ABSTRACT

The use of formally marked and unmarked nouns varies and has changed in Aramaic dialects throughout the course of history. Until recently, it was assumed that determination in nouns in Targum Prophets was no longer working properly since extant grammars do not point out specific rules of grammar and syntax in this regard. It has been argued that the marked form of the noun came to depose the unmarked form. However, a focused study on Targum Samuel by Renaud Kuty (2010) demonstrates that the retention or abandonment of determinate and indeterminate nominal forms functions according to two linguistic systems in this Targum. This contribution investigates the retention or abandonment of final long A in nominal forms in Targum Malachi by observing how marked and unmarked nominal forms appear in typical grammatical, syntactic, and semantic arrangements, and what the impact of discourse perspective is.

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Due to the different Aramaic dialects and peculiar scribal traditions that characterise diverse Targum traditions, the retention or abandonment of marked and unmarked nominal forms in Targumic renderings of the Hebrew Bible remains a relevant topic for scholarly investigation. Various studies show that over time the use of formally marked and unmarked forms changed.

There are several challenges regarding how the retention or abandonment of final long A in nominal forms affects their meaning since the difference between the uses of “emphatic” or “definite” forms varies from dialect to dialect and also between the

1 Kaufman (2013:5) notes, “... we cannot escape the conclusion that every composition has unique characteristics that deviate from the normative type ...”

Semitic languages. In older Aramaic (through Middle Aramaic), final long A indicates definiteness and is marked for that (Kaufman 2014a; Stevenson 1999:22; Rosenthal 2006:27–28; Schuele 2012:19–21). But in other languages the use of the marker may be different.

In linguistic terminology, nominal forms in Aramaic with final A (e.g., אֲחָא) are referred to as “emphatic”. In Eastern Aramaic, nouns with the addition of final A became semantically unmarked (cf. CAL 2017; Kaufman 2014a). This means that basic forms of nouns changed from being unmarked without final A in the absolute state to being unmarked with final A in the emphatic state. By implication therefore, the semantic markedness of a noun was no longer revealed from the addition of the final A. But the process of change was gradual and so we find that in Jewish Literary Aramaic Targumic (JLAtg) the distinction between definite and indefinite nominal forms is still flexible. What may at times appear to be a change in emphasis is actually not; it could be a literal translation of the Hebrew text.

A further problem is that scholars do not necessarily agree on terminology. Renaud Kuty (2005:187) defines the status emphaticus as “the determinate form of the noun” and the status absolutus as “the indeterminate form of the noun”. Stephen Kaufman (2014a) is critical of this labelling. His argument is that scholars developed terminology like “emphatic vs. absolute” because the form with final A became the unmarked form in later Eastern Aramaic and the “absolute” became the marked form. In his view, the terminology “emphatic vs. absolute” is incorrectly used for earlier Aramaic and is not even correct for Eastern Aramaic since the so-called “emphatic” is

---

3 As per e-mail correspondence with Kaufman (2014a).
4 Rosenthal (2006:28) submits that the definite article is a demonstrative element.
5 For an overview on determination in Aramaic, see Kuty (2010:19–21). He observes that by the LA period (ca. 200–700 C.E.), the dialects of the eastern part of the Achaemenid Empire had witnessed a “thorough weakening of the determining force of the st. emph”. The status emphaticus had become semantically unmarked and was gradually promoted to the status of the basic form of the noun. Consequently, other methods to express determination and indetermination emerged.
not “emphatic” at all but simply the normal form of the word. Presumably, therefore, greater clarity on this subject will only be gained from more focussed studies on the incidence and use of the definite article in the individual Targumim.

With respect to the incidence of determination and indetermination in the different prophetic books of the Targum Prophets (Tg. Neb.), only the Targum Prophets to Samuel (Tg. Sam.) has received individual attention by Kuty (2005; 2010). The problem of determination in the Tg. Neb. is compounded because questions of its date and place of origin have not yet been satisfactorily resolved (cf. Kuty 2010:21; Flesher and Chilton 2011:228). It is now generally believed that its text derives from second century Eretz Yisrael (Kaufman 2014a; cf. also Flesher and Chilton 2011:226-227; Ho 2009:25). When it was accepted further along as final, it was transmitted yet again and even repeatedly in the East. According to Kaufmann (2014b), subsequent changes can probably be attributed to later scribes who were primarily familiar with Talmudic Aramaic (cf. also Ho 2009:10–25). Basically, Tg. Neb. is a text written in Jewish Literary Aramaic (JLA) with adstrates of Babylonian forms due to later scribal changes (Kaufman 2013:3–4; Kaufman 2014c; cf. also Kuty 2010:20–21).7

**METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

This study will focus on the question of nominal markedness in the Targum Prophets to Malachi (Tg. Mal.) in line with a linguistic approach. In this approach, nouns that come with the definite article are labelled “marked” or “emphatic” (in linguistic terminology) in correspondence with the CAL database. The status of determination of “marked” nouns is defined from the way they operate on the level of lexical meaning (idiomatic expression), morphology (type and form), grammar (apposition), syntax (phrase, clause, genitive relationship), and semantics.

---

7 “Adstrates” here refers to systematic influences or a layer of borrowings in JLA from Eastern Aramaic.
With regard to the notion of “idiom”, Kuty’s observation (2005:195) is significant, namely that “the status in which a noun occurs is not open to variation, but rather pre-
determined by the larger context of the set phrase in which the noun is embedded”.

Nouns in this study are categorised according to “types” and “forms”. Noun
“types” may include abstract, collective, common, mass, concrete, participles used
substantively, proper, and vocative. The description noun “forms” refers to the form
of a noun in the plural or singular.8

A notable distinction made by F.R. Palmer (1981) will be kept in mind. He
differentiates (1981:126–128) between “individuated” nouns, which indicate
individual specimens, and “mass” nouns that refer to an uncountable quantity. This
study will, furthermore, consider that the semantic markedness of a noun with final A
is dependent on the context in which it is used. Its *status emphaticus* may simply be
determined from its reference to something that is familiar (cf. Palmer 1981:129).

The investigation, moreover, takes into account W. R. Garr’s detailed study (1990)
on genitive relationships in which he looks at the role of nouns in the discourse; how
salience and reference impact the definiteness of nouns.9 Garr (1990:229–230) couples
subordinate, backgrounded, or relatively incidental items with the absence of explicit
tracking devices. Like Palmer, he differentiates between “individuated” nouns (count
nouns) and “non-individuated” nouns (mass nouns). In his assessment individuated
nouns tend to be concrete, autonomous, topicalised, and “definite” whereas non-
individuated nouns tend to be abstract, indistinct, neutral, and “indefinite”. Further,
when nouns play a certain role in the discourse, they are individuated and also

8 Kuty (2010:25) found that in *Tg. Sam.* determination in the singular and plural works
different for both feminine and masculine nouns. See also Kuty (2005:190–194).

9 Garr (1990:213–231 [228]) observes, “When the B term is a real, physical, concrete entity,
BA employs a *dī* phrase. When B is more of a quality or property, the construct phrase is
used.” The significance of this finding is that the selection of the phrase type is sensitive to
the (non)concreteness of B. Accordingly, the concreteness of the B term is determined by
an element of distinction in the immediate context, i.e., contrastive, emphatic or particularly
important. Cf. also Golomb (1985:218), who differentiates between three genitive
constructions, Type A (noun with anticipatory pronominal suffix + *d* + noun), Type B
(noun + *d* + noun), and Type C (noun + noun [the “construct state”]). In the example of the
Type B construction, he uses the example of “the son of Joseph” where “the son” is
presented in the determined state before *d* and followed by the proper noun “Joseph”.

---

8 Kuty (2010:25) found that in *Tg. Sam.* determination in the singular and plural works
different for both feminine and masculine nouns. See also Kuty (2005:190–194).

