David M. Golomb

A GRAMMAR
OF TARGUM NEOFITI

A GRAMMAR OF TARGUM NEOFITI

David M. Golomb

© 1985
The President and Fellows of Harvard College

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1. Preliminary Remarks

The Codex Vatican Neofiti, a complete text of the Palestinian Targum, has assumed a certain amount of notoriety since its publication. In 1949, Alejandro Díez Macho, a student of Paul Kahle, found it in the Vatican Library, marked on the spine "Targum Onkelos," but with a title page that read trgwm ḥwmš yrwšlmy hwʾ spr ḥqdš nqrʾ kgwmʾ.

Díez Macho returned to the MS some few years later and announced its discovery in 1956. The MS has turned out to be, not a complete copy of the Fragmentary Targum as first thought, but a different Palestinian Targum. It is, however, a 16th century copy, completed in 1504 A.D., as attested by the colophon.[1] Twelve years elapsed until the first volume of the editio princeps appeared in 1968, the book of Genesis, and this was followed by Exodus (1970), Leviticus (1971), Numbers (1974), and Deuteronomy (197S).

The MS was copied by at least three hands, and has the additional feature of (often copious) marginal, variants and interlinear readings. There may be as many as 12 hands involved in the writing of the last two. Occasionally verses accidentally omitted from the MS (e.g. Gen 35:10) and corrections to the text (e.g. Gen 36:21 where lbny bnyhwn b'rcʾ dgblʾ is crossed out and bnwy dgblh b'rchwn d'dwmyy is written alongside in a large unpractised hand) are added in the margin. Unfortunately, Díez Macho often refers to the whole MS including marginalia and interlinear readings as though they are a uniform text. The language under consideration in this study is only that of the main text, except in those instances where occasional verses were omitted erroneously and have been added in the margins.

The edition of Madrid-Barcelona, while impressive in its binding and presentation, is not particularly easy to use (a medium-quality facsimile edition has also been published by Makor in Jerusalem). The Hebrew lemmata of each verse have been omitted in this edition, often obscuring for the user without access to the original an error or a misreading. Similarly, the many "false starts" in the MS are not recorded. Characteristically, when the copyist made an error, he simply left it and wrote the correct word immediately following,

occasionally underlining the wrong word with dots. These false starts are often instructive for determining the correct reading and interpretation, something not always understood by the editor. More problematic is the indiscriminate use of square brackets for all kinds of corrections (including emendations), which has already been commented upon by others.[2]

Díez Macho, in a long article published in 1973,[3] lays out his ideas concerning the Palestinian Targum, and Neofiti 1 in particular. Controversy has arisen due to the fact that, following Paul Kahle, Díez Macho and his pupils (as well as, for example, Martin McNamara[4] and others) have insisted on taking the extreme position that the Palestinian Targum (i.e. Neofiti) constitutes a pre-Christian version. Other scholars, such as Fitzmyer and Jonas Greenfield[5] among others, have objected strongly to these "strident" arguments and have dealt with them on many grounds. Díez Macho's main thesis is that Palestinian Targumic Aramaic (= Neofiti 1) is close to that of Jesus and the Jews of the 1st century (in other words, it is contemporaneous with the Aramaic of Qumran and Murabba^Cat), which itself has been "contaminated" by a popular, contemporary, spoken Aramaic, namely that preserved by the Palestinian Targum. His methodology involves examining a number of selected morphological features in Qumran Aramaic (specifically in 11 Qtg Job and the Genesis Apocryphon) and comparing them in Neofiti.

2. The Nature of Targum

Díez Macho[6] has argued strongly and convincingly against the suggestion that the text of Neofiti is a product of the 16th century editorial activity of the school of Cardinal Egidio, and the arguments need not be recapitulated here. Such obvious alterations as Gen 1:1 are indeed subsequent to the copying of the MS (the erasure of the w before wĕkll can be detected even with the naked eye), and probably date from the same time as the censorial erasures of references to idols, etc. that are common throughout the MS. It is a given of this study that the MS is an authentic Targum, albeit at times demonstrating conflated readings or even mixed traditions,[7] and that the language of the MS is reasonably uniform and hence amenable to analysis. However, the understanding of the nature and function of a targumic text that is offered here needs to be argued.

While this is not the place for a comprehensive analysis of the character of the Palestinian Targum, methodologically and conceptually the study of targumic materials often betrays a confusion of a number of different levels of analysis. The ideas below represent the position taken throughout this study, and are important in order to avoid argument that in essence revolves around different objects of study. Various studies (including at times the editio princeps) have confused, in the first place, the spoken and the literary forms of the language (see above, note 5); the activities of the maturgaman with the written Targum; and the chronology of the texts dealing with maturgaman and Targum in the Mishna and in the Gemara.

Despite Fitzmyer's eloquent rebuttal,[8] there persists a confusion among some scholars between the spoken and the literary forms of the language. In Fitzmyer's succinct words, "when one is dealing with ancient written texts, especially of limited number, and of (in some cases) uncertain provenience, it is a moot question whether one can say that one text is written in a literary form of the language and that another is composed in the spoken or popular form -- unless, of course, one has some independent, extrinisic evidence of such a distinction. How do we know what the spoken form of Aramaic was like in 1st century Palestine?" (p. 73). It is, of course, absurd to argue from an ancient text for evidence of the spoken form of a language. But this kind of methodological confusion has come to be used to bolster other assumptions, particularly concerning the antiquity of the targumic tradition.

It is a fundamental misunderstanding of the nature and function of Targum to even attempt to isolate and identify spoken forms. Targum is first and foremost rabbinic literature -- it is no more a collection of orally transmitted stories, random translations, recorded versions, etc. than is the Hebrew Bible on which it is based and which it purports to "translate." The Hebrew Bible was viewed as a coherent, unified text by the rabbis, one whose mysteries could be revealed if the true meaning could be discovered. The rabbis, after all, were not exegetes, and viewed their task as explicating God's word. The coherence of the entire Pentateuch was a matter of faith, and hence the vehicle in which explication was done was of necessity also coherent. Examples of textual coherence abound, and the following is merely offered as representative.

In Gen 32:7, Jacob is told that Esau is coming toward him with four hundred men. The Hebrew 'arba^c-mē'ôt 'îš is translated 'rb^c m'h dgbryn pwlmrkyn 'four hundred (of) men, generals' (not 'soldiers' as in the translation in the editio princeps). The question then arises, why did the "translator" add the word pwlmrkyn 'generals'? The answer lies in an understanding of the rabbinic view of the incident. Prior to the relevant verse, in Gen 31:18 Jacob leaves Laban's household with cattle, possessions, and wealth -- a well-off and powerful individual. The reasoning appears to be that it was not probable that he would be distressed by the sight of a mere four hundred men, hence each "man" must have been a general, each with his own army (cf. Bereshit Rabba, ad loc.), and so Jacob was "greatly afraid." The denouement of this encounter is even more interesting, however, because, when Jacob finally does meet Esau (Gen 33:1), not only is there no confrontation, but also the four hundred "generals" are now "four hundred men on foot" (gwbryn rglyn). What has brought about this peaceful encounter when a military one was anticipated, and why have the armies of Esau turned into a small battalion of foot soldiers?

The answer of the rabbis lies in the incident that took place between the report of the spies (Gen 32:7) and the actual encounter (Gen 33:1): the confrontation of the angel (named Sariel in the Targum) with Jacob, their wrestling together, and Jacob's transformation into "Israel" (Gen 32:25-33). Jacob is no longer afraid of Esau because Jacob is no longer the same Jacob -- having met and conquered the divine, he is now self-assured and confident, and is clearly in charge during his meeting with his brother. Thus the rabbis attempt to explain a series of apparently confusingly related incidents: the report of the four hundred; the wrestling with the angel; the non-violent encounter between the two brothers. It is clearly missing the point to suggest, then, that the targumic text somehow preserves the "spoken" form of the language -- this is a well-structured, literary account and is most definitely not an oral "folk tradition" merely recorded by the "translator!"

A second confusion, and one related to that which confounds the "spoken" and the "literary" forms of the language, is that which conjoins the oral translation of the Hebrew Bible, as well as the activities of the "translator," with the written Targum. A number of well-known mishnaic texts have been used

by numerous authors in describing their view of the Targum and its relation to the Hebrew Bible.

Most scholars,[9] even those who are acutely aware of the dangers of confusing the oral translation with the Targum, begin with a premise that the unlearned masses did not know Hebrew, and could not follow the Bible readings in the synagogue service. As a consequence, the text was translated for them into the 'vernacular' Aramaic (hence the assumption that the Targum somehow represents the "spoken" as opposed to the literary language). Then a variety of mishnaic texts are cited[10] that demonstrate the system involved -- the rules concerning the interpreter; how many verses are to be translated at a time; the texts to be read but not translated, and those to be neither read nor translated, etc., etc. But there is not the slightest shred of evidence to show that the text we are considering, i.e., the "Palestinian Targum," is connected in any way with the activities of a synagogue functionary called the məturgəman, or, indeed, with the lectionary practices of the Jewish community, except that all three are concerned with the notion of "translation."

As many scholars have pointed out,[11] this identification of the Targum with the synagogue activities derives from an opinion, given by R. Ika, in the name of R. Hananel who attributed it to Rab in the Babylonian Talmud, (Meg. 3a) where Rab interpreted the word məpōrāš in Nehemiah 8:8 as referring to the Targum.[12] Furthermore, what evidence there is does not seem to demonstrate that the Jews of the first century C.E. needed an Aramaic translation at all.[13] The use of Hebrew as a literary language at Qumran is well noted, and there is some indication of its use as a colloquial tongue. Fitzmyer is typically cautious when he points out that "pockets of Palestinian Jews also used Hebrew, even though its use was not widespread" (p. 46). While one could, I believe, interpret the available evidence as showing a much more widespread use of Hebrew, even a conservative interpretation is sufficient to demonstrate that, whatever the functions of the Targum may have been (see below), providing a biblical text for the unlearned masses in their own vernacular was not one of them. The confusion of the oral translation in the synagogue with the written Targum is a confusion of what Sperber (1973, Vol. IVB, pp. 1-2) colorfully called The Targum as a Religious Institution and The Targum as a Literary Document. As he

clearly states, "there remains a gap of about 1,200 years" between the two. Furthermore, "any attempt to treat the Literary Document as the direct successor of the Institution, or, as one might say, as the Institution transfigured from oral into written form, must be considered as a complete failure, since it has nothing even resembling a trustworthy evidence to rest upon. It is utterly unscientific!" (p. 2).

A third common confusion is a chronological one concerning the evidence found in the Mishna and that found in the Gemara. There seems to be an attitude that the Targum as Institution began sometime after the period of Ezra, and continued down intact until perhaps the sixth century C.E. However, most of the evidence cited from the Talmud refers to the functions and activities of the məturgəman, not to the Targum. Furthermore, the talmudic passages clearly indicate an evolution of the role of the məturgəman, so that one must clearly distinguish between the facts the Mishna presents us concerning the translator, and the later comments on that text in the Gemara. Even more importantly, one must not then take the final step of transferring this mixed view back into the pre-Christian period; nor can one then extrapolate from the məturgəman to the Targum. In other words, if we are discussing the role of the "translator," we must distinguish (as least) three separate periods in the evolution of this official position: pre-mishnaic, mishnaic, and post-mishnaic. We must furthermore distinguish between: (i) those talmudic texts that discuss the written document we know as the Targum;[14] (ii) those that discuss the activities of a synagogue official called the məturgəman;[15] and (iii) those texts that discuss the lectionary activitiy connected with an Aramaic translation of the Hebrew text.[16]

One example should suffice. McNamara, as mentioned, believes that the Bible was rendered into Aramaic for the benefit of the masses who knew no Hebrew. He then continues:

> The Mishnah gives considerable detail on how this rendering into Aramaic was to be done. The interpreter (called the Meturgeman) had to be distinct from the reader. Any competent person, even a minor, could act as interpreter, subject, naturally, to the control of the head of the synagogue.
>
> Certain texts detrimental to the honour of Israel or the ancients, were read out in Hebrew and not rendered into Aramaic.

> The Aramaic translation had to be given orally. It was forbidden to use written texts for this purpose. One reason given for this is that the written law should be transmitted in writing and the oral law by word of mouth (Palestinian Talmud, Meg. 4, 1, 74d, 1.16). Another reason given in the Babylonian Talmud (Meg. 32a) is that of impressing on the people the difference between the sacred text and its interpretative translation (McNamara, "Targum and Testament," p. 48).

As can be seen, this is a classic case of confusion. Oral law and written Targum, a variety of historical periods and talmudic texts, all are thrown together in a bewildering account of what constitutes the Aramaic Targum.

How, then should this material be understood? Clearly, the interpreter was not "rendering" the Hebrew into Aramaic, as even McNamara hints at further along:

> By the time the Mishnah rule came to be codified, and probably long before, the task of the Meturgeman was scarcely that of rendering the Hebrew text into Aramaic for the first time. Nor was he likely to have had the liberty to render the Hebrew text at will (p. 49).

The function of the "translator" in the mishnaic period (there is no evidence for a "translator" prior to the mishnaic period) was to recite a fixed, traditional, authorized Aramaic version in conjunction with the reading of the Hebrew text (see further below). Hence even a child could do it, since it involved memorizing a standard literary translation.[17] In the post-mishnaic period, this function appears to have been performed by a low-level synagogue functionary, the məturgəman (a fairly inferior status position if we can judge from some of the negative comments recorded[18] in the Talmud).

One must similarly understand the prohibition against "written" Targumim. The restrictions clearly state that the Targum may not be read out in the synagogue,[19] and these rules certainly became hard and fast in the post-mishnaic period. But this surely implies that there is a written text![20] R. Akiba's early training involved studying Bible and Targum, and "in Sifre, Deut. 161, the Targum is mentioned as a branch of study intermediate between the Mikra and the Mishnah" (Bacher, "Targum," p. 57). The prohibition is against an activity in the synagogue service, not against writing down the Aramaic translation.

One obvious question must now be asked: If the Jews of the 1st century spoke, wrote and understood Hebrew, and did not need a vernacular Aramaic translation, just what is the Targum

that we have preserved today, and what was the purpose of translating the Bible into Aramaic in the first place? The first part to this answer is that it is not a vernacular translation. Even a casual contact with the text is enough to convince the researcher that the text is a highly technical piece of rabbinic literature. There is structure to this work, cohesion, literary technique, and above all, translation technique[21] -- it is most certainly not an "off-the-cuff" rendering into colloquial Aramaic for the benefit of the illiterate. Secondly, as has been already mentioned, the Aramaic translation is an interpretive rendering, and this is the key to understanding the function of the Targum. While post-biblical Hebrew was known and used, it clearly would have been inappropriate to interpret the sacred text from one "Hebrew" to another. Aramaic was the language in which this sacred text could be commented upon, discussed, expanded, manipulated to extract meaning -- the language of interpretation; not the close reading of the Mishnah, wherein the text might be scrutinized for truths, hidden or otherwise, but rather the explanation of what the Hebrew text is trying to say. The Targum is the authorized community standard of what the words of the Torah mean -- in discussing Zechariah 12:11 in Meg. 3a, R. Joseph comments 'ilmale' targumna' dəha'i qra' la' yada^cna' ma'i qa'mar "if it were not for our Targum of that verse, we would not know what it means."[22]

With this view of the Targum in mind, a number of conclusions can be drawn that provide both a theoretical infrastructure for the linguistic analysis that follows, and also form a set of methodological principles:

1. A Targum is a written document, not an example of a spoken form of the language.

2. A Targum MS forms a coherent body of literature and is not a random collection of stories, homilies, translations, etc.

3. A Targum constitutes a fixed, traditional, authorized, interpretive translation.

As a consequence, certain translation conventions can be identified, and the motivations for their use, as well as for the overall translation of the text, can be explored and described (see especially Chapter 9, Syntax).

3. A Grammar of Targum Neofiti

This grammatical study differs from other Aramaic grammars in a number of ways. In the first place, it is an attempt to write a synchronic model of the language of one MS. As a consequence, the analysis (see especially Chapter 7, Nouns and Adjectives) is based primarily on the written forms as found in the MS, not on supposed vocalized forms derived from other Aramaic dialects or traditions. When vocalizations are offered, they are based on the form in Targum Onkelos, taken from Sperber, "Onkelos," and/or Jastrow, "Dictionary," and they are usually only offered to resolve a problem or to illustrate a form that is not clear in the MS Neofiti 1.

Unlike other grammars of Aramaic, there is no attempt made to suggest the historical development of forms (except when such information is essential for the understanding of a particular word in Neofiti). This constitutes a clear decision to focus only on synchronic material with the aim of finally providing the scholarly community with a useful grammar of this MS, so that further work on it, as well as on the vexing question of the "Palestinian Targum," will be able to rest on a reliable linguistic base. During the writing of this work, I often had recourse to the "standard" reference grammar for "Jewish" Aramaic, Gustaf Dalman's Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch, published in Leipzig in 1894, and like all students of Aramaic, I am indebted to Dalman for his work. However, as Kutscher pointed out over twenty years ago ("Studies in Galilean Aramaic," Tarbiz, Vol. 21, 1961, p. 192), the volume suffers from serious defects and flaws, not the least of which is the fact that Dalman lumped the language of the Palestinian Targum together with that of the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim, and with that of Onkelos. The volume is, at best, exceedingly difficult to work with, especially so as it entirely lacks a section on syntax. In spite of Kutscher's marvellous studies, or perhaps because of them, a modern, thorough grammar of "Galilean" Aramaic still remains a scholarly desideratum. It is hoped that such studies as this present one will form a basis for a better understanding of the language until such time as a good, synthetic grammar does appear. One thing that does seem clear is that studies based on individual manuscripts will enable conclusions to be more tightly drawn. Kutscher's insistence on reliable texts demonstrates the need to thoroughly understand a particular MS idiom before general statements on the nature of a particular

"dialect" of Aramaic can be formulated. This is even more the case when one wishes to discuss a concept such as "the Palestinian Targum," without first being able to appreciate the relationships between the various surviving representatives of the Palestinian targumic tradition.

Dalman's work provided one model for an Aramaic grammar: the volume is rich in the collection of forms to be found there (even though they are not always easily accessible). However, in the tradition in which Dalman wrote, the synchronic and the diachronic are thrown together, and the analysis is often obscure. The researcher cannot be sure where a particular form comes from, whether it is a "true" form or a postulated one, nor even whether all the necessary information has been collected. This present work is based on my Ph.D. dissertation, completed in 1978 under Professor Thomas O. Lambdin of Harvard University, which was a grammar of the language of the book of Genesis in the Targum Neofiti 1. As a consequence, much of the analysis is indeed based on Genesis, however reference is always made to the rest of the MS when this is done. As a further consequence, and unlike Dalman, there is no attempt in this study to provide a comprehensive concordance of all the forms in Neofiti, but rather to offer a schematic analysis of the forms of the language, illustrated by copious references from the text. Similarly, there is no attempt to reconcile the language of Neofiti with that of other examples of Palestinian Aramaic. Such studies must appear in another format.

Other models for an Aramaic grammar are not easy to come by. Students often have recourse to such small works as W. B. Stevenson, Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic (Oxford, 1924), or Max Margolis, Lehrbuch der aramäischen Sprache (München, 1910), however both of these are really little more than student workbooks containing paradigms (themselves not always useful or even accurate). While it is considerably more reliable, the small Grammar of Biblical Aramaic by Franz Rosenthal (Wiesbaden, 1963) is also aimed primarily at the student. However, I did make use of this for some comparisons, even though it deals with a completely different period of Aramaic. To the same period of Aramaic belongs Hans Bauer and Pontus Leander's Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen (Tübingen, 1927). The model it provides is essentially that of Dalman: an analysis based on a mixture

of synchronic forms and historical reconstruction. As a model for the writing of a grammar I found it wanting, however I did gain many insights into the historical development of Aramaic forms from this volume.

Even further afield is Stanislav Segert's Altaramäische Grammatik (Leipzig, 1975), which mixes Old Aramaic inscriptional material with Imperial Aramaic (in particular Biblical Aramaic). In this volume there is less mixing of synchronic and diachronic analysis, and also a much greater reliance on cited forms. While the format is very much that of 19th century German Semitic scholarship, the copious and reliable citations make this a useable book, and a good model, at least in part, for writing a grammar of one Aramaic dialect.

This present volume, then, has attempted to combine the best features of its predecessors: as little mixing as possible of contemporary and historical analysis; schematization of information coupled with numerous, reliable citations; in-depth analyses of a variety of problematic questions in Aramaic syntax (notably lacking in all Aramaic grammars); and a useful format that provides scholars with both data and suggested analysis of that data on which other scholarship may be based.

NOTES

[1]Díez Macho, "Deuteronomio," pp. S5-S7.

[2]E.g., Joseph Fitzmyer, review of Neophyti 1, Tomo I: Genesis, by Alejandro Díez Macho (ed.) in Catholic Biblical Quarterly 32 (1970): 107-112 and review of Neophyti 1, Tomo II: Exodo, by Alejandro Díez Macho (ed.) in Journal of Biblical Literature 91, No. 4 (December 1972): 575-57S.

[3]Alejandro Díez Macho, "Le targum palestinien" in Exegese biblique et judäisme, J.E. Ménard, (ed.) (Strasbourg, 1973): 14-77.

[4]Martin McNamara, Targum and Testament (Shannon, 1972).

E.g., Jonas Greenfield, "Standard Literary Aramaic" in Actes du premier congrès international de linguistique sémitique et chamito-sémitique, Paris, 1969, André Caquot and David Cohen (eds.) (The Hague, 1974): 2S0-2S9.

[6]Díez Macho, "Deuteronomio," pp. S4-100.

[7]E.g., the famous "Four Cases of Moses" midrash that appears in Lev 24:12, Num 9:S, 15:34, and 27:5. However, it is by no means clear that these four versions do indeed represent different traditions, and a detailed study of their language, together with their relationship to the surrounding verses, should prove instructive on this point. It must be recognized, after all, that a targumic text is viewed by its compilers as a coherent whole, just as is the biblical text on which it is based, and as such the insertion of a midrashic expansion is to be seen as having conscious literary, religious, and/or didactic intent.

[S]"The Phases of the Aramaic Language," pp. 73-74, in A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays, Scholars Press, 1979.

[9]See, for example, J.F. Stenning, The Targum of Isaiah, Oxford, 1949, p. vii; M. McNamara, Targum and Testament, Shannon, Ireland, 196S, p. 4S; A. Sperber, "Onkelos," Vol. IVB, p. 1; even Fitzmyer cautiously assents: "There is no reason to deny that the targums came into existence as orally translated forms of the Scriptures being read in Hebrew in the synagogues" ("Phases of Aramaic," p. 73).

[10]E.g., McNamara, Targum and Testament, p. 57.

[11]Cf. e.g., W. Bacher, "Targum," p. 57.

[12]The rest of the verse is not usually quoted -- not only was məpōráš interpreted as Targum, but also śôm śekel as the pəsuqin, and wayyābinû bammiqrā' as pisqey təᶜamim, or some say the masoret, which had been forgotten and was now established again. In other words, the whole verse is an interpretive attempt to plumb the depths of Scripture by attributing a variety of current divisions of the text to a famous historical character. It is certainly not a verse on which modern scholarship can base theories concerning the origins or the nature of the Aramaic Targum!

[13]Cf. Fitzmyer, "The Languages of Palestine" in A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays, Scholars Press, 1979, pp. 44-46.

[14]Such as Meg. 3a.

[15]Such as Moed Qatan 21a, Hagigah 14a and 16a.

[16]Such as Meg. 21b, 23b, 24a, 24b.

[17]The Mishnah from which this quote is taken (Meg. 24a) is not a description of who can or cannot be a translator, but rather lists a series of synagogue activities: reading from the Torah; "translating;" repeating the blessings before the šəmaᶜ; passing before the ark; and lifting up the hands. A child may read and translate, but not pass before the Ark nor lift up his hands. Similarly, a person in rags (pôhēᵃh) may repeat the blessing and translate, but may not read from the Torah, nor pass before the Ark, nor lift up his hands. Finally, a blind man may repeat the blessings and translate. Hence it is absurd to interpret this as evidence about the nature or functions of the Targum, or even about the role of the məturgəman. What is being discussed here is the verbatim recitation of a fixed Aramaic version of the Torah, which can be done by anyone who has memorized it, including the three cases mentioned in the Mishnah (who are restricted from performing the obviously more important functions of passing before the Ark, raising the hands, etc.).

[1S]Cf. e.g., Moed Qatan 21a.

[19]There is no reason to doubt the authenticity of the quote in the Talmud (Meg. 32a): so that people will not say targum katub battorah 'the Targum is written in the Law'. However, I doubt that this means that the general populace will be gullibly deceived into thinking that the Targum really is to be found in the scroll of the Law. Rather this should be

understood to mean that the authorities should be wary of attributing to the Targum the same status as the Scripture. This is clearly a potential danger -- the Targum had an official role as the sanctioned community interpretation of the Hebrew text. Hence people could become convinced of the primacy of its interpretations. That this is a potential danger is apparent from the quote mentioned above (Meg. 32a). The debate between R. Meir and R. Judah centers on the order for opening the scroll, finding the place, saying the blessing, and reading. R. Meir draws a parallel to Ulla who, in discussing why the reader should not prompt the translator, explains that this is so that people will not say targum katub battorah 'the Targum is written in the Law', to which R. Judah replies targum 'ika ləmiṭ^{C}e 'with the Targum they might make an error', bərakot lika ləmiṭ^{C}e 'with the blessings they will not make an error'.

[20]Cf. W. Bacher, "Targum," pp. 57-58 for a variety of talmudic citations concerning the written nature of the Targum.

[21]Cf. Chapter 9, Syntax, especially Section Two, Parts A and B, and the literature cited there for detailed examples. The most obvious case of translation technique is the use of anthropomorphic avoidance formulae, though there are others. Cf. also M. Klein, "Converse Translation: A Targumic Technique," in Biblica, Vol. 57, No. 4, 1976: 515-537, and "The Translation of Anthropomorphisms and Anthropopathisms in the Targumim," in Supplement to Vetus Testamentum, Vol. 32, Congress Volume, 1981: 162-177.

[22]Cf. also Hag. 28b.

CHAPTER 2
ORTHOGRAPHY

1. **The Nature of Error**

The various questions concerning the production of the MS, the relationships between the copyist hands, and the presence of interlinear and marginal variants have been extensively studied. The presence of many errors in the MS has been noted, and suitable caution has been urged in dealing with this medieval copy.[1] Nevertheless, the language of this MS does display an internal consistency, and even the presence of interpolations can be detected, usually with a good degree of certainty.

One crucial distinction that must be made is that between errors that are attributable to the medieval copyist(s), probably quite unfamiliar with Palestinian Aramaic, and perhaps even unfamiliar with Onkelos, and errors that are attributable to undetermined scribes who prepared the text which provided the basis for the medieval copyists' work. At times, these two errors may be difficult to distinguish (e.g., w/y confusion is both a medieval copyist phenomenon, and one familiar from early Jewish manuscripts). However, one can often determine what is blatant copyist error, e.g., Gen 35:9, mrb^{C}yt' for mrbnyyt', with 'y for ויי; and so too in many other examples.

This distinction is important, for it enables us to eliminate many of the gross infractions from our analysis of the language, or even from a consideration of the provenance, milieu, etc., of the MS. The failure to make this distinction, for instance, makes it difficult at first to follow the reasoning of A. Tal, "Neophyti 1," where he says that "the scribe was most unfamiliar with the Aramaic language" (p. 38), but then later, that a number of phenomena which he adduces constitute "sufficient proof of the presence of Onqelos in the consciousness of the scribe" (p. 42)! Clearly, by the first he means what we refer to here as "copyist," by the second, "scribe." It is difficult to argue with his assessement that Neofiti cannot be classified as a "good manuscript" (p. 38), but one cannot then extrapolate that the language of Neofiti is either inconsistent or irrevocably flawed. It is the thesis of this study that the language is reasonably consistent; that interpolations can be identified, by and large; and that, once medieval copyist phenomena are explained and considered, the

language of the MS is readily amenable to investigation and analysis.

2. Types of Error

The largest number of errors in the MS are what can broadly be termed "spelling errors," namely, the unintentional replacement of one or more letters in a word by one or more other letters. This replacement creates a form that is not paradigmatically justifiable in terms of the canons of the Aramaic language, or else is justifiable but semantically it is other than that which is expected. For an immediate example of the former, see, e.g., mrb^cyt' for mrbnyyt', cited above; for the latter, the spelling of qimā 'pillar' as qyym', under the impact of the common qyym' 'covenant' (= qəyāmā), or the spelling of the construct of 'land' as 'r^c' for 'r^c, under the impact of the commonly occurring determined state, might both be cited. It must be stressed that it is not always possible to distinguish "scribal spelling errors" from "copyist spelling errors," as defined above. The routine replacement of certain letters by others might point to a medieval copyist phenomenon, but this must be balanced against the multitude of times the "correct" form occurs. Without doubt, the written Vorlage from which Neofiti was copied must have contained spelling conventions that made the task of the inexperienced(?) medieval copyists much more difficult, e.g., the similarity of w and y, or of final n and final k.

But beyond that, some spelling errors are considerably less common, and seem to derive from copyist inabilities, e.g., y for h, d for l, final m for s, s, and ^c. These are often encountered in less common words that were presumably not understood by the copyist.

Letter confusion occurs frequently in the MS, the following being found numerous times:

			for		
1)	t	ט	for	ḥ	ח
				r	ר
				y	י
2)	y	י	for	w	ו
				h	ה
3)	w	ו	for	y	י
				final n	ן
4)	z	ז	for	w	ו
5)	k	כ	for	b	ב

			for		
6)	h	ה	for	ḥ	ח
7)	h	ה	for	t	ת
8)	r	ר	for	d	ד
9)	d	ד	for	l	ל
10)	g	ג	for	n	נ
11)	s	ס	for	ṭ	ט
12)	final n	ן	for	final k	ך
13)	final m	ם	for	s	ס
				ṣ	צ
				c	ע

As can be seen, letter confusions fall into four broad groups:

1) a group based on a single downstroke (ר ו ז ו י);
2) a group based on a curved single downstroke, with or without a second stroke (ח ה ה ר ו י);
3) a group based on a semicircular stroke (ל נ ר ד ג ב כ);
4) a group based on a circular stroke (ם ל ע צ ט ס).

Some letters fall into more than one group (ל ר ו י), hence the apparent chaotic situation in the MS. However, once these conventions are kept in mind, the MS reads well. Nevertheless, it cannot be determined whether these confusions also existed in the work of the pre-medieval scribe, and hence constitute "scribal" as opposed to "copyist" error.

A second kind of spelling error occurs very frequently in Neofiti, that called "aural" in this study. By this term is meant a mistake that results from the incorrect recording of a word that was read aloud. This view of the medieval copying process, in which the text was dictated at least in part, presumably to a group of copyists, will account for such common spellings as the masculine construct plural ending in -yh rather than -y, under the impact of the common 3rd masculine singular pronominal suffix -yh; or the spelling 'r^c' for the construct 'r^c 'land of --', mentioned above; or the occasional spelling of b for w, reflecting a medieval pronunciation of w as /v/, e.g., Gen 27:41 hywby 'his life', for hywwy; or the occasional confusion of t/ṭ, k/q, ^c/', e.g., Deut 4:42, wbtqwp for wbtkwp 'suddenly', or Gen 4:6 (and Exod 23:2) b^cš (and mb^cš') for b'š (and mb'š'). A detailed analysis of such phenomena, including a description of their occurrence by groups of folios, will surely help resolve

important questions concerning the number of hands involved in the production of the MS.

The final group of spelling errors are ligatures and letter simplifications, and these can certainly be attributed to the copyist, who either misread letters written closely together in the Vorlage, or else formed his own letters quickly or carelessly, and so fashioned the ligature or the simplification. See, for example, Gen 35:9 - עׄ - for ניי cited above, or Gen 37:2, where the suffix הון - is written over as הק, or Deut 19:5, where the form wyzdhp (ויזדחף) occurs for expected wtdhp (ותדחף).

Finally, note should be taken of the many abbreviations found throughout the MS. In these, one or two (rarely more) letters are left off, and the apocopated form is marked with a slanting stroke, thus `. This manuscript convention can cause difficulty in the analysis, especially in determining whether a form ends in א or ה , see, e.g., Chapter 9, Syntax, Part Two, Section B. At times, the expected ending (usually a pronominal suffix) has been added in the margin, and at times, the slanting stroke is absent.

3. The Use of Matres Lectionis

The use of matres lectionis in Neofiti, as in Onkelos, is not indicative of synchronic vowel length. The letters h/y/w can be used to represent various vowels, however, just as frequently, the vowel is not marked. The situation may be summarized thus:

In final position

the letter w can mark either o or u;
the letter y can mark either i or e;
the letter h can mark either ā or e;
the letter ' can mark either ā or e
(the latter usually in historical spellings that are based on a root ending in ').

In medial position

the vowels o or u can be marked by w or Ø;
the vowels i or e can be marked by y or Ø;
the vowel a (ā) is usually unmarked
(however, cf. occasional examples such as kl m'n d- 'whoever', Gen 20:16, and yt'rq 'it shall be poured out', Lev 21:10, Ct yittāraq from root r-y-q);
the vowel ə (shewa mobile) is usually unmarked

(however, cf. occasional rare examples such as mlk'hwn 'their king', malkəhon → malkahon, Gen 26:1, or z^{c}yr't' 'the young woman', zə^{c}irātā →zə^{c}irātā, Gen 19:35, with aleph as internal mater lectionis; and the more common forms with y as internal mater lectionis for ə, e.g., lyhwn 'to them', ləhon → lihon, Gen 1:28, or '^{c}ybr 'let me pass', 'a^{ca}bar → 'a^{c}əbar → 'a^{c}ibar, Deut 2:27).

The letter y is also used on occasion to resolve a final consonantal cluster, one that ends in -t for the most part, e.g., ^{c}bdyt 'you (ms) did', ^{ca}badt → ^{ca}badet → ^{ca}badit, Gen 26:10.

Finally, consonantal /w/ can be marked with either single or double w, e.g., lwt/lwwt; consonantal /y/ can be marked with either single or double y, e.g., qym'/qyym'. There appears to be a slight preference for single w for /w/, and for double y for /y/, however there are also obvious spelling conventions, e.g., lwwt occurs over lwt at a ratio of approximately 10:1.

4. Methodological Considerations

When dealing with any unpointed text, one of the main problems is vocalization, and certain factors must guide the choice of the vocalization that is suggested. First and foremost, in dealing with this MS, a general knowledge of Aramaic is assumed, including the historical development of the Aramaic forms. Many forms as they are spelled in the MS cannot reflect a legitimate pronunciation, given the fact of their historical development, and they must be accounted for in some way. For example, a few 2 ms perfect verb forms are spelled qtlyt. This suffix should not historically end in -it/-et, and so this spelling must be accounted for as indicating a resolution of the final cluster -Ct, where C is a dental stop, for example the word ^{c}bdyt 'you did', as discussed above.

Secondly, a specific knowledge of the Aramaic of Targum Onkelos is assumed. Most of the lexical items in Neophyti 1 can be paralleled in Onkelos, and therefore it has been chosen as the basis for the vocalization proferred, when it is not obviously at odds with the form suggested by the matres lectionis or with the historically necessary form. Onkelos, however, has many problems of vocalization and is itself not at all uniform, especially in those forms where Neophyti is most difficult to interpret (e.g., the segholate nouns).

In this study emendations are proposed for many forms in order to bring them into uniformity with the Aramaic "norm" that common sense and a knowledge of the history of Aramaic demand. This is especially so when "incorrect" forms result from one of the orthographic confusions mentioned above, and this represents an intentional attempt to classify the forms of the language as effectively as possible. This approach eliminates the need for citing long lists of apparently "exceptional" forms (especially in the chapter on the noun) which are in fact not abnormal at all.

The use of <u>matres lectionis</u> with vowels in both Onkelos and Neophyti is not indicative of synchronic vowel length, and consequently they have been ignored in vocalized transliterations. As a result, the following transliteration for the Aramaic has been adopted:

א	or	אֵ				=	i
אֹ	or	אֹו				=	o
א	or	אֻו				=	u
א	or	אֵ				=	e
א	or	אָה	or	אָא		=	$\bar{a}$
א	or	א				=	a (the latter primarily in segholate nouns)
א						=	ə (with guttural, a = א)

On the other hand, full account of <u>matres lectionis</u> has been taken in the transliteration of Hebrew, as follows:

Without matres		With matres		Shewa	
א =	i/ī	אֵ =	î	א =	ə
אֹ =	ō	אֹו =	ô	א =	a
א =	ū	אֻו =	û	א =	e
א =	ē	אֵה =	ē(h)	א =	o
א =	e	אֵ =	ey		
א =	ā/o	אָה =	ā		
א =	a	אֵ =	ê		

The traditional terms for the verbal conjugations ($p\partial^{c}al$ etc.) have been replaced by the following terminology:

G stem — "Grundstamm," the basic form of the verb (= $p\partial^{c}al$)

D stem — "Doppelungsstamm," the stem with doubled middle radical (= $pa^{cc}el$)

C stem — "Causative," the stem formed with prefix $\underline{'-}$ in the perfect (= $\underline{'a\bar{p}^{c}el}$)

Gt stem — The medio-passive of the G stem (= $\underline{'itp\partial^{c}el}$)

Dt stem — The medio-passive of the D stem (= $\underline{'itpa^{cc}al}$)

Ct stem — The medio-passive of the C stem (= $\underline{ittap^{c}al}$)

Verbs, one of whose triconsonantal radicals is a "weak" letter (i.e., $\underline{w/y/h/'}$), are referred to in the body of this work as Primae Infirmae (or I-weak), Mediae Infirmae (or II-weak) and Tertiae Infirmae (or III-weak). When there is a further division within one of these groups, terminology such as I-$\underline{y}$, II-$\underline{w}$ or III-$\underline{Aleph}$ is employed, indicating that the first radical of that root is $\underline{y-}$, (e.g., y-n-q) or that the second radical is $\underline{-w-}$ (e.g., q-w-m) or that the third radical is $\underline{-'}$ (e.g., q-r-'), respectively.

NOTES

[1]See, e.g., Klein, "Printed Edition;" Tal, "Neophyti 1;" Martin, "Palaeographical Character," and the critique of this in Weil, "Le codex neophyti I;" Miller, "Type II Marginalia;" and the bibliography cited in Grossfeld, "Bibliography," I and II, and in Díez Macho, "Neophyti," Vol. 5.

CHAPTER 3
PREPOSITIONS

As in other Aramaic dialects and Semitic languages, prepositions can occur either independently or with nominal suffixes. For the actual forms of the suffixes, see Chapter 7, Nouns and Adjectives. The following list is presented as a complete inventory, and the use of suffixes is noted. References are only cited where comment is deemed appropriate.

+   '1 'to': This non-Aramaic form appears but rarely in N, and it is probably an accidental occurrence of the Hebrew preposition which it translates. Cf. Gen 4:8 wqm qyn '1 hbl 'hwy 'and Cain rose up against Abel his brother' (MT wayyāqām qayin 'el-hebel 'aḥîw), Gen 39:10 wl' šm^c '1yh 'and he did not listen to her' (MT wəlō'-šāma^c 'ēleyhā), and Deut 32:46 '1hwn 'to them' (MT '^alēhem).

+   'rwm '1hn 'except', 'but rather': When translating a passage with a Hebrew Vorlage, it usually stands for MT kî-'im, however note should be taken of the unusual, misspelled form in Gen 21:26 'rwm '1hym (sic) ywm' hdyn 'except today' (MT biltî hayyôm, 'except today',) and Deut 1:36 (MT zûlātî).

+   b- 'in', 'by', 'with', etc.

+   bgw 'inside': This translates both MT bətôk and bə in equal proportion, and occasionally for ləma^can, cf. Gen 18:24. Suffixed forms usually are spelled with two ws; note also the archaizing spelling bgw' in Gen 3:8.

+   bgyn 'on account of': Usually followed by kdyn, occasionally by kn, rarely by kk, most often translating MT ^cal-kēn 'therefore'.

+   bgll 'because of': Usually for MT ba^ca^bur (and rarely bə, cf. Gen 18:28), including with suffixes, as in Gen 12:13 bgllk 'because of you' and Gen 1S:26 bgllhwn 'because of them'. Cf. mn bgll below.

+   byn 'between': This occurs primarily in such constructions as byn ... wbyn, byn ... 1byn, and byn ... 1- 'between ... and ...', but also in an extended sense of 'whether', as in Gen 38:25 byn mkw1t' ṭb' byn mkw1t' byš' 'whether a good measure, whether a bad measure' (no MT). It also occurs with singular suffixes, cf. Gen 16:5 byny wbynk, 'between me and you' (MT bênî ûbêneykā). There are some examples of an alternate plural form as in Gen 15:17 byny gzryy' h'ylyn 'between these pieces' (MT bên haggəzārîm hā'ēlleh),

Gen 36:37 (mn) byny nhryy' '(from) between the rivers' (for the MT toponym (mē)rəḥōbōt hannāhār), and Gen 23:6 bbynnn 'among us' (MT bətôkēnû).

+ bzmn 'at the time of': Twice in Genesis (7:13 and 17:26 for MT bə^ceṣem hayyôm hazze, and elsewhere without Hebrew Vorlage (cf. also hyk zmn and ^cd zmn below).

+ bl' 'without': In paraphrase for MT ^{ca}rîrî 'childless' (Gen 15:2), bl' bnyn 'without children'. Cf. also Chapter 4, Conjunctions, mn bly d-.

+ bmṣy^cwt 'in the middle of: For MT bətôk.

+ b^cd 'for': This form occurs rarely, and is probably a Hebrew gloss, cf. Gen 20:18 'rwm mtrwd trd YYY b^cd kl pthy yldh lbyth d'bymlk 'because the Lord had indeed sealed up every birth opening in the house of Abimelech' (MT kî-^cāṣōr ^cāṣar YHWH bə^cad kol-reḥem ləbêt '^abîmelek).

+ br mn 'besides', 'apart from': Also appears with suffixes, e.g., Gen 14:24 br mny 'apart from me' (MT bil^cāday).

+ bš^ct 'at the time of': cf. bzmn.

+ btr 'after', 'behind': Usually translates MT 'aḥar, especially in the idiom btr ptgmy' h'ylyn 'after these things', e.g., Gen 15:1 and many others. This preposition usually occurs with plural suffixes, as in Gen 24:39 btryy 'after me' (MT 'aḥ^arāy), etc., however cf. Gen 19:6 btrh 'after him' (MT 'aḥ^arāyw), and others.

+ gb 'with': Rare, only twice in Genesis (22:5 and 31:32), for MT ^cim. Cf. ^cm below.

+ d- 'of': As a preposition this form is used in genitive expressions of Type 1 and Type 2 (see Chapter 9, Syntax, and Golomb, JAOS, 1982. However cf. also Chapter 4, Conjunctions). It is spelled less commonly dy, though no apparent criterion for the use of one over the other is discernible. That they are orthographic alternants seems indicated by phrases such as Gen 15:17 šbybyn dy nwr šlh⟨b⟩yn d'šh 'sparks of fire, flames of fire' (no MT). The form can also translate an MT construct; with suffixes, it is used as the possessive, usually translating MT lə + suffixes.

The form of the possessive varies. Most commonly, it is constructed on the reduplicative base d(y)d-, e.g., Deut 32:35 dydy 'mine', Gen 4:8 dydk 'yours' (no MT), Num 16:5 dydh 'his' (MT lô), Gen 34:23 dydn 'ours' (MT lānû), Gen 15:13 dydhwn 'theirs' (MT lāhem), Lev 22:27 bš^ct 'nnqy ddhwn(:) 'at the hour of their distress' (no

MT, compare the similar phrase in Gen 38:25 š^ct 'nnqy 'the hour of my distress'); less common are d(y) + 1 (e.g., Gen 47:6 dly 'mine', Gen 38:25 dylyh 'his', MT lô) and also with suffix added directly to dy, cf. Gen 26:20 dynn (MT lānû).

+ hyk 'as': Usually translates MT kə-, but is common in passages with no Vorlage, or in paraphrase. Note the defective spelling hk in Gen 31:2 l' hk d'tml wl' hyk dqdmwy 'not as yesterday nor as before' (MT ('ênennu ^cimmô) kitəmôl šilšôm, and cf. the similar phrase in Gen 31:5).

+ hyk zmn 'at the time of(?)': Only once, Gen 7:11 hyk zmn ywm' hdyn 'on that (very) day' (MT bayyôm hazze), but note also the prefixed (:) use of the preposition in Deut 6:24 hkzmn ywm' hdyn, MT kəhayyôm hazze.

+ ḥlp 'in place of': Translates MT taḥat 'instead of', and also without Vorlage, e.g., Gen 29:22 lmsbh yth ll'h ḥlp rḥl 'to marry him to Leah in place of Rachel'. Cf. thwt below, which is occasionally used in error for ḥlp due to the similarity of form between Aramaic thwt and MT taḥat.

+ ytyr mn 'more than': Used as a form of the comparative (cf. mn below).

+ k- 'as', 'according to': Usually translates MT kə- and also in paraphrase. It is common in the technical translation idiom whwh kn kmymryh 'and it was so, according to His word', often for MT wayəhî kēn, e.g., Gen 1:7 and parallel verses. Cf. also Exod 15:3 kšmyh kn gbwrtyh 'as is His name, so is His might' (based on MT YHWH 'îš milḥāmā YHWH šəmô).

+ k'lw 'as (if)': An uncommon preposition, possibly late Hebrew rather than Aramaic. Cf. Gen 31:15 hl' k'lw nkryyn 'thšbnn lyh 'have we not been considered by him as strangers?' (paraphrasing MT h^alô' nokriyyôt neḥšabnû lô).

+ kwwt 'like': This preposition occurs both independently, e.g., Num 12:7 l' kwwt kl nby'h hw' ^cbdy mš⟨h⟩ 'not like any (other) prophet is my servant Moses' (based on MT lô'-kēn ^cabdî mōše), and with suffixes, e.g., Exod 15:11 kwwtk 'like you' (bis, MT kāmōkā), Gen 34:15 kwwth 'like him' (MT kāmōnû), Deut 1:11 kwwtkwn 'like you (pl)' (MT kākem).

+ klpy 'towards': Used with the G and C stem of the root dwq 'to look' to translate the MT idiom hišqîp ^cal-pənê.

+ kl q(w)bl 'opposite': Translates the MT idiom ^{C}al-pənê + toponym, and also pānîm 'el-pānîm in Gen 32:30, in the phrase 'pyn kl qbl 'pyn 'face to face'. Cf. also lqbl, mn kl q(w)bl, and qbyl below.

+ l- 'to', 'for': This preposition occurs as a much less common alternate for yt (q.v.) to mark the direct object of a transitive verb. In most cases, counter examples with yt in similar or identical situations can also be found; the one common denominator seems to be that, in most of the cases, the direct object is a proper name, however there are, as stated, many more counter examples with yt (see Chapter 9, Syntax.) As the citations demonstrate, there does not appear to be any direct copy of the Hebrew preposition used in the Vorlage.

With Vorlage: Gen 4:4-5, wqbl YYY br^{C}ww' yt(:) hbl wyt (:) qrbnyh: (5) wlqyn (:) wlqrbnyh (:) l' qbl br^{C}ww' 'and God received Abel and his offering favorably: (5) but Cain and his offering he did not receive favorably' (MT 'el throughout); Gen 24:14 w'p lgmlyk 'šqy 'and your camels also will I water' (MT wəgam-gəmalleykā 'ašqe); Gen 27:15 w'lbšt ly^{C}qb 'and she clothed Jacob' (MT 'et, cf. also Gen 27:30).

Without Vorlage: Gen 4:16, 4:24, 27:42 qtl lhbl 'he killed Abel'; Gen 16:5 nsbyt lhgr 'I took Hagar'; Gen 34:1 (erased by censor) s'ybw btwln wplhy (erased by censor) lbrtyh dy^{C}qb ... (erased by censor) ^{C}l dy s'bw ldynh brtyh dy^{C}qb '(uncircumcised ones) have defiled virgins and worshippers of (idols) the daughter of Jacob ... (idolators), because they defiled Dinah, the daughter of Jacob'; Num 21:34 hm' mšh l^{C}wg 'Moses saw Og' (cf. also Gen 28:12); Gen 18:1 lmšyzbh llwṭ 'to save Lot'; Lev 22:27 śrh yldh lyṣhq 'Sarah gave birth to Isaac'. There does not appear to be any common feature to the selection of verbs in the examples cited but as mentioned, the fact that the direct object is a proper noun seems significant.

+ lblh(w)d 'alone', 'by one's self': Always translates MT ləbadd + suffixes, and always with plural suffixes, e.g., Gen 2:18 lblhwdwy 'on his own', etc. Note the "defective" spelling lblhdwy in Gen 32:34.

+ lbr mn 'outside of': For MT mi(h)hûs lə-.

+ lbtr 'behind': With singular suffixes, in the sense of 'backwards', as in Gen 9:23, whwwn mhlkyn lbtrhwn ... w'pyhwn hpykw lbtrhwn 'they walked backwards ... and their

faces they turned backwards' (MT 'a hōrannît, both times). Cf. btr above, and mn btr below.

+ lgw 'into': All examples occur in the idiom ^{C}l (G & C stem) lgw 'to enter into (a house, etc.)', for MT bā' (G & C stem) 'el. Cf. bgw above, and ^{C}l below.

+ lw(w)t 'to', 'into', 'unto': The regular translation of MT 'el with verbs of motion, e.g., ^{C}ll, hzr, 'th, etc. Also occurs with singular suffixes, e.g., Gen 22:5 lwwtkwn (MT 'a lêkem) and note especially Gen 8:9 where MT wattāšab 'ēlāyw 'el-hattēbā is translated interestingly as whzrt lwwtyh ltybwth (:) 'and it returned to him to the ark.' The spelling lwwt predominates over lwt at the rate of approximately 10:1 (cf. Chapter 2, Orthography).

+ l^{C}yl mn 'on top of': For MT mimma^{C}al lə-.

+ lqbl 'opposite', 'in front of': Translates a variety of MT terms: lə^{C}ênê (Gen 23:18); 'el (Gen 30:40); neged (Gen 31:37); 'el mûl (Exod 26:9). It also appears in idiomatic paraphrase, e.g., Deut 5:4 mmll lqbl mmll 'speech against speech' (MT pānîm bəpānîm), or Gen 15:10 šwy kl hd lqbl hbryh 'he placed each one opposite its fellow' (MT wayyittēn 'îš-bitrô liqra't re^{C}ēhû).

It is particularly common in the idiom sdr (sdry) qrb' lqbl 'to array the battle line in front of', e.g., Gen 14:9, Gen 15:1, Num 24:20, etc. It occurs with both singular and plural suffixes, e.g., Gen 31:5 lqbly 'towards me', Gen 31:2 lqblyh 'towards him', Exod 1:10 lqwbln 'against us' (MT bānû), but Num 24:20, Deut 2:19, etc. lqblyhwn. Note especially Gen 14:8 wsdrw lqblthwn (:) sdry qrb' 'and they arranged the battle lines before them', for the MT technical military idiom wayya^{C}arəkû 'ittām milhāmā. (There is a not uncommon letter confusion of t for y in Neofiti, cf Chapter 2, Orthography.)

+ lqdmwt 'towards': Only with singular suffixes, usually for the MT liqra't/liqrā't + verb of motion.

+ m(n) 'from': This usually translates MT min. It is also used in a partitive sense, e.g., Exod 18:25 mn kl yśr'l 'from all of Israel', Lev 4:2 hd' mnhwn 'one of them', Gen 30:14 mn ybrwhy (sic) dbryk 'some of your son's mandrakes'.

In general, MT min + infinitive is translated mn l- however cf. Gen 20:6 mlmhty 'from sinning' (MT mēh a tô). For the comparative, see Gen 4:8 w^{C}l dhww ^{C}wbdyy ṭbyn mn dydk 'and because my works were better than yours'.

It is also common in the idiom mn ... (w)ᶜd ... 'from ... to ...' (usually for MT min ... (wə)ᶜad .... The preposition takes singular suffixes. Note occasional plene spellings, e.g., Deut 3:17 myn, Gen 44:18 mynk 'from you'/mynhwn 'from them'; cf. also the numerous compound prepositions listed below.

+ mn bgyn 'on account of': With kdyn etc., cf. bgyn above.
+ mn bgll 'because of': Usually with singular suffixes, for MT baᶜabûr + suffixes, however, also independently, cf. Gen 18:24 mn bgll ḥmyšty zkyy (sic) 'because of the fifty righteous ones' (MT ləmaᶜan), etc., and numerous examples in passages without Hebrew Vorlage, or in paraphrase. Cf. bgll above.
+ mbyn 'from among': Cf. Gen 35:2 mbynykwn 'from among you' (MT bətōkᵃkem), and byn above.
+ mn btr 'after': Usually for MT 'aḥar/'aḥᵃrê, cf. btr above. Note the spelling mbtrh 'after him' in Gen 22:14.
+ mn gw' 'from within': Mostly found in the technical religious idiom wmyt w'tknš mn gw' ᶜlm' 'and he died and was gathered up from within the world' (often for MT wayyāmōt, cf. e.g., Gen 5:5 and others). It is less commonly spelled mn gw/mgw, cf. bgw above.
+ mn kl q(w)bl 'opposite', 'in front of': Usually with singular suffixes for MT minneged/ləneged. Cf. kl q(w)bl, lqbl above, and qbyl below.
+ mn lwwt 'from (the presence of)', 'by (means of)': Translates MT mē'ēt, mēᶜim, miyyad, both with and without (singular) suffixes. The preposition is variously spelled: mlwwt, mlwt, mn lwt.
+ mlᶜyl l- 'above': Infrequent, for MT mēᶜal lə-, cf. mᶜlwy below.
+ mn lrᶜ 'below': Infrequent, for MT mittaḥat, cf. mn tḥwt below.
+ mᶜlwy 'above', 'from upon/before': This is the most common spelling -- less commonly found are mᶜylwy, mᶜlwwy, mᶜylwwy, also for MT mēᶜal. So too with suffixes, e.g., Exod 10:28 mᶜlwy 'from before me' (MT mēᶜālāy), Gen 38:14 mᶜlwwh 'from upon her' (MT mēᶜāleyhā).
+ mn qdm 'from before': Most often found in the phrase mn qdm YYY 'from before the Lord', especially paraphrasing a biblical anthropomorphism, e.g., Gen 1:2 rûᵃḥ 'ᵉlōhîm = rwḥ drḥmyn mn qdm YYY 'a spirit of mercy from before the

Lord', or Num 27:18 'ᵃšer rûᵃḥ bô = drwḥ qdš mn qdm YYY šryyh ᶜlwy 'upon whom rests a holy spirit from before the Lord'. It also translates MT mippᵊnê (e.g., Gen 16:8) and min e.g., mēYHWH = mn qdm YYY, many times. The preposition takes plural suffixes, cf. qdm below.

+ mn tḥwt (1-) 'beneath', 'below': For MT mittaḥat (e.g., Gen 1:7) and mittaḥat lə (e.g., Exod 6:7). Note Gen 35:8, where the MT wattiqqābēr mittaḥat ləbêt 'el taḥat hā'allôn is condensed as w'tqbrt mn tḥwt blwṭh 'and she was buried beneath the oak', and also Exod 20:4 where the MT wa'ᵃšer bā'āreṣ mittaḥat wa'ᵃšer bammayim mittaḥat lā'āreṣ is (mistakenly?) expanded to wdy b'rᶜ' mn lrᶜ wdy bmy' mn tḥwt l'rᶜ' mn tḥwt 'and which is in the earth below, and which is in the water beneath the earth beneath'.
+ smyk 1- 'near': Paraphrasing a number of MT idioms. The example in Deut 2:19 (MT mûl) appears to be spelled smwk, but this is more likely a case of w/y letter confusion.
+ ᶜd 'up to', 'until': The preposition is used in a directional sense and a temporal sense, in both cases for MT ᶜad. Note especially the common phrase ᶜd ᶜlm 'until eternity'. It is also found often in various constructions for some Hebrew adverbials, e.g., ᶜd kdwn (MT 'āz, Gen 12:6, and often), and in a variety of paraphrases and passages with no Hebrew Vorlage.
+ ᶜd zmn 'until (the time of)': Only in the common phrase ᶜd zmm ywm' hdyn 'until this (very) day' (MT ᶜad hayyôm/ᶜad hayyôm hazze). Cf. bzmn above.
+ ᶜl 'on', 'upon': Most commonly for MT ᶜal, and in the common phrases 'tgly (mmryh dYYY) ᶜl '(the word of the Lord) was revealed to' and ᶜll ᶜl 'to enter into' (MT bā'). Cf. lwwt above.
+ ᶜl gby 'on (the surface of)': Uncommon, cf. ᶜl gby mdbḥh 'on the altar' (Lev 22:27 no MT, Gen 8:20, MT bammizbēᵃḥ).
+ ᶜl ydy 'by (means of/the hands of)': For MT min, bə, ᶜal yad; note Num 21:7 ᶜl ydyhwn dᶜm 'on behalf of (?) the people', for MT bəᶜad hāᶜām. Takes plural suffixes.
+ ᶜl ᶜsq 'concerning', 'because of': Most commonly for MT ᶜal dəbar, ᶜal 'ōdōt, ᶜal, etc. Without Vorlage, often in the idiom ᶜl ᶜsq ptgm' hdyn 'concerning this matter'. Occasional spellings ᶜl ᶜysq and once (Gen 25:21), MT lənokāḥ is translated by the plural, ᶜl

^{c}sqy. Note also Gen 26:32 ^{c}l ^{c}sq db'yrh dḥꜥrw 'concerning the well which they dug'.

+ ^{c}m 'with': Translates MT ^{c}im and its equivalents, occasionally spelled plene ^{c}ym, and cf. especially Gen 44:18 ^{c}myn! (no MT) 'with us' (= metathesis for ^{c}ymn?). Cf. gb above.

+ qbyl 'in front', 'before': Rare, e.g., Gen 31:32 (MT neged), cf. kl qwbl, lqbl, and mn kl q(w)bl above.

+ q(w)dm 'in front of', 'before': The usual translation of MT lipnê, and often in the paraphrase wgly qdm YYY 'and it was revealed before the Lord' (MT wayyar(') ^{e}lōhîm). Note also the irregular use of qdmyy l-, apparently the adjective 'first' + l- in place of qdm in Gen 29:26 lmytn z^{c}yrt' qdmyy lrb‹rb›nt' 'to give the younger before the older'. Takes plural suffixes, e.g., Deut 1:1 qdmykwn 'before you (pl)'/qwdmwy 'before him', etc.

+ tḥwt 'beneath', 'under': The usual translation for MT taḥat = 'beneath'; there are examples, however, of mistranslation for MT taḥat 'in place of' for ḥlp (q.v.), e.g., Gen 22:13 tḥwt bryh 'under (= in place of) his son', and Exod 21:26 tḥwt ^{c}ynyh 'under (= in place of) his eye'. Also occurs with both singular and plural suffixes, e.g., Gen 2:21 tḥwth 'under it' (MT taḥtennā), Gen 37:34 wšwy śq' tḥtwy 'and he placed sackcloth under him' (MT wayyāśem śaq bəmotnāyw).

CHAPTER 4

CONJUNCTIONS

The following list is presented as a complete inventory, and is divided into the following categories: Time; Place; Condition; Purpose; Manner; Coordination and Disjunction. Some prepositions are found in more than one category. Examples are only cited where comment is deemed appropriate.

1. **Time**

+ 'rwm 'when': Always translates MT kî, at times abbreviated to 'rw. Cf. 4. Purpose, below.

+ bzmnh dy '(at the time) when': All occurrences paraphrase Hebrew bə- + infinitive, with or without pronominal suffix; also common in passages without Vorlage.

+ bywm' d- 'on the day when': For MT bəyôm + infinitive.

+ bš^{c}t' d- 'at the time when': Usually for MT bə^{c}ēt/lə^{c}ēt + infinitive.

+ btr d- 'after': Not common, e.g., Gen 18:12, btr ds'byt 'after I have grown old' (MT 'aḥ^{a}rê bəlōtî). Cf. the more common mn btr d- below.

+ kd 'when': When translating Hebrew, it usually translates (wayhî) ka'^{a}šer, however, it more usually paraphrases a Hebrew infinitive with bə-, cf. e.g., Gen 9:14 (MT bə^{c}an^{a}nî), etc., or it is used in passages with no Hebrew Vorlage, cf. e.g., Gen 21:33 whwwh kd 'klyn wštyn 'when they were eating and drinking' (note that here whwwh does not translate MT wayhî!).

It is also used in a technical religious idiom in Genesis, in the phrase kd npq b- 'similar to'. In 1:26 bdmwtn kd npq bn 'in our image, similar to us' translates MT bəṣalmēnû kidmûtēnû; in 5:3 a similar phrase bdmwtyh kd npq byh 'in his image, similar to him' translates the similar (but not identical) MT bidmûtô kəṣalmô--both these phrases were obviously considered identical by the targumist; finally, in Gen 2:18 and 2:20 the MT ^{c}ezer kənegdô is also translated by the same idiom, zwg kd npq byh 'a partner, similar to him'. The idiom is possibly to be understood as a calque of late Hebrew kayyôṣē' bə, cf. Jastrow, "Dictionary," p. 926.

