d \)-relation is always used.\(^{38}\) The same applies to the compound \( \text{יְהוָה} \text{לָוֹד} \). Typical instances without opposing parameters include: I.1.9 ‘the temple of the Lord’, I.4.4 ‘the ark of the covenant of the Lord of hosts’, I.12.10 ‘the service of the Lord’, I.14.18 ‘the ark of the Lord’, II.14.17 ‘the angel of the Lord’. More significant, however, are examples involving parameters otherwise favouring the construct relation:

- the A-term denotes a stative SoA: II.23.3 ‘the fear of the Lord’;
- the A-term refers to a verbal/informational content: I.3.7 ‘the prophecy of the Lord’, II.12.9 ‘the word of the Lord’, I.12.15 ‘the Memra of the Lord’, II.21.7 ‘the oath of the Lord’;
- the A-term is a collective: II.6.21 ‘the people of the Lord’;
- the A-term is the noun: II.6.2 ‘the name of the Lord of Hosts’;
- the A-term is plural: I.8.10 ‘the words of the Lord’,

\(^{38}\) This was already noted by Kaddari (1963a: 244) with reference to the Aramaic of TO. Lambdin & Huehnergard (unpublished: 24) explain this peculiarity of the theonym as follows: ‘Considering the almost universal avoidance of anthropomorphic implications with [God], we should probably view the avoidance of the construct in the same way, namely that the use of the construct would imply a type of genitive relationship inappropriate to God, possibly “inalienable” attributes, of which God presumably has none’.

\(^{39}\) When the theonym \( \text{יְהוָה} \) is used as a B-term the noun \( \text{כָּלָה} \) אָלִים refers to a theological concept, translated as ‘Memra’, which in all likelihood has but little to do with the notions of verbal/informational contents. Be that as it may, grammatically it turns out to behave as such (cf. discussion of noun \( \text{כָּלָה} \) ‘God’ below), so that it seemed acceptable to include it here, whatever its semantic content may actually be.
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I.2.17 ‘the sacrifices of the Lord’. I.22.21 ‘the priests of the Lord’. In all these instances, the d-relation is found even though the A-term is a parameter in favour of the construct relation. With the theonym (הַנְּצָרָה), this rule is absolute.

2. On the other hand, it is worthy of notice that the hieronym אֵל ‘god’ displays a morphosyntactic behaviour analogous to that of anthroponyms and not to that of the theonym יהוה. In concrete terms, this means that the d-relation is the rule, but that the construct relation will normally be selected if principles favouring it interfere. Examples without opposing parameter include: I.10.19 חֵן אֵל ‘the service of your God’, Jos 9.23 ‘the sanctuary of my God’ but, with opposing parameter:

- the A-term is the noun מֶמְר ‘Memra’: II.22.30 מֶמְר אֵל ‘the Memra of my God’, II.23.1 מֶמְר אֵל ‘the Memra of the God of Jacob’;
- the A-term is a plural noun: II.10.12 כְּרוֹעַ אֵל ‘the cities of our God’.

3. Finally, it is interesting to note that the deity דאגו ‘Dagon’, heathen though it may be, is not only treated differently from the theonym, but also from the hieronym אֵל ‘god’. In concrete terms, linguistically it is treated as an ordinary common noun, and does not enjoy even the status of the anthroponyms. This is clear from the fact that the construct relation is selected not only when some principle favouring it is present, e.g. I.5.5 בָּטֶן דאגו ‘the idol priests of Dagon’ (with plural A-term), but also when no such principle is involved, e.g. I.5.2 בָּטֶן דאגו ‘the side of Dagon’ (compare I.20.25 בָּטֶן דאגו ‘the side of Saul’, with anthroponymic B-term), I.5.5 בָּטֶן דאגו ‘the threshold of Dagon’).

40 Here too one may note a few instances involving a fem.pl. A-term: I.4.8 נְפָתַיָה ‘the mighty acts of the Lord’, I.12.7 נְפָתַיָה ‘the righteous deeds of the Lord’.

41 The only exception found in TJS is the oftentimes repeated כְּרוֹעַ אֵל כֶּסֶף ‘the ark of the god of Israel’, where the construct relation is used.

42 In the same vein, insofar as conclusions can be drawn on the basis of evidence so meagre II.14.20 כְּרוֹעַ אֵל כֶּסֶף ‘the wisdom of the angel of the Lord’ suggests that entities such as angels, which somehow occupy an intermediate position between man and God in the grand chain of beings, do not behave grammatically as the theonym.
2.4 TOPYNOMS AND ETHNONYMS
B-Terms referring to Geographic Locations and Ethnic Groups

2.4.1 INTRODUCTION

Certain toponyms and ethnonyms, nouns referring to geographic locations and ethnic groups, appear to be in favour of the $d$-relation when used as a B-term. In the case of toponyms, we are mostly concerned with proper nouns, whether simple nouns like יזח ‘Ziph’ and מצרים ‘Egypt’, or compounds like בית-שבע ‘Beth-shean’ and בית-לב ‘Bethlehem’. As for the ethnonyms, they include essentially names of peoples, tribes and families (eponyms), whether bare nouns such as בני ישראל ‘(the people of) Israel’ or compounds made up of a construct relation involving one of the two nouns בית ‘house of’ and בני ‘sons of’, e.g. בית ישראל ‘the house of Israel’, בני ישראל ‘the sons of Israel’.\(^{43}\) The compounds just mentioned are clearly ethnonyms, i.e. they refer unambiguously to a group of people rather than a geographic location. Bare (i.e. uncompounded) nouns, however, can function both as a toponym and as an ethnonym according to the context, e.g. the noun ישראל, which can be used to refer either to the land of Israel or to the people of Israel. Since it is not always easy to distinguish between the two usages, and since, more importantly, the behaviour of these nouns in terms of genitive construction does not differ markedly in either context, bare toponyms and bare ethnonyms will be treated together in this study, and will be referred to as ‘(bare) topo-/ethnonyms’.

Another, more serious difficulty involved in the study of the toponyms and ethnonyms is the scarcity of the evidence. Many toponyms and ethnonyms are very poorly attested in genitive relations in our corpus, and often in contexts in which the influence of parameters in favour of the construct relation can be detected. As a result, much of the evidence found in TJS is bound to be inconclusive. In order to remedy this uncertainty, the material for our analysis has been expanded by extending the scrutiny to the whole of TJFP, all toponyms and ethnonyms involved at least once in a genitive construction in TJS being checked in the rest

\(^{43}\) Both בני and בני are systematically connected to their B-term by the construct relation, the former because of its semantics, the latter because of its plurality (cf. G:2.4.3). Besides, though by virtue of their semantics gentilic adjectives of the type פלסטינים ‘Philistines’ are ethnonyms, they are primarily plural anthroponyms and turn out to be treated as such by the Aramaic of TJS (cf. G:2.2.2.2.2).
of TJFP as well for further occurrences in a genitival context. Unfortunately, even so the state of affairs observed often begs more questions than it offers answers. But this expansion of the covered material allows us at least to venture a few observations, which may contribute to shed some light on an otherwise difficult subject.

Be that as it may, the evidence encountered in TJFP in general and TJS in particular suggests that the behaviour of toponyms and ethnonyms in genitive constructions is dependent on their actual shape: (1) bare nouns or, for the ethnonyms specifically, compounds with (2) ‘sons of’ and (3) ‘house of’. We shall therefore treat these three types separately.

2.4.2 BARE TOPO-/ETHNONYMS

Bare topo-/ethnonyms (henceforth ‘topo-/ethnonyms’) are so labelled because they can be used either as toponym or as ethnonym depending on the context. On the whole, topo-/ethnonyms present us with a state of affairs much more complicated than the other parameters in favour of the $d$-relation, essentially because not all topo-/ethnonyms favour the $d$-relation, or do so to the same extent. The relation between topo-/ethnonyms and genitive constructions is therefore far from unequivocal, some distinctly preferring the $d$-relation when used as a B-term, whereas others do not and therefore usually occur with the construct relation.

Another complicating factor is the fact that the use of the $d$-relation in a given instance cannot always be taken as a sure indication of a preference of the B-term. As we shall see, in some cases there are good reasons to suspect that the $d$-relation is motivated by the A-term rather than by the topo-/ethnonym. In this, topo-/ethnonyms take up a unique position among the other parameters bearing on the B-term, such as the anthroponyms and the hieronyms.44 Last but not least, here even more than with the compound ethnonyms, the lack of clarity is also due to the scarcity of the evidence, many topo-/ethnonyms occurring no more than one (or only a few) time(s) as the B-term of a genitive relation in our corpus, which makes comparative analyses rather difficult.

Be that as it may, the conclusions that a study of the whole of TJFP

---

44 With the possible exception, as we have seen, of the noun ‘army, strength’ used as an A-term with anthroponymic B-terms.
allows us to draw are presented below.

2.4.2.1 Bare Topo-/Ethnonyms and the $d$-Relation

2.4.2.1.1 A-Term in Favour of the $d$-Relation

Some bare topo-/ethnonyms sometimes occur with the $d$-relation, others never do. With bare topo-/ethnonyms, however, the use of the $d$-relation in a given instance cannot always be taken as a sure indication of a preference of the B-term for the $d$-relation. Indeed, in some cases there are good reasons to believe that the $d$-relation is not the effect of the topo-/ethnonymic B-term, but is rather motivated by the A-term. In other words, certain nouns, when used as A-terms with a bare topo-/ethnonymic B-term, appear to promote the use of the $d$-relation.

In our corpus, at least four such nouns have been identified:

- **entrance**: I.17.52 ‘the entrance of Gai’, I.27.8 ‘the entrance of Hagra’, II.5.25 ‘the entrance of Gezer’, Jos 13.5 ‘the entrance of Hamath’, Jdg 6.4 ‘the entrance of Gaza’;
- **ascent**: II.15.30 ‘the ascent of the Mount of Olives’, Jos 10.10 ‘the ascent of Beth-horon’, Jos 15.7 ‘the ascent of Adummim’, 2Kgs 9.27 ‘the ascent of Gur’;\(^{45}\)

\(^{45}\) With the nouns \textit{and} the preference for the $d$-relation is absolute: not a single exception has been found in the whole of TJFP. Though attested in other parts of TJFP and not in TJS proper, two more nouns belong here, in view of their analogous pattern and semantics: \textit{descent} (as in Jos 10.11 ‘the descent of Beth-horon’) and \textit{lit. exit} (as in 2Kgs 2.21 ‘the spring of the waters’).
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‘the king of Aram’;46

2.4.2.1.2 Bare Topo-/Ethnonyms in Favour of the d-Relation

Though it is difficult to establish whether the four nouns מְלֵךְ מַכָּה מַעֲלָה and נַחַל are really the factor responsible for the selection of the d-relation, the fact remains that when they are used as A-term the d-relation is systematic, even with B-terms that do not appear to favour it otherwise. In quite a few cases, unfortunately, the topo-/ethnonym used as B-term does not occur in d-relations outside those involving one of these four nouns as A-term. These instances can therefore not be used as elements of proof for a possible preference of the topo-/ethnonym for the d-relation. In final analysis, the number of instances in which the use of the d-relation can be held as a plausible indication of the preference of the B-term is reduced considerably. Below is a list of potential candidates:

• ‘Edom’: 1Kgs 9.26 ‘the land of Edom’,48 2Kgs 3.8 ‘the wilderness of Edom’;
• ‘Bethlehem’: II.23.15 ‘the well of Bethlehem’;
• ‘Beth-shean’ : I.31.10 ‘the wall of Beth-shean’;
• ‘Gibeon’: II.2.13 ‘the pool of Gibeon’, II.2.24 ‘the wilderness of Gibeon’;
• ‘Gilboa’: I.31.8 ‘Mount Gilboa’;

46 The only exception in our corpus is II.10.6 מֶלֶךְ מַכָּה ‘the king of Maacah’.

47 When the A-term is plural, however, the construct relation is normal, e.g. I.14.47 ‘the kings of Zobah’, II.23.30 ‘the brooks of Gaash’. Moreover, the fact that with these nouns the use of the d-relation is dependent on the A-term is suggested by instances in which the B-term can hardly be regarded as prompting its selection, e.g. I.9.11 ‘the ascent of the city’, I.21.12 ‘the king of the land’, II.10.8 ‘the entrance of the city’, Jdg 1.24 ‘the entrance of the temple of the Lord’ and, with plural B-term (!), Jos 12.23 ‘the king of the nations’, 2Kgs 2.21 ‘the spring of the waters’, 2Kgs 11.16 ‘the entrance of the horses’ (regarding כִּי ‘city’ and כָּל ‘land’ as B-term, see also footnote n.51 below).

48 On the A-term in this and other examples, cf. G:2.4.2.2.2 below.
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- ‘Gilead’: Jdg 7.3 ‘Mount Gilead’;
- ‘Ziph’: I.23.15 ‘the wilderness of Ziph’;
- ‘Hamath’: 2Kgs 25.21 ‘the land of Hamath’;
- ‘Hereth’: I.22.5 ‘the forest of Hereth’;
- ‘Israel’: I.7.13 ‘the land of Israel’, I.15.23 ‘the kingdom of Israel’, II.7.27 ‘the God of Israel’, II.23.3 ‘the powerful one of Israel’;
- ‘Canaan’: Jdg 21.12 ‘the land of Canaan’;
- ‘Moab’: Jdg 11.18 ‘the land of Moab’;
- ‘Maon’: I.23.25 ‘the wilderness of Maon’;
- ‘Egypt’: I.12.6 ‘the land of Egypt’;
- ‘Zion’: II.5.7 ‘the stronghold of Zion’, II.19.31 ‘Mount Zion’;

The exact status of the nouns referring to the twelve tribes of Israel (‘Benjamin’, ‘Reuben’, etc.) is not clear. When they combine with the collective A-term ‘tribe’, in TJFP at large both the construct relation and the d-relation appear to occur indiscriminately, e.g. I.9.21 vs. I.15.17 ‘the tribe of Benjamin’, II.24.5 vs. Jos 21.36 ‘the tribe of Gad’, Jos 18.7 vs. Jos 20.8 ‘the tribe of Reuben’.49 Aside from these, these twelve nouns are never encountered with the d-relation in TJFP, the construct relation being systematic.50 As shall be seen below, however, all these instances of construct relation also involve A-terms that have been found to promote the construct relation in TJS (cf. G:2.4.2.2), so that no conclusions can be drawn from this omnipresence of the construct relation.51

49 In TJS specifically, however, the construct relation clearly predominates, insofar as only one instance featuring the d-relation is encountered: I.15.17 ‘the tribe of Benjamin’.