9 Garr (1990:213–231 [228]) observes, “When the B term is a real, physical, concrete entity,
BA employs a *dī* phrase. When B is more of a quality or property, the construct phrase is
used.” The significance of this finding is that the selection of the phrase type is sensitive to
the (non)concreteness of B. Accordingly, the concreteness of the B term is determined by
an element of distinction in the immediate context, i.e., contrastive, emphatic or particularly
important. Cf. also Golomb (1985:218), who differentiates between three genitive
constructions, Type A (noun with anticipatory pronominal suffix + *d* + noun), Type B
(noun + *d* + noun), and Type C (noun + noun [the “construct state”]). In the example of the
Type B construction, he uses the example of “the son of Joseph” where “the son” is
presented in the determined state before *d* and followed by the proper noun “Joseph”.
“referential” while nouns of low categoriality are “non-referential” and de-individualised. Individuated nouns (count nouns) are important to the narrative context. Such nouns are fully inflected for definiteness. When nouns display differential marking, they are more prominent in the specific context. In the discourse they may take on the function of foregrounding whereas unmarked nouns are backgrounded and tend to function as props. This suggests that “marked” and “unmarked” nouns respond to discourse needs. They do not always conform to strictly semantic and syntactic factors but are governed by the discourse perspective, which hinges on the condition of prominence.

Kuty (2005:189) distinguishes between two co-existent linguistic systems of the Aramaic in Tg. Sam. Accordingly, semantic determination can be established along the lines of “cognitive availability” and “genericity”. “Cognitive availability” may be established from verbal interaction that involves a speaker and an addressee (Kuty 2010:23). “Genericity” refers to nouns that are used generically “when they are intended to refer to a whole class or species”; also referred to as collective nouns (Kuty 2010:23). Such nouns can occur in the plural where they are treated as a unity and in the singular where a representative of the class is singled out to represent the whole. When a term is not previously mentioned in the text (i.e., not cognitively available), it is considered semantically unavailable although it occurs formally determinate in the emphatic state. Kuty (2005:188–189) further distinguishes between “formal determination and semantic determination” where formal refers to form and semantic to meaning. Kuty (2005:197–198) found that nouns in Tg. Sam. (i) display a clear preference for the emphatic state; (ii) have a largely consistent distribution of the emphatic state (st. emph.) and the absolute state (st. abs.); and (iii) their determined status can be distinguished on the basis of number and gender.

---

10 The two systems are: “(a) A linguistic system in which the distinction between the st. emph. and st. abs. is fully maintained and carried out, (b) A linguistic system in which the distinction between the two is neutralized to the advantage of the st. emph., that by and large proves to exert both functions.”

11 In Kuty’s definition, semantic determination refers to cognitive availability (when the entity the noun refers to is considered to be in some way available to the addressee) or generic use (when the noun refers to a whole class or species).
This study will entertain relevant aspects of the different approaches highlighted above, to investigate the incidence and nature of marked nominal forms in *Tg. Mal.*

**MARKED RENDERING OF UNMARKED HEBREW NOMINAL FORMS**

When *Tg. Mal.* follows the marked form of nouns in the Hebrew *Vorlage* it does not imply that these Aramaic nouns are always emphatic throughout the Targum. It may simply indicate that the Targumist rendered Scripture literally. The scope of this study is limited to the investigation of marked nominal forms in *Tg. Mal.* which are unmarked in the Hebrew *Vorlage.*

**Nouns in d-relation with the theonym יְהֹוָה**

In every instance in *Tg. Mal.* where a common noun stands in the d-relation with the theonym יְהֹוָה “the Lord” it occurs in the determined state and is semantically marked: יִשְׂמָא דַיָּי “the word of the Lord” (*Tg. Mal.* 1:1); יִשְׂמָא דַיָּי “the glory of the Lord” (*Tg. Mal.* 1:5); יִשְׂמָא דַיָּי “the table of the Lord” (*Tg. Mal.* 1:7; 1:12); “the sanctuary of the Lord” (*Tg. Mal.* 2:12); יִשְׂמָא דַיָּי “the altar of the Lord” (*Tg. Mal.* 2:13) and יִשְׂמָא דַיָּי “the worshippers of the Lord” (twice at *Tg. Mal.* 3:16).

**Nouns in apposition**

Proper names are regarded as determinate. It can therefore be expected that designations which correspond to such particular beings or objects are also in the emphatic state, because they express a unique position of occupation or hierarchy of the beings they serve to identify, e.g., אֵלִיָּהוּ “Ezra, the scribe” (*Tg. Mal.* 1:1); וֶֽזֶרַא ספָּרָא

12 A further study on the treatment of Hebrew nouns with the article in *Tg. Mal.* could throw light on the treatment of unmarked nouns in the Hebrew.