+ kdy 'when': This "archaism" occurs often where kd is expected, usually for MT kə/bə + infinitive, with or without pronominal suffixes. Note also Gen 12:11 whwh kdy qrb 'and when he drew near' (MT wayhî ka'^{a}šer hiqrîb),

and especially Deut 2:16 <u>whwh kd dy spw</u> 'and when they had perished' (MT <u>wayhî ka'^ašer tammû</u>).

+   <u>kywn d-</u> 'when': Unlike <u>kd/kdy</u> above, this conjunction appears only in paraphrastic or untranslated passages, cf. Gen 31:22 <u>whwh kywn d'zlw</u> 'and when they went', Num 12:12 <u>wkywn dmt' qšh</u> 'and when the appointed time came'. Spellings such as Gen 28:10 <u>kwwn d-</u> either reflect <u>w/y</u> confusion or "defective" spelling.

+   <u>kl ywmyn d-</u> 'all the days that': cf. Chapter 5, <u>Adverbials</u>, for nouns in the absolute after <u>kl</u>, and cf. also ^c<u>d zmn d-</u> below.

+   <u>mn btr d-</u> 'after': Usually translates MT <u>'ah^arê</u> + infinitive, with or without pronominal suffix, and occasionally in paraphrase. Cf. <u>btr d-</u> above.

+   <u>mn d-</u> 'when', 'after': Translates a number of MT idioms, and common in paraphrase, cf. especially Num 21:19 <u>mn d'tyhybt lhwn byr'</u> 'after the well had been given to them', paraphrasing the poetic <u>mimmattānā nah^alî'ēl</u>, and Gen 4:16 where it is used in the apodosis following ^c<u>d l'</u> 'before', <u>whwh ^cd l' qtl lhbl ... wmn dht' wqtl lhbl</u> 'and before he killed Abel ... then after he sinned and killed Abel'.

+   <u>mn zmn' d-</u> 'from the time when': Uncommon, cf. <u>mn d</u> above, and ^c<u>d zmn d</u> below.

+   ^c<u>d dy</u> 'until', 'while': For MT temporal idioms with ^c<u>ad</u>, and also in untranslated passages. There appear also to be a number of examples of ^c<u>d</u> alone used as the conjunction especially in verses without <u>Vorlage</u>, e.g., Exod 14:25 ^c<u>d 'ynwn yhybyn bmṣrym</u> 'while they were (yet?) in Egypt', and Deut 1:1 ^c<u>d 'ynwn yhybyn b^cbr yrdnh</u> 'while they were (still?) in Transjordan'. These last examples may also be ^c<u>d</u> = /^cād/, the adverb 'again', cf. the discussion in Chapter 5, <u>Adverbials</u>, ^c<u>d</u>.

+   ^c<u>d zmn d-</u> 'until': The more common translation of MT ^c<u>ad</u> + infinitive (cf. ^c<u>d dy</u> above), and also for other MT temporal idioms with ^c<u>ad</u> (^c<u>ad</u> '^ašer, ^c<u>ad</u> 'im, ^c<u>ad kî</u>). Note also Gen 24:19 ^c<u>d zmn yšlmwn</u> 'until they finish' (MT ^c<u>ad 'im-killû</u>). Also common without <u>Vorlage</u> or in paraphrase.

+   ^c<u>d l'</u> 'before': For MT <u>terem</u> (+ imperfect) and <u>lipnê</u> (+ infinitive), though much less common than <u>qdm</u> ^c<u>d l'</u> (q.v.). Cf. also <u>mn d-</u> above.

+   <u>qdm</u> ^c<u>d l'</u> 'before': The common translation of MT <u>terem</u>

(+ imperfect) and <u>lipnê</u> (+ infinitive). There are isolated examples of the spelling <u>qdm</u> ^c<u>l l'</u> with assimilation of the <u>-d</u> to the <u>l-</u>, presumably the common pronunciation, the form with ^c<u>d</u> being a standard literary spelling.

2. <u>Place</u>

+   <u>b(kl) 'tr' dy</u> 'where(ever)': For MT <u>ba'^ašer</u>, <u>māqôm</u> '^ašer, <u>bəkol məqôm '^ašer</u>, etc.

+   <u>l'n d-</u> 'whither': Occurs rarely in the MS, cf. e.g., Gen 27:8, in a mistranslation of MT <u>la'^ašer</u> 'according as', in which the Aramaic adds the imperative 'go!' to effect the sense 'to where', clearly as a result of the following verse, beginning <u>lek-nā'</u>, cf. MT <u>šəma^c bəqōlî la'^ašer '^anî məṣawwā 'ōtāk</u> = Aramaic <u>šm^c bqly w'zl l'n d'nh mpqdh ytk</u>.

+   <u>lkl 'tr dy</u> 'to wherever': Occurs once in the MS, Gen 20:13, translating MT <u>'el kol-hammāqôm '^ašer</u>. Note that <u>'tr</u> is not determined state to parallel <u>hammāqôm</u>, and cf. Chapter 5, <u>Adverbials</u>, for nouns in the absolute state after <u>kl</u>.

+   <u>mh d-</u> 'wherever': The indefinite pronoun is used only once, Gen 20:15, in the phrase <u>mh dšpr b'pk šry</u> 'dwell wherever it seems good to you', translating MT <u>baṭṭôb bə^cêneykā šēb</u>. Elsewhere <u>mh d-</u> = 'that which', cf. Chapter 6, <u>Indefinite Relative Pronouns</u>.

+   <u>mn 'n d-</u> 'from wherever': Infrequent in the MS, cf. e.g., Exod 5:11 <u>sbw lkwn tbn mn 'n dy tškḥwn</u> 'take straw for yourselves from wherever you find it' (MT <u>qəḥû lākem teben mē'^ašer timṣā'û</u>).

3. <u>Condition</u>

+   <u>'y</u> 'if': Most uncommon, cf. Gen 37:32, translating MT <u>'im-lō'</u>, as <u>'y l'</u>. Cf. <u>'n</u> below.

+   <u>'ylw</u> 'if (only)': Occurs mostly in passages without Hebrew <u>Vorlage</u>, always followed by a perfect tense. Also used in paraphrase of an MT narrative perfect, e.g., Gen 26:10 and Gen 31:27. For a passage with <u>Vorlage</u>, cf. Num 22:29 <u>'ylw hwh bydy ḥrb</u> 'if only there were a sword in my hand' (MT <u>lû yeš ḥereb bəyādî</u>).

+   <u>'(y)lwly</u> 'if it were not that': Translates MT <u>lûlê</u>, <u>lûlē'</u>.

+   <u>'n</u> 'if': Translates MT <u>'im</u>, also in the negative <u>'(y)n l'</u> = <u>'im lō'</u>. Also used in paraphrase of the Hebrew, and in passages where there is no Hebrew <u>Vorlage</u>. The spelling <u>'n</u> predominates over <u>'yn</u> at the rate of approximately 4:1. In

numerous instances, the Hebrew '_im_ is used where that word
is found in the MT.   .

+ '_rwm_ '_lh(y)n_ 'except that', 'rather': Used occasionally as
a conjunction translating MT kî '_im_ + finite verb, and
other MT idioms. Cf. the same form in Chapter 3,
Prepositions.

+ dl' 'lest', 'that not': Translates MT _pen_ + imperfect, and
'^{a}šer + lō' i.e., 'that not', followed by the imperfect
or the perfect. Also used in passages with no Hebrew
Vorlage, and in paraphrase. Note the form in Gen 39:10
dlh' (!) lmhwy ^{c}mh l^{c}lm' d'ty 'so as not to be with her
in the world to come', with the spelling dlh' apparently a
copyist error.

+ dlm' d- 'perhaps': Used as a conjunction, usually without
Hebrew Vorlage; variously spelled dylm' d-, dlmh d-. Cf.
mh dylm' d- below.

+ mh dylm' d- 'perhaps', 'what if': The common translation
of MT 'ûlay, variously spelled: mh dylm' d-, mh dylm', mh
dylmh 'm (!), mh dylmh d-, mh dylmh. Note also Gen 24:39,
mh llm' d- : (= assimilation or error?).

4. Purpose

+ 'lwly d- 'because': Uncommon, cf. Deut 1:1 (no MT).

+ '_rwm_ 'because': Often, usually for MT kî.

+ 'ry 'because': Uncommon, also for MT kî.

+ 'p ^{c}l gb d- 'in spite of the fact that': Only in
passages with no Hebrew Vorlage; note the spelling in
Num 12:16, 'wp ^{c}l gb d-.

+ bgll d- 'because': For MT ba'^{a}šer and ləma^{c}an.

+ d(y) 'because', 'that': For a variety of MT idioms, and
also very common in verses without Vorlage

+ hw'yl w- 'since': Uncommon, cf. Gen 18:17 (no MT).

+ hlp d(y) 'since', 'because': For a variety of MT purpose
idioms: ^{c}ēqeb '^{a}šer, ya^{c}an '^{a}šer, taḥat '^{a}šer.

+ lpm d- 'because': Rare, cf. Num 12:16 lpm dqmt lh mrym
^{c}l gyp nhr' 'because Miriam stood on the bank of the
river' (no MT).

+ mn bgll d(y) 'so that', 'because': The common translation
of MT ba^{ca}bûr ('^{a}šer) and ləma^{c}an ('^{a}šer), and also
in paraphrase and in passages without Vorlage, e.g.,
Gen 16:5 mn bgll dl' yqṭlwn ytk 'so that they should not
kill you', and Gen 28:10 mn bgll dhwh dbyr' mtḥmd lmmll<h>
^{c}myh 'because the Word was desirous of speaking with him'.

+ mn bly d- 'because not' For MT mibbəlî, e.g., Exod 14:11,
Deut 28:55, etc.

+ ^{c}l d(y) 'because (of the fact that)': Usually found in
passages without Hebrew Vorlage, through cf. Gen 31:20 ^{c}l
dl' tny lh 'because he did not tell him' (MT ^{c}al bəlî
higgîd lô). Note also Gen 3:22 ^{c}d dy, with assimilation
of the -l to the d- (no MT).

5. Manner

+ hyk mh d(y) '(just) as', 'according as': The common
translation for MT ka'^{a}šer, and also in paraphrase and in
passages with no Hebrew Vorlage. Note Gen 34:22, where the
form is hyk d- (MT ka'^{a}šer), and especially Deut 2:14 hyk
mn dy (!) (MT ka'^{a}šer).

+ kmh d- 'as': Uncommon, cf. Gen 18:5 kmh dmlylt' (sic) 'as
you have spoken' (MT ka'^{a}šer dibbartā).

6. Coordination and Disjunction

+ 'w 'or'. Invariably transates MT 'ô. Twice in Genesis
(24:21 and 27:21), MT 'im lō' is translated 'w l'.
Otherwise it is the normal disjunction between nominal or
verbal forms; it also occurs in passages without Vorlage,
e.g., Gen 38:25, h' hy' prgwd' dbrk 'w l' 'is this the
cloak of your son, or not?', in possible imitation of the
biblical idiom. In the parallel verse in Gen 37:32, the
phrase is 'y l', perhaps an error for 'w l' due to w/y
confusion.

+ 'l' 'but (on the other hand)': In apposition to phrases
containing l', e.g., Gen 13:7 l' hwwn zmmyn b^{c}yrhwn 'l'
mbqryn w'zlyn 'they did not muzzle their cattle but let
them graze and wander', and Gen 22:14 l' hwwh blby plgw ...
'l' mn yd 'qdmyt bṣpr' 'there was no division in my heart
... but I immediately arose in the morning', neither with
Vorlage.

+ brm 'but', 'however': Occasionally for MT '^{a}bal and
'ûlām, otherwise, it occurs in passages without Hebrew
Vorlage, and in paraphrase. Note the use in Gen 20:16,
^{c}l dy 'tksyt brm mn ^{c}yynwy dṣdyq' lyly' ḥd 'because you
were hidden, even, from the eyes of the righteous one, for
one night'.

+ w- 'and'.

Many of the adverbial expressions listed here, in particular those consisting of a preposition + nominal form, are used exclusively in paraphrastic passages or in midrashic interpolations in the text. They are often adverbial "comments" added to the text, and they are designed to provide background information on the motives, reactions, etc. of the characters, in particular those passages in which God is seen as the (often arbitrary) initiator of events. Numerous of them are indeed parts of euphemistic paraphrase to avoid either anthropomorphism or divine offense (e.g., bb^cw, $bmymr$). At other times, the comment they provide has been suggested by some word, phrase, or element in the massoretic text (cf. $brgz$, based on the MT 'ap 'also', resembling 'ap 'anger'). Where the use in Neofiti is exclusively or primarily in paraphrase, it has been so noted in the entry.

1. Adverbial Forms

+ 'p 'also': Usually translates MT gam, occasionally spelled 'wp, cf. Deut 2:11. Note also Gen 24:25 'p tbn 'p ksh sgyn ^{c}mn w'p 'tr lmbth 'there is with us both much straw and fodder and also a place to spend the night' (= MT gam ... gam ... gam), for extended adverbial usage.

+ bb^cw 'in prayer' ⟶ 'please': Only used in such idioms as the commonly occurring bb^cw brhmyn mn qdmyk, 'in prayer, with mercy from before you' addressed in prayer to God; also the similar bb^cw mn qdmyk, in speaking with God; and simply bb^cw mn, addressing angels and human beings, cf. Gen 19:2, 38:25, etc.

+ bdyn' 'it is right/just': Always in the phrase bdyn' hw' d, 'it is right that', e.g., Gen 4:24, Lev 1:1 (no MT).

+ bh $b\check{s}^ct'$ 'at that very time': Only found in passages with no Hebrew Vorlage; cf. also the next entry.

+ bhn bšnyh 'in those very years': Primarily used in the phrase wbhn bšny(y)h hwh mwl(y)d bnyn wbnn 'and in those very years he begat sons and daughters', in Genesis, e.g., 5:4, 5:7, 11:13, etc.

+ bhdwh 'joyfully': Only in paraphrase, e.g., Gen 22:14, w'qdmyt w^cbdyt mymryk bhdwh 'and I arose early and did your commandments joyfully'.

+ bkd(y)n 'then': Usually for MT 'āz. Occasional apparent spellings bkdw/y are to be understood as due to the common confusion in this MS between w/y/final n, cf. Chapter 2, Orthography.

+ bmymr 'by command': Usually in phrases such as bmymr mn qdm YYY 'by command from before the Lord'.

+ bpry^C 'quickly': The regular translation of the MT infinitive mahēr used adverbially, e.g., Exod 32:8, Deut 4:26, and often; occasionally spelled bwpry^C, e.g., Deut 9:12, etc.

+ bqwšṭ' 'truthfully', 'faithfully': Only in paraphrase, e.g., Gen 5:22.

+ brgz 'angrily', 'in anger': Only in paraphrase, but cf. especially Gen 18:23 h' brgz 't mšyṣyy' zkyy' ^{C}m ḥyyb' 'will you in anger destroy the righteous with the guilty?' (MT ha'ap tispe ṣaddîq ^{C}im-rāšā^C) with a misunderstanding(?) of 'p 'also' as 'p 'anger' leading to the Aramaic addition of brgz.

+ br^{C}ww' 'favorably': To be found in such expansions as Gen 4:4 and 4:5, wqbl YYY br^{C}ww' yt hbl wyt qrbnyh wlqyn wlqrbnyh 1' qbl br^{C}ww' 'and the Lord received Abel and his offering favorably, but Cain and his offering he did not receive favorably', paraphrasing the MT verb šā^{C}ā 'el.

+ br^{C}wt 'with pleasure' ⟶ 'it pleases': In paraphrase, in expressions such as Gen 24:42, 'm (sic) br^{C}wt qdmk lmṣlḥh 'rḥy 'if it is pleasing before you to make my way prosper', etc. Note the spelling br^{C}tkwn in Gen 24:49.

+ bšbw^{C}h 'in oath': Used of either God or human beings, e.g., Gen 4:15, w'mr lyh YYY bšbw^{C}h 'and God swore to him' (MT wayyō(')mer lô YHWH), or Gen 21:24 w'mr 'brhm h' 'n' 'štb^C w'qyym bšbw^{C}h 'and Abraham said: Behold I swear and I will carry out by oath' (MY wayyō(')mer 'abrāhām 'ānokî 'iššābē^{ac}).

+ bšlm 'in peace': Only in paraphrase, e.g., Deut 5:30 ḥzwrw lkwn bšlm lmšknykwn 'go back in peace to your tents' (MT šûbû lākem lə'oh°lêkem).

+ btkwp 'suddenly': For MT bəpeta^C, bəpeta^C pit'ōm, e.g., Num 35:22, Num 12:4. Note the apparent spelling btkyp in Num 6:9, probably a case of w/y confusion, or else cf. Jastrow, "Dictionary," p. 1668. Note also the case cited by the editor, Deut 4:42, which has btqwp, where MS 440 of the Vatican Library has btkwp. In this case,

however, the other suggested emendation, i.e., to add rwgz' appears to be indicated, given the MT.

+ gmyr' 'completely': For MT kālîl, and also in paraphrase of MT ^{C}āśû kolāh in Gen 18:21 klyyh ^{C}bdw gmyr' 'they did the destruction completely'.

+ dmḥr 'tomorrow', 'on the next day': Only in Gen 30:33 wyshdn ^{C}ly zkwwty bywm' hdn wdmḥr 'and my righteous deeds will witness for me this day and the next day', expanding the MT wə^{C}āntā-bî ṣidqātî bəyôm māḥār, perhaps ellipsis for bywm' hdn wbywm' dmḥr.

+ hdh zmnh 'now', 'this time': Always translates MT happa^{C}am.

+ hkh 'here': Translates various Hebrew idioms, pōh, hēnnā, kōh (Gen 31:37), mizze (mn hk') and also in paraphrase, lō' hāyətā bazze in parallel verses in Gen 38:21/39:22 as lyt hk'. It is also used idiomatically in Gen 24:60 brm mn hk' wlhl' 't 'zlh 'but from here and henceforth you shall go'.

+ zmn tn(y)ynwt 'again', 'a second time': Mostly translates MT šēnît (e.g., Gen 41:5, Lev 13:58, occasionally for MT ^{C}ōd.

+ ḥzwr ḥzwr 'round about': For MT sābîb and its derivatives. Note also Gen 35:5 dy ḥzwr ḥzwr ythwn (with the first ḥzwr dotted out, apparently a mistake by the copyist, who seems to have assumed dittography, i.e., ḥzwr for the correct ḥzwr ḥzwr) 'which is around about them', translating MT 'ªšer səbîbôtêhem.

± ḥs l- 'far be it from': Only in Gen 38:25, ḥs lh tmr klty hy' m^{C}br' bnyn dznw 'far be it from her, Tamar my daughter-in-law, that she conceive children of harlotry'. Cf. also Gen 44:7 (expected but missing in the text); see also mḥws below.

+ y'wt 'rightly', 'correctly': Usually in paraphrase, though cf. Deut 13:15 (= MT hêṭēb).

+ ywm btr ywm 'day after day': For MT yôm yôm.

+ ywm' hd(y)n 'today': For MT hayyôm and hayyôm hazze. Note that in Gen 24:42, MT hayyôm is rendered ywm' dyn whereas Gen 25:33, kayyôm 'this (very) day' is translated as an apparent calque kywm' hdyn. Cf. also dmḥr above.

+ ywm hd 'in/for one day': For MT yôm 'eḥad.

+ kdwn 'now': Primarily translates MT ^{C}attā, but also ^{C}ōd and its variants, as well as less common idioms, e.g., hªlōm. Also common in verses where there is no Hebrew Vorlage in phrases such as h' kdwn, ^{C}d kdwn, mn kdwn, etc.

+ kd(y)n 'thus': Mostly translates MT kēn, especially in the phrase bgyn kdyn translating MT ^{C}al-kēn. Also for MT kōh, ^{C}attā, and twice, Gen 10:18 and 24:5, the idiom mn btr kd(y)n 'then', 'afterwards', translates MT 'aḥar; in Gen 6:4 it translates 'aḥ^{a}rê-kēn. Cf. also mn bgyn kdyn 'therefore' and kl kdyn 'all this'. The spelling kdn is rare.

+ kḥd' 'together': For MT yaḥdāw.

+ kk 'thus': Only in Gen 38:26, in the phrase bgyn kk, translating MT ^{C}al-kēn (cf. kdyn above).

+ kmst 'worthy' ⟶ 'in accordance with': In Num 7:7, kmst pwlḥn{y}hwn 'in accordance with their service' (MT kəpî ^{Ca}bōdātām), otherwise Deut 16:10/17 and Gen 20:16 and elsewhere in paraphrase or used adjectivally.

+ k(y)n 'thus': Usually for MT kēn, and without Vorlage, especially in the phrase wkn ktb' wmprš w'mr 'and thus (says) the Scripture, and it explains saying' (e.g., Gen 30:22). The spelling without -y- is the more common.

+ k^{C}n 'now', 'please': Translates MT nā' often, after imperatives etc., and also in h' k^{C}n 'and now', translating MT hinne-nā' (often). Also used in numerous paraphrastic contexts.

+ lbr' 'outside': Usually translates MT haḥûṣā/baḥûṣ (e.g., Gen 19:7, Num 35:4, etc.); cf. also Gen 19:6 where the paraphrase of wayyēṣē' '^{a}lēhem lôṭ happetḥā 'and Lot went out to them to the door' is wnpq lwwthwn lbr' 'and he went out to them outside'.

+ lhl(') 'away', 'beyond': The normal translation for MT hāl'ā (e.g., Gen 19:19, Num 17:2, etc.) and also in the common idiom mn hk' wlhl' 'from here/now and henceforth' (cf. hkh above).

+ lḥd' 'very': Translates MT mə'ōd. Cf. the next entry.

+ lḥd' lḥd' 'very much', 'exceedingly': For the MT extended idioms (bi)mə'ōd mə'ōd.

+ lḥwd 'only': The common translation for MT gam, 'ak, and raq.

+ l^{C}lm 'forever': Translates MT lə^{C}ōlām.

+ ltmn 'thither': Translates MT šāmmā.

+ mgn 'for nothing': Always for MT ḥinnām; cf. ^{C}l mgn below.

+ mḥws 'grace' ⟶ 'far be it from': In the idiom (b)mḥws mn qdm 'please do not ── ', for MT ḥālîlā and paraphrase (e.g., Gen 19:16). Cf. ḥs l- above.

+ mlgw' '(from) within': In Gen 6:14, translating MT mibbayit (opposed to mn lbr (q.v.) = miḥûṣ '(from) without').

+ mlqdmyn 'in the beginning': In Gen 1:1, translating MT bərē(')šît and also in Deut 33:27 mdwr 'yqr škynth d'lh' mlqdmyn 'the dwelling place of the Shekinah of God is from the beginning', based on the poetic mə^{C}ōnā '^{e}lōhê qedem. Cf. also Gen 3:24 w'šry yqr škyntyh mn mlqdmyn (sic) mn mdnḥ 'and the Glory of his Shekinah placed from the beginning to the east' etc., paraphrasing the MT wayyaškēn miqqedem ləgan-^{C}ēden etc.

+ mn btr 'afterwards': Only in Gen 30:21, translating MT wə'aḥar, apparently ellipsis for mn btr kdyn (see kd(y)n above.

+ mn yd 'immediately': Only in paraphrase, e.g., Gen 22:14 mn yd 'qdmyt bṣpr' 'I immediately arose early in the morning', and Lev 22:27, also based on the Abraham story. Also spelled myd.

+ mn ywm' dbtryh 'on the next day': In Num 11:32 for MT mimmoḥ^{o}rāt; cf. also Gen 19:34, mn ywm' dbtr which is probably an abbreviation for mn ywm' dbtrh as Díez Macho emends, even though there appears to be no abbreviation mark on the word (which is the last word in the line).

+ mn lbr '(from) without': In Gen 6:14, translating MT miḥûṣ; see lbr' and mlgw' above.

+ mn l^{C}yl 'above': For MT miləma^{C}əlā, however note also Deut 3:24 bšmyy' mn l^{C}yl ... ^{C}l 'r^C' mn lr^C (q.v.) 'in heaven above ... on earth below', based on MT baššāmayim ûbā'āreṣ.

+ mn lr^C 'below': cf. mn l^{C}yl above, and also Exod 20:4 (MT mittaḥat).

+ mn qwšṭ' 'truly': For MT hā'umnām, 'omnā, h^{a}kî and 'ākēn, in a variety of passages.

+ mn tmn 'from there': Translates MT miššām and without Vorlage in the same sense, cf. e.g., Gen 21:33 wl' hwwn z^{C}yyn mn tmn 'and they would not move from there'. Also spelled mtmn.

+ ^{C}d l^{C}lmyn 'forever': Only in midrash, e.g., Gen 3:22 'yt hwh ḥy wqyym k'ln ḥyy' ^{C}d l^{C}lmyn 'he would live and endure as the tree of life forever' (see l^{C}lm above).

+ ^{C}d 'again', 'another': (= ^{C}ad) in Gen 29:27 for MT ^{C}ôd and in Gen 25:6 ^{C}d hwwh bḥyyn 'he was still alive' for MT bə^{C}ôdennû ḥay. Spelled often ^{C}wd, presumably

the Hebrew $^c\hat{o}d$ introduced to avoid confusion with the preposition $^c\underline{d}$ (= ^cad), also translating $^c\hat{o}\underline{d}$, and frequently the combined form $^cwd\ twb$. Also in verses without <u>Vorlage</u> with the same meaning (cf. <u>twb</u> below).

+ $^c\underline{l}\ mgn$ 'in vain': In the Decalogue, Exod 20:7, for MT <u>laššāw'</u> (cf. <u>mgn</u> above).

+ <u>štq</u> 'silently': A participle used adverbially, cf. Gen 24:21 translating MT <u>mah^{a}rîs</u>, <u>wgbr</u> (sic) <u>hwh šty wmstkl bh štq</u> 'and the man drank and looked at her silently'.

+ <u>twb</u> 'again': The common translation of MT $^c\hat{o}\underline{d}$, cf. $^c\underline{d}$ above.

+ <u>tmn</u> 'there': Translates MT <u>šām</u>, cf. <u>ltmn</u> and <u>mn tmn</u> above.

2. <u>Interjections and Introductory Particles</u>

+ <u>'l(w)wy(y)</u> 'oh that', 'would that': Translates MT interjections <u>lû</u> and <u>hēn lû</u> (e.g., Num 14:2, Gen 17:18, etc.); in paraphrase, cf. Gen 21:7 <u>w'mrt 'lwwy mn yyzyl wtny</u> ... 'and she said: Oh, who will go and tell ...' (MT <u>wattō(')mer mî millēl lə'abrāhām</u>), and especially Num 24:23 <u>'lwwyy mn yyhy bywmy' h'ynwn</u> ... 'Oh who will live in those days ...' (based on the poetic MT <u>'ôy mî yihye miśśûmô 'ēl</u>). For a similar idiom, and in particular the example in Num 23:10, cf. <u>lwwy</u> below.

+ <u>h'</u> 'here', 'behold': Usually in translation of MT <u>hēn</u>, <u>hinne</u>, and the interrogative proclitic <u>h^a-</u>. Note Gen 24:23, where the same proclitic in the MT <u>h^{a}yeš</u> is translated by <u>h'yt</u> 'is there?'. It is commonly used in translating MT <u>hinne</u> + suffixes, cf. e.g., Gen 6:17 <u>h' 'nh</u> (= <u>hinanî</u>) and Gen 16:11 <u>h' 't</u> (= <u>hinnāk</u>). (Note that three times in Genesis 22, verses 1, 7 and 11, the Hebrew word <u>hnny</u> 'here I am' is used by Abraham in his answer to God, presumably due to the explanation advanced in 22:1 $^c\underline{ny}$ <u>'brhm blšn byt qwdš' w'mr lyh 'brh⟨m⟩ hnny</u> 'Abraham answered in the language of the Sanctuary and Abraham said to Him, Here I am'. However, note that in Gen 27:18, in the dialogue between Jacob and Isaac, the same <u>hnny</u> (= MT) is used. There are also many examples of <u>h'</u> used in passages without Hebrew <u>Vorlage</u>: with verbs, e.g., Gen 3:22 <u>h' nytrw⟨d⟩ ytyh mn gnth d^{c}dn</u> 'we will expell him from the garden of Eden', and Gen 15:7 <u>h' šmš' tm^c</u> 'the sun set'; with nouns, e.g., also Gen 15:7 <u>wh' ghynm</u> 'and here was Gehinnom'.

+ <u>hl'</u> 'is it not that': Usually used where MT has <u>h^{a}lō'</u>, however cf. e.g., Gen 6:3 <u>hl' mhtm hw' qdm⟨y⟩y sdr dyn' ddry⟨h⟩ dmbwl'</u> 'is it not that the judgement of the generation of the flood is sealed before me', without Hebrew <u>Vorlage</u>.

+ <u>wwy</u> 'woe': Common in the phrase <u>wwy k^{c}n ^{c}ly</u> 'oh woe is me', usually without Hebrew <u>Vorlage</u>, however cf. Num 21:29 <u>wwy lkwn mw'byy</u> 'woe to you, Moabites' (MT <u>'ôy-ləkā mô'āb</u>).

+ *<u>twby</u>-- 'happy is -- ': Uncommon in the Pentateuch, cf. Gen 38:25 <u>wtwbwy kl 'nš dmgly ^{c}wbdwy</u> 'and happy is every man who reveals his works' (no MT), and Deut 33:29 <u>twbykwn yśr'l mn kwwtkwn</u> 'happy are you, Israel, who is like you?' (MT <u>'ašreykā yiśrā'ēl mî kāmôkā</u>).

+ <u>lwwy</u> 'if only': Common in the phrase <u>'n lwwy</u>, cf. Gen 23:13 <u>lhwd 'n lwwy 't mqbl mny</u> 'but if only you would listen to me' (MT <u>'ak 'im-'attā lû šəmā^{c}ēnî</u>), especially in <u>'n lwwy mn ytn</u> ... 'if only, who would give ...' (e.g., Deut 5:29, 28:67), for MT <u>mî yittēn</u>. Note particularly Exod 16:3 <u>'lwy</u> (< <u>'n lwy</u>?) <u>my</u> (sic) <u>ytn</u>, also for MT <u>mî yittēn</u> and Num 23:10, where there appears to be a conflated reading of the poetic passage: <u>lwwyy tyhwy swpyh 'lwwy tyhwy 'hryth hz^{c}yrh dbhwn</u> 'would that his end will be, would that his last day will be as (that of) the least among them' (MT ... <u>ûtəhî 'ah^{a}rîtî kāmôhû</u>). Cf. <u>'lwwy</u> above.

3. <u>Negatives</u>

+ <u>l'</u> 'no', 'not': Common in verses without <u>Vorlage</u> and also for MT <u>lō'</u> (and <u>'al</u>) in a variety of functions:

    i) as an interjection: Gen 18:15 <u>l' 'rwm ghkt</u> 'no but you did laugh' (MT <u>lō' kî ṣāhāqt</u>), Gen 27:21 <u>h' 't hw' dyn bry ^{c}św 'w l'</u> 'are you really my son Esau, or not' (MT <u>ha'attā ze bənî ^{c}ēśāw 'im-lō'</u>), Num 13:20 <u>h' 'yt bh 'ylnyn 'w l'</u> 'are there trees in it, or not' (MT <u>h^{a}yeš bāh ^{c}ēṣ 'im-'ayin</u>);

    ii) negating an adjective: Gen 7:2 <u>dy l' dky' hw'</u> 'which is not clean' (MT <u>'^{a}šer lō' ṭəhōrā</u>);

    iii) negating a noun or nominal phrase: Gen 20:12 <u>lhwd l' brth d'mh</u> 'but not the daughter of my mother' (MT <u>'ak lō' bat-'immî</u>), Deut 5:3 <u>l' ^{c}m 'bhtn qyym YYY yt qyymh hdyn</u> 'not with our fathers did the Lord establish this covenant' (MT <u>lō' 'et-'^{a}bōtênû kārat YHWH 'et-habbərît hazzō(')t</u>);

iv) negating a possessive; Gen 15:13 b'r^C' dl' dydhwn
'in a land which is not theirs' (MT bə'ereṣ lō' lāhem);

v) negating a verb in the perfect or imperfect: Deut 8:4
lbwšykwn l' blwn m^Cylwykwn wrglykwn l' hlykw hpyyn
'your garments did not wear out from off you, and your
feet did not go unshod' (MT śimlātəkā lō' bālətā
mē^Cāleykā wəragləkā lō' bāṣēqā), Gen 18:15 l' gh‹k›t
'I did not laugh' (MT lō' ṣāḥaqtî);

vi) as a negative imperative/jussive: Gen 35:17 l' tdḥlyn
'do not fear' (MT 'al-tîr'î), Exod 20:5 l' tsgdwn lhwn
'you shall not bow down to them' (MT lō'-tištaḥwe),
Gen 31:35 l' yb'š b'pwy drybwny 'let it not be evil in
my master's sight' (MT 'al-yi(ḥ)ḥar bə^Cênê
'^adōnî), Exod 20:7 l' ysb gbr mnkwn 'let not any man
from among you take' (MT lō' tiśśā').

l' is also used in idiomatic expressions:

i) l' ... wl' 'neither ... nor', e.g., Gen 26:35 l' mn
yṣḥq wl' mn rbqh 'neither from Isaac nor from Rebecca'
(no MT), Gen 30:22 l' lml'k' wl' lśrp (sic) 'neither
to an angel nor to a seraph' (no MT);

ii) wl' ^Cwd 'and no more', e.g., Gen 2:23 hd' zmn' wl'
^Cwd 'this time and no more' (MT zō(')t happa^Cam).

+ lyt '(there) is not': This occurs translating MT 'ên etc.,
and also in idiomatic paraphrases:

i) it functions as the negative of 'yt (see Predicate of
Existence, below): Gen 4:8 lyt dyn wlyt dyyn etc.
'there is no justice and there is no judge ...'
parallel to 'yt dyn w'yt dyyn etc. 'there is justice
and there is a judge ...' later in the same verse (no
MT). As such, it translates MT 'ên, e.g., Num 14:42
lyt 'yqr škynth dYYY šry ^Clykwn 'the glory of the
Shekinah of the Lord does not dwell upon you' (MT
'ên YHWH bəqirbəkem), Gen 37:24 lyt byh myyn 'there is
no water in it' (MT 'ên bô māyim);

ii) it also translate 'ên + suffixes: Gen 20:7 w'yn lyt
't mḥzyr yth 'and if you do not return her' (MT wə'im
'ênkā mēšîb), Gen 39:9 lyt rb wšlyt bbyth hdyn mny
'there is none greater or more powerful in this house
than I' (MT 'ênennû gādôl babbayit hazze mimmennî);

iii) it occurs as the negative of possession: Gen 15:1 lyt
ly hwl‹q› l^Clm' d'ty 'I have no part in the world to
come' (no MT), Exod 22:1 lyt lyh ḥwbt špykt 'dm zkyy
'he shall not have guilt for spilling innocent blood'

(‹MT 'ên lô dāmîm), Num 20:5 'wp l' myyn lyt ln lmšty
'even water we do not have to drink' (‹MT ûmayim 'ayin
lištôt);

iv) it occurs often as the negation of a participle (for
MT imperfect or participle): Deut 1:9 lyt 'nh ykyl 'I
am not able' (MT lō'-'ûkal), and see also Gen 44:26
and Num 13:31 (lyt 'nn yklyn 'we are not able'),
Deut 7:22 (lyt 'twn yklyn 'you (pl) are not able'),
etc., Deut 1:32 lyt 'twn mhyymnyn 'you (pl) do not
believe' (MT 'ênkem ma'amînîm), Exod 32:1 lyt 'nn
yd^Cyn 'we do not know' (MT stative perfect lō'
yāda^Cnû), etc.;

v) note the following idioms: (a) Gen 18:1 lyt 'pšr lḥd
mml'ky mrwm' dy ... 'it is not possible for one of the
heavenly angels that ...' (no MT), and see also
Gen 4:14, 29:15, etc.; (b) Num 14:16 lyt yklh qdm YYY
'there was (= is) not the ability before the Lord'—→
'it was not possible for the Lord' (‹MT mibbiltî
yəkōlet YHWH), and cf. the parallel positive phrase in
vs 14:12 (and also Exod 32:10) 'yt yklh qdmyy lmmnyh
ytk l'wmh rbh wtqyph mnhwn 'there is the ability
before me to appoint you as a people greater and
mightier than them';

vi) note also the unusual negation of an imperfect verb in
Gen 19:19 w'n' lyt 'wkl 'and as for me, I am not able'
(MT wə'ānōkî lō' 'ûkal), cf. (iv) above.

4. Predicate of Existence

+ 'yt 'there is': Usually translates MT yeš, e.g., Gen 18:24
mh dylm' d'yt ḥmšyn zkyyn bgw qrt' 'perhaps there are fifty
righteous in the city' (MT 'ûlay yeš ḥ^amiššîm ṣaddîqîm
bətôk hā^Cîr), Num 13:20 h' 'yt bh 'ylnyn 'w l' 'are there
trees in it, or not' (MT h^ayeš bāh ^Cēṣ 'im-'ayin). It
is not the usual translation for MT yeš + suffixes, where a
form of r^Cwt is preferred (e.g., Gen 43:4 'n br^Cwtk
mšlḥh 'if (it is) in your wish (to) send', for MT 'im-yeškā
məšallē^aḥ, etc.), however cf. also Deut 13:4 h' 'yt rḥmyn
yt 'wlpn 'wryyth dYYY 'is there love for the teaching of
the law of the Lord?' (‹MT h^ayiškem 'ōh^abîm 'et-YHWH).
It is also common in passages without Hebrew Vorlage, e.g.,
Gen 4:8 'yt dyn w'yt dyyn w'yt ^Clm 'whrn w'yt mtn 'gr ṭb
lṣdyqy' w'yt mtpr^Ch mn rš^Cy‹'› l^Clm' d'ty 'there is
justice and a judge and another world and the giving of

good reward to the just and retribution exacted from the wicked in the world to come', and many other examples.

As the possessive, it translates MT _yeš 1-_, e.g., Gen 33:9 _'yt ly sgyn_ 'I have much' (MT _yeš-lî rāb_), or MT _1-_, e.g., Gen 27:38 _h' brkh ḥd' 'yt lk_ 'do you have one blessing?' (MT _habərākā 'aḥat hî' ləkā_), and also often in paraphrase or untranslated passages, e.g., Lev 19:18 _'yt lh zkw bdynh_ 'he has innocence in the law' (no MT), and especially Gen 31:29 _'yt ^{c}my ḥyl w'wklsyn sgyn_ 'there are with me many soldiers and people' (MT _yeš-lə'ēl yādî_).

It is also to be found in idiomatic and other expressions, for example in translating the common MT _'^{a}šer b-_ as _d'yt b-_ 'in which there is' (the same is also found without Vorlage, e.g., Gen 30:22 _d'yt bhwn r^{c}w'_ 'in which there is pleasure'). Noteworthy also are the constructions, the negative of which were discussed above (Negatives, _lyt_), _h' 'yt 'pšr_ 'is it possible?' (e.g., Gen 18:14) and _'yt yklh qdm_ 'there is ability before -- ' (e.g., Gen 4:13, Exod 32:10); similarly to be noted is the unusual example with finite verb in Gen 3:22 _'ylw nṭr mṣwth d'wryt' wqyym pqwdh 'yt hwh ḥy wqyym k'ln ḥyy' ^{c}d 1^{c}lmyn_ 'if he had kept the commandments of the law and observed its precepts, he would have lived and endured like the tree of life forever, (but now, since he did not ...)' in a midrashic expansion based on the MT _wə'ākal wāḥay lə^{c}ōlām._

1. **Independent Personal Pronouns**

The following forms are attested:

	Singular	Plural
1	'n'/'nh	'nn/'nḥn'
2m	't	'twn
f	't	---
3m	hw'	'nwn/'ynwn/'nn(!)
f	hy'	'ynyn/'nwn(!)

Remarks:

1s: The spelling _'n'_ predominates over _'nh_ at the rate of about 2:1

2fs: There is no orthographic difference between the 2ms and the 2fs; the latter is recognized from context e.g., Gen 24:23 _brt mn 't_ 'whose daughter are you?' (MT _bat-mî 'att_), and is only found in verses with Vorlage. There are two noteworthy examples in Gen 12:13, the form is written, in a cramped line, merely as א , apparently just a copyist error for אֵת; also, in verse 11, the MT _'iššā yəpat mar'e 'āt_ is translated as _'t(!) špyrt ḥzy 't_ 'you are a woman beautiful of appearance'. Here, the first _'t_ should probably be read as an error for _'t'_ 'woman', rather than as apposition, or the like.

3ms: The expected _hw'_ often appears to be written _hy'_ due to the common _w/y_ confusion in the MS, cf. Chapter 2, Orthography.

3fs: In Gen 35:6, the form is written _hy_, probably to be understood as an abbreviation, even though the expected abbreviation mark is absent (or else, a simple spelling error on the part of the copyist).

1pl: The common form in _'nn_, either for MT _'^{a}naḥnû_ e.g., Deut 5:3 _'rwm 'lhn ^{c}mn h' 'nn kwln hkh ywmh hdyn ḥyyn wqyymyn_ 'but rather with us, behold, we, all of us here this day are alive and enduring' (MT _kî 'ittānû '^{a}naḥnû 'ēlle pōh hayyôm kullānû ḥayyim_), or for MT _naḥnû_, e.g., Exod 16:7,8 _w'nn mh 'nn ḥšybyn_ 'and as for us, what are we accounted?' (MT _wənaḥnû māh kî tallînû ^{c}ālēnû/wənaḥnû māh lō'-^{c}ālēnû_

təlūnnōtêkem), and also Gen 42:11, Num 32:32. The "archaic" 'nḥn' occurs once, in Gen 37:7, and note also Gen 13:8 where the MT kî-'ᵃnāšîm 'a(ḥ)ḥîm 'ᵃnaḥnû is translated in error as 'rwm hyk gwbryn 'ḥyn 'n' (sic, = 'nn) 'for we are like brothers'.[1]

2pl: The 2mpl does not occur frequently in the Pentateuch; the 2fpl is expected only in Gen 31:6, but here it is missing in favor of the Hebrew lemma, viz. w'tnh ydᶜtn ('rwm) ...[2]

3mpl: The spelling 'ynwn occurs twice as often as 'nwn. The form 'nn(!) only occurs in Gen 26:20 dynn 'nn my' 'the water is ours' (MT lānû hammāyim). This form may be influenced by the spelling of the previous word dynn 'ours', or, more likely, it may be emphatic opposition, i.e., the 1pl pronoun (q.v.).

3fpl: The form 'ynyn only occurs once (Gen 33:6, subject lḥynth 'concubines', MT haššəpāḥôt); elsewhere, the 3mpl '(y)nwn is used (e.g., Gen 21:29, subject šbᶜty 'mrt' h'yln 'these seven lambs', MT šebaᶜ kəbāśôt hā'ēlle, Gen 28:8, subject bnthwn dknᶜnᶜ'y (sic) 'the daughters of the Canaanites', MT bənôt kənāᶜan, cf. also Gen 6:2).[3]

2. Pronominal Suffixes Attached to Singular Nouns

The following forms are found attached to nouns ending in a consonant:

	Singular	Plural
1	-y	-n/-nn/-n' (!)
2m	-k	-kwn
f	-(y)k	(-kwn)
3m	-(y)h	-hwn
f	-h	-h(y)n

When attached to nouns ending originally or presently in a vowel (e.g., 'ḥ) the forms are:

	Singular	Plural
1	'ḥy	'ḥwnn
2m	'ḥwk	'ḥwkwn
f	'ḥwk	('ḥwkwn)
3m	'ḥw(h)y	'ḥwhwn
f	'ḥwh	'ḥwhn

Remarks:

1s: There are occasional apparent spellings of the 1s suffix with -w, due to the w/y confusion previously mentioned, cf. Chapter 2, Orthography. With the two kinship terms 'b 'father' and 'm 'mother', the 1s suffix is replaced by the determined state either as a term of deference or as a vocative, e.g., 'bh/'b' 'my father' or 'oh father!' This should not be confused with occasional spelling errors, such as Exod 5:1 wyḥgwn qdm'(!) bmdbr' 'and they will celebrate a feast before me (!) in the desert', MT wəyāḥōggû lî bammidbār. Note should also be taken of the unusual form in Gen 37:9 š'lyn bšlmyy 'ask after my welfare' ⟶ 'give me greeting', written with -yy. This may indeed be the plural noun šlmyn, but this word does not usually occur in the plural in Aramaic (and nowhere else in this MS). The idiom is always used elsewhere in the singular (e.g., Gen 37:10 lmš'l bšlmk, and many other examples), and hence the example in Gen 37:9 may be simple copyist error.

2ms: The form is always -k (vocalized presumably -āk after consonants), with occasional rare errors of the plural suffix for the singular, e.g., Gen 27:40 ṣww'ryk 'your neck'. In Gen 17:2, the expected ytk is written ytn (!) with orthographic confusion of final n (ן) for final k (ך), cf. Chapter 2, Orthography.

2fs: The 2fs is ideally -yk (= -ik), but it is just as regularly written defectively -k (compare qltk 'your jug' in Gen 24:43 with qwltyk in Gen 24:14, etc.).

3ms: Again, the form is ideally -yh (= -eh), but it appears as often (if not more often) written defectively -h. Nouns ending in consonantal -y are written with one -y-, e.g., Gen 11:1 šrwyh 'its beginning' (i.e., šeruyeh).

There are some examples of nouns ending in א where the 3ms suffix would be expected, e.g., Gen 27:41 blb' 'in (his) heart' (MT bəlibbô) or Gen 36:32, 36:39 qrt' '(his) city' (MT ᶜîrô), which should be seen as the determined state of the noun, rather than as -' = -eh, however cf. the impossible form in Exod 4:3, tlq yt' (!) 'cast it' (MT hašlîkēhû), and also the form in Exod 5:1 (qdm') cited above. Attached to nouns ending in a vowel, the 3ms

2fs: The 2fs suffix is always -yk, though presumably not distinguished from the 2ms in pronunciation (i.e., both = -ak, due to extension of the masculine form to the feminine of section 2 above).

3ms: The suffix is usually written -wy (= -owi/-o'i), derived from an earlier -why (= -ohi). The development of this suffix is complicated: original -ahu > -au, to which the suffix was secondarily readded, -au + hu > -awhu > -ohu, with dissimilation to -ohi. This earlier form occurs occasionally in the MS, but its distribution appears to be limited to a number of nominals: the prepositions qdmwhy and ^Clwhy, and the nouns bnwhy, hywhy, ydwhy, nšwhy, ^Cwlymwhy and ^Cyynwhy, i.e., all nouns that indicate inalienable possession (see Chapter 9, Syntax). The motivation for the retention of the historical spelling is not immediately obvious, but the limited distribution of the forms argues that they are clearly retentions and in no way reflect the actual pronunciation of the suffix. (The original suffix -hu > -hi, which has not undergone the development described above for -ohi, is seen on the forms *'bw 'father' and *'hw 'brother', i.e., 'bwhy = 'əbuhi, Gen 22:7 etc., and 'hwhy = 'əhuhi, Gen 31:46, alongside the expected 'bwy/'hwy, although superficially these two separate suffixes appear to have had the same development.

There are a variety of noteworthy forms in Genesis:

(a) In Gen 27:41 'his life' is written hywby for hywwy, certainly a copyist error reflecting the medieval pronunciation of -w- as [v], i.e., hayyowi = [hayyovi], written hywby;

(b) There are occasional examples of the 3ms suffix for the 3fs on 'b/'h in Genesis Chapter 29, apparently a scribal/copyist error due to the more common occurrence of the masculine suffix;

(c) Finally, the two forms mwy (dmbwl') 'waters (of the flood)' (7:7, 7:10, 9:11 and elsewhere) and hwy 'his life' (11:32) for expected mywy (not attested) and hywy (e.g., 5:7) appear to result from a misinterpretation of the -y- of myn as part of the plural suffix and not as a radical of

the word Hence the root m- was extracted to which the suffix was then attached, i.e., mowi. This was then presumably extended to hy(y)n, even though the -y- in this word = [yy] i.e., a doubled consonant, with the resulting h- + suffix ⟶ hwy, i.e., howi.

Of course, with the noun 'h, the singular and plural forms with 3ms suffix are homographous, i.e., 'hwy = 'his brother' or 'his brothers', but presumably differed in pronunciation as in, e.g., Targum Onkelos, singular = '^ahuwi, plural = 'a(h)howi.

3fs: The suffix is usually written -yh, with occasional rare defective spellings -h,. e.g., Gen 24:46 m^Clwh 'from above her', Gen 21:19+ ^Cyynh 'her eyes' (MT ^Cêneyhā), indicating a pronunciation -ah, homophonous with the suffix added to the singular noun.

There are two examples in Genesis of the archaic suffix -h'/-hh (cf. e.g., the Genesis Apocryphon for similar archaic retentions): in 25:22 the MT bəqirəbāh is translated bm^Ch' 'in her womb' (=bimə^Cehā?), vs. the expected m^Cyyh in Gen 38:27; in 33:7, the MT wîlādêhā is transalted wbnhh (= wabənehā?), vs. the expected bnyh in Gen 3:15, plus other examples.

1pl: In accordance with the rule enunciated for the singular noun, i.e., following a vowel the suffix is always -nn, the 1 pl suffix is always found as -ynn (= -enan). Note also trynn 'the two of us'.

Noteworthy also is the form in Gen 29:22 b'rnn (!), clearly to be vocalized as plural be(')renan 'our wells' with the suffix written defectively (otherwise the suffix would have been written -n, as on a singular noun).

The only other exceptional form is ^Cln' 'over us' (Gen 37:8), translating MT ^Cālênû, apparently to be vocalized ^Cəlenā (cf. Biblical Aramaic, Ezra 4:12 etc.), an archaism as in ln' and 'r^Cn', see above, section 2.

2pl: The normal form of the 2mpl is -ykwn (= -ekon), with occasional defective spellings -kwn, e.g., Gen 3:5 wytpthn ^Cyynkwn 'and your eyes will be opened'. There are no 2fpl forms attested.

3mpl: Similarly, the 3mpl form is normally -yhwn (= -ehon), with occasional defective spellings -hwn, e.g., Gen 37:25 qmlhwn 'their camels' (MT gəmallêhem) inter alia. Note also Gen 36:7, where an apparent Hebrew suffix mmwnyhm(!) appears to result from a later hand ligaturing the Aramaic]ן→]ה, cf. Chapter 2, Orthography.

Noteworthy is the alternation in Genesis translating MT (bi)šəmōtām '(by) their names' (i.e., written defectively without -w- in the MT), between (b)šmtyhwn (25:13, 36:40), i.e., apparently imitating the plural Hebrew houn form + the Aramaic suffix and šmhtwn (25:16), i.e., the "correct" Aramaic irregular plural form + the singular form of the suffix.

3fpl: The 3fpl suffix is usually written -yhn (= -ehen), with occasional examples of the 3mpl suffix extended to the feminine, e.g., Gen 31:43 bnyhwn 'their sons' (subject = bnty 'my daughters', MT bənêhen).

4. **Demonstrative Pronouns**

The following forms are attested:

ms   dyn / dn / dnh
fs   d'
m/f pl   'lyn / 'ylyn / 'ln

Remarks:

ms: The spelling dyn is only slightly more frequent than dn, both in passages for MT ze and in passages that have no Masoretic Vorlage. There are occasional instances of the older dnh for MT ze, usually in difficult passages not always well understood by the "translator," e.g., Gen 27:36 wh' ^Cqb yty dnh tryn zmnyn 'surely this one has been on my heels twice', for MT wayya^Cəqəbēnî ze pa^{Ca}mayim, i.e., 'for he has supplanted me these (!) two times'.

fs: The fs d' translates MT zō(')t, and also occurs in passages without Vorlage, e.g., Gen 30:15 h' z^Cyr' hy' d' 'is this a little thing?', paraphrasing MT hamə^Cat. As in other Aramaic dialects, this feminine form is used for the "neuter," as in Gen 30:15, and also e.g., Gen 4:10 mh hy' d' d^Cbdt 'what is this that you have done?' (MT me ^Caśîtā, cf. Gen 26:10). There are occasional translation

errors, when a masculine Aramaic noun is treated as feminine because it translates a feminine Hebrew noun, e.g., Gen 17:10 d' qymy 'this is my covenant' (MT zō(')t bərîtî). Note also the unusual mistake(?) in Gen 36:10, d' r^Cw'l bt bśmt 'this is Reuel, daughter of Bosmat', misinterpreting the Hebrew '^elîpaz ben-^Cādā 'ešet ^Ceśāw rə^Cû'ēl ben-bośmat 'ešet ^Ceśāw '(these are the names of the sons of Esau) Eliphaz son of Adah, wife of Esau, Reuel son of Bosmat, wife of Esau' by identifying Reuel with Eliphaz, and as a woman (?), perhaps due to a misunderstanding of the term 'ešet ^Ceśāw 'wife of Esau'. However, cf. Gen 36:17, where Reuel is correctly identified as a male. Finally, in Gen 2:23, the demonstrative adjective is used for the pronoun, lhd'(!) y'y lmtqryh <'t'> 'this one is worthy of being called woman', paraphrasing MT ləzō(')t yiqqārē' 'iššā (perhaps due to dittography with the preceding hd' zmn').

pl: These are used primarily to translate MT 'ēlle. The spelling 'lyn predominates at the rate of about 5:1; there are rare examples of alternate spellings, e.g., 'lyyn and even 'ln (cf. e.g., Gen 36:10). The same forms are used for both mpl and fpl, cf. Gen 15:11, 'ylyn 'ynwn mlkwwt' d'r^C' 'these are the kingdoms of the earth'.

It is also used in a distributive sense, e.g., Exod 14:25 'mryn 'lyn l'lyn 'saying to each other' (no MT), and especially Lev 24:17 b'lyyn wb'ylyn 'in both (sets of cases)', and cf. Num 15:34 and Num 27:5 for two other occurrences of the same midrash with the same expression.[4]

5. **Demonstrative Adjectives**

The attested forms are:

	Proximate		Distant
m s	hdyn/ hdn (dyn/ dn)		hhw' (hw')
f s	hd'/ hdh (d')		hhy'
m/f pl	h'lyn/ h'ylyn/ h'yln ('lyn)		h'ynwn

Remarks:

Proximate:

ms: The spelling hdyn predominates at the rate of about
7:1; the adjective commonly translates MT hazze, often
in such phrases as bywm' hdyn, ptgm' hdyn, zmn' hdyn,
etc. The normal position is postnominal, after all
other adjectives, e.g., Gen 29:22 gbr' ḥsyd' hdyn
'this righteous man', however there are isolated
preposed examples, e.g., Gen 28:17 hdn tr^c' 'this
gate' (no MT), the motivation for which is not
apparent.

There are also occasional examples of the
demonstrative pronoun dyn/dn used for the adjective
(cf. Section 4 above), e.g., Gen 4:14, 17:26, 31:43
ywm' d(y)n 'this day', Exod 32:1 dn mšh 'this Moses'.

fs: The fs usually translates MT hazzō(')t; the spelling
hd' is twice as frequent as hdh. The form is common
in the phrase bš^{c}t' hd' 'at this time', and
especially in Genesis, 'r^c' hd' 'this land'. In one
instance (Gen 2:23) the adjective precedes the noun it
modifies, hd' zmn' (!) 'this time', in imitation of
the MT zō(')t happa^{c}am. Cf. the ms above for the
"correct" phrase. There are also occasional examples
of the demonstrative pronoun (d') usd for the
adjective (cf. the ms above), usually where the MT has
zō(')t, but note especially Gen 24:65 mn hw' d' gbr'
(sic) 'who is that man?' for the opaque archaic MT
form mî hā'îš hallāze.

pl: The common spellings are h'lyn and h'ylyn, rarely
h'yln, and usually for MT hā'ēlle, especially in the
phrase ptgmy' h'lyn 'these things'. The normal
position is postnominal, however, cf. the
demonstrative pronoun used for the adjective preposed
at least once, Gen 14:3 kl 'lyn mlkyy' 'tḥbrw 'all
these kings were joined together', clearly based on
the MT kol-'ēlle ḥobrû; for the pronoun replacing the
adjective postnominally, see, e.g., Gen 19:8 lgbry'
'lyn 'to these men' (MT lā'^{a}nāšîm hā'ēl) and other
examples where the Masoretic text contains uncommon
forms or unusual syntax.

Distant:

ms: The form commonly translates MT hahû', especially in
fixed phrases such as 'tr' hhw' 'that place', lyly'
hhw' 'that night', and ywm' hhw' 'that day'. There
are occasional examples of hw' for hhw', always in
imitation of the MT, e.g., Gen 19:33 ballaylā hû' as
blyly' hw'.

fs: Always translates MT hahî', especially in the common
phrases 'r^c' hhy' 'that land', bš^{c}t' hhy' 'at that
time', and bšt' hhy' 'in that year'.

pl: An uncommon form, usually in the phrase bywmyh h'ynwn
'in those days' (e.g., Gen 6:4, for MT bayyāmîm hāhem).

6. Interrogative Pronouns

'yy 'how': Unusual, in Deut 7:17 (MT 'êkā); cf. the more
common 'ykdyn/hyk below.

'ykdyn 'how': The more common translation of MT 'êkā/'êk, e.g.,
Deut 1:12; cf. also Deut 18:21 for the unusual
defective spelling 'kdn (!), and hykdyn, below.

'n 'where': The common translation for the MT idioms 'êpōh
(e.g., Gen 37:16); 'ê (e.g., Deut 32:37); and
'ayyē (+ suffixes, e.g., Gen 18:9, Exod 2:20, MT
'ayyô = 'n hw'); also common in paraphrase, cf.
Gen 3:9 'n hy' mṣwth dpqdt ytk 'where is the
command that I commanded you (based on MT
'ayyekkā). Cf. hn, below.

hyydh 'which': fs (cf. hyydyn, below), in the idiom found
in the parallel verses Deut 4:7 and 4:8 (and
4:33 based on the preceding two) hyddh 'wmh
wmlkw d- 'which (is) a (= the) people and
kingdom who--' (based on MT mî gôy gādôl;
4:33 = ^{c}am).

hyydyn 'which': ms (cf. hyydh above), also based on MT mî,
in Deut 5:26 hyydyn kl bśr' dy 'which (is)
any flesh that ...' (i.e., 'who are the
human beings who ...', MT mî kol-bāśar).
For examples without Hebrew Vorlage, cf.
Gen 15:11 hyydyn hw' ṭyys' dn 'which (one)
is this bird?', and Lev 24:12 bhydyn dyn'
mqṭlyn ytyh 'by which judgement they should
kill him' (note that this final explanatory
sentence is missing from the other three

examples of this midrashic passage, the "Four Cases of Moses", Num 9:8, 15:34, and 27:5).

hn 'where': Only once, in Gen 4:9, spelled with the Hebrew vowel (הֻן), presumably to indicate the pronunciation of an unfamiliar word: hn hw' hbl 'hwk 'where is Abel your brother?' (MT 'ê hebel 'āhîkā); cf. 'n, above, and lhn, below.

hyk 'how': For MT 'êk, e.g., Gen 26:9, 44:8, etc., and cf. hykdyn, below.

hykdyn 'how': Usually written as one word, e.g., Gen 39:9, Exod 6:12 (both for MT 'êk), however note, e.g., Gen 44:8 hyk kdyn ngnb 'how then shall we steal' (MT 'êk).

l'n 'whither': For MT 'ānā, e.g., Gen 16:8, Deut 1:28, and many other examples.

lhn 'whither': Only once, Num 22:30, lhn 't 'zl blᶜm ršyᶜ' 'whither are you going, evil Balaam?' (no MT), cf. hn, above.

lmh 'why': For MT lammā, usually in the phrase lmh kᶜn (however, cf. Gen 12:19). Note, however, that the preferred expression for 'why' is the composite bgll mh (e.g., Gen 4:8, no MT); in addition, MT maddûᵃᶜ is similarly always translated mn bgll mh, e.g., Gen 26:27, Exod 18:14 (note apparent error forms in Exod 3:3, mn bgll (:), and Gen 40:7 mn bgll mn (:)).

mh 'what': Translates MT mā.

mn 'who': Translates MT mî. There are occasional spelling errors, e.g., Gen 3:11 m'n, and occasional instances of mh for mn (e.g., Gen 27:18). Noteworthy also is Gen 38:25 dmn 'ynwn 'to whom do these belong?' (based on MT ləmî).

mn 'n 'whence': Translates MT mē'ayin; note especially the unusual form in Gen 16:8 mnn(:) 't 'tyyh 'whence are you coming?' (MT 'ê-mizze bā(')t), and cf. mn hn, below.

mn hn 'whence': Only once, Num 11:13 mn hn 'yt ly bśr 'whence should I have flesh?' (MT mē'ayin lî bāśār), cf. hn, lhn, above.