50 With only one exception, Jos 19.50 ‘Mount Ephraim’, which, however, is not without scribal difficulties, inasmuch as several variant readings insert in front of , to the effect that the B-term is and that the d-relation is therefore what we should expect (cf. G:2.4.4).

51 Finally, a few common nouns referring to physical locations, such as ‘land’ and ‘town’, sometimes occur as the B-term of a d-relation, e.g. I.21.12 ‘the king of the land’, Jos 6.20 ‘the wall of the city’, Jdg 1.17 ‘the name of the city’, 2Kgs 11.14 ‘the people of the land’. But counterexamples are also found, e.g. I.5.12 ‘the crying of the city’, I.9.27 ‘the side of the city’, II.12.30 ‘spoil of the city’, which suggests that the former genitive constructions may be set phrases. Be that as it may, when the
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2.4.2.2 Bare Topo-/Ethnonyms and the Construct Relation

The topo-/ethnonyms listed above as potential candidates for the status of parameter in favour of the $d$-relation regularly occur with the construct relation when they are featured with A-terms that promote its use.

2.4.2.2.1 Parameters in Favour of the Construct Relation with Anthroponymic B-Terms

Interestingly, the construct relation is regularly encountered when the genitive relation involves one of the parameters that have been found to promote the use of the construct relation with anthroponymic B-terms (cf. G:2.2.2). Given the very semantics of topo-/ethnonyms, in TJS we are mostly concerned with the collective אפרים ‘men’ and the morphosyntactic parameter of plurality, though other parameters are occasionally involved as well:

- the A-term refers to a stative SoA: I.9.20 אֶתֶרֶךְ יְשָׁרַיְא ‘the delight of Israel’, Jdg 10.16 עֵמָל יְשָׁרַיְא ‘the suffering of Israel’, 1Kgs 5.10 אֶתֶרֶךְ ‘the wisdom of Egypt’;
- the A-term is אָשָׁר אֶתֶרֶךְ (collective): I.7.11 אָשָׁר יְשָׁרַיְא ‘the men of Israel’, I.26.1 אָשָׁר אֶתֶרֶךְ ‘the men of Ziph’, II.8.14 אָשָׁר אֶתֶרֶךְ ‘the men of Edom’, II.19.17 אָשָׁר אֶתֶרֶךְ ‘the men of Judah’, Jdg 10.12 אָשָׁר ‘the men of Maon’ (not one single exception is encountered with אָשָׁר in the whole of TJFP);52
- the A-term is noun בִּית שֵׁם אֲדִילָה ‘the house of Israel’ (8x in TJS),53 II.2.9 בִּית נוֹפָא ‘the house of Gilead’;54

A-term is plural the construct relation is the rule, in accordance with the plurality parameter, e.g. I.2.10 אָשָׁר אֶתֶרֶךְ ‘the ends of the earth’, I.16.4 אָשָׁר אֶתֶרֶךְ ‘the elders of the city’, II.11.17 אָשָׁר אֶתֶרֶךְ ‘the men of the city’, II.15.23 אָשָׁר אֶתֶרֶךְ ‘the inhabitants of the land’.

52 As with the anthroponyms, not all collectives appear to favour the construct relation. Thus with אָשָׁר ‘assembly, congregation’, few though the attestations may be, the $d$-relation is always found in TJFP: I.2.1 אָשָׁר ‘the assembly of Israel’, 2Kgs 19.21 אָשָׁר ‘the assembly of Zion’.

53 As will been seen below, the genitive construction בִּית שֵׁם אֲדִילָה constitutes a (compounded) ethnonym in its own rights, cf. G:2.4.4.

54 Within the whole of TJFP one encounters one case of genitive relation involving the nouns שֵׁם אֲדִילָה ‘Israel’ and שֵׁם ‘name’ and featuring the $d$-relation: 2Kgs 14.27 שֵׁם אֲדִילָה ‘the name of Israel’. On the other hand, in I.2.29 שֵׁם ‘all the offering of Israel’ the construct relation is encountered even though the A-term does not otherwise belong to the nouns that have been found to favour the construct

In addition, one should note that the topo-/ethnonym שְׂארַיָּא ‘Israel’ displays atypical properties with collective and plural A-terms. Thus, aside from those above the d-relation is encountered in all cases in which the A-term is a collective, e.g. I.28.19 ‘the camp of Israel’, II.6.19 ‘the multitude of Israel’, II.20.23 ‘the army of Israel’. With plural A-terms, שְׂארַיָּא displays some fluctuation. Thus one finds I.10.20 ‘the tribes of Israel’ (standard construction in the whole of TJFP), Jdg 5.13 ‘the armies of Israel’, 1Kgs 2.5 ‘the armies of Israel’ (fem. pl. A-term), as against I.18.6 ‘the cities of Israel’, II.1.24 ‘daughters of Israel’ (fem. pl. A-term), II.7.6 ‘the sons of Israel’, II.10.9 ‘the chosen ones of Israel’, II.17.15 ‘the elders of Israel’, 1Kgs 14.19 ‘the kings of Israel’. The topo-/ethnonym שְׂארַיָּא is also encountered once with the d-relation: Jos 13.32 ‘the plains of Moab’, as against Jdg 10.6 ‘the idols of Moab’; 2Kgs 13.20/2Kgs 24.2 ‘the armies of Moab’ (fem. pl. A-term).

2.4.2.2.2 Terms of Topography as A-Terms

Our analysis allows us to posit the existence of yet another type of semantic parameters in favour of the construct relation: the terms of relation.

55 Though II.20.23 is not in itself unusual, as with the name הַלְּבָנָה ‘military force, army’ the d-relation appears to be the norm in TJFP (cf. G:2.2.2.1(5))

56 Only one exception has been found in the whole of TJFP: Jos 3.12 ‘the tribes of Israel’.

57 The use of the genitive construction נֵבֶן יִשְׂרָאֵל is constant in the whole of TJFP. Moreover, as will be seen below, it constitutes a (compounded) ethnonym in its own rights, cf. G:2.4.3.
topography.\textsuperscript{58} When these nouns are used as A-terms, the construct relation is the rule in TJFP. In our corpus, this set of nouns includes: \textit{\textendash} territory, border, \textit{\textendash} road, \textit{\textendash} plain and \textit{\textendash} land\textsuperscript{2} (in the sense of national/regional territory):

1. \textsuperscript{I.10.2} ‘the territory of Benjamin’, \textsuperscript{I.11.7} ‘the territory of Israel’, \textsuperscript{Jos 15.21} ‘the border of Edom’, \textsuperscript{Jdg 11.18} ‘the border of Moab’, \textsuperscript{1Kgs 5.1} ‘the border of Egypt’;

2. \textsuperscript{2Kgs 3.20} ‘the way of Edom’;

3. \textsuperscript{I.10.3} ‘the plain of Tabor’;

4. \textsuperscript{Jos 14.1} this noun belongs here only in part. In concrete terms, its influence appears to be dependent on the B-term that it accompanies, being nil with some of them (so that the \textit{d}-relation is selected) and optional with others (to the effect that \textit{d}-relation and construct relation alternate):
   - With the \textit{d}-relation exclusively: \textsuperscript{I.7.13} ‘the land of Israel’, \textsuperscript{I.12.6} ‘the land of Egypt’, \textsuperscript{Jos 14.1} ‘the land of Canaan’;
   - Alternation between the \textit{d}-relation and the construct relation: \textsuperscript{Jdg 11.18} ‘the land of Moab’, \textsuperscript{1Kgs 9.26} ‘the land of Edom’, \textsuperscript{2Kgs 25.21} vs. \textsuperscript{2Kgs 23.33} ‘the land of Hamath’;
   - With the construct relation exclusively: \textsuperscript{II.17.26} ‘the land of Gilead’ (no less than 17x in the whole of TJFP).\textsuperscript{59}

\textbf{2.4.2.3 Other Bare Topo-/Ethnonyms}

All other topo-/ethnonyms attested in TJS never occur with the \textit{d}-relation

\textsuperscript{58} Some of these nouns have already been mentioned with regard to their occasional use with anthroponymic B-terms (cf. G:2.2.2.1(4)).

\textsuperscript{59} On the basis of their behaviour with anthroponyms (cf. G:2.2.2.1(4)), terms denoting the four cardinal directions, such as \textit{east} and \textit{south}, probably belong here as well. Though none of them occurs in a conclusive context, i.e. with a B-term otherwise displaying a defensible preference for the \textit{d}-relation, the fact remains that not a single case of \textit{d}-relation involving them is found throughout TJFP. Thus \textsuperscript{I.13.5} ‘the east of Beth-aven’, \textsuperscript{I.27.10} ‘the south of Judah’, \textsuperscript{I.30.14} ‘the south of Chereth’, \textsuperscript{I.30.14} ‘the south of Caleb’, \textsuperscript{Jos 4.19} ‘the east of Jericho’, \textsuperscript{Jdg 1.16} ‘the south of Arad’.
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in the whole of TJFP. Two main cases must be distinguished:

1. Topo-/ethnonyms that happen to always occur with parameters promoting the use of the construct relation. In such cases, the evidence is inconclusive, inasmuch as it is impossible to establish whether the systematic use of the construct relation is the effect of the opposition of those parameters or due to the fact that these topo-/ethnonyms do not favour the *d*-relation in the first place. Examples include:
   - the A-term is collective: I.5.6 ‘the men of Ashdod’, I.11.9 ‘the men of Beeroth’,
     I.4.3 ‘the men of Jabesh-gilead’, II.6.8 ‘the men of Aram’;
   - the A-term is plural: I.6.15 ‘the men of Beth-shemesh’,
     2Kgs 17.30 ‘the men of Babylon’, 2Kgs 19.17 ‘the kings of Assyria’;
   - the A-term is a topographical term: I.6.12 ‘the border of Beth-shemesh’, I.13.18 ‘the road of Beth-horon’,
   - the A-term is the noun: Jdg 1.10 ‘the name of Hebron’.

2. Topo-/ethnonyms that, aside from possible occurrences with parameters in favour of the construct relation, do also occur in genitive relations that do not involve such parameters. The latter occurrences suggest that these topo-/ethnonyms do not favour the *d*-relation. Examples include: I.2.4 ‘the kingdom of Greece’, I.13.2 ‘mount Bethel’, I.13.23 ‘the pass of Michmash’, I.23.19 ‘the hill of Hachilah’, I.24.2 ‘the wilderness of En-gedi’, I.25.1 ‘the wilderness of Paran’, II.2.4 ‘the hill of Ammah’, Jos 18.12 ‘the wilderness of Beth-aven’.

---

60 With the exception, of course, of cases of *d*-relation involving one of the four nouns אָדָם, אֹהֶל, מַשָּׁם and מֵשֶׁךָ which, as has been pointed out, cannot be used as elements of proof for a possible preference of the topo-/ethnonymic B-term for the *d*-relation (cf. G:2.4.2.1.1).
2.4.2.4 Bare Topo-/Ethnonyms: Conclusions

Meagre though the available evidence may be, the foregoing suggests that the bare topo-/ethnonyms can be divided into two main groups on the basis of their behaviour in a genitival context:
1. Those that display a defensible preference for the \( d \)-relation;
2. Those that do not display such a preference, either because they do not favour the \( d \)-relation, or because their preference cannot be demonstrated on the basis of the available evidence.

In addition, the topo-/ethnonyms of the first group must be further distinguished according to the strength of their preference for the \( d \)-relation:

a) Toponyms that behave in a way similar to anthroponyms, i.e. the \( d \)-relation is selected unless any opposing parameter comes into play. Most toponyms in favour of the \( d \)-relation belong to this type. On the basis of their behaviour with the collective \( בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל \), it is arguable whether the names of the twelve tribes of Israel belong here as well;

b) Toponyms whose preference for the \( d \)-relation appears to be stronger than that of anthroponyms, in that they resist at least in part some of the parameters otherwise favouring the construct relation. In TJS, this concerns first and foremost \( יִשְׂרָאֵל \) ‘Israel’, in view of its behaviour with collectives (except \( בֵּית \)), plural A-terms and the topographical term \( אָרֶץ \). On the basis of their behaviour with the topographical term \( אָרֶץ \), the nouns \( מצרים \) ‘Egypt’ and \( קנעם \) ‘Canaan’ may possibly belong here as well.

2.4.3 ETHNONYMS COMPOUNDED WITH THE NOUN ‘sons of’

When the B-term is part of a compound ethnonym involving the A-term \( בֵּית \) ‘sons of’ and a proper noun denoting a tribe, people or family (in TJS only \( בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל \) ‘sons of Israel’, \( בֵּית בֵּית \) ‘sons of Benjamin’, \( בֵּית אָמִמֵן \) ‘sons of Ammon’ and, though not an ethnonym proper, \( בֵּית אָנָון \) ‘sons of men’), the state of affairs is much clearer. Essentially, ethnonyms of this type follow the principles of sg. anthroponyms,\(^{61}\) i.e. the \( d \)-relation is selected,

---

\(^{61}\) Contrary to what we might have expected, as ethnonyms of this type are basically plural (cf. G:2.2.2.2.2).
unless the genitive relation also involves parameters that have been found to be in favour of the construct relation with anthroponyms and bare topo-/ethnonyms. Examples without opposing parameters include:

I.11.2 'the king of the sons of Ammon', II.12.9 'the sword of the sons of Ammon', Jos 18.14 'a city of the sons of Judah'. Examples with opposing parameter:

- the A-term is a term of landed property: Jos 13.23 'the inheritance of the sons of Reuben’, Jos 21.41 ‘the inheritance of the sons of Israel’;
- the A-term is a toponographic term. With ‘territory, border’: Jos 13.10 ‘the territory of the sons of Ammon’. Interestingly, with ‘land’ the construct relation is the rule, e.g. II.10.2 ‘the land of the sons of Ammon’, Jos 11.22 ‘the land of the sons of Israel’;
- the A-term is plural: I.2.8 ‘the deeds of the sons of men’, I.24.10 ‘the words of the sons of men’, 1Kgs 18.31 ‘the tribes of the sons of Jacob’.64

On the basis of Jos 18.1 ‘the assembly of the sons of Israel’, it would appear that the noun ‘assembly, congregation’, though collective in meaning, does not favour the construct relation.65 The same applies to ‘tribe’, with which the d-relation is the rule, e.g. Jos 16.8 ‘the tribe of the sons of Ephraim’, Jos 19.39 ‘the tribe of the sons of Naphtali’.66 Finally, the ethnonym

62 In the whole of TJFP, the noun ‘territory/border’ is encountered only once with the d-relation, and precisely with an ethnonym of this type: Jos 12.2 ‘the territory of the sons of Ammon’. The marginal character of this case is suggested by the fact that the construct relation is also encountered with this ethnonym, as in Jos 13.10 ‘the tribe of the sons of Naphtali’.