13 The theonym יְהֹוָה is the equivalent of the Tetragrammaton יהוה in *Tg. Neb.* See also Kuty’s discussion (2010:83–84) on B terms referring to God. Whether this is also true for other nouns after the d-particle would entail a further focused investigation.

14 In his study on *Tg. Sam.*, Kuty notes (2010:106, V.1) that the noun יְהֹוָה “the Lord” ranks highest amongst the parameters that favour the d-relation.
Marked nominal forms in *Targum Malachi*

“Elijah, the prophet” (*Tg. Mal. 3:23*) and אֲלָהָא יִוַי “the Lord God” where אֲלָהָא “the God” is regarded as unique (*Tg. Mal. 1:9; 2:16; cf. 2:17).*

In a similar instance, at *Tg. Mal. 1:2*, the discourse perspective influences the determined state of the noun and in the same vein its semantic markedness: Targum renders the unmarked nounֶנְבִיָא “brother” in the Vorlage (לְיַעֲקֹב הֲלוֹא־אָח עֵשָֹו “Is not a brother Esau for Jacob?”) with the marked form יֵאלָהָא (הֲלַא אֲחָא עֵשָו לְיַעֲקֹב “Is not the brother, Esau, for Jacob?”). By marking the nounֶנְבִיָא at *Tg. Mal. 1:2*, the Targumist specifies the unique position Esau occupied in the history of Israel.* Cathcart and Gordon (1989:229) mark out the emphasis that the Targumic rendering places on the brother of Jacob by fronting his name in their English translation: “Was not Esau Jacob’s brother.” The above argument may be substantiated from a KWIC search of the CAL, which reveals that in JLA
gn the nounֶנְבִיָא also occurs in the unmarked state (see for instance לְאָח “for a son” at *Tg. Ezek. 44:25*).

**Abstract nouns**

Abstract nouns in *Tg. Mal.* are in the determined state, but in English translation they are semantically unmarked (cf. Stevenson 1999:22).

At *Tg. Mal. 1:4*, the noun עָלְמָא occurs together with the preposition עַד in the phrase עָלְמָא עַד (cf. van Staaldhuine-Sulman 2002:172). Although עָלְמָא is in the emphatic state when it follows the preposition עַד, the corresponding phrase עַד־עולם in the Vorlage and also its English translation “until eternity” are both semantically unmarked. An advanced concordance search of the CAL database for the sememe עלם in *Tg. Latter Prophets* shows that it typically occurs in the status emphaticus when it is preceded by the preposition עַד. Similarly, at *Tg. Mal. 3:4*, עָלְמָא is marked in the expression כְיוֹמֵי עָלְמָא, whereas it is unmarked in the Vorlage כימי עולם “like the days of

---

15 The marked use of the noun אֲלָהָא “[the] God” in apposition to the theonym יִוַי “the Lord” is generic throughout *Tg. Neb.* Cf. also Kuty’s discussion (2010:84–85) on the use of אלה “god” in *Tg. Sam.*


18 This is in agreement with Kuty (2010:45).
eternity”. This also applies at Tg. Mal. 3:6, where עָלְמָא is preceded by the preposition מִן in the phrase דְּמִן עָלְמָא “which is from eternity”. The same rule applies when עָלְמָא is preceded by other prepositions, e.g., עָלְמָא מִן טוֹרָה.

However, in the plural form and also when the singular form עָלְמָא is used in idiomatic association with other nouns, עָלְמָא is unmarked in Targum, e.g., עָלְמָא קיימים “eternal covenant”.

As a rule, when Tg. Mal. renders abstract nouns, they have final A but are semantically unmarked: יְקָרָא “honour” (Tg. Mal. 2:2); מְאֵירְתָא “ruination” (Tg. Mal. 2:2),20 five abstract nouns at Tg. Mal. 2:6 אֲלִירְתָא לֶבֶנְת הַפָּרֹשָׁא לְאַנְשִׁיָּא “from eternity” (ところtering to Tg. Mal. 3:6, where עָלְמָא is preceded by the preposition מִן in the phrase דְּמִן עָלְמָא “which is from eternity”). The same rule applies when עָלְמָא is preceded by other prepositions, e.g., עָלְמָא עַל; עָלְמָא בְ. The same rule applies when עָלְמָא is preceded by other prepositions, e.g., עָלְמָא עַל; עָלְמָא בְ.