ᶜd 'ymt 'how long', 'until when': The standard translation for MT ᶜad-mātay, e.g., Exod 10:7, Num 14:27 (spelt ᶜd 'mt in Exod 10:3). Note also Exod 8:5, for MT ləmātay, and Num 14:11 (twice) spelt ᶜd 'mty/'ymty, paraphrasing MT ᶜad-'ānā.

7. **Relative Pronoun**

The relative pronoun can be written either dy or d-. When it translates MT 'ᵃšer, dy predominates over d- at the rate of about 3:1. Otherwise, there appears to be no motivation for the use of one form over the other; however, as a nominalizer, the form d- clearly predominates (see below). Parenthetically, one should note some isolated examples where no relative pronoun occurs where it is expected: Gen 28:13 'rᶜ' 't dmk ᶜlh 'the land upon which you are sleeping' (MT hā'āreṣ 'ᵃšer 'attā šōkēb ᶜāleyhā) and, in a verse without a Masoretic Vorlage, Gen 27:27 hw' ṭwr' brk ytyh hy wqyym kl ᶜlmy' YYY 'this is the mountain which he who lives and endures for all eternity, the Lord, has blessed'. Other uses of the relative pronoun are:

(a) often in paraphrase of a Hebrew participle, e.g., Gen 1:11 dtyn dᶜśb dmzryᶜyn zrᶜ 'the plants of grass which produce seed' (MT deše' ᶜēśeb mazrîᵃᶜ zeraᶜ, and for a determined participle, Gen 2:13 hw' dhzr wmqp yt kl 'rᶜ' dkwš 'it is the one that returns and encompasses all the land of Kush' (MT hû' hassôbēb 'et kol-'ereṣ kûš), or Num 24:4 (24:16, etc.) 'ymr dšmᶜ mymr mn qdm YYY 'an utterance of one who has heard a word from before the Lord' (MT nə'ūm šōmēᵃᶜ 'imrê-'ēl;

(b) introducing the apodosis of a "cleft sentence,"[5] e.g., Gen 34:41 l' y'h hw' dyhwwn 'mryn ... brm y'y hw' dyhwwn 'mryn 'it is not right that they should say ... but it is right that they should say' (no MT), and especially the example in Gen 28:16, which has no antecedent marker expressing 'it is', 'yqr škynh dYYY dšryh (sic) b'trh hdyn '(it is) the glory of the Shekinah of God that is dwelling in this place' (MT yeš YHWH bammāqôm hazze).

(c) as a nominalizer, 'the one who', 'that which', commonly (but by no means exclusively) following the direct object marker yt, often appearing to imitate MT 'et 'ᵃšer, e.g., Gen 28:15 yt dmlylyt lk 'that which

I spoke to you' (MT 'et 'ᵃšer-dibbartî lāk), and especially Num 22:6, where the copy is most obvious, ydᶜ 'nh dy 't mbrk yhwwy mbrk wyt mh dy (!) 't lyyt hwwy (!) lyṭ 'I know (that) that which you bless will be blessed and that which you curse will be cursed' (MT yādaᶜtî 'et 'ᵃšer-təbārēk məbōrāk wa'ᵃšer tā'ōr yû'ār.

For the accusative not based on Hebrew 'et, see Exod 4:12 w'lp ytk yt dy tmll 'and I will teach you that which you shall say' (MT wəhôrêtîkā 'ᵃšer tədabbēr) or Exod 15:26 wdšpyr b'pwy tᶜbdwn 'and that which is good in his sight you shall do' (MT wəhayyāšār bəᶜênāyw taᶜᵃśe).

The relative pronoun is also used in the nominative, e.g., Gen 22:10 dnks l' mᶜkb wdmtnks pšṭ ṣw'ryh 'the one who sacrifices does not hesitate and the one who is sacrificed stretches out his neck' (no MT).

In a number of verses in Balaam's prophecies (Num 23:7 to Num 24:19), the often-recurring MT yaᶜᵃqōb ... yiśrā'ēl 'Jacob ... Israel' are translated by dbyt yᶜqb ... dbyt yśr'l 'those of the house of Jacob ... those of the house of Israel'. Most noteworthy are three cases (23:23, 24:5, bis) of ddbyt yśr'l/yᶜqb '(some of ?) those of the house of Israel/Jacob' -- the first, however, may be an error for ldbyt yśr'l, as it follows lbyt yᶜqb; the last two appear in a paraphrase of the famous verse MT ma-ṭṭōbû 'ōhāleykā yaᶜᵃqōb miškənōteykā yiśrā'ēl, and this verse is characterized by a number of unusual forms, transmission errors, and the like (including the final phrase wmšknyhwn dy ḥzwr ḥzwr lh dy(!) dbyt yśr'l 'and their tents which are round about it, those of those of the house of Israel'). The "expected" nominalized form is also found, e.g., Exod 4:13 šlḥ kᶜn byd dn dḥmy lyh lmštlḥ' 'send, now, by the hand of he who is worthy to be sent' (MT šəlaḥ-nā' bəyad-tišlāḥ).

(d) followed by a preposition + resumptive suffix referring to the antecedent of the relative, e.g., Gen 38:25 bmklwt' d'ynš mykl byh 'by the measure by which a man measures' (no MT);

(e) in possessive idioms, e.g., Gen 38:25 gbr' d'ylyn dylyh 'nh mᶜbrh ... dmn 'ynwn ᶜzqth wšwtp' wḥwṭr' h'ylyn mynyh 'nh mᶜbrh 'the man to whom these belong, by him am I pregnant ...the one to whom these ring, cord, and staff belong, by him am I pregnant' (no MT), or Num 16:5 wydᶜ (sic) YYY mn dmn dydh 'and God will make know who is his' (MT wəyōdaᶜ YHWH 'et-'ᵃšer-lô, cf. above).

8. Indefinite Relative Pronouns

This term encompasses a number of idioms compounded with kl, mn, mh + d (and occasionally dy), usually translated 'whoever', 'the one who', etc.

bkl d 'wherever': For MT bəkol 'ᵃšer, e.g., Gen 28:15 (possibly a Hebrew calque).

kl d 'whoever', 'whatever': Usually for MT kol + determined participle, e.g., Gen 4:15 kl dyqṭwl qyn 'whoever kills Cain' (MT kol-hōrēg qayin), or Gen 21:6 kl dšmᶜ 'whoever hears' (MT kol-haššōmēaᶜ); or for MT kol ('ᵃšer), e.g., Gen 7:8 kl drḥyš 'whatever crawls' (MT kōl 'ᵃšer rōmēś, and cf. Gen 1:30 kl drḥš, MT kōl rōmēś).

kl mh d 'whatever' 'that which': Usually translates MT kol 'ᵃšer. Cf. without Vorlage, e.g., Gen 3:19 kl mh dᶜbdt 'whatever you have done'. There are occasional errors with kl mn d for kl mh d, e.g., Gen 7:5.

kl mn d 'whoever', 'the one who': Apparently a variant for kl d (see above), e.g., Gen 3:24 lkl mn dlᶜy bh 'for whoever studies it' (no MT), or Exod 15:1 kl mn dmtg'y qdmwy 'whoever exalts himself before him' (no MT, in the midrashic expansion of the Song of Moses). Note the unusual spelling kl m'n d in Gen 20:16, with א as an internal mater lectionis (MT kol 'ᵃšer). Cf. the following idiom mn d, and Chapter 2, Orthography).

mn d 'whoever', 'the one who': The most common of the three possibilities (cf. kl d, kl mn d). Usually used to translate MT determined participles, and occasionally for MT 'ᵃšer (= 'the one who',

'that which'), e.g., Gen 9:6 mn dšpk 'dmyh dbr nš 'whoever spills the blood of a man' (MT šōpēk dam hā'ādām), Gen 7:23 wmn dhwh ^cmyh btybwt' (MT wa'^ašer 'ittô battēbā). Common in paraphrase and in midrashic expansions, e.g., Gen 2:9 mn dhwh 'kl mnh 'whoever would eat from it', Exod 3:14 mn d'mr whwh ^clm' mn šrwy' ... 'the one who spoke, and the world existed from the beginning ...' (based on the name of God in the MT 'ehye), Num 24:9 mn dmbrk ythwn yhwwy mbrk wmn dlyyt ythwn yhwwy lyt 'whoever blesses them will be blessed and whoever curses them will be cursed' (based on the poetic MT məbār^akeykā bārûk wə'ōrəreykā 'ārûr, and cf. also Num 22:6, cited above, 7(c) Relative Pronouns, for a different idiom, and also Gen 27:29 for a translation based on the Balaam verses).

mh d 'whatever': Translates MT '^ašer (='that which', cf. kl mh d, above) e.g., Gen 9:24 mh d^cbd lyh 'what he had done to him' (MT '^ašer-^cāśā-lô), and MT determined adjectives, e.g., Gen 16:6 mh dšpyr 'that which is good' (MT haṭṭôb) or Gen 32:14 mh d'yty 'that which he had brought' (MT habbā'). For further paraphrastic usage, see, e.g., Gen 31:39 mh dhwwn gnby' gnbyn b'ymm' 'whatever the thieves used to steal during the day' (based on the difficult archaic MT form gənūbtî yôm).

9. Reflexive Pronoun

The only examples of an independent reflexive pronoun occur in the idiom mn^c grm- 'withhold (one)self', cf. Gen 27:40 mn^cyn grmyhwn mlml^cy b'wryyt' 'withholding themselves from studying the Law' (no MT), and Exod 32:10 mn^c grmk mn lmb^cy rḥmyn ^clyhwn 'withhold yourself from praying on their behalf' (based on MT hannîḥā lî, in the story of the Golden Calf). The use of the reflexive pronoun is uncommon and appears to be restricted to this one idiom in two midrashic passages. Otherwise, the medio-passive stems regularly express the reflexive (see Chapter 8, Verbs). For grm = 'bone', cf. Gen 50:25 wtsqwn yt grmyy mn hkh 'and you will bring up my bones from here' (MT wəha^{ca}lîtem 'et-^caṣmōtay mizze).

10. Miscellaneous Forms

Collected in this section are the nominal forms based on kl 'all' and the adverbial uses of the interjection kmh/mh 'how much!' etc. For the expression of the direct object, see below, Section 11.

+ kl 'everything', 'all', 'any': Always translates MT kol/kōl, and used often in verses without Vorlage, e.g., Gen 13:16 hyk mh dlyt 'pšr dy kl gbr lmymny (sic) yt ^cpr' d'r^c' 'just as it is impossible that any man count the dust of the earth'.

In the determined state kwl'/kwlh/kl'/klh 'everything', 'everyone', it either translates various forms of kol/hakkol, or is used in paraphrase etc., see e.g., Gen 20:16 w^cl kwl' 'twwkḥt 'and above all you have been justified', Gen 22:14 kwl' gly wydy^c qdmyk 'everything is revealed and known before you'. Note especially the unusual expression in Gen 34:31 kl' mn kl hdyn kl' yhww⟨y⟩ škm br ḥmwr mlglg bnpšyh 'everything more than all this (?), that Shechem son of Hamor should not be proud in his soul'.

The noun is used commonly with possessive suffixes, e.g., Gen 34:16 kwln 'all of us', Exod 14:7 kwlhwn 'all of them' (MT kullô!), etc.

It is also used in partive expressions, e.g., Gen 31:39 kl ḥd mnhwn 'every one of them' (no MT). It should be noted that kl is generally not used in translating MT partitives in which the nominal form is repeated. Each expression is translated in a different manner, cf. e.g., Gen 39:10 ywm btr ywm 'day after day' (for MT yôm yôm), or Exod 36:4 gbr mn ^cbydth dy 'nwn ^cbdyn '(each) man from his work which they (!) were doing' (for MT 'îš 'îš mimməla(')ktô '^ašer hēmmā ^cośîm), etc.

+ kl dkn 'how much more so!': In a long midrash in Gen 44:18 based on the meeting in Egypt between Joseph and his brothers: dlm' l' 't'mr lk ... mh d^cbdw šm^cwn wlwy ... mn bgll ds'ybw bgwwh yt dynh ... kl dkn bgll bnymn 'ḥwnn 'perhaps it has not been told to you ..... what Simeon and Levy did ... because they had defiled Dinah in it (i.e., Shechem) ... how much more so because of Benjamin our brother'. See ^cl ḥd kmh (wkmh) below for three other similar expressions in the same verse.

+ kl mn d^cm 'anything' (with negative ⟶ 'nothing'): In verses with Hebrew Vorlage, for MT (kol)-mə'ûmā, e.g., Gen 22:12 wl' t^cbd lyh kl mn d'm 'and do not do anything to him' (MT wə'al-ta^caś lô mə'ûmā), or for MT dābār, e.g., Deut 2:7 l' hsrtwn kl mn d^cm 'you have lacked nothing' (MT lō' ḥāsartā dābār). There are also occasional positive examples, e.g., Gen 33:11 'yt ly kl mn d^cm 'I have everything' (MT yeš-lî-kōl). Note the variety of spellings; kl mn d^cm, kl m'n d^cm (Gen 39:6), kl mh d^cm (Gen 39:9), klwm md^cm (: Gen 30:31, and cf. Abraham Tal, The Language of the Targum of the Former Prophets, Tel Aviv, 1975, pp. 16-17). Cf. also md^cm, below.

+ kmh 'how (much)': Only one example, in a paraphrase of Balaam's prophecies in Num 24:5 characterized by a number of such forms (cf. mh below), kmh ṭbn wnhmn mmryh ^ctyd myytyyh ^clykwn ddbyt y^cqb 'how good and consoling are the words (that are) destined to come upon you, oh ones of the house of Jacob'.

+ md^cm 'anything': Usually found in the idiom kl mn d^cm (q.v. above), however see Exod 5:11 l' mtmn^c mn pwlhnykwn md^cm 'nothing shall be withheld from your labors' (MT 'ên nigrā^c mē^{ca}bōdatkem dābār).

+ mh/m' 'how (great, etc.)': For MT ma(h) 'how (great, etc.)' usually followed by an absolute state adjective, e.g., Gen 28:17 mh dhyl hw' 'tr' hdyn 'how fearful is this place' (MT ma(h)-nnôrā hammāqôm hazze), or Gen 38:29 mh tqpt 'how you have become strong' (MT ma(h)-ppārastā), and common in paraphrase, see, e.g., twice in the Song of the Sea, Exod 15:6 and 15:18 ymnk mh hdyr' hy' bhyl' 'your right hand, how beautiful it is in strength' (based on MT yəmînkā YHWH ne'dārî bakkō^aḥ), and mh y'h hw' lk klyl mlkwt' YYY 'how lovely is the crown of kingship to you, oh Lord' (no MT), or twice in Balaam's prophecies, Num 24:5 mh y'yyn mšknyhwn dbyt y^cqb ... mh y'h hw' mškn zymn' dšry bynykwn ddbyt y^cqb 'how beautiful are the tents of the house of Jacob ... how beautiful is the tent of meeting which dwells among you, oh ones of the house of Jacob (based on MT ma(h)-ṭṭōbû 'ōhāleykā ya^{ca}qōb miškənōteykā yiśrā'ēl).

Followed by an absolute state noun, meaning 'what a--', see e.g., Num 23:23 mh 'gr ṭb mtqn lkwn qdm YYY l^clm' d'ty 'what a good reward is prepared for you before the Lord, for the world to come' (based on MT ma(h)-ppā^cal 'ēl).

11. Direct Object Marker

There are four methods used in the MS to mark the direct object of a transitive verb: yt, l-, zero, and by a pronominal suffix attached to the verb. The choice of one form over the other is often, though not entirely, dependent on the Massoretic Vorlage. For complete details and discussion, see Chapter 9, Syntax, Part One, Section B, below.

The most common expression of the direct object is yt. In passages with a Hebrew Vorlage, it usually translates MT 'et-/'ēt, and can even be misemployed for the MT 'et= 'with', e.g., Gen 39:2 whwh YYY yt ywsp 'And God was (with) Joseph', MT wayhî YHWH 'et-yôsēp.

The marker yt can also translate other MT prepositions, e.g., l -, Gen 29:13, etc., depending on the needs of the particular Aramaic verb, and it also occurs commonly with suffixes, yty, ytyh, ytn, etc.

Much less commonly occurring is the preposition l-, see Chapter 3, Prepositions, above. Its use is considerably more restricted than that of yt, being used with proper nouns, e.g., Gen 16:5 nsbyt lhgr 'I took Hagar', Lev 22:27 śrh yldh lyṣhq 'Sara bore Isaac', Num 21:34 ḥm' mšh l^cwg 'Moses saw Og', or with nouns that are either associated with proper nouns or are substitutes for proper nouns, e.g., Gen 4:5 wlqyn wlqrbnyh l' qbl 'but He did not accept Cain and his offering', and Gen 34:1 s'ybw ... lbrtyh dy^cqb 'they defiled the daughter of Jacob'.

However, cf. Gen 24:14 w'p lgmlyk 'šqy 'and your camels also will I water'. As noted above, many counter examples of similar environments using either yt or ∅ can be brought, and the motivations for the use of l- in these few cases (and those cited in Chapter 3) are not immediately apparent.

The use of ∅ to mark the direct object is also not common, and usually occurs where the MT also has ∅. However, there are cases in passages with no Hebrew Vorlage, cf. Chapter 3, above for examples, and again the motivation for the use of this expression is not clear.

Most limited of all are those few examples with a pronominal suffix. In the books of Genesis and Exodus, twelve examples only were noted, eight imperfects, three perfects, and

one participle. Most significant is the fact that in six of the twelve cases, the form attested is identical to that found in Onkelos in the same verse. However, it must be stressed that the verses are not identical in Neofiti and Onkelos, merely the specific verb form! Indeed the language of these verses is quite different, e.g.,

Exod 2:12 -- Neofiti = w'stkyl lhk' wlhk' whm' 'rwm l' hwwh tmn gbr wqtl yt mṣryyh wtmryh(!) bhl';

Onkelos = w'tpny lk' wlk' whz' 'ry lyt 'nš wmh' yt mṣr'h wtmryh (!) bhl'.

'And he looked from side to side and saw that there was no one (there), and he killed the Egyptian and hid him in the sand'.

It is difficult to know how to interpret cases such as this (others can be found at Gen 21:13 'šwynyh; Gen 32:18 yš'lynk; Gen 35:12 'tnnh; Exod 3:15 šlhny; and Exod 4:21 t^cbdynwn). There is no mimic of the language of Onkelos, however it is beyond the range of coincidence that these individual verbs should be identical, even in such a small sample. It is even more confusing when one realizes that, in Gen 32:18, Onkelos has y^cr^cynk ^cśw 'hy wyš'lynk, while Neofiti has y^cr^c ytk ^cśw 'hy wyš'lynk 'my brother Esau will meet you and will ask you', i.e., both verbs in Onkelos have the suffixed direct object, whereas only the second verb of the pair in Neofiti has it!

NOTES

[1] Not to be corrected to 'nhn', as suggested by Díez Macho, p. 69, given the preponderance of the form 'nn.

[2] Each verse in the MS is preceded by a one or two word quote of the beginning of the Hebrew verse. Occasionally, as in this case, the first Aramaic words of the verse are omitted, and the Aramaic continues as though the Hebrew lemma is part of the text.

[3] One might also see 'ynyn in Gen 33:6 as an error for 'ynwn, due to w/y confusion; otherwise, it is an archaic retention.

[4] In the fourth occurrence of this, the Four Cases of Moses midrash, the phrase is not used (Num 9:8).

[5] For a detailed discussion of the cleft sentence, see H. J. Polotsky, Etudes de syntaxe copte, Le Caire, 1944, p. 57-68; reprinted in Collected Papers, Jerusalem, 1971. See also Gideon Goldenberg, "Tautological Infinitive," Israel Oriental Studies I, 1971, pp. 36-85, especially pp. 50-59.

NOUNS AND ADJECTIVES

The analysis presented here is based primarily on data collected from the book of Genesis,[1] however its results have been cross-checked and supplemented by reference to the other books of the Pentateuch in the MS.

PREFIX FORMS
A. Nouns Formed with Prefix m-

	Abs.	Det.	Cons.	Suff.
ms	mqtl	mqtl'/h	mqtl	mqtl-
mp	mqtlyn	mqtly'/h	mqtly	mqtly-
fs	mqtl'/h	mqtlt'/h	mqtlt	mqtlt-
fp	mqtln	mqtlt'/h	mqtlt	mqtlty-

1. **Masculine Forms**

   a. **Strong Roots**

   Common nouns are found such as mgdl/mgdl' 'tower', mdbḥ/mdbḥ' 'altar', mdnḥ/mdnḥ' 'east', m^crb/m^crb' 'west', mqdš/mqdš' 'sanctuary', etc., as well as some less well attested, e.g., mrḥq' 'abomination' (Gen 34:7), and m^cbr 'crossing' (Gen 32:32). There are occasional unusual spellings, e.g., Gen 26:6, 29:1 mdynh', probably madnₐhā ⟶ madnḥā ⟶ madinḥā, and mškynyn 'tents', presumably maškₐnin ⟶ maškinin, with matres lectiones for vocalic shewa. Nouns of this class are also attested commonly with suffixes, e.g., mdršhwn 'their study', mdršyhwn 'their studies', mtqlh 'its (ms) weight', mtqlhwn 'their weight', mšknyh 'his tent', mšknh 'her tent', and note also the spelling in Gen 35:21 mškwnyh 'his tent', presumably maškₐneh ⟶ maškoneh.

   b. **Weak Roots**

   A well-attested set of classes:

   (1) **I-Weak:** mymr/mymr' 'word', myšr/ myšr' 'plain', mbwl' 'flood', mtn 'giving, etc. Note the misspelt plural construct forms mšryh, myšryh, mšrh, all used in the phrase mšry ḥzw(w)h 'The Plains of the Vision', for

MT 'ēlōnê mamrē' 'The Plains of Mamre', the mistranslation and consequent misinterpretation apparently due to the homograph mmr' 'word', except in Gen 12:6, where the phrase translates MT 'ēlōn môre, which is apparently identified with 'ēlōnê mamrē'. With suffixes, e.g., mymry 'my word', etc., mṭwlhwn 'their burden', and cf. mṭlnwy 'his wanderings' in Nouns Formed with Suffix -(w)n', below.

(2) II-Weak: ml'k/ml'k' 'messenger', mmwn/mmwn' 'property', mrwm'/mrwmy' 'height(s)', mzwn 'food', mhws 'insult'. Note also such misspellings as ml'kyh for construct ml'ky (Gen 28:12), and mdwrwnyn (!) 'dwellings', for mdwryn (Gen 6:14). Suffixes: ml'kyh 'his messenger', mzwnk 'your food', mdwryhwn 'their dwellings'.

(3) III-Weak: mrᶜy 'pasture', and with suffixes, mšrwyk 'your dwelling', mšrwyyhwˋ 'their dwelling' (Gen 10:30), mštw⟨y⟩hwn 'their foundations' (Gen 30:11, spelled mštwrhwn!).

(4) Geminate: mmll 'speech', mgn 'protection', myhˋ 'heat' (Gen 18:1), mṭlyn 'booths'.

(5) Double Weak: mytyy' 'comings' (Gen 33:18).

(6) Special Root: msq 'ascent' (Gen 19:15, root s-l-q).

2. Feminine Forms
   a. Strong Roots
      mpth/mpṯḥ' (sic!, in Gen 30:22, where the plural is mpṯḥn with femine numeral, but with other masculine modifiers), mᶜrt' 'cave', mhšbt 'thought' (construct), mktšyn(!) plagues (Gen 12:17, with f pl adjective rbrbn).
   b. Weak Roots
      (1) I-weak: mtnh/mtnth 'gift(s)', mwrkywn (presumably morkiwan)/mw⟨r⟩kw(w)t' 'feeding troughs' (with confusion of -d- for -r-, see Chapter 2, Orthography), mpḥn (rwḥ) 'despairing (of spirit)', Gen 26:35. Suffixes: mṭrty 'my service', mynqth 'her nurse-maid', mdynthwn 'their states'.

(2) II-Weak: mklwt' 'measure' (?), three times in Gen 38:25. If this is from the root k-w-l, the form is presumably məkilutā.

(3) III-Weak: mṣwh/mṣw(w)th/mṣwwn 'commandment(s)' (Deut 7:10, mṣwwn qlylyn!. Note the misspelling in Gen 35:9, mrb⟨nyy⟩t' 'foster-mother', spelled mrbᶜyt', with a copyist error of ˋy for ˋˋɔ. Suffixes: mṣwty 'my commandments', mṣwtyh 'its (fs) commandments'.

B. Nouns Formed with Prefix t-
This is not a well-attested class of nouns. The forms found, primarily in Genesis, are:

1. Masculine Forms
   a. Strong Roots
      tbšyl/tbšyl'/tbšylyn/tbšylyyh 'meal(s)', thmd 'delight', tšlwmy 'payment(s)', Deut 19:21, Exod 21:24, and cf. twrgmn 'interpreter', in Nouns Formed with Suffix -(w)n', below.
   b. Weak Roots
      (1) I-Weak: twtb/twtbyn 'sojourner(s)'.

2. Feminine Forms
   a. Strong Roots
      (1) twšbḥ'/h/tšwbḥn 'praise(s)' (cf. also Exod 14:3, 15:11).
   b. Weak Roots
      (1) II-weak: ttwbh 'repentance'.
      (2) III-weak: thyyt 'resurrection' (construct, Gen 25:34).

C. Nouns Formed with Prefix '-
Only occasional feminine forms are attested.
   a. Strong Roots
      'hsn'/'hsnh/'hsnt (construct) 'possession', 'rmlh 'widow', and cf. also 'rdᶜnyn 'frogs' in Nouns Formed with Suffix -(w)n', below.
   b. Weak Roots
      (1) Double Weak: 'wry(y)t' 'Law'.

SUFFIX FORMS

A. <u>Nouns Formed with Suffix -w(t')</u>

All nouns with this suffix are feminine.

	Abs.	Det.	Cons.	Suff.
fs	qtlw	qtlwt'/h	qtlwt	qtlwt-
fp	qtlw(w)n	qtlw(w)t'/h	qtlw(w)t	qtlw(w)t-

1. <u>Strong Roots</u>

A variety of spellings with <u>matres lectionis</u> <u>w</u> and <u>y</u> are included here.

a. <u>qtlw</u>: bqrwth 'cattle'; mlkw/mlkwwn/mlkwwt' 'kingdoms'; tpšwt (construct) 'stupidity' (Deut 10:16); plgw 'division'; pršwt (construct) 'crossing'; shdw/šhdwt'(!) 'witness' (Gen 21:30 and 31:47, respectively); (byny) šmšwt' 'twilight' (Exod 12:6, but cf. Gen 49:27 byny šmšyy').

b. <u>qtwlw</u>: bkwrwt' 'birth-right' (Gen 25:32).

c. <u>qtylw</u>: 'rykwt 'length'; knyšwt'/knyšwt (construct) 'confluence,' 'congregation'; mṣy^{c}wt (construct) 'middle'; qšyṭwt (construct) 'uprightness'; špykwt (construct) 'spilling'; tmymwt (construct) 'innocence'.

d. <u>qwtlw</u>: 'wmnwt (construct) 'craft'.

e. <u>qytlw</u>: zydnw 'wilfulness' (Lev 24:12).

f. <u>Derived from the Gt stem</u>: 'tpgšwt' 'meeting' (Gen 32:25), cf. 'ytbrywthwn, below.

g. <u>With Suffixes</u>: 'bylwtn 'our mourning' (Deut 26:14); bkwrty (sic) 'my birth-right' (Gen 27:36)/ bkwrwtyh 'his birth-right'; ṣdyqwtk 'your (ms) righteousness'.

h. <u>With Prefixes</u>: 'hsnw 'possession'; 'rmlwth 'widowhood'.

i. <u>With Double Suffix</u>: swkltnwtkwn 'your (mp) understanding' (Deut 4:6, and cf. the adjective swkltnyn 'clever' in the same verse); pwr^{c}nwth 'retribution' (Deut 32:35).

2. <u>Weak Roots</u>

a. <u>I-Weak</u>: 'ntw 'wifehood'; hymnw 'belief'.
   <u>With Suffixes</u>: yldwty 'my kindred', yšrwtk 'your (ms) right conduct'.
   <u>With Prefixes</u>: t(w)ldw(w)t' 'births' (in genealogical formulae).

<u>With Suffixes</u>: t(w)ldw(w)tyh etc. 'his births', etc.

b. <u>II-Weak</u>: ṭ'bwt(!) 'good thing', used adverbially ⟶ 'well' (Gen 30:34), apparently for ṭb'wt (e.g., Deut 9:21, the spelling ṭ'bwt apparently influenced by such words as Onkelos ṭ'b', cf. also ṭbw', however, also attested here is ṭ(y)bw 'goodness' (Exod 20:6, 34:7); śybw/śybw(!) 'old age' (the first, in Gen 15:15 and 25:8 probably influenced by the MT śêbā, cf. with suffixes, below. Contra, however, see Deut 32:25 gbryn sbyn 'old men', for MT poetic 'îš śêbā).

<u>With Suffixes</u>: sybwt(y)h 'his old age' (Gen 21:2, 21:7, Lev 22:27), but śybty 'my old age' (Gen 42:38, MT śêbātî).

c. <u>III-Weak</u>: 'sw 'cure'; b^{c}w 'grace'; dmw/dmwt (construct) 'image'; zkw/zkwth/zkwwt' 'merit(s)'; znw 'harlotry'; zpw 'loan' (Deut 23:20); hyzw 'appearance'; nbw 'prophecy'; ṣlw/ṣlwt' 'prayer'; ršw/ršwt' 'permission'; š(y)rw/šyrwt' 'meal'; tbw/t(y)bwt' 'ark'; thw 'regret'; ṭ^{c}wn 'idols' (Deut 4:8); l^{c}wt(!) 'toil' (Gen 3:18, cf. Onkelos for the spelling with ⟂ also, even though the root appears to be l-'-h).

<u>Derived from the D stem</u>: rmyw 'deception' (Gen 29:22); qšyw 'severity' (Exod 1:13,14).

<u>Other</u>: On formal grounds, the feminine hdw (=hedu)/ hdwh/hdwn 'joy(s)', with consonantal -w- in the determined, should also be considered here (cf. Gen 21:6 hdw rbh 't^{c}bd! 'a great joy has been done').

<u>With Suffixes</u>: dmwtyh 'his image', dmwtn 'our image'; zkwtk 'your merit', zkwwtk 'your merits', zkwwtyh 'his merits'; ṭ^{c}wwthwn 'their idols'; lwwty(!) 'my toil' (Gen 31:42, apparently laᵊwuti ⟵ la'uti, cf. l^{c}wt above); r^{c}tkwn(!) 'your (mpl) favor' (= rᵊ^{c}utkon?, Gen 24:49); (byt) šqwwtn 'our watering places' (Gen 29:22).

<u>Other</u>: Abstract nouns derived from other nominal forms include ṭlywty 'my youth'/ṭlywthwn 'their youth' (from ṭly 'young person'), špywtyh 'his peace' (from špy 'quiet'), and nśywtyh 'his leadership' (Num 11:26, from nśy' 'leader').

With Double Suffix: ^Cnwwt<nw>tyk 'your (ms) humility' (Gen 35:9, spelled with an error of metathesis ^Cnwwtwntyk, i.e., root ^C-n-h + n + wt).

With Prefixes: 'ytbrywthwn 'their creation' (Gen 2:4, derived from the Gt stem), twtbwtk 'your dwelling'/ twtbwtyhwn(!) 'their dwelling' (or 'dwellings'?, Gen 36:43).

d. Geminate: twrbwwt (construct) 'children' (root r-b-b), and note numerous spelling errors twrbbt (Gen 17:12), trbbt (Gen 17:23, 27), ttbbt! (Gen 17:13, see Chapter 2, Orthography).

B. Nouns Formed with Suffix -yt'
All nouns with this suffix are feminine.

	Abs.	Det.	Cons.	Suff.
fs	(qtlyt)	qtlyt'	(qtlyt)	qtlyt-
fp	qtly(y)n	qtly(y)t	qtly(y)t	qtly(y)t-

1. Strong Roots

a. There is only one example in the absolute, gpryt 'sulphur' (Gen 19:24), for the MT absolute goprît, and perhaps in imitation of it. However, cf. Deut 29:22 gpry!, for the same MT goprît. Other strong root examples have mater lectionis w, zhwryt' 'crimson thread' (Onkelos zəhoritā); qlwpyt' 'peel' (Jastrow, "Dictionary," p. 1373, qəlupitā), zr^Cy(y)t (construct)/ zr^Cyyt' 'progeny' (pl).

(1) Forms with Suffixes: zr^Cy(y)ty 'my progeny', zr^Cy(y)thwn 'their progeny', etc.

b. Strong Roots with Prefix: mrglyt'/mrglyyn (absolute = margaləyān?) 'pearl(s)'

2. Weak Roots

a. III-Weak: bkyth 'weeping'; rbyt'/h 'girl' (Note Gen 24:55 rbyty for MT hanna^Carā, with -y for -h or -').

(1) Forms with Suffixes: klytyh 'his wrath' (Onkelos = klwtyh, therefore perhaps w/y confusion); šryty 'my beam' (again Onkelos = šrwty, therefore perhaps w/y confusion); rbyth(!) 'her girls' (Gen 24:61, MT na^{Ca}rōtêhā).

b. III-Weak with Prefix: mšryt'/mšry(y)n (absolute) 'camp(s),' (=mašrəyān?); mštyt' 'feast'.

C. Nouns Formed with Suffix -(w)n'
All nouns of this form are masculine. Adjectives formed with this suffix are either masculine or feminine, depending on the referent. Nouns derived from strong roots fall into three categories, with or without matres lectionis w/y: qtln, qwtln, qytln. There are two subcategories: Nouns with prefixes; and nouns derived from III-weak roots.

1. qtln
'bdn 'destruction' (Num 24:20); 'mtnyh 'fearful ones'; bsmnyh 'perfumes'; gzlnyn 'robbers'; sprwn 'scribe'; ^Clbnh 'humiliation'; ^Crbwn/^Crbwn' 'surety' (for MT (hā)^Cērābôn, Gen 38:17,18); qrbn 'sacrifice' (Lev 16:1); rḥmn' Merciful One; (Exod 34:6); šltwnyn 'rulers' (Gen 49:17).

a. With Suffixes: '<b>dnhwn 'their destruction' (Num 24:20, the b is added above the word); srhny 'my offense'; ^Clbny 'my humiliation', ^Crbwnyh 'his surety'; qrbny 'my sacrifice', etc.; šltnwy 'his commanders'.

b. Feminine Adjective: ś^Crnyyn 'hairy' (=śa^{Ca}rānəyān, for MT śə^Cīrōt, Gen 27:23).

2. qwtln
'wlpn 'instruction'; hwšbn 'accounting' (cf. hšbnwy, below), ^Cwrmn' 'serpent' (Gen 49:17); pwlḥn 'worship' (Gen 21:9, but cf. plḥny etc. below, and plḥn' four other times in Genesis, plus construct plḥn, Gen 1:2, and absolute plḥn in Exod 1:14); pwr^Cn 'avenger' (Deut 6:15, Exod 20:5); rwḥṣn 'safety'.

a. With Suffixes: kwprnyhwn 'their willages'; hšbnwy 'his accounts'.

b. Adjectival Forms: 'whrn 'other' (but cf. hwrn four other times in Genesis); swkltnyn 'clever' (Deut 4:6, with double suffix, -t-, -n-); swrbnyn 'rebellious' (Gen 26:35, feminine plural!); qwštnyn 'truthful' (Gen 42:16, Exod 18:21).

3. qytln
zywtnyh 'distinguished ones' (Gen 14:5).
   a. Adjectival: ryqn/ryqn'/ryqnyn 'empty' (Gen 31:42, ms, Gen 1:2, fs, Exod 3:21, mpl).

4. Nouns with Prefixes
'rdᶜnyn/'rdᶜny' (!) 'frogs' (Exod 7:28ff, cf. Onkelos ᶜurdəᶜān, and once only in Neofiti, Exod 8:9 ᶜrdᶜnyy'), mṭlnwy 'his wanderings' (Gen 13:3, root n-ṭ-l), twrgmn 'interpreter' (Exod 4:16, for MT pe 'mouth').

5. III-Weak Roots
b(y)zywn 'disgrace', mnyyn/mnyynh 'counting', nsywnh 'temptation', qny(y)n 'possession', rbbnyn (!) 'chiefs' (Gen 25:16, perhaps a copyist error for rbrbnyn).
   a. Suffixed: qnyynwy 'his possessions'.

6. Other
šwpnynyn 'turtle-doves' (Num 6:10, with suffix -yn-).

OTHER NOMINAL FORMS
Unlike those nouns formed by the addition of prefixes or suffixes, the following categories are marked by internal vowel patterns, at times spelled with w or y as matres lectionis, but not necessarily so. In general, the vocalizations offered are based on Targum Onkelos, except where a mater lectionis indicates a clearly divergent form. In those cases, a vocalization is suggested and the Onkelos is also given. In the following analysis, a noun is vocalized only the first time it appears, the other forms being easily derived, so for example, the vocalization of the absolute singular of lbwš 'clothing' is given as ləbuš, but not that of lbwšyn or lbwšykwn etc.

A. Nouns of the Form qtwl
These include the following vocalizations:-
(qətulā:) qətul; (qutlā:) qətol; (qātolā:) qātol;
(qitolā:) qitol; (qittulā:) qittul; (qattulā:) qattul;
(qittolā:) qittol.

1. qətul
The largest category attested in the MS, in both the masculine and feminine, with no special discernible meaning.

   a. Masculine Forms
   lbwš/lbwšyn/lbwšy (construct) 'clothing'; lḥwš 'red'; qrḥ(:)/qr(w)ḥyn/ qrwḥy' (without -w- in Gen 30:32 and 31:8); blwṭ (construct) 'oak'; gbwl' 'border'; ḥbwš' 'imprisonment'; tḥwm' 'area'; krwbyh 'cherubs', etc.
      (1) With suffixes: tḥwmh 'her area', tḥwmhwn 'their area', tḥwmyhwn 'their areas'; ḥbwšwy 'his prisoners'; lbwšwy 'his clothes', lbwšykwn your (m pl) clothes', etc.
   b. Feminine Forms
   btwlh/btwln 'virgin(s)'; khwnth 'priesthood', Exod 28:3 (abbreviated khntˈ in Gen 14:18); ktwbh 'marriage contract'; nmwrt' (pl.) 'speckled'; qbwrh/qbwrt' 'burial-place'; qṭrt (?) 'incense' (construct, Gen 27:27); qrwht' (pl) 'white-spotted'; rṣwᶜh 'strap'; šbwᶜh/šbwᶜth 'oath'.
      (1) With suffixes: ybwmtyh 'his brother's wife' (cf. however, Onkelos yəbimtā, Deut 25:7,9); qbwrtˈ 'her burial-place' (Gen 35:20, for MT qəbūrātāh); šbwᶜty 'my oath'.

2. qətol
A common category with masculine nouns and also adjectival forms; no special meaning discernible
   a. Masculine Forms
   bkwr'/bkwrh 'first-born' (however, cf. Onkelos bukrā, therefore this may be a Hebraism, Gen 10:15 and 38:7 respectively -- also the form bkyr, below); ḥšwk' 'darkness'; lṭwm (absolute) 'a resin' (Gen 37:25); nhwr/nhwr'/nhwryn/nhwry' 'light(s)'; nmr(:)/nm(w)ryn 'speckled' (five times without -w-, twice with); ᶜ<bw>ry' 'passers-by' (?, in Gen 21:33 spelled ᶜwbry', without Hebrew Vorlage, but perhaps nevertheless influenced by Hebrew ᶜōbərîm, or otherwise an assimilation to the bilabial, i.e., ᶜaborayyā ──→ ᶜoborayyā, or most likely, a combination of these two); qṭwlyn 'slayings' (?, in Gen 37:33, qṭwlyn 'tqtl ywsp 'Joseph has truly been slain', attempting to render the MT cognate infinitive ṭārōp ṭōrāp yôsēp; cf. qāṭolin 'murderers' below, with the same spelling);

qšwṭ 'truth' (Exod 34:6, Deut 22:20, cf. qwšṭ', Segholates, below); rḥwb' 'open place'; šḥwd 'bribe' (Deut 10:17); thwm' 'the Deep'.

(1) With suffixes: bkwrk 'your (ms) first-born', bkwr(y)h 'his first-born' (the forms spelled bkwrh may also be determined state).

b. Feminine Form

qṭrt (construct) 'incense' (Gen 27:27).

c. Other

Perhaps śm'lh (= śəmo(')lā) 'left' in Gen 24:49 (MT śəmō(')l), śm'l(y)h 'his left', Gen 48:13,14 (MT śəmō(')lô), and śml'hwn (?) 'their left', Exod 14:22 (MT śəmō(')lām) should be considered here also. Note that elsewhere MT śəmō(')l is translated by drwm (q.v , in (3.) below).

3. qāṭol

As in other Aramaic dialects, this category is used primarily as a nomen agentis (however cf. also dārom and pātor). Only masculine forms drwm'/drwmh 'south' (for MT negeb, śəmō(')l, and in Gen 36:34 ('ereṣ) hattêmānî, cf. śm'lh above); hmwdyn/hmwdyh 'covetors' (Deut 5:21); yrwt 'inheritor'; mtwly (construct) 'poets' (Num 21:27, mtwly mtlyyh, for MT hammōšəlîm); nṭwr' 'keeper'; prwq 'redeemer' (Exod 6:7); ptwrh/ptwr' 'table' (Exod 25:23,27); qṭwl/qṭwlyn 'murderer(s)', cf. 2. qaṭol 'above'.

a. Suffixes: ptwry 'my table' (Num 28:2, see Kaufman, "Akkadian Influences," pp.81-2).

b. Other

Perhaps 'dwnyh 'his lord', only in Gen 39:20, for MT 'adōnê (yôsēp) should be included here. This appears to be a Hebraism, for the expected rbwnyh (q.v., in (7.) below).

4. qiṭol

An obscure class. The only possible examples may indeed by classifiable elsewhere: 'šwn/'šwn' 'exact time', spelled thus everywhere except in Gen 18:5, in a midrashic expansion of the text, where the construct form b'yštwn(!) occurs, in 'rwm bgyn kdyn b'yštwn šyrwt' Cbrtwn 'for because of this at the time of the meal you have passed by', clearly for b'yšwn, the confusion apparently due to the similarity with

b'yštwn 'you have done evil'. Furthermore, this is the only occurrence of the word in any form spelled with -y-, presumably also adding to the copyist's confusion. However, given the alternate Onkelos form 'ašun, see, e.g., Jastrow, "Dictionary," p. 60, perhaps this belongs in the category qəṭul, above (see also Kaufman, "Akkadian Influences," p. 59, especially n. 134); qyṭwr'/qyṭwr (construct) 'smoke', only in Gen 19:28 for MT qîṭōr, therefore perhaps a Hebraism (or possibly qiṭṭurā in Aramaic). Cf. Pseudo-Jonathan ad loc., quṭrā.

5. qiṭṭul

A well-attested class, primarily of abstract nouns. Only masculine forms are attested: yḥws (construct) 'genealogy' (=yeḥus<*yiḥḥus), usually used in Genesis in the phrase yḥws twldwwth, etc. for MT tôldōt (note Gen 37:2, yyḥws), however cf. forms with suffixes, below; nswkyn 'libations'; sdwr 'arrangement', cf. Gen 1:16 sdwr kwkby 'arrangement of the stars', for MT hakkôkābîm, Num 28:2 lḥm sdwr ptwry 'the bread of the arrangement of my table', expanding MT laḥmî, and especially Lev 24:6,7 sdwryn (twice)...sdwr for MT maCArākôt...maCAreket[2]; smwq' (m.s. det)/smwqh (f.s.abs.) 'red' (in Gen 25:30 and Num 19:2, respectively, for MT hā'ādōm/'adummā); Cybwr/Cybwr' 'grain' (Gen 27:28,37, Num 18:27 [Cybwr'], Deut 28:51, all for MT dagan[3]; p(y)qwdy' 'commandment(s)'.

a. Other forms:

Possibly qyṭwr/qyṭwr' in Gen 19:28, cf. qiṭol, above. One might also include here slq 'ascent' (= silluq?), in Gen 32:26, however cf. 32:24 slyq (but this may be slwq, with w/y confusion).

(1) With suffixes: ḥsdyy 'my shame' (=ḥissuday?); pqwdh 'her commandment' (Gen 3:22, but possibly the plural noun, with the 3fs suffix spelled defectively), pqwdyh 'her commandments' (Gen 3:24, and pqwdyyh!, Gen 3:15, therefore perhaps all should be interpreted as determined state plural).

6. <u>qattul</u>

A small class, attested only by inanimate objects. <u>'bwb'</u> 'flute'; <u>'twnh</u>/<u>'twn'</u>/<u>'twn</u> (construct) 'oven', including Gen 11:3, abbreviated <u>'twn`</u>; ^C<u>mwd</u>/^C<u>mwd'</u>/^C<u>mwd</u> (construct) 'pillar'.

7. <u>qittol</u>

A small class, with no distinguishable semantic content.

a. <u>Masculine Forms</u>

<u>gywryn</u> 'strangers'; <u>knwr'</u> 'lute' (Gen 4:21, for MT <u>kinnōr</u>, and possibly in imitation thereof, cf. Gen 31:27 <u>kynryn</u> (= <u>kinnārin</u>?), also for MT <u>kinnōr</u>; ^C<u>dnh</u>/^C<u>(y)dn'</u>/^C<u>dn</u> and ^C<u>dwny</u> (constructs) 'appointed time', usually for MT <u>mô^Cēd</u>. At the same time, the MS translates <u>lə^Cēt</u> ^C<u>ereb</u> in Gen 8:11 and 24:11 by <u>l^Cdwny</u> <u>rmš'</u> (the same translates <u>lipnôt</u> ^C<u>ereb</u> in Gen 24:63) and <u>hērōnēk</u> in Gen 3:16 by ^C<u>dwnyk</u>. Hence, it appears that these are two separate words with similar meanings, ^C<u>iddānā</u> 'appointed time' and ^C<u>iddonā</u> 'period', specifically 'menses' (the latter may be a Hebraism); <u>rbwn</u> 'lord'.

(1) <u>Suffixed Forms</u>: <u>gywrykwn</u> 'your strangers' (Exod 20:10); ^C<u>dwnyk</u> 'your (fs) periods'; <u>rbwny</u> 'my lord', <u>rybwnyh</u> 'his lord', <u>rbwnh</u> 'her lord', <u>rbwnn</u> 'our lord', <u>rbwnyy</u> 'my lords', <u>rbwnyhw`</u> 'their lord!' (Gen 13:7, thus abbreviated, referring to Abram, presumably <u>pluralis excellentiae</u>, cf. Hebrew '^a<u>dōnā(y)w</u> 'his lord').

b. <u>Feminine Form</u>

(1) <u>With suffixes</u>: <u>rbwnty</u> 'my mistress' (= <u>ribbonəti</u>), <u>rbwntyk</u> 'your (fs) mistress', <u>rybwnyth:</u> 'her mistress' (presumably = <u>ribbonətah</u> ⟶ <u>ribbonitah</u>), usually for MT <u>gəbîrā</u> + suffixes.

8. <u>Unclassified</u>

<u>špwryn</u> 'beautiful' in Gen 6:2 (= ?, probably a mistake for <u>špyrn</u> or even (masculine) <u>špyryn</u> 'beautiful' in <u>špwryn</u> <u>ḥyzw</u> <u>'nwn</u>(?) 'they are beautiful of (?) appearance', for MT <u>tōbōt</u> (<u>ḥēnnā</u>). Or even perhaps the noun <u>šuprā</u> used in the plural. The subject, however, is f pl. Even so, the <u>ḥyzw</u>, based on the Hebrew text,

appears to be an interpolation, which would account for the fact that <u>špwryn</u> is not in the construct state. The vocalization, is nevertheless, unclear).

B. <u>Nouns of the Form qwtl</u>

These include the following vocalizations: (qutālā:) qutāl; (qotəlā:) qotal; (quttālā:) quttāl; (qutelā:) qutel; (qutlā:) qótal, qətol, qətal (< *qutl).

1. <u>qutāl</u>

<u>'wmn</u> 'craftsman'; <u>qwdš</u> '(nose)-ring' (in Gen 24:22,= <u>qudāš</u> < <u>qədāš</u>, cf. Onkelos, e.g., Jastrow, "Dictionary," p. 1321, and the singular and plural determined forms, <u>qdš'</u>/<u>qdšh</u> and <u>qdšy'</u> for MT (han)<u>nezem</u>, <u>hannəzāmîm</u>); <u>šwtpyn</u> 'partners' (Deut 5:17 ff).

2. <u>qotal</u>

a. <u>Masculine Forms</u>

<u>'wgr</u>/<u>'gr'(:)</u>/<u>'ygr</u> (:construct) 'pile'. The form with -<u>w</u>- occurs in Gen 31:46, for MT <u>gal</u>. The -<u>w</u>- is clear, however <u>'ygr</u> has been added supralinearly by a different hand. All other occurrences are on the base <u>'ygr</u>, including Gen 31:47 <u>'ygr šhdwt'</u> for the MT Aramaic phrase <u>yəgar śah^adûtā</u>. In this case, one can postulate <u>yəgar</u>>'<u>əgar</u> ⟶ '<u>igar</u>, '<u>ogar</u> ; <u>'wṣr'</u> 'treasure'; <u>qwzl</u> 'young bird' (for MT <u>gōzāl</u> in Gen 15:9, and apparently in imitation thereof, since it is expanded in the Aramaic to <u>qwzl br ywn</u>; cf. suffix forms below); <u>kwkbyn</u>/<u>kwkby'</u>/<u>kwkby</u> (construct) 'star(s); ^C<u>(w)bdh</u>/^C<u>bd</u> (construct)/^C<u>wbdyn</u> 'deed(s)' (with -<u>w</u>- in the singular in Exod 20:10, without in Gen 44:15; the construct is in Exod 28:32; the plural form is in Gen 21:8,9 and 38:7).

(1) <u>III-Weak Roots</u>: <u>s(w)gy</u> (absolute and construct) 'largeness', cf. Onkelos <u>sạge:</u> <u>sagəyā</u>, i.e., <u>səge</u> ⟶ <u>soge</u> with assimilation to the velar.

(2) <u>Suffixed Forms</u>: <u>qwzlwy</u> 'its young' (Deut 32:11, MT <u>gôzālā(y)w</u>); ^C<u>wbdk</u> 'your deed'/^C<u>wbdyy</u> 'my deeds'/^C<u>wbdyk</u> 'your deeds'/^C<u>wbdyhwn</u> 'their deeds'.

b <u>Feminine Forms</u>

<u>'wrḥ</u>/<u>'(w)rḥ'</u>/<u>'(w)rḥ</u> (construct)/<u>'(w)rḥth</u> 'way(s)'

(=ʼoraḥ < *ʼurḥ, unmarked feminine noun in the singular), usually for MT derek (but for ʼoraḥ in Gen 18:11 and 49:11, and in the plural, in the phrase pršwt ʼ(w)rḥth 'crossroads', for MT (petaḥ) ^Cênayim twice in Gen 38); slt 'fine flour' (= solat?, feminine in Onkelos and in Hebrew, therefore also here?), in Gen 18:6 qmḥ dslt for MT qemaḥ sōlet, spelled also defectively, so the Aramaic may be in imitation of the Hebrew.

(1) Suffixed Forms: ʼ(w)rḥy 'my way'/ʼrḥk 'your way'/ʼ(w)rḥ(y)h 'his way'/ʼrḥkwn 'your way'/ʼwrḥtyˋ (Gen 6:12, thus abbreviated, for MT darkô) and ʼrḥtyh 'his ways' (Deut 32:4, MT dərākā(y)w).

3. quttāl

Only slm(!) 'ladder' in Gen 28:12, for MT sūllām, also spelled defectively.

4. qutel

bwṣynyh 'lamps' (Lev 24:2); kwrsy{h} 'chair' (= kurse, Gen 28:12, with aural error -yh for -y, no Hebrew Vorlage)/kwrswwn 'chairs' (Gen 15:17) ^Cwlm 'young man'.

(a) Suffixed forms: ^Cwlymwy/^Cwlymwhy 'his youths' (the latter in Gen 22:3), usually for MT nə^Cārā(y)w, but also ^Clmwy in Gen 14:14 for ḥ^anîkā(y)w/^Cwlymyhwn 'their youths'.

5. *qutl

The matres lectionis in this MS, as well as the comparative data in Onkelos, indicate that this well-represented segholate class may have developed into three separate vocalization groups in the absolute state. The forms rarely appear in the absolute or construct singular, however, so conclusions must be regarded as tentative. Many early mergings in Aramaic, together with some current assimilations, complicate the analysis, as does the confusion in this MS between w and y (e.g., Onkelos ^Ciqba = Neofiti ^Cwqbh 'end'. Is this velar assimilation or merely copyist confusion of w for y?). The majority of forms appear to be the expected qótal (vocalized thus in the absence of the vowel seghol in the Aramaic transcription); other forms are qətol and qətal.

a. Masculine Forms

(1) qutlā:qótal

ʼwrkˋ 'length' (Gen 6:15, thus abbreviated, possibly also for 3fs pronominal suffix)/ʼrkh 'its length' (3fs, Gen 13:17); ḥ(w)ṭrʼ/ḥ(w)ṭryʼ 'rod(s)'/ḥwṭry 'my rod'/ḥwṭrk 'your rod' (for MT maṭṭe/maqqal); ^Cwrbʼ 'raven'; q(w)dšʼ/qdšh 'holiness' (cf. qdšʼ 'nose-ring' in (B.1)qutāl, above); q(w)šṭʼ 'truth' (without -w- only in Gen 17:1, usually in adverbial constructions bqwšṭʼ 'in truth', e.g., Gen 5:22 or mn qwšṭʼ 'in truth', e.g., Deut 13:15, 17:4)/qwšṭh 'his truth' (Gen 24:27).

(2) qutlā:qatol

tqph/tqwp (construct) 'strength'/twqpk 'your stength'.

(3) qutlā:qatal

rgz (absolute)/rwgzʼ 'anger' (abbreviated rwgzˋ in Gen 18:32)/rwgz(y)h 'his anger'.

b. Assimilated Forms

The following nouns are assimilated to the qutlā group in this MS, based on their appearance in Onkelos: ^Cwqbh 'end', 'future' (Gen 3:15); šwtpʼ 'seal-cord' (= šutpā<šatpā, cf. Onkelos, perhaps influenced by šwtpʼ 'partner', above)/šwtpk 'your (ms) seal-cord'.

Also included here are the plural forms (only) of gbrʼ 'man' spelled with a -w-, gwbryn/gwbryʼ/gwbryyh 'men' alongside the "expected" gbryn/gbryʼ/gbryyˋ. Approximately 50% of the plural forms are spelled with -w-, indicating assimilation of the vowel to the bilabial, however in none of the many singular forms is any assimilation indicated graphically (so gabrā:gəbar, but gubrayyā:gubrin?).

c. Feminine Forms

ḥkmh/ḥkmʼ 'wisdom'/ḥkmthwn 'their wisdom' (in the phrase bs(w)gy ḥkmt'/ḥkmthwn 'in (their) great wisdom' for MT bəmirmā in Gen 27:35 and 34:13, cf. Onkelos for the vocalization ḥukmā); ḥwmṭh 'darkness' (Gen 15:17); nqbh/nqbth/nqbn 'female(s)' (note the abbreviated forms nqbˋ in Gen 7:2 and

nwqb` in Gen 5:2). The absolute singular usually
occurs in the Genesis phrase dkr wnqbh 'male and
female'. For the determined, see Lev 27:7; ^Crlt
(construct) 'foreskin' (Deut 10:16)/^Crlt(y)h 'his
foreskin' (e.g., Gen 17:25,26, Lev 19:23)/^Crltkw`
'your (mp) foreskin(s)' (thus abbreviated in
Gen 17:11)/^Crlthwn 'their foreskin' (Gen 17:23),
usually for MT ^Corlā, etc.

An unmarked feminine is gwmryn 'coals', in
Gen 3:24, gwmryn mb^Crn 'burning coals'.

6. **Unclassified Forms**
There are two unusual feminine forms, when compared to
Onkelos: kwrkwwn 'sheaves' (= kurikəwān?, cf. Onkelos
kərikān, also feminine)/ kwrkwty 'my sheaves'/kwrkwtkwn
'your (mp) sheaves'; ^Cbydt' (sic) 'beasts of burden'
(Gen 33:14, for MT hamməlā(')kā). Onkelos has
^Cobadətā and this ^Cobidətā(?) presumably reflects
copyist confusion with ^Cbydt' 'work'.

C. <u>Nouns and Adjectives of the Form qtyl</u>
Nouns and adjectives in this category are either of the
type qattil, always spelled with -y-, with some possible
exceptions, e.g., tqn, šltwy, and the feminine ybšt', which
may all be interpreted differently (cf. also sgy'yn vs.
sgyn); or of the type qatil (<passive participle) or qətel,
also spelled with -y-, but with numerous exceptions. Due
to the early merging in Aramaic of *qatal/qatil/*qatul with
*qatl/*qitl/*qutl, many of these nominal forms are
indistinguishable from the segholates (q.v), e.g., kəšar:
kasrā; 'əbel: 'ablā, etc. For details, see the respective
entries. Once again, the basis for comparison is the form
as found in Onkelos.

1. **qattil**
   a. **Masculine Forms**
      zbydyn 'gifts' (cf. Onkelos zəbudin, therefore
      possibly w/y confusion here); ḥkym/ḥkym'
      (!construct plural)/ḥkymy''wise' (cf. Exod 28:3 for
      ḥkym' lyb' 'the wise of heart'); ḥmym 'warmth';
      ytyr 'more; lqyšy'/lqyšy (construct plural)
      'early-born' (Gen 30:42); sgy'/sgy'yn (rare)/sgyn
      (common) 'great' (cf. Gen 3:22 for sgy'yn);
      ^Ctyd/^Ctydyn 'designated' ———→ 'destined'

(+ participles or infinitives); ptyryn 'loaves'
(Gen 18:6, 19:3, Lev 22:27); ṣdyq/ṣdyq'/
ṣdyqyn/ṣdyqy' 'righteous'; qdyš (Exod 3:5)/qdyš'
(Gen 38:25) 'holy'; qlyl (construct)/qlylyn 'a
few'; qryb (construct) 'close' ———→ 'relative'
(Gen 29:14, Lev 18:6 + Gen 37:27 qrb bśrn for MT
bāśār); qryr 'cold' (noun); rḥyq 'far'
(= rāḥiq < *raḥḥiq); rṭyb 'fresh'; rkyk 'tender';
ršy^Cy' 'evil' (once abbreviated ršy^Cy` in
Gen 4:8; šlyṭ/šlyṭ' 'commander' (cf. suffixed forms
below); špyr 'good', but cf. also špr = šapar;
tnyny' 'giants'; tqn 'fitting' (presumably Onkelos
taqqin, or else perhaps taqen); tqyp' 'strong'
(Gen 31:42 and 53, for MT paḥad ('abîw) yiṣḥāq).
   (1) <u>Suffixed Forms</u>: dqyqyhwn 'their children';
       qrybyhwn 'their relatives'; šlṭwy (!) 'his
       commanders' (cf. šlyṭ above).
   b. <u>Feminine Forms</u>
      ybšt' 'dry land' (= yabbištā ?, however cf.
      Jastrow, "Dictionary," p. 562, for alternate
      yabbaštā, or even yabbeštā); mryr' 'bitter';
      ^Cmyqh 'deep'; qlyln 'a few' (note also the error
      in Gen 29:20 ywmyn qlyln 'a few days', for qlylyn);
      qrybh 'close'; špyr'/špyrt (construct) 'beautiful';
      tqyph 'strong' (Gen 18:15, and tqyp' in
      Gen 27:34). An unmarked feminine is skyn' 'knife'
      (Gen 22:6,10, for MT hamma'^akelet) No suffixed
      forms are attested.

2. **qətil/qətel**
   a. **Masculine Forms**
      'blyn/'blyh 'mourners'; bkyryh/bkyry (construct
      plural) 'first-born'; b^Cyr/b^Cyr' (b^Cyrh)
      'cattle'; gzl (construct!)/gzylyn 'robbery
      (robberies)'; dbyr'/ dbyryh 'word(s) (in the
      singular, Gen 28:10; in the plural in Deut 4:9ff
      etc. ^Cśrty dbyryh 'The Ten Commandments'); dḥyl
      'feared one' (Exod 15:2); z^Cyr/z^Cyr' 'small';
      zqyq 'obligated' (probably the passive participle
      of root zqq 'to obligate', in Gen 30:30; cf. also
      Deut 9:21 zqyq ṭb'wt 'finely ground', MT ṭāḥôn
      hêṭēb, possibly passive participle of the same
      root, see Jastrow, "Dictionary," p. 410, and Levy,
      "Wörterbuch," p. 229; ḥbybh 'uncle' (Lev 10:4, MT

dōd); ḥsyd' 'pious' (Gen 24:60, 28:12, 29:22, gbr' ḥsyd' 'pious man'); ymyn' 'right hand'; yqd 'burning' (Gen 38:25, cf. Onkelos yqyd, or else yəqad, but note the feminine yqydh/ yqydt' below); kšr/kšryn 'fitting' (cf. Onkelos kəšer, but also kəšar); mṣy^ch 'middle'; mšyḥ' 'Messiah'; nby' 'prophet'; npyš 'breathing (space)' Gen 32:17, for MT rewaḥ); ^cbyt' 'saddle'; pryq 'redeemer' (Exod 15:2, but cf. prwq in (A.3.) qātol, above); spyr (construct)/spyr' 'he-goat'; rdydh 'veil'; rqy^c (construct)/rqy^c' 'firmament' (note also the error in Gen 1:17 rqy^c' šmy'); šbybyn 'sparks'; šlyḥyn 'envoys'; šl(y)m/šlmh/šlmyn 'perfect'; šmyn 'fat' (Lev 22:27); tlymyn 'twins' (Gen 49:5).