63 On the A-term with ethnonymic and toponymic B-terms, cf. G:2.4.2.2.2.

64 The noun ‘punishment, correction’ in II.7.14 ‘the correction of the sons of men’ does not appear to refer to a SoA, whether fientive or stative. The use of the construct relation is therefore unusual. Moreover, one also ought to mention II.17.27 ‘Rabbah of the sons of Ammon’ and II.23.29 ‘Gibeon of the sons of Benjamin’ where the A-term, though itself a toponym, behaves differently in both instances.

65 A similar observation was made with reference to the bare topo-/ethnonyms (cf. G:2.4.2.2.1, esp. footnote n.52).

66 Instances involving all twelve tribe names are encountered in TJFP. All of them feature the d-relation, with only one exception: Jdg 18.16 ‘the tribe of the sons of Dan’.
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appears to enjoy a special treatment in TJFP, inasmuch as with pl. A-terms it usually occurs with the d-relation, e.g. I.2.28 ‘the offerings of the sons of Israel’, Jos 4.5 ‘the tribes of the sons of Israel’ (six times in the whole of TJFP) and Jdg 3.2 ‘the generations of the sons of Israel’.67

2.4.4 ETHNONYMS COMPOUNDED WITH THE NOUN ‘house of’

The behaviour of the ethnonyms compounded with the noun ‘house’ (e.g. בֵּית אָפְרָיָם ‘the house of Ephraim’, בֵּית סָ울 ‘the house of Saul’) is also much clearer than the state of affairs presented by the bare topo-/ethnonyms. Essentially, compounds with בֵּית appear to behave differently according as they denote (1) one of the twelve tribes of Israel, or (2) a people (other than the twelve tribes) or a family:

1. When they combine with the name of one of the twelve tribes of Israel, they favour the d-relation so strongly as to tolerate virtually no opposition to its use. Examples without opposing parameter: I.9.4 בֵּית אפְרָיָם ‘the mountain of the house of Ephraim’, II.18.6 בֵּית סָוָא ‘the forest of the house of Ephraim’. Examples with parameters in favour of the construct relation include:

- the A-term is topographic term ‘land’: I.30.16 בֵּית אֵרֶץ יֹודָה ‘the land of the house of Judah’;
- the A-term is a collective: II.3.8 בֵּית אֵרֶץ יֹודָה ‘the rest of the house of Judah’, II.19.41 בֵּית אֵרֶץ יֹודָה ‘the people of the house of Judah’;
- the A-term is plural: I.27.6 בֵּית אֵרֶץ יֹודָה ‘the kings of the house of Judah’, II.6.2 בֵּית אֵרֶץ יֹודָה ‘the cities of the house of Judah’.68

With the collective, which has not been found to promote the construct relation in the first place (cf. G:2.4.2.1.2; G:2.4.3), the d-relation is obviously the rule, e.g. I.22.7 בֵּית אֵרֶץ יֹודָה ‘the tribe of

67 The only instance of construct relation encountered in the whole of TJFP is Jos 22.33 ‘the eyes of the sons of Israel’.

68 The only exception in TJS is I.30.26 בֵּית אֵרֶץ יֹודָה ‘the elders of the house of Judah’. It should be noted, however, that this passage is not without scribal difficulties. One variant reading inserts בְּ, others omit, to the effect that the B-term is יֹודָה (instead of בֵּית יֹודָה), with which, as we have seen (G:2.4.2.1.2), the use of the construct relation comes less as a surprise (compare II.19.12 בֵּית יֹודָה ‘the elders of Judah’).
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the house of Benjamin’, 1Kgs 12.27 ‘the tribe of the house of Judah’. Instances with all tribe names are plenty in the whole of TJFP, and no exception has been found.

2. When they denote names of peoples or families (e.g. ‘the house of Israel’, ‘the house of Amaleq’, ‘the house of Saul’, ‘the house of your father’), they tend to behave like sg. anthroponyms. Examples without opposing parameter: I.15.32 מלך חלשת ‘the king of the house of Amaleq’, I.15.5 ‘the city of (those of) the house of Amaleq’, II.19.18 ‘היא לסה פניך מלך ‘the young man of the house of Saul’, 2Kgs 8.27 ‘the son-in-law of the house of Ahab’. Examples with parameters in favour of the construct relation:

• the A-term is a collective: I.2.31 דוד חלשת ‘the seed of the house of your father’, I.22.22 ‘the persons [lit. soul] of the house of your father’, II.9.12 ‘היה בכם מעשה ‘the inhabitants of the house of Ziba’, II.16.5 ‘היה בם מעשה ‘the clan of the house of Saul’;

• the A-term is plural: I.3.14 ‘היה בדם ‘the sins of the house of Eli’, 1Kgs 5.3 ‘היה בדם ‘the kings of the house of David’, 1Kgs 20.31 ‘the kings of the house of Israel’.

The discussion of the toponyms and ethnonyms rounds off our analysis of the parameters in favour of the $d$-relation that bear solely on the B-term. We can now turn our attention to the only parameter in favour of the $d$-relation that bears on the genitive relation as a whole rather than on either of its individual terms: the genitive of matter (and related constructions).

2.5 GENITIVE OF MATTER

2.5.1 GENITIVE OF MATTER AND THE $d$-RELATION

The only case where it is the meaning of the genitive relation as a whole, rather than that of one of the two terms involved, that appears to exert an influence on the selection of the genitive construction is the genitive of matter. The genitive of matter, traditionally known as *genitivus materiae*, is a type of genitive relation in which the A-term denotes an
object (in a broad sense) and the B-term the material of which this object is made. Our corpus shows that with the genitive of matter the $d$-relation is the rule. Representative examples include I.2.36 ‘a coin of silver’, I.14.4 ‘a crag of rock’, I.17.6 ‘the javelin of bronze’, I.22.18 ‘the ephod of linen’, II.12.30 ‘a talent of gold’, II.23.7 ‘a garment of iron’.

Furthermore, an identical behaviour is displayed by *partitive* constructions, in which the B-term denotes a mass (or something that can be thought of as a mass) and the A-term a given quantity or (sub)unit of that mass. Most of these genitive relations fall under the scope of what is known in BH grammar as the *genitive of measure*. Here too our corpus shows that the $d$-relation is the rule, e.g. I.10.1 ‘the portion of oil’, I.10.3 ‘a skin of wine’, I.28.22 ‘a piece of bread’, I.17.17 ‘the measure of grain’, I.26.11 ‘the vessel of water’.

A close scrutiny of our corpus reveals that the influence of this parameter is very strong. With only a very few exceptions, the $d$-relation is the rule.

---

69 For a similar phenomenon in TO, cf. Lambdin & Huehnergard (unpublished: 24).

70 Understood in FG’s sense, i.e. essentially as an uncountable noun whose sole grammatical number is the singular, e.g. ‘water’ (cf. FG1: 137-42).

71 Cf. JM (§129f).

72 Certain cases seem to waver between a partitive and a non-partitive interpretation, e.g. with the noun רֹאשׁ ‘rest, remnant’ used as an A-term, as in II.22.32 שָׂרֵא הַפָּרָק ‘the rest of your people’ (partitive) and I.13.2/II.10.10/II.12.28 שָׂרֵא הַפָּרָק ‘the rest of the people’ (non-partitive). With the noun פַּלּוֹמָה ‘half’ the non-partitive reading is systematic in our corpus, e.g. II.10.4 פַּלּוֹמָה הָעִיר ‘the half of their beard’, II.19.41 פֶּלַלְתָּה פְּסָלָה ‘the half of the people of Israel’. On the other hand, in some instances the material/partitive character of the genitive construction is not immediately noticeable, but is nonetheless present, e.g. I.19.13 עֲדֵי נְעַר ‘a goatskin’ (lit. ‘skin of goat’). II.15.14 עֶשֶׁר הָשָּׁבָך ‘edge of sword’. In addition, some figurative use of the material/partitive construction may explain cases such as I.21.5 לַמֶּשֶׁחַ הָעִיר ‘holy bread’ (lit. ‘bread of holiness’), II.8.15 ‘judgement of truth and righteousness’ (and hence also II.14.14 הָעִיר דְּוִי עֵשֶׁר ‘judge of truth’).

73 The only unambiguous exceptions encountered in our corpus are I.14.26 מַשָּׁחַ כֹּל ‘a stream of honey’ and II.22.35 מַשָּׁחַ דְּוִי עֵשֶׁר ‘the bow of bronze’.
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2.5.2 PARAMETERS IN FAVOUR OF THE CONSTRUCT RELATION

As for the opposing factors, due to the semantic restrictions imposed by the inherent meaning of the *genitivus materiae* and the *genitivus partitivus* on the two terms of the relation, in actual fact the semantic parameters in favour of the construct relation do not generally apply here. In contrast, our corpus features many cases of *genitivus materiae* and *genitivus partitivus* involving a plural A-term, which makes possible the influence of the morphosyntactic parameter of plurality.\(^74\)

In this respect, however, our corpus also reveals that the operation of the plural parameter is subjected to the influence of another morphosyntactic parameter: semantic *determination*.\(^75\) This parameter appears to play a passive rather than an active role:

1. As a rule, when the A-term is semantically *determinate* the determination parameter is not activated: the plural parameter is then given free rein and the construct relation is selected, e.g. I.6.8 פְּלֵסֶת בֶּשֶׂר ‘the vessels of gold’, I.6.17 בֵּית הָאֵבֶן ‘the haemorrhoids of gold’, I.6.18 עֲבָרָה ‘the mice of gold’, II.8.7 שִׂפְחִית הָאֵבֶן ‘the shields of gold’, all instances involving the B-term מִנּוֹ ‘gold’.\(^76\)

2. When the A-term is semantically indeterminate, however, the determination parameter is liable to be activated, which has then the effect of neutralizing the action of the plural parameter. In other words, the influence of the plural parameter is made, as it were, optional, so that one may encounter either the construct relation (influence of plurality unaffected) or the *d*-relation (influence of

\(^74\) Referring typically to a material or mass, the B-term of a *genitivus materiae* or partitive genitive is not usually in the plural. In the few instances where it is, however, one can clearly see that the genitive of matter and partitive genitive are distinct from the anthroponymic parameter, in that they allow the *d*-relation with plural B-terms: I.19.16 פֵּית הָאֵבֶן ‘a goatskin’ (lit. ‘the skin of the goats’), I.26.11 פֶּת הָאֵבֶן ‘the vessel of water’.

\(^75\) As against the instances involving anthroponymic, hieronymic, toponymic and ethnonymic B-terms, where determination has not been found to exert any influence (cf. G:4.2 below). On the contrast between semantic and formal determination, cf. D:1.3.

\(^76\) In addition, one will note the unusual I.17.17 פְּלֵסֶת הָאֵבֶן ‘the(se ten) loaves of bread’ and I.17.18 פְּרֵסֶת הָאֵבֶן ‘the(se ten) cheeses of milk’, irregular not only because the A-term, though semantically determinate, is in the st.abs., but also because there is no determination agreement between A-term and B-term (cf. D:3.2.2.1, esp. footnote n.72).
plurality cancelled). Examples include:

- With the construct relation: I.17.7 '(600) shekels of iron’, I.6.4 ‘(five) mice of gold’, I.6.4 ‘(five) haemorrhoids of gold’, II.8.10 ‘vessels of gold’, II.12.31 ‘axes of iron’; 77

The reasons motivating the neutralization (or absence of neutralization) of the plural parameter and the resulting alternation between d-relation and construct relation are not clear. Whatever these reasons may be, however, our corpus shows clearly that the neutralization of the plural parameter largely prevails, to the effect that the d-relation is resorted to more often than the construct relation.

We are on the verge of rounding off our discussion of the construct and bare d-relation. Before we move on to the proleptic d-relation, the third and last type of genitive constructions to be addressed in the present study, two special nouns denoting body parts must be treated.

77 Contrast these three examples I.6.4, I.6.4 and II.8.10 with (respectively) I.6.18, I.6.17 and I.6.8 above.

78 On the formal determination of the B-term in these examples, cf. D:3.2.2.2, where it has been noted that when the A-term is in the st.cst. pl. the B-term, if sg., is formally determinate. In contrast, two instances feature a pl. B-term: one of them complies with the tendency of plural nouns to respect the distinction between st.emph. and st.abs. (II.1.24 ‘garments of coloured stuff’); the other does not (II.7.2/II.7.7 ‘panels of cedars’), but there is no indication that this is due to the plurality of the A-term.

79 As these examples show, most of the instances featuring the d-relation also feature an accompanying numeral. But this is by no means indicative of any connexion between the presence of a numeral and the use of the d-relation, as other examples featuring a numeral also feature the construct relation, e.g. I.6.4, I.6.4 and I.17.7 above. Besides, one will also note I.21.4 ‘(five) loaves of bread’ and II.21.16 ‘(300) selas of bronze’, which contravene the regular agreement in determination between A-term and B-term (cf. D:3.2.2.1).
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2.6 SPECIAL CASES
THE NOUNS רָּחַב ‘hand’ AND רְשַׁע ‘head’ USED AS A-TERMS

The two nouns רָּחַב ‘hand’ and רְשַׁע ‘head’ display a rather atypical behaviour when they are used as A-terms of a genitive relation with anthroponymic B-terms.

1. With ‘head’ the construct relation prevails, but the $d$-relation is also attested:

As expected, with plural B-terms the construct relation is regularly selected, e.g. I.9.22 ‘רוֹחֲב יָשָׁשְׁשַׁת’, II.23.8 ‘רוֹחֲב יָשָׁשְׁשַׁת’, I.29.4 ‘רוֹחֲב יָשָׁשְׁשַׁת’, II.33.23 ‘רוֹחֲב יָשָׁשְׁשַׁת’.

2. The behaviour of the noun רְשַׁע ‘head’ in terms of genitive construction is even more unexpected and unpredictable. With anthroponymic B-terms, both the construct relation and the $d$-relation occur in equal proportion. The reasons for this are not clear. E.g.:

$80$ This distribution is confirmed when the analysis is extended to the whole of TJFP. However, as expected the construct relation is the norm when the noun רְשַׁע is used with non-anthroponymic B-terms in a figurative sense, e.g. to denote the summit of an elevation (as in I.26.13 ‘רוֹחֲב כַּפָּן’, I.26.14 ‘רוֹחֲב כַּפָּן’, the top of the mountain’), the leader of a group (as in I.18.13 ‘רוֹחֲב יִשְׂרָאֵל’ the head of the people’), the extremity of an object (as in I.14.43 ‘רוֹחֲב יִשְׂרָאֵל’ the tip of the staff’), etc. Interestingly, in II.5.2 ‘רוֹחֲב יִשְׂרָאֵל’ the noun רְשַׁע is used figuratively with the ethnonym רְשַׁע ‘ישראל’ and the construct relation is selected.