Vocatives

The common noun plural כָּהֲנַיָא “O priests” (Tg. Mal. 1:6; 2:1) has final A in the vocative. George B. Winer (1882:199), F. Rosenthal (1999[1924]:43) and Stanislav Segert (1990:335) point out that the vocative is generally expressed by the status emphaticus, e.g., כְּנִישַׁתָא “O congregation” (Tg. Mal. 2:2); כִּתְפַלֹתָא “O anointed one” (Tg. Mic. 4:8); כְּנָחָה “O city” (Tg. Mic. 4:14; Tg. Zeph. 3:14); כִּסֵפְ銷售 “O seducer” (Tg. Zech. 3:2).21

19 See also, עָלְמָא קיימים “eternal life” (Tg. 1 Sam 25:29) in van Staaldhuine-Sulman (2002:172).
20 The definite form of this noun also occurs as such at Tg. Onq. Deut 28:20, and twice at Tg. Hag. 1:6 and 1:9. In these contexts, Cathcart and Gordon (1989:177, fn. 7), connect the meaning of כְּנָחָה by extension to “poverty” (based on Jastrow 1996:724).
Mass nouns

Mass nouns are not countable. Segert (1990:335) notes that words expressing species, as well as the names of substances, often appear, but not always, in the determinative state. This is also true for Tg. Mal. where mass nouns as a rule are marked, although they are for the most part unmarked in the Vorlage, and are also translated semantically unmarked by Cathcart and Gordon in their English translation (1989:229–238): אֲלֹהֵינוּ “[the] ruins” (Tg. Mal. 1:4); אוֹתָא “[the] tears” (Tg. Mal. 2:13); אֲשֶׁר “[the] fire” and אֲנָשֵׁי “[the] alkali” (Tg. Mal. 3:2); וְתֵפֶסֲרוּ “[the] tithes” and אֶתְרָשֵׁי “[the] offerings” (Tg. Mal. 3:8); וָאֲשָׁמֵי “[the] chaff” (Tg. Mal. 3:19); and אֲנָשֵׁי “[the] ashes” (Tg. Mal. 3:21).

Nouns governed by חַד

Since cardinal numbers refer to a single identifiable item in a context, it is to be expected that nouns which are governed by them will be in the determined state, e.g., the noun אַבָא is marked at Tg. Mal. 2:10 where it is followed by the cardinal number חַד “one”: אַבָא חַד לְכוּנָא “Is not one father for all of us?” However, in the same verse the hieronym אֲלָה “God” is not marked for definiteness: אֲלָה חַד בְרָא יָתַנָא “Did not one God create us?” It appears though that the discourse here treats אֲלָה as proper noun. According to Michael Sokoloff (2002:59), the noun אֲלָה is also used for “God of Israel” in Targum. However, it mostly appears to be in the determined state when it occurs as A term in the d-relation (see Tg. Mal. 2:16).

---

22 אֲלֹהֵינוּ is generically determined in Targum.
23 אֲנָשֵׁי generally appears in the emphatic state in Targum.
24 Cathcart and Gordon (1989:235), translate the marked targumic rendering semantically unmarked with “like fire and (is) like soap”.
25 Kuty (2010:56−57) found that the numeral חַד in Tg. Sam. does not seem to exert a noticeable influence on the formal determination of the noun it modifies.
The collective noun עַמְמַיָא

In JLAtg the masculine plural noun עַמְמַיָא denotes a specific class of people, the gentile nations (Segert 1990:335). It always occurs in the emphatic state in Tg. Mal. and is semantically marked in every instance (Tg. Mal. 1:11, 1:14, 2:11 and 3:12) (cf. Kuty 2005:189).

Nouns modified by כל

In Tg. Mal., common nouns (singular and plural, masculine and feminine) modified by כל are in the emphatic state: כָל עַמָא “all the people” (Tg. Mal. 2:9); כָל מַעסְרָא “all the tithe” (Tg. Mal. 3:10); כָל עַמְמַיָא “all the nations” (Tg. Mal. 3:12); כָל רַשִיעַיָא “all the evil-doers” (Tg. Mal. 3:19); and כָל אַרעָא “all the land” (Tg. Mal. 3:24) (cf. Kuty 2010:26, 48). Grammatically, when the proper name ישראל “Israel” appears in apposition with the modifier כל as in כָל יִשרָאֵל “all Israel” (Tg. Mal. 3:22), it is considered determinate since it refers to a particular nation.