(1) Suffixed Forms: b^cyrk 'your (ms) cattle'/b^cyryh 'his cattle'/b^cyrhwn 'their cattle'/b^cyryhwn 'their cattle (pl)'; dbyry 'my words' (Deut 4:12, cf. dbry, Deut 4:10)/dbyrwy 'his words' (Deut 4:36); zbnn (?) 'our purchase' (or else perhaps zabbinān, Gen 31:15 ksp zbnn 'the silver of our purchase', for MT kaspēnû); yḥydk 'your (ms) only one' (Gen, Chapter 22); nḥyrwy 'his nostrils'; rdydh 'her veil'; šmynyhwn 'their fats' (Gen 4:4, spelled šmyny with hwn added in the margin in a different hand, for MT ḥelbēhen)

b. Feminine Forms

bkyrth 'first-born'; bsymh 'pleasant' (Gen 15:12 šnh bsymh 'pleasant sleep', for MT tardēmā, cf. Gen 2:21 šnh ^cmyqh for MT tardēmā); bryt (construct) 'creation' (root b-r-', Gen 2:1); gzyrt (construct) /gzrt' 'decree'/'circumcision'; hpkt' 'destruction' (cf. Onkelos h^apektā); zbynt (construct) 'that which is bought' (Gen 17:27); z^cyr'/z^cyrt' 'small' (note the unusual spellings in Gen 19:31 z^crt', and 19:35 z^cyr't': with internal 'aleph as mater lectionis for shewa mobile, cf. Chapter 2, Orthography, i.e., zə^cirtā → zə^cirtā); ḥbybh 'precious' (Gen 44:30, for MT qəšûrā:, cf. masculine ḥbybh 'uncle', above); yqydh/yqydth 'burning' (cf. yqd,

above, Deut 29:22 and Gen 38:25, respectively)'; knyšt (construct)/knyšt' 'assembly'; lḥynth/lḥynt' 'concubine(s)'; nb(y)lh 'carrion', Lev 17:15, Deut 14:21; qbylt (construct) 'complaint' (Gen 6:13); škynh 'Shekinah' (cf. suffixed forms, below). An unmarked feminine is lbnyn/lbnyh 'bricks' (cf. Onkelos).

(1) Suffixed Forms: gzyrtyh 'his circumcision'/gzrthwn 'their circumcision'/gzyrtk 'your (ms) decree'; knyštyhwn 'their assemblies'; lḥyntyh 'his concubine' (Gen 22:4, and the same spelling for 'his concubines', Gen 32:22; note also lḥynty in Gen 25:6); ^cbdtyh 'his work' (Gen 2:2, and cf. again in Gen 2:2,3, ^cybydtyh 'his work', presumably ^ca bidteh ⟶ ^cibidteh, all for MT məla(')ktô); qbyltyh 'its (i.e., Sodom's) complaint'/qb(y)lthwn 'their complaint'; škyntk 'your Shekinah'/škynt(y)h 'his Shekinah'.

D. Nouns and Adjectives of the Form qtl

1. Masculine

This classification includes all those nouns usually unmarked by the use of matres lectionis, the primary group being the segholates, i.e., those derived from PS *qatl, *qitl, and *qutl. Once again, the vocalizations offered here are based on the way these forms appear in Onkelos, given the unvocalized nature of Neofiti and the inconsistent use of matres lectionis. However, many of these words are inconsistent in Onkelos also, consequently comparative data are used where appropriate. Nonetheless, there remains a certain degree of arbitrariness regarding the citation of some of the forms.

None of the groups here is exhaustive. Rather, these groupings should be taken as representative, citing as they do many of the common words (and also most of the unusual ones). Once again, the analysis is based on Genesis, with frequent cross-checks and additional citations from the other Pentateuchal books. No attempt has been made to present a concordance of all

nominal forms that occur in the MS Neofiti 1. Where apparent overlap exists between these <u>qtl</u> forms and others, reference is made to the relevant sections, and the forms as presented there should be consulted. The groups under consideration here are:

a. <u>qatlā:qətal</u>

This is the most common nominal form in the MS (derived from PS *<u>qatal</u>). In the absolute, it is indistinguishable from <u>qitlā: qətal</u> and <u>qutlā:qətal</u> (see below); given the inconsistent use of <u>matres lectionis</u>, the determined form is not always marked, consequently the classification of these three types depends most heavily on the Onkelos forms (usually as cited in Jastrow, "Dictionary," and Levy, "Wörterbuch"). The majority of the nouns in these classifications are masculine. Marked feminine forms of the types (1) <u>qatlətā:qatlā</u>; (2) <u>qitlətā:qitlā</u>; (3) <u>qutlətā:qutlā</u> are not heavily attested [the majority belong to group (1)], and are gathered at the end in separate classifications. Where an unmarked feminine form occurs (e.g., <u>'r^c'</u> 'land', etc.), the gender is noted in the comments. Representative suffixed forms are also noted in the comments.

Singular Determined	Singular Absolute	Plural Determined	Plural Absolute	Gloss
---	'gr	---	---	'reward'
'dmh	'dm	'dmyyh	---	'blood'
dm'(!)				
'rk'	---	---	---	'length'
'r^c'	---	'r^ct'	---	'land'
'tr'	'tr	---	---	'place'
'gbr'	gbr	gbry(y)'	gbryn	'man'
		gwbry'	gwbryn	
		gwbryyh		
---	grm	---	---	'bone'
dhb'	dhb	---	---	'gold'
wwldh	---	---	---	'child'
zhr'	---	---	---	'moon'
---	zr^c	---	zr^cyn	'seed'
---	ḥlb	---	---	'milk'
---	---	---	ḥmsyn	'violent acts'

Singular Determined	Singular Absolute	Plural Determined	Plural Absolute	Gloss
ḥmr'	ḥmr	---	---	'wine'
ḥql'	---	ḥqlyh	ḥqlyn	'field'
ḥtnh	---	---	---	'groom', 'son-in-law'
yldh	---	---	---	'birth'
yrḥ'	---	---	yrḥyn	'month'
yrk'	---	---	---	'thigh'
ksp'	ksp	---	---	'silver'
kpn'	---	---	---	'famine'
krkh	---	---	---	'city'
---	mḥr	---	---	'tomorrow'
---	mll	---	---	'word'
mšk'	---	---	---	'skin'
nhr'	nhr	nhryy'	nhryn	'river'
nḥlh	---	---	---	'valley'
npš'	npš	npšt'	---	'soul'
---	shd	---	shdy! śhdy!	'witness'
^cpr'	^cpr	---	---	'dust'
---	ṣ^cr	---	---	'pain'
ṣpr'	ṣpr	---	---	'morning'
---	---	---	qdmyn	'east', 'beginning'
---	---	---	qlpyn	'strips'
---	qmḥ	---	---	'flour'
qšt'	---	---	---	'bow'
rmš'	rmš	---	---	'evening'
r^cw(w)'	---	---	---	'favor'
---	---	---	śhryn	'moon'
---	ś^cr	---	ś^cryn	'hair'
---	śrp	---	---	'Seraph'
šḥr'	---	---	---	'dawn'
---	špr	---	---	'choice'
---	tb^c	---	---	'teba-weight'
tr^c'	---	---	---	'door'

Comments:

'gr: Construct also <u>'gr</u>; suffix forms <u>'gry</u>, <u>'grk</u> (and note Gen 31:8 <u>'gryk</u> 'your (ms!) reward').

'dmh: Construct 'dm; suffix forms 'dmyh, 'dmhwn; note especially Gen 38:25 dm'(!) dṣpyr' 'the blood of a goat'. Plural in Gen 13:13 špykwt 'dmyyh 'the spilling of blood'. Note the identity of form with the plural construct noun 'dmy 'price', e.g., Gen 21:33.

'rᶜ': Feminine noun, note the marked plural ending, but with suffixes, the "expected" 'rᶜwthwn (compare Gen 26:3 with 10:5). There are numerous misspellings of the singular: ᶜr'ᶜ (Gen 22:18), 'rᶜy' ('his land', Deut 11:3), 'rᶜyh ('my land', Gen 30:25), 'rᶜ' for construct 'rᶜ often, abbreviations 'rᶜˋ and 'rˋ.

'tr': Occasional spellings 'trh, note the error 'rth in Gen 19:14. With suffixes, 'try, 'tryh, 'tryhwn (Gen 36:40).

gbr': See the note Assimilated Forms in Section 2, Nouns of the Form qwtl, (B.5.b), above.

grm: As the Reflexive Pronoun, see Chapter 6, Section 9. In the absolute, for MT ᶜeṣem, see Gen 2:23; for suffixed forms, with the meaning 'bone', see grmy 'my bone', Gen 2:23, grmyy 'my bones', Gen 50:25.

wwldh: Construct wwld, twice in Gen 30:2, with suffix wldh 'her child', Exod 21:22 (for MT yəlādeyhā, but cf. the Samaritan and LXX cited in BHS, p. 121, wəlādāh). Cf yldh below.

zrᶜ: The singular means 'seed' (MT zeraᶜ, numerous times); the plural in Gen 8:22 meaning 'seed-times', is for MT collective zeraᶜ in the list zeraᶜ wəqāṣîr, etc.; with suffixes, zrᶜyhwn 'their seed'⟶'their progeny'.

htn: With suffixes htnk 'your son-in-law', Gen 19:12, htnwy 'his sons-in-law', Gen 19:14. Cf. the feminine htntyh (Deut 27:23), below.

yldh: In Gen 20:18 ptḥy yldh 'wombs', for MT collective reḥem, but cf. Exod 13:13 ptḥy wwld', for MT peṭer.

yrḥ: For MT ḥōdeš. Note the spelling yrt' in Gen 7:11, with ḥ/t confusion, see Chapter 2, Orthography, and the abbreviation yrḥˋ dywmyn 'a month of days' (Gen 29:14).

yrk': Feminine noun. With suffixes yrky, yrkyh.

krkh: Possibly karakkā, cf. Jastrow, "Dictionary," p. 669 and Levy, "Wörterbuch," p.387.

mll: Gen 34:3 mll dšlm 'word(s) of peace' only. Possibly maləlā: məlal, cf. Jastrow, "Dictionary," p. 792, through usually one finds mylt' in Neofiti.

nhr: Note Gen 36:37 byny nhryy' 'Between-the-Rivers'= 'Mesopotamia', for the MT toponymn rəḥōbōt hannāhār 'Rehoboth by the River'.

npš: Feminine noun, with marked feminine plural form.

shd: The plural form without -n is found once in Deut 5:20, spelled with ś, śhdy dšqr 'false witnesses' (based on MT ᶜēd šāw') and twice in a midrashic passage in Gen 38:25, wbᶜt tlt' shdy wl' 'škḥt ythwn...whb ly tlt' shdy w'nh mqyymh lk tlt' ṣdyqyn 'and she sought three witnesses and did not find them...and give me (my?) three witnesses and I will raise up for you three righteous men'. The second may be interpreted as 'my witnesses', although the first clearly can not. Perhaps both result from homoieteleuton with the following ws, due to a copyist confusion between -w- and final -n. The examples with suffixes are spelled with ś also: śhdy 'my witness' and śhdwy 'his witnesses', both also in Gen 38:25.

ṣᶜr: Note the form ṣᶜrwn 'their pain', Exod 4:31, for expected ṣᶜrhwn (cf. Gen 25:22)

qdmyn: Gen 1:1 mlqdmyn 'since the beginning' (MT bərē(')šît); Gen 2:8, 13:11 mn lqdmyn and Gen 3:24 mn mlqdmyn (!) 'at the east', both for MT miqqedem, (cf. Gen 25:6 qdmyyn 'east', MT miqqedem, and Deut 33:27 mlqdmyn 'since the beginning', based on the poetic MT 'ᵉlōhê qedem). Probably two separate idioms mlqdmyn and qdmyn that are confused in the MS due to the similarity of the forms.

b. qatlā:qátal

These are the segholates Tiberianized from Babylonian (<PS*qatl, and corresponding to Hebrew and occasional Biblical Aramaic forms mélek, etc.), transcribed thus due to the lack of the vowel seghol in the Aramaic transcription. Also included here are the II-guttural segholates, qatlā : qátel, usually spelled plene with -y- in Onkelos, though not necessarily so in this MS.

Singular Determined	Singular Absolute	Plural Determined	Plural Absolute	Gloss
'bn'	---	'bny'	'bnyn	'stone'
---	'lp	'lpyh	'lpyn	'thousand'
---	b^{c}l	---	---	'lord'
ḥrb'	ḥrb	---	---	'sword'
---	ṭ^{c}m	---	---	'taste'
---	---	ṭply'	---	'children'
ksp'	ksp	---	---	'silver'
---	krm	---	---	'vineyard'
lḥm'	lḥm	---	---	'bread'
mlk'	mlk	mlky(y)'	mlkyn	'king'
^{c}bd'	^{c}bd	---	^{c}bdyn	'servant'
---	---	psgyyh	---	'parts'

Comments:

'bn':   Feminine noun; with suffixes, 'bnwy 'its (ms) stones'.

b^{c}l: Often in the idioms b^{c}l dbbw 'enmity', b^{c}ly dbb' 'enemies'. (Cf. Kaufman, "Akkadian Influences", p. 42). Most common with suffixes, b^{c}ly, b^{c}lh, etc.

ḥrb':   Feminine noun.

ṭ^{c}m: Cf. Num 11:8 hwh ṭ^{c}myh kṭ^{c}m ššyn bdbš 'its taste was like the taste of pancakes with honey' (MT ṭa^{c}mô...ṭa^{c}am).

ṭply':   Plural only. For MT haylādîm in Gen 33:5. With suffixes, translates MT ṭap + suffixes in Gen 34:29, ṭplyhwn, Gen 43:8, ṭplynn, Deut 1:39 ṭplykwn. (The more common translation for yeled etc. in the MS is ṭly' (or even occasionally bnyn), cf. Gen 33:5 where both ṭply' and ṭly' are used for haylādîm.

mlk':   The singular and plural determined state is occasionally abbreviated mlkʾ/mlkyʾ. Note the unusual spelling in Gen 26:1 mlk'hwn(!) dplšt'y 'the king of the Philistines', with א for shewa mobile, cf. Chapter 2, Orthography.

psgyyh: Once in Gen 15:11 for MT happəgārîm, and again in the same verse, abbreviated psgyyʾ in an interpretive expansion. Elsewhere MT peger = Neofiti pgr, e.g., Lev 26:30.

Other forms probably to be included here are dmkyh 'his bed', Gen 2:24 and ḥlṣyk 'your (ms) loins', Gen 17:6 and 35:11.

c. qātəlā:qātel

For the active participle, cf. Chapter 6, Verbs, Stem Forms.

d. qitlā:qətal

A common group of nominals, from PS *qatal/qital (cf. section (D.1.a) above). Once again, due to the inconsistent use of matres lectionis, the forms are based on Onkelos, however the Onkelos forms also vary considerably. Hence, a certain degree of arbitrariness is involved in assigning any given word to a given category.

Singular Determined	Singular Absolute	Plural Determined	Plural Absolute	Gloss
'l^c'(!)	---	---	---	'rib'
b(y)śr'	bśr	---	---	'flesh'
---	---	gzryy'	---	'sections'
dk(w)r'	dkr	dkryyh	dkryn	'male','ram'
---	---	---	dtyn	'sproutings'
z(y)mn'	zmn	---	zmnyn	'time'
---	---	---	zmryn	'songs'
ḥzw(w)h	ḥ(y)zw	---	---	'vision'
ḥlm'	ḥlm	ḥlmy'	---	'dream'
mṭr'	mṭr	---	---	'rain'
---	mšh	---	---	'oil'
---	ndr	---	---	'vow'
---	---	nksy'	nksyn	'goods'
sṭr'	sṭr	---	---	'side'
---	---	---	sl^{c}yn	'selas'
---	^{c}dr	^{c}dry'	^{c}dry(!)	'flocks'
^{c}śb'	^{c}śb	---	---	'grass'
---	---	---	ṣmḥyn	'plants'
---	qṭm	---	---	'ash(es)'
---	qṭp	---	---	'balsam'
---	śy^c	---	---	'cement'

Comments:

'l^c':   Usually spelled thus, e.g., Gen 2:21,22 'l^c mn 'l^{c}wy 'a rib from his ribs', 'l^c 'rib', but note

in 2:21 a "mistaken" form ^cl' is "corrected" by repeating the word (cf. Klein, JSS, pp. 228-29), however this form seems to reflect the normal Onkelos ^cl^c', which is found in Gen 44:19 ^cyl^c' (for the same dissimilation, cf. also the verb 'r^c 'to meet' for Onkelos ^cr^c).

b(y)śr': The spelling byśr' is found in Gen 6:12. The word occurs often, also with suffixes.

dk(w)r': Spelled often with -w- meaning 'male', e.g., Gen 17:10, Num 31:17, etc., usually for MT zākār (and occasionally 'îš or ben), but also without -w- in the same circumstances. Spelled only without -w- meaning 'ram' for MT 'ayil/'êlîm.

dtyn: Gen 1:11,12 for MT deše' (also Deut 28:23), and Deut 32:2 dty ^cśbyh 'sproutings of grasses' based on MT poetic deše'...^cēśeb (ditin < dit'in).

ḥzw(w)h: Spelled variously ḥzwh/ḥzwwh/ḥzww'. Absolute ḥyzw, e.g., Gen 24:16 špyrt ḥyzw 'beautiful of appearance', and note Gen 12:11 špyrt ḥzy (?), presumably ḥzw with w/y confusion.

nksy': Note the error spelling nknsyn(!) in Gen 15:14.

^cdr: Note the absolute plural ^cdry d^cn(!) 'flocks of sheep' (Gen 29:2, MT ^cedrê ṣō(')n), presumably an error due to haplography of the letters ^cd/d^c for the construct ^cdry ^cn (or else segholate, see section (D.1.e) below).

šy^c: i.e., šəya^c, Gen 11:3, for MT ḥōmer, Num 19:5, for MT (ṣāmîd) pātîl.

e. qitlā:qétal

Segholate type (< PS *qitl), cf. (D.1.b) above.

Singular Determined	Singular Absolute	Plural Determined	Plural Absolute	Gloss
'bl'	'bl	---	---	'mourning'
ḥsd'	ḥsd	ḥsdy'	---	'kindness'
yṣrh	yṣr	---	---	'inclination'
yrq'	---	---	---	'greens'
mlḥh	mlḥ	---	---	'salt'
sgdh(?)	---	---	---	'idol'
sdr'	sdr	---	sdryn	'arrangement'
spr'	---	---	---	'book'
---	---	---	pl'yn	'miracles'

Singular Determined	Singular Absolute	Plural Determined	Plural Absolute	Gloss
---	[ṣlm]	ṣlmy(y)h	---	'image'
qbrh	---	qbryh	qbryn	'grave'
rglh	rgl	---	---	'leg'
šm^ch	---	---	---	'news'
šmš'	---	šmšyy'	---	'sun'
---	tbn	---	---	'straw'

Comments:

'bl: Cf. 'bylwtn 'our mourning', Deut 26:14.

ḥsd: Common with suffixes; for the plural, see Gen 32:10, for MT haḥ^asādîm.

yrq': Deut 11:10, and in the construct, Gen 9:3 (the latter spelled with Hebrew vowels יֶרֶק). Note also Lev 14:37, the feminine plural adjective yrqn, qualifying šq^cn 'green cavities', for MT yəraqraqqōt.

sgdh: In Onkelos this form is the abstract 'worship', however in Neofiti it occurs in Gen 11:4 wn^cbd ln br'šyh sgdh 'and let us make for ourselves an idol at its head', cf. Pseudo-Jonathan, ad loc., sigdu and Fragment targum, ad loc., səgidu.

sdr': e.g., Gen 6:15, Exod 28:17. Common in construct, especially in Genesis chapter 1 in the idiom sdr ^cbd br'šyt ywm... 'the order of the making of Genesis, day (number)..., and also in sdr dyn'/sdry dynyyh 'the order(s) of the judgement(s)', Gen 6:3 and Deut 5:31, respectively.

spr': Exod 17:14, and in the construct in Gen 5:1.

pl'yn: Exod 15:11, spelled plyyn in Exod 8:18.

ṣlmy(y)h: Possibly ṣalmayyā, cf. Onkelos. All occurrences of the singular ṣlm in this MS have been erased by the Catholic censor.

qbrh: Common with suffixes, e.g., qbryh, qbrynn, etc. For the plural, cf. Exod 14:11, and the toponym in Num 11:34 qbry š'lth 'The Graves of the Request', for MT qibrot hatta'^awā

šmš': For the plural, cf. Gen 49:27 byny šmšyy' 'twilight'.

f. qutlā:qətol

A small group of nouns (< PS *qatul); in Aramaic

this group has by and large merged with those segholates from PS *qutl (section (D.1.g), below), as both are spelled qtwl in the absolute (when matres lectionis are used). So too in this MS, in which most of the forms are written defectively. Hence, the classification, while based on the forms in Onkelos, is also determined by comparative/historical considerations.

Singular Determined	Singular Absolute	Plural Determined	Plural Absolute	Gloss
q(w)šṭ'	---	---	---	'truth'
tqph	---	---	---	'strength'

Comments:

q(w)šṭ': Spelled qšṭ' in Gen 17:1.

tqph: Gen 18:1, btqph dywm' 'in the strength of the day'; also in the construct, tqwp rwgz(y)h 'the strength of his anger', e.g., Gen 27:45, Num 25:4.

g. qutlā:qótal

A small group of segholates, from PS *qutl.

Singular Determined	Singular Absolute	Plural Determined	Plural Absolute	Gloss
'wdnh	---	---	---	'ear'
ḥ(w)ṭr'	ḥṭr	ḥwṭry'	---	'rod'
kwtlh	---	---	---	'wall'
q(w)dš'	---	---	---	'holiness'
rwgz'	rgz	---	---	'anger'

Comments:

'wdnh: Exod 29:20; for the plural, Gen 35:4 'dnhwn(!) 'their ears' (MT 'oznêhem).

ḥ(w)ṭr': Spelled ḥṭr' in Gen 30:37, ḥṭr in Exod 4:2,4 and ḥṭry' in Gen 30:39.

kwtlh: Num 35:4, and the plural kwtly(!) dbyyth 'the walls of the house' (= kwtlyh?), Lev 14:37, 39.

q(w)dš': Variously spelled qwdš', qdš', qdšh.

rwgz': Abbreviated rwgz` in Gen 18:32.

2. Feminine

a. qatlatā:qatlā

The most common group of feminine form nouns (for the feminine active participle, see Chapter 6, Verbs, Stem Forms).

Singular Determined	Singular Absolute	Plural Determined	Plural Absolute	Gloss
'dmt'	---	---	---	'earth'
'm(h)t'	'mhh	---	'mhn	'handmaid'
bhtth	---	---	---	'shame
dḥlt'	---	---	---	'fear'
dᶜth	---	---	---	'knowledge'
ḥqlt<'>	---	---	---	'field'
[ḥtnt']	---	---	---	'mother-in-law
---	---	----	nkswn	'sacrifices'
ᶜqrt'	---	---	---	'barrenness'
rḥmt'	---	---	---	'love'
---	šᶜwwh	---	---	'wax'
šᶜt'	---	---	---	'hour'

Comments:

'm(h)t': Variously spelled, 'mht', 'mt' (Gen 16:8, 25:12), 'mth (Gen 21:10, 13); with suffixes also usually without -h-, but note Gen 30:4, 9, 10, 12 'mhth 'her handmaid' and also the error form in Gen 30:7, 'mhhth!

dḥlt': Note the plural in Gen 31:30 meaning 'idols', dḥlty 'my idols' (MT 'ᵉlōhāy); elsewhere, the expected tᶜwt' etc. is found for 'idol'.

dᶜth: Especially in the idiom gnb dᶜt 'to deceive' (Gen 31:20,26), cf. Levy, "Wörterbuch," p. 182.

ḥqlt<'>: Only in Gen 23:17, ḥqlt<'> dᶜprwn ' Ephron's field', for MT śade(h) ᶜeprōn; elsewhere, the masculine form ḥql is used (see section D.1.a above).

[ḥtnt']: Only with suffix, Deut 27:23, ḥtntyh 'his mother-in-law' (MT ḥōtantô).

nkswn: So in Gen 43:16. The apparent nksyn in Gen 31:54 is presumably the same, with w/y confusion (also possibly influenced by the more common nksyn 'goods'). The singular construct occurs commonly in

šᶜt'

the technical religious idiom <u>nkst qwdšyn/qdyšyn</u> 'holy sacrifices' (e.g., Exod 18:12, 32:6, Lev 19:5). Common in compound conjunctions, usually for MT (bā)ᶜēt, etc. and note Gen 28:10 šᶜ<w>y 'its hours', spelled šᶜyy, with w/y confusion.

b. qitlətā:qitlā

A less well-attested group of nouns than qatlətā: qatlā.

Singular Determined	Singular Absolute	Plural Determined	Plural Absolute	Gloss
---	bqᶜh	---	---	'valley'
brkt'	brkh	brkth	brkn	'blessing'
dᶜth	---	---	---	'sweat'
	mšḥ'	---	---	'measure'
nṣbt'	---	---	---	'shoot'
nšmˋ	n(y)šmh	---	---	'breath'
ᶜglth	ᶜglh	---	---	'calf'
ᶜzqth	---	[ᶜzqy'(:)]	[ᶜzqyn(:)]	'signet-ring'
ṣdqth	---	---	---	'righteousness'
---	ṣwwḥh	---	---	'shout'

Comments:

mšḥ':   Exod 26:2; construct in Gen 6:15,16, and note Num 13:32 mšyḥ'(:), either error for myšḥ' or else mišəḥā ⟶ mišiḥā.

nšmˋ: The determined is abbreviated in Gen 2:7, nšmˋ dḥyyn 'the breath of life'; the absolute is variously spelled, nšmh (Gen 7:15,22,9:3), nyšmh (Deut 20:16), nšwmh(:), in Gen 6:7.

ᶜzqth: Gen 38:18,25, for MT ḥōtemet; the masculine plural forms (Exod 25:12,14) translate MT ṭabbāᶜōt, hence presumably a different word.

c. qutlətā:qutlā

The only two words apparently belonging to this classification are also classifiable elsewhere, hence perhaps the grouping is not really attested in this MS.

yklh 'ability', Gen 4:13 'yt ykl qdmk 'you are able' (no <u>Vorlage</u>), Num 14:16 lyt yklh qdmk 'you are not able' (MT mibbiltî yəkōlet), but perhaps yəkālā.

hwṭrt' 'rods', Gen 30:37, for MT hammaqlōt (and influenced by its gender?), cf. the masculine singular and plural forms ḥwṭr'/ḥwṭry' (section (D.1.g) above).

E. Nouns and Adjectives of the Form qtāl

There is, of course, no indication of the length of the vowel in the second syllable of words of this type. However, based on comparative grounds, and especially Onkelos, these words in this MS must also have -ā-. The most common type is qətālā: qətāl, representative examples of which (again primarily from Genesis) are included below. Less common types follow.

1. qətālā:qətāl

a. Masculine Forms

Singular Determined	Singular Absolute	Plural Determined	Plural Absolute	Gloss
'lh'	'lh	---	---	'god'
---	---	---	dgnyn	'grains'
ḥmr'	---	---	ḥmryn	'ass'
ḥṣd'	---	---	ḥṣdyn	'harvest'
ṭyys'	---	---	---	'bird'
---	yqr	---	---	'honored'
ktb'	ktb	---	---	'writing'
---	lbn	---	---	'white poplar'
---	---	---	lwwṭn(:)	'curses'
---	msn	---	---	'shoe'
nḥš'	nḥš	---	---	'copper'
---	ny(y)ḥ	---	---	'rest'
ᶜbd'	---	---	ᶜbdyn	'deed'
ᶜnn'	ᶜnn	---	---	'cloud'
---	ᶜrd	---	---	'wild ass'
---	prn	---	---	'dowry'
qdš'	qwdš(:)	qdšy'	qdyšyn(:)	'ring'
qy(y)m'	qyym	---	---	'covenant'

Singular Determined	Singular Absolute	Plural Determined	Plural Absolute	Gloss
---	qyym	---	---	'enduring'
qrb'	---	qrbyyh	---	'battle'
---	---	---	š^Cryn	'grains'
šbḥ'	---	---	---	'praise'
šlm'	šlm	---	---	'peace'
šrb'	---	---	---	'heat'
---	---	tyšy'	---	'he-goats'
tnn'	---	---	---	'smoke'

Comments:

tyys': Three times in a midrashic expansion on Gen 15:11, based on MT hā^Cayiṭ.

ktb': For the absolute, see Exod 32:16, Lev 19:28; also with the meaning 'Scripture', e.g., Gen 30:22, and note the spelling in Gen 35:9, ktbt, with h/t confusion, (see Chapter 2, Orthography, and Klein, JSS 19 (1974), p. 222).

lbn: Possibly also a segholate, i.e., laban.

lwwṭn: In Gen 27:12, lwwṭn wl' brkn 'curses and not blessings'. Note Onkelos ləwāṭin, therefore possibly the feminine here is due to a copyist's mistaken imitation of the following feminine plural brkn (cf. lwwṭk 'your curses', Gen 27:13).

nḥš': For the absolute, Num 21:9; for the determined, Gen 14:23.

qdš': Note the absolute qwdš, presumably qədāš ——→ qudāš with assimilation to the velar, and note also the plural qdyšyn (Num 31:50), either qədāšin —→ qədišin or, more likely, a copyist error based on the common qdyšyn 'holy'.

šlm': Note occasional Hebraisms, e.g., Gen 33:3 šlwmhwn 'their welfare', and also occasional plural forms, e.g., Gen 37:9, 23:7; šlmyy/šlmyhwn 'my/their welfare'.

b. Feminine Forms
There is a small group of feminine nouns belonging to this category:
'tnth: 'the (his?) she-ass' (Num 22:21)/'tnyn (Gen 12:16, 32:15); ^Cllt' 'harvest'; ^Cqrh

'barren'; ^Clt'/^Clh/^Clwn 'offering' (Genesis Chapter 22, and Gen 8:20 for the plural).

2. qitālā:qitāl
A less common group of nouns than group (E.1) above, however still well attested (only masculine forms).

Singular Determined	Singular Absolute	Plural Determined	Plural Absolute	Gloss
'(y)ln'	'yln	'ylny'	'ylnyn	'tree'
'ymm'	---	---	ymmyn(:)	'day(-time)'
(')nš'	(')nš	---	---	'human being'
---	---	['sdy']	---	'pillows'
'yqr'	'yqr	---	---	'glory'
---	'tml	---	---	'yesterday'
lyšnh	lšn	---	---	'tongue'
---	symn	---	---	'sign'

Comments:

'(y)ln': Occasionally spelled 'ln' (e.g., Gen 3:11) and abbreviated 'yln` (Gen 3:17).

'ymm': Occasionally for MT yôm, though cf. the much more common ywm/ywmyn below. The normal Onkelos singular ymm' does not appear in Neofiti, but the plural ymmyn is the only form attested (cf. Gen 7:24).

['sdy']: Only occurs in the construct plural 'sdy r'š(y)h 'the pillows of his head', in Gen 28:11, 18 for MT məra'^ašōtā(y)w and in Gen 28:10 without Vorlage, but based on the following verse.

'yqr': Note the absolute 'wqr in Gen 3:21 with w/y confusion, and the variant spellings 'qryh (Gen 1:29), 'yqry` (Gen 1:17) and construct yqr(:), Gen 9:27.

'tml: Spelled thus Gen 31:2,4, Deut 4:42, but note Exod 4:10 'tmwl.

lyšnh: Spelled thus Lev 19:16; elsewhere, absolute lšn, e.g., Gen 11:1, Deut 27:8, but note occasional Hebraisms lšwn, e.g., Gen 31:47. Note the use of the singular for the plural in Deut 27:8, šb^Cym (sic) lšn 'seventy tongues'.

3. **qattālā:qattāl**

Generally used for professional classes, however cf. also hbl', below (only masculine forms attested).

Singular Determined	Singular Absolute	Plural Determined	Plural Absolute	Gloss
---	---	[gzzy']	---	'shearers'
gnb'	---	gnby'	gnbyn	'thief'
dyyn	dyyn	dy(y)ny'	dyynyn	'judge'
---	dyyr	---	dywryn(!)	'dweller'
ḥbl'	---	---	---	'destruction'
ḥyyb'	---	ḥyybyh	ḥyybyn	'guilty'
srd'	---	---	---	'net-maker'
---	qyym	---	qyymyn	'enduring'
---	---	---	tgryn	'traders'

Comments:

[gzzy']: Only in the construct plural, Gen 38:12 gzzy ^cnh 'the shearers of the flock' (or else the active participle gāzəze), for MT gōz^azê.

gnb': For the singular, see Exod 22:1; for the plural, see Gen 31:9, Exod 20:15.

dyyn': The plural is spelled dyny' in Gen 6:4, elsewhere all forms have -yy-, e.g., Gen 4:8, 18:25, Deut 16:18, but note the construct in Gen 19:9 lmhwy dyn dynynn 'to be judge of our cases' (MT wayyišpōṭ šāpōṭ), unless dyn = the active participle dāyen rather than the noun dayyān, with the spelling influenced by the following word dyn (= din).

dyyr: The absolute singular is in Gen 23:4, but cf. dywr in Gen 44:18. The plural also has two forms: dyyry ('r^c') 'the residents (of the land)', e.g., Gen 6:11, 10:25, etc. (and even spelled d'yry in Gen 11:9), plus with suffixes dyyryh 'its (fs) residents' (Gen 19:25, 36:20, etc.); but also dywryn (Deut 23:8). It is possible that the two examples spelled with -w- should be read dyyr/dyyryn, with w/y confusion, however cf. Jastrow, "Dictionary," p.297, for the existence of both forms.

srd': Gen 36:39, expanding the MT proper name maṭrēd (= sārūdā < *sarrādā).

qyym: The singular occurs in the idiom ḥy wqyym 'living and enduring' (e.g., Gen 3:22, 24), and in the construct in the idom qyym kl ^clmyy' 'the one who endures forever' (e.g., Gen 16:14, 25:11, etc.). The plural occurs in ḥyyn wqyymyn, Deut 4:4

4. **Other**

There are isolated examples of other forms that must also have a long vowel in the second syllable:

qittālā: qittāl--'mr'/'mr/'(y)mry(y)'/'mryn 'lamb(s)' (but cf. the feminine forms 'mrh/'mrt'(pl), Lev 5:6 and Gen 21:29,30 respectively); gybr/gybry(y)' 'warrior(s)'. An adjectival form is ḥwwrt': ḥywr' (fs)/ḥwwryn (mpl) 'white' Gen 30:35, 37).

qutālā: qutāl -- ḥwlq': ḥwlq 'portion' (often, e.g., Gen 44:18, 48:22, and abbreviated ḥwl' in Gen 15:1). The form is also spelled without -w- in Gen 31:14, and in the plural, ḥlqyn (Gen 47:24)/ḥlqyhwn 'their portions' (Gen 14:24).

qetālā: qetāl -- ḥmr': ḥmr 'pitch' (Gen 6:14, 11:3, and 14:10, respectively).

F **Nouns and Adjectives Ending in -y.**

The majority of the forms in this classification have two root radicals (usually from III-weak roots), however the following 3 (and 4) radical nominals contain a suffix -y.

1. **Masculine Forms**

'r^cyyn 'lower': mpl, Gen 6:16, but note the masculine singular 'r^c', in Gen 1:6, presumably 'ar^cā for expected 'ar^cāyā, spelled thus under the influence of the common 'r^c' 'land'.

'ḥryyn 'last': mpl, Gen 33:2.

zhwry 'crimson thread': Absolute in Num 19:6, determined zyhwryh in Gen 38:28.

yḥydyy 'lone': ms in Gen 3:22, mpl yḥydyyn in Gen 22:10.

l(y)ly' 'night': Spelled lly' in Gen 1:5. The absolute lyly occurs in Gen 8:22, Exod 12:42 (the form in Gen 30:16 blyly hw' 'in that night' is presumably an error for lyly'). The plural lylw(w)n· can be seen in Gen 7:4,12.

n(w)kry(y)h 'foreign': Variously spelled, usually in the phrase pwlḥn' nwkryh 'foreign worship', including nkr'h (Gen 24:31), nwkr'h (Gen 26:35).

ᶜbdy 'servitude': Only in Exod 20:2 byt ᶜbdy 'the house of bondage' for MT bêt ᶜaḇāḏîm, in which case this may be simply a defective spelling for ᶜbdyn, or else the Onkelos form ᶜbdw, with w/y confusion. The form ᶜbdy is not known in Onkelos.

ᶜrṭl'y 'naked': Masculine singular, Gen 3:10 (ᶜrṭlyy in Gen 3:11), masculine plural ᶜrṭlyn in Gen 2:25, 3:7.

qdmyy 'first': Gen 38:28, and note also the plural (?) qdmyyn meaning 'east', Gen 25:6.

rgly(y)n 'footsoldiers': Gen 33:1, Exod 12:37, Num 11:21.

For two root examples, cf. the following:

bhy' 'Bohu, 'void'; gdyyh/gdyyn/gdy(y)'(pl) 'kid(s)'; gylwy 'uncovering'; dkyh 'clean' (variously spelled, dykyh, dwky' in Gen 8:20); zwy 'angle' (Lev 24:12); zkyy'/zkyy 'innocent' (plural zkyyn and determined zkyy' in Gen 18:24, 28); ḥwy'/ḥ(y)wy 'snake' ṭly'/ṭly/ṭly(y)' (pl) 'young man'; mlyyn 'full' (fpl), Gen 14:10; nsy' 'sinew' (Gen 32:32); ᶜdwyyn 'menstrual periods' (Gen 18:12); ᶜ(y)ly' (ᶜl'h) 'upper'; pty(y)h 'its width' (Gen 6:15, 13:17); rby' 'lad'; šby 'captivity' (Exod 15:9); šmy(y)' 'heavens' (variously spelled, including šmyy', Gen 15:1, and šmyMy'?, Gen 14:19, i.e., with final -m in the middle of the word, and -y added following it; note the construct šmy mrwm' 'the heavens on high', Gen 3:22); špy 'tranquil' (Num 23:3, MT šepî); šqyy' 'watering' (but note Gen 13:10 byt šqh', in error for šqyh?); šrwyh 'its beginning' (Gen 11:1, and note the construct šrwy); thy' 'Tohu', 'waste'.

2. Feminine Forms

There are only two three-root radical nominals among the feminine forms: qdmyth and nkryyn. All the rest have two-root radicals.

bryyt' 'creations': Gen 7:23, but note the spelling bryytyh' in Gen 7:4, presumably an error for bryyth. Note also the similar bryt šmy' w'rᶜ' 'creation of heaven and earth', Gen 2:1.

zk'h 'innocent': cf. the masculine singular and plural forms above.

klyyh 'destruction': Gen 18:21.

nkryyn 'foreign': cf. the masculine singular above.

slw(w)y 'quail': Apparently an unmarked feminine common noun (Exod 16:13, Num 11:26, 32, 21:6).

qdmyth 'past-time': Gen 13:4, 28:19, Num 10:13, Deut 9:18, 13:10.

qrt'(!) 'city': Absolute singular - qryh; determined plural - qryyt'; absolute plural - qryn (e.g., Exod 1:11). The construct singular is variously spelled: qyry/qry/qrwy (= Gen 19:29). With suffixes, cf., e.g., qrtyh/qrthwn.

rbyt' 'young woman': Note the error form rbyty in Gen 24:55, for rbyth, with y/h confusion, see Chapter 2, Orthography.

ššyn 'pancakes': Num 11:8, but cf. Exod 16:31 šyšyn. The Onkelos form is šašyān

G. Unclassified Nominal Forms

The nouns in this section are either of foreign origin, or else quadriliterals or quinquiliterals, however cf. hrk', ᶜlm', etc.

1. Masculine Forms

'rdᶜnyn 'frogs' (Exod 7:28 etc., spelled ᶜrdᶜnyy' in Exod 8:9); bdlh' 'bdellium' (Gen 2:12); bwṣynyh 'lamps' (Lev 24:2); glgly' 'wheels' (Exod 14:25, plural absolute and construct); drdryn 'brambles' (Gen 3:18, 4:16); zyqwqyn 'sparks' (Gen 3:24); zᶜ⟨z⟩wᶜ 'shock' (Gen 27:33, spelled in error zᶜwᶜ'); hrk' 'window' (= ḥarakkā, cf. Onkelos; Gen 26:8; ṭlwphyn 'lentils' (Gen 25:29,34); ybrwhyn 'mandrakes' (Gen 30:14-16, numerous spellings); kwkby'/kwkbyn 'stars' (i.e., kokab < *kawkab < *kabkab); kmst 'worthy' (Gen 20:16, 32:10); smqm⟨q⟩ 'red' (Gen 25:25, spelled smqyn, in a corrupt verse); ᶜlm'/ᶜlm/ᶜlmy(y)'/ᶜlmyn 'world', 'universe' (= ᶜālam); prds/prdsyy 'garden (see the spelling prdysy' in Gen 14:3); przl' 'iron' (Gen 4:22); ptgm'/ptgm/ptgmy' 'matter'; ṣw'rk, etc. 'your neck' (Gen 27:40, variously spelled ṣww'ryk, ṣw'ryh 'his neck', ṣwwryh, Gen 27:16, and the plural ṣw'ryhwn 'their necks', Num 31:50); rybwwdh '(her) appearance' (?), only in Gen 29:17, translating MT

tō'ar; <u>rbrby'</u>/<u>rbrbyn</u> 'great' (as an adjective, but also with suffixes meaning 'chiefs', e.g., <u>rbrbnwy</u>, <u>rbrbnyhwn</u>, etc.; <u>šyzbh</u> 'that which is saved' (Gen 32:8); <u>šlh⟨b⟩yn</u> 'flames' (Gen 15:17, spelled <u>šlhyn</u> with -<u>byn</u> written in another hand); <u>š^cbwd'</u>/<u>š^cbwd</u> 'servitude' (Gen 27:40, Exod 14:13); <u>špnyn</u> 'turtle-dove' (masc. singular, Gen 15:9).

2. Feminine Forms

<u>prnst'</u> 'provision' (Gen 30:22); <u>rb⟨rb⟩nt'</u>/<u>rbrbn</u> 'great' (Gen 29:26, spelled in error <u>rbbrnt'</u>; <u>rbrbn</u> in Gen 12:17, <u>mktšyn rbrbn</u> 'great plagues'); <u>š^cšw^ct</u> (construct) 'smoothness' (Gen 27:16).

H. Nouns with Two Radicals

These nouns fall into three basic categories: <u>ql</u>, <u>qyl</u>, <u>qwl</u>. Among the nouns of the form <u>ql</u>, there are three types identifiable:

<u>qəlā</u>: <u>qal</u> (cf. Hebrew <u>yād</u>);
<u>qallā</u>: <u>qal</u> (cf. Hebrew <u>^cam</u>);
<u>qālā</u>: <u>qāl</u> (cf. Hebrew <u>qôl</u>).

In addition, there is a limited number of non-classified forms.

Similarly, there are three types within the category <u>qyl</u>:

<u>qilā</u>: <u>qil</u> (cf. Hebrew <u>dîn</u>);
<u>qaylā</u>/<u>qelā</u>: <u>qayil</u>/<u>qel</u> (cf. Hebrew <u>bayit</u>);
<u>qillā</u>: <u>qel</u> (cf. Hebrew <u>hēṣ</u>).

In the category <u>qwl</u>, there are two types identifiable:

<u>qulā</u>: <u>qul</u> (cf. Hebrew <u>šûq</u>);
<u>qolā</u>: <u>qol</u> (cf. Hebrew <u>yôm</u>).

In addition, there are some isolated examples of a type <u>qullā</u>: <u>qol</u>, and two cases in which the -<u>w</u>- is consonantal.

1. The Form ql

a. Masculine - <u>qəlā</u>: <u>qal</u>::<u>qəlayyā</u>: <u>qəlin</u>
'<u>^cyn</u> 'trees' (Gen 6:14, but cf. Onkelos '<u>ə^cin</u> or '<u>ā^cin</u>); <u>br'</u>/<u>br</u>/<u>bny'</u>/<u>bnyn</u> 'son'; <u>yd'</u> 'hand', and for the plural, see construct <u>ydy</u>, suffixes <u>ydyk</u>, <u>ydwy</u>, <u>ydynn</u>, etc.; <u>rm</u>/<u>rmyh</u> 'high' (singular, Gen 39:14, plural, Gen 7:19).
Feminine - No forms attested (for <u>brt'</u>, the feminine of <u>br'</u>, see below).

b. Masculine - <u>qallā</u>: <u>qal</u>::<u>qallayyā</u>:<u>qallin</u>
'<u>pyn</u> 'face' (plural only, also construct '<u>py</u>, and with suffixes '<u>pyk</u>, '<u>pwy</u>, '<u>pykwn</u>, etc.); <u>br'</u>/<u>br</u>

'open space'; <u>gb</u> 'back' (singular in the compound preposition '<u>p ^cl gb</u> d- 'despite', plural in the compound preposition <u>^cl gby</u> 'on top of'); <u>gdh</u> 'luck' (Gen 30:11); <u>gp</u> 'side' (construct, Gen 22:17); <u>hy(y)'</u>/<u>hy</u>/<u>hyyn</u>/<u>hyy'</u> 'living (creature)', 'life' (plural only; for the absolute singular and plural, cf. <u>hy wqyym</u>, <u>hyyn wqyymyn</u> 'living and enduring'); <u>tl'</u> 'dew' (Gen 27:28,39); <u>ym'</u>/<u>ymyy'</u> 'sea' (for the plural, note Gen 1:22, but cf. 1:10 <u>ymm'</u>, an error for <u>ymy'</u>); <u>kwwy</u> 'openings' (construct plural, Gen 7:11, 8:2); <u>kp</u> 'palm' (construct singular, and construct plural, <u>kpy</u>, Gen 20:5); <u>^cm'</u>/<u>^cm</u>(<u>^cmm</u>)/<u>^cmy'</u>(<u>^cmmy'</u>)/<u>^cmmyn</u>! 'nation' (the forms <u>^cmm</u>/<u>^cmmy'</u> are only found in Gen 20:4,13 respectively; the only absolute plural form attested is <u>^cmmyn</u>, e.g., Gen 17:12,27, Exod 21:8); <u>rb'</u>/<u>rb</u> 'great' (for the plural, cf. <u>rbrbyn</u> in Section G, Unclassified Nominal Forms, above); <u>šq'</u> 'sackcloth' (Gen 37:34).

Feminine – The only forms attested are:

<u>hyyt'</u> 'midwife' (= <u>ḥayyatā</u>, Gen 35:17, 38:28); <u>hyyt'</u> 'animals' (= <u>ḥayyātā</u>, Gen 1:24, 25, 28, 9:2, etc.); <u>rb'</u>/<u>rbt'</u> 'great'.

c. Masculine - <u>qālā</u>: <u>qāl</u>::<u>qālayyā</u>:<u>qālin</u>
'<u>tyn</u> 'signs' (Gen 1:14); <u>drh</u>/<u>dryn</u>/<u>dry'</u> 'generation'; <u>hl'</u> 'sand' (Gen 22:17, 32:12); <u>tb'</u>/<u>tb</u>/<u>tby'</u>/<u>tbyn</u> 'good'; <u>ql'</u>/<u>ql</u> 'voice'.
Feminine - <u>tb'</u>/<u>tbth</u> 'good'; <u>^cqt'</u>/<u>^cq'</u> 'distress' (Gen 15:7, 22:14, and with suffixes, <u>^cqty</u>, <u>^cqthwn</u>); note also the unmarked feminine noun <u>^cnh</u>/<u>^cn</u> 'flock'.

d. Other
The following noun forms, for one reason or another, are not classifiable in the above three categories.

(1) Masculine Forms
(a) <u>my(y)'</u>/<u>my(y)n</u> 'water' (plural only, = <u>mayā</u>/<u>mayin</u> (?), however cf. the commonly occurring suffixed form <u>mwy(:)</u> 'its waters', i.e., <u>mowi</u>, in such idioms as <u>mwy dmbwl'</u> 'the waters of the flood', Gen 7:7, 10, 9:11, and <u>mwy dym'</u> 'the waters of the sea', Exod 15:19. This

would necessitate postulating a change from mayowi ⟶ mowi, however one also finds forms such as Deut 29:10 myykwn 'your waters', presumably mayekon. However this same verse in Onkelos has mk! = māk. Note also Exod 7:19 mymyhwn 'their waters' (but here the MT has mêmêhem, hence this is probably in imitation of the Hebrew).

(b) mn/mnyn 'vessel(s)' (presumably mān/mānin, and never spelled with medial aleph). The singular is in Lev 11:33, the plural in Gen 24:53, Exod 11:2. For suffixed forms, cf. mnyy 'my utensils' (Gen 31:37) and for the construct, Gen 27:3, 31:37.

(c) mr' 'master' (presumably = mārā, cf. Exod 21:34, 22:7). Also singular construct mry in Gen 21:33, 25:27, 37:19, and with suffixes mryh, Exod 21:28, 29, 36, 22:11. For the plural, cf. the construct mry in Gen 14:13, 46:34, and with suffixes, mrwy 'its masters' in Exod 21:29.

(d) sb'/sb 'old' (= sābā/sāb?, cf. Onkelos sābā/sā(')bā, parallel to MT śāb?), Gen 10:4, 24:2.

(e) rᶜy/rᶜy' 'shepherd(s)' (= rāᶜe/ rāᶜayyā?), Gen 4:2, 28:10, and with suffixes rᶜyy, rᶜyk, rᶜwy 'my, your, his shepherds', and note the Spelling rᶜwwy (= rāᶜowi) once in Gen 13:7.

(2) Feminine Forms

(a) ht'h 'sin (=hat'ā/het'ā?), twice in Gen 10:9.

(b) brth/bnn/bnt' 'daughter(s)' (=barattā/banān/ banātā, irregular, presumably as in Onkelos, feminine of br 'son'). Common also in the construct brt/bnt (=barat/banāt), and with suffixes brtyh, brtn, bnty, bntyh, bnthwn, etc.

(c) rᶜyyh 'shepherdess' (=rāᶜəyā, cf. the masculine rᶜy above), Gen 29:9.

2. The Form qyl

a. Masculine - qilā: qil::qilayyā:qilin
byš'/byš/byšyy'/byšyn 'evil'; gyd' 'sinew' (Gen 32:32, twice, once misspelled through metathesis gdy'); gyryn 'arrows' (Exod 15:4); dyn'/dyn 'judgment', note also the plural dynynn 'our judgments', Gen 19:9, and the misspellings dyynyn, for dynyn, meaning 'arguments', in Gen 13:7,8, and dyyny 'my judgments', for dynyy, in Gen 26:5, cf. dyny 'my judgment', Gen 16:5, and note also Exod 21:9, dnhwn!; zyw(w)hwn 'their brightness' (Gen 4:5, 6); mynyh/mynh/mynhwn 'its (ms)/ its (fs)/ their type'; myt/mytyy' 'dead' (singular, Deut 14:1, plural Gen 19:26, 25:34, and note also mty, mtk, mtyh 'my/ your/ his dead', all in Gen 23:4, 6, 8, 11, 13, 15); nsy 'islands' (construct, Gen 10:5); nyr 'yoke' (construct, Gen 27:40); syt 'joint' (construct, Gen 11:4, 28:12, 17); qys'/qysyn/qysy(y)' 'wood', 'twigs'; šyryn 'songs'.

Feminine - There are limited feminine forms of this type attested:
byšt'/byš'/byšn 'evil'; tyrthwn 'their castles' (Gen 25:16); ksh 'fodder' (Gen 24:25, 32, cf. Onkelos); mytty 'my death' (Gen 27:2); syᶜ' 'company' (Gen 26:26, 37:25).

b. Masculine - qaylā(qelā):qayil(qel) :: qaylayyā(qelayyā):qaylin(qelin)
There is no evidence to indicate whether the diphthongs in these words have been monophthongized: by(y)t' 'house' (common in compound expressions, byt knyšwt my',byt 'pyh, byt qwdš', etc.). The plural is attested, e.g., in Gen 25:27 bty mdrš' 'schoolhouses', Gen 30:13 bty knyšwt' 'synagogues', and with suffixes in Gen 17:12,13 btykwn 'your houses', however cf. Exod 1:21 btym! (for MT bāttîm, therefore presumably in imitation thereof) and especially Exod 8:9 byty!? (for MT habbāttîm, = bete?); zynk 'your weapon' (Gen 27:3); zyt 'olive' (Gen 8:11, abbreviated zy`); hyl 'strength' (Gen 31:29, cf. also hyyly 'my strength', Gen 31:6); ᶜy(y)n' 'spring' (common, and in place names such as ᶜyn dyn and ᶜyn gdy

tmry', Gen 14:7); ᶜyn/ᶜyynyh 'eye(s)' (the singular in Lev 24:20, the plural in Gen 3:6; note also Gen 29:17 ᶜyny dl'h 'the eyes of Leah', presumably for ᶜyny l'h, and also Gen 38:25 ᶜyyny for ᶜyynyh 'her eyes'; also common with suffixes); syd/sydh 'game' (Genesis, Chapter 27); qyt 'summer' (Gen 8:22); ryḥh 'smell' (Gen 27:27, and also construct ryḥ in the same verse).

Feminine - There is a limited number of feminine forms:
'ymtkwn 'your dread' (='ematkon?, Gen 9:2); ḥywh 'animal' (= hewā?, Gen 37:33, determined ḥywwt', Gen 37:20, construct ḥywt br' 'wild animals', Gen 31:39, plural determined ḥywt' in Gen 3:14, though possibly also the singular); ḥy(y)lwwt(y)h 'his hosts' (= helwāteh?, Gen 21:22, 32, 26:26)/ ḥlwwthwn 'their hosts' (Gen 2:1).

c. Masculine - qillā: qel:: qillayyā: qillin

zyq'/zyq 'bottle' (Gen 21:14,15,19); ḥṭy(y)'/ḥṭtyn 'wheat' (=feminine noun, as in Onkelos?, Gen 30:14, Deut 8:8, 32:14; ḥn 'favor'; ṭl 'shade' (construct, ṭl šryty 'the shade of my roof', Gen 19:8); lbh 'heart', and common with suffixes, lby, lbk, etc., and cf. lbb in Section D, above); n(y)s'/nsy'/n(y)syn 'miracle(s)' (Gen 15:2, 21:8, 28:10, and note also nsy in Exod 4:21, for nsy'?; ᶜz/ᶜ(y)zy(y)'/ᶜzyn 'goat(s)'; syypyh 'ends' (Gen 23:9, bsyypyh ḥqly 'at the ends of his fields', for bsyypy ḥqlyh?); ryq 'empty' (Gen 37:24); š(y)ry'/šryn 'bracelets' (Gen 24:22, 30, 47). Also šyṭyn 'acacia wood' (Deut 10:3, feminine as in Onkelos?).

Feminine - The following common feminine forms are attested:
'št'/'š' 'fire'; 'tt'/'th 'woman' (spelled 'ytt' in Gen 3:1, 2, 4, 15, and with suffixes, 'tty, 'ttk, '(y)ttyh, etc.); gnth/gn' 'garden', and in the construct gnt ᶜdn 'garden of Eden' (Gen 3:24); mylh/m(y)ly'/m(y)lyn 'word(s)', 'thing(s)', with masculine plural ending, and with suffixes mlyy, mlyk, mlwy 'my/ your/ his words', etc.

d. Other

(1) Masculine

The following forms, usually spelled with -y-, do not belong in one of the above categories for a variety of reasons, and hence are grouped together in a miscellaneous category.
b'r'/b'r/b'ry'/b'ryn 'well(s)' (= be(')r < bə'er, with aleph retained as an historical spelling). Note occasional spellings b'yrh, byr', etc.; feminine noun, e.g., b'r ḥwry, Gen 26:21,22, but cf. b'ryyt', feminine plural below; lyb' 'curds' (Gen 18:8, cf. Onkelos in Jastrow, "Dictionary," p. 695, Levy, "Wörterbuch," p. 405, but not in Sperber, "Onkelos," nor in Aberbach and Grossfeld, "Onkelos," ləwā'e, perhaps to be taken here as ləwā'e ⟶ ləwe = /ləve/ ⟶ /live/, and spelled thus in error by the medieval copyist); mᶜyy' 'womb' (=meᶜayyā, plural only, Gen 30:2, and note the suffixed forms mᶜyk, mᶜy(y)h 'your/her loins', but cf. mᶜk, Gen 3:14, and especially mᶜh'(!) Gen 25:22); ᶜyqy: 'sorrowful ones' (= ᶜāyəqi?) in a midrash in Gen 38:25; pyry (singular)/pyryn 'fruit' (=pire/ pirin?), Gen 1:11, 12, 3:18, Deut 11:9, plus construct plural p(y)ry, and with suffixes prwy 'its fruits' (= pirowi?, Gen 3:6); ryš 'head' (Gen 32:26), and with suffixes r'šk, r'š(y)h, ryšyh, r'šh. For the plural, cf. the construct r'šy (Gen 2:10, 25:3) and ryšy (Gen 8:5).

(2) Feminine

b'ryyt' 'wells', an alternate feminine plural form found only in Gen 26:18, cf. b'r etc. in the masculine forms above; s'yn 'seahs' (= se'in, sə'in?), Gen 18:6; ᶜšh/ᶜšn 'advice' (= ᶜaṣā/ᶜaṣān?), Gen 29:22, Gen 15:11, Exod 1:10; qyymt'/qyym'(!) 'pillar' (= qimā?, or perhaps qāyəmā, cf. Onkelos, spelled only thus, apparently due to confusion with qəyāmā 'convenant', often in Genesis, e.g., 28:10, 18, 22, 35:14, 20, etc.); qynyyn:

'laments' (= qinyān?, cf. Onkelos qinin, the spelling here possibly due to a copyist's confusion with the more common qinyān 'possessions', Gen 4:22; šnh 'sleep' (= šǝnā?, Gen 2:21, 15:12), and with suffixes šnty, šntyh; šyr' 'meal' (= šerā?, only in Gen 26:30, perhaps an ' error for the expected šyrw, cf. Gen 19:3, 21:8, 29:22); tynh/t'ynyyh/t'nyn(tynyn) 'fig(s)', cf. Onkelos tǝ'enā/tenā, spelled with aleph in Num 13:28, Deut 8:8, without in Gen 3:7, Num 20:5. For the same phenomenon, cf. r'šh/ryš, b'rh/byr'.

3. The Form qwl

a. Masculine – qulā: qul:: qulayyā: qulin

hwt 'thread' (construct, Gen 14:23); twb' 'goodness' (construct twb in Gen 27:28, 39, and with suffixes, cf. twbwy 'his goodness'—→ 'blessed', used predicatively in Gen 38:25 twbwy kl 'nš 'blessed be every man'); twr'/twry' 'mountain(s)' (= ṭurā/ṭurayyā, but note the plural forms twwryn/twwry (construct), i.e., ṭawrin, Deut 11:1, Gen 10:30, respectively, and also in Onkelos, cf. Jastrow, "Dictionary," p. 526); lwhh/lwhyn 'tablet(s)' (= luhā/luhin, Exod 26:19, 20, but cf. also lwwhyn in Deut 10:1, 3, i.e., lǝwāhin?, cf. Jastrow, "Dictionary," p. 696); lwz 'almond' (Gen 30:37); mwš 'feel' (construct, Gen 27:22); nwny' 'fish' (Gen 1:26, plural nwnwy 'its fish', Gen 1:28, 9:2); nwr'/nwr 'fire', e.g., Gen 3:24, 38:25); p(w)m' 'mouth' (Gen 29:2 etc., and with suffixes pwmh/pmh 'her mouth', Gen 8:11, 24:57); rwh 'wind', 'spirit'; rwmh 'its (fs) height' (Gen 6:15, abbreviated rwm); šwq' 'market'. Feminine – qwltyk/qwlth 'your/ her jug' (= qultik/qultah, e.g., Gen 24:14, 15, etc., and spelled qltk in Gen 24:43); šwmh 'mark' (Gen 30:35).

b. Masculine – qolā: qol:: qolayyā: qolin

zwg 'mate' (cf. Onkelos zog or zug, Gen 2:18, 20, and with suffixes zwg(y)h 'his mate', Gen 1:27, 7:9, 35:9); hwbyn 'guilty', and with suffixes hwbyy/hwbyhwn 'my/ their guilt', Gen 4:13, 15:16; ywm'/ywm/ywmy'/ywmyn 'day(s)'; mwt' 'death'

(Gen 21:16); swph 'end' (Gen 19:26, and common in construct swp, e.g., Gen 4:3); Cwp' 'bird(s)', and common in construct Cwp; twr/twry(y)'/twryn 'bull'/'cattle', e.g., Lev 16:3, Gen 18:8, 32:5, and note the error form twry'(!), a medieval copyist aural confusion for twry' (MT habbāqār).