$81$ Similarly, the construct relation is also the rule when the A-term רְשַׁע ‘head’ itself is plural (which, rather logically, also requires a plural B-term): I.29.4 ‘רוֹחֲב יִשְׂרָאֵל’ the heads of the men’, 2Kgs 10.8 ‘רוֹחֲב יִשְׂרָאֵל’ the heads of the sons of the king’.
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- With the construct relation: I.12.4 ‘hand of man’, I.16.20 ‘the hand of David’, I.23.20 ‘the hand of the king’, II.14.16 ‘the hand of the man’, II.20.10 ‘the hand of Joab’ and also I.12.3 ‘whose hand’ (‘the hand of whom’).82

As expected, the construct relation is the norm with plural B-terms, e.g. I.4.3 ‘the hand of our enemies’, I.11.7 ‘the hand of the messengers’, I.14.48 ‘the hand of those plundering them’, I.20.6 ‘the hand of those hating David’, II.28.15 ‘the hand of the teachers’, II.21.9 ‘the hand of the Gibeonites’. But the d-relation is also attested, e.g. I.10.18 ‘the hand of the Egyptians’, II.10.2, II.21.22 ‘the hand of his servants’ and the frequent ‘the hand of the Philistines’ (no less than twelve times in TJS, as against only two instances with the construct relation), Jdg 15.18 ‘the hand of the uncircumcised (ones)’.83

3. In contrast, nouns denoting other body parts or components such as פָּנִים ‘eye’, פְּסָפוּת ‘mouth’, פָּרֶץ ‘heart’, פְּתַח ‘blood’ (etc.) behave normally:
- When they are themselves used in the plural, which basically occurs with the noun פָּנִים ‘eye’ only, the construct relation is used, e.g. I.8.6 פְּנֵי סַמּוֹאֵל ‘the eyes of Samuel’, I.18.5 פְּנֵי פִּלְאָט ‘the eyes of the servants of Saul’, II.13.2 פְּנֵי אֲמֹנָן ‘the eyes of Amnon’;
- When the B-term is plural, the construct relation is also the rule, e.g. II.1.22 פִּסְמֵי מְנַחֵל ‘the blood of the killed’, II.23.17 פִּסְמֵי פָּרֶץ ‘the blood of the men’, 1Kgs 22.22 פִּסְמֵי פְּרֵי ‘the mouth of all his prophets’, 2Kgs 9.7 פִּסְמֵי עֲבֹד ‘the blood of my servants’;84
- Otherwise, the B-term being a singular anthroponym the d-relation is selected, e.g. I.17.32 פֹּלְחַת אֵל ‘the heart of man’, I.23.28 פֹּלְחַת כּוֹנֵן ‘the heart of the king’, II.3.27 פֹּלְחַת אֲשָׁאלה ‘the blood of Asahel’, II.3.28 פֹּלְחַת אֲבִינֶר ‘the blood of Abner’, I.13.28 פֹּלְחַת אֲבָנָן ‘the heart of...’

82 In I.13.22 דֶּעַי בֵּית פָּנִים ‘the hand of all the people (who...)’ the d-relation is encountered for no obvious reason.

83 Of course, the construct relation is also attested when the A-term פֶּרֶץ itself is plural, e.g. I.12.6 פְּרֶץ מְשַה ‘the hands of Moses’. Finally, with the noun ישָׁרָא ‘Israel’ the d-relation is attested (two times): I.14.12/I.14.37 יִשָּׁר אֲבָנָן ‘the hand of Israel’; the construct relation is not.

84 Occasionally the d-relation is found: II.12.14 פֹּלְחַת הָעֵבִירוֹת פִּסְמֵי מְנַחֵל ‘the mouth of the enemies of the people of the Lord’, II.15.6 פֹּלְחַת הָעֵבִירוֹת פִּסְמֵי מְנַחֵל ‘the heart of the men of Israel’. 
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The discussion of the body parts rounds off our analysis of the construct relation and the bare d-relation in TJS. We can now proceed to discuss the proleptic d-relation, which will provide us with a more complete picture of the way the construct relation and the d-relation interact in TJS.

3. PROLEPTIC d-RELATION

The reason why the proleptic d-relation has been left over for the end of our discussion is that it is really difficult, not to say impossible, to formulate hard and fast rules regulating its use. The main reason for this is its scarcity of use in our corpus: out of 2157 genitive relations found in TJS only 31 are proleptic d-relations, i.e. less than 1.5% of all genitive relations encountered in the corpus. But few though they may be, instances of proleptic d-relations enable us to venture four general statements:

1. The two terms of the genitive relation are always semantically determinate.
2. With only three exceptions (I.2.5 ‘the sons of Haman’, I.21.6 ‘the vessels of the young men’ and II.23.1 ‘the praises of Israel’) the A-term of the genitive relation is always in the singular, which is in keeping with the customs of the bare d-relation.
3. The B-term of the genitive relation belongs to the nouns that have been shown to display a clear preference for the bare d-relation: in 26 cases, we have a sg. anthroponym, e.g. I.14.51 ‘the father of Abner’, I.14.3 ‘the brother of Ichabod’; and three times we find ‘Israel’ (I.15.29 ‘the glory of Israel’, II.22.29 ‘the praises of Israel’). The only exceptions are II.5.20 ‘the name of the

85 In one single instance the construct relation is used with זון ‘heart’: I.25.36 ‘the heart of Nabal’. In addition, a few uncommon uses of the d-relation are encountered: I.11.2 ‘the right eye’, II.17.10 ‘the heart of the lion’ (vs. I.17.37 ‘the hand of the lion’, I.13.37 ‘the hand of the bear’), II.17.19 ‘the mouth of the well’.
place’ and II.11.1 ‘the end of the year’, where we find inanimate entities, which are usually not offered such a preferential treatment.  

4. The only definite correlation that can be made between the proleptic d-relation and semantic categories is the use of the proleptic d-relation with terms of kinship. In practice, the proleptic d-relation is systematically used when the A-term is ‘father’, ‘brother’, ‘mother’, ‘sister’ and ‘uncle’, e.g. I.14.51 ‘the father of Saul’, II.19.21 ‘the brother of David’, II.17.25 ‘the mother of Joab’, II.13.4 ‘the sister of Absalom’, I.10.14 ‘the uncle of Saul’.  

Finally, it should certainly be mentioned that there is no systematic correlation between the use of the proleptic d-relation and the existence or absence of a Vorlage. With terms of kinship (18 out of the 31 instances of proleptic d-relation) there is always a Vorlage (with the exception of I.2.5 ‘the sons of Haman’); out of the 13 remaining cases, eight have a Vorlage, five do not.

Before we conclude our analysis, a few morphosyntactic observations are in order.

4. MORPHOSYNTACTIC OBSERVATIONS

4.1 GENITIVE RELATION AND PARTICIPLE

The presence of an active participle used as the A-term may be another morphosyntactic consideration that has a bearing on the selection of genitive constructions. Indeed, in several other Aramaic dialects the

86 If one extends the scrutiny to the whole of TJFP, however, it turns out that with the noun ‘name’ the proleptic d-relation is the rule when the B-term is either ‘place’ or ‘city’, e.g. Jos 5.9 ‘the name of the place’, Jdg 18.29 ‘the name of the city’ (in one case one finds the bare d-relation: Jdg 1.17 ‘the name of the city’, but several other versions of TJFP amend it to . Though the reasons for this use of the proleptic d-relation are not clear, one should therefore be cautious when treating II.5.20 as irregular.

87 In the whole of TJFP only two exceptions have been found, involving the noun ‘mother’ in a bare d-relation: 1Kgs 2.19/2Kgs 24.15 ‘the mother of the king’. Moreover, in one unique instance in our corpus another term of kinship occurs with the proleptic d-relation: I.2.5 ‘the sons of Haman’.
construct relation is favoured when the A-term is a participle. Unfortunately, this preference cannot be controlled as regards TJS, since in all instances involving a participle as an A-term in TJS either (1) the B-term is neutral in terms of genitive construction, e.g. I.17.7 ‘the bearer of the shield’, II.18.26 ‘the gatekeeper’; or (2) the participial A-term itself is in the pl. and therefore requires the construct relation if only on that ground, e.g. I.25.22 ‘those who hate David’.

4.2 GENITIVE RELATION AND DETERMINATION

As we have seen, with the genitive of matter and the partitive genitive determination appears to exert a significant influence on the selection of genitive constructions. More specifically, it plays the role of a restrictor, neutralizing the effect of the plural factor when the A-term is semantically indeterminate.

In contrast, with anthroponymic, hieronymic, toponymic and ethnonymic B-terms determination has no noticeable impact on genitive constructions. This, of course, does not mean that determination has no impact at all, merely that the evidence provided by our corpus does not enable us to assess it properly:

1. With anthroponymic B-terms, almost all instances feature a semantically determinate B-term, e.g. II.1.22 ‘the sword of Saul’, II.17.20 ‘the servants of Absalom’: only a very few genitive relations (approx. 2% of all genitive relations involving an anthroponymic B-term) feature a semantically indeterminate B-term.89

What is more, most of these genitive relations, few though they may be, involve a parameter in favour of the construct relation, to which, as we have seen, the anthroponymic parameter is responsive, e.g.:

- the B-term is plural: II.3.33 ‘a death of wicked men’;
- the A-term and the B-term are plural: II.3.14 ‘(one

88 Cf. G:6.3. Interestingly, Kaddari (1963a: 244) noted the same phenomenon with regard to the Aramaic of TO.

89 Of course, TJS also features genitive relations with indeterminate A-terms, but with anthroponymic B-terms these are expressed by other means than the construct relation and d-relation (e.g. with the help of the preposition -א, as in I.16.18 ‘a son of Jesse’, I.17.8 ‘servants of Saul’) and are therefore not included in the present discussion.
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hundred) foreskins of Philistines’;  
- the A-term is collective, the B-term is plural: II.22.5 ‘company of sinners’;
- the A-term is the noun ‘son’: II.23.20 ‘son of a man fearing sins’.

As a result, the resort to the construct relation is inevitable, to the effect that the influence, if any, of the determination on its selection cannot be checked.

2. With toponymic, ethnonymic and hieronymic B-terms, sheer lack of evidence makes the influence of determination even more opaque: with toponymic/ethnonymic B-terms only one instance of a genitive relation featuring an indeterminate A-term has been found in our corpus (I.15.4 ‘(10,000) men of Judah’); with hieronymic B-terms not a single one.

All in all, with these four types of B-terms the influence of determination on the selection of a genitive construction cannot be assessed, either because evidence is lacking, or because it is inadmissible.

4.3 GENITIVE RELATION AND STRUCTURAL COMPLEXITY

1. The complexity of the terms involved in the genitive relation (i.e. the fact that the A-term or B-term is composed of various constituents or not) has not been found to exert any influence on the selection of genitive constructions. In other words, the parameters at work in the selection of a genitive construction are unaffected by the relative complexity or simplicity of the terms involved. Thus II.4.4 ‘the news of Saul and Jonathan’ and I.12.6 ‘the hands of Moses and Aaron’, as against II.19.38 ‘the grave of my father and my mother’. All three examples involve an anthroponymic

90 The B-term ‘Philistines’ is only formally determinate (cf. D:2.1, footnote n.30).

91 The only instance of a genitive relation involving an indeterminate anthroponymic B-term without parameter in favour of the construct relation is II.14.14 ‘the death of a dying (person)’, where we see that the $d$-relation, being unopposed, is used.

92 It is worthy of notice that complex B-term is not equivalent to plural B-term.
B-term, hence a natural preference for the $d$-relation. In the first and second examples this preference is objected to by some opposing parameter (the A-term is a term of wordy content in the first example and plural in the second), so that the construct relation is resorted to. In the third example, however, the $d$-relation is not objected to, and is therefore selected.

2. In the same vein, it appears that the complexity of a ‘genitive chain’ as a whole — i.e. the number of terms that it connects (e.g. ‘the sword of the son of the brother of the king of Babylon’) — does not necessarily entail the recourse to the $d$-relation as a means to break the monotony of an otherwise lengthy sequence of construct relations. A succession of two (or more) construct relations is indeed what one gets if nothing justifies the use of a $d$-relation, and even more so if some principle or other enforces the use of the construct relation. Instances featuring a succession of two construct relations are numerous in our corpus, e.g. I.2.22 ‘the gate of the tent of the meeting’, I.4.18 ‘the path of the road of the gateway’, I.14.50 ‘the name of the wife of Saul’, II.6.20 ‘the eyes of the handmaids of his servants’, II.11.7 ‘the health of the wagers of battle’, II.14.11 ‘the hair of the head of your son’, II.19.35 ‘days of years of my life’ (etc.). One also finds one instance featuring a sequence of three construct relations, I.2.31 ‘the strength of the seed of the house of your father’, and even one featuring four, I.14.14 ‘the space of (the) half (of) the journey of the yoke of the oxen’.

As a result of the above, Muraoka’s suggestion that whatever the exact circumstances of its origins the $d$-relation, highly flexible by virtue of its analytical character, enriched the Aramaic language with new possibilities of expression that the construct relation and

In other words, the fact that B-terms like ‘Saul and Jonathan’ refer to more than one entity does not make them responsive to the plurality parameter. In order to trigger the morphosyntactic parameter of plurality, terms must be plural morphologically, not merely a part of a plural syntagm.