Nouns modified by demonstrative pronouns

Demonstrative pronouns give nouns they govern a foregrounded function within the discourse, e.g., at Tg. Mal. 2:1, the demonstrative pronoun הָדָא “this” has the function of pointing out the noun תַפקֵידתָא “commandment” as a particular identifiable item in the context. Similarly, at Tg. Mal. 3:6, the demonstrative pronoun הָדֵין “this” specifies the noun עָלְמָא “world” in the phrase בְעָלְמָא הָדֵין “in this world”.

Marked nouns in d-relations

As a rule, in Tg. Mal., A term nouns in d-relations come with final A and are semantically marked, but their markedness does not necessarily always conform to strictly semantic and syntactic factors. Remarkably, every d-relation in Tg. Mal. renders a genitive relation in the Vorlage. This is significant in the light of Garr’s

---

27 In three of these instances, at Tg. Mal. 2:9 כָל עַמָא “all the people”, at Tg. Mal. 3:10 כָל מַעסְרָא “all the tithe” and at Tg. Mal. 3:12 כָל עַמְמַיָא “all the nations”, the markedness of the Aramaic nouns following כל are also marked in the Hebrew Vorlage.
convincing demonstration that the *d*-phrase expresses contrastive or important, verse-internal information while the construct phrase conveys incidental, subordinate information (Garr 1990:219, 213–231). When therefore *Tg. Mal.* renders a genitive relation in the *Vorlage* as a *d*-relation, the intent is probably to focus the attention of the addressee on important verse-internal information, since the Targumist could simply render a construct relationship in the *Vorlage* with a similar construct relationship.

In a case of metonymy, *Tg. Mal.* 1:4 renders the genitive relation **בַּרְוַר רֶשֶׁת** “border of wickedness” in the *Vorlage*, expansive with a *d*-relation as **תָּחוּמָא דְּעַמֵיה רַשִיעָא** “lit. the territory whose people are the wicked [ones]”. Notably, while the construct chain in the *Vorlage* is indeterminate, it is rendered with a *d*-relation which is determinate in all its parts. This corresponds with Kuty’s study (2010:41–42) that *d*-relations always feature agreement in determination between the A term and the B term (cf. Garr 1990:219). From a discourse perspective, the use of the *d*-phrase in this narrative context expresses the contrast between the land where “the wicked” live, whom the Lord has cursed, as opposed to the land of the people of Israel, whose territory the Lord has widened (cf. *Tg. Mal.* 1:5). The emphatic marking of all the terms in the *d*-relation highlights the interrelatedness of moral behaviour and land ownership in the discourse.

At *Tg. Mal.* 2:6, the *d*-relation **אוֹרָיתָא דְּקֻטָּשָא** renders the genitive relation **תְּחוּמָא דְּקֻטָּשָא** “law of truth” in the *Vorlage*. In the *d*-relation **אוֹרָיתָא דְּקֻטָּשָא** “the law which is the truth” there is agreement in determination between the A term and the B term. From a discourse perspective, the A term **אוֹרָיתָא** is identifiable and referential, referring to **אוֹרָיתִי** “my law” in the previous verse 5. Its markedness can therefore be attributed to its anaphoric function. Except for three instances at Jer 18:18, Ezek 7:26, and Mal 2:7, the noun **אוֹרָיתָא** always occurs in the *status emphaticus* in Targum. Its determinate status can therefore be described as “canonical” since it represents a typical exemplar of a category, i.e., of law (the Torah) (see Aarts, Chalker and Weiner 2014:56). The

---

28 The marked noun **תְּחוּמָא** occurs in Targum 63 times in 53 verses whereas the unmarked state **תְּחַוְּמָא** occurs 93 times in 84 verses.