Feminine – hwbty/hwbthwn 'my/ their guilt' (Gen 31:36, 18:20); ywnh/ywn (= yonā/yon, e.g., Gen 8:11, 15:9, but see ywwnh in Gen 8:8, 9, 10, 12, i.e., yawnā?, cf. twr' and lwhh in (3.a) above (apparently not known in Onkelos); twr' 'cow' (Num 19:2).

c. Other

qwb'/qwb/qwby'/qwbyn 'pit(s)' (= qubbā/qob, Gen 37:22ff, Exod 21:33, Gen 27:30, Num 21:22, respectively); gwryk 'your arrows' (= qurāk?, Gen 27:3, but cf. Gen 49:23 gyryy', therefore probably here also girak, with w/y confusion); hwny 'my condition' (Gen 33:14, = honi, hǝwāni, hawwāni?, cf. Jastrow, "Dictionary," p. 339); hwby/hwbk/hwbyh 'my/ your/ his bosom' (Exod 4:6, 7); kwbyn 'thorns' (= kubbin/*kob, plural only attested, Gen 3:18, 4:16, Exod 22:5, spelled kwkyn with b/k confusion, see Chapter 2, Orthography); lwb(!) 'plane-tree (= lub? Gen 30:37, but Onkelos ad loc. has dlwb, hence probably also here, in a dittographic error, i.e., htr' dlbn rtyb wdlwz wd<d>lwb 'rods of fresh poplar, and of almond, and of plane-tree'); swsy'/swswn/swswwth 'horse(s)' (= susyā/suswān/ suswātā, Gen 49:17, Exod 15:1, 14:9, respectively, and also the plural construct swswwt, Exod 14:23); rwwh 'his appearance' (with consonantal -w-, presumably reweh, Gen 39:6); t'wmyn 'twins' (plural only in the MS, = tǝ'omin/tǝ'umin, in Gen 25:24, but spelled twmyyn? in Gen 38:27, possibly an error of metathesis for tywmyn, which would reflect the Onkelos tǝyomin/tǝyumin < tǝ'omin/tǝ'umin, as in the former. Note that the Hebrew is also unstable, tômîm in the former, tǝ'ûmîm in the latter); twpyn 'drums' (= tuppin/*top, Gen 31:27). The following feminine noun can also be classified under a miscellaneous heading: 'wmh/'(w)my(y)'/'wmyn

(= 'ummā/'ummayyā/'ummin, with masculine plural suffix, and note the determined singular 'mt', i.e., 'ummǝtā, Gen 15:14).

I. Gentilics

This section includes most examples of those nouns that are the names of ethnic groups or members thereof. It also encompasses classes, e.g., lywwyh/lywwyy' 'Levite(s)', and professional and regional groups, e.g., srqyy 'Saracens' and mdynḥ'y 'Orientals'. In the MS Neofiti 1, these gentilic nouns occur in three situations: (1) for an MT gentilic name, e.g., mṣryyh 'the Egyptian', for MT hammiṣrî; (2) expanding an MT toponym, e.g., lhbyy' 'the Lehabites', for MT ləhābîm (these are usually masoretic place names with plural endings, but cf. also 'dwm'y 'the Edomites', for MT 'eḏôm); (3) interpretive "modern" renderings of masoretic gentilics, e.g., šlm'y 'the Salmites', for MT haqqênî 'the Kenite'. The nominal inflexion is as follows:

Masculine

	Absolute	Determined	
Singular:	ᶜibray	ᶜibrāyā	'Hebrew'
Plural:	ᶜibrāyin	ᶜibrāye	

Feminine

Singular:	miṣriyā	miṣritā	'Egyptian'
Plural:	[not attested]	miṣrāyātā	

The spellings of the above forms is most varied. The following forms are attested:

Masculine

Singular Determined	Singular Absolute	Plural Determined	Plural Absolute	Gloss	Hebrew Vorlage
		'dwm'y 'dwmyy		'the Edomites'	'eḏôm
'mwryh		'mwr'y 'mwry'		'the Amorite(s)'	hā'emōrî
		'ntwky		'the Antiochenes'	haḥamātî
		'rwwdyy'		'the Arvadites'	hā'arwādî
'rm'h 'rmyyh				'the Aramaean'	hā'arammî
		'rtwsy'		'the Orthosians'	hassînî
		grgš'y (drgsyy', Gen 15:21)		'the Girgashites'	haggirgāšî
		zymryy'		'the Zimarites'	haṣṣamārî
ḥywwyh ḥywwy'		ḥwwy' (Gen 10:17) ḥwwyy (Exod 3:8) ḥywyy (Exod 3:17)		'the Hivite(s)'	haḥiwwî
		ḥwwryy' (Gen 14:6)		'the Haurites'!	haḥōrî
ḥwwrnyh (Gen 36:20) ḥwwrny' (Gen 36:21)				'the Hauranite'!	haḥōrî
ḥytyy' ḥytyyh ḥty(y)h		ḥtyy ḥyt'y ḥt'h (Gen 23:5)		'the Hittite(s)'	haḥittî banê ḥēt banôt ḥēt
		ybwsy' ybwsyy		'the Jebusites'	haybûsî

Masculine

Singular Determined	Singular Absolute	Plural Determined	Plural Absolute	Gloss	Hebrew Vorlage
yśr'lyyh (Lev 24:10,11)				'the Israelite'	hayyisra'ēlî
knᶜn'h		knᶜn'y(y) knᶜny' knᶜnyy knᶜy': (Gen 10:18) knᶜnᶜy:? (Gen 24:3, 28:1,6,8)		'the Canaanite(s)'	hakkənaᶜănî kənāᶜan
		kslwḥy'		'the Casluhites'	kaslūḥîm
		lhbyy'		'the Lehabites'	ləhābîm
		lwdy'		'the Ludites'	lūdîm
lywwyh (Exod 4:14)		lywwyy' lywwyyh lyw(w)yy (Lev 25:32,33) lwyy(Num 3:12)		'the Levite(s)'	hallēwî halləwiyyim
mdynyh (Num 10:29)		mdyyny(y)	mdyynyn (adj., Gen 37:28)	'Midianite(s)' 'Midianite'(adj.)	hammidyānî midyān hamməḏānîm midyānîm(adj.)
		mdynh'y (Gen 15:19)		'the Orientals'	haqqaḏmōnî
		mw'byh mw'byy		'the Moabites'	mô'āb
mṣry(y)h	mṣr'y (Gen 39:1)	mṣr'y mṣry(y)h (Exod 3:8)		'the Egyptian(s)'	hammiṣrî
		mṣryy (Exod 2:11)		'an Egyptian'	miṣrî
		mṣryy (Exod 3:17)			hammiṣrîm
		nptwḥyy'		'the Naphtuhites'	naptūḥîm

Masculine

Singular Determined	Singular Absolute	Plural Determined	Plural Absolute	Gloss	Hebrew Vorlage
	sdwmy'			'the Sodomites'	no Vorlage
	spry'			'the Sepharites'	səpārā (directional)
	srqyy		srqyn (*)		(hay)yišməᶜē(')lîm
cbryy' cbr'(!) (Gen 39:17)	cbry(ẏ) (Exod 2:11)	cbry'	cbryyn (Exod 2:13)	'the Hebrew(s)' 'Hebrew'	hāᶜibrî ᶜibrî (ᶜibrîm) bənê ᶜēber
cdwlmyyh		cdwlmyy		'the Adullamite' 'an Adullamite'	(hā)ᶜăḏūllāmî
		(bny) cmwnyy		'(sons of) the Ammonites'	bənê ᶜammôn
		cmlqy'		'the Amalekites'	hāᶜămālēqî
		cnmyh		'the Anamites'	ᶜănāmîm
		crqy'		'the Arkites'	hāᶜarqî
		plšt'y plyšty'		'the Philistines'	pəlištîm
		pryzy' pryzy(y)		'the Perizzites'	happərizzî
		ptrwsy'		'the Pathrusites'	patrūsîm
		qnyz'y		'the Kenizzites'	haqqənizzî
		qpwdqy'		'the Capadocians'	kaptōrîm
		šlm'y(šlmyy) (Gen 15:19, Num 24:24)		'the Shalmites'	haqqênî

Feminine

Singular Determined	Singular Absolute	Plural Determined	Plural Absolute	Gloss	Hebrew Vorlage
yśr'lyth (Lev 24:10				'the Israelite'	hayyiśra'ēlît
kwšyth (Num 12:1)	kwšyh (Num 12:1)			the 'Cushite' 'a Cushite'	hakkūšît / kūšît
kn^{c}nyth (Exod 6:15)				'the Canaanite'	hakkəna^{ca}nît
mdynyth (Num 25:6)				'the Midianite'	hammidyānît
mṣryth/ mṣryt' (Gen 16:3, 21:9, 25:12)	mṣryy' (Gen 16:1)	mṣryyth (Exod 1:19)		'the Egyptian(s)' 'an Egyptian'	hammiṣrît / miṣrît / hammiṣriyyōt
		^{c}bryyt' (Exod 1:15,16,19)		'the Hebrews'	hā^{c}ibriyyōt

(*)Gen 37:25, written srqyn srq^{c}yn:, which is apparently the normal method in this MS of deletion, i.e., read srq^{c}yn, in which case, perhaps error of ^{c} for ', i.e., srq'yn?

NOTES

[1]For the full particulars of the data, see Golomb, A Grammar of the Aramaic in Codex Vatican Neophyti 1 (Genesis), Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1978.

[2]Note should also be taken of sydwryh, presumably = siddurayyā, meaning 'blindness' in Gen 19:11, emended by Díez Macho to sy⟨n⟩wryh to better render MT (bas)sanwērîm. However, in view of the biblical Hebrew hapax legomenon in Job 10:22 'ereṣ ^{c}ēpātā kəmô 'ōpel ṣalmāwet wəlō' sədārîm, usually translated 'a land of darkness, like darkness, the shadow of death, without any order', this may be a genuine Semitic idiom for 'blindness'. Further militating against Díez Macho's emendation is the spelling with -y-, since a form such as *sinwer(îm) is unattested in any language. The Job passage might then be rendered 'a land of darkness, like darkness, the darkness of death, not that of blindness'.

[3]Note also the same spelling in Gen 1:14, presumably also = ^{c}ibbur, meaning 'passing', in lmqdš⟨'⟩ bhwn ^{c}bwr śhryn yrḥyn 'to sanctify by them the passing of moons (and?) months', paraphrasing MT (wəhāyû) ləyāmîm wəšānîm.

CHAPTER 8

VERBS

A. Inflection

1. Tense Forms

In a targumic text, the appearance of any given
verbal tense is often conditioned on the tense used in
the Hebrew base text. In particular, the Targum
usually follows the Hebrew in the matter of the use of
the perfect tense, less so with the imperfect (which is
often translated into the Aramaic by a participial
form, or, commonly, by a compound tense of 'to be' +
participle). However, other factors must also be
considered, e.g., intentional mimicking of Hebrew,
"archaizing," interpretive translation,
misinterpretation of the Hebrew, and the like. A
discussion of the many complexities of the targumic
verbal conventions is out of place in a grammatical
study such as this, however for two syntactic
questions, see Chapter 9, Syntax. In this section, the
different forms attested are described and discussed,
with examples provided for each section. No attempt
has been made to provide an exhaustive list of all
attested forms in the entire MS, but rather to provide
paradigms with selected examples.

The tenses are as expected: perfect, imperfect,
imperative, infinitive, participles. There is no
independent jussive attested, with the exception of the
verbs 'to be' and 'to live' (see below, Section 3.J).
In general, the use of these tenses in this MS conforms
to expected Aramaic norms; there are, however, numerous
error forms, where one finds perfect for imperfect,
imperfect for perfect, and these must be considered by
and large as copyist visual or aural errors (see
Chapter 2, Orthography). There is considerable
variation in forms, especially due to the variable use
of the matres lectionis w and y. The classification of
the different verbal classes in this MS must await an
independent detailed study, however when variant forms
are attested they are noted below.

The participial forms occur either in isolation or compounded with the verb 'to be' (in all finite and infinite verbal forms), or also occasionally with attached pronominal suffixes (e.g., Gen 26:22 tqpynn 'we are strong', Num 13:32 ^cbrynn 'we are passing'), however cf. Dalman, "Grammatik," pp. 230, 234-5. Participles also occur in the construct state (e.g., Gen 4:21 tpśy knwr' 'those who hold the lyre'), the determined state (e.g., Exod 15:6,9 śn'h 'the enemy'), or with suffixes (e.g., Exod 20:5 śn'y/ śn'yy 'my enemies'). The active and passive participles of the D and C stems are spelled identically, as are the D and C stem infinitives (see below).

2. Conjugations

The following conjugations are attested in the MS: (a) a base stem, referred to here as the G stem; (b) an "intensive" stem, referred to as the D stem; (c) a causative stem, referred to as the C stem; (d) two medio-passive (with occasional reflexive meanings) stems, corresponding to the G and D stems, referred to here as the Gt and the Dt stems (for the Ct, see below); (e) other rarer forms.

a. The vowel classes that characterize the G stem in Aramaic are, by and large, not distinguishable in this MS due to the unvocalized nature of the text. There are many examples of a G stem stative type verb written plene with y, among both the strong and the weak verbs, but all are also attested spelled without y, usually much more frequently, e.g., dḥl/dḥyl, nsb/nsyb.

b. The D stem is indistinguishable from the G stem in the perfect and imperfect (many G stem imperfects are spelled yqtl), however infinitives and participles of the D stem are marked by prefix m-. Furthermore, even if marked forms are not available for a given lexical item, many are identifiable as D stem on either comparative grounds (e.g., brk 'to bless', śmś 'to serve', śbḥ 'to praise') or due to the existence of contrasting pairs (e.g., ^cbr G 'to pass'/^cbr D 'to be pregnant', ^ctr G 'to be rich'/^ctr D 'to make rich'). Nevertheless, some are still open to

interpretation, e.g., šlḥ translates both MT šālaḥ and śilleᵃḥ in the MS, and hence it could be either G or D stem. Similar considerations hold for the Gt and Dt stems.

c. In the C stem, the preformative of the perfect tense is always '-, never h-. The forms of the imperfect are not always spelled yqtyl, i.e., with medial y hence they are often indistinguishable from the G (and D) imperfect. Similarly, the spelling of the C stem infinitive and participles is also generally indistinguishable from the D stem counterparts, and while many are obviously C stem on comparative grounds, there are many whose interpretation is unclear (however, a glance at both Jastrow and Levy reveals that this is the common situation throughout Middle Aramaic).

d. The perfect prefix of the Gt/Dt stems is 't-, with occasional spellings 'yt- (e.g., Gen 21:6 'ytqbl, etc.), never ht-, however there are occasional unusual error forms, e.g., Gen 22:18 htbrkwn, Gen 34:9 ht^crbw, where the sense of the text demands an imperfect. In all forms, the Gt is indistinguishable in spelling from the Dt, and individual items can only be assigned based on comparative grounds, or on the existence of a G or D stem base verb. There are also rare error forms with syncope of the '- of the prefix 't, e.g., Gen 8:4 wštdkt 'and it came to rest', probably to be explained as simple copyist error. In the Gt/Dt stems, there is the expected sibiliant metathesis (e.g., Deut 18:10 yštkḥ, Gen 15:17 'stdrw); sibilant metathesis with partial assimilation (e.g., Gen 22:18 'zdmn, Num 24:24 ystrpwn), and full assimilation to dentals (e.g., Num 22:25 'dhqt, Gen 31:49 ntmr, Exod 22:9 ytbr, however cf. occasional learned copyist error forms such as Deut 19:5 wyzdhp in error for wtdhp, see also Chapter 2 Orthography). Less commonly, one finds other medio-passive stems spelled without the -t-, presumably reflecting full assimilation to the first root consonant, familiar from Babylonian Talmudic Aramaic (e.g., Exod 5:12 'bdrwn 'they were

scattered', MT wayyāp̱eṣ, Gen 32:19 'šlḥt 'it has been sent', MT šəlûḥā, and others).

In the strong verbs there are very few obviously Ct forms attested, however, cf. Exod 21:29 where the MT wəhûᶜad is translated by the explicitly spelled (and imperfect!) wyt'shd! 'and it will be (!) made known', based on the C stem 'shd (cf. Onkelos ad loc., wə'ittashad); similarly, Lev 27:29 yt'prš 'he will be set aside', MT yoḥᵒram, based on the C stem 'prš (cf. Onkelos ad loc., yittaḥram). However, elsewhere the spelling is inconclusive, e.g., Lev 4:10 ytprš 'it will be separated', MT yûram (cf. Onkelos ad loc., mittapraš).

e. The most widely attested of the rarer stems is the Š (and occasional Št), found in the following verbs: šzyb, škll, šlhp, šᶜbd and the tertiae infirmae verbs šyṣy and šlhy (see below, and cf. Kaufman, "Akkadian Influences," pp. 104-105, 123-124).

There are also three roots found in intensive stems spelled with -w- ("Poᶜel", "Ithpoᶜel"), sbr, rqn and tqp (see below), and occasional geminate stems spelled with -w- ("Polel", "Ithpolel"), e.g., mᶜwrr 'stir up' (Deut 32:11), nrwmmnh 'we will extol him' (Exod 15:12), mšwṭṭn 'scanning' (Gen 22:10) and 'tbwnnw 'consider!' (Deut 32:7). For details, see below.

B. **Strong Verbs**
1. **The G Stem** (Paradigm A)
a. The situation in the MS concerning the G stem vowel classes is most complex, with considerable mixing of the classes; this is exacerbated by the inconsistent use of matres lectionis. However, this situation is familiar from other contemporary Middle Aramaic dialects, and especially so in the language of Onkelos. There are numerous examples of a stative perfect written plene with -y-, however all verbs so attested are also found unmarked, usually much more frequently. The following strong verbs are found marked (at least

once) with -y- in the perfect: dhyl, zbyn, hkym, hpyr(!), ᶜbyd, pqyd, qtyl, qryb, šlym, tqyp. Numerous other examples are found in the weak verbs, for which see below.[1] These examples from the strong verbs are as expected; cf. Dalman, "Grammatik," pp. 206 ff.

The spelling of the 1s suffix is distributed evenly between -t and -yt, and note also occasional error(?) forms such as Gen 44:18 'mry 'I said'. There is no indication of gender distinction in the second person singular (however there are some rare 2ms D stem "archaic" forms spelled -t'!, e.g., Gen 35:9, 'lpt', Gen 18:15, 19:21, ml(y)lt', ; note also other rare forms, e.g., Gen 20:9, ht'n'. Occasionally, the 2m and 2f singular is spelled -yt, e.g., Gen 26:10, ᶜbdyt (ms), Gen 3:13, ᶜbdyt (fs), apparently the resolution of the final consonant cluster (or, with this verb, an error of metathesis for ᶜbydt).

The 3fpl form is rarely distinguished from the 3mpl, but when so, it is spelled -n, e.g., Gen 19:8 hkmn, Gen 33:6 qrybn. There are also 3 pers. pl. forms ending in -wn, with the suffix extended from the imperfect, e.g., š'lwn, Gen 26:7 (3mpl), ᶜbdwn, Exod 1:17 (3fpl). Few 2fpl forms are attested in the MS, but those found appear to be identical to the 2 mpl, e.g., Exod 1:18 ᶜbdtwn, Exod 2:20 šbqtwn.

Apart from the anomalous ht'n', the 1pl is spelled qtlnn. There are some examples of a suffix -ynn that from context cannot be interpreted as compounded participial forms, ᶜbrynn, Num 13:32, kbšynn, Deut 2:34, šmᶜynn, Gen 42:21, Deut 5:24, presumably ᶜabarenan/ kəbašenan/ šəmaᶜenan with the suffix extended from nearby tertiae infirmae verbs, namely hmynn, Num 13:32, šyṣynn, Deut 2:34 hmynn, Gen 42:31, Deut 5:24 respectively. Note also rare error forms such as 'šthynwn and hzrnwn! in Gen 43:10, perhaps influenced by Hebrew -nw and by the adverb kdwn in the same verse.

b. In the imperfect too there is considerable confusion of vowel classes -- numerous plene spellings with -w- with occasional defectively

spelled doublets, e.g., 'ḥzwr (Gen 18:14) vs. 'ḥzr (Gen 18:10), in addition to many verbs not marked by <u>mater lectionis</u> at all, but presumably of the u-imperfect type. The only verbs unequivocally assignable to the a-imperfect class are tertiae gutturalis, e.g., tšlḥ (Deut 15:13), and it should be noted that there are some mediae gutturalis spelled with -w-, e.g., yš'wl (Num 27:21), yrḥwm (Deut 7:13). The only strong verb spelled with -y- in the imperfect is ^Cbd, e.g., '^Cbyd (Gen 31:43), t^Cbyd (Gen 6:16, 18:5), see Dalman, "Grammatik," pp. 216ff.

The 2fs is not common, but when found is spelled -yn, e.g., tdḥlyn (Gen 21:17, 35:17), t^Cbdyn (Gen 20:13, spelled t^Cbdwn with w/y confusion). In the 1s, there are occasional spellings such as '^Cybr 'let me pass' (Deut 2:27) with -y- to mark the shewa mobile, so 'a^{Ca}bar ⟶ 'a^Cəbar ⟶ 'a^Cibar?, however, cf. '^Cbr (Gen 30:32) and Dalman, "Grammatik," p. 218 (and also Chapter 2, <u>Orthography</u>, above).

There is no gender distinction marked between the 3 pers. pl. masc. or fem., nor between the 2 pers. pl. masc. or fem., e.g., yšlṭwn 'they will rule' (Gen 16:12, 3 fpl), tqṭlwn 'you will kill' (Exod 1:16, 2 fpl), however cf. occasional feminine plural forms preserved in, e.g., D stem yshdn 'they will witness' (Gen 30:33) and elsewhere. There are some prefixes spelled plene with -y-, e.g., nyṭrw⟨d⟩ (Gen 3:22, abbreviated at the end of the line).

c.   In the G stem imperative, there are some masc. sing. forms spelled with -w-, e.g., ḥzwr, ṭrwd, kpwt, nkws, but most are spelled simply without <u>mater lectionis</u>, e.g., dbr, ḥkm, ^Cbd, qrb, etc. The fem. singular has ^Cbydy (Gen 18:6), alongside ^Cbdy (Gen 16:6) and ḥzry (Gen 16:9), but cf. the mpl ḥzrw! (Deut 5:30), and also šlwṭw and tqwpw, as well as tqypw and kbyšw (= w/y confusion?). As can be seen, the situation is confused with the imperatives, and while in general they appear to belong to the same vowel class as the imperfects, the lack of a <u>mater lectionis</u> is in no way

significant, and each lexical item should be examined independently. Again, there is no gender distinction between masc. and fem. plural forms, e.g., šm^Cw (Gen 4:23, fem. pl.).

d.   Most G stem infinitives are spelled without -w-, mqtl, however cf. e.g., msbwl (Gen 4:13) mṭrwd (Gen 20:18), mzbwn (Deut 2:6), mdḥwl (Deut 4:9, but mydḥl in Deut 10:12), etc. For other spellings of the prefix with -y-, see, e.g., mydḥwp (Deut 6:19). Again, absence of a <u>mater lectionis</u> is not significant, nor does there appear to be any connection between the spelling of the infinitive and that of the imperfect, e.g., mḥzr, mšbq, mšlṭ, etc. Occasional forms spelled without m- appear to be either copyist error (e.g., Gen 19:33 dmkh, cf. the parallel verse in 19:35 mdmkh 'her lying down') or else imitation of a Hebrew form (e.g., Gen 23:6 mlqbr 'from burying' MT miqqəbōr, cf. Gen 23:8 mqbr 'to bury'). However, other stems also lack the prefix on occasion, e.g., D stem lqbl', Exod 15:12.

The infinitive can also occur with pronominal subject suffixes, e.g., m^Crqk 'your fleeing' (Gen 35:1), mšm^Chwn 'their hearing' (Gen 20:8), and much less commonly, with pronominal direct object suffixes, e.g., mqṭlyh 'to kill him' (Gen 37:18, MT lah^amitô), cf. Chapter 9, <u>Syntax</u>.

e.   While the ideal form of the masc. sing. active participle is spelled qtyl, in fact the defective spelling qtl occurs at the rate of approximately 8:1. While one does find such isolated forms as rḥyš 'creeping' (Gen 7:8), the preferred spelling rḥš occurs no less than eight times in Genesis, and cf. rḥym (Gen 37:3,4)/rḥm (Gen 29:20), etc. (The form pryq 'redeeming' in 'lh pryq, Gen 17:8, 28:21, may be rather the noun prwq, i.e., pāroq, cf. Lev 26:45 'lh prwq, or else w/y confusion for pryq.) There are also many examples of roots ending in either -r or a guttural, presumably, then, of the type qātal, e.g., ^Cbr 'passing', ptḥ 'opening', šm^C 'hearing', etc.

The fem. sing. active participle is predominantly spelled qtlh (approximately 10:1 over the spelling qtl'). For the fs used in the

construct, cf. the common phrase npqt brh 'whore',
literally 'she who goes out into the open' (e.g.,
Gen 38:21).

Some masc. plural forms are spelled with -y-,
e.g., ḥkymyn 'knowing' (Gen 29:5), rḥyṣyn
'trusting' (Deut 28:52), i.e., presumably ḥākəmin→
ḥākimin, rāḥəṣin→rāḥiṣin, since they cannot be
passive participles by context. These are also
construct forms, e.g., tpśy knwr' 'those who hold
the lyre' (Gen 4:21), plḥy tᶜwwth 'those who
worship idols' (Deut 3:29), etc.

The fem. plural is ideally qtln, but generally
it has been replaced by the masc. plural, cf. npqn
'going out' (Gen 24:11), slqn 'going up'
(Gen 41:5), but more commonly slqyn (Gen 41:2ff,
and others), npqyn (Gen 24:13), qrbyn 'approaching'
(Num 27:1), etc.

The participle occurs most commonly as a
compound tense with either finite or infinite forms
of the verb 'to be', often for an MT imperfect or
participle. For full discussion, see Chapter 9
Syntax.

There do not appear to be any compound
participles of the type qtyln', qtylnn, etc.
familiar from Babylonian Talmudic Aramaic. In
Section A.(i) above, it was suggested that such
forms as ᶜbrynn, kbśynn, etc. are perfects with
suffix -ynn extended from tertiae infirmae verbs.
All the examples cited did indeed have such weak
forms in the same verse, but there are also
examples without, e.g., Gen 26:22 tqpynn 'we have
become strong' (MT pārînû). It is doubtful that
these are compound participial forms, since (1)
there are no examples from other conjugations; (2)
unattached examples of participle + personal
pronoun are common, e.g., ydᶜ 'nh 'I know'
(Num 22:6), ḥkymyn 'nn 'we know' and ḥkymyn 'twn
'you know' (both in Gen 29:5), etc.

f.   The passive participle of the strong verb
occurs frequently, e.g., ktyb 'written'
(Deut 9:10), šmyᶜ 'heard' (Exod 2:24), etc., and
in the determined state brykh 'the blessed one'
(Gen 24:31, 26:29). There are occasional

defectively spelled forms, e.g., ḥ' slm qbᶜ 'a
ladder was fixed' (Gen 28:12).

The feminine singular is usually spelled qtylh,
rarely qtyl', e.g., qbyᶜ' (Gen 28:12), and note
also š'lh 'borrowed' (Num 22:30), and others. For
the construct, see Gen 17:27 zbynt ksp 'that bought
with silver'.

The masc. plural (ktybyn, Deut 9:10, ḥšybyn
'considered', Exod 16:7, rbyᶜyn 'crouched',
Gen 29:2, etc.) also has determined forms, e.g.,
qtylyh 'the killed ones' (Gen 15:1, 34:27),
construct forms, e.g., zbyny ksp 'those bought with
silver' (Gen 17:23), and forms with pronominal
suffixes, e.g., ḥbyšwy 'his bound ones' (Gen 39:20).

Feminine plural forms are not common -- ideally
ending in -n, more commonly in -yn, e.g., zqypn
'raised' (Gen 29:17, Exod 17:12), msyryn 'handed
over' (Gen 30:22), štylyn 'planted' (Num 24:6).

There are also uncommon passive participles of
the form qtwl, e.g., tᶜwnyn 'loaded' (Gen 37:25);
pswl/pswlh 'blemished' (Gen 49:2 but cf. psyl in
the parallel verse Deut 6:4, hence perhaps a case
of w/y confusion?); ḥtwm 'sealed' (Deut 32:34,
MT ḥātūm), etc.

2. The D Stem (Paradigm B)

a.   The spelling of the perfect of the D stem is by
and large not distinguished from that of the
G stem. Occasional spellings with -y- are found,
e.g., qtylw (Gen 49:6), zbynw (Gen 25:33), zbyn
(Gen 25:33), bryk (Gen 14:9, cf. brk, Gen 24:1),
šmyšt (Gen 19:33, cf. šmšt, Gen 19:35), but the
overwhelming majority are spelled "defectively,"
e.g., qdš (Exod 19:14), qrbt (Exod 4:25), srbtwn
(Deut 1:26), etc.

There are occasional error forms, usually of
metathesis, e.g., Gen 30:17 ᶜbryt 'she became
pregnant', for ᶜbyrt; also Gen 37:28 zbn' 'they
sold', for zbnw; Gen 19:36 ᶜbryn 'they became
pregnant' (for ᶜbyrn?).

b.   Most imperfect forms are also spelled without
-y-, but cf. e.g., Gen 4:14 yqtyl 'he will
slaughter' (MT yahargēnî), Lev 6:14 tqryb 'you will
offer' vs., e.g., Lev 6:15 yqrb 'he will offer',

Lev 20:17 yqbl 'he will receive', Exod 22:4 yšlm
'he shall make restitution', Lev 5:18 ykpr 'he
shall make atonement', etc. For quadriliteral
imperfects, cf. e.g., Lev 27:33 ypšpš 'he shall
search', Exod 15:17 t'ḥsn 'you shall cause them to
possess', Exod 23:8 ytltl 'it shall remove',
Gen 11:7, Exod 14:13, 14 nᶜrbb 'let us confound',
but cf. Deut 7:23 yᶜrbwb(!) 'he will confound'
(= yᶜrbyb, with w/y confusion?), and note also
Exod 14:13, 14 nlwly, nlwwly 'let us shout'
(presumably w/y confusion for nlwlw = nəlawlew for
nəlableb, cf. Jastrow, "Dictionary," p. 689).

For the 3 fpl imperfect ending in -n, cf.
Gen 30:33 yshdn, Deut 31:21 y'rᶜn, etc. vs.,
e.g., Gen 30:13 yšbḥwn.

c. Most D stem imperatives are in the masc. sing
and again most are spelled without -y-, e.g., brk,
zbn, qbl, qrb, šmš (all occurring frequently). For
forms spelled plene, cf. e.g., ḥšyb 'reckon'
(Gen 23:15), zᶜyr 'make small' (Num 23:7) and
qbylw 'listen' (Gen 38:25 and often). Feminine
forms are rare, however cf. Exod 15:12 qbly
'accept' (twice) and note Gen 19:34 šmš!, clearly a
copyist error for šmšy in the phrase ᶜwly wšmš(y)
'enter and serve' (MT bō'î šikbî). No fem. plural
forms are found.

d. The spelling of the D stem infinitive is
divided approximately evenly between mqtlh and
mqtl'. There are occasional forms without the
prefix m-, e.g., Gen 9:15 lḥbl' 'to destroy',
Exod 15:12 lqbl' to receive', always with the
preposition l- (not exclusive of m- however, cf.
Exod 8:25 lmšqrh 'to lie', lmšlḥ' 'to send
forth'). There are also copyist errors such as
Gen 28:12 lmbśry 'to bring good news' with y/h
confusion (i.e., ＇ for ﬨ , cf. Chapter 2,
Orthography).

It is not certain whether the construct (qdmwt
'to meet'⟶'towards' (e.g., Exod 19:17) should be
interpreted here as a D stem infinitive (with
Dalman, "Grammatik," p. 227), or as an independent
nominal form.

e. The active participle is as expected, however
there are no masc. sing. forms spelled with -y-.
All are spelled mqtl, e.g., Gen 27:29 mbrk 'bless',
Num 32:25 mpqd 'command', and determined state,
Exod 4:25 mḥblh 'the destroyer'. There are some
unusual forms, e.g., Deut 4:8 ('nh) sdr! '(I)
order'; Gen 12:3 mbrkk (ytk) 'blesses (you)'
(presumably an error of dittography, probably
influenced by the Hebrew məbārəkeykā, and cf. mbrk
in the identical idiom in Gen 27:29; Gen 21:9 mǧhk
'laugh' for mǧhk with ḥ/h confusion.

Note the fem. sing. participle with the direct
object suffix in Gen 38:25 mprsyyh 'divulge him'
(presumably məparsəyeh < məpārəsā + eh), and also
the masc. plural determined state mšbḥy' 'those
whose praise' (Gen 32:27). The fem. plural forms
are spelled with -n, e.g., Gen 26:35 mǧhkn 'laugh',
mqbln 'receive', the masc. plural -yn, e.g.,
Lev 24:12, Num 21:15 mqtlyn 'kill', Gen 49:27
mqrbyn 'offer', mplǧyn 'divide', etc.

f. The passive participle is always mqtl, e.g.,
Gen 4:8 mdbr 'lead', Gen 24:13, 43, Num 22:34
mᶜtd 'placed', Exod 12:9 mhbhb 'roasted', mbšl
'cooked', Deut 4:25, 27:15 mrḥq 'abominable', etc.
In Gen 28:17, Exod 19:11 (and elsewhere) one also
finds mzwmn(yn) 'prepared', but cf. Exod 19:15,
33:31 mzmn(yn) (and especially Exod 15:17 mwzmn?!,
see 3(f) below).

The fem. sing. has mᶜbrh 'pregnant'
(Gen 38:25) and for the determined state, cf.
mprnqth 'the delicate woman' (Deut 28:56).

The masc. plural is, e.g., mšbḥyn 'praised'
(Num 24:6), mqdqdyn 'striped' (Gen 30:39, 31:12),
mᶜrbyn 'mixed' (Deut 22:11), and in the construct
mzmny (ᶜm/ qhlh) 'those chosen (out of the
people/community)' (Num 1:16, 16:2).

Note the unusual mpqdym 'commanded' (Gen 13:7,
no Vorlage, apparently in imitation of Hebrew
forms); and also Gen 27:15 mšbḥyyn! (?). There are
no fem. plural forms found.

3. The C Stem (Paradigm C)

   a.   As mentioned above, the C stem perfect prefix
is always '-, never ḥ-. All examples of the 3ms
noted were of the type 'qtl, never 'qtyl, e.g.,
'prš 'he separated' (Gen 30:40), etc., however
there are occasional 3mpl forms spelled with -y-,
e.g., 'qdymw 'they arose early' (Gen 24:22), 'rgyzw
'they caused anger' (Deut 32:30), and note Deut
32:16 'k^cwsw! 'they roused to anger' (presumably
'k^cysw with w/y confusion). The 3fs is
occasionally abbreviated, e.g., 'shn` 'it
supported' (Gen 13:6, root ḥsn?), 'šlm` 'she
completed' (Gen 24:19).

        The 1pl suffix is -nn, e.g., Gen 26:32 'škḥnn
'we found', but cf. 'rgzn! 'we caused anger'
(Deut 32:31, perhaps an error of haplography for
'rgznn).

   b.   The C imperfect is not well represented. Few
of the attested forms are spelled with -y-, and
hence they are indistinguishable from those G and
D stem imperfects written yqtl. Examples cited are
from verbs attested clearly as C stem elsewhere:
yṣlḥ (Gen 24:40), tšlm (Deut 20:12, or D?) 'šb^c
(Gen 24:3), yšlmwn (Gen 24:19, or D?), tqdmwn
(Gen 19:2), nškḥ (Gen 47:25). Problematic is the
C stem of root ḥzr spelled apparently with -w- ,
e.g., 'ḥzwr (Gen 24:5, 28:15), tḥzwr (Gen 24:8),
either due to w/y confusion, or copyist confusion
with the commonly occurring G stem, or most
probably a combination of both.

   c.   In the C imperative also, most forms are
spelled without -y-, however the stem is generally
poorly attested. In the ms one finds, e.g., 'dkr
'call to mind' (Lev 22:27), 'nhr 'lighten'
(Gen 38:25), 'qrb 'bring near' (Gen 27:25), 'šlm
'complete' (Gen 29:27); in the fs, 'rkyny 'incline
down' (Gen 24:14); in the mpl, 'dkrw 'remember'
(Deut 32:7), 'mtynw 'wait' (Gen 19:18), and note
'ṣn^cwn(!) 'retain' (Gen 42:33, with suffix
extended from the imperfect. In this case, this
may however be a case of mimicking the ending -wn
found three more times in this verse, 'twn, mnkwn,
btykwn).

        No fpl forms are attested.

   d.   The C stem infinitive is usually spelled mqtlh
(slightly less so mqtl'), i.e., indistinguishable
from the D stem infinitive, e.g., mprš' 'to divide'
(e.g., Gen 1:4), mḥzrh 'to restore' (e.g.,
Deut 24:13), etc. Note the y/h confusion in lmškḥy
(Gen 27:20, and cf. D stem lmbšry above). The
construct form in Exod 36:6, Num 18:19, etc.,
'pršwt 'offering' may be a C stem construct
infinitive, however cf. other forms of the noun
'pršw (Num 18:14), 'pršwth (Exod 36:3), 'pršwty
(Num 18:8), and note also, e.g., 'nhrwth
'illumination' (Num 4:9), 'ḥsnwtk 'your possession'
(Exod 15:17), etc.

   e.   The C stem active participle is also rarely
marked with -y-, hence indistinguishable from the
D stem forms. For the ms, see mḥzyr 'return'
(Gen 20:7) vs. mḥzr (Gen 44:18), mdkr 'remember'
(Gen 41:9), mšhd 'testify' (Deut 32:46), mmtyn
'wait' (Gen 27:41), mśby^c 'satisfy' (Gen 30:22),
etc. For the mpl, see mzry^cyn 'produce seed'
(Gen 1:11) vs. mzr^cyn (Gen 1:12), mškḥyn 'find'
(Gen 19:11), mḥzyryn 'return' (Gen 29:3), mqdmyn
'advance' (Gen 49:8).

        The fs and fpl are problematic, as the only
examples in the MS have the prefix '-!, Gen 16:8
w'n byt 't 'škḥh kbytyh d'brm 'and where is the
house that you could find like Abram's house' (no
Vorlage) and Gen 19:15 wyt trtyn bntk d'škḥn 'and
your two daughters that are here', (MT wə'et-šətê
bənōteykā hannimṣā'ōt), explicable only as an error
of א for ה. No other feminine forms are available.

   f.   The only C stem passive participles attested
are Exod 15:17 mwzmn 'prepared' (but cf. D stem,
Section 2(f) above, perhaps an error of metathesis
for mzwmn) and especially mḥlṭ'/mḥlṭh 'declared
leprous' (Lev 13:11, 51, 52, for MT nōšenet and
mam'eret).

4. The Medio-Passive Stems (Paradigm D)

   a.   As mentioned previously, there is no
orthographic difference between the Gt and the Dt
stem, and individual lexical items must be assigned
on comparative or synchronic grounds. The prefix

is always 'ṯ- (with occasional plene spellings 'yṯ-, e.g., 'yṯqblt Gen 15:1, 'yṯknš Gen 5:27, etc.). The spelling 'ṯqṭyl is only attested in 'ṯ^Cbyd 'it was done' (Exod 2:4, for MT imperfect!), 'ṯ^Cbydw 'there were made' (Exod 14:13), etc. There is also a number of medio-passive perfects spelled without -ṯ-, presumably reflecting full assimilation to the first radical of the root, e.g., 'knyš 'he was gathered' (Gen 5:20), 'bdrwn 'they were scattered' (Exod 5:12), 'dbqtwn 'you adhered' (Deut 4:4, cf. Jastrow, "Dictionary," p. 278), among others. In the 3 masc. and fem. plural perfect there are isolated examples of the imperfect suffix -wn extended to the perfect, e.g., 'ṯ^Cbdwn 'they were made' (Deut 32:31), 'yṯpthwn 'they (eyes, fpl) were opened' (Gen 3:7). For the 3fpl endings in -n, see 'ṯpr^Cn 'they (our hands) were revenged' (Deut 32:27).

For the very few Ct forms attested in the ms, see section A.2(d) above, and see the I-Aleph, II-w/y, and Geminate verbs below.

b.   The stem vowel is marked with -y- only in very few of the many attested 3ms imperfect forms, however cf. yṯpsyl 'it will be rejected' (Gen 22:10), yṯqṭyl 'he will be killed' (Exod 22:18), vs. yṯqṭl (Exod 21:29, Num 35:16, etc.).

For forms with metathesis and/or dental assimilation, cf. yštb^C 'he has sworn' (Lev 5:24), yzdrqwn 'they will be thrown' (Exod 19:13), tzdhrwn 'you will be careful' (Deut 4:15), etc. Note also tbdqwn 'you will be tested' (Gen 42:15), and yṯqp 'he shall be strong' (Num 24:7, or else G stem), and cf. the perfect in section (a) above.

The 3mpl has occasional error forms, e.g., yṯknšw 'they will be gathered' (Gen 34:30, for yṯknšwn) and yṯ^Cbd! 'they will be done' (Exod 33:16, subject nsyn wpl'yn 'miracles and wonders').

The 3fpl has both endings, -wn (from the 3mpl) and -n, cf. yṯpršwn 'they will be separated' (Gen 25:23, subject tryn(!) mlkwwn 'two kingdoms') and yṯpr^Cn 'they will be revenged' (Deut 33:7, subject ydwy 'his hands').

c.   There are few medio-passive imperative forms attested, none in the fem. pl. Masc. sing. 'zdhr 'take care', masc. pl. 'zdhrw occur frequently (e.g., Gen 31:24, Exod 10:28, Deut 4:9, 8:11), but note Exod 23:21 'zdhrwn! One also finds 'stkl 'look' (Gen 15:5), 'štb^C 'swear' (Gen 21:23+), 'ṯ^Ctd 'be ready' (Deut 5:31), etc.; in the masc. pl., 'tgrw 'trade' (Gen 34:10), 'tknšw 'be gathered' (Gen 49:1), and note Exod 14:13 'ṯ^C⟨t⟩dw 'be ready' (spelled 'ṯ^Cdw!). The only fem. sing. form attested is 'st^Cry 'be troubled' (Gen 16:9).

d.   Medio-passive infinitives are also not widely attested, but those found are as expected, e.g., mthmdh 'to long for' (Gen 31:30), mstkl' 'to look at' (Gen 3:6), mt^Cbd' 'to be done' (Gen 20:9, 34:7), mtqṭl 'to be killed' (Gen 26:11+), mtnhmh 'to be comforted' (Gen 37:35), mštlh 'to be sent' (Exod 4:13+), mṣṭ^Crh 'to be troubled' (Num 12:16), etc.

The infinitive occurs often translating an MT cognate infinitive, e.g., Exod 22:18 mtqṭlh yṯqṭyl 'he shall surely be killed', and note the same in Gen 26:11 spelled mytqṭl(!) yṯqṭl (MT môt yûmāt).

e.   Medio-passive participles are as expected, e.g., masc. sing. mtnks 'being sacrificed' (Gen 22:10), masc. pl. mtr^Cmyn 'murmured' (Exod 16:8), fem. sing. mt^Cbrh 'become pregnant', fem. pl. mtknšyn! 'being gathered' (Gen 37:7, subject = kwrkwtkwn 'your sheaves'). For metathesis and/or assimilation, cf. mstkl, mstrpyn, mzdbn, and mdbryn(!) 'being led' (Deut 33:3).

5.   Intensive Stems with -w-

There are remnant forms in Neofiti of the stems usually called "Poel", "Ithpoel", "Polel", and "Ithpolel". The majority of the attested verbs belong

to the first two categories; and all these are found
with three verbal roots only, tqp, rqn, and sbr.

Poel
Perfect:	twqpt	'I made strong' (Gen 17:20)
	twqpt	'you made strong' (2 ms, Gen 19:19)
	rwqn	'he emptied' (Gen 31:9)
	rwqn⟨w⟩	'they despoiled' (Exod 12:36, spelled rwqnn with w/final n confusion).
Imperfect:	'twqp	'I will make strong' (Gen 12:2, 17:2,6)
	ttwqp	'she shall seize' (Deut 25:11)
	yrwqn	'he shall empty' (Num 24:17)
	trwqnwn	'you (pl) shall despoil' (Exod 3:22).
Imperative:	tqwpw	'be strong' (masc. pl., Gen 1:28, MT pərû).
Infinitive:	mswbr'	'to endure' (Gen 45:1, MT ləhit'appēq, Exod 12:39, MT ləhitmahmē^ah, and note Gen 49:4 mswbryh! no MT).

Ithpoel
Perfect:	'twqp	'he seized'? (Exod 4;4, for twqp?)
	'twqpw	'they seized'? (Gen 19:15, 16, for twqpw?).
Imperative:	'twqp	'be strong' (masc. sing., Deut 31:7, 23, MT h^azaq)
	'twqypw	'be strong' (masc. pl., Deut 31:6, MT ḥizqû)
	'twqpw	'be strong' (masc. pl., Deut 12:23, MT h^azaq).

Polel
Imperfect:	yrwmm	'he will lift up' (Gen 40:13, MT yiśśā')
	nrwmmnh	'we shall praise him' (Exod 15:2, MT 'anwēhû, with direct object suffix).

Participle:	m^cwrr	'stir up' (Deut 32:11, based on MT poetic yā^cîr)
	mšwṭṭn	'scan' (fem. pl., subject 'eyes', Gen 22:10, no MT).

Ithpolel
Imperfect:	ytrwmm	'it shall be exalted' (Num 24:7, subject fem. mlkwtyh!, cf. 24:8 and Deut 32:3 for cognate noun rwmmw[th]).
Imperative:	'tbwnnw	'consider' (masc. pl., Deut 32:7, bînû).

6. The Š/Št Stems

The Š prefix is not a productive causative prefix in Aramaic, and so too in Neofiti, as its limited attestation demonstrates. It occurs on the verbs šzyb, škll, šlḥp and š^cbd in the strong roots, and šyṣy and šlḥy in the weak (both tertiae infirmae, q.v.).[2]
Only a partial paradigm is attested.

Š Stem
Perfect:	šlḥpt	'you have changed' (masc. sing., Gen 31:41)
	šlḥp	'he has changed' (Gen 31:7, 48:14)
	šyzb/šzyb	'he saved' (Exod 2:19, Exod 12:27, Gen 37:21)
	škll/šklyl	'he perfected' (Gen 1:1, 2:22, Deut 20:5)
	š^cbydw	'they enslaved' (Exod 1:13)
	škll⟨w⟩	'they perfected' (3fp, Exod 15:7, spelled šklly with w/y confusion).
Imperfect:	'šyzb	'I will save' (Exod 6:6)
	tškll	'you shall perfect' (masc. sing., Gen 6:16)
	yš^cbdwn	'they will enslave' (Gen 15:13, 14).
Imperative:	šyzb	'save' (masc. sing., Gen 32:11).
Infinitive:	mšyzb'/mšyzbh	'to save' (Gen 18:1, 32:2, 37:22).

Active
Participle: myšyzyb 'one who saves' (masc. sing., Deut 32:39)

           mšyzyb 'one who saves' (masc. sing., Deut 28:29).

Passive
Participle mš^{C}bd 'enslaved' (masc. sing., Gen 25:23)
           mšw^{C}bd! 'enslaved' (masc. sing., Gen 27:40)
           mšyzb' 'the one saved' (masc. sing. determined, Gen 14:13)
           mšyzbh 'it is delivered' (fem. sing., Gen 15:11).

Št Stem
Perfect: 'štzbt/
           'štyzbt 'it was saved' (3fs Deut 2:36, Gen 32:31)
           'štyzbwn 'they were delivered' (3mpl, Gen 15:17).

Imperfect: 'štyzb 'I will be saved' (Gen 19:20)
           yštyzb 'he will be saved' (Deut 23:16)
           yšt^{C}bdwn 'they will be enslaved' (Gen 27:29).

Imperative: 'štyzb 'be saved' (masc. sing., Gen 19:17 (x2), 19:22).

Infinitive: mšt^{C}bd' 'to be enslaved' (Gen 40:12)
           mštyzb' 'to be saved' (Gen 19:19).

Participle: mšt^{C}bd 'enslaved' (Gen 9:25, 26, 27)
           mšt^{C}bdyn 'enslaved' (Num 12:12).

C. Weak Verbs

    1. Primae Infirmae -- I-Aleph (Paradigm E)

        a.   For the G stem, the verb 'kl 'eat' is taken as the paradigm, however the forms cited apply to other verbs such as 'gr 'hire', etc. (For 'zl 'go', 'mr 'say' and 't' 'come', cf. section I below.) Forms in the derived conjugations are not well attested; in this discussion, as for all the

weak verbs, only attested forms found in the MS are cited. The remaining elements of the paradigm can usually be inferred.

    b.   The presence of the letter aleph in the imperfect and infinitive is to be understood as a morphological spelling based on the perfect, e.g., t'kl vs. tykl. The spelling of the stem vowel of the imperfect shows some variation, and the use of matres lectionis is not consistent within a given root, e.g., tykwl vs. tykl. No general conclusions can be made solely on the spelling in the MS, however, and any discussion of vowel classes must take comparative considerations into account.

        Plural forms are by and large poorly attested, however cf. t'klwn/n'kl with aleph, tyklwn without, and note ylpwn 'they will learn' /tlpwn 'you will learn' (Deut 4:10/5:1) in the G stem.

    c.   The derived conjugations are also poorly attested, however cf. D stem t'rš(!) 'you will betroth' (Deut 28:30), y'r^{C}wn 'they will meet' (Deut 31:17), m'rsh 'betrothed' (Exod 22:15) for forms spelled with aleph, and also the medio-passive perfects and imperfects cited. Note also the "archaic" spelling of the suffix in 'lpt' 'you have taught', three times in a midrash in Gen 35:9 (twice abbreviated 'lpt`), and the unusual use of aleph in the 3fs suffix 't'sy't 'she was cured' (Num 12:16, vs. 't'syt, Num 12:15).

        In the C stem, the perfect has 'klt! 'I fed' (Exod 16:32, MT he'^{e}kaltî) alongside expected 'yykl 'he fed' (Deut 7:3, 8:3, 32:13, Lev 22:27, but 'yykwl! again in Lev 22:27). C stem infinitives are spelled with prefix mw-, i.e., they are assimilated to the I/y verbs (q.v.).

  2. Primae Infirmae -- I-y/w (Paradigm F)

    a.   This is the most well attested of the primae infirmae groups, especially so in the G stem. There is considerable intermixing between vowel classes, and presumably also assimilation to verbs I-Aleph, I-n, and possibly II-w (as in Onkelos). The following representative verbs are attested:

Perfect	Imperfect	Imperative	Infinitive
yl(y)d (yəled)	yld (yellad, yelid?)	—	m(y)ld (melad?)
yd^c (yəda^c)	yd^c (yidda^c?)	d^c (da^c)	m(y)d^c (midda^c, meda^c?)
—	y(y)rt (yerat)	yrtw (yartu)	myr(w)t (merat, merot)
ykyl (yəkel)	yk(w)l (yikkol)	—	mkl (mikkol?)
yhb (yəhab)	—	hb (hab)	--
ytyb (yəteb)	—	tb (tib)	--
yqd (yəqad?)	yyqwd (yiqqod)	--	--
—	y(y)t(y)b (yetib)	--	--

As can be seen, a complex situation is complicated even further by a lack of certain forms, and by the inconsistent use of matres lectiones.

(1) The imperfect of yld is never spelled with internal -y-, hence it is impossible to determine whether it is vocalized yalid, as in Onkelos (presumably assimilated to the II-w group) or perhaps yillad (< I-nun). The spelling of the infinitive mld/myld would admit either millad (< I-nun) or melad (< I-Aleph, as in Onkelos).

(2) The imperfect of yd^c is presumably yidda^c, infinitive midda^c (or meda^c?), assimilated to I-nun (or I-Aleph).

(3) There is no example of the perfect of yrt (= yryt, i.e., yaret, as in Onkelos?); the imperfect is presumably yerat (spelling yyrt, < I-Aleph). There are two examples of the imperative, both masc. plural yrtw (Deut 1:8, 21) and yrytw (Deut 9:23). The latter is problematic, and might be explained as yarətu → yaritu, i.e., with -y- for vocalic shewa, rather than as yaretu. Similarly problematic is the infinitive spelling myrwt (Deut 4:5). Based on Onkelos, one expects merat (= spelling m(y)rt?); the form myrwt may represent assimilation to I-n (cf. mpwq). It is not possible to determine whether the

spellings m(y)rt are "defective" or whether both vocalizations are to be admitted in Neofiti.

(4) The spelling of the various forms of ykl is not consistent. The perfect is spelled either ykyl (= Onkelos) or ykl, and note also Gen 36:7 3fs yklyt:, presumably an error of metathesis for ykylt; the imperfect is spelled ykwl (= Onkelos) or ykl (cf. nykl, Num 13:30, nkl, Gen 24:50, etc., i.e., < I-nun), and note also Gen 19:19, 22 'wkl:, perhaps a Hebraism, Gen 31:35 'kyl, perhaps w/y confusion for 'kwl, and Deut 7:17 'ykl, perhaps w/y confusion for the Hebraism (?) 'wkl. The only example of the infinitive is Num 13:30 mkl (MT yākôl, = mikkol?).

(5) The perfect yhb is found in a suppletive paradigm with the imperfect ytn, but cf. imperative hb/hby/hbw (= hab, etc.).

(6) There are no examples of the imperfect of ytyb, however cf. imperative tb/tby/tbw (= tib, etc.); the verb is less commonly used in Neofiti than šrh 'to sit', 'to dwell'.

(7) The perfect yqd (e.g., Exod 3:2), imperfect yqwd (e.g., Gen 38:25 nyqwd) may belong to the same class as ykyl/ykwl, i.e., perfect yəqed, however no forms spelled with -y- are found in the MS.

(8) The verb yytyb only occurs in the imperfect (cf. also MT yîṭab), spelled yytb, yytyb, tytb, ttyb.

b.   In the derived conjugations, only three forms are found in the D stem. However, the C stem is very well attested, and preserves most distinctions between verbs originally I-w (e.g., yld, ysp, ykḥ, ybl, yqd, yd^c) and those originally I-y (e.g., yng, ytb). Some mixing does seem to occur, but this may reflect w/y medieval copyist confusion rather than paradigmatic assimilation.

Verbs originally I-w have -w- in all forms, e.g.,:

Perfect: 'wl(y)d (Gen 5:3, 5 and often), 'ws(y)pw (Gen 37:5, 8), 'wkḥ (Gen 21:25, Deut 1:1), 'wbylw (Gen 50:13), 'wqdt (Deut 9:21), 'wdᶜt (Exod 6:3, spelled 'wdᶜt with -y- added supralinearly);

Imperfect: ywld (Gen 17:20), twsp (Gen 4:12), ywkyhn (Gen 31:37, with w/ final n confusion for ywkyhw), twqdwn (Deut 7:5), twdᶜ (Exod 18:20), twzp (Deut 24:10), ywqr (Deut 5:16);

Imperative: 'wbylw (Gen 42:19);

Infinitive: mwldh (Gen 17:7), mwqrh (Num 22:37);

Participles: mwl(y)d (often), mwqd (Lev 16:28).

Verbs originally I-y are less commonly attested, e.g.,:

Perfect: 'yyṭb (Gen 12:16), 'yynyqt (Gen 21:7);
Imperfect: 'yyṭb (Gen 32:12);
Imperative: --;
Infinitive: myyṭybh (Gen 32:12, Deut 6:24, but cf. Onkelos meṭābā, hence perhaps influenced by the imperfect?);
Participles: myynqth 'her nurse' (Gen 24:59, with pronominal suffix), myynqyn (fpl, Gen 32:15, for MT mênîqôt).

However, the picture is complicated by numerous "unexpected" forms, cf.:

Perfect: 'wnqt (Exod 2:9, w/y confusion for 'ynqt?);
Imperfect: 'yqr/'yyqr (Num 24:11, 22:7, cf. mwqr', Num 24:11, and others), ysp (Gen 30:24, but the MT has the defectively written yōsēp, also spelled ysp), nwṭb (Num 10:29, and cf. also 'wṭb, Gen 32:9, w/y confusion for nyṭb/'yṭb?);
Imperative: 'wnyqy/'yybyly (both in Exod 2:9, cf. 'wnqt above, and also 'wbylw, Gen 42:19);
Infinitive: myqrh (Num 22:17, cf. mwqrh, Num 22:37, therefore perhaps w/y confusion).

c. The medio-passive stems in the I-w/y verbs generally distinguish a Ct stem, based on the existence of a C stem, e.g.,:

Perfect: Ct - 'twtbt (Gen 32:4, 1s, Gen 21:23, 2ms), 'twtb (Gen 20:1, etc.), 'twtbw (Exod 6:4), vs. Gt/Dt - 'tylyd (Gen 4:18, etc.), based on G stem yld, 'tyhmw (Gen 30:30, etc.), based on D stem yhm, and especially 'twwkḥt in Gen 20:16 with consonantal w;

Imperfect: Ct - ttwqd (Gen 38:24), ytwqd (Lev 19:6), ytwspwn (Gen 49:26), vs. Gt/Dt - ytyhb (Gen 4:1), based on G stem yhb, 'tyqr (Exod 14:17), based on G stem yqr, and note ttyybbwn (Num 10:7), ytldwn (Gen 8:17, perhaps yittiladun written defectively, or else a copyist spelling error), and ytwdᶜ (Exod 33:16, with w/y confusion for ytydᶜ, or else a Hebraism?, cf. Jastrow, "Dictionary," p. 565);

Imperative: Ct - 'twtb (Gen 26:3), vs. Gt/Dt - 'tyldwn (Gen 9:7);

Infinitive: Ct - mtwqdh (Gen 38:25), mtwtbh (Gen 12:10);

Participles: Dt - mtylp (Gen 21:20).

3. Primae Infirmae -- I-n (Paradigm G)

a. There are very few examples of a stative perfect type in the G stem of I-n verbs. The spellings nsyb, nsybt, nhyt occur infrequently, and most perfect forms are of the type nsb, nht, and also ntl, ntr, nks, nsk, npḥ, npq, etc. (The spelling npwq(?) occurs in Gen 27:30, either w/y confusion for npyq or, more likely, influenced by the accompanying cognate infinitive mpwq.) There are three attested 1pl perfect suffixes: nsbnn, 'we took' (Deut 3:4, cf. kbšnn in the same verse); ntln(!) 'we travelled' (Deut 1:19, cf. hlknn in the same verse?); and ntlynn 'we travelled' (Deut 2:1, cf. kwwynn/'pqnn(!) in the same verse, and cf. Section 2.A(i) above).

b. All three historical vowel possibilities are
attested in the imperfect:

a - ysb (common), 'tr (Num 23:12, but note
ntwr, Deut 6:25?);

i - ytn (occasional);

u - ypwq (Exod 21:3,4, 'hwt (Gen 37:35), ntwl
(Gen 33:12), ykws (Lev 4:24), but note
the occasional defective spellings of the
last group -- tpq (Exod 21:3, 22:5) and
ypl (Exod 19:21), and cf. also the
infinitives below.