93 The extreme rarity of such longer sequences in our corpus does not need to be considered the product of stylistic considerations, but appears to be nothing more than a coincidence, i.e. TJS hardly features any longer genitive sequence that does not involve at least one parameter in favour of the $d$-relation. This should not come as a surprise: the more terms a genitive chain connects, the greater the chance that a parameter in favour of the $d$-relation be involved in it.
its rigidity would not have allowed,\textsuperscript{94} cannot be verified in our corpus. Indeed, the strongly literal character of TJ’s translation of the Vorlage, \textit{inter alia} as far as word order is concerned (cf. W:1.3), entails that the freedom of expression brought about by the use of the $d$-relation is nearly not taken advantage of.\textsuperscript{95}

\section*{5. Unsolved Cases}

Having reached the end of our discussion it may be appropriate, before we proceed to summarize the above, to list all cases for which the present model fails to provide an adequate explanation.\textsuperscript{96} I.1.9 ‘the doorpost of the temple’, I.4.16 ‘battle line’, I.9.16 ‘the distress of my people’, I.10.25 ‘the law of kingship’,\textsuperscript{97} I.11.2 ‘right eye’, I.13.22 ‘the day of the battle’, I.17.7 ‘the wood of his spear’, I.17.7 ‘the point of his spear’, I.17.44 ‘the bird of the heavens’, I.17.44 ‘the beast of the field’, I.20.5 ‘the evening of the third day’, I.20.19 lit. ‘the profane day’, I.21.5 ‘holy bread’, I.23.19 ‘the stronghold of the forest’, I.30.17 ‘the evening of the day that was after it’, I.31.7 ‘the side of the plain’, I.31.7 ‘the side of the Jordan’, II.1.18 ‘the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{95} A few times, when the Vorlage is not translated literally and is rendered in Aramaic with a $d$-relation, the loose character of the $d$-relation is used, e.g. I.9.8 \textsuperscript{88} ‘a fourth of a shekel of silver’, rendered \textsuperscript{89} with ‘one zuz silver’ in TJS, where we see that the numeral \textsuperscript{90} ‘one’ has been inserted between the A-term and the B-term, which would not have been possible with the construct relation. On the other hand, in other cases the word order of the Vorlage is strictly adhered to, even when in the Aramaic translation the $d$-relation is substituted for the construct relation of the Vorlage, e.g. I.7.9 ‘one suckling lamb’ [Hebrew: \textit{lifnim be-fleishah}, II.6.19 ‘one cake of bread’ [Hebrew: \textit{lifnim be-fleishah}].
\item \textsuperscript{96} Occurrences of the construct relation where the $d$-relation would have been expected have already been treated in the foregoing discussion. Similarly, the proleptic $d$-relation has been shown to be so marginal a phenomenon in TJS as to lie beyond the scope of predictable rules. The present list is therefore restricted to unexpected occurrences of the bare $d$-relation. It should certainly be mentioned that not a few of these unsolved cases could actually be explained by some derived or secondary use of the parameters discussed above, but I have found it preferable to err on the side of caution.
\item \textsuperscript{97} For this particular case, cf. footnote n.35 above.
\end{itemize}
book of the law’,\textsuperscript{98} II.3.26 ‘the pit of the thorn’, II.17.19 ‘the mouth of the well’, II.18.9 ‘the branch of the terebinth’, II.21.20 ‘man of stature’, II.22.43 ‘the dust of the earth’, II.23.20 ‘a snowy day’, II.23.21 ‘a handsome man’. All in all, these unsolved cases constitute only 1.16% of all cases of the genitive in TJS.

6. CONCLUSIONS

6.1 SUMMARY

The foregoing discussion has attempted to demonstrate the following points:

I. With only 1.5% of all genitive relations encountered in TJS, the proleptic $d$-relation is but a marginal phenomenon in our corpus. Besides the terms of kinship אב ‘father’, אמה ‘mother’, אח ‘brother’, עי ‘sister’ and אב ‘uncle’, with which the proleptic $d$-relation is regular, its use is unpredictable, which raises the impression that it is idiomatic and not subjected to definite rules. As a result, a study of the genitive in TJS boils down to a study of the interactions between the construct relation and the bare $d$-relation.

II. Concerning the construct relation and the bare $d$-relation, two observations can be made:

1. With 71.5% of all genitive relations encountered in TJS, the construct relation largely predominates over the bare $d$-relation;

2. The use of the bare $d$-relation appears to be motivated; in contrast, in many instances the use of the construct relation is not.\textsuperscript{99}

The above allows us to reach the following functional model for the working of the genitive in TJS:

\textsuperscript{98} Contrast with II.14.11 ‘the book of the law of the Lord’.

\textsuperscript{99} In the final analysis, the only instances in which the use of the construct relation can be said to be motivated are those cases where the presence of some parameter, semantic or morphosyntactic, stands in the way of the use of the $d$-relation, to the effect that the construct relation obtains.
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III. The construct relation is the genitive relation by default in TJS.

1. Some parameters tip the scales in favour of the $d$-relation. In the final analysis, five main parameters have been identified: one bearing on the genitive relation as a whole (genitive of matter and related constructions) and four bearing on the B-term only (anthroponyms, hieronyms, some toponyms and some ethnonyms);\(^{100}\)

2. Some other parameters display a preference for the construct relation, and belong to one of two types, semantic and morphosyntactic:
   a) Semantic: certain nouns, by virtue of their semantics, appear to favour the construct relation (or, to put it another way, to resist the pressure towards the $d$-relation). These parameters have been discussed in connexion with the parameters favouring the $d$-relation with which they are liable to interact, and cover such categories as collectives, terms of kinship, terms of landed property, terms of topography (etc.);
   b) Morphosyntactic: the influence of plurality is pervasive in TJS, inasmuch as in contrast to the semantic parameters just discussed plurality interacts with all parameters in favour of the $d$-relation discussed above.

IV. For each case of genitive:

1. When no parameter in favour of either construction is present, the genitive construction by default, viz. the construct relation, is selected;
2. When a parameter in favour of the $d$-relation is present, the $d$-relation will usually be selected;
3. When parameters in favour of the $d$-relation coincide with parameters in favour of the construct relation in one and the same genitive relation, linguistic tension arises. The tension is then resolved to the advantage of one of the two (sets of) parameters, which allows us to rank these parameters in terms of their resilience.

V. In the main, the parameters in favour of the $d$-relation can be

\(^{100}\) To these five main parameters might be added the four nouns $\text{מִשְׁרָה}$ ‘entrance’, $\text{עֵמֶנֶה}$ ‘ascent’, $\text{מִלְאָה}$ ‘king’ and $\text{תַּרְגָּמָה}$ ‘wadi, stream, valley’, inasmuch as when these nouns are used as an A-term in a genitive relation with toponymic B-terms the $d$-relation is systematically selected, even when the B-term cannot be demonstrated to be in favour of it (cf. G:2.4.2.1.1). We have seen that $\text{בָּשָׂר}$ ‘military force, army’ might belong here as well.
divided into three main groups, depending on their degree of resilience: 101

1. The noun אֲרוֹן ‘the Lord’ ranks highest amongst the parameters that favour the d-relation. It tolerates no exception, so that all parameters in favour of the construct relation give way when they combine with it in a genitive relation. The ethnonyms compounded of the names of the twelve tribes of Israel with בֵּית ‘house’ (e.g. בֵּית יְהֹוָה ‘the house of Judah’) also belong here. With only one dubious exception involving a plural A-term, these compounds do not tolerate any exception either in TJFP as a whole;

2. Next we find certain items that resist some of the principles in favour of the construct relation and give way to others. There is no easy way to classify or rank these items, as the parameters resisted or yielded to vary from item to item. Thus the topo-/ethnonym ישראל ‘Israel’ resists the collectives (except יִתְנָה), the topographical term והר and, partly, the plural factor. The compounded ethnonym יִשְׂרָאֵל, for its part, gives way to all semantic parameters with which it interacts (except the collective יִתְנָה), but resists as a rule the plural factor. Finally, along with והתואם, the topo-/ethnonyms מצרים ‘Egypt’ and קננה ‘Canaan’ resist the topographic term והר;

3. Finally, all other parameters give way when parameters in favour of the construct relation interfere. These include all anthroponyms, the hieronym יהוה ‘god’, certain bare topo-/ethnonyms (other than those of group 2, e.g. ישע), the ethnonyms compounded with בֵּית ‘sons of’ (except יִתְנָה, which belongs to group 2) and בֵּית ‘house of’ (except those of the type יִתְנָה, which belong to group 1) and the genitivus materiae/partitivus. 102 It should be emphasized that the parameters of this group constitute the large majority among the parameters in favour of the d-relation, so that it is legitimate to posit that giving way to parameters in favour of the construct relation is standard, or typical, practice.

101 The resilience of the parameters at work in the selection of genitive constructions (sections V and VI) is summarized in tabular form on p.133.

102 In the case of the genitivus materiae/partitivus, we have also seen that yet another morphosyntactic parameter — determination — is influential, inasmuch as when the genitive relation is semantically indeterminate the influence of the plural factor is made optional (G:2.5.2).
VI. The parameters in favour of the construct relation can likewise be ranked according to their resilience. Since the parameters in favour of the *d*-relation can be divided into three groups, the first of which (group 1) outweighs all opposing parameters, parameters in favour of the construct relation fall into two basic groups, which we will designate by means of roman capitals: (A) those that prevail over both group 2 and group 3, (B) those that prevail over group 3 only. To these two groups one may add a third group (C) comprising a few items that display a rather atypical behaviour:

A. This group includes (at least) the terms referring to stative SoAs, the noun מִזְרַח ‘house’, the topographic term מֵית ‘territory/border’ and the collective מָכָה ‘men’. Finally, the morphosyntactic parameter of plurality belongs here at least in part, inasmuch as certain plural A-terms systematically occur in the construct relation, even with items of group 2 (e.g. נְכֹלֶת יֶשֶׁר אֲנָשָׁה ‘as in בְּנוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל ‘the sons/daughters of Israel’);

B. This group includes all other parameters, i.e. those that do not enforce the construct relation on items of group 2, or that do not co-occur with items of group 2 at all in TJS: terms denoting verbal contents (with only a few exceptions involving the noun מִסְתַּר ‘word’ and some anthroponyms), terms of kinship (in the sg.), terms of landed property, certain collectives (other than מָכָה ‘men’), miscellaneous nouns מַעַן ‘name’ and דִּשָּׁה ‘soul, life’, topographic terms (other than מֵית) and plurality (but cf. above);

C. This group includes the terms יָד ‘hand’ and נַח ‘head’, which sometimes (but by no means always) prevail over group 3 (e.g. יָד מֵית ‘the hand of David’, מֵית מִלְצָה ‘the head of the king’ vs. יָד דְּרוֹד ‘the hand of David’), and which are also featured together with the *d*-relation even when the B-term does not require it (e.g. יָד פִּלְסְטִים ‘the hand of the Philistines’).

103 Inasmuch as not all parameters in favour of the construct relation co-occur with all types of B-terms in favour of the *d*-relation, the exact status of certain parameters in favour of the construct relation cannot be properly assessed. This is especially true of the parameters that do not occur together with items of group 2 (and the like) in TJS, which make up quite a few of the parameters encountered with anthroponymic B-terms. For these parameters, it has proven impossible to establish whether they belong to group A or B. Inasmuch as they do not interact with items of group 2, in this study they are classified as items of group B.
Chapter Three: GENITIVE CONSTRUCTIONS
Chapter Three: GENITIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

6.2 INALIENABILITY AND INDIVIDUATION

All in all, the state of affairs of the genitive in TJS is rather intricate. As the above has attempted to show, a scrutiny of the text brings more tendencies than absolute rules to the fore. This variation should come as no surprise, however, since the construct relation and the $d$-relation, as in most other Aramaic dialects, are used side by side for the expression of the genitive. The main question that arises at the close of this analysis is how such a state of affairs is to be explained, i.e. what underlies the operation of the various parameters at work in TJS.

Such a question is not easy to answer, inasmuch as the working of the genitive, like other linguistic phenomenons, is multifactorial. Be that as it may, two linguistic notions can be clearly identified, which allow us to explain the action of some of the parameters discussed in this study: inalienability and individuation.

1. Interestingly, several parameters found to be in favour of the construct relation pertain to what is usually referred to as inalienable or intrinsic possession. This notion is brought to bear on genitive relations ‘which indicate that the entity denoted by the [A-term] intrinsically belongs or is inherent to its ‘possessor’ indicated by the [B-term]’. With anthroponymic B-terms, this involves first and foremost the terms of kinship, the nouns denoting wordy contents and the miscellaneous nouns $תֵית, בָּרִי, מְשִי$ and $םֶשֶׁת$. Genitive relations involving body parts are also typical instances of inalienable possession, but, as we have seen, their behaviour in TJS is not without problems. With topo-/ethnonymic B-terms, the notion of inalienable possession also bears on the genitive constructions with topographical A-terms ($תֵית, מְשִי, אָדָם, אָגָר$).

The above suggests that in TJS inalienable possession tends to be expressed by the construct relation. As will be seen below, this state of affairs is typical of IA too, whereas the regular use of the proleptic $d$-relation with certain terms of kinship relates TJS to LA usage.


2. **Individuation** appears to play an important role in the working of the genitive in TJS as well. The notion of individuation is essentially cognitive, i.e. rooted in categories of human perception and representation, which does not make it easy to define in formal terms. Within the present study, individuation will be understood along the lines set out by Khan.\(^{106}\) Essentially, Khan understands the individuation of an item in terms of its ‘distinctness or salience [...] from its own background’;\(^{107}\) the more distinct an item is, the more individuated it is.\(^{108}\) Khan also emphasizes that individuation is multifactorial, i.e. the individuation of an item results from several, cooperating considerations, rather than from any individual consideration.\(^{109}\) Regarding TJS specifically, individuation turns out to be a key concept in the selection of genitive constructions. In concrete terms, two general, complementary principles can be formulated:

I. **The more individuated the B-term is, the more likely the d-relation is to be selected.** Taking Khan’s individuation hierarchies as a basis,\(^{110}\) we may posit the following factors (in all likelihood among others) at work in the process of individuation in TJS:

- Perceptual salience: Divine > Human > non-Human
- Concrete > Abstract
- Singular > Plural
- Proper > Common
- Textually prominent > Incidental

Thus the preference of anthroponyms and hieronyms for the


\(^{108}\) Dubois *et al* (1994) have essentially the same notion of linguistic individuation: ‘On appelle *individuation linguistique* le processus par lequel un groupe se caractérise face à un autre groupe grâce à des constantes de l’activité langagière’.

\(^{109}\) Thus ‘a nominal which refers to a specific entity is more individuated than a generic nominal, which refers to a class of entities. A proper noun with a unique referent is more individuated than a common noun [...]. The distinctness of a nominal also depends on the perceptual salience of its referent. Humans do not perceive the environment with uniform objectivity [...]. This means that a human being tends to pay more attention to entities which are most akin to himself, i.e. other human beings [...]. Human individuals are [...] therefore more perceptually salient than inanimate objects’ (Khan 1988: xxxvii).
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d-relation can be derived from their ranking in the perceptual salience hierarchy, the critical pivot being situated between ‘Human’ and ‘non-Human’. Thus in TJS divine entities (‘, ) and human entities (‘, , etc.) tend to require the d-relation, whereas by their very nature non-human entities, whether animate (e.g. animals) or inanimate (e.g. objects, things) are not perceptually salient enough to command its use.