At Tg. Mal. 2:8, the d-relation in the clause קְיָמָא דְעִם לֵוִי “the covenant that is with Levi” circumscribes the construct relationship ברית הלוי “[the] covenant of Levi” in the Vorlage. Similarly, at Tg. Mal. 2:10, the d-relation קְיָמָא דְעִם אֲבָהָתַנָא “the covenant that is with our fathers” circumscribes the construct relationship ברית אבתינו “[the] covenant of our fathers” in the Vorlage. In both the above construct relationships in the Vorlage, the respective determined nouns הלוי and אבתינו are real, physical, concrete entities and for this reason, as Garr convincingly argues, the Targumist employs a d-phrase, which is determinate in all its parts (Garr 1990:213–231 [228]; cf. Kuty 2010:41–42).

The d-relation is used in the repetitive construction אַגרָא דַאֲגִירָא “[the robbers of] the wages that are the hireling’s” (Tg. Mal. 3:5) to render the idiomatic Hebrew genitive relation שְֹכַר־שָֹכִיר “[in oppression of] hire of hireling” (“oppression of the poor”). The rendering of this Hebrew idiom with a marked d-relation probably has the function of specifying a particular case of injustice.

At Tg. Mal. 3:11, the marked d-relation אִיבָא דְאַرعָא “the produce, that of the land” renders the genitive relation ואת־פרי האדמה “the fruit of the land” in the Vorlage. The determined noun האדמה in the construct chain in the Vorlage is a real, physical, concrete entity. For this reason, the Targumist renders with the d-relation (Garr 1990:213–231 [228]), which is determinate in all its parts (Kuty 2010:41–42).

At Tg. Mal. 3:20, only the A term שִמשָא “the sun” in the d-relation שִמשָא דְזָכוּ “the sun of righteousness” is marked. In the Vorlage, שמש occurs as construct noun in the genitive relation שמש צדקה “sun of righteousness”. Although the noun צדקה is an abstract noun, it always is typically unmarked when it occurs in the d-relation in Tg.

---

29 Fishbane (2002:27) notes that Abravanel construes the reference to Levi to mean “the one” of Levi, that is, Aaron, permitting a harmonisation with Num 25:12-13. At Jer 33:21b the priestly covenant is considered to be with the whole tribe.

30 Kuty (2010:44) found that in Tg. Sam., “The st. abs. is used in what may be termed ‘repetitive constructions’”.

31 This example does not agree with Kuty’s categorisation (2010:41–42) of d-relations and determination.
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Neb. (cf. van Staalduine-Sulman, 2002:172). The A term of the *d*-relations in which it occurs is not always marked. The markedness of the A term שמשא in the *d*-relation שמשא at *Tg. Mal.* can be attributed to its figurative allusion to a single identifiable item in the verse-internal context, namely God (Palmer 1981:129).

At *Tg. Mal.* 3:22, the *d*-relation אֹרָיתָא דְּמֹשַה “the Torah that of Moses” renders the genitive relation הוראת משה in the *Vorlage*. The *d*-relation reflects the typical agreement in determination between the A term and the B term where the B term is a proper name. The A term is marked because it specifies a particular law code, namely that of Moses. Notably, at *Tg. Mal.* 2:7 the noun אֹרָיתָא is not in the determined state.

**Marked nouns in genitive relations**

Genitive relations in *Tg. Mal.* do not necessarily reflect the underlying text in the *Vorlage*. Instead, they frequently form part of an explanatory or expansive rendering. In such genitive relations, it is typically the B term that is marked, taking on the function of foregrounding to respond to discourse needs.\(^{32}\)

At *Tg. Mal.* 1:11, the B term שמשא in the genitive relation מִמַדנַח שמשא “from the rising of the sun” is marked for definiteness. In the *Vorlage*, the noun שמש is unmarked in the genitive relation ממרחשת שמש “from the rising of the sun”. Although שמש is mostly marked with final A in Targum, there are two instances at *Tg. Isa.* 18:4 and 19:18 where it is unmarked. Without forcing the explanation, there is reason to argue that שמש, as the principal symbol in the figurative expression, is marked for salience in Targum where the expression “from the east to the west” is idiomatic for encompassing the whole world.

At *Tg. Mal.* 2:3, the construct relation כְעַלְלַת אַרְעָא “the increase of the land” is an expansive rendering of the direct object אַרְעָא “the seed” in the *Vorlage*. The markedness of the B term אַרְעָא in the construct relation כְעַלְלַת אַרְעָא is determined by its cognitive availability as a land of blessing