In I-nun verbs, the prefix is occasionally
spelled plene, e.g., tyhwt (Gen 26:2), tysb
(Gen 24:4,7,38), tykswn (Lev 19:5), etc.

c. Imperatives of the verbs spelled with -w- in
the imperfect are usually similarly spelled, e.g.,
twl (Deut 3:27), pwq (Gen 8:16, 31:13), hwtw
(Gen 42:2), however cf. tl (Gen 31:12), pq
(Gen 27:3), tlw (Deut 2:24, vs. twlw,
Deut 1:7,40). For verbs whose imperfect has the
vowel a, cf. sb, šq (Gen 27:26), sby (Gen 18:6),
sbw (Exod 12:21). There is no imperative of the
verbal root ntn (cf. yhb in Section 3.B above). As
all other G stem imperatives of the I-nun group are
formed by omitting the first root consonant, it is
likely that nksw 'sacrifice' in Exod 12:21 is in
fact a D stem imperative, however cf. Levy,
"Wörterbuch," Vol. II, p. 110, and Jastrow,
"Dictionary," p. 911.

d. The situation with the infinitives parallels
that of the imperfects: mytwr (Deut 24:8)/mtwr
(Gen 2:15) but mytr (Deut 4:2); mpwq (Gen 27:30)
but mpq (Num 12:12), and cf. mht (Gen 43:20) and
mykws (Gen 22:10). Roots in which -w- is not
expected include: mšb 'blow' (Gen 3:8), mysb
(Gen 4:8, 30:15, etc.), mytn (Gen 15:2,7, etc.)/
mtn (Gen 4:8,12). For the infinitive with
pronominal suffixes, see Gen 35:18 bmpqh dnpšh 'at
the going out of her soul' (MT bəṣē(')t napšāh).

e. Most masc. sing. active participles are spelled
without -y- in the second syllable, e.g., nht, ntl,
nks, npq, etc., but cf. npyq (Exod 20:13). The

plural has nhtyn (Gen 43:20 etc.), nplyn
(Num 11:26), npqyn (Num 21:15), etc. in the
absolute, nzly' 'flowing' in the determined (my'
nzly' 'flowing waters', based on MT poetic nēd
nōzlîm), and nsby 'taking' (Gen 19:14) and npqy
'leaving' (Gen 9:10, 34:24) in the construct. The
only fem. sing. form attested is also construct,
npqt br/brh/br' 'whore' (usually for MT qədēšā,
e.g., Gen 38:15,21,22). There is only one passive
participle, fs construct nsybt gbr 'taken by man'
(Gen 20:3, Deut 22:22, MT bə‘ūlat ba‘āl).

f. In the D stem imperfect, infinitive, and
participles, the first root consonant is
preserved: ynšy 'he will forget' (Gen 27:45), yntr
'he will guard' (Gen 28:20), 'ntr 'I will guard'
(Gen 28:15), tnskwn 'you (pl) shall pour libations'
(Exod 30:9), ynbh 'he shall bark' (Exod 11:7),
tnšwn 'you (pl) shall forget' (Deut 25:19); mnhmh
'to comfort' (Gen 35:9, 37:35), mnšqyh 'to kiss'
(Gen 31:28 – written at the end of the line, with
-yh added later, by a different hand, i.e., read
mnšq', abbreviation for mnšqh); mntr 'keep'
(Gen 37:11), mntryn 'keep' (Gen 27:40), mnšb'
'blow' (Gen 1:2); mntlyn 'exalted' (Num 24:6).

g. The C stem perfect, imperfect, and imperative
are written either with or without -y- in the
second syllable (the first root consonant is always
assimilated), e.g.,:

Perfect: 'pyq (Exod 19:17) vs. 'pq (Lev 19:36);
Imperfect: ypyq (Deut 24:11) vs. npq (Num 20:10);
Imperative: 'pyqw (Gen 38:24) vs. 'pqw (Gen 45:1).

The perfect form 'whtw 'they brought down' in
Gen 39:1 is problematic. In the same verse one
also finds the C stem passive perfect form hwnht
'he was brought down', translating the MT hûrad
(spelled hwrd). Further on the verse reads 'ašer
hôrîdûhû (spelled hwrdhw) and it is this that is
translated 'whtw for 'htw [= 'a(h)hetu], clearly
under pressure of the MT form, combined with the
prima infirmae possibility of the I-y stem in -w-.

Alongside expected mnhr' 'to give light'
(Gen 1:15,17) and msbh 'to give (as a wife)'
(Gen 29:19,22), one also finds some problematic C
stem infinitival forms. The infinitive of root nht
occurs once in Gen 37:24 as nhth, once in Gen 49:23
as mhty, presumably both copyist errors for
expected mhth (y/h confusion is known elsewhere in
the MS, not so m/n confusion); the root nsb occurs
twice (Gen 29:17, 34:30) as mysb' (for expected
msbh); and npq has one example (Exod 22:28) of
mypqh (for mpqh).

For a C infinitive with pronominal suffix, see
Exod 3:12 'pqwtk 'your bringing forth'
(MT hôṣî'ᵃkā).

The C stem active participles attested are: ms
- mht (Gen 7:4)/mhyt (Num 22:32), mqp
(Gen 2:11,13); mp - mnhryn (Gen 1:15); fp - mpqn
(Num 24:6). Passive participles are: fs - mqph
(Gen 15:17, Num 19:15); fp - mqypn (Deut 3:5),
presumably maqqəpān ⟶ maqqipān, with -y-
representing vocalic shewa; mp - mntlyn (Num 24:6),
and mp det. mntly' 'the exalted ones' (Exod 15:21);
fs det. mntlth.

h.   The medio-passive stems are poorly attested:

Perfect:	'tnsybt (Gen 38:14);
Imperfect:	ytnzr (Num 6:12), ytnsk (Num 28:7);
Infinitive:	mtnhmh (Gen 37:35);
Participles:	mtnhm (Deut 32:36), mtnks (Gen 22:10),
	mtntlyn (Num 23:24).

4. Media Infirmae -- II-w/y (Paradigm H)

a.   While the G stem II-w/y perfects are not well
attested, examples are found of both original
a-perfect verbs, e.g., qm/qmt/qmw and original
i-perfect verbs, e.g., myt/mytt/mytw. Special note
should be taken of the following unusual forms:
(i) mwtnw! (Exod 16:3, copying MT mûtēnû);
(ii) mtynn(!) 'we died' (Num 20:3, cf. Onkelos, ad
loc., Sperber, "Onkelos," p. 256, mytn', and cf.
also Babylonian Talmudic Aramaic, e.g., drynn,
Margolis, "Lehrbuch," p. 51, Epstein, "Grammar,"
p. 89, and cf. active participles, below);

(iii) the error form w'bytw(!) 'and they spent the
night' (Gen 31:54) for expected wbytw (presumably a
dittographic error with the preceeding verb w'klw
rather than C stem or medial aleph, cf. the
imperative, below);
(iv) and the error form w'zl 'and it became
worthless' (Gen 16:5) for expected wzl (by
confusion with the common w'zl 'and he went').
Note also Gen 22:19 qmn 'they (mp) arose," for qmw
with w/final n confusion.

b.   Most imperfect examples found are with original
u stem vowel, e.g., 'ᶜwṣ 'I will advise'
(Num 24:14), tšwᶜ 'you will plaster' (Gen 6:14),
tṣwmwn 'you (pl) will fast' (Lev 16:29), yqwmwn
'they will arise' (Exod 20:15), etc., however there
are occasional i-imperfects, e.g., tbyt 'it (fs)
shall spend the night' (Deut 21:23), nbyt 'we shall
spend the night' (Gen 19:2). Forms such as ydynwn
'they will judge' (Gen 31:53) should be seen as due
to w/y confusion, probably complicated by the
presence of the common noun dyn (cf. ydwnwn,
Exod 18:22). Note the unusual forms tmtwn, spelled
defectively (Gen 3:4) and tyqwm (3fs, Lev 19:16,
Num 31:50), with plene prefix. The 3fpl is
attested in yhwsn 'they shall (not) have pity'
(Deut 25:12, subject ᶜyynykwn 'your eyes').

c.   In the G stem imperative, all but the fpl forms
are attested, but note lwwṭ(!) 'curse' (Num 22:6,
cf. lwṭ, Num 22:11), and also w'bytwn (w'šhwn
rglykwn) 'and stay the night (and wash your feet)'
(Gen 19:2, both the prefix and the suffix
presumably due to dittography with the following
imperative, and cf. the perfect, above).

d.   The spelling of the infinitive is fluid, e.g.,
mlwṭ 'to curse' (Gen 8:21), mmwt 'to die'
(Deut 2:16), mṣwd 'to hunt' (Gen 27:5), mqwm 'to
arise' (Deut 10:8), but myqwm (Gen 4:10), myqm
(Gen 31:35, Exod 17:16, Deut 9:2), mymt (Gen 2:17),
mmt (Gen 20:7, 25:32), mdn 'to judge' (Exod 18:13),
etc. It is not possible to determine whether the
forms with -w- really represent an ideal spelling.
The forms mmyt (Gen 3:4) should probably be taken
as mmwt with w/y confusion; the problematic root

byt 'to spend the night' has mbt'/mbth (Gen 19:8, 24:23, 25), presumably C stem for expected G stem (C stem usually meaning 'to keep over night', 'to postpone burial', cf. Jastrow, "Dictionary," p. 167, and cf. Onkelos ad loc., mbt, Sperber, "Onkelos," Vol. I, p. 35).

e.   Similarly, the spelling of the active participles fluctuates, e.g., q'm/qym/qyym/q'ym, and none can be determined as "ideal." There is one impossible fpl form, qyym' (Gen 15:12). Note the forms of myt: m'yt (Gen 20:3), myt (Gen 25:8,17), myth (Gen 30:1, 35:18), myytyn (Deut 5:25), myytynn/ mytynn (Num 14:2, MT matnû, though cf. the perfect, above), mytn (Num 16:29, mpl), mytn (Gen 33:13, fpl) -- the picture is complex and must await a comprehensive treatment.

There is one passive participle -- lyt 'cursed' (Gen 12:3, Num 22:16), but note lwt (Gen 9:25, with w/y confusion for lyt, and the impossible lyyt (Gen 27:29) in m⟨n⟩ dlyyt ytk yhwy lyyt 'whoever curses you will be cursed', a copyist error by dittography with the preceeding active participle.

f.   Forms in the derived conjugations are not well attested. The D stem is as expected; the C stem perfect has occasional defective spellings, e.g., 'qm 'he raised' (Gen 30:38, 31:45, 33:20, 35:20), 'qmyt 'I raised' (Gen 44:18). No defective spellings of the imperfect or imperative were noted, e.g., imperfect - 'qym (Deut 18:18) tnyp (Exod 29:26), ynyh (Deut 25:19), tqymwn (Lev 26:1), yzydwn (Deut 17:13); imperative - 'tyb (Gen 37:14), 'sytw (Deut 27:9).

g.   The medio-passive stems clearly distinguish between Gt/Dt on the one hand, and Ct on the other; this is especially to be seen in roots involving sibilant metathesis. Unfortunately, examples only exist in the perfect, imperfect, and participles, however the general scheme is clear.

Gt/Dt	Ct
Perfect:	
't^{c}yqt 'I am distressed' (Gen 27:46)	't^{c}r 'he awoke' (Gen 28:16)
'yt^{c}yryt 'I awoke' (Gen 41:21)	'tnp 'it (ms) was waved' (Exod 29:27)
't^{c}yr 'he awoke' (Gen 9:24, 41:7)	'ttš 'it (ms) was plastered' (Lev 14:43)
'tpyys 'he was appeased' (Gen 6:6)	
'dyyn 'he argued' (Gen 31:36)	
'thyyb 'he was guilty' (Lev 5:5)	
'tlytt 'it (fs) was cursed' (Gen 5:29)	
'yzdyyntwn 'you (pl) armed yourselves' (Deut 1:41)	
'zdyynw 'they armed themselves' (Num 31:7)	
'dy(y)nw 'they argued' (Gen 26:20, 26:21,22)	
'tqymn 'they (fpl) were established' (Gen 15:1	

Gt/Dt	Ct
Imperfect:	
ytqyym 'let it remain' (Gen 33:9)	yt'rq: 'it will be poured out' (Lev 21:10)
ythyyb 'he will be guilty' (Lev 5:23)	ytdnwn 'they will argue' (Gen 6:3)
ttqyym 'it (fs) will exist' (Gen 12:13, 19:20)	ytznwn 'they will be fed' (Gen 41:40)
nthyyb 'we will be guilty' (Gen 37:21)	

Gt/Dt

ttnḥwn/ttnwḥwn! 'you (mpl) shall rest'
(Exod 34:21, bis)

ydyynwn 'they will quarrel'
(Exod 21:18)

Ct

Participles:

mtkwyn 'aiming'
(Gen 3:15, ms)

mštyyr 'remaining'
(Exod 17:16, ms)

mštryyh! 'remaining'
(Gen 32:8, with error of metathesis
for mštyyrh, fs)

mtkwwnyn 'aiming'
(Gen 3:15, mpl)

mtgyyryn 'sojourning'
(Lev 16:29, mpl)

mytkl 'measured'
(Gen 38:25, root kwl)

The inconsistent use of the _matres lectionis_ complicates the question of the vocalization of these forms, as does the small size of the sample. The forms spelled with -yy- can be safely assigned to Dt, e.g., 'itpayyas, 'iddayyanu, yitqayyam, yiddayyanun, mištayyar, mitgayyarin, however it is not clear that those spelled with one -y- are necessarily to be vocalized as Gt, e.g., 'it^cirit, 'itliṭat. Note also the doublets 'dynw/'dyynw and 'tqymn/ytqyym. Those forms spelled without -y- are taken as Ct, e.g., 'ittanāp, yittədānun, mittəkāl. The following are problematic: Exod 34:21 -- ttnḥwn/ ttnwḥwn, presumably both titnuḥun, or else tittənaḥun (Ct)/ titniḥun (Gt, with w/y confusion based on other forms of nwḥ). A Ct of this root is known, cf. Jastrow, "Dictionary," p. 886, as is a Dt (but no Gt); Lev 21:10 -- yt'rq, presumably Ct yittāraq from root ryq spelled with medial aleph to mark the vowel [ā].

5. **Mediae Infirmae -- II-Aleph** (Paradigm I)

a. These verbs are found in all stems, but only with the roots b'š 'to be evil', s'b 'to be old' (D stem 'to defile'), š'l 'to ask', 'to borrow'. The paradigms are not complete. The root š'r 'remain' only occurs in the D/Dt stems, and the spelling indicates that the verb has been assimilated to the II-w/y verbs (see Paradigm I for examples, and compare to Paradigm H). The root m'k 'to be humble' only occurs in Gen 35:9, but spelled in error 'mk! Note should also be taken of the copyist errors b^cš 'it was bad' (Gen 4:6) and mb^cš' 'to do evil' (Exod 23:2), both with ^c for '.

b. There are occasional perfect spellings with -y- indicating a vocalization šə'el, bə'eš, sə'ebu, e.g., Gen 19:1, Num 16:15, Gen 18:11, respectively. Otherwise, cf. š'ltwn (Deut 18:16), š'l (Gen 40:7), š'lw (Gen 37:7), etc. Note also sb! (Gen 25:8, analogous to the II-w/y perfects) and š'lwn! (Gen 26:7, with suffix extended from the imperfect).

c. All forms of the imperfect are spelled with aleph, and note especially Gen 32:17 yš'lwnk! 'he (sic) will ask you', presumably w/y confusion for yš'lynk, 3ms imperfect + direct object suffix joined by nun (MT šə'ēlkā).

d. In the imperative, only mpl š'ylw/ š'lw is attested (Deut 4:32, 32:7), presumably to be vocalized šə'elu. The only infinitive in the G stem in the MS is mš'l (e.g., Gen 37:10, 43:7); the active participles are also of this root: ms š'yl (Gen 32:29), mpl š'lyn (often), fpl š'lyn! (Gen 33:6).

e. The derived conjugations are poorly attested. All forms of the D and C stems are spelled with aleph (for šyyr, etc., see section (i) above). The D stem infinitive has ms'b' 'to declare unclean' (e.g., Lev 13:44, 20:25) and, with suffixes, s'bwthwn/ s'bthwn 'their uncleanness' (both in Lev 15:31); note also Num 24:1 mš'lyh(?). The only root attested in the medio-passive is s-'-b (for 'štyyr, etc., cf. section (i) above), e.g., 'st'bt

(3fs, Lev 18:25), yst'b (Lev 5:3, Num 6:12), mst'b' (Lev 15:32, 18:20), etc.

6. **Mediae Infirmae -- Geminates** (Paradigm J)

a. As in other dialects of Middle Aramaic, the geminate verbs occur both with contraction of the two identical consonants and also without contraction, e.g., ^{C}l, ḥn, ^{C}lw, bzw, qlw ('they grew small', Gen 8:11), but bzzw (Num 31:53, MT bāzəzû), bzznn (Deut 2:35, 3:7, MT bāzaznû/bazzônû, respectively), and note bzwn (Gen 34:27, with suffix extended from the imperfect, MT wayyābōzzû). So too for the active participles: ^{C}lyn (Deut 11:29) vs. ^{C}llyn (Gen 41:21, Deut 4:5), zmmyn 'grazing' (Gen 13:7), and construct ^{C}lly (Gen 23:10, 18), determined ^{C}llyh (Gen 7:16); and the infinitive my^{C}wl 'to enter' (Gen 19:31, Deut 9:1) vs. mgzz 'to shear' (Gen 31:19). The infinitive also occurs with nominative pronominal suffixes, e.g., m^{C}lk 'your entry', m^{C}lh 'his entry' (Lev 16:23).

The imperfect, imperative, and infinitive, as in other dialects, are characterized by the shift of the gemination to the first radical, evidenced in the spelling, e.g., yqn (Exod 12:23), 'bwz (Exod 15:9), tqswn (Deut 25:12), thqwn (Exod 12:14, Deut 16:15); ^{C}wl (ms), ^{C}wly (fs), ^{C}wlw (mpl); my^{C}wl, however cf. mgzz. Note especially Exod 22:8 y^{C}l' mly tryhwn 'the words of both of them will enter', for an unusual 3fpl imperfect form, and note also "defective" spellings, e.g., y^{C}l (Lev 16:23), n^{C}wl (Gen 20:13), and ms imperative ^{C}l (Gen 30:3), and tswrwn 'you (pl) shall bind' (Deut 14:25, tiṣṣarun → tiṣṣorun?).

b. The D stem is well attested, especially for the verb mlyl 'speak'. The perfect is not usually marked as different from the G stem -- the spelling mll occurs approximately twice as frequently as mlyl, cf., e.g., gpp (Gen 48:10), mšš (Gen 27:22), mllnn (Exod 14:22), mrrw (Exod 1:14), mllw (Gen 34:13), vs. mlylyt (Gen 28:15), mlylt' (sic, Gen 18:5, 19:21, Num 14:17), mlylw (Gen 34:20, Deut 5:28), ylylw (Deut 1:22).

There are occasional "collapsed" forms in the imperfect and participles, e.g., yglwn (Gen 29:8), mglyn (Gen 29:3). The infinitive of mll is variously spelled, with numerous copyist errors: mmllh, mmll', mmlllyh (sic, Gen 28:10), mllh/mll' (four times in Genesis), and note also mgzllh! (Gen 28:10, for mgllh, spelled with -z-).

c. The C stem perfect and imperfect are well attested: 'gn (Gen 7:16), '^{C}l (Exod 40:21), '^{C}lt (2ms, Num 16:14), '^{C}ltwn (Deut 1:1), and with -y-, '^{C}yl (Gen 29:13, '^{C}ylw (Gen 19:10). Note the two error forms: 'wqlw (Gen 8:8, apparently analogous to the I-w/y verbs) and '^{C}yl for 'tyl! in Exod 40:21, copying '^{C}l at the beginning of the verse. The imperfect, imperative, and infinitive are usually spelled conservatively, e.g., t^{C}l (Exod 27:7, 40:4), yy^{C}l (Deut 6:10), n^{C}l (Num 32:17); '^{C}l (ms, Exod 4:6); m^{C}l (ms participle, Lev 18:3), however cf. y^{C}yl (Deut 11:29), t^{C}yl (Gen 6:19). There is no nasalization in the C stem, familiar from other dialects.

d. In the medio-passives, few forms are found, however it does appear that the language distinguishes a Ct stem, cf. Section A.2(d) above:

Gt/Dt:

'tnddt	'it (i.e., sleep) wandered' (Gen 31:40)
ytmll	'it will (not) be spoken' (Exod 20:19)
ythll	'it will be praised' (Gen 15:1)
'tqrrw	'refresh yourselves' (mpl imperative, Gen 18:4)
mtmllh	'to converse' (Gen 18:29)
mtwqrrh!	'to refresh himself' (Exod 7:15, perhaps for mtqwrrh, with -w- for a labialized vowel following the -q-?)
mthmm	'warming himself' (ms participle, Gen 18:1)

Ct:

't^{C}lw	'they were brought in' (Gen 43:18, Onkelos ad loc. 'itta^{C}alu)
yt^{C}l	'it will be put in' (Lev 11:32, Onkelos ad loc. yitta^{C}al)

ytmswn   'they will be melted' (Lev 26:39, Onkelos
          ad loc. yitməson)

mt^clyn   'brought in' (Gen 43:18, Onkelos ad loc.
          mitta^cəlin)

The form 'tw^cl (Lev 16:27) is anomalous
(Onkelos ad loc. = 'itta^cal) and possibly a
copyist error.

7. **Tertiae Infirmae — III-h/Aleph** (Paradigm K)

   a.   All verbs originally III-Aleph are included in
this group, although one does find occasional
spellings in which the aleph is preserved, e.g.,
br't 'I created', śn'twn 'you (pl) hated', qr'
'calling', etc. However, one finds many more cases
of III-h 3ms perfects spelled with aleph, e.g.,
ḥm', ḥz', rb', etc., as well as occasional
imperfects, e.g., ytks' (Gen 18:14), indicating
that the spelling with aleph is generally
arbitrary, and only occasionally morphologically
based (cf. also brh, qrh, etc.).

    In the perfect, the 1s suffix is usually
spelled -yt, only rarely -yyt or -t, (on
comparative grounds, one expects the vocalization
-et). The 3ms has some examples ending in -y(:),
e.g., dry 'he scattered' (Gen 11:8,9), zky 'he
acquired' (Gen 25:10), possibly active participles
or D stem perfects. Note also the verbs with
consonantal -h, e.g., tmh/tmht/tmhw 'he/she was
astonished/they were astonished' (Gen 17:17,
Gen 18:12, Gen 43:33). The spelling of the 3mpl
suffix -wn occurs approximately three times as
frequently as the spelling -w, and note also the
problematic forms śrn (Gen 11:31), presumably
w/final n confusion for śrw, and qr'n (Gen 24:58),
either defective spelling for qəron, or else
w/final n confusion for qr'w (however there are no
other examples in the MS of the G stem spelling -'n
or -'w).

    There are also isolated examples of a passive
perfect: qly (often, possibly always a passive
participle), ltyt '(the serpent) was cursed'
(Num 21:6), qlyw '(hidden things) were revealed'

(Gen 41:45), rmyw '(thrones) were thrown (i.e., set
up)' (Gen 15:17).

    In the imperfect, the spelling indicating the
final vowel as -y is the norm, -h/-' being
occasional isolated examples. Similarly, the
imperfect prefix is only rarely spelled plene with
-y-, e.g., tyqry (Gen 16:11), nyśry (Gen 29:22).
The unexpected form nśrwn(:) 'they will reside'
(Gen 34:23) presumably results from copyist error
confusing the prefix with that of the preceding
1 pl verb in the sentence, nt^crb.

    The spelling of the ms imperative usually ends
in -y, with perhaps only 25% of the examples ending
in -h, e.g., ḥmy 'see' (Deut 3:27), ^cny 'answer'
(Lev 22:27), etc., indicating a vocalization ḥəme,
etc. No fem. sing. examples are found. In the
plural, all masc. forms end in -wn, the fem. is
represented by qryn 'call' (Exod 2:20), cf. the
same spelling in Onkelos, ad loc. (Sperber,
"Onkelos," Vol. I, p. 90).

    The spelling of the infinitive is varied,
including plene prefix (e.g., myhmy, Gen 38:25).
Most commonly, the final vowel is spelled -y (e.g.,
mḥty), rarely -h (e.g., mzkh, Gen 3:16); there are
occasional spellings with aleph (e.g., mḥm',
Gen 26:28, mḥt', (Gen 3:16). Note the aberrant
forms mr^c 'to pasture' (Gen 37:12), followed by
yt, hence probably due to homoieteleuton with the
y-; and mbryh 'to create' (Exod 12:42), presumably
a copyist aural error rendering mibre.

    The active and passive participles are well
attested.

Active:

    Most ms forms are spelled with -y; occasionally
one finds spellings with aleph (e.g., qr',
Gen 2:19, śr' (Gen 24:37). In the fs, aleph seems
to predominate, and note the spelling of śtyyh in
Deut 11:11.

    In the mpl, the spelling -yy- is equally
distributed with -y, whereas in the fpl, only three
examples are found — khyyn (Gen 27:1), ḥmyyn
(Exod 1:16), and qryn (Num 25:2).

The following forms should be noted -- Exod 15:12, ym' hwh b^ch... 'r^c' hwwt b^ch (sic) 'the sea (did not) want... the land (did not) want'; Gen 37:16, r^cn 'shepherds' (cf. Gen 37:13 r^cyn), presumably rā^can as regularly in Onkelos (cf. ad loc.); Exod 15:6,9, śn'h 'the enemy', determined state participle with morphologically based aleph (= śānə'ā); Gen 37:4, the same root, mpl, is spelled snyn 'hating'; Exod 20:5, the same root occurs twice with 1st pers. pronominal suffix śn'y/śn'yy 'my enemies'.

Passive: All forms but the fpl are attested, e.g.,

   ms - sny 'hated' (Deut 4:25), gly 'revealed' (Exod 2:25, plus many others; the same spelling also for 'exiled', Gen 4:12,14,16, etc.).

   mpl - glyyn 'revealed' (Gen 18:21), špyn/šypyn 'friendly' (Gen 31:2,5).

   fs - śny' 'hated' (Gen 29:31,33), construct ksyyt 'pyn 'covered of face' (Gen 38:15).

b.   In the derived conjugations, most 1s perfect suffix forms are spelled -yt; less commonly one finds -yyt, e.g., pnyyt (Gen 24:31), 'šthyyt (Gen 32:4), problematic forms given the expected vocalization -it, but probably due to confusion with the G stem perfect suffix -et (itself, however, only rarely spelled -yyt!). Note also the error form šwyty! (Gen 27:37), for šwyyt(?), due to Hebrew influence? Noteworthy also are the spellings of the 3fs, usually -yyt, occasionally -yt; the 3mpl form tny'w! (Gen 26:32, cf. Onkelos, ad loc.), alongside the common kswn, qnwn, šwwn, etc.; the varied spellings of the 3fs medio-passive forms, 't'syt (Num 12:15), 'tr^cyyt (Gen 34:3, 8, 19), 'tmly't (Gen 6:11,13), 't'sy't (Num 12:16), 'ytmlyt (Gen 9:19); and the unusual gly 'he rolled(?)' (Gen 29:10, MT wayyāgel).

The imperfect paradigms of the D and the medio-passive stems are well-attested; the C stem lacks many forms. There are occasional spellings with aleph, some morphologically based, e.g., ttbr' (Gen 2:23), ttml' (Gen 16:5), but also ytks' (Gen 18:14). Note also the varied spellings of the -t- stem of root zkh: tzdky (Gen 24:8), yzdkyh (Exod 21:19), tzdkh (Gen 24:41). In the D stem, 'yšwwy 'I shall place' (Deut 18:18), 'yqry 'I shall incite' (Lev 26:22) are unusual plene spellings. The 3fpl is represented in the D stem by yṣdwn 'they will desolate' (Lev 26:22), subject ḥywwth 'animals', extended from the 3mpl, but in the C stem by yt^cyyn 'they shall lead astray', subject bnthwn 'their daughters' (Exod 34:16).

The imperatives and infinitives are numerous, and as expected. Noteworthy are the D stem ms 'dy 'sprinkle' (Num 8:7, root n-d-h), the C stem mpl 'šqw 'water' (Gen 29:7, for expected 'šqwn), and the D stem infinitive mṣwlyyh! 'to pray' (Gen 24:63, = maṣalloyeh?, cf. the derived infinitives of Babylonian Talmudic Aramaic). For infinitival forms with pronominal suffix, see 'ytbrywthwn 'their creation' (Gen 2:4).

In the derived stem active participial forms, all save the fs C stem, fpl C and -t- stems are found. The feminine and plural forms can be spelled with -yy- or -y-, neither predominating, e.g., mrbyh/ mrbyyh 'producing' (both in Gen 4:16), mṣlyyn 'praying' (Exod 1:19), mskyyn 'calculating' (Gen 18:21), mšqyn 'watering' (Gen 29:3).

The passive participles are less well attested, however see D stem mdmy (ms)/ mdmyh (fs) 'similar' (Gen 16:12, 3:24), and C stem mḥtyn (mpl) 'delicate' (Gen 33:13).

c.   One may include in this discussion the numerous forms of the verb šyṣy 'to destroy'/ 'štyṣy 'to be destroyed'; for a discussion of the origin of these verbs in Aramaic, see Kaufman, "Akkadian," pp. 104-5.

The following forms are found in the MS:

Š Stem

Perfect:	3ms	šyṣy (Gen 7:23, 13:10, etc.)
		šyṣy' (Exod 9:25)
	1pl	šyṣynn (Deut 2:34)
	3mp	šyṣwn (Num 21:35)

Imperfect:	3ms	yšyṣy (Gen 32:11, Num 24:19, Deut 9:3, etc.)
	1s	'šyṣ' (Gen 18:28, 29, 30, 31, 32, etc.)
		'yššy (Gen 7:4)
		'yšyṣy (Lev 23:30)
		'šyṣh (Gen 6:7)
		'yšyṣ' (Lev 17:10)
	3mp	yšyṣwn (Gen 34:30)
	2mp	tyšyṣwn (Num 33:52, 53)

Infinitive:		mšyṣy' (Gen 8:21, 19:13)
		myšyṣyh (Gen 6:3)
		myšyṣy (Deut 1:1)
		šyṣy?! (Deut 9:19)

Participle:	ms	mšyṣ' (Gen 18:24, 28)
		mšyṣyy'? (Gen 18:23)
	mpl	mšyṣyyn (Deut 12:2)

Note also mšlhy 'weary' (Gen 25:29, 30)

Št Stem

Perfect:	3mpl	'štṣwn (Gen 7:23)

Imperfect:	3ms	yštṣy (Gen 9:11)
		yštyṣy (Gen 6:17, Lev 17:9)
	3fs	tyštṣ' (Num 15:30)
		tštyṣy (Lev 19:8)
	2ms	tštyṣ' (Gen 19:15)
	3mpl	yštyṣwn (Exod 12:42)

8. The Verbs slq 'go up'/ hlk 'go'
   a. slq

   As in other dialects of Middle Aramaic, this verb is characterized by the assimilation of the middle radical -l- in the G and C stems, on the analogy of the assimilation of the n in I-n verbs, specifically the semantic opposite of slq, namely nḥt 'go down' (cf. ntn/lqḥ in Hebrew). In particular, the -l- is assimilated in forms with a prefix, i.e., G stem imperfect and infinitive, and all of the C stem. In the G stem imperative, the -l- is absent also by analogy to nḥt imperatives ḥwt/ḥwty/ḥwtw. See the table below for the collected forms.

   The existence of a D stem (meaning 'to remove') is confirmed by the imperfect example tslq, Gen 18:3, l' tslq 'yqr škyntk mᶜylwwy ᶜbdk 'may you not remove the glory of your Shekinah from upon your servant' (paraphrasing MT 'al-nā' taᶜăbōr mēᶜal ᶜabdekā). A corresponding medio-passive ('to depart', 'to be removed') occurs in a number of forms, all but the first translating a form of the N stem of root ᶜ-l-h:

Perfect: 'stlq 'he departed' (Gen 12:8, MT wayyaᶜăteq)
'stlqw 'they departed' (Num 16:27, MT wayyēᶜālû)

Imperfect: ystlq 'it will (not) be removed' (Exod 40:37, MT yēᶜāle/ heᶜālōtô)

Imperative: 'stlqw 'depart' (mpl, Num 16:24, MT heᶜālû)

Infinitive: bound form, b'stlqwt ᶜnnh 'at the departure of the cloud' (Exod 40:36, MT bəheᶜālōt heᶜānān)

Collected Forms:

	G Stem	C Stem
Perfect:		
1s	--	'sqt (Num 21:6)
2ms	--	'sqt (Num 16:13)
fs	--	--
3ms	slq/slyq (Gen 19:28, 32:35)	'sq (Exod 32:1)
fs	slqt/slyqt (Exod 2:23, 19:18)	'sqt (Gen 40:10)
1pl	slqnn (Gen 28:12, 44:24)	--
2pl	--	'sqtwn (Num 20:5)
3pl	slqw (Exod 13:18)	--

	G Stem	C Stem

Imperfect:

1s	'swq (Exod 32:30)	'syq (Gen 30:22, 46:4)
		'sq (Exod 3:11)
2ms	tysq (Exod 19:24)	--
3ms	yswq (Exod 12:42)	--
1pl	nsq (Gen 35:3)	--
	nswq (Num 20:19), Deut 1:41)	--
	nyswq (Num 13:30)	--
2pl	tsqwn (Num 13:17)	tsqwn (Gen 50:25)

Imperative:

ms	swq (Gen 35:1, Deut 3:27, 32:49)	'sq (Exod 8:1)
fs	swqy (Num 21:17)	--
mpl	swqw (Num 13:17, Deut 1:21)	--
	swqwn! (Gen 44:17, Num 22:19)	--

Infinitive:

	mswq (Num 13:30, 31)	'sq'! (Exod 3:17)
	mysq (Exod 19:24, Deut 1:26)	'sqwty! 'my going up'(?) (Deut 9:9, MT ^{ca}lōtî)

Participles:

ms	slq (often)	msq 'that which brings up' (grh 'cud') (Lev 11:5)
		msqyyh (det.) 'those who take up (money)' i.e., 'tax collectors' (Deut 28:42, MT haṣṣəlāṣal)
		msqy (construct) 'those who bring up' (msym! 'tribute') (Gen 49:15); 'those who bring up' (grrt' 'cuds') (Lev 11:4)
mpl	slqyn (Gen 28:12, 41:2,3,5, Num 16:12,14, Deut 1:28)	

	G Stem	C Stem
fs	--	msqh 'that which brings up' (grrh 'its cud') (Lev 11:6)

In the G stem imperfect, the forms spelled without -w- should be noted (tysq, nsq); the mpl G stem imperative sqwn has the suffix extended from the imperfect; the C stem infinitives spelled with aleph are anomalous (the similarity between these forms and Babylonian Talmudic 'assoqe, spelled 'swqy, is minimal at best, cf. Epstein, "Grammar," p. 76).

b. hlk

Unlike the situation that prevails in other dialects of Middle Aramaic, in the MS Neofiti 1 this root does not occur in a suppletive paradigm with a medial weak root h-w-k, or the like, for the imperfect/infinitive. Of forty-four examples collected, the h is preserved in all forms of the verb. The use of this verb does appear to be restricted, especially when compared to the very common 'zl, but the data are not large enough to determine the exact relationship between the two verbs. Over half of the forms (23) occur in Leviticus, Chapter 13, dealing with the laws concerning leprosy, and 20 of these are translations of various forms of the MT root p-s-h 'to spread' (of a disease). The other three translate MT p-r-ḥ 'to break out' (of a disease), however, cf. e.g., Exod 9:9, 10 for MT p-r-ḥ translated by Aramaic p-r-ḥ. Of the other 21 forms collected, 17 translate a form of the G stem of MT h-l-k, two the medio-passive of MT h-l-k, and two occur in paraphrase. The forms translating h-l-k refer both to walking on a road (derek, e.g., Num 21:22), and also to following the way/laws of the Lord (e.g., Deut 10:21/ Lev 18:3); some are preceded by the verbs n-s-^c, q-w-m, ^c-l-h (e.g., Deut 1:19, Gen 35:3); others are used in the idiom hlk 'aḥ^arê 'to follow after' (Gen 24:61).

However, the verb 'zl also occurs in all the same circumstances, and no distinction is readily apparent. It should be noted that, with one exception (Gen 24:61, fpl active participle hlkyn), all the collected forms are also open to interpretation as D stem forms, and perhaps this may provide fruitful ground for future investigation (note especially the infinitive/participles).

The collected forms are:

	Singular	Plural
Perfect:		
1	hlkt (Gen 35:3)	hlknn (Deut 1:19)
2m	--	hlktwn (Deut 1:31)
f	--	--
3m	hlk (Lev 13:5, 6, 32, etc.)	hlykw (Deut 8:4)
f	hlkt (Gen 7:18, Lev 13:8, 20)	--

	Singular	Plural
Imperfect:		
1	'hlk (Lev 26:41, Deut 2:27)	nhlk (Gen 33:12, Num 20:17, 21:22)
2m	--	thlkwn (Lev 18:3)
f	--	--
3m	yhlk (Lev 13:35)	--
f	thlk (Lev 13:7, 22, 27)	--

	Singular	Plural
Imperative:		
masc.	hlk (Gen 13:17)	--
fem.	--	--

Infinitive:

mhlkh (Lev 13:7, 27, 35 - cognate infinitive, cf. also the error form mhlk! in Lev 13:22)

lmhlkh (Lev 18:14, Deut 10:12, for MT lāleket)

Active Participle:		
masc. mhlk (Gen 3:8, 24:42, 28:20,30:36, 32:20)	mhlkyn (Gen 9:23)
fem. mhlkh (Gen 32:21, Lev 13:42, 57)	hlkyn! (Gen 24:61)

---

9. **The Verbs 't' 'come'/ 'zl 'go'/ 'mr 'say'**

a. **'t'**

The verb 't' occurs in both the G and C stems. The forms attested appear to represent the vocalizations as found in other Middle Aramaic dialects, e.g., Onkelos.

	Singular	Plural
G Stem		
Perfect:		
1	'tyt (Gen 24:42, Num 22:38)	'tynn (Gen 44:18)
		'tyn' (Gen 44:18)
2m	'tyt (Num 22:37)	'tytwn (Gen 26:27)
		'ty⟨t⟩wn (Gen 42:9, spelled 'tyhwn)
f	--	--
3m	't' (Gen 19:9, 39:16+)	'twn (Gen 12:5, Exod 2:17, 35:21, 22)
	'th (Gen 23:2)	
f	'tt (Gen 29:9)	'tyyn (Exod 2:18)
		'tyn (Exod 2:16)

	Singular	Plural
Imperfect:		
1	--	nyty (Gen 37:10)
2m	tyty (Gen 24:41)	tytwn (Gen 49:18, 19)
	tyyty (Gen 27:31)	
f	--	--
3m	yyty (Gen 32:8, 11)	yytwn (Exod 18:22, 35:10)
f	tyty (Gen 24:39)	ytyn (Gen 49:26, subj. = brkt')
		yytyyn (Deut 33:16, subj. = brkyyt'!)

	Singular	Plural
Imperative:		
masc.	't' (Gen 31:44, 37:13, Exod 3:10)	'twn (Gen 11:3, 4, 7+)
	'yth (Gen 4:8)	'ytwn (Exod 1:10)
		'tw. (Gen 37:20, 27)

	Singular	Plural
fem.	'twy! (Gen 19:32, for 'tyy?, cf. Onkelos ad loc., 'yt')	--

Infinitive:

myyty (Gen 37:10, Num 22:14, 16)

myty (Gen 24:5)

mytyh! (Gen 24:8, aural confusion of -yh for -y, representing the vowel /e/)

mtyyh! (Gen 35:16, error of metathesis for mytyh, or -yyh for the vowel /e/)

With suffixes:

mytyyh 'his coming' (Gen 35:9, MT bō'ô)

myytwy! 'my coming' (Gen 48:5, 7, MT bō'î, for myytyy?)

Active Participles:

masc.	'ty (Gen 4:7, 8+)	'tyn (Gen 15:1, 24:63)
	't⟨y⟩ (Gen 33:1, spelled 't!)	
	't'! (Gen 32:6)	
	'tyh! (Gen 26:26, cf. Infinitive above)	
fem.	'tyyh (Gen 16:8)	'tyn (Gen 32:3, subj. = mšryn)
	'ty' (Gen 37:25)	'tyyn (Gen 41:29, subj. = šnyn)
	'tyy' (Gen 29:6)	

C Stem

Perfect:

1	'yytyt (Gen 31:39)	--
	'yytt (Gen 33:11, 44:18)	
2m	'yytt (Gen 20:9, 39:17, the latter with -y- added above)	'yytytwn (Num 20:4)
f	--	--

	Singular	Plural
3m	'yyty (Gen 4:3,4, 27:12,23 39:14+)	'yytwn (Exod 35:21,23, 24,27,29, 36:3+)
	'yty (Gen 2:19, 32:13, 37:2)	
f	'ytt (Exod 2:10)	--

Imperfect

1	'yyty (Gen 27:12, 31:52)	--
2m	tyyty (Gen 27:10)	tyytwn (Gen 42:20, Exod 23:19, Lev 23:14)
	tyty (Exod 3:18, 18:19)	
f	--	--
3m	yyty (Gen 18:19, Lev 5:25, 13:2)	yytwn (Lev 4:14, 10:15)
f	tty (Lev 15:29)	--

Imperative

masc.	'yyty (Gen 27:4,7,9,13)	'yytwn (Gen 42:34, Exod 32:2)
fem.	--	--

Infinitive

myytyyh (Gen 27:5, Exod 35:29, Lev 12:8)

myytyh (Lev 14:32)

myyth (Exod 36:5)

Active Participles

m.s.	myyty (Gen 6:17)	--
	myty (Gen 26:10)	

b. **'zl**

The perfect is inflected like the strong verb. The 3ms is always **'zl**, with one exception, Gen 18:6, **'zyl!** For other forms, cf. 2ms **'zlt** (Gen 31:30), 3fs **'zlt** (Exod 2:8), 3mpl **'zlw** (Gen 14:11, 12, 24, etc., but note **'zlwn** in Gen 37:12).

In the imperfect, the aleph of the root is never written (cf. **'mr**, below, and other I-aleph verbs, above). The following imperfect forms are attested:

	Singular	Plural
1	'zyl (Gen 24:58, Exod 2:7)	nzyl (Exod 3:18)
	'yzyl (Gen 24:56)	nyzyl (Gen 33:12, 37:17)
	'zl (Gen 33:14, Exod 3:11)	nyzl (Gen 30:2, 34:17)
2m	tzyl (Gen 24:4)	tzlwn (Gen 19:2)
	tyzl (Gen 24:38)	tyzlwn (Deut 6:14)
	tzl (Gen 28:15)	
f	tzlyn (Gen 24:58)	--
3m	yyzyl (Gen 21:7, Exod 10:24)	yzlwn (Gen 15:1)
f	tyzl (Gen 24:55)	--

In the imperative, the <u>aleph</u> of the root is always present:

masc. sing.	'zl (Gen 22:2, Exod 3:16, Num 22:35, Deut 5:30, and often)
fem. sing.	'zly (Exod 2:8)
masc. Pl.	'zlw (Gen 29:7)
	'zylw (Exod 10:24)
	'yzylw (Exod 5:4, Num 22:13)

Infinitive

myzl (Gen 11:31, 31:30, Exod 3:19, Deut 29:17, and often)
mzl (Gen 12:5)

With Suffixes

myzlk 'your going', Exod 4:21, MT <u>lektəkā</u>)

Active Participles

masc. sing.	'zl (Exod 3:13, 19:19, and often)
fem. sing.	'zlh (Gen 16:8, 24:60)
masc. pl.	'zlyn (Gen 8:3, 5, 13:17, 37:25)
fem. pl.	--

c. **'mr**

The inflection of the perfect of **'mr** follows that of the strong verb, e.g., 2ms **'mrt** (Gen 12:19), 3ms **'mr** (Gen 29:19, 21, etc.), 3fs **'mrt** (Gen 16:13, etc.)/**'myrt** (Gen 24:58), 3mpl **'mrw** (Gen 26:28, etc.)/**'mrwn** (Gen 11:4); and note occasional error (?) forms such as 1s **'mry**

(Gen 44:18, cf. Babylonian Talmudic Aramaic, e.g., Epstein, "Grammar," p. 35).

In the imperfect, one often finds forms in which the <u>aleph</u> is retained in the spelling, however forms spelled with -y- to indicate the prefix vowel e are more common, cf.:

	Singular	Plural
1	'ymr (Exod 3:13, Gen 24:14, spelled 'mr with -y- added above)	nymr (Gen 37:20)
		n'mr (Gen 44:16)
	'mr (Gen 22:2)	
2m	tymr (Exod 3:16)	tymrwn (Exod 3:18)
	t'mr (Exod 3:14)	t'mrwn (Lev 25:20)
f	--	--
3m	yymr (Num 5:19)	yymrwn (Deut 4:6)
	y'mr (Exod 22:8, Deut 5:27)	ymrwn (Gen 12:12)
		y'mrw! (Exod 3:13)
		yy'mrwn (Deut 31:17)
f	tymr (Gen 24:14, 44)	--

The remainder of the attested forms are predictable: imperatives and participles inflect like the strong verb, e.g.,

masc. sing. imperative:	'mr (Exod 6:6), but note also
	'mwr! (Deut 1:42, 5:30)
fem. sing. imperative:	'mry (Gen 12:13, 20:13)
masc. sing. participle:	'mr (Exod 2:14, 3:13)
masc. pl. participle:	'mryn (Gen 18:5, 9, etc.), but note also
	'mrn! (Gen 26:32, 34:14, perhaps copyist errors influenced by the spelling of 'škḥnn and 'nn later in the respective verses).

Note also the participle + pronominal suffix(?) in Gen 26:28, **'mrynn** (but more likely a perfect with irregular suffix extended from the <u>tertia infirma</u> verb in the same verse, ḥmynn; cf. Section B.1.a, above, where the examples from the strong verbs are cited).

fem. pl. participle: 'mryn! (Gen 31:14, subj. =
                          rḥl wl'h, Exod 2:19,
                          subj. = daughters of
                          Reuel)

The infinitive is never spelled with aleph, and is most commonly used as the common noun "word," e.g., Gen 4:23 mymryh dpwmy 'the word of my mouth', etc. Note the "defective" spelling mmr (rarely, e.g., Gen 21:22).

10. **The Verbs hwh 'be'/ ḥyh 'live'**

a. **hwh**

The verb hwh occurs commonly translating the forms of the MT hāyā; in predicate usage; in compound tenses with the participle of another verb.

The most common attestation is in the phrase whwh 'and it happened', usually for MT wayhî, e.g., Gen 39:19, whwh kd šmᶜ rybwnyh 'and when his lord heard' (MT wayhî kišmōᵃᶜ 'ᵃdōnāyw), however it also occurs in passages that have no Hebrew Vorlage. Whether this is solely a translation idiom or indeed reflects natural Aramaic usage cannot be determined. For an example of predicate usage, see, e.g., Gen 3:1, whwy' hwh ḥkym mn kl ḥyyt' 'and the snake was cleverer than all the beasts' (MT wəhannāḥāš hāyā ᶜārûm mikkōl ḥayyat haśśāde), and many others. For a discussion of compound verbal forms, see Chapter 9, Syntax, below).

The 3ms perfect form occurs most commonly, and the spelling hwh occurs approximately at the ratio of 6:1 over the spelling hwwh. Note also occasional error spellings of hw' for hwh (confusion with hw' 'he'), e.g., Gen 1:5 whw' rmš whwh ṣpr 'and it was evening and it was morning' (elsewhere in Genesis Chapter 1 always spelled whwh/ whwwh).

There are numerous examples of variation in spelling and usage with the perfect of hwh, e.g., singular for plural (Gen 5:14, 27:15 hwh/hwwh for hww); masculine for feminine (Gen 15:17, 39:5, the Hebrew 3ms, with fs subject, is faithfully translated into Aramaic as hwh; Gen 35:18, myth hwh

'she was dead', for hwt, with h/t copyist confusion); errors for hwh (Gen 6:9, 31:42); w/y confusion (Gen 26:35, 41:53, hwyn for hwwn?); z/w confusion (Num 10:31 hzynn for hwynn), etc.

The attested forms in the perfect are:

	Singular	Plural
1	--	hwynn (Num 13:33, 31:50, Deut 6:21, etc.)
		hwwynn (Exod 16:3, Num 31:50)
		hwwnn! (Num 13:13, probably w/y confusion, cf., hwynn in the same verse)
		hwyn'! (Num 12:12, in the compound hwyn' mštᶜbdyn 'we were enslaved')
2m	hwwt (Gen 26:10)	hwytwn (Exod 23:9)
		hwwytwn (Exod 22:20)
f	hwwyt (Gen 24:60)	--
3m	hwh (Gen 1:2, etc.)	hwwn (Gen 5:4, and often)
	hwwh (Num 7:9, etc.)	hww (Gen 2:25, 4:8, 13:7, 14:5)
	hw'! (Gen 1:2, Deut 5:7)	hwn! (Gen 4:10, 14:17, with w/final n confusion for hww?)
	hww'! (Deut 4:46)	hwwwn! (Exod 15:12)
f	hwwt (Gen 1:1, and often)	hwwyyn (Gen 22:10, twice, subj. = ᶜyynwy; Gen 29:17, subj. = ᶜyny dl'h [sic])
	hwt (Gen 19:26)	hwyn (Gen 26:35, subj. = wives of Esau, see below; Gen 41:53, subj. = šny šbᶜn')
		hwwn (Gen 26:35, subj. = wives of Esau, see above; Gen 29:20, subj. = šnyn; Exod 1:5, subj. = npšwt')
		hwh! (Gen 15:1, subj. = mšwwn)

The spelling and usage of the different imperfect forms show considerable variation, including occasional "plene" spellings of the prefix, e.g., nyhwwy (Gen 34:16); stem vowel sometimes spelled with -ḥ in the singular (overwhelmingly spelled -y, and note also thww'!, 3fs, Gen 9:2); masculine singular for feminine singular, e.g., yhwwy (Gen 26:28, MT təhî); and learned and copyist error, including the unique lhwwn (Gen 8:21, no Vorlage, cf. Babylonian Talmudic Aramaic), the copyist aural error yhby (Gen 9:11, i.e., reflecting the medieval pronunciation /yihve/, hence written b for w), and yhwwn (Gen 34:31 for 3ms yhwwy, probably due to y/final n confusion.

The unusual 3fpl thwwn (Gen 21:30) is apparently the result of an interpretation of the MT 'et-šebaᶜ kə̄bāśōt tiqqaḥ...baᶜᵃbûr tihye-llî̂ laᶜēdā 'the seven ewes you shall take...that it (!) may be a witness for me', as yt šbᶜty 'mrt tsb...mn bgll dthwwn ly lshdw 'the seven ewes you shall take...that they (you?) may be a witness for me', i.e., thwwn perhaps based on MT thyh.

As with the verb ḥyh 'live' (see below), there are also examples found of a "short" imperfect of hwh, however the motivations for its usage are not immediately apparent, e.g., Gen 9:14 yhy = yəhe, for the MT converted perfect wəhāyā; Gen 3:5 (w)thwn, pointed in the MS וִהְיִיתֶן, but perhaps = təhon, or else defective spelling for tihwon (cf. the spelling lhwn in Biblical Aramaic); and Exod 27:1 mrbᶜ yhy mdbḥ' 'the altar will be square' (MT rābûᵃᶜ yihye hammizbēᵃḥ).

The attested forms in the imperfect are:

	Singular	Plural
1	'hwy (Gen 17:8, 31:3)	nhwy (Gen 27:12, 44:18)
	'hwwh (Gen 26:3)	nhwwy (Gen 38:23)
		nyhwwy (Gen 34:16)
2m	thwy (Gen 3:14, 4:12)	thwwn (Lev 19:2, Deut 7:26)
	thwwy (Gen 4:12, Exod 22:24)	thwn! (Gen 3:5, 34:15)
	thwh (Gen 3:14)	

	Singular	Plural
	tyhwy (Gen 4:12, Num 10:31)	
	tyhwwy (Gen 14:23)	
2f	--	thwwn (Exod 1:16)
3m	yhwy (Gen 1:3)	yhwwn (Gen 3:15, 27:40)
	yhwwy (Gen 16:12, Exod 22:22)	lhwwn! (Gen 8:21)
	yhwh (Gen 18:18)	
	yhwwyy! (Exod 22:23)	
	yhywwy! (Num 9:14)	
	yhby! (Gen 9:11)	
	yhy! (Gen 9:14)	
f	thwy (Gen 3:17, 4:7)	yhwyn (Gen 41:27)
	tyhwy (Num 12:12)	yhwwyyn (Gen 44:36)
	thwwy (Gen 17:16)	yyhwwyyn! (Deut 21:15)
	tyhwwy (Gen 11:4)	thwwn! (Gen 21:30)
	thww'! (Gen 9:2)	

The remaining attested forms of the verb hwh are:

Imperative:

masc. sing.	hwh (Gen 17:1)	
	hwwy (Gen 27:29, Exod 3:14)	
masc. pl.	hwwn (Exod 19:15)	

Infinitive:

	mhwy (common, e.g., Num 31:50)
	mhwwy (occasional, e.g., Gen 17:7, 18:11, 12)
	mhwh (rare, e.g., Gen 18:18)

Active Participles:

masc. sing.	hwy (e.g., Gen 21:20)
	hwwy (e.g., Exod 3:14)
fem. sing.	hwwy' (Exod 9:3)
masc. pl.	hwyn (Gen 11:3)
	hywn! (Gen 26:35, an error of metathesis compounded with w/y confusion, for hwyn)
	hwwyyn (Lev 22:27)
fem. pl.	--

The participial form <u>hwy</u> occurs often for MT <u>wayhî</u>, and one might offer the preliminary suggestion that it is used in clauses that are subordinate to a main verb, or in temporally subordinate clauses, cf., e.g., Gen 21:20 <u>whwy YYY</u> <u>^Cm</u> <u>ṭly'</u>...<u>whwy</u> <u>mn</u> <u>mtylp</u> <u>mrmy</u> <u>bqšt'</u> 'and the Lord was with the child...and he became one of those expert at shooting with a bow' (MT <u>wayhî</u> <u>'^elōhîm</u> <u>'et-hanna^Car</u>...<u>wahyî</u> <u>rōbe</u> <u>qaššāt</u>); Gen 29:13 <u>whwy</u> <u>kdy</u> <u>šm^C</u> <u>lbn</u>...<u>wrhṭ</u> 'and this is what was happening when Laban heard...that he ran' (MT <u>wayhî</u> <u>kišmō^{-ac}</u> <u>lābān</u>...<u>wayyāraṣ</u>); Gen 43:2 <u>whwy</u> <u>kdy</u> <u>'šlmw</u> <u>lmykl</u>...<u>w'mr</u> 'and this is what happened when they finished eating...that he said' (MT <u>wayhî</u> <u>ka'^ašer</u> <u>killû</u> <u>le'^ekōl</u>...<u>wayyō(')mer</u>).

Both the ms and the fs participles of this root occur with the ls personal suffix <u>-nh</u>/ <u>-n'</u>, and while the examples are not numerous, a preliminary statement may be made concerning the use of this idiom, and its contrast to both the simple perfect and the compound of perfect <u>hwh</u> + participle. All examples save that in Gen 31:40 are followed by the participle of another verb (possibly also excepting <u>kmst</u>, Gen 20:16). The examples collected are:

(1) ...'ylw yhbt kl mh dy ly <u>l'</u> <u>hwynh</u> kmst... '...if I gave everything I had, I would (still) not be worthy...' (Gen 20:16);

(2) ...kl ḥd' mnhwn dhwwt ^Crqh mn mnyynh <u>'nh</u> <u>hwynh</u> mšlm yth...<u>'nh</u> <u>hwyn'</u> mšlm ythwn '...every one of them that would flee from the flock, there I was replacing it...there I was replacing them' (Gen 31:39);

(3) <u>hwyn'</u> b'ymm' 'kl yty šrb'...'There I was, in the daytime the heat devoured me...' (Gen 31:40, MT <u>hāyîtî</u> <u>bayyōm</u> <u>'^akālanî</u> <u>hōreb</u>...);

(4) 'nh k^Cn <u>hwynh</u> <u>m^Ctd</u> byn mymryh dYYY wbynykwn 'There I was standing between the word of the Lord and you' (Deut 5:5, MT <u>'ānōkî</u> ^Cōmēd bēn YHWH ûbênêkem);

(5) ḥmyt dl' <u>hwynh</u> <u>yldh</u> wnsbyt lhgr...'I saw that I was not going to give birth, so I took Hagar...' (fem., Gen 16:5);

(6) <u>mbśr</u> <u>hwwyn'</u> ... wl' mn swp <u>dhwyn'</u> <u>tb^C</u> ^Clk mn qdm YYY <u>hwwyn'</u> <u>mṣly</u> ^Clk...'There I was being notified...and not finally that I was making petition for you from before the Lord, there I was praying for you...' (Exod 10:29).

As can be seen from the suggested translations, this form indicates duration of action in the past, with the added feature of first person reportage. In other words, this form is used whenever the narrator wishes to create a "picture" of his/her action in the past and convey that action as ongoing. Contrast this with the conditional and other uses of the compound verbal forms with <u>hwh</u> + participle (see below, Chapter 9, Syntax), e.g.,

Gen 26:10 'ylw šmš ḥd mn ṭly' ^Cm 'ttk whwwt myyty ^Clynn ḥwbyn rbrbyn 'if one of the young men had had intercourse with your wife, then you would have brought great sins upon us', or

Gen 44:18 h' mn zmn' qdmyy' d'tynn lwwtk hwwyt 'mr ln...'now, from the first time that we came to you, you have been (continuously) saying to us...', and also contrast with the simple past, also in Gen 44:18,

h' bzmn' qdm'h d'tyn' 'mrt ln...'now, the first time that we (or perhaps better, 'I') came, you said to us...'

b. <u>hyh</u>

Few forms are attested, and those are mostly 3ms perfect <u>hyh</u>, occuring in genealogical formulae, cf. especially Genesis Chapter 5 and 11, <u>whyh PN x</u> <u>šnyn</u> 'and PN lived x years'. Note the occasional spelling <u>hyyh</u>, e.g., Gen 25:7 (and also the abbreviated form <u>hy'</u> in Gen 11:21).

The imperfect is a little better represented:

2ms	thy (Gen 20:7, 27:40)
3ms	yhy (Gen 3:22, 17:18, Lev 18:5, 25:36, Num 12:12)
	yyhy (Deut 8:3)
3fs	tyhy (Exod 1:16)
1pl	nhy (Gen 42:2)
2mpl	tyhwn (Deut 4:1)
3mpl	yyhwn (Gen 19:26)

As can be seen, all forms found are "short" imperfect forms; the prevelance of "plene" prefix spellings would indicate a vocalization _yehe_, _tehe_, _tehon_, hence presumably also _nehe_.

The other forms attested are mpl imperative _hywn_ (Gen 42:18, MT _wihyû_) and possibly the ms active participle, Num 21:9 (_whwwh_ _hyy_ 'then he would live' (= _hāye_?, MT _wāhāy_), or else the common adjective (?) _hy_, spelled with -_yy_ for the diphthong.

There is one rare C (D?) stem participle form, Deut 32:39 _mhyy_ 'bring to life' (based on MT poetic '^a_hayye_); this idiom is usually expressed in the MS by the D stem _qyym_, e.g., _qyymtwn_ (Exod 1:18, Num 31:15), _qyymt_ (1s, Num 22:33), _qyymwn_ (Exod 1:17), _tqyymwn_ (Exod 1:22, 22:17), _nqy(y)m_ (Gen 19:32, 34), imperative _qyymw_ (Num 31:18), and many more examples.

VERBAL PARADIGMS
Strong Verbs

G Stem

	Singular	Plural
Perfect		
3m	qtl/ qtyl	qtlw/ qtylw
f	qtlt	qtln (qtlw)
2m	qtlt	qtltwn
f	qtlt	qtltwn
1	qtlt/ qtlyt	qtlnn/ qtlynn
Imperfect		
3m	yqtwl/ yqtl	yqtlwn
f	tyqtwl/ tqtl	yqtlwn
2m	tqtwl/ tqtl (tqtyl)	tqtlwn
f	tqtlyn	tqtlwn
1	'qtwl/ 'qtl ('qtyl)	nqtwl/ nqtl
Imperative		
masc.	qtl/ qtwl	qtlw/qtylw
fem.	qtly/ qtyly	qtlw
Infinitive		
	mqtl/ mqtwl	
Active Participle		
masc.	qtl/ qtyl	qtlyn
fem.	qtlh/ qtl'	qtlyn!/ qtln
Passive Participle		
masc.	qtyl	qtylyn/ qtwlyn!
fem.	qtylh	qtyln/ qtylyn!

VERBAL PARADIGMS

Strong Verbs

D Stem

	Singular	Plural
Perfect		
3m	qtl/ qtyl	qtlw/ qtylw
f	qtlt/ qtylt	qtlyn (?)
2m	qtlt	qtltwn
f	qtlt	--
1	qtlt/ qtlyt	qtlnn
Imperfect		
3m	yqtl/ yqtyl	yqtlwn
f	tqtl	yqtln/ yqtlwn
2m	tqtl/ tqtyl	tqtlwn
f	--	--
1	'qtl	nqtl
Imperative		
masc.	qtl/ qtyl	qtlw/ qtylw
fem.	qtly	--
Infinitive		
	mqtlh/ mqtl'	
Active Participle		
masc.	mqtl	mqtlyn
fem.	mqtlh/ mqtl'	mqtln
Passive Participle		
masc.	mqtl/ mqtwl:	mqtlyn
fem.	mqtlh/ mqtl'	--

VERBAL PARADIGMS

Strong Verbs

C Stem

	Singular	Plural
Perfect		
3m	'qtl	'qtlw/ 'qtylw
f	'qtlt	--
2m	'qtlt	'qtltwn
f	--	--
1	'qtlt/ 'qtlyt	'qtlnn
Imperfect		
3m	yqtl	yqtlwn
f	--	--
2m	tqtl (tqtyl)	tqtlwn
f	--	--
1	'qtl ('qtyl)	nqtl
Imperative		
masc.	'qtl	'qtlw
fem.	'qtyly	--
Infinitive		
	mqtlh/ mqtl'	
Active Participle		
masc.	mqtl/ mqtyl	mqtlyn/ mqtylyn
fem.	'qtlh?!	'qtln?!
Passive Participle		
masc.	--	--
fem	--	--

VERBAL PARADIGMS

Strong Verbs

Gt/Dt Stems

	Singular	Plural
Perfect		
3m	'tqtl/ 'ytqtl/ 'tqtyl	'tqtlw/ 'ytqtlw
f	'tqtlt	'tqtln/ 'ytqtlwn!
2m	'tqtlt	'tqtltwn
f	--	--
1	'tqtlt	'tqtlnn
Imperfect		
3m	ytqtl/ ytqtyl	ytqtlwn/ ytqtlw!
f	ttqtl	ytqtln/ ytqtlwn
2m	ttqtl	ttqtlwn
f	--	--
1	'tqtl	ntqtl
Imperative		
masc.	'tqtl	'tqtlw
fem.	'tqtly	--
Infinitive		
	mtqtl'/ mtqtlh	
Participle		
masc.	mtqtl	mtqtlyn
fem.	mtqtlh	mtqtlyn!