II. The less individuated the terms involved in the genitive relation are, the less likely the d-relation is to be selected. This second principle is significant. It suggests that items that rank low in the individuation hierarchies are not necessarily neutral with regard to the selection of the d-relation, but rather that they can actively oppose it. One of the most striking examples of this in TJS is the plural factor. A group of entities is obviously less individuated than a single entity, and this explains why the presence of a plural item in a genitive relation, whether as A-term or B-term, successfully opposes the selection of the d-relation in TJS. In the latter case, when e.g. the B-term is both anthroponymic and plural, this also indicates that the necessarily un-individuated nature of a collection of entities outweighs the ‘individuatedness’ of their human nature. This last aspect is particularly significant, because it suggests that the individuation hierarchies are not equally weighty: the plurality of the A-term or B-term indeed outweighs, e.g., the humanity of the B-term in the process of selecting genitive constructions.

The hierarchy concrete > abstract is also relevant here. Thus the abstractness of terms denoting wordy contents, in addition to their being inalienable, usually opposes successfully the selection of the d-relation commanded by anthroponymic B-terms. The effect of stative SoAs is probably to be explained in the same way, specifically in contrast to the fientive SoAs, which, as we have seen, do not stand in the way of the selection of the d-relation. The reason is probably that processes actually in progress are felt as less abstract than states, whether they refer to a temporary or permanent quality.

The hierarchy prominent > accidental plays an essential role.

111 Similar reasons explain why certain collectives (‘, ) impede the use of the d-relation when they are used as an A-term.
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The notion that underlies this hierarchy is that entities that somehow occupy a prominent position in the discourse are more individuated than entities that do not. The prominence hierarchy explains the absolute preference of the theonym נְצָר for the $d$-relation. The hieronym נְצֶר is a common noun that, depending on the context, refers to any god in general or to God in particular. In the latter case, it is highly individuated ('Divine’ rank in the perceptual salience hierarchy) and as such favours the $d$-relation.\footnote{By the same line of reasoning, the deity name נְצָר ‘Dagon’ does not rank as ‘Divine’ in the perceptual salience hierarchy, which explains that the construct relation is standard when it is used as B-term of a genitive construction.}

In actual grammatical terms, however, this preference is not stronger than that of anthroponyms. In contrast, the theonym נְצָר is a proper noun referring exclusively to the one God of Israel. This makes it, both literally and figuratively, absolutely unique and supremely prominent in our corpus. In terms of individuation, this absolute discourse prominence probably explains the theonym’s unchallenged preference for the $d$-relation, un-individuated though the A-term may be.

To conclude, the preference of certain toponyms for the $d$-relation may be explained in a similar way. By their very nature, toponyms denote single (i.e. unique) places, which makes them highly individuated according to Khan’s proper > common hierarchy, according to which ‘a proper noun with a unique referent is more individuated than a common noun’.\footnote{Khan (1984: 470).} On the other hand, they also denote non-human entities, which counterinfluences their uniqueness in the individuation process, and may explain the variation of behaviour of the toponyms with the $d$-relation. Decisive in this regard might be their relative prominence within the discourse in which they occur.
As Folmer points out, there is a consensus among scholars that the $d$-relation spread in Aramaic under the influence of the use of the particle šā in Akkadian,\footnote{Folmer (1995: 323, referring to Kaufman 1974: 130-132); Muraoka (1983-1984: 102). Cf. also Muraoka & Porten (2003: 229).} the most archaic form of the particle being zy in Aramaic.\footnote{Diez Mereno (1983).} In OA, however, the use of the $d$-relation was only sporadic, the construct relation being almost universal in corpora of that period.\footnote{Folmer (1995: 259-260).} In contrast, IA displays a dizzying array of genitive constructions, which have been meticulously studied by Kaddari, Folmer and Muraoka & Porten.\footnote{Kaddari (1969); Folmer (1995: 259-325); Muraoka & Porten (2003: §§61-63).} Kaddari\footnote{Kaddari (1969).} studied the genitive constructions in IA from an essentially formal viewpoint, focussing mainly on the (formal) determination of the terms involved. Our understanding of the genitive in Aramaic is certainly indebted to Kaddari’s analysis, though, as Folmer has pointed out, one may deplore his insistence on the formal aspects, to the detriment of the semantic aspects, of the genitive constructions.\footnote{Folmer (1995: 259-260).} Be that as it may, Kaddari formulated an interesting observation, which has often been echoed in subsequent studies: the fact that ‘two factors […] determine the variations of proportion between [construct relation] and [$d$-relation]. First, there is a chronological factor, and second, a stylistic. Chronologically, the later the document, the greater are the number of [$d$-relations] in it; and stylistically, the closer the language to the official one, the more [$d$-relations] it contains’.\footnote{Kaddari (1969: 103).}
Folmer, for her part, studied thoroughly the use of the genitive constructions in IA, both from a quantitative and qualitative approach. The most prominent results of her study can be summarized as follows:

1. The B-term of a proleptic $d$-relation is always definite (anthroponym or toponym). When the $d$-relation (as against the construct relation) is used, it is proleptic rather than bare ‘in some specified instances: always when the [A-term] is a kinship term; frequently when the [A-term] refers to person(s) with a status inferior to that of the person referred to in the [B-term] (esp. slaves) and often when the [A-term] refers to inanimate property, especially real-estate property (byt), only once some other property’; \(^{121}\)

2. When the $d$-relation is used for the expression of inalienable possession, it is often proleptic. Nevertheless, in IA inalienable possession is more frequently expressed by the construct relation.\(^{122}\) Folmer is also of the opinion that the possessive relation expressed by the proleptic $d$-relation is more solid than that expressed by the bare $d$-relation: ‘the presence of a proleptic [pronominal suffix] indicates that the relation is viewed by the scribe as one which cannot be terminated’;\(^{123}\)

3. With the genitivus materiae, the bare $d$-relation is the most frequent genitive construction, though cases of construct relation are found as well.\(^{124}\) In the genitive of species, however, the construct relation is always encountered.\(^{125}\) In what Folmer calls the ‘genitive of origin’, the construct relation or bare $d$-relation predominates according to the actual semantic contents of the genitive relation.\(^{126}\)

---

\(^{121}\) Folmer (1995: 303). As Folmer underscores, this statement bears on the contradistinctive uses of bare $d$-relation and proleptic $d$-relation; as such it says nothing as to the contradistinctive uses of construct relation and $d$-relation. Thus the use of the construct relation with terms of kinship as an A-term is extremely frequent in the Aramaic of the Achaemenid period (Folmer 1995: 274ff.); what Folmer actually explains is that if (1) the A-term is a (definite) term of kinship and (2) the $d$-relation is selected, it will as a rule be proleptic rather than bare (Folmer 1995: 276).


Finally, Muraoka & Porten\(^{127}\) acknowledge that it is not always possible to establish a clear functional opposition between construct relation and \(d\)-relation, but note that semantic constraints can exert an influence on the selection of either construction. Further, they pay special attention to various morphosyntactic features of the genitive constructions, e.g. (1) the fact that the \(d\)-relation allowed the breaking up of otherwise lengthy construct chains and thereby the unambiguous formalization of the hierarchical structure of the terms involved; (2) the fact that an adjective does not usually intervene between the two terms of an \(ad\)-relation, even if the analytical character of the structure would actually have permitted it; (3) the preference for the \(d\)-relation when the A-term is quantified by a numeral; (4) the use of the \(d\)-relation when the A-term consists of two coordinate nouns; and (5) the fact that the \(d\)-relation allows the explicit marking of the indetermination of the A-term. Their treatment of these formal features of the \(d\)-relation leads them to conclude that ‘the analytical structure by means of \([d-]\) has opened up new possibilities to express ideas and logical relationships which would otherwise have been outright impossible to express or which could have been at best expressed in rather clumsy manners and circumlocutions’.\(^{128}\)

These studies of genitive constructions in IA bear at least in part on BA as well, inasmuch as BA spans both IA and MA. Regarding BA specifically, Bauer & Leander\(^{129}\) noted that the construct relation is still very lively, but that its domain of use is severely curtailed by the \(d\)-relation. Importantly, they also claimed that the use of the \(d\)-relation runs perfectly parallel to that of the construct relation (with the exception of certain tight genitive relations into which the particle \(d\)- has not found its way yet), and that it is hardly possible to distinguish differences of meaning between the two constructions. Finally, they also noted that the \(d\)-relation was especially frequent with the genitive of matter.

Muraoka,\(^{130}\) for his part, noted that on the whole the construct relation is more frequent than the \(d\)-relation. He also noted that the use of the \(d\)-relation allowed genitive constructions of three, four (or even more) terms, which is otherwise extremely rare with the construct relation,


\(^{129}\) Bauer & Leander (1927: §§89-90).

\(^{130}\) Muraoka (1966: 152-155).
and added that the combination of construct relation and \(d\)-relation within one and the same genitive chain of three or more terms allowed the division of that chain into sub-units, thereby making its internal structure clearer. The use of the \(d\)-relation also allowed the insertion of an adjective between the A-term and the B-term when it is the former that is to be qualified. Finally, and most importantly, Muraoka contested Bauer & Leander’s contention that the \(d\)-relation is fully equivalent to the construct relation,\(^{131}\) but also noted that the choice between the two may at times be arbitrary.

In his study of genitive constructions in BA, Garr\(^{132}\) precisely addressed the cases where the use of the construct relation or \(d\)-relation seems to be arbitrary, and attempted to demonstrate that even in those cases the selection of either construction is not. In order to do so, he invoked discourse parameters, essentially salience, which subsumes individuation and categoriality.\(^{133}\) Garr’s analysis is very interesting. But his main concern with the cases of (apparently) arbitrary selection of genitive construction led him to focus on instances of ‘doublet’ between construct relation and \(d\)-relation, rather than to aim at a full account of the working of the genitive in BA. The results of his analysis are therefore of limited value for the present study.

Regarding QA, Sokoloff\(^{134}\) noted, with reference to TgJob, that the construct relation largely predominates, and echoed Kaddari’s views on the ratio between construct and \(d\)-relations. Muraoka\(^{135}\) pointed out that the few instances of \(d\)-relation are all bare, not proleptic. His analysis of the text led him to conclude that the \(d\)-relation, scarce though its use may be, was a grammatical device at the disposal of the Targumist, and added that this scarcity of use should not be considered the result of a Hebrew influence. Concerning the GenApoc, Fitzmyer\(^{136}\) noted \textit{en passant} that the text features cases of doublet between construct relation and \(d\)-relation, e.g. מִלְּאָלָה פֶּן מֵדֶה \textit{vs.} מַלְּאָלָה פֶּן מֵדֶה, ‘with no apparent

---

\(^{131}\) E.g. בֵּית אֲרוֹב \textit{vs.} בֵּית אֲרוֹב, ‘a lions’ den’ \textit{vs.} ‘the den of the lions’; אֲרוֹב \textit{vs.} אֲרוֹב, ‘the vision Daniel saw on that particular night’ \textit{vs.} אֲרוֹב \textit{vs.} אֲרוֹב, ‘night visions (in general)’.

\(^{132}\) Garr (1990).

\(^{133}\) Garr (1990: 228-231).

\(^{134}\) Sokoloff (1974: 189).


difference of meaning’. Muraoka\textsuperscript{137} essentially agreed with Fitzmyer, stating that ‘it is not certain whether [...] the choice of the analytical structure over against the synthetic one [...] is functionally relevant or not’.\textsuperscript{138} He further discussed various instances of genitive in detail and, following his study of the genitive in BA, concluded that the ‘analytical tendency made it possible for a greater amount of information to be conveyed with greater precision. In this sense, the new structure [i.e. the $d$-relation] is more than a mere free variant of the older synthetic one’.\textsuperscript{139} Finally, in her most recent study of QA Schattner-Rieser\textsuperscript{140} noted that the construct relation is considerably more frequent than the bare $d$-relation, and that the proleptic $d$-relation is rather rare. In order to explain the differences of proportion of use between the construct relation and the $d$-relation, she invoked Kaddari’s views, in the wake of Sokoloff.

Studies of the genitive in Nabatean and Palmyrene are rather sparse.\textsuperscript{141} On Nabatean, Cantineau states that the use of the $d$-relation is rare.\textsuperscript{142} With reference to Palmyrene, Cantineau observes that construct relation, bare and proleptic $d$-relations are all three attested, and adds that the construct relation is ‘still largely attested’, the bare $d$-relation is ‘very frequent’ and the proleptic $d$-relation is ‘sometimes encountered, without being frequent’.\textsuperscript{143}

Regarding Western LA, Nöldeke concisely notes that in CPA the construct relation is still used, but that the $d$-relation, whether bare or proleptic, is often used instead. However, Nöldeke does not dwell on the uses of the three constructions.\textsuperscript{144} In the same vein, Schulthess adds a few remarks on some formal aspects of the genitive constructions, but deals

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Muraoka (1972a: 14-16).
\item Muraoka (1972a: 16).
\item Muraoka (1972a: 15). Concerning the working of the genitive in GenApoc, cf. discussion below.
\item Schattner-Rieser (2004: 90).
\item For a succinct discussion of the genitive in the inscriptions from Hatra, cf. Degen (1967).
\item Cantineau (1930: 110).
\item Cantineau (1935: 145-146).
\item Nöldeke (1868: 507).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Chapter Three: GENITIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

just as little with their functionalities.\textsuperscript{145}

Probably the most detailed study of the genitive in the Western LA dialects to date is Golomb’s investigation of the JPA corpus Neofiti.\textsuperscript{146}
The results of his analysis can be summarized as follows:

1. With terms denoting inalienable possession, the proleptic $d$-relation largely predominates, which, according to Golomb, is due at least in part to the fact that with these items the B-term is usually anthroponymic. This category features the following items:
   - Terms of kinship (אֶבֶן ‘father’, בֵּן ‘son’, בָּרֶב ‘daughter’, etc.). With these items, the proleptic $d$-relation is overwhelming, the use of the bare $d$-relation is very restricted. The construct relation, for its part, is encountered mainly with בָּרֶב and בָּרֶב, and then usually in idiomatic expressions (e.g. expressions of age, etc.);
   - Six other terms (אֵין ‘face’, בָּתָא ‘house’, בֵּית ‘life’, בֵּית ‘hand’, בּוּד ‘day’ and בּוּד ‘name’) commonly used in idiomatic expressions. These occur primarily with the proleptic $d$-relation, otherwise with the construct relation. The bare $d$-relation, for its part, is hardly attested.

2. With certain nouns commonly used as A-terms,\textsuperscript{147} the bare $d$-relation is the prevalent genitive construction; in its absence the construct relation is used.

3. With the theonym מְמַר used as B-term, Golomb draws a distinction between two types of genitive constructions:
   - Formulaic expressions (most usually involving the A-term מְמַר ‘Memra’) used to avoid anthropomorphisms: the proleptic $d$-relation is again the dominant type, which, according to Golomb, precisely makes the formulaic nature of these expressions apparent. The use of the bare $d$-relation, for its part, is minor.
   - Non-formulaic expressions: these do not know such restrictions, however, and the bare $d$-relation turns out to be frequent.


\textsuperscript{146} Cf. especially Golomb (1982), as well as Golomb (1985: 218-227), which is an abridged version of Golomb (1982).

\textsuperscript{147} Golomb discusses ten nouns (םִיק ‘god’, לִי ‘land’, גִּרְגֵּר ‘garden’, זָה ‘animals’, מָלֶך ‘king’, בּוּד ‘breath’, מַעְרֶש ‘servant’, דֶּשֶׁנ ‘fowl’, דֶּשֶׁנ ‘dust’ and דֶּשֶׁנ ‘door’), but adds that this list is by no means exhaustive.
Chapter Three: GENITIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

4. Finally, Golomb discusses an ensemble of idiomatic expansions, i.e. expansions of (rather disparate) idioms or place names of the MT into genitive constructions in Neofiti, whether simple or compounded. According to Golomb, when Neofiti features a simple genitive construction, the bare *d*-relation is frequent (e.g. מֶּֽלֶּֽהְמָ֝א דֶּֽעְבָּֽו, ‘the streets of the city’ [譯, ‘the city Rehoboth’]); otherwise the construct relation is used (e.g. מֶּֽלֶּֽהְמָ֝א דֶּֽעְבָּֽו, ‘the families of your children’ [譯, ‘your seed’]). In the case of compounded genitive constructions, however, the preferred idiom is construct relation plus proleptic *d*-relation (e.g. אֶֽשֶּׁ֑רֶבֶ֑ו מֶּֽלֶּֽהְמָ֝א דֶּֽעְבָּֽו, ‘the furnace of the fire of the Chaldeans’, rendering בַּלֶּֽהְמָ֝א דֶּֽעְבָּֽו, ‘Ur of the Chaldeans’).

All in all, Golomb concludes that proleptic and bare *d*-relations are ‘marked’ and ‘unmarked’ genitive constructions respectively, inasmuch as of the items discussed by Golomb the proleptic *d*-relation is preferred in certain specific cases and the bare *d*-relation in the ‘other cases’. The bare *d*-relation should be viewed as the ‘normal’ genitive construction. For its part, the construct relation ‘is invariably “the second choice” when [the proleptic *d*-relation] or [the bare *d*-relation] is not used where one has come to expect it. The motivations’, Golomb admits, ‘for using [the construct relation] over the expected [proleptic] or [bare *d*-relation] are not immediately apparent’.

Four years later, Cook produced a concise study of the genitive in PsJ by using Golomb’s work as a template. He concluded that although there are points of contact between PsJ and Neofiti, the use of the genitive in PsJ is really quite different. So with terms of kinship the construct relation is clearly prevalent, and the same is also true of the six other terms מֶּֽלֶּֽהְמָ֝א דֶּֽעְבָּֽו, ‘face’, מֶּֽלֶּֽהְמָ֝א דֶּֽעְבָּֽו, ‘house’, מֶּֽלֶּֽהְמָ֝א דֶּֽעְבָּֽו, ‘life’, מֶּֽלֶּֽהְמָ֝א דֶּֽעְבָּֽו, ‘hand’, מֶּֽלֶּֽהְמָ֝א דֶּֽעְבָּֽו, ‘day’ and מֶּֽלֶּֽהְמָ֝א דֶּֽעְבָּֽו, ‘name’ examined by Golomb. With the noun מַדְּוָֽרֶֽבֶ֑ו used with a hieronym as B-term, the bare *d*-relation is overwhelming. Finally, it is only with the nouns מֶּֽלֶּֽהְמָ֝א דֶּֽעְבָּֽו, מֶּֽלֶּֽהְמָ֝א דֶּֽעְבָּֽו, and מֶּֽלֶּֽהְמָ֝א דֶּֽעְבָּֽו, that PsJ and Neofiti agree in their preference for the bare *d*-relation. So, Cook concluded, PsJ has a marked preference for the construct relation, and a noticeable tendency to avoid the proleptic suffix in genitive constructions, and cogently underlined that both tendencies are also traits of TO and BA.
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In 1990, Fassberg\(^{151}\) offered a brief discussion of the genitive relations in the Targumic Fragments of the Cairo Genizah, and noted that the construct relation is statistically prevalent. In the case of genitive constructions involving הלל and the hieronyms the \(d\)-relation is used; though the spelling does not always allow us to establish whether it is bare or proleptic. Fassberg further remarked that the syntagm ‘the children of Israel’ is regularly expressed by the construct relation, whereas ‘the land of ...’ usually resorts to the bare \(d\)-relation. Finally, he noted in passing that ‘although inalienable possession is usually expressed by the [proleptic \(d\)-relation], there are several exceptions’.

As for Eastern LA, Nöldeke\(^{153}\) notes with reference to Mandaic that the construct relation is still extant, and that the extent of its use is comparable to Syriac. The construct relation remains usual (or even the only possibility) in some specific contexts, e.g. in compounds, in superlative expressions (e.g. מלך מלחמתי lit. ‘the king of kings’), with participial and adjectival A-terms.\(^{154}\) Combinations of construct relations are very rare. Lively though the construct relation may be, however, the \(d\)-relation is more frequent by far. The distinction between bare and proleptic \(d\)-relations is made more difficult by various graphic considerations. Importantly, however, Nöldeke maintains that the construct relation, bare and proleptic \(d\)-relations are semantically equivalent, to the effect that no difference in meaning can be detected between e.g. המלך והמדים and המלך והמדים ‘in the name of Life’. Nöldeke adds, however, that the use of a proleptic pronominal suffix (1) makes the determination of the two terms explicit, and (2) is impossible in certain contexts, e.g. in the genitive of matter/measure, or when the B-term is an abstract noun. Finally, Nöldeke adds that the use of the \(d\)-relation allows a greater flexibility of expression, inasmuch as A-term and B-term can be separated by intervening words. Macuch,\(^{155}\) for his part, does not add much to Nöldeke’s observations.

\(^{151}\) Fassberg (1990: 251-252).

\(^{152}\) Fassberg (1990: 253, n.3).

\(^{153}\) Nöldeke (1875: §§218-222).

\(^{154}\) However, the construct relation is only rarely used for the genitive of noun (e.g. הר הכרמל ‘Mount Carmel’), for which an appositional structure is preferred (Nöldeke, 1875: 310).

\(^{155}\) Macuch (1965: 390-393).
He states, however, that uses of the construct relation are numerous in Mandaic, and more frequent than in Syriac.

Regarding JBA, Schlesinger\textsuperscript{156} notes that the use of the construct relation is very curtailed for the benefit of the $d$-relation, and more than in Mandaic. In the main, the construct relation is encountered, though not to the exclusion of the $d$-relation: (1) in stereotyped notions and tight compounds (e.g. הַנְּחוֹךְ תִּשְׁעָה ‘his sister-in-law’); (2) in certain genitive relations in which the B-term is the central notion and the A-term provides some explanation about it (e.g. נַחֲלָתִים נְשָׁמָה ‘the main Qiddush’); (3) in the epexegetical genitive (\textit{genitive of noun}, e.g. מַדְרוֹן אָכַף ‘the land of Africa’); (4) in the \textit{genitivus subjecti} and \textit{objecti} with an infinitival or participial A-term (e.g. בּוּרְא (וֹדָעַת) תַּשְׁאִיל ‘a (man) fearing sin’); (5) with designations of materials (e.g. בּוּרְא (וֹדָעַת) תַּשְׁאִיל ‘vessels of gold and silver’); (6) with some adjectives (גַּלְיָה קָט נְקַש ‘a little water’); and (7) with specific nouns. The $d$-relation, for its part, is much more frequent than the construct relation, and displays a wide variety of uses.\textsuperscript{157} Importantly, Schlesinger notes that the proleptic (as against bare) $d$-relation is usually, though not always, employed when both the A-term and the B-term are ‘explicitly determinate’, and more especially when the B-term is an anthroponym.\textsuperscript{158}

Finally, of all LA dialects Syriac is without a doubt the most intensively studied with regard to genitive constructions.\textsuperscript{159} In his treatment of the genitive constructions, Nöldeke\textsuperscript{160} noted that the construct relation, though still in use, is far less frequent than the $d$-relation, though, he maintained, both are in many cases interchangeable. However, he also remarked that the construct relation is the rule when both terms form a tight unit,\textsuperscript{161} and when the A-term is an adjective. In contrast, he added, the proleptic $d$-relation is preferred when both terms of the

\textsuperscript{156} Schlesinger (1928: 62-73).

\textsuperscript{157} For details, cf. Schlesinger (1928: 66ff.).

\textsuperscript{158} Schlesinger (1928: 66).

\textsuperscript{159} For a recent, detailed discussion of the history of research on the genitive in Syriac, cf. Williams (2001: 9-14). Only the aspects of the past research most relevant to our purpose will be discussed here.

\textsuperscript{160} Nöldeke (1898: §§205-210).

\textsuperscript{161} Though sharing Nöldeke’s views on the construct relation, Muraoka is more specific: ‘The [construct relation] tends to be confined to standing phrases verging on compound nouns’ (2005: §73b). The tight units referred to by Nöldeke are therefore better understood as essentially lexical.
genitive relation are determinate. Finally, he also underscored the greater autonomy of the $d$-relation, inasmuch as various elements can intervene between the A-term and the B-term, whereas in the construct relation both terms can only be separated by inconsequential words ($\text{بَعْضُ}$, etc.).

Avinery has written at length about the genitive in Syriac. One of his most interesting results is the idea that the three genitive constructions form a scale of determination, the construct relation being less determined than the bare $d$-relation, which in turn is less determined than the proleptic $d$-relation.\footnote{Cf. especially Avinery (1977a). For a detailed discussion of Avinery’s views, cf. Williams (2001: 10-12).} As will be seen below, this view is challenged by others.

Joosten has also produced an important study of the genitive in New Testament Syriac.\footnote{Joosten (1996: 47-57).} He distinguished two main uses of the bare $d$-relation:

1. Fairly often when the B-term describes the A-term (e.g. $\text{الله}	ext{الملو} \text{ذكاء} \	ext{الله}$ ‘the Holy Spirit’);
2. When the B-term refers to a concrete person or thing to which the A-term belongs (e.g. $\text{الله}	ext{الملو} \text{ذكاء} \	ext{الله}$ ‘an angel of the Lord’, $\text{الله}	ext{الملو} \text{ذكاء} \	ext{الله}$ ‘the king of the Jews’).

In the latter case, bare and proleptic $d$-relations are partly in competition. As Joosten notes, the proleptic $d$-relation, which is only used to express that the referent of the A-term belongs in some way to the B-term, is the more frequent construction when the expression is definite and the B-term is a known individual.\footnote{Of the instances adduced by Joosten one may usefully compare $\text{الله}	ext{الملو} \text{ذكاء} \	ext{الله}$ (def.) and $\text{الله}	ext{الملو} \text{ذكاء} \	ext{الله}$ (indef.). In contrast, Joosten notes some variation in the selection of the genitive constructions when the B-term is not a known individual.} More specifically, the proleptic $d$-relation is regular in the case of inalienable possession (e.g. $\text{الله}	ext{الملو} \text{ذكاء} \	ext{الله}$ ‘the son of David’, $\text{الله}	ext{الملو} \text{ذكاء} \	ext{الله}$ ‘the eye of your brother’) and, in the case of terms of kinship, this regularity is such that the proleptic $d$-relation is usual even when the expression is indefinite ($\text{الله}	ext{الملو} \text{ذكاء} \	ext{الله}$ ‘sons of your father’).

To conclude, Joosten notes that the construct relation is used quite frequently, and that it occurs, on the one hand, in expressions which could have been constructed with the bare and proleptic $d$-relations. On the other hand, it has functions of its own, i.e. it does not
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commute with the bare and proleptic \( d \)-relations: (1) in compound words; (2) when the A-term is an adjective, participle or abstract noun;\(^{165}\) and (3) when the A-term is (part of) a compound preposition (e.g. 

Finally, one of the most detailed treatments of the genitive in Syriac to date is Williams’ discussion of the genitive constructions in the Peshitta of 1 Kings.\(^{166}\) Williams proceeds to a very detailed analysis of the use of the genitive constructions, both with qualitative and quantitative criteria, and discusses at length the numerous items that occur as A-term and B-term in the various constructions. The main results of Williams’ study can be summarized as follows:

1. The selection of the construct relation emanates essentially from the A-term, not the B-term of the genitive relation;
2. The bare \( d \)-relation is used for the expression of the genitive of matter. It is further used with a large number of A-terms and B-terms, which are not otherwise featured with the construct and the proleptic \( d \)-relations;
3. The proleptic \( d \)-relation occurs most frequently with masculine sg. A-terms and B-terms; the B-term is very frequently an anthroponym;
4. B-terms that occur both with the construct and the proleptic \( d \)-relation are semantically determinate and animate. In these cases, the use of the construct relation appears to be conditioned by the A-term;\(^{167}\)
5. Some A-terms occur both with the bare and with the proleptic \( d \)-relations. When the B-term is the same in both constructions, the use of the construct relation and proleptic \( d \)-relation may mark the A-term as semantically indeterminate and determinate respectively;
6. Avinery’s analysis of the three constructions as marking degrees of definiteness is to be rejected. In other words, the bare \( d \)-relation is not functionally intermediate between the construct relation

\(^{165}\) With abstract nouns and infinitives, Joosten notes, the use of the construct relation is not exclusive, but commutes with the bare \( d \)-relation.

\(^{166}\) Williams (2001: 7-37).