VERBAL PARADIGMS

Weak Verbs

PRIMAE INFIRMAE (I-Aleph)

	Singular				Plural			
	G	D	C	-t-	G	D	C	-t-
Perfect								
3m	'kl	'sy	'yykl/ 'yykwl	't'bl/ 't'kl	'klw	'r^cw		
f	'klt			't'syt/ 't'sy't!				
2m	'klt	'lpt'!						
f	--							
1	'klyt/ 'klt	'lpyt	'klt					
Imperfect								
3m	yykwl/ykl y'kl			yt'kl	ylpwn/ yyklwn	yylpwn/ y'r^cwn		
f	tykwl/ t'kl			tt'kl/ tt'sy	--			
2m	tykwl/ tykl/t'kl	tlyp/ t'rś			tlpwn/ t'klwn/ tyklwn			
f	--				--			
1	'kwl/ 'ykwl/'kl	'lp			n'kl			
Imperative								
masc.	'kl	mlp/ 'sy	'ykl					
fem.	--	--	--					
Infinitive								
	mykl	mlph/ mlp'	mwbdh					
Active Participles								
masc.	'kl/'kyl	mlp			'klyn			
fem.	'klh	--			--			
Passive Participles								
masc.	--	--	--		--			
fem.	--	m'rsh	--		--			

VERBAL PARADIGMS
Weak Verbs

PRIMAE INFIRMAE (I-y/w)

	Singular				Plural			
	G	D	C	-t-	G	D	C	-t-
Perfect								
3m	yhb/ytyb		'wl(y)d/'yyṭb	'tylyd/'twtb	yhbw/ylydw		'ws(y)pw	'tylydw/'tyḥmw/'twtbw
f	yhbt/ylydt		'wspt/'yynyqt/'wnqt!	'tylydt/'tyḥmt	ylydw/yldn			
2m	yhbt		—	'twwkḫt/'twtbt	—			
f	yhbt		—	—	ydᶜtn			
1	yhbt/yhbyt		'wqdt/'wdᶜ(y)t	'twtbt	yrtynn!			
Imperfect								
3m	y(y)rt/ydᶜ/yyṭ(y)b	yḥm	ywld/ysp!	ytyhb/ytwdᶜ!	yrtwn		ywkyḥn!	ytyldwn/ytldwn!/ytwspwn
f	tld		twsp	ttwqd	yldn		—	—
2m	tykl/tdᶜ/tyṭb/tṭyb		twzp	—	tyrtwn		twqdwn	ttyybbwn
f	tldyn		—	—	—		—	—
1	'yrt/'ld/'wkl/'kyl/'kwl		'wsp/'yqr/'yyqr!/'yyṭb	'tyqr	n(y)kl/nyqwd		nwṭb!	—
Imperative								
masc.	hb/tb	ybm	—	'twtb	hbw/tbw/yr(y)tw	—	'wbylw	'tyldwn
fem.	hby/tby	—	'wnyqy!/'yybyly!	—	—	—	—	—
Infinitive								
	mld/myld/m(y)rt/myrwt	—	myyṭybh!/mwldh	mtwqdh				
Active Participles								
masc.	ykl/ykyl	mylp	mwl(y)d/mld!	—	yhbyn	—	—	—
fem.	ytbh	—	myynqth (suff.)	—	yldn	—	myynqyn!	—
Passive Participles								
masc.	yhyb	—	—	mtylp	yhybyn	—	—	—
fem.	yhybh	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

VERBAL PARADIGMS
Weak Verbs

PRIMAE INFIRMAE (I-n)

	Singular				Plural			
	G	D	C	-t-	G	D	C	-t-
Perfect								
3m	nsb/nsyb	nḥm/nsy	'syb/'ḥt	—	nsbw	—	'pqw/'pyqw/'qypw/'wḥtw!	
f	nsbt/nsybt	—	'sbt	'tnsybt	—	—	—	
2m	nsbt	—	'pqt	—	npqtwn	—	—	
f	nsbt	—	—	—	—	—	—	
1	nsb(y)t	—	'sbt/'pqyt		nsbnn/nṭln!/nṭlynn!	—	'qpnn	
Imperfect								
3m	ytn/ysb/ypwq	ynbḥ/ynšy	ypyq	ytnzr/ytnsk	ytnwn/ysbwn	—	ypqwn/yhtwn	
f	tsb/tpq!	—	tpq	—	ypqwn	—	—	
2m	ttn/tyḥwt/t(y)sb	—	—	—	tkswn/tykswn	tnskwn	thtwn	
f	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
1	'tn/'sb/'ḥwt	'nṭr	'pyq	—	nsb/ntn/nṭwl	—	npq	
Imperative								
masc.	sb/ṭwl/ṭl!	—	'pq/'pyq	—	pwqw	—	'sbw/'pyqw/'pqw	
fem.	sby/ṭwly	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Infinitive								
	mysb/mšb/mpwq/myṭwr/mṭwr/mṭr	mnḥmh	mnhr'/msbh/mqph/mypqh!	mtnḥmh				
Active Participles								
masc.	npyq/nḥt	mnṭr	mḥt/mḥyt/mqp	mtnḥm	nplyn/nsby(const)/nzly'(det)	mnṭryn	mnhryn	
fem.	—	mnšb'	—	—	—	—	mpqn	
Passive Participles								
masc.	—	—	—	mtnks	—	mntlyn/mnṭly'(det)	—	mtnṭlyn
fem.	nsybt const)	—	mqph/mnṭlth(det)	—	—	—	mqypn!	—

VERBAL PARADIGMS

Weak Verbs

MEDIAE INFIRMAE (II-w/y)

	Singular				Plural			
	G	D	C	-t-	G	D	C	-t-
Perfect								
3m	qm/myt	qyym	'qym/'qm!	'tᶜr/'tᶜyr/'tpyys	qmw/mytw	qyymw	—	'dy(y)nw/'zdyynw
f	qmt/mytt	—	—	'tlytt	—	—	—	'tqymn
2m	—	qyymt	'qymt	—	—	—	'zydtwn	'yzdyyntw
f	—	—	—	—	—	qyymtwn	—	'yzdyyntw
1	—	qyymyt/qyymt	'q(y)myt/'rymt	'tᶜyqt/'ytᶜyryt	mtynn!	šyymn	—	—
Imperfect								
3m	ymwt	—	yqym	ytqyym/yt'rq!	ymwtwn/ydwnwn/ydynwn!	yqyymwn	yzydwn	ytdnwn/ydyynwn
f	tmwt/tbyt	—	—	ttqyym	yhwsn	—	—	—
2m	tmwt	—	tnyp	—/tmtwn!	tmwtwn/	—	tqymwn	ttn(w)hwn
f	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1	'mwt	'qyym	'qym	—	nmwt/nbyt	nqyym	—	nthyyb
Imperative								
masc.	qwm	—	'qym	—	qwmw	qyymw	'sytw	—
fem.	qwmy	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Infinitive

myqwm/myqm/mqwm/mmt/mmyt!/mmwt!   mqyymh/mqyym'   mqm'/mmth

Active Participles								
masc.	qy(y)m/q'(y)m	mqyym	msyt		qyymym	mdyynyn	—	
fem.	qyymh/qy(y)m'	mqyymh	—		qyymn/qyym'!	—	—	

Passive Participles								
masc.	lyt/lwt!/lyyt!	msyyr	—	mytkl/mtkwyn	—	mzyynyyn!	—	mtkwwnyn
fem.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

VERBAL PARADIGMS

Weak Verbs

MEDIAE INFIRMAE (II-Aleph)

	Singular				Plural			
	G	D	C	-t-	G	D	C	-t-
Perfect								
3m	š'l/š'yl	s'b/šyyr	'b'š	'šty(y)r	s'ybw/s'(y)lw/š'lwn!	s'bw	'b'šw/'š'lw	'štyyrw
f	—	—	—	'st'bt/'štyyrt	—	—	—	'štyyrn
2m	—	—	'b'št	—	š'ltwn	—	'b'štwn/'byštwn	—
f	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1	s'byt/s'bt	—	—	—	šyyrnn	—	—	—
Imperfect								
3m	yb'š	ys'b/yšyyr	—	yst'b	yš'lwn	ys'bwn	—	yštyyrwn
f	tb'š	—	—	tst'b/tštyyr	—	—	—	—
2m	—	—	—	—	tb'šwn	—	—	tst'bwn/tštyyrwn
f	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1	—	—	—	—	nb'š	—	—	—
Imperative								
masc.	—	—	—	—	š'(y)lw	—	—	—
fem.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Infinitive

ms'l   ms'b'/mš'lyh?   mb'š'   mst'b

Active Participle								
masc.	š'yl	—	—	—	š'lyn	—	—	—
fem.	—	—	—	—	š'lyn	—	—	—

Passive Participle								
masc.	—	ms'b/mšyyr	—	—	ms'byn	—	—	—
fem.	—	ms'bh/ms'b'	—	—	—	—	—	—

VERBAL PARADIGMS
Weak Verbs

MEDIAE INFIRMAE (Geminates)

	Singular				Plural			
	G	D	C	-t-	G	D	C	-t-
Perfect								
3m	C_1	mlyl/mll	'gn/'C_yl	'twC_1?	bzw/bzzw! bzwn!	mllw/mlylw	'$C_y$lw/'wqlw!	'tC_1w
f	C_1t	mllt	—	'tnddt	C_1w	—	—	—
2m	—	ml(y)lt'!	'C_1t	—	—	mlltwn	'C_1twn	—
f	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1	C_1yt	mlylyt	—	—	C_1ynn/bzznn	mllnn	—	—
Imperfect								
3m	yC_1/ygn	—	yC_yl/yyC_1	ytC_1/ytmll	yC_1wn	yglwn!	yC_1wn	ytmšwn
f	tyC_wl	—	—	—	yC_1'!	—	—	—
2m	tyC_wl/tC_wl	tmll	tC_yl/tC_1	—	tyC_1wn/tbzwn/tswrwn!	tmllwn	—	—
f	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1	'yC_wl/'C_wl	'mll	—	—	nyC_wl/nC_wl	—	nC_1	—
Imperative								
masc.	C_wl/C_1!	mlyl/mll	'C_1	—	$C_w$lw	—	—	'tqrrw
fem.	$C_w$ly	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Infinitive								
	myC_wl/mgzz	mmllh/mmll'/mllh!/mll'!	—	mtmllh/mtwqrrh!				
Active Participle								
masc.	C_1yl	mmll	mC_1	mthmm	C_1yn/C_1lyn	mgššyn/mglyn!	mtlyn	mtC_1yn
fem.	—	mmll'	—	—	—	—	—	—
Passive Participle								
masc.	hlwl!	—	—	—	rsysyn	—	—	—
fem.	—	—	—	—	sryrn	—	—	—

VERBAL PARADIGMS
Weak Verbs

TERTIAE INFIRMAE (III-h/Aleph)

	Singular				Plural			
	G	D	C	-t-	G	D	C	-t-
Perfect								
3m	hmh/hm' tmh	sgy	'šqy	'tgly/'ytgly	hmwn/bnw	sgwn/tny'w!/tmhw	'qnwn	'tglwn
f	hmt/qr't tmht	sgyyt/sgyt	'šqyyt	'(y)tglyt/'tgly'y/'tglyyt	khn/dlyyn	mlyyn	'šqyyn	—
2m	hmyt	sgyt	—	'tglyt/'tglyt'!	bnytwn/šn'twn!	nysytwn!	'šytwn	—
f	styt	—	—	'tksyt	—	—	—	—
1	hmyt/hmt! br't/bryyt	sgyt/sgyyt!	—	'tglyt/'tglyyt	hmynn	kwwynn	—	'štlynn
Imperfect								
3m	yšry/yklh/ybr'	ysgy	—	ytgly/ytks'!/yzdkyh!	yhmwn/nšrwn!	—	yšqwn	ytglwn
f	tšry	tsgy	—	ttgly/ttbr'!	—	ysdwn	yt$C_y$yn	—
2m	tqry	tsgy	—	ttgly	tšrwn	tsgwn	tšhwn	—
f	tyqry	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1	'hmy/'bnh	'sgy/'sg'/'yšwwy!	'sqy	'tgly	nhmy/nbnh/nyšry/nbr'	nsgy	nšqy	ndhy!
Imperative								
masc.	šth/šty	tny	'dy	—	šrwn	tnwn	'shwn/'šqw!	'dkwn!
fem.	—	—	—	—	qryn	tnyyn	'šqyyn	—
Infinitive								
	mbny/mzkh myhmy/mht'	mtnyyh/mslwyyh!	msgy'/mshyh/mšqyyh	mthmyy'/mtmnyh				
Active Participle								
masc.	qry/qr'/šn'h(det)	mgly/mksh	mšqy/msgy'!	mtqry	šryn/šryyn	mknyyn	mskyyn/mšqyn	mthmyn/mthnyyn
fem.	šryh/pty' štyh	mrby(y)h	—	mstpyyh	khyyn/qryn	mslyyn	—	—
Passive Participle								
masc.	gly	mdmy	—	—	špyn/šypyn!	—	mhtyn	—
fem.	šny'/ksyyt (cons)	mdmyh	—	—	—	—	—	—

186

NOTES

^{1}The following weak verbs are found spelled (at least once) with -y- in the perfect: 'zyl, 'myr!, hpyk, ylyd, nhyt, nsyb.

^{2}For the origin of these verbs in Aramaic, see Kaufman, "Akkadian Influences," pp. 104-5, 123-4, and see also Dalman, "Grammatik," p. 200.

CHAPTER 9

SYNTAX

In most respects, the syntax of the Aramaic of Targum Neofiti resembles other examples of Middle Aramaic. Hence, this study will not describe all features of the syntax of the language, but rather reference should be made to already existing (however deficient) published descriptions of other dialects, manuscripts, etc. For a similar decision, see Levy, "Language," pp. 187-215, however his resolution of the problem of discussing syntax without a comprehensive analysis of the language is "to limit the comments to brief statements on various phenomena" which are "idiomatic to Aramaic" and wherein Neofiti differs from the Hebrew it is translating. This present study, by contrast, provides an in-depth analysis of four important features of Aramaic, two verbal and two nominal.

Levy's statement (p. 187) that "Aramaic syntax, especially in the later periods, is fairly loose" is difficult to understand. The features isolated here are both unique to Aramaic (in contradistinction to biblical Hebrew) and central to a description of and adequate comprehension of the language of this MS. The language is by no means "loose," as shall be obvious from the discussions below; nor is it necessary to view the Targum solely as a "translation" of the Hebrew, and hence as copying the syntax of biblical Hebrew, although this indeed occurs. More than this, one can also identify probable attempts to mimic biblical Hebrew syntax even in midrashic inserts or expansions, where there is no exact correspondence in the Vorlage, and these phenomena should be accounted for in a complete description of the syntax of Neofiti. However, Neofiti also differs very often from the biblical Hebrew word order, etc., and such occurrences must also be marked. This is especially so in the discussion of compound verbal forms and the use of the predicate adjective, below (for a complete discussion of the latter phenomenon, see Golomb, "Predicate Adjective").

PART ONE

Features of Verbal Syntax

SECTION A

Compound Verbal Forms

This discussion is based on a collection of some 143 examples of compound verbal forms taken from the book of Genesis, and cross-checked with over 100 examples culled from the other four books of the Pentateuch. The term "compound verbal forms" refers to a form of the verb hwh 'be' in the perfect, imperfect, imperative, infinitive, or participle, followed by one or more participles of another verb. Other "compound" forms, such as ^ctyd + infinitive and swp + infinitive are not discussed in this present format.[1]

The unusual first person form hwyn' + participle has been discussed above, Chapter 8, Verbs, Section C.10.a.

In all cases where Neofiti uses a form of the verb hwh + participle, the option of the simple perfect, imperfect, etc. was also open to the "translator," hence the question of the motivation for using the compound form must be addressed. In the MT, one finds such compound Hebrew forms rarely (only 6% of the total Genesis sample are based on a form of hāyā + participle, see Table 1, line 1), hence one cannot accuse the targumist of intentionally mimicking the Hebrew.[2]

By contrast, over one-third of the Genesis sample are to be found in passages that have no Hebrew Vorlage, or are used in midrashic expansions of the Hebrew text, and as such, this represents an important body of information concerning the use of these forms (see Table 1, line 4; it should also be noted that over half the examples of imperfect of 'be' + participle are found in passages that have no masoretic Vorlage). Finally to be noted is that nearly one-quarter (22%) of all the examples in the sample (25% of the examples of the perfect and 11% of the examples of the imperfect) translate an MT participle, and the appearance of such a form in the MT is clearly enough justification to suggest to the "translator" that he use the compound verbal form in his work (see Table 1, line 2).

We shall first look at the largest group in the sample, examples of perfect hwh + participle, and we shall examine this group with respect to the four suggested lines in Table 1, i.e., what does the form translate. Then we shall briefly look at the smaller groups (imperfect, imperative, infinitive, and participle), and finally conclude with some general remarks arising out of the discussion.

TABLE 1

Sample from Genesis Showing Relationship between Hebrew Base Text and Aramaic Compound Verbal Forms

Hebrew Base Text	Total of Compound Verbal Forms in Sample	Compound Verbal Forms of Type: Perfect hwh + Participle	All other Compound Verbal Forms
1. Compound of hāyā + participle	6% (8)	6% (6)	5% (2)
2. Simple participle	22% (32)	25% (27)	14% (5)
3. Other:	38% (55)	40% (42)	35% (13)
Perfect Converted Imperfect	9% (13)	11% (12)	3% (1)
	13% (19)	18% (19)	--
Imperfect Converted Perfect	9% (14)	6% (6)	22% (8)
	1% (1)	—	3% (1)
Infinitive	4% (6)	3% (3)	8% (3)
Other	1% (2)	2% (2)	—
4. No Hebrew base text (midrash or expansion of a Hebrew term)	34% (48)	29% (31)	46% (17)
TOTAL	100% (143 cases)	100% (106 cases)	100% (37 cases)

1.   The use of a compound verbal form in early biblical Hebrew is limited, and usually describes continuing or repeated action in the past or future, depending on whether it is used with a form of hāyā or of yihye.[3] The expansion of this form in mishnaic Hebrew is one of the more notable features distinguishing it from the earlier language. In mishnaic Hebrew it also denotes repeated action, the simple imperfect being restricted to the modus, and the simple perfect to the preterite.[4] In the Aramaic of Targum Neofiti, the compound perfect can also indicate repeated or habitual action in the past, consequently, on those few occasions where the Hebrew has a compound, the Aramaic mimics it (see above, Section 1.A, and refer to line 1 of Table 1).

2.   The appearance of a simple participle in the MT (Table 1, line 2), while not necessitating a compound form in the Aramaic, clearly provides a "trigger" to the "translator" to use one, should its appearance not totally violate the clear meaning of the Hebrew, and should the understanding of the Hebrew admit of a durative sense. Often this contains a nuance of meaning not found in the Hebrew, and this presumably provided an opportunity for exegetical comment. For instance, example (1):

(1)   ...whšwk' prys ^{c}l 'py thwm' wrwḥ drḥmyn mn qdm YYY hwh (sic) mnšb' ^{c}l 'py my' (Gen 1:2 wəhōšek ^{c}al-pənê təhôm wərûaḥ 'elōhîm məraḥepet ^{c}al-pənê hammāyim) '...and darkness was spread over the face of the abyss and a spirit of love from before the Lord was blowing (better 'began to blow') over the face of the water'.

In this case, two exegetical comments are apparently made: (1) the insertion of the passive participle prys where none is used in the Hebrew; and (2) the ingressive, durative nature of the compound form hwh (sic) mnšb'. The participle prys appears to indicate the perfective aspect in the past, in this case following w'r^c' hwwt thy' wbhy' 'and the earth was empty and formless,' and the compound form, based on the MT participle məraḥepet, provides the "translator" with the opportunity to comment that the 'spirit of love' had indeed begun its motion and was continuing to move.

A similar case can be seen in (2):

(2)   wnhr hwh npq mn ^{c}dn lmšqyyh yt gnt' wmn tmn hwh mtprš whzr...(Gen 2:10 wənāhār yōṣē' mē^{c}ēden ləhašqôt 'et-haggān ûmiššam yippārēd) '...and a river used to go out from Eden to water the garden and from there it would split and return...'

Whereas the Hebrew participle actually describes a present state of affairs (from the narrator's point of view), the Aramaic now has become a statement of duration in the past. For the Hebrew indeed is part of a general description in Genesis Chapters 1 and 2 that is characterized by the use of participles, in an apparent attempt to offer the reader a glimpse of the creation of the world. In a sense, the writer of the Hebrew is telling his audience what "he sees," what the Garden "looks" like. By contrast, the Aramaic has replaced this with a factual description of an on-going past event, with no indication that this is a present-day phenomenon.

The compound form is also used to describe a state of affairs obtaining during the action of the main verb, as can be seen in (3) and (4). Here the parallel to the use of the participle in biblical Hebrew is clear.

(3)   ...w'tgly mmryh dYYY ^{c}l 'brhm bmšry ḥzwh whw' hwwh ytyb btr^c mšknyh btqph dywm'...(Gen 18:1, part of a midrash based on the MT wayyērā' 'ēlā(y)w YHWH bə'ēlōnê mamrē' wəhû' yōšēb petaḥ-hā'ōhel kəḥōm hayyôm) '...and the word of the Lord was revealed to Abraham in the Valley of the Vision while he was sitting at the door of his tent during the strength of the day...'

(4)   whzrw w^{c}lw l^{c}yn dyn' hy' rqm wqtlw yt kl thwmhwn d^{c}mlqy' w'p yt 'mwry' dhwwn šryyn b^{c}yn gdy tmry'...(Gen 14:7 wayyāšūbû wayyābō'û 'el-^{c}ên mišpat hî' qādēš wayyakkû 'et-kol-śədē(h) hā^{ca}mālēqî wəgam 'et-hā'emōrî hayyōšēb bəḥaṣəṣōn tāmār) 'And they turned back and entered the Spring of Judgement, that is Rekem and massacred all the territory of the Amalekites and also the Amorites who were dwelling (at the same time) in Ein-Gedi of the palm trees'.

In both these examples, the participles y̲ō̲š̲ē̲b̲/h̲a̲y̲y̲ō̲š̲ē̲b̲ are translated by compound verbal forms, and describe a state of affairs that obtains during the action described by the main verbs w̲a̲y̲y̲ē̲r̲ā̲'̲/w̲a̲y̲y̲ā̲š̲u̲b̲û̲/ w̲a̲y̲y̲ā̲b̲ō̲'̲û̲.[5]

3.a.   The compound perfect of h̲w̲h̲ + participle also translates an MT perfect (or converted imperfect, especially in certain set phrases), see Table 1, line 3. The sentences below offer instructive examples to compare the use of the simple perfect with the compound form; in particular, the nonperfective, durative use of the compound form is apparent, and this is especially true with the stative verbs, e.g., r̲ḥ̲y̲m̲ in example (5):

(5)   wyśr'l h̲w̲h̲ r̲ḥ̲y̲m̲ yt ywsp mn kl bnwy 'rwm br sybw hwh lyh w^Cbyd ly<h> prgwd mṣyyr (Gen 37:3 w̲ə̲y̲i̲ś̲r̲ā̲'̲ē̲l̲ 'āhab '̲e̲t̲-̲y̲ô̲s̲ē̲p̲ m̲i̲k̲k̲o̲l̲-̲b̲ā̲n̲ā̲(̲y̲)̲w̲ k̲î̲-̲b̲e̲n̲-̲z̲ə̲q̲û̲n̲î̲m̲ h̲û̲'̲ l̲ô̲ w̲ə̲^Cā̲ś̲ā̲ l̲ô̲ k̲ə̲t̲ō̲n̲e̲t̲ p̲a̲s̲s̲î̲m̲, cf. also 37:4 for the same idiom) 'And Israel was enamored of Joseph more than all his sons because he was a son of old age to him, and (so) he made him a colored cloak'.

The translation 'was enamored of' is offered in an attempt to convey both the stative nature of the verb and the durativeness of the compound form. Compare this nonperfective use of h̲w̲h̲ r̲ḥ̲y̲m̲ with the perfective use of the simple perfect in (6):

(6)   w̲r̲ḥ̲m̲ yṣḥq yt ^Cś̲w̲ 'rwm mn ṣydyh hwh 'kyl wrbqh r̲ḥ̲m̲t̲ yt y^Cqb (Gen 25:28 w̲a̲y̲y̲e̲'̲^eh̲a̲b̲ y̲i̲ṣ̲ḥ̲ā̲q̲ '̲e̲t̲-̲^Cē̲ś̲ā̲w̲ k̲î̲-̲ṣ̲a̲y̲i̲d̲ b̲ə̲p̲î̲w̲ w̲ə̲r̲i̲b̲q̲ā̲ '̲ō̲h̲e̲b̲e̲t̲ '̲e̲t̲-̲y̲a̲^{ca}q̲ō̲b̲) 'Now Isaac loved Esau because he was (in the habit of) eating from his hunt, but Rebecca loved Jacob'.

This case is especially interesting, as the Aramaic masculine r̲ḥ̲m̲ translates a converted imperfect, whereas the feminine r̲ḥ̲m̲t̲ translates a participle! How is the Hebrew to be understood, and how the Aramaic? In the context of the preceding verse, clearly the Hebrew verb w̲y̲'̲h̲b̲ here means 'to love better than', 'to prefer', i.e., the Hebrew verses read: (27) 'Now the youths grew up, and Esau became a man proficient in hunting, a man of the open country, but Jacob was a quiet man, (preferring to) sit around (the) tents. (28) Now Isaac preferred Esau, because game was to his taste (lit 'in his mouth'), but Rebecca (continued to) love Jacob.' (The use of the

participle '̲ō̲h̲e̲b̲e̲t̲ indicates the on-going nature of the action in the past, i.e., continuing affection, in contrast to the emotion attributed to Isaac, namely that of making a preferential choice betwen the two youths.)

The Amamaic has altered the verses and the scene somewhat. Verse 27 now reads: 'Now the youths grew up, and Esau was a man proficient in hunting, a man (who was) lord of the fields, and Jacob was a man perfect in good work, dwelling in the Academies (b̲t̲y̲ m̲d̲r̲š̲'̲). This is then followed by verse 28, in which not only is the contrast between the brothers made evident, but also the competition between the parents. For the emotion attributed to both in the Aramaic is the same: Isaac loved Esau, Rebecca loved Jacob, and we are (of course) to understand that this is because of their different employment: Esau is still the hunter, but Jacob now no longer mopes around the tents, but is a scholar in the (talmudic) Academies.[6]

Compound forms translating MT perfects generally express the durative, nonperfective aspect of the verb, e.g.,:

(7)   wyd^C 'wnn 'rwm l' lšmyh ytqrwn bnyh whwh kd h̲w̲h̲ ^Cl̲y̲l̲ lwwt 'tt' d'ḥwy h̲w̲h̲ m̲ḥ̲b̲l̲ ^Cwbdwy ^Cl̲ 'r^C' dl' mqm' bnyn lšmh d'ḥwy (Gen 38:9 w̲a̲y̲y̲ē̲d̲a̲^C '̲ô̲n̲ā̲n̲ k̲î̲ l̲ō̲'̲ l̲ô̲ y̲i̲h̲y̲e̲ h̲a̲z̲z̲ā̲r̲a̲^C w̲ə̲h̲ā̲y̲ā̲ '̲i̲m̲-̲b̲ā̲'̲ '̲e̲l̲-̲'̲ē̲š̲e̲t̲ '̲ā̲ḥ̲î̲w̲ w̲ə̲š̲i̲ḥ̲(̲ḥ̲)̲ē̲t̲ '̲a̲r̲ṣ̲ā̲ l̲ə̲b̲i̲l̲t̲î̲ n̲ə̲t̲a̲n̲-̲z̲e̲r̲a̲^C l̲ə̲'̲ā̲ḥ̲î̲w̲)

'Now Onan knew that her children would not be (allowed to be) called by his name and it happened that, when he would enter into his brother's wife, he would destroy his works upon the ground, so as not to raise up children in his brother's name'.

This durativeness is particularly apparent with other verbs of motion, e.g., h̲w̲w̲n̲ m̲h̲l̲k̲y̲n̲ in (8):

(8)   wnsb šm wypt yt 'sṭlyth wšwwn ^Cl ktp tryhwn w̲h̲w̲w̲n̲ m̲h̲l̲k̲y̲n̲ lbtrhwn wkswn yt ^Cryth d'bwhwn w'pyhwn hpykw lbtrhwn w^Cryth d'bwhwn l' ḥmwn (Gen 9:23 w̲a̲y̲y̲i̲q̲q̲a̲ḥ̲ š̲ē̲m̲ w̲ā̲y̲e̲p̲e̲t̲ '̲e̲t̲-̲h̲a̲ś̲ś̲i̲m̲l̲ā̲ w̲a̲y̲y̲ā̲ś̲î̲m̲û̲ ^Ca̲l̲-̲š̲ə̲k̲e̲m̲ š̲ə̲n̲ê̲h̲e̲m̲ w̲a̲y̲y̲ē̲l̲k̲û̲ '̲^aḥ̲ō̲r̲a̲n̲n̲î̲t̲ w̲a̲y̲k̲a̲s̲s̲û̲ '̲e̲t̲ ^Ce̲r̲w̲a̲t̲ '̲^ab̲î̲h̲e̲m̲ û̲p̲ə̲n̲ê̲h̲e̲m̲ '̲^aḥ̲ō̲r̲a̲n̲n̲î̲t̲ w̲ə̲^Ce̲r̲w̲a̲t̲ '̲^ab̲î̲h̲e̲m̲ l̲ō̲'̲ r̲ā̲'̲û̲)

'And Shem and Japheth took the cloak and they placed it on both their shoulders and (then) they went walking backwards and they covered their father's nakedness, and they turned their faces behind them and (so) they did not see their father's nakedness'.

Here, the compound form used for the verb of motion is "embedded" in a whole sequence of other verbs, all in the simple perfect (the Hebrew sequence is composed of all perfects): 'they took', 'they placed', 'they covered', 'they turned', 'they did not see'. In clear contrast, the durative nature of the one action in the past, viz. 'they were walking' must be expressed by the compound verbal form.

The compound perfect hwh + participle is also used in conditional expressions, as in (9) and (10):

(9) ...'ylw šmš ḥd mn ṭly' ^Cm 'ttk whwwt myyty ^Clynn ḥwbyn rbrbyn   (Gen 26:10...kim^Caṭ šākab 'aḥad hā^Cām 'et-'ištekā wəhēbē(')tā ^Cālênû 'āšām) '...if one of the youths had used your wife then you would have brought great sins upon us'.

(10) 'n kdyn hwh 'mr qrḥyn yhwh 'gryk hwwt yldh kl ^Cnh...(Gen 31:8 'im-kōh yō(')mar məqūddîm yihye śəkārekā wəyāldu kol-haṣṣō(')n...) 'If he would say thus: "The white-spotted will be your wages," (then) all the flock would bear...'

The same idiom expresses iterativeness, in (11):

(11) wśry 'tth d'brm l' hwwt yldh lh... (Gen 16:1 wəsāray 'ēšet 'abrām lō' yāldā lô..., and cf. also Gen 30:1) 'And Sarai the wife of Abram had not been bearing children for him...'

Finally, the formulaic idiom hwh mwlyd (variously spelled) occurs nine times in Genesis Chapter 5 and eight times in Genesis Chapter 11 in the set genealogical phrase whyh PN₁ mn btr d'wyld yt PN₂ ( ) šnyn wbhn bšnyh hwh mwlyd bnyn wbnn 'and PN₁ lived after he had begotten PN₂ ( ) years, and in those very years he was (continually) begetting sons and daughters', translating the MT wayyôled by the durative compound form; compare this form to the perfective 'wlyd (used as a pluperfect), and note that neither the Hebrew hôlîdô nor wayyôled is marked for durativeness, whereas the Aramaic must make the distinction between the act of begetting one child and that of begetting numerous children over a period of years.

3.b. While most of the examples in line 3 of Table 1 translate a MT perfect or converted perfect, there are some examples that translate either an MT imperfect, or an infinitive, or another nominal form. The examples below are representative of the Genesis sample; the same categories identified above for the use of the compound form are to be found in this current group also, i.e., conditional, durative, etc. The question is rather what is to be found in the Vorlage that required the "translator" to translate an imperfect by a compound perfect of hwh + participle.

For the comments concerning the nature of the narrative of Genesis Chapters 1 and 2, and hence the explanation of the use of the form hwh mtprš whzr 'it would split and return' (for MT yippārēd) in Gen 2:10, see above, example (2).

In example (12), the compound form expresses an iterative idea, (translating the Hebrew imperfect), and it is preceded by a (future) participle, qr' (= qāre).

(12) ...w'yty ythwn lwt 'dm lmḥmy mh hw' qr' lyhwn wkl mh dhwh 'dm qry lyh...   (Gen 2:19...wayyābē' 'el-hā'ādām lir'ôt mah-yiqrā'-lô wəkol ^ašer yiqrā'-lô hā'ādām...) '...and he brought them to Adam to see what he will call them, and whatever Adam would call it,...'

Example (13) shows habitual action in the past, expressed in Hebrew by an imperfect, in Aramaic by the compound form.

(13) 'n kdyn hwh 'mr... (Gen 31:8 'im kōh yō(')mar...) 'if he would say this...' cf. example (10) above.

This compound form occurs a number of times for a pair of MT inifinitive absolutes, used adverbially with a verb of motion; see examples (14), (15) and (16).

(14) wšlḥ yt ^Cwrb' whwwh npq whzr npq whzr ^Cd dy... (Gen 8:7 wayšallaḥ 'et-hā^Cōrēb wayyēṣē' yāṣô' wāšôb ^Cad...) 'And he sent forth the raven and it continually went out and back, out and back, until...'

This example clearly demonstrates the frequentative nature of the compound form, and eloquently captures the sense of the adverbial use of the Hebrew infinitives (see Gesenius, "Grammatik," p. 358, §113s); so too in the following two examples:

(15) wmy' <u>hwwn</u> <u>'zlyn</u> <u>whsryn</u> ^cd... (Gen 8:5 wəhammayim hāyû hālôk wəhāsôr ^cad...) 'And the waters <u>kept on gradually diminishing</u> until...' (see verse 3 for the use of the perfect with this same idiom: <u>whzrw</u> my' m^cylwy 'r^c' <u>'zlyn whs<r>yn whsrw my'</u> lswp m'h <u>whmšyn ywmyn</u> 'And the waters <u>gradually receded</u> from upon the earth and the waters <u>had diminished</u> by the end of one hundred and fifty days').

(16) wtqp gbr' <u>whwwh</u> <u>'zl</u> <u>wtqp</u> ^cd zmn dy tqp lhd' (Gen 26:13 wayyigdal hā'îš wayyēlek hālôk wəgādēl ^cad kî-gādal mə'ōd) 'And the man became powerful and <u>he kept on growing powerful</u> until such time as he had become very powerful'.

The final two examples (17) and (18) show the use of the compound form to translate an MT nominal form. In the former, the nominal is in a sense an equivalent of a perfect; in the latter, the adjective in the MT (<u>ra^c</u>) is expanded in an exegetical comment describing the evil that was done.

(17) ...whwwn b'pwy kywmyn qlylyn mn rhmt' <u>dhwh rhm</u> <u>yth</u>. (Gen 29:20 wayyihyû bə^cênā(y)w kəyāmîm '^ahādîm bə'ah^abātô 'ōtāh) '...and they were in his face as a few days because of the love with which <u>he was loving</u> her'.

(18) <u>whwh</u> ^cr bkwrh dyhwdh ^cbd ^cwbdyn byšyn qdm YYY wmyt bmymr mn qdm YYY (Gen 38:7 wayhî ^cēr bəkôr yəhûdā ra^c bə^cênê YHWH waymîtēhû YHWH) 'And Er, the first born of Judah, <u>used to do</u> evil deeds before the Lord and he died at a command from before the Lord'.

3.c.   Nearly one-third of the examples of perfect <u>hwh</u> + participle in the Genesis sample occur in passages that have no Hebrew base text, i.e., either in midrashic passages or in verses which expand a single word or phrase in the MT. Hence this group of examples is particularly valuable since there is generally no "interference" from the Hebrew base, and we are dealing solely with an Aramaic idiom, see Table I, line 4.

As expected, these forms display the same semantic range as those described in sections 2 , 3.a, and 3.b above; these examples, however, are often in longer passages, and hence the use of the compound perfect can

be easily appreciated, and contrasted with that of the "simple" forms in the same passages. The main function of this form is to express the durative aspect of the verb in the past, and this gives rise to a number of nuances (not always clear from a translation) such as iterativeness, inchoativeness, frequency, etc. One use in particular is to express a kind of continuous or progressive pluperfect, e.g., example (19):

(19) w^cbr 'brm ^cd 'trh škm w^cd mšryh (sic) hzwwh wkn^cny' ^cd k^cn <u>hwwn</u> <u>šryyn</u> b'r^c' 'And Abram moved on to the place Shechem and to the Plain of the Vision, and up until now the Canaanites <u>had been dwelling</u> in the land' (Gen 12:6).

This formulation is based on the MT <u>wəhakkəna^{ca}nî</u> 'āz bā'āres, and see also the same idiom in Gen 14:5 (w'mtnyh <u>dhwwn šryyn</u> bgwwh qrth 'and the powerful who <u>had been dwelling</u> in the midst of the city', for MT wə'ēt hā'êmîm bəšāwēh qiryātāyim). However, compare this with Gen 13:7, which is a midrash based on an MT text containing the participle <u>yōšēb</u>: l' tntwn lkn^cny' wpryzy' ^cd k^cn 'nwn <u>šryyn</u> b'r^c' 'do not turn aside to the Canaanites and the Perizzites; so far they are (continuing to) dwell in the land'.

The compound form also expresses a habitual action in the past (20), or continuous action in the past (21):

(20) whwwn kl dyyry<h> d'r^c' lšn hd wmmll hd wblšn byt qdšh <u>hwwn</u> <u>mšt^cyn</u> dbh 'tbry ^clm' mn šrwyh 'Now all the residents of the earth were one language and one speech, and <u>they used to converse</u> in the language of the sanctuary in which the world was created from the beginning' (Gen 11:1). Note especially the contrast between the compound form and the simple perfect (<u>'tbry</u>) used for a single action in the past.

(21) ...whw' hwh qyym ^clyhwn thwt 'yln <u>whwwn</u> <u>mthmyn</u> hyk 'klyn whyk štyn '...and he was standing over them under the tree and <u>they were giving the appearance</u> of eating and drinking' (Gen 18:8). This verse is based on the MT <u>wəhû'-^cōmēd</u> ^{ca}lêhem tahat hā^cēs wayyō(')kēlû, and in both the Hebrew and the Aramaic the first part of the verse is in the perfect. The compound form is also common in past tense modal expressions, usually to be translated by auxiliaries such as 'would', 'could', 'might', etc., e.g.,

(22) ...'yln d^cth dkl mn <u>dhwh</u> <u>'kl</u> mnh yd^c lmprǎh byn
ṭb lbyš '...the tree of knowledge from which
anyone who <u>might eat</u> will know how to distinguish
between good and evil' (Gen 2:9, 17, both based on
MT ^c ēṣ hadda^c at ṭôb wārā^c).

Note the normal use of the participle yd^c for the
assured, non-modal future, 'will know'.

The following two examples (23) and (24) both come
from longer midrashic passages, and contain numerous
examples of the compound, especially in contrast to the
use of "simple" verbal forms.

(23) <u>wnṣb</u> 'brhm prds bb'r šb^c <u>wyhb</u> <u>bgwyh</u> l^cwbry'
<u>whwwh</u> kd <u>'kylyn</u> <u>wštyn</u> <u>hwwn</u> b^cyn lmytn byh...<u>whwh</u>
<u>'mr</u> lhwn mn d'mr whwh ^clm' <u>'twn</u> <u>'klyn</u> <u>wl'</u> <u>hwwn</u>
z^cyyn mn tmn ^cd zmn <u>dhwh</u> <u>mgyyr</u> ythwn <u>wmylp</u>
ythwn...<u>wplḥ</u> <u>wṣly</u>... 'And Abraham <u>planted a</u> garden
in Beesheba and <u>gave</u> within it food for the
passers-by; and it <u>happened</u> that, while <u>eating and</u>
<u>drinking, they would attempt</u> to give him...and <u>he</u>
<u>would say</u> to them: "From he who said and the world
was <u>you are eating</u>," and <u>they would not move</u> from
there until <u>he would convert</u> them and <u>teach</u>
them...and <u>he worshipped and prayed</u>...'
(Gen 21:33). In this text, the compound forms
express the habitual past, and contrast clearly
with the simple perfects that precede and follow
them. Note also the participle (<u>'kylyn</u>) used for
the continuous present.[7]

(24) ḥmǎh nsyn 't^cbdw ^cm 'bwnn y^cqb...ns' qdmy'
<u>'tqṣrw</u> š^cwwy dywm' w⟨ṭ⟩m^ct šmš' dl' b'šwn' mn
bgll <u>dhwh</u> dbyr' <u>mthmd</u> bmmll⟨h⟩ ^cmyh...wnys'
rby^c'h 'bn' <u>dhwwn</u> kl r^cy' <u>mtknšyn</u> lmgllh yth
m^clwy pwm' db'rh <u>wl'</u> <u>hwwn</u> <u>yklyn</u>...wnys'
ḥmyš'h...<u>ṭpt</u> b'rh <u>wslyqt</u> b'pwy <u>whwwt</u> <u>ṭyyph</u> ^cšryn
šnyn kl ywmyn <u>dhwh</u> <u>šry</u> bḥrn 'lyn ḥmyšty nsy'
<u>'t^cbdw</u> ^cm 'bwnn y^cqb bzmn' dy <u>npq</u> mn b'r
šb^c lmyzl lḥrn 'Five miracles <u>were worked</u> with
our father Jacob...The first miracle: the hours of
the day <u>were shortened</u> and the sun <u>set</u> before its
time because the Word <u>was desirous</u> of speaking with
him...And the fourth miracle: the stone which all
the shepherds <u>were in the habit of gathering</u> in
order to roll from off the mouth but <u>were not</u>
<u>able</u>...And the fifth miracle: the well <u>overflowed</u>

and <u>came up</u> at its mouth and <u>it (continued)</u>
<u>overflowing</u> for twenty years, all the days that <u>he</u>
<u>(continued) to dwell</u> in Haran. These five miracles
<u>were worked</u> with our father Jacob when <u>he went forth</u>
from Beersheba to go to Haran' (Gen 28:10).

Once again, the compound forms contrast with the
"simple," and the durative aspect of the former is
apparent: progressiveness (<u>hwh...mthmd</u>); habit
(<u>hwwn...mtknšyn</u>); iterativeness (<u>hwwt</u> <u>ṭyyph</u>, <u>hwh</u> <u>šry</u>).
The unreal nature of these events is stressed since, in
the targumic narrative, they have not yet occurred. This
summary midrash occurs at the beginning of Jacob's
journey (the first miracle takes place in the next verse,
Gen 28:11) and the event at the well will not be
recounted until Gen 29:2-10.

4. Other forms of hwh + participle

While the majority of compound verbal forms comprise
the perfect of <u>hwh</u> + participle, there are occasional
examples of other forms. Most of these are the imperfect
of <u>hwh</u> + participle, however there are also examples of
imperative, infinitive, and participles of <u>hwh</u> +
participle, so that an entire paradigm of the compound
verbal forms may be identified.

As expected, the one unifying characteristic of all
these forms is that they are marked for durativeness.
This allows the form to accrue to itself other aspectual
nuances, such as incohativeness, habitualness, frequency
of action, etc., as have been extensively catalogued in
the discussion of the perfect compound forms above.

4.a Imperfect of hwh + participle

Just as the perfect compound forms indicate a variety
of aspectual phenomena relative to the past, the
imperfect forms have a similar function relative to the
future. The following examples are drawn primarily from
passages which have no Hebrew <u>Vorlage</u>, or which are
expansions of a single MT word or phrase.[8]

(25) ...kd <u>yhwwn</u> bnyh <u>nṭryn</u> 'wryyt' <u>w^cbdyn</u> <u>pqwdyyh</u>
<u>yhwwn</u> <u>mtkwwnyn</u> lk <u>wmḥyy⟨n⟩</u> ytk lr'šk <u>wqṭlyn</u> ytk wkd
<u>yhwwn</u> <u>šbqyn</u> pqwdy⟨h⟩ d'wryt' <u>thwy</u> <u>mtkwyn</u> <u>wnkt</u> ytyh
b^cqbh <u>wmmr^c</u> ytyh... '...when her children
<u>shall be</u> (continually) <u>observant</u> of the Law and

performing its commandments, they shall (continually) be taking aim at you and striking you on your head and killing you; but when they shall be abandoning the commandments of the Law, (then) you shall be taking aim at and wounding him in his heel and making him ill...' (Gen 3:15).

In this example, as in many others, the compound form is used to describe a future, prophesied state of affairs, one in which, if such-and-such shall be done, then so-and-so will follow, but if not, then the reverse will take place. One might freely translate this passage by such paraphrase as: "as long as her children continue to observe the Law, then..." The imperfect compound forms primarily record such continuing future action (either in this kind of implied conditional or not), and the contrast with the simple imperfect (used for the modus), and the simple participle (used for the plain future) is clear in (26):

(26) w'mrwn 'twn wnbnh ln qryh wmgdl wr'šh mṭy ^cd ṣyt šmy' wn^cbd ln br'šyh sgdh wntn ḥrb' bydyh wtyhwwy ^cbd⟨'⟩ lqblyh sdry qrb' qdm ^cd l' ndry ^cl 'py kl 'r^c' 'And they said: "Come, let us build for ourselves a city and a tower, whose top shall reach to the heights of the heavens, and let us make for ourselves an idol on top of it, and let us put a sword in its hand so that it shall be able to wage war (lit. "make battle lines") against him lest we be scattered over the face of all the earth"' (Gen 11:4, based on the MT imperfects nibne, wəna^{ca}śe, and nāpôṣ).

The ingressive nature of this compound is most apparent in example (27). This is one of the four appearances of the midrash of the four cases brought for decision to Moses (the others are at Num 9:8, 15:34, and 27:5), and while each occurrence is slightly different in its phraseology, all four use compound imperfects to express a nuance of undertaking an action, the result of which can have unforeseen consequences (in this instance, e.g., putting an innocent man to death and consequently being ashamed):

(27) dn ḥd mn 'rb^ch dynyn dqmw qdm mšh...btryn mnhwn hwh mšh zryz wbtryn mnhwn hwh mšh mṭyn...lmlph ldyynyh dqyymyn btr mšh dyhwwn zryzyn bdyny mmwnh wmmtynyn bdyny npšth dl' yhwwn qṭylyn bpry^c yt mn

dḥmy lyh lmtqṭlh bdynh dylmh dyštkḥ lh zkw mn zwy ḥwry bdynh dl' yhwwn bhtyn lmymr... 'This is one of four cases that arose before Moses...in two of them Moses was hasty and in two of them Moses was slow...in order to teach the judges who will exist after Moses that they should always be hasty in fiscal cases and they should delay in capital cases, so that they should not undertake the killing in haste of someone whom it is permissible to kill in law, lest acquittal be found for him from another angle in the law, so that they should not have to be ashamed to say...' (Lev 24:12).[9]

Other aspectual nuances are apparent also, e.g., inchoate action in (28):

(28) kd yhwwn ^cnny' prsyn ^cl 'r^c' wtthmy qšt' b^cnn' 'When the clouds (begin to) break up over the earth, then the bow may be seen in the cloud' (Gen 9:14, based on the MT bə^canəni ^cānān ^cal-hā'āreṣ wənir'^atā haqqešet be^cānān).

4.b Infinitive of hwh + participle

Compound infinitival forms, while not common, are well enough attested that the general circumstances of their use are clear. These forms either translate an MT infinitive, when the "translator" understands the action of the Hebrew verb to be an on-going action, or else they appear in passages with no Hebrew Vorlage, in which the durative aspect of the verbal action is required. In both sets of examples, the compound infinitive often follows a finite verb which is itself inchoative or ingressive, e.g., šrw 'they began' in Gen 4:26, ḥzrw 'they changed' in Gen 44:18.

Examples which translate or are based on an MT infinitive include:

(29) ...w'dm ^cd kdwn l' 'tbry lmhwy plḥ b'r^c' '...and Adam had not yet been created to work (i.e., continually) on the land' (Gen 2:5, MT ... wə'ādām 'ayin la^{ca}bōd 'et-hā'^adāmā).

(30) ...w'šry ytyh bgnt' d^cdn lmhwy plḥ b'wryt⟨'⟩ wlmṭwr pqwdyh '...and he placed him in the garden of Eden to be striving (continually) in the Law,

and (consequently) <u>to keep</u> its commandments' (Gen 2:15, MT ...<u>wayyannihēlû bəgan-^cēden lə^cobdāh ûləšomrāh</u>). Note that the second infinitive in the Aramaic is simple, hence to be understood as consequent on the (frequentive) action of the first infinitive.

(31) ...bkdyn <u>šrw</u> bny 'nš' <u>lmhwy</u> ^c<u>bdyn</u> lhwn ṭ^cwn <u>wmknyyn</u> ythwn bš⟨m⟩ mmrh dYYY '...then men <u>had begun to be making</u> idols for themselves and <u>to be calling</u> them by the name of the word of the Lord' (Gen 4:26, MT ...<u>'āz hûḥal liqrō' bəšēm YHWH</u>).

Examples in passages with no Hebrew <u>Vorlage</u> include:

(32) ...wmn dḥṭ' wqṭl lhbl ḥzrt <u>lmhwy mrbyh</u> qdmw⟨y⟩ kwbyn wdrdryn '...and after he had sinned and killed Abel, it (the earth) <u>changed to become (one) producing</u> thorns and thistles before him' (Gen 4:16).

(33) ...wkdwn ḥzrw dynk (<u>sic</u>) <u>lmhwy mdmyyn</u> ldynwy dpr^ch rbk... '...and now your judgements have changed <u>to become similar</u> to the judgements of Pharaoh your master...' (Gen 44:18).

(34) ...wzmn bnwy <u>lmhwy mṣlyyn</u> w'mryn... '...and he appointed his sons <u>to be</u> (continually) <u>praying and saying</u>...' (Lev 22:27).

4.c   Imperative of hwh + participle

Given the narrative nature of most of the pentateuchal text, the number of durative imperatives to be found is unremarkably small. Two examples are found in one version of the Decalogue only, namely Exodus 20:8 and 20:12, and they are both passive participles. Whether this is the only type of compound imperative expression possible cannot be determined considering the paucity of examples, however both verbs commonly use these passive participles in an "active" sense.

The two cases are:

(35) ^cmy bny yśr'l <u>hwwn dkyryn</u> yt ywm' dšbt' lmqdš⟨'⟩ ytyh 'Oh my people, the children of Israel, <u>be mindful</u> (continually) of the Sabbath day to sanctify it' (Exod 20:8, MT <u>zākôr</u>).

(36) ^cmy bny yśr'l <u>hwwn zhyryn</u> gbr byqryh d'bwy wb'yqrh d'ymyh... 'Oh my people, the children of Israel, <u>be watchful</u> (constantly), each man for the

honor of his father and for the honor of his mother...' (Exod 20:12, MT <u>kabbēd</u>).

4.d   Participle of hwh + participle

Again, examples of compound participial forms are not especially common, but they do occur frequently enough to enable general guidelines to be enunciated. Clearly, these forms also express durative, habitual, or frequent action, however the scarcity of examples make it difficult to pinpoint the motivations for use, and also to ascertain the differences between these compound forms and others, e.g., the compound perfect forms.

Some cases translate an MT participle, when it refers to action contemporaneous with a main verb (37), or when that action also describes another state of affairs (38).

(37) ...<u>wmll</u> ^c<u>mhwn</u> lmymr ...<u>wyzbn</u> ly yt m^crt kpylh...w^cprwn <u>hwy šry</u> bgw bnwy dḥt w^cnh ^cprwn ḥtyyh... '...and <u>he spoke</u> to them, saying: "...<u>let him sell</u> me the cave of Kephelah..." Now Ephron <u>was dwelling</u> (at that time) among the sons of Heth, so Ephron the Hittite <u>answered</u>'... (Gen 23:8-10, MT <u>waydabbēr 'ittām lē(')mōr</u>... <u>wəyittēn-lî</u> 'et- mə^cārat hammakpēlā ... wə^ceprôn <u>yōšēb</u> bətôk bənê ḥēt wayya^can ^ceprôn haḥittî...).

(38) <u>wqmt</u> rbqh wrbyth <u>wrkbyn</u> ^cl gmly' <u>whlkyn</u> btr gbr' <u>wnsb</u> ^cbd' yt rbqh <u>w'zl</u>: wyṣḥq <u>hwy šry</u> b'r^c' drwm' 'And Rebecca and her maidens <u>arose</u>, <u>mounting</u> camels and <u>following</u> after the man, and so the servant <u>took</u> Rebecca and <u>departed</u>. Now (at the same time), Isaac <u>was coming</u> (= 'on his way') from the sanctuary of Lord Shem...for <u>he had been dwelling</u> in the south country' (Gen 24:61-62, MT <u>wattāqām ribqā wəna^{ca}rōteyhā wattirkabnā ^cal-gəmallîm wattelaknā 'aḥ^arê hā'îš wayyiqqaḥ hā^cebed 'et-ribqa wayyēlak</u>: <u>wəyiṣḥāq bā'</u> .. <u>wəhû' yōšēb bə'ereṣ hannegeb</u>).

This example uses two participles in the Hebrew, <u>bā'</u> and <u>yōšēb</u>, dependent on the perfects in the previous verse: Rebecca "arose," "rode," and "followed." Now, while this was happening, Isaac was on his way north, because he was normally to be found dwelling in the

south. In the Aramaic, this contemporaneity is expressed by a compound participle, hwy 'ty, and the perfect-in-the-past, "he had been dwelling," by the compound perfect hwh šry.

This compound participial form also translates an MT imperfect (39) and a perfect (40).

(39) ...wšwy y^{c}qb yt ḥwṭry' qdm ^{c}nh ...wblqyšy ^{c}nh l' hwy mšwy... '...and Jacob placed the rods before the flock...but with the first-born of the flock, he used not to put (them)...' (Gen 30:41-42, MT... waśśām ya^{ca}qōb 'et-hammaqlōt lə^{c}ênê haṣṣō(')n ...ûbəha^{ca}ṭîp haṣṣō(')n lō' yāśîm...).

(40) wqnwn byh 'ḥwy w'bwy hwy mnṭr yt ptgm' 'And his brothers were jealous of him, but his father was keeping note of the matter' (Gen 37:11 wayqan'û-bô 'eḥā(y)w wə'ābîw šāmar 'et-haddābār).

This unusual use of the perfect šāmar in the MT is what Joüon, "Grammaire," calls "quasi-statif" (p. 295), in which the perfect of non-stative verbs denoting mental activity expresses an apparent stative condition. Examples are rare in narrative, and are confined mostly to poetic passages, see Joüon, pp. 295-297 for references. The only other case he cites using the verb šāmar is in Jer 8:7, in which this verb is used in parallel to the more commonly occurring yāda^c 'to be in a state of knowledge about something': gam-ḥ^{a}sîdā baššāmayim yād^{c}ā mô^{ca}deyhā wətōr wəsîs wə^{c}āgûr šāmərû 'et-^{c}ēt bō'ānā wə^{c}ammî lō' yādə^{c}û 'et mišpaṭ YHWH 'Even the stork in the heavens knows her appointed times, and the dove and the swift and the thrush keep the time of their coming, but my people do not know the judgement of the Lord?' In Gen 37:11, the targumist clearly did understand this rare usage, and translated accordingly by a durative form: w'bwy hwy mnṭr yt ptgm' 'but his father was keeping the matter in mind'.

There are also some examples of compound participles found in passages that have no Hebrew Vorlage, and these are especially explicit in expressing the habitual (41, 42) and continuous (43) aspects of the action of the verb.

(41) whwwn swrbnyn wmpḥn rwḥ wmgḥkn bpwlḥn' nwkr'h wl' hwyn mqbln 'wlpn... 'And they were rebellious and haughty of spirit, acting licentiously in foreign cultic practices, nor would they accept instruction...' (Gen 26:35).

Here and in the following case, the habitual nature of the verbal action is stressed. It should also be noted that the form hwyn is fem. pl. active participle, to be vocalized hāwəyān, cf. also example (43), below.

(42) ^{c}dn dtdkr ln qrb‹n›ynn mh dḥwwyyn mqrybyn wmtkpr ^{c}l ḥwbynn... '(This is) the time when you should remember for us our sacrifices which are being offered, so that atonement shall be made for our sins...' (Lev 22:27).

This is the beginning of a very long midrash which recounts three of the sacrifices of the patriarchs as a prelude to explaining why the Hebrew states that three specific animals are to be sacrificed. The participial hwwyyn mqrybyn is understood here as masc. pl. participle of hwh + masc. pl. C stem passive participle, i.e., hāwayin maqribin (< maqrəbin), with -y- spelling the vocalic shewa, as often in this MS. It should be noted that the English translation of the editio princeps does not translate the verse thus, rendering the imperfect tdkr by a past tense, "you remembered(!)" and the participial form as "we used to offer."

Continuity of action is expressed in the final example (43):

(43) w^{c}yny‹h› dl'h hwwyyn zqypn bṣlw...wrḥl hwwt y'yh... 'And Leah's eyes were (constantly) raised in prayer...but Rachel was fair... (Gen 29:17).

This is the passive participle zəqipān, fem. pl. agreeing with 'eyes', and consequently hwwyyn is to be understood also as fem. pl. active participle, hāwəyān.

5. Concluding Remarks

The contrast between the various compound forms and those termed here "simple" is dependent on an aspectual opposition. The compound forms are marked for durativeness, the other forms unmarked.

The basic uses of the different forms can be summarized thus:

perfect - past; preterite; pluperfect.

imperfect - future modus (precative, imperative, jussive, etc.).

participle - future; present continuous; describes a state of affairs contemporaneous with the action of a main verb, when that main verb is either perfect (e.g., Gen 13:17), or non-perfect (e.g., example 19).

compound perfect - durative action in the past; habitual, iterative, etc.; unreal conditions in the past; describes a state contemporaneous with the action of a main verb, when that main verb is in the perfect (e.g., example 3).

compound imperfect - durative action in the future; habitual, iterative, etc.; unreal conditions in the future.

compound participle - durative action in the present; habitual, iterative, etc.; describes a state of affairs contemporaneous with the action of a main verb, when that main verb is a compound verb (37, 38).

As can be seen, there are three forms available for expressing a state contemporaneous with a main verb, i.e., that function which is fulfilled by the participle in biblical Hebrew: the compound perfect, the compound participle, and the simple participle. In these three forms there is an opposition between forms which can be used when the main verb is perfect and those which cannot be used when the main verb is perfect. Within both groups, there is a further opposition between compound verbal forms (= durative) and simple verbal forms (= non-durative), see Tables 2 and 3:

TABLE 2

The Forms Used for Expressing Contemporaneous State in Targum Neofiti

Main Verb is Perfect	.	Main Verb is Non-Perfect
State = Compound Perfect or Simple Participle		State = Compound Participle or Simple Participle

Durative	.	Non-Durative	.	Durative	.	Non-Durative
State = Compound Perfect	.	State = Simple Participle	.	State = Compound Participle	.	State = Simple Participle

This opposition between the durative and non-durative aspects of the verb is a key element found throughout the entire verbal system, along with a tense opposition between past and non-past:

TABLE 3

The Tense System in Targum Neofiti

	Durative	Non-Durative
Past	Compound Perfect (hwh + participle)	Perfect (p^c1)
Future	Compound Imperfect (yhwh + participle)	Participle (p^cy1)
Present	Compound Participle (hwy + participle)	Participle (p^cy1)
Modus	Imperfect (yp^c1)	Imperfect (yp^c1)

The opposition between past and non-past is clear in the non-durative aspect ($p^c l$ vs. $p^c yl$) and hence one might postulate a similar state of affairs in the durative (hwh + participle vs. non-hwh + participle), even though the past is not explicitly marked. One other consideration in this regard might be the number of examples (see Table 1), since 75% of the samples are indeed found to be of the compound perfect, however further study, in addition to comparisons with other dialects, is necessary before final conclusion can be drawn.

SECTION B
Expression of the Direct Object

There are four ways to express the direct object of a transitive verb employed in the MS: yt, 1-, Ø, and by pronominal suffix attached to the verb. While the choice of means is often dependent on the Masoretic Vorlage, the motivation for the use of one form over another in untranslated or paraphrastic passages is not immediately clear.

1. yt: The most common expression of the direct object is yt. It usually translates MT 'et, e.g., Num 13:21 wslyqw wylylw yt 'r^c' 'and they went up and spied out the land' (MT wayya^{ca}lû wayyātūrû 'et-hā'āres̱), and examples throughout the MS. There are also examples of slavish following of the Hebrew, even to the point of mistranslation for MT 'et = 'with', e.g., Gen 39:2 whwh YYY yt ywsp 'and God was (with) Joseph' for MT wayhî YHWH 'et-yôsēp.

For examples translating multiple direct objects with 'et, see, e.g., Lev 14:9 wyhwy bywm' šby^{c}yh yspr yt kl ś^{c}ryh yt r'šyh wyt dqnh wyt gbyny ^{c}yyny (sic) 'and on the seventh day he shall shave all his hair, his head, his beard and (his) eyelashes' (MT wəhāyā bayyôm haššəbî^{c}î yəgallaḥ 'et-kol-śə^{c}ārô 'et-rō(')šô wə'et-zəqānô wə'et gabbōt ^{c}ênāyw, and especially the example in Gen 21:10, where the Aramaic adds 'et missing in the Hebrew, ṯrwd yt 'mt' hdh wyt brh 'expel this handmaid and her son' (MT gāreš hā'āmā hazzō(')t wə'et-bənāh).[10]

The particle yt also translates other MT prepositions, e.g., lə-, depending upon the semantics of the individual Aramaic verb, e.g., Gen 29:13 wqpp yth wnšq yth 'and he embraced him and kissed him' (MT wayḥabbeq-lô waynaššeq-lô).

The particle yt is used distinctively in this MS in technical translation idioms following passive verbal forms in euphemistic contructions to avoid anthropomorphisms. The "subject" of these constructions is usually God, but can also be angels (cf. Gen 31:12), and even human beings, when the Hebrew has the N stem of root yld + 'et (Gen 4:8 and 21:5). Examples are usually found with šmy^c 'heard' and gly 'revealed', cf. Gen 21:17 wšmy^c qdm YYY yt qlyh dṯly' 'and the boy's voice was heard before the Lord' (MT wayyišma^c '^{e}lōhîm 'et-qôl hanna^{c}ar) and Exod 4:31 qly qdmwy yt ṣ^{c}rwn (sic) 'their distress was revealed before Him' (MT rā'ā 'et-^{c}onyām).

Similarly, in Gen 31:12, the subject is an angel, 'rwm gly qdmyy yt kl mh dlbn ^{c}bd lk 'because all that Laban is doing to you is revealed before me' (MT rā'îtî 'ēt kol-'^{a}šer lābān ^{c}ōśe lāk). There are two examples in Genesis which mimick the unusual Hebrew construction of N stem of root yld followed by the direct object marker 'et: 4:18 w'tylyd lḥnwk yt ^{c}yrd 'and Irad was born to Enoch' (MT wayyiwwālēd la ḥ^{a}nôk 'et-^{c}îrād) and 21:5 bzmnh d'tyld lh yt yṣḥq bryh 'when Isaac his son was born to him' (MT bəhiwwāled lô 'ēt yiṣḥāq bənô).

Finally, yt is used with pronominal suffixes, either translating MT 'et + suffixes, e.g., Gen 29:19 yth (twice) 'her' (MT 'ōtāh), Gen 50:26 ytyh 'him' (MT 'ōtô), and even uncommon MT forms, e.g., Exod 29:35 ytk 'you' (MT 'ōtākāh), etc., or, more commonly, for MT pronominal suffixes affixed directly to a transitive verb, e.g., Num 22:33 whmt yty 'tnth 'and the ass saw me' (MT wattir'anî hā'ātôn), Gen 27:4 mn bgll dy tbrk ytk npšy 'so that my soul may bless you' (MT ba^{ca}bûr təbārekəkā napšî), or Gen 29:13 w'^{c}yl yth lgw byytyh 'and he brought him into his house' (MT waybî'ēhû 'el-bêtô).

2. **1-**   See the complete discussion under Chapter 3, <u>Prepositions</u>, <u>1-</u>, above. As indicated, for every example with <u>1-</u>, counter examples of <u>yt</u> in similar situations can be found. However, the fact that the direct object of many of these verbs is a proper noun seems to be significant.

The verb <u>ḥm'</u> 'to see' does seem to occur in a number of the examples, cf. Gen 28:12, Num 21:34 cited above, and also Num 24:17 <u>ḥmy 'nh lyh</u> 'I see him' (MT <u>'er'ennû</u>). However, in a selective sample of some forty chapters of Genesis, there were thirty eight examples of <u>ḥm'</u> + direct object. Of these, 28 used <u>yt</u>, eight used Ø, one used <u>1-</u>, and one (Gen 21:16) used <u>b</u>, mimicking the Hebrew <u>bə-</u>. Of the 28 examples with <u>yt</u>, no less than 20 were copies of a Hebrew <u>'et</u>, two translated a Hebrew verb + pronominal suffix, and six were used in paraphrastic or midrashic passages. All eight examples of Ø copied a Hebrew verse using Ø, and the one example of <u>1-</u> was in a midrashic passage. Clearly, when viewed in this perspective, the use of <u>1-</u> as the mark of the direct object is secondary at best, and certainly restricted to a limited number of examples.

3. **Ø:**   Even more limited are the examples where no object marker is used. These occur overwhelmingly in passages where the MT also has no marker, e.g., Gen 27:40 <u>wtprwq nyr š^cbwd' m^clwy ṣww'ryk</u> 'and you shall remove the yoke of servitude from upon your neck' (MT <u>ûpāraqtā ^cullô mē^cal ṣaww(')ārekā</u>), or Gen 30:31 <u>'n t^cbd ly ptgm' hdn</u> 'if you do this thing for me' (MT <u>'im-ta^{ca}śe-lî haddābār hazze</u>). However, there are some instances where the MS has Ø where the MT has <u>'et</u>, cf. e.g., Gen 24:52 <u>whwh kd šm^c ^cbd' d'brhm mlyhwn</u> 'and when Abraham's servant heard their words' (MT <u>wayhî ka'^ašer šāma^c ^cebed 'abrāhām 'et-dibrêhem</u>), Gen 24:64 <u>wntlt rbqh ^cyynh</u> 'and Rebecca raised her eyes' (MT <u>wattiśśā' ribqā 'et-^cênêhā</u>) and Gen 30:26 <u>'rwm 't yd^ct plḥny</u> 'because you have known my work' (MT <u>kî 'attā yāda^ctā 'et-^{ca}bōdātî</u>). For examples without Vorlage, cf. e.g., Gen 13:7 <u>r^cwy d'brm hwwn zmmyn b^cyrhwn</u> 'Abram's shepherds used to muzzle their cattle' and Gen 27:40 <u>yhwwn mšwyyn nyr mtwlhwn ^cl</u>

<u>šw'rk</u> 'they will place the yoke of their burden on your neck', etc.

4. **Pron. Suff.:**   The most limited group of examples are those in which a pronominal suffix is attached directly to a finite verb. Some of the examples attested are: Gen 32:18 <u>'rwm y^cr^c ytk ^cśw 'hy wyš'lwnk(:)</u>[11] <u>lmymr</u> ... 'when my brother Esau meets you and they(:?) ask you, saying ...' (MT <u>kî yipgoškā ^cēśaw 'āḥî wiša'ēlkā</u> (sic, see <u>Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia</u>, <u>ad loc.</u>, p. 52); Gen 30:22 <u>'rb^c mptḥn d'ynwn msyryn byd rbwn kl ^clm' YYY wl' msrn l' lml'k' wl' lśrp</u> '(there are) four keys which are passed over into the hand of the master of all the world, the Lord, and he did not pass them over, neither to an angel nor to a seraph' (no MT); Exod 4:21 <u>wt^cbdynwn qdm pr^ch</u> 'and you shall do them before Pharaoh' (MT <u>wa^{ca}śîtām lipnê par^cōh</u>, cf. the example in Exod 15:2, and also the same form in Onkelos, Sperber, "Onkelos," Vol. I, <u>ad loc.</u>, p. 95; cf. also Dalman, "Grammatik," p. 310); and in the Song of the Sea, Exod 15:2 <u>dn hw' 'lhn wnšbḥynyh 'lh 'bhtn wnrwmmnh</u> 'this is our god and we shall praise him, the god of our fathers and we shall extol him' (MT <u>ze 'ēlî wə'anwēhû '^elōhê 'ābî wa'^arōməmenhû</u>).

Clearly these are frozen, literary forms; the question, however, why they are employed where they are is one perhaps not totally admitting of an answer. One might account for the forms in Gen 32:18 and Exod 4:15 by an appeal to Onkelos; however, this will not explain the other two forms. One might account for <u>msrn</u> in Gen 30:22 as part of an intrusive midrash which presumably has a different provenance, whereas the forms in the famous Song of the Sea clearly owe their appearance to the very similar forms in the Hebrew <u>Vorlage</u>. However, the retention of just these forms in these verses is undoubtedly due to non-linguistic reasons.

PART TWO

Features of Nominal Syntax

SECTION A

The Use of the Predicate Adjective

One notes in the Targum Neofiti two kinds of nominal sentence word order: one where the Subject precedes the Predicate (SP) and one where the predicate is fronted, with the addition of a pronominal "copula" acting as a Pronominal Anticipation of the Subject (PAS).[12]

It is important to note that there are no examples of sentences where the Subject is fronted and then followed by the "copula", i.e., SAP does not exist. The following examples are representative:

SP

(1) ^{C}wbdyhwn byšyn 'their deeds are evil' (Gen 6:3).

(2) dhb' d'r^C' hhy' ṭb 'the gold of that land is good' (z^{a}hab hā'āreṣ hahî' ṭôb) (Gen 2:12).

(3) qrt' hdh qrybh 'this city is close' (hā^{C}îr hazzō(')t) qərōbā) (Gen 19:20).

(4) b'ryyn mlyyn ḥmr 'wells full of pitch' (be'erōt ḥēmār) (Gen 14:10).

PAS

(5) zk'h hy' tmr klty myny hy' m^{C}brh 'Tamar my daughter-in-law is innocent; by me is she with child' (Gen 38:25).

(6) ṭb' hy' 'wryt.' lplḥy (sic) b^{C}lm' hdyn hyk pyry 'yln ḥyy' 'the Law is good for those who serve it in this world just like the fruits of the tree of life' (Gen 3:24).

(7) (wḥmh ^{C}św 'rwm) byšn 'nwn bnthwn dkn$^Cn^C$'y (sic) b'pwy dyṣḥq 'bwy '(and Esau saw that) the daughters of the Canaanites were evil in the sight of Isaac his father' (rā^{C}ōt bənôt kənā^{C}an bə^{C}ênê yiṣḥāq 'ābîw) (Gen 28:8).

(8) h' z^{C}yr' hy' d' dy nsbt yt b^{C}ly w't b^{C}y' lmysb yt ybrwḥ⟨w⟩y dbry 'is it a small thing that you have taken my husband? Would you (also) take away the mandrakes of my son?' (hamə^{C}aṭ qaḥtēk 'et-îšî walāqaḥat gam 'et-dûdā'ê bənî) (Gen 30:15, and cf. Num 16:9, 13 for the same idiom).

SAP

(9) * ^{C}wbdyhwn 'ynwn byšyn.

(10) * qrt' hdh hy' qrybh.

These last do not exist in the language of Neofiti.

It is suggested here that sentences (5) – (8), i.e., PAS, be interpreted as "cleft sentences," in which the predicate is highlighted by preposing it.[13] The cleft sentence, by setting the predicate off, enables this element to be contrasted, hence the common notion that the main function of this device is contrastive. However, when viewed in terms of the greater discourse unit, one sees a more subtle function.

Recent work on such syntactic devices as Left-Dislocation and Topicalization gives an interesting insight to this notion of the contrastive nature of cleft sentences, especially since this work deals primarily with discourse units. Most of the examples we are examining come from so-called midrashic passages, i.e., long, story-like textual interpolations that are perhaps the closest thing to a discourse that can be found in an ancient text. Even those examples that are taken from exegetical passages can be understood in terms of discourse units since the difference is generally one of degree, not kind, and one can only understand such an explanatory expansion of a holy Hebrew text in terms of conscious didactic intent. Ellen Prince[14] theorizes that such devices as Topicalization are used to signal features of the organization of the discourse. The text is a set of instructions for the construction of a discourse model, and information is added by what she calls 'incrementation,' the most common form of which is 'forward incrementation.' Prince hypothesizes that speakers provide clues in their syntactic (and other) choices to the arrangement of the pieces of information. In particular, Topicalization indicates that a change of direction in the incrementation of pieces of information is required. I would suggest that clefting be understood in a similar manner. As a matter of fact, most of the examples discussed here occur towards the end of a midrashic passage; those that do not are to be found towards the beginning. In this case, clefting can be viewed as an isolating feature, one that sets off one piece of information from the rest of the story. Now, this piece is invariably the main point or the moral of a particular discourse, and hence it appears to show up as a contrast to the rest of the discourse.

A brief analysis of the examples (5) - (8) will provide clarification.

(5)   zk'h hy' tmr klty myny hy' m^cbrh (Gen 38:25).

This sentence occurs towards the end of a long midrash describing the trial of Tamar, who is to be burned for harlotry. The scene builds in intensity, as Tamar's prayers to heaven are answered in the form of three witnesses (the signet, cord, and staff) in exchange for three just men who will be her descendants (Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah). Her "eyes were enlightened" and she presents these three objects to the court. Judah at once ups and confesses, since "as a man measures, it will be measured to him." Hence, to avoid the fire of the world to come, he shall reveal his evil deeds: -- first he dipped his brother Joseph's cloak in blood and deceived his father; and now it is being said to him: "To whom this signet, cord and staff belong," by him is Tamar pregnant. Now the clefting device draws attention to the moral of the story: as regards Tamar, it is innocent that she is. This piece of information is isolated as the main point of the discourse, and hence provides the contrast that is so often described as being a part of the nature of cleft sentences: "As regards Tamar my daughter-in-law, she is innocent, and this is so because she is pregnant by me (and hence guiltless)." That this is the main point of the discourse, and hence to be highlighted by this clefting device, is reinforced by the fact that the story then ends abruptly with the anticlimactic addition: br⟨t⟩ ql' mn šmy' npqt w'mrt trykwn zkyyn mn qdm YYY hwh ptgm' 'A bat qol (divine voice) came forth from heaven and said: You are both innocent; the affair is the doing of the Lord'.[15]

Note that the cleft sentence zk'h hy' tmr, the main point of the discourse isolated by this syntactic device, is followed by the non-cleft trykwn zkyyn -- that this is anticlimax, and quite possibly a later accretion to the original midrashic tale, is instantly apparent. If this were the main point of the story, then what value would there be in the telling?! It is the innocence of Tamar that is the main point of this story, and the dramatic effect of Judah's declaration is decidedly reduced by this apologetic after-thought.

(6)   ṭb' hy' 'wryt' lplḥy (sic) b^clm' hdyn hyk pyry 'yln ḥyy' (Gen 3:24).

This sentence is the last sentence of a long midrash on the Garden of Eden and Gehenna. Each is described, Eden for the just, Gehenna for the wicked; in Eden the just will eat of the Tree of Life, in Gehenna the wicked will be tormented by fire, and this will take place ^cl dy l' nṭrw mṣwth d'wryt' b^clm' hdyn 'because they did not observe the precepts of the Law in this world.' The moral of the story is now introduced by a cleft sentence, highlighting the predicate of the sentence. A change of direction is indicated, from one of simple forward incrementation of additional facts about Eden and Gehenna, to one that picks up the theme of (the Torah as) the Tree of Life that was introduced at the beginning of the midrash (and with which the Hebrew verse on which it is based ends):   'rwm 'yln dḥyyn hy' 'wryyt' lkl mn dl^cy bh 'for it is a Tree of Life that the Law is for all who labor therein',

wnṭr pqwdyh hwy ḥy wqyym k'yln ḥyy' l^clm' d'ty 'and whoever observes its commandments is going to be alive and enduring like the Tree of Life for the eternity to come.' And now the midrash closes with another cleft sentence, which explains the moral of the moral, as it were, i.e., the reason why the Law is the Tree of Life:

ṭb' hy' 'wryt' lplḥy (sic) b^clm' hdyn hyk pyry 'yln ḥyy'! 'It is good(ness) that the Law is for those who serve it in this world, just like the fruit of the Tree of Life'!

(7)   (wḥmh ^cśw 'rwm) byšn 'nwn bnthwn dkn^cn^cy (sic) b'pwy dyṣḥq 'bwy (Gen 28:8).

This sentence too, even though it appears close to a verbatim translation of the Masoretic Vorlage, should be understood as an exegetical translation, since the use of the cleft sentence to isolate the predicate (and not merely preposing the predicate as would be were this a straight mimic of the Hebrew) provides the "translator" with the opportunity to comment on the episode.

Rebecca, in fear for the life of Jacob, deceives the aging Isaac into sending him away from Esau on the pretext that the Hittite women are not suitable wives. Isaac summons Jacob, blesses him, and sends him off to Padan-Aram. Now Esau has been observing all this and finally "puts two and two together;" he saw the blessing, saw Isaac send Jacob away for the express purpose of finding a wife, saw Jacob obey his

father and his mother (vs. 7 wšm^C y^{C}qb l'bwy wl'mh w'zl lpdn 'rm). Then verse eight, introduced by whmh ^{C}šw 'rwm 'then Esau realized that', focuses upon the main point, the reason (according to Esau and the "translator") why Jacob was sent off, but Esau was not -- "it was evil that the daughters of the Canaanites were in the sight of his father and of his mother." Having finally realized why his two previous wives had not found favor in his parents' sight, and why Jacob had been sent off to his relatives, Esau (pathetically) tries to mimic Jacob and does the next best thing -- takes a wife from distant relatives, the Ishmaelites.

The fact that the Hebrew has a preposed predicate is what enabled (and presumably inspired) the "translator" to translate by the cleft sentence. It must be noted that a verbatim translation was not possible -- such sentences as *byšn bntyhwn dkn^{C}n'y do not exist in this MS. The "translator" could only translate either:

    (i)   bnthwn dkn^{C}n'y byšn, or

    (ii) byšn 'nwn bnthwn dkn^{C}n'y, as he did.

The choice of translation (ii), while clearly dependent on the Hebrew work order, departs from it in plainly exegetical terms. The cleft sentence introduces a change of direction by isolating the moral of this episode, and explains, from Esau's point of view, the set of events that he had witnessed. It also refers back to Gen 26:35, and finally indicates for Esau the cause of his parents' dislike of his wives (although presumably the women were not evil in his sight). It may even hint at an ultimate cause for Esau's disinheritance, since the Rabbis would have felt that it was unfitting for a man married to idolators to receive his father's blessing, and hence Jacob's otherwise reprehensible deception of Isaac was justified.

(8) h' z^{C}yr' hy' d' dy nsbt yt b^{C}ly w't b^{C}y' lmysb yt ybrwh⟨w⟩y dbry (Gen 30:15).

The Aramaic indeed both translates and effectively captures the mood of the Hebrew (hamə^{C}at qaḥtēk 'et-îšî, and it is this strongly sarcastic Vorlage that enables the Aramaic to utilize the cleft sentence to highlight the adjectival predicate z^{C}yr' 'small thing'. In the Hebrew, Leah's unexpectedly violent outburst appears to come as a shock, both to Rachel and indeed to the reader. The Aramaic "translator" effectively portrays the episode: Reuben brings mandrakes to

Leah, his mother, and Rachel asks Leah for some of them. The bitter sarcasm with which she is answered marks a sudden directional change in the incrementation of information. This statement of Leah's immediately becomes the focus of the entire incident: h' z^{C}yr' hy' d' 'is it an insignificant thing (that you think) that this is', dy nsbt yt b^{C}ly 'having taken my husband', w't b^{C}y' lmysb yt ybrwh⟨w⟩y dbry 'now do you want to take my son's mandrakes!?' It is this focus that then gives perspective to Rachel's equally bitter reply -- bgyn kdn yšmš ^{C}myk blyly' hdyn thwt ⟨y⟩brwhwy dbryk 'because of this, let him use you tonight in payment for your son's mandrakes'! (Hebrew lākēn yiškab ^{C}immāk hallaylā taḥat dûdā'ê bənēk).

This same idiom occurs twice in Num 16:9, 13, also for MT hamə^{C}at, in the story of the death of Korah and his cronies. Here too the apparently "minor" discrepancies between the Aramaic and the Hebrew indicate conscious exegetical comment. The first use of h' z^{C}yr' hy' d' is at the beginning of Moses' major address to Korah and the "sons of Levi," and here the intent of the speech is to admonish them for desiring too much: 'is it an insignificant thing to you that the God of Israel has separated you', i.e., are you not satisfied with what you have been given? w'twn b^{C}yyn lmysb 'wp khnth rbth 'do you now want to take the High Priesthood also'? (MT ûbiqqaštem gam-kəhūnnā). Here the sin is explicitly stated. The second use of h' z^{C}yr' hy' d' is (mockingly) from the mouths of Dathan and Abiram: 'is it an insignificant thing that you brought us up from a land that produces good fruits, pure as milk and sweet as honey, to kill us off in the desert'? (MT hamə^{C}at he^{ce}lîtānû mē'ereṣ zābat ḥālāb ûdəbāš lah^{a}mîtēnû bammidbār). They then proceed to ridicule Moses further, who is grieved, and commands the "contest" that is ultimately the undoing of the renegades. Again, the sarcasm of the Aramaic is much more pointed than in the Hebrew, and it is the cleft sentence used twice by either side of the dispute that is the fulcrum around which the scene revolves.

SECTION B
The Expression of the Genitive Relation

Aramaic has three possible expressions of the genitive, and the question of the relationships between them has long been a vexing one. While all the issues have not been resolved, it is possible to enunciate some guidelines for the choice of one form over another, at least in the Aramaic of this targumic MS, and to specify some environments in which one form or another is expected to appear.[16]

The three genitive constructions are here referred to as Type A, Type B, and Type C, and they are as follows:

Type A: bryh dywsp /bəreh dəyosep/ 'the son of Joseph', i.e., noun with anticipatory pronominal suffix + d + noun

Type B: br' dywsp /bərā' dəyosep/ 'the son of Joseph', i.e., noun + d + noun

Type C: br ywsp /bar yosep/ 'the son of Joseph, i.e., noun + noun (the "construct state")

One can identify a number of kinds of expression in which one type appears to be preferred over another; moreoever, when that "expected" type is not used, the replacement is invariably Type C. In summary, one finds:

1) Nouns indicating inalienable possession - Type A.
    This is the case both with kinship terms (e.g., 'b 'father', 'm 'mother', etc.), and with other terms (e.g., byt 'house', yd 'hand', ywm 'day', etc.).

2) Common idioms - Type B
    This category includes nouns used often enough in the text of Genesis so that potential patterns can be identified (e.g., 'lh' 'god', 'r^c' 'land', mlk' 'king').

3) Anthropomorphic avoidances - Type A or Type A + Type C
    This is a small group of expressions usually used in paraphrase of the masoretic YHWH or '^{e}lōhîm (e.g., (šm) mmryh dYYY '(the name of) the word of God'). This group contrasts with other, non-formulaic expressions involving the name of God in which Type B is an acceptable form (e.g., ml'k' dYYY 'angel of the Lord', 'wrḥ' dYYY 'the way of the Lord').

4) Expansions of masoretic place names - Type B
    This includes places such as plṭywt' dqrt' 'the streets of the city', MT rəḥōbōt ^{c}îr, twr' dgbl' 'the mountain of Gabla', MT har śə^{c}îr, etc., and this group contrasts with other exegetical translation formulae, in which a masoretic idiom or idioms had one acceptable rendering into Aramaic, and which departed from the Hebrew in plainly exegetical terms (e.g., 'twn nwrhwn dkśd'y 'the furnace of the fire of Chaldeans', MT 'ûr kaśdîm 'Ur of the Chaldeans'). This group usually has combined genitives of the form Type C + Type A, or simple genitives of Type B.

For details of the sample, reference should be made to Table 4 at the end of this section. The following discussion presents the data for each of the four groups enumerated above, all of which is drawn from the book of Genesis. Consequently, textual reference is made solely by chapter and verse number, without continual specification that the text referred to is Genesis.

1. NOUNS INDICATING INALIENABLE POSSESSION.
1.A Kinship terms.

The following kinship terms are discussed: 'b 'father', 'h, 'brother', 'hh 'sister', 'm 'mother', 'mh 'handmaid', 'th 'wife', br 'son', brh 'daughter'. The semantics of kinship terms dictate that the possessor will always, of course, be a human being, or a group of human beings.

Most examples (91%) occur in passages with a masoretic Vorlage, usually a Hebrew construct form. The first four terms ('father', 'brother', 'sister', 'mother') occur a total of 31 times, all translating Hebrew constructs, and all translated by Type A genitives (e.g., 'bwhwn d-'; 'bwy d-; 'hwy d-; 'htyh d-; 'hth d-; 'mhwn d-; 'mh d-. In this MS, final heh can represent the definite article, the 3ms pronominal suffix, or the 3fs pronominal suffix, hence some of these forms can be interpreted as determined, i.e., Type B, though this seems unlikely given the general preference of all kinship terms for Type A). With one exception, the five examples without Vorlage also use Type A.

1.A.1 'Son'/'Daughter'.

The situation concerning the very frequently occurring noun br 'son' (and also brh 'daughter') presents a complicated picture. In the singular, the form bryh d- occurs three times, the form brh d- five times, all for the Hebrew construct ben. These five spellings brh appear to consist of the 3fs suffix three times and the 3ms suffix twice, though of course all five could also be interpreted as the determined state. In the plural, Type A (bnw(h)y d- 'sons of ...') occurs 40 times for the Hebrew plural construct bənê. The forms brtyh d-/brth d- 'daughter of...' occur six times for the Hebrew construct bat, and twice in a passage (34.31) that has no masoretic Vorlage. The determined state with 'aleph (i.e., Type B) occurs with this noun only once, 36.10 br' d^cdh 'the son of Adah', also for Hebrew construct ben. On the other hand, the Aramaic construct (Type C) is used, but in the following rather specific circumstances:

> (a) expressions of age -- br tš^cyn wtš^c šnyn 'ninety-nine years old' (17.1), brt tlt šnyn 'three years old' (15.9, Hebrew məšullešet);
>
> (b) expressions of membership -- br byty 'member of my household' (15.2), br ^cmy 'member of my people' (19.38, translating the proper name ben ^cammî), br nš(:) 'man', gwzl br ywn 'pigeon' (15.9), spyr br ^czyn 'young goat' (37.31), brt btw'l 'the daughter of Bethuel' (24.47), bny yśr'l 'sons of Israel' (etc. 32.33), bny 'nš' 'men', gdyy' bny ^cyzyy' 'goats' (27.16, Hebrew gədāyê hā^cizzîm), bnt yśr'l 'daughters of Israel' (30.13);
>
> (c) compound kinship terms -- br brh 'his grandson', br 'hwy 'son of his brother', br 'hth 'son of his sister', brt 'hwy drybwny 'the daughter of the brother of my lord' (24.27), bny bnyhwn d^cm' 'the sons of the sons of the people' (16.5).

In the case of these eight kinship terms, the preferred expression of the genitive relationship is this MS, either in passages with a masoretic Vorlage or without, is overwhelmingly Type A, Type B being restricted to six examples in three words, and Type C being restricted to 20 cases of the singular or plural of br, eight of brt. Many of these, however, occur in fixed idioms usually paraphrasing a particular Hebrew idiom.

1.B. Other terms.

There are six very common nouns used in expressions of inalienable possession which also occur exclusively or primarily in Type A, again usually fixed or formulaic expressions: 'pyn 'face', byt 'house', hyyn 'life', yd 'hand', ywm 'day', and šm 'name'. When these nouns do not occur in Type A genitives, the preferred expression of the genitive is then Type C. As was the case with the kinship terms, there are very few cases of Type B genitives with these words, when compared with Types A and C. Many of the occurrences of these nouns do not have a human possessor in the genitive relationship, as was the case with the kinship terms.

With these words, the preferred expression of the genitive relationship in this MS is Type A, with 62% of the examples (65 out of 105). Type B accounts for under 6% (six out of 105, two with the word byt, two with yd, one with ywm and one with šm). Statistically, Type C appears to have a much greater distribution than in kinship words (32%, or 34 out of 105 cases), but these include 15 used in phrases with the word 'py and 12 with the word ywm (especially ywmy hywy d- 'the days of the life of' for Hebrew yəmê.)

The most common of these is byt 'house', and it occurs some 24 times in Type A and twice in Type B. Type C is used only in formulae, mostly in verses without Vorlage, or in idioms which expand a single word in Hebrew:

> (a) without Vorlage -- lšn byt qdšh/qdš 'the language of the sanctuary' (three times, plus 35.18 spelled lšwn:); byt mqdš' 'temple' (24:62 and 27.27); byt mdrš'/mdršhwn '(their) academy' (25.22 and 34.31); byt mr^cy 'pasture' (13:7); byt tldwwty 'the house of my birth' (16.5);
>
> (b) expansions of Hebrew -- byt mqdšy' 'temple' (28.22, paraphrasing the Hebrew bêt '^elōhîm); byt nhwr 'window' (6.16, Hebrew sōhar); byt špr 'best' (23.6, Hebrew mibhar).

1.C Conclusion

The situation with nouns expressing inalienable possession is very clear -- Type A is overwhelmingly the preferred expression of the genitive. This is so in part because the possessor (or what Kaddari calls member B of the phrase) in such expressions is usually a human being (though not necessarily with expressions other than kinship terms, as we have seen). Of the sample of 179 examples of kinship terms, 81% are of Type A, 3% of Type B, and 16% of Type C. Of the

sample of 135 non-kinship terms, 55% are of Type A, 6% of Type B, and 39% of Type C. When totalled together, the entire sample of 314 examples of terms used to express inalienable possession consists of 70% Type A, 4% Type B, and 26% Type C (see Table 4 below).

2.   COMMON FIXED IDIOMS
2.A   Common Idioms

There are a number of nouns in the MS that are used primarily in certain oft-recurring expressions. Certainly in the text of Genesis, such idioms as 'the god of...', 'the land of...', 'the king of ...', etc. appear often enough to enable certain conclusions to be drawn as regards the use of the idioms. The words included here in this section are 'lh' 'god', 'r^C' 'land', gnt' 'garden', hyyt' 'animals', mlk' 'king', nšmh 'breath', ^{C}bd' 'servant', ^{C}wp' 'fowl', ^{C}pr' 'dust', tr^C' 'door'. This list is by no means exhaustive; the words chosen merely occur frequently enough in the same or similar expressions to enable patterns to be determined. The immediate conclusion that can be drawn is that in these common expressions, Type B is not only an acceptable form, but indeed the overwhelmingly preferred expression of the genitive.

The three most common idioms, 'god', 'land', and 'king' can be taken as representative:

(i)   'god of...' -- 13 out of 25 Type B ('lh' d-). Moreover, there are nine cases of 'lhh, some or all of which may be Type B (there is only one sure example of Type A, 'lhyh d'b' (31.42). There are also two cases of Type C, 'lh šmy' 'god of heaven' (28.3, 35.11).

(ii)   'land of...' -- 21 cases of Type B, 'r^C' d- (+ toponym); five cases of Type A, followed by ethnonym. Finally, there are also four definite occurrences of Type C genitives. Furthermore, there are no less than ten other occurrences of the determined 'r^C' (= ['ar^{C}a] used in a construct (nine of which translate the Hebrew construct 'ereṣ; one, 29.1 l'r^C' mdynh' 'to the land of the east' is for the Hebrew directive 'arṣā benê qedem), and these are presumably all copyist errors for the construct 'r^C (= ['^{a}ra^C].

(iii)   'king of ...' -- 25 of 28 Type B; three of 28 Type A; no examples of Type C.

2.B   Conclusion

There are ten common nouns dealt with in this section, comprising a total of 145 examples of the three genitives. Ninety-four (65%) of the cases occur with three nouns only, 'lh', 'r^C' and mlk'. Of the 145 cases, 16 (11%) are of Type A, 96 (66%) are of Type B and 33 (22%) are of Type C. When we examine the situation with the three most common nouns, however, the picture is even more striking: Type A comprises 11 cases (12%), Type B comprises 66 cases (70%) and Type C comprises 17 cases (18%). Even if we consider as Type A all those forms ending in -h, the situation is still one in which the predominant form is Type B [Type A would then consist of 29 cases (20%), Type B 83 cases (57%) and Type C 33 cases (22%)]. It becomes clear from these figures that when one examines nonformulaic occurrences of commonly recurring nouns the preferred expression of the genitive is overwhelmingly Type B; but in its absence Type C is used (see Table 4 below).

3.   DEISTIC EXPRESSIONS
3.A   Anthropomorphic Avoidances

One of the most characteristic uses of the genitive with d- forms (Types A and B) in the MS is in expressions referring to God, usually in euphemistic paraphrases to avoid anthropomorphism. The masoretic forms YHWH and '^{e}lōhîm are both translated by numerous expressions, primarily of Type A or of a combination of Type C followed by Type A. There does not appear to be any significant factor involved in the choice of which euphemistic expression translates which masoretic form, although (šm) mmryh dYYY '(the name of) the word of God' does occur more frequently. The formulaic nature of some of these specialized translation techniques is again apparent in the almost total lack of Type B genitives.

The expressions in this group are:

Type A   --   mmryh dYYY 'the word of God' - 16 examples.
              'yqryh dYYY 'the glory of God' - 5 examples.
Type B   --   mymr' dYYY - 1 example (21.23).
              šm' dYYY 'the name of God' - 1 example (24.6, but note also 3 cases of šmh dYYY, = Type A?).
Type C   --   yqr škyntyh 'the glory of his Shekinah' (3.24 + yqr škynty in 9.27).
Type C plus Type A   --   šm mmryh dYYY 'the name of the word of God' - 11 examples.
              yqr škyntyh dYYY 'the glory of the Shekinah

of God' - 5 examples.

ql mmrh dYYY 'the voice of the word of God' - 2 examples.

Type C plus Type B - šm mmr' dYYY - 1 example (15.6).

3.B Other Terms

The fixed nature of the above formulae is dramatically highlighted when one examines the other expressions involving the names of God (again usually translating the masoretic YHWH or 'eₗōhîm) which do not appear to necessitate avoidance of anthropomorphism. In this group of expressions, Type B appears as an acceptable form.

Indeed, of the 16 expressions involving the names of God used other than in technical or religious formulae, only one is clearly of Type A, four are clearly Type B, and there are only combined forms of Type C (e.g., twr mqdš' dYYY 'the mountain of the sanctuary of the Lord', 22.14, for Hebrew har YHWH). Unfortunately, this is a very small sample, and conclusions must be tentative. The situation is further complicated by the orthographic alternation alluded to previously, viz., the possibility of spelling the determined state with either 'aleph or heh, since eight of these genitive examples are spelled with -h, and could be interpreted as Type A or Type B. A final complication is the use of abbreviated forms, making it impossible to tell whether a Type A or Type B genitive is intended.

The expressions are:

ml'kh dYYY -- 'angel of the Lord' - 5 examples (all the rest occur only once).

ml'k' dYYY -- 'angel of the Lord'

dhlth dYYY -- 'fear of the Lord'

dhlt' dYYY -- 'fear of the Lord'

brykh dYYY -- 'blessed of the Lord'

gynt‵ dYYY -- 'garden of the Lord' (abbreviated)

'wrh' dYYY -- 'the way of the Lord'

brktyh dYYY -- 'the blessing of the Lord'

rwgz' dYYY -- 'the anger of the Lord'

rwgz‵ dYYY -- 'the anger of the Lord' (abbreviated)

There is also one Type C plus Type B:

twr mqdš' dYYY -- 'the mountain of the sanctuary of the Lord'.

3.C Conclusion

The formulaic uses of deistic expressions indicate a preference for Type A (53%) or combinations of Type C plus Type A (34%), and there are less than 6% Type B genitives (three examples). In marked contrast, the non-formulaic expressions (even in the extremely limited sample available) do not have such restrictions. In this group, at least five out of the 16 (42%) are of Type B, and possibly as many as 13 out of 16. There is only one sure Type A, and one combined Type C plus Type B (see Table 4 below).

4. EXPANSIONS OF MASORETIC FORMS

4.A Exegetical Translation Formulae

One of the more striking characteristics of targumic language is the standard literary or exegetical expansion of various masoretic idioms or place names. Some of these are well-known interpretive renderings, such as 'twn nwrhwn dkśd'y 'the furnace of the fire of the Chaldeans' for 'ûr kaśdîm 'Ur of the Chaldeans', though others are less obvious expansions of a Hebrew base, e.g., yhws tldwwtyh d- 'the genealogy of...' (for Hebrew tōlₐdōt, or zrᶜyyt bn(y)k 'the families of your children' (for Hebrew zeraᶜ).

This section contains a limited group of four exegetical expansion idioms, a regrettably small sample of only 26 examples, however the general system is clear. Seventeen of the 26 examples (65%) translate with a combined genitive idiom, nine with a simple genitive of Type A, B, or C. The idioms are 'twn nwrhwn dkśd'y, yhws tldwwtyh d-, qhl knyšt 'wmyn ṣdyqyn, and zrᶜyyt bnyk.

These idioms tend to be combined genitive forms, usually Type C + Type A:

Combined Forms - 65% (17)
  Type C + Type A - 42% (11)
  Type C + Type C - 19% (5)
  Type C + Type B - 4% (1)
Uncombined Forms - 35% (9)
  Type A - 4% (1)
  Type B - 19% (5)
  Type C - 12% (3)

4.B Expansions of place names

Many place names which are of the construct type in the Hebrew text are expanded in the Aramaic translation, usually by a Type B genitive. These at times reflect an interpretive

rendering, at other times an apparent misunderstanding of the Hebrew place name.

When a Hebrew construct place name is translated into Aramaic, the preferred form again is a Type B genitive. Of 21 cases, 14 (67%) are of Type B, though perhaps the three spelled with -h could be considered Type A. These 14 examples also include one combined form of Type B followed by Type B, mdbr' db'rh dšb̌^c.

There are five cases (24%) of Type C, including one combined form of Type C plus Type C (^cyn gdy tmry') and only one sure case (5%) of Type A, and that is the prepositional phrase bgwwh dqrth 'inside the city'. Even if the three examples spelled with -h are considered as Type A, the situation still remains heavily weighted towards the Type B genitives, viz., Type A = 19%, Type B = 57% and Type C = 24%.

4.C Conclusion

This final section presents us with the data that are the most difficult to interpret, but at the same time the most tantalizing. For in these expansions of masoretic idioms we come face to face with the real essence of the targumic method. The interpretive exegesis (e.g., zr^cyyt bnyyk) is at once the most subtle and the most opaque of the translation methodologies. Yet it is clear that these are fixed translation idioms -- the "translator" was not at liberty to translate as he wished, but was obliged to render each "loaded" Hebrew term with its appropriate technical Aramaic equivalent, at once both translating and interpreting the biblical text.

There are a total of 46 idioms discussed in both sections 5.A and 5.B. Simple genitives of Type A, B, or C comprise 59% (27 cases) of the examples, combined genitives comprise 41% (19 cases). Once again the sample is regrettably small, however the general outline is clear. The exegetical expansion idioms, both translation formulae and place names, contain 39% (18 cases) Type B genitives (but 67% of the simple, uncombined genitive forms). As we have noted previously, the alternative to the preferred form is always Type C (15%, i.e., 7 cases, but 26% of the simple genitive form), one of which is a prepositional phrase.

As regards combined genitive forms, the preferred idiom is Type C plus Type A (11 cases, 24%, but 58% of the combined forms). Similarly, the alternative to the preferred idiom is Type C plus Type C (6 cases, 13%, but 31% of the combined forms). Finally, there is one example of Type C plus Type B, and one Type B plus Type B (see Table 4 below).

5.   GENERAL

It is clear from this analysis that Type A genitives are 'marked', and occur in particular in expressions of inalienable possession and in euphemistic anthropomorphic avoidance. Type B is 'unmarked' and occurs in most "common" phrases. Type C is invariably the "second choice," though the motivations for its use are not immediately apparent.

Combined forms of these genitives are common, especially when translating highly technical religious idioms. In this case, combinations are usually Type C plus Type A or B (rarely Type C plus Type C or Type B plus Type B).

TABLE 4:

Statistical Summary of Genitive Forms
in Targum MS Neofiti 1 (Genesis)

		Type A	Type B	Type C
I.a.	Inalienable Possession			
	Kinship Terms	81%	3%	16%
	Other Terms	55%	6%	39%
b.	Common Idioms [a]	11%	66%	22%
II.a.	Deistic Expressions			
	Anthropomorphic			
	Avoidance	53%	6%	4% [b]
	Other Terms	6%	42%	---[c]
			(>81%)	
b.	Masoretic Expansions	4%	39%	15% [d]

NOTES:
   a. The three most common idioms, 'god', 'land', 'king', comprised Type A - 12%, Type B - 70%, Type C - 18%.
   b. Combined genitives C + A - 34%.
   c. Combined genitives C + B - 6%.
   d. Combined genitives C + A - 24%; C + C - 13%; C + B - 2%; B + B - 2%.

NOTES

[1] Both these periphrastic forms are common in mishnaic Hebrew, as well as in Middle Aramaic, and the question of mutual influence is an open one, as is that of the direction of that influence. Cf. Segal, "Grammar," p. 167, and also Fink, "Aspects," p. 41 for the same phenomenon in "Maimonidean" Hebrew.

[2] When such a form does occur in the MT, it is always copied in the Targum, e.g., Gen 1:6 wyhwy mprš, MT wîhî mabdîl, Gen 39:22 hw' hwh ᶜbd, MT hû' hāyā ᶜōśe, Deut 9:24 msrbyn hwytwn, MT mamrîm heyîtem, etc.

[3] See, e.g., Bergstrasser, "Grammatik," pp. 72-74, for examples.

[4] See Kutscher, "History," pp. 131-132.

[5] The Aramaic cannot translate these participles by simple participles, for, as in mishnaic Hebrew, the participle alone signifies either a present tense, or else an immediate or assured future. The following extracts from the midrashic insertion in Gen 38:25 concerning the trial of Tamar will serve to illustrate the use of both the simple participle and the use of the imperfect as modus: ...tlt ᶜyyny (sic) bmrwmy' w'mrt...hb ly tlt' shdy w'nh mqyymh lk tlt' ṣdyqyn...kd nḥtyn bnwr' yqydt' wmqdšyn šmk qdyš'...w'nhrwn ᶜyynh wḥmt ythwn...w'mrt lyh gbr' d'ylyn dylyh mynyh 'nh mᶜbrh w'nh 'p ᶜl gb d'nh yqdh l' mprsyyh brm śhdy dbyny lbynyh hw' ytn blybyh lmyḥmy ythwn bšᶜt' hdh wyprwq yty mn dyn' rb' hdyn... '...she raised her eyes on high and said: "...give me my three witnesses and I shall (surely) raise up for you three just men ...when they shall go down into the burning fire then they shall sanctify your holy name..." Then her eyes were enlightened and she saw them...and she said to him: "The man to whom these belong, by him am I pregnant and I, even though I shall burn, I shall not reveal him; but rather the (or 'my') witness that is between me and him may it allow his heart to see them at this time, and may it deliver me from this great judgement."...'

Here the participles mqyymh, nḥtyn, mqdšyn, yqdh, and mprsyyh all indicate the future; the participle mᶜbrh is stative, and hence describes her condition at the time of address. By contrast, the imperfects ytn are yprwq are both precative. The situation can at times be complicated when the Aramaic uses the imperfect to translate an MT imperfect,

however cases such as this midrash are instructive and can be found throughout the MS. It should also be noted that the English translation in the *editio princeps* does not understand the Aramaic in this fashion and translates both as simple English futures: "will put" and "will deliver" (pp. 603-604).

[6]In Hebrew, stative verbs (including 'hb) in the perfect express a present condition, e.g., 'āhabtā 'you are in love with' (Gen 22:2) or 'āhabtî 'I am in love with' (Exod 21:5), see Gesenius, "Grammatik," p. 321, 106g. This is not the case in Aramaic and this (mis?)understanding of the MT accounts for the (mis?)translation of, e.g., the above two verbs in the MS by the perfect: Gen 22:2 dbr k[c]n yt brk yt yḥydk dy rḥmt yt yṣhq... 'Take, therefore, your son, your only one, whom *you have loved(?)*, Isaac...'; Exod 21:5 w'm mymr ymr [c]bd' rḥmyt yt rbny yt 'tty wyt bny lyt 'nh npq lḥyrwth. 'And if the slave actually says: "*I have loved(?)* my lord, my wife, and my children; I shall not go forth to freedom."'

[7]It should be mentioned that the English translation in the *editio princeps* does not understand the Aramaic thus, and translates: "when they had eaten and drunk they wanted to give him...you have eaten...they did not move...until he had converted them and he used to teach them...and he worshipped and prayed..." (p. 550). However, the participles cannot be translated as perfects, nor can the compound forms be understood as punctual pluperfects, since the essence of both is the durativeness of the action expressed.

[8]Many of the other compound imperfect examples, which either mimic a Hebrew compound, or translate an MT participle or imperfect, are made up of a compound of imperfect of hwh + passive participle. This unusual fact may be partially accounted for by the general development away from the use of separate passive verbal stems (Gt/Dt and Ct), and their replacement by various paraphrastic expressions. Examples of this are common: Gen 4:12 gly wmṭlṭl tyhwy qyn b'r[c]' 'exiled and cast out will you be, Oh Cain, in the land' (MT nā[c] wānād tihye bā'āreṣ, and cf. Gen 4:14 for a similar expression); Deut 28:29/33/34 thwwn...[c]ṣyn wqzylyn/wthwwn...[c]ṣn (sic) wrṣyṣyn/wthwwn mšg[c]yn 'you will be oppressed and robbed'/'and you will be oppressed and crushed'/'and you will be driven mad' (MT wəhāyîtā...[c]āšûq wəgāzûl/wəhāyîtā [c]āšûq wərāṣûṣ/ wəhāyîtā məšuggā[c]'); Gen 25:23 wrbh yhwwy mš[c]bd qdm z[c]yr' 'and the greater

shall be subjugated before the smaller' (MT wərab ya[ca]bōd ṣā[c]îr).

[9]The spelling of the participle qtylyn does not necessarily indicate a passive participle, and many active participles are spelled thus, with -y- to indicate a vocalic shewa, so qātilin < qātəlin.

[10]The Samaritan Pentateuch does have 'et, see *Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, ad loc., p. 29.]

[11]Cf. Sperber, "Onkelos," Vol I, ad loc., p. 53, for the form in Onkelos wyš'lynk, and also the variant form in other MSS wš'ylynk. One should probably also read the form here as wyš'lynk, due to w/y confusion, see Chapter 2, Orthography.

[12]This is a condensed version of a paper "Nominal Syntax in the Language of Codex Vatican Neofiti 1: Sentences Containing a Predicate Adjective," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 42 No. 3, 1983, pp. 181-194.

[13]This device is familiar for other Aramaic dialects (and other Semitic languages). Examples and discussion can be found in Gideon Goldenberg, "Tautological Infinitive," *Israel Oriental Studies* I, 1971, pp. 36-85, and for full details, see H.J. Polotsky, *Etudes de syntaxe copte*, Le Caire, 1944, reprinted in his *Collected Papers*, Jerusalem, 1971, pp. 102-202.

[14]Cf. Ellen Prince, "A Comparison of Left-Dislocation and Topicalization in Discourse," University of Pennsylvania, MS.

[15]Not "They are both just," etc. as the English translation in the *editio princeps* states, p. 604.

[16]An expanded version of this section has appeared as "Nominal Syntax in the Language of Codex Vatican Neofiti 1: The Genitive Relationship," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 102.2 (1982), pp. 297-308. The data for this study were drawn solely from the text of the book of Genesis in the MS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aberbach, Moses, and Bernard Grossfeld. Targum Onkelos on
     Genesis 49. Society of Biblical Literature Aramaic
     Studies, Number 1. 1976.

_____ and Bernard Grossfeld. Targum Onkelos to Genesis.
     Center for Judaic Studies, Ktav, New York. 1982.

Bacher, W. "Targum." Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. 12, 1906,
     pp. 57-59.

Bauer, Hans, and Pontus Leander. Grammatik des Biblisch-
     Aramäischen. Tübingen, Max Niemyer Verlag. 1927.
     Reprinted Georg Olms Verlag, 1969.

Baumgartner, Walter. Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexicon zum
     Alten Testament. Leiden, Brill. Vol. I, 1967; Vol. II, 1974.

Bergsträsser, G. Hebräische Grammatik, Vol. II, Verbum.
     Leipzig, J.C. Hinrichs. 1929. Reprinted
     Georg Olms Verlag, 1962.

Berliner, Abraham. Raschi. Der Kommentar des Salomo b. Isak über
     den Pentateuch (Hebrew). Frankfurt a.M., J. Kauffmann. 1905.

Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. Eds. K. Ellinger and W. Rudolph.
     Deutsche Biblestiftung, Stuttgart. 1977.

Bowker, John. The Targums and Rabbinic Literature. Cambridge,
     University Press. 1969.

Bravmann, M.M. "The Idea of 'Possession' in Linguistic
     Expression." Studies in Semitic Philology, pp. 357-373.
     Leiden, Brill. 1977.

Brockelmann, C. Semitische Sprachwissenschaft. Berlin/Leipzig,
     Göschen'sche Verlagshandlung. 1916.

Cohen, Gerson D. "Esau as Symbol in Early Medieval Thought."
     Jewish Medieval and Renaissance Studies, Vol. IV, 1967,
     pp. 19-48.

Coxon, Peter W. "The Syntax of the Aramaic of Daniel:
     A Dialectal Study." Hebrew Union College Annual, Vol. 47,
     1977, pp. 107-122.

Dalman, Gustaf H. Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch.
     Leipzig, J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. 1894.

_____. Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Wörterbuch. Frankfort a.M.,
     J. Kauffmann. 1901.

Díez Macho, Alejandro. Neophyti 1: Targum Palestinense. Consejo
     Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas. Vol. I, Genesis,
     1968; Vol. II, Exodo, 1970; Vol. III, Levitico, 1971; Vol. IV,
     Numeros, 1974; Vol. V, Deuteronomio, 1978.

_____. "Le targum palestinien." Exegese biblique et judaïsme,
     J.-E. Ménard (ed.), Strasbourg, 1973, pp. 14-77.

Epstein, Jacob N. A Grammar of Babylonian Aramaic (Hebrew).
    Jerusalem, Magnes Press. 1960.

Fink, David. "Aspects in the Mišne Tora." Hebrew Annual Review,
    Vol. 5, 1981, pp. 37-46.

Fitzmyer, Joseph. The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1: A
    Commentary. Rome, Pontifical Biblical Institute. 1966.

_____. Review of Neophyti 1, Tomo I: Genesis, by
    Alejandro Díez Macho (ed.). Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 32,
    1970, pp. 107-112.

_____. Review of Neophyti 1, Tomo II: Exodo, by
    Alejandro Díez Macho (ed.). Journal of Biblical Literature,
    91, No. 4, 1972, pp. 575-578.

_____. "The Languages of Palestine in the First Century A.D."
    A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays, Scholars
    Press, Chico. 1979, pp. 29-56.

_____. "The Phases of the Aramaic Language." A Wandering
    Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays, Scholars Press, Chico.
    1979, pp. 57-84.

Gesenius, Wilhelm. Hebräische Grammatik (Revised by E. Kautzsch),
    Leipzig. 1909. Reprinted by Georg Olms Verlag, 1962.

Goldenberg, Gideon. "Tautological Infinitive." Israel Oriental
    Studies, I, 1971, pp. 36-85.

Golomb, David. Targumno, Part I: Genesis. Berlin. 1932.

Golomb, David M. A Grammar of the Aramaic in Codex Vatican
    Neophyti 1 (Genesis). Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.
    1978.

_____. "Nominal Syntax in the Language of Codex Vatican
    Neofiti 1: The Genitive Relationship." Journal of the
    American Oriental Society, Vol. 102.2, 1982, pp. 297-308.

_____. "Nominal Syntax in the Language of Codex Vatican
    Neofiti 1: Sentences Containing a Predicate Adjective."
    Journal of Near Eastern Studies, 42, No. 3, 1983, pp. 181-194.

Goshen-Gottstein, M.H. "The 'Third Targum' on Esther and Ms.
    Neofiti 1." Biblica, Vol. 56, No. 3, 1975, pp. 301-329.

Greenfield, Jonas. "Standard Literary Aramaic." Actes du premier
    congrès international de linguistique sémitique et
    chamito-sémitique, held in Paris, 1969, André Caquot and
    David Cohen (eds.). The Hague, 1974, pp. 280-289.

Grossfeld, Bernard. A Bibliography of Targum Literature. Hebrew
    Union College Press, Ktav, New York. Vol. I, 1972; Vol. II,
    1977.

Grossfeld, Bernard. "The Relationship Between Biblical Hebrew
    נרבה and נוכ and their Corresponding Aramaic Equivalents in
    the Targum - נצרק, אפק, אזל: A Preliminary Study in Aramaic-
    Hebrew Lexicogrphy." Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche
    Wissenschaft, 91, No. 1, 1979, pp. 107-123.

Haneman, Gideon. A Morphology of Mishnaic Hebrew (Hebrew).
    Tel Aviv, Texts and Studies in the Hebrew Language and
    Related Subjects, Tel Aviv University. 1980.

Hayward, Robert. "The Memra of YHWH and the Development of its
    Use in Targum Neofiti 1." Journal of Jewish Studies,
    Vol. 25, No. 3, 1974, pp. 412-418.

Hengel, Martin. Judaism and Hellenism. 2 Volumes, Philadelphia,
    Fortress Press. 1974.

Holladay, William L. A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the
    Old Testament. Leiden, Brill. 1971.

Hyman, Aaron. Torah Hakethubah Vehamessurah, Part 1: Pentateuch.
    Tel Aviv, Dvir. 1979.

Jastrow, Marcus. A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli
    and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature. The Judaica
    Press, New York. 1975.

Joüon, P. Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique. Rome. 1923.

Kaddari, Menahem Z. "The Use of -ד Clauses in the Language of
    Targum Onkelos." Textus, Vol. 3, 1963, pp. 36-59.

_____. "Construct State and di-Phrases in Imperial Aramaic."
    Proceedings of the International Conference on Semitic
    Studies, held in Jerusalem, 1965, pp. 102-115. Jerusalem,
    Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities. 1969.

Kasher, Menahem M. Torah Shelemah, Vol. 24: Aramaic Versions of
    the Bible. Jerusalem, American Biblical Encyclopedia Society.
    1974.

Kasovsky, Hajim J. Concordance to Targum Onkelos (Hebrew).
    Jerusalem, Ha'ivri Press. 1935.

Kaufman, Stephen A. The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic. The
    Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago Assyriological
    Studies, No. 19, the University of Chicago Press. 1974.

Klein, Michael. "Deut 31:7, תבוא or תביא?" Journal of Biblical
    Literature, 92, No. 4, 1973, pp. 584-585.

_____. "Notes on the Printed Edition of MS Neofiti 1."
    Journal of Semitic Studies, Vol. 19, No. 2, 1974, pp. 216-230.

_____. "Elias Levitas and MS Neofiti 1." Biblica, Vol. 56,
    No. 2, 1975, pp. 242-246.

_____."Converse Translation: A Targumic Technique."
    Biblica, Vol. 57, No. 4, 1976, pp. 515-537.

_____. "The Translation of Anthropomorphisms and
    Anthropopathisms in the Targumim." Vetus Testamentum,
    Supplement, Vol. 32, Congress Volume, 1981, pp. 162-177.

Krauss, Samuel. Griechische und Lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud,
    Midrash und Targum. Vol. I, Berlin, 1898; Vol. II, Berlin,
    1899. Reprinted Georg Olms Verlag. 1964.

Kutscher, Eduard Y. "Studies in Galilean Aramaic" (Hebrew).
    Tarbiz, Vol. 21, 1950, pp. 192-205; Vol. 22, 1950-51,
    pp. 53-63, 185-192; Vol. 23, 1951, pp. 36-60. Reprinted by
    Academon, Jerusalem, 1969. Translated by Michael Sokoloff,
    Studies in Galilean Aramaic, Bar Ilan Press, Ramat Gan. 1976.

_____. "Aramaic." Current Trends in Linguistics, ed.
    Thomas A. Sebeok, Vol. 6, 1970, pp. 347-412.

_____. A History of Aramaic, Part 1 (Hebrew). Jerusalem,
    Academon. 1973.

_____. The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah
    Scroll. Leiden, Brill, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of
    Judah, Vol. VI. 1974.

_____. A History of the Hebrew Language (ed. by
    Raphael Kutscher). Jerusalem, Magnes Press. 1982.

Le Déaut, Roger. La nuit pascale. Rome, Institut Biblique
    Pontifical. 1963.

Levy, B. Barry. The Language of Neophyti 1: A Descriptive and
    Comparative Grammar of the Palestinian Targum. Ph.D.
    dissertation, New York University. 1974.

Levy, J. Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim.
    Koln, Joseph Melzer Verlag. 1959.

Lieberman, Saul. Greek in Jewish Palestine. New York, Jewish
    Theological Seminary of America. 1942.

_____. Texts and Studies. New York, Ktav. 1974.

Lund, Shirley and Julia Foster. Variant Versions of Targumic
    Traditions Within Codex Neofiti 1. Society of Biblical
    Literature Aramaic Studies, Number 2. 1977.

Margolis, Max. Lehrbuch der aramäischen Sprache. München, C.H.
    Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1910.

Martin, M. Fitzmaurice. "The Paleographical Character of Codex
    Vatican Neofiti 1." Textus, Vol. 3, 1963, pp. 1-35.

McNamara, Martin. The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum
    to the Pentateuch. Rome, Pontifical Biblical Institute.
    1966.

_____. Targum and Testament. Shannon, Irish University Press.
    1972.

Melammed, Ezra Z. Bible Commentators, Vol. I (Hebrew). Jerusalem,
    Magnes Press. 1975.

Miller, Jonathan Robert. A Grammar of the Type II Marginalia
    Within Codex Neofiti 1 with Attention to Other Aramaic
    Sources. Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University. 1979.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. "Notes on the Syntax of Biblical Aramaic."
    Journal of Semitic Studies, Vol. XI, No. 2, 1966, pp. 151-167.

Polotsky, Hans J. Etudes de syntaxe copte. Le Caire. 1944.
    Reprinted in Collected Papers, Jerusalem, Magnes Press. 1971.

Porath, Ephraim. Mishnaic Hebrew (Hebrew). Jerusalem, Bialik
    Foundation of the Jewish Agency. 1938.

Prince, Ellen. A Comparison of Left-Dislocation and Topicalization
    in Discourse. University of Pennsylvania. MS.

Rosenthal, Franz. A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic. Wiesbaden,
    Otto Harrasowitz. 1963.

Seeligmann, Isac L. The Septuagint Version of Isaiah.
    Leiden, Brill. 1948.

Segal, Moses H. "Misnaic Hebrew and its Relation to Biblical
    Hebrew and to Aramaic." The Jewish Quarterly Review, Vol. XX,
    1908, pp. 647-737.

_____. A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew. Oxford. Clarendon Press.
    1927.

Segert, Stanislav. Altaramäische Grammatik. Leipzig, Veb Verlag
    Enzyklopädie. 1975.

Sperber, Alexander. The Bible in Aramaic. Leiden, Brill.
    Vol. I, 1959; Vol. II, 1959; Vol. III, 1962; Vol. IVA, 1968;
    Vol. IVB, 1973.

Stenning, J.F. The Targum of Isaiah. Oxford. 1949.

Stevenson, W.B. Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic. Oxford,
    Clarendon Press. 1924.

Tal (Rosenthal), Abraham. "Ms. Neophyti 1: The Palestinian Targum
    to the Pentateuch." Israel Oriental Studies, IV, 1974,
    pp. 31-43.

_____. The Language of the Targum of the Former Prophets and its
    Position within the Aramaic Dialects. Tel Aviv, Texts and
    Studies in the Hebrew Language and Related Subjects, Tel Aviv
    University. 1975.

Weil, Gerard E. "Le codex Neophiti I: à propos de l'article de
    M. Fitzmaurice Martin." Textus, Vol. 4, 1964, pp. 225-229.

York, Anthony. "The Dating of Targumic Literature. Journal for
    the Study of Judaism," Vol. V, No. 1, 1974, pp. 49-62.

INDEX OF VERSES CITED