\(^{167}\) Cf. Williams’ conclusion n.1 above.
and the proleptic $d$-relation.\footnote{To these detailed treatments of the genitive in Syriac one may add Wertheimer (2001a), which is an attempt to produce a unified account of the various functions of the particle $d$- in Syriac. However, the question of the distribution of the genitive constructions in Syriac is not addressed in that study.}

6.4 GENITIVE CONSTRUCTIONS AND THE ARAMAIC OF TARGUM JONATHAN TO SAMUEL

Two aspects of the discussion above are particularly significant for the characterization of the Aramaic of TJS in terms of genitive constructions:

1. The first aspect is the \textbf{frequency of use of the proleptic $d$-relation} in the Aramaic dialects. The proleptic $d$-relation is a standard feature of IA and of those LA dialects, whether Eastern or Western, for which scholarly studies are available. In sharp contrast, in the Aramaic of TJS the proleptic $d$-relation is an extremely rare occurrence, which sets this Aramaic dialects clearly apart from them. In view of this overall scarcity of use in TJS, the exact origin of TJS’ use of the proleptic $d$-relation with the kinship terms אָב, אָבָה, אָבָא, and אָלָה — which has been found to be the only clear correlation between proleptic $d$-relation and semantic categories in TJS — is uncertain. Interestingly, however, it is fully in keeping with IA and LA dialects, in which the use of the proleptic $d$-relation with terms of kinship is attested, or even regular (e.g. in Neofiti).\footnote{Cf. Golomb (1982: 299-301). 1.2.5 וָנָהוּוּבָו, וָנָהוּוּבָו, ‘the sons of Haman’, which is to say the least peculiar in TJS, but admissible in IA and in LA, is probably to be understood in the same way.} Besides, it is worthy of notice that in this respect the Aramaic of TJS is closer to IA than to a LA dialect such as JPA, inasmuch as in IA, just as in TJS, inalienable possession is otherwise usually expressed by the construct relation\footnote{Cf. Folmer (1995: 310-311).} (the terms of kinship, as it were, forming an exception), whereas in JPA the proleptic $d$-relation is the rule.\footnote{Cf. discussion above. In addition, the exclusive use of the construct relation with אָב, אָבָה and אָלָה in TJS, in blatant contrast to the other terms of kinship, might have to do with the fact that these three items, more than the other terms of kinship under discussion (אָב, אָבָה, etc.), also have appellative significance.}
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2. The second aspect is the distribution of the genitive constructions across the Aramaic dialects. As we have seen, in the LA dialects for which linguistic information is available, the d-relation, whether bare or proleptic, is clearly prevalent. The construct relation, for its part, is mostly confined to certain specific usages (compounds, genitivus subjecti/objecti after participles and infinitives, etc.), which suggests that in those dialects the d-relation has become the normal way to express the genitive. \(^{172}\) In contrast, the most frequent construction in TJS is the construct relation, which also functions as genitive relation by default. In this respect, the Aramaic of TJS is markedly different from those LA dialects.

All in all, this comparative discussion suggests that the behaviour of the genitive in TJS is clearly distinct from both IA and LA, which should not come as a surprise, as (according to Fitzmyer’s periodization of Aramaic) TJS is usually classified in the MA period. However, what is decisive in this regard is the fact that the working of the genitive in TJS appears to be very close to the working of the genitive in QA, which is the best documented MA dialect to date. A cursory survey of the genitive in QA, carried out on the basis of the methodology developed in the present study for TJS applied to GenApoc, \(^ {173}\) reveals indeed the following

\(^{172}\) Possible exceptions are the JPA of the Targumic Fragments of the Cairo Genizah and of PsJ, in which, according to Fassberg and Cook respectively, the construct relation is the most common construction (cf. discussion above). However, these observations cannot be considered conclusive at this time. Cook correctly noted that the preference for the construct relation and the tendency to avoid the proleptic d-relation in PsJ connect it to TO. But he also argued that PsJ was composed in an artificial literary Aramaic compounded of elements drawn from different Aramaic dialects but used in a more or less consistent manner (Cook 1986a: 269). This type of Aramaic, he added, is distinct from other Western LA dialects; it is actually no closer to the JPA of the unquestionable Palestinian Targums than to TO and TJ, and therefore forms an entirely different category (Cook 1986a: 277). Cook also confirmed the impressive reliance of PsJ on TO (Cook 1986a: 40-52), and invoked this reliance to account for the existence of various grammatical features in PsJ, among which the promiscuous use of the st.emph. (cf. D:1.1, footnote n.9). It is therefore likely that the similarity between the Aramaic of PsJ and that of TO/TJ with regard to the use of the genitive constructions may be explained along these lines. The prevalence of the construct relation in the Targumic Fragments from the Cairo Genizah is admittedly more puzzling, inasmuch as in our current state of knowledge the JPA in which they were composed cannot be defined as a mixed, artificial language. It is difficult, however, to draw any definite conclusion on the basis of statistical, i.e. quantitative data alone, and it would certainly be interesting to investigate the genitive in that corpus with qualitative criteria.

\(^{173}\) As edited by Fitzmyer (2004).
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facts:

1. Quantitative observations:
   a) The construct relation is by far the most common construction: according to my count, GenApoc counts 204 genitive constructions, of which 183 are construct relations (i.e. 89.70%) and 21 d-relations (i.e. 11.30%). In this respect, the construct relation is even more common than in TJS (71.49%);
   b) Of the 21 attested d-relations only two are unambiguously proleptic. One other, xix:24 ‘the ... of the Pharaoh Zoon’, could be either bare or proleptic. The remaining 18, however, are unambiguously bare. The instances of proleptic d-relation therefore make up 0.98% (or 1.47%, depending on the exact status of xix:24) of all cases of genitive relation encountered in GenApoc. This figure comes most close to TJS (1.44%).

2. Qualitative observations:
   a) The two unambiguous instances of proleptic d-relation attested in GenApoc involve one and the same anthroponymic B-term ‘Abram’ and involve a semantically determinate A-term and B-term, which is in line with TJS. The use of the proleptic d-relation with the term of kinship also stands in line with TJS’ usage;
   b) 12 of the 18 unambiguous instances of bare d-relation involve anthroponymic B-terms (2), toponymic B-terms (7) and genitives of matter/partitive genitives (3), all of which have

---

174 The text of GenApoc contains many lacunae and uncertainties. Obviously, only those instances of genitive construction that could be established as such beyond reasonable doubt are taken into consideration here.

175 xxi:34 ‘the brother of Abram’; xxii:22 ‘the wealth of Abram’.

176 xxii:17 ‘the possessions of the king of Elam’. If xix:24 ‘the ... of the Pharaoh Zoon’ should be bare rather than proleptic (cf. above), it would belong here as well.


178 xx:33 (many) garments of linen and purple’; xxii:31
been found to be parameters promoting the use of the $d$-relation in TJS;\(^{179}\)

c) Anthroponymic B-terms are also found in construct relations, but all of these instances also feature parameters that have been found to promote (and successfully impose) the use of the construct relation in TJS: plural A-term,\(^{180}\) plural B-term,\(^{181}\) term of kinship,\(^{182}\) and possibly term of topography.\(^{183}\) This suggests that the preference of anthroponymic B-terms for the $d$-relation is as systematic as in TJS;\(^{184}\)

d) Both the hieronym נָון and the noun יהוה ‘lord’ used as hieronym occur three times in total in GenApoc, always in the construct relation. But in all cases opposing parameters are involved.\(^{185}\)

‘pits of bitumen’ (Fitzmyer’s reconstruction); xxii:21 (lit.) ‘a sandalstrap’.

\(^{179}\) The six remaining instances of bare $d$-relation are unusual by TJS’ standards. In the case of o:13 פְּנֵי אָדָם ‘the time(?) of our imprisonment’, the A-term is uncertain, which makes the whole instance inconclusive. In the case of xxi:28 פִּסַּת הַשָּׁלֹם and xxii:4 פִּסַּת הַשָּׁלֹם ‘the route of the Great Valley’, the B-terms have not been found to promote the use of the $d$-relation in TJS, and even if they did, the presence of the A-term נְפָשׁוֹת would most probably have impeded it (cf. G:2.4.2.2.2). In the case of xxi:4 specifically, however, one cannot exclude that the B-term would have toponymic status and that this toponym would prompt the use of the $d$-relation in GenApoc. As for xi:17 פְּלֵימַן וּפָנָיו ‘the greenery and herbs of the land’ and xxi:16 פְּלֵימַן וּפָנָיו (lit.) ‘this great Sea of Salt’, the use of the $d$-relation might have been prompted by the complexity of the A-term: as we have seen, a possible influence of the complexity of the A-term and B-term on the selection of genitive constructions could not be established with reference to TJS (G:4.3), but Muraoka has suggested that this is the case in other types of Aramaic (cf. G:6:3). In the case of xxi:16 specifically, strictly speaking the whole genitive construction forms a genitive of matter, which would make the use of the $d$-relation perfectly regular. Finally, in the case of xxi:8 מִיָּדָה יֵלֵךְ ‘a vision of the night’ the use of the $d$-relation is unattested in TJS, but runs parallel to BA (cf. Dan 2.19).\(^{181}\)

\(^{179}\) E.g. iii.3 יָמַי יְהוָה ‘the days of Jared’; vi:1 נֵפָשׁ יִתְנַה ‘the womb (lit. entrails) of my mother’; xii.10 נֵפָשׁ יִתְנַה ‘the sons of Shem’, xix.25 יִתְנַה ‘the words of Enoch’.

\(^{180}\) xxii:23 יִתְנַה וְיִתְנַה ‘the portion of the three men’.

\(^{181}\) xx:11 רְחֵם יִתְנַה ‘the son of my brother’, xx:25 יִתְנַה ‘the wife of Abram’.

\(^{182}\) xxii:14 יִתְנַה וְיִתְנַה ‘the valley of the king’ (cf. TJS II.18.18 יִתְנַה וְיִתְנַה ‘the plain of the king’).

\(^{184}\) One possible exception (instance involving an anthroponymic B-term in a construct relation without any obvious parameter favouring it) is vi:1 נֵפָשׁ יִתְנַה ‘the womb of the one who bore me’. But we might be dealing with a Hebraism (cf. Fitzmyer 2004: 145).

\(^{185}\) With plural A-term: vii:7 נֵפָשׁ יִתְנַה ‘the words of the Lord of the heavens’.
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Seen from the angle of TJS, however, the fact that these hieronyms give way to opposing parameters suggests that, just as in TJS, they behave like the anthroponyms rather than like the theonym ייושבכנש.

e) Just as in TJS, some topo-/ethnonyms are featured with the d-relation (cf. above), others with the construct relation. The limited scope of GenApoc makes it even more difficult than in TJS to establish principles and detect tendencies. Be that as it may, the following points should be noted:

- Provided the use of the d-relation with the toponym בֵּיתֵל in xxii:7 ‘the mountain of Bethel’ can be taken as an indication of the preference of that toponym for the d-relation, then xxii:8 שֵׁם בֵּיתֵל ‘the north of Bethel’ suggests that terms denoting the four cardinal directions belong indeed to the topographical terms in favour of the construct relation, as is likely to be the case in TJS.

- In contrast to TJS, the noun מֶלך ‘king’ does not appear to promote the use of the d-relation when used as an A-term with a topo-/ethnonymic B-term.

- In TJS, the exact status of the topo-/ethnonym פִּן ‘Egypt’ with regard to the d-relation is uncertain, inasmuch as with the A-term אָרֶץ ‘land’ it is always featured with the d-relation (cf. G:2.4.2.2.2). In GenApoc, however, it is obvious that the topo-/ethnonym פִּן does not exert any influence in favour of the d-relation, inasmuch as it is always (five times, excluding

With the noun שֵם ‘name’ as A-term: xxii:2 שֵׁם הַלֵּבַע פִּקְדֵי ‘the name of the Lord of the ages’, xxii:2 שֵׁם יְהוָה ‘the name of God’.

186 On the other hand, the hieronym יְהֹוָה-קְדָשִׁים ‘(Great) Holy One’ occurs twice in the same genitive construction as the B-term of a construct relation, without any obvious parameter prompting it: vi:13/15 יְהֹוָה-קְדָשִׁים ‘the sending of the (Great) Holy One’.

187 E.g. xxii:5 שֵׁם פִּינָה ‘the province of Damascus’, xxii:13 שֵׁם שַׁעֲר ‘the valley of Shaveh’, xxii:14 שֵׁם פִּינָה ‘the valley of Beth-hacherem’.

188 Cf. footnote n.59 above.

189 Only two instances involve the d-relation: xxii:14 שֵׁם פִּינָה ‘the king of Salem’, xxii:18 שֵׁם פִּינָה ‘the king of Sodom’. All other instances involve the construct relation, e.g. xxii:23 פִּינָה ‘the king of Babylon’ and several more instances in xxii:23, xxii:24, xxii:25. Interestingly, with the B-term שֵׁם פִּינָה ‘Sodom’ the construct relation is attested no less than seven times, as against the one instance mentioned above with the d-relation.
four instances with plural A-term) featured with the construct relation, whether with (e.g. xix:11/13/14 ‘ensus ḫallim’ or with another A-term (xx:14 מלח מתרמר ‘the king of Egypt’, xxi:11 מלח מתרמר ‘the river of Egypt’);

f) The morphosyntactic parameter of plurality appears to be an active grammatical device in GenApoc as well. One unambiguous instance involving a plural B-term is featured in the text. Several instances involving a plural A-term have already been mentioned, and more can be found in the text. On the whole, only two exceptions, cases of bare d-relation with a plural A-term, are encountered in GenApoc. Such exceptions, it bears reminding, occur occasionally in TJS as well.

In the final analysis, the working of the genitive in TJS and GenApoc is strikingly similar, and in this respect TJS appears to be closer to QA than to any other documented type of Aramaic. As we have seen, scholarly studies available on other MA dialects such as Nabatean and Palmyrene are rather parcimonious about the genitive; interestingly, however, the few statements they venture on the question do not contradict the facts of TJS and GenApoc, and differ from both IA and the LA dialects discussed above. Similarly, quantitatively the Aramaic portions of Daniel feature figures comparable to those of TJS and GenApoc. Sparse and strictly quantitative though this information may be, this similarity suggests some amount of typological uniformity among the MA dialects with regard to the genitive.

190 xxii:23 ‘the portion of the three men’ (cf. above). Instances like vi:8 ‘the daughters of my brothers’, vi:8 ‘the sons of my brothers’, xx:8 מלח מתרמר ‘the words of his two companions’ also feature a plural A-term, which makes them inconclusive. xxi:5 ‘the conduct of our shepherds’ might be another case in point, unless one interprets the A-term as denoting a stative SoA (cf. G:2.2.2.1).

191 These two cases feature one and the same plural A-term xxxii:33 ‘the possessions of Sodom’ (with topo-/ethnonymic B-term) and xxii:17 ‘the possessions of the king of Elam’ (with anthroponymic B-term).

192 According to my count, the Aramaic of Daniel comprises 263 genitive constructions: 217 construct relations (82.51%) and 46 d-relation (17.49%), of which 36 are bare (13.69%) and 10 proleptic (3.80%). I have not subjected the material of BA to a qualitative examination.

193 Obviously, much more research is needed before this statement can be verified. I hope to investigate the question of the genitive in Aramaic more extensively in later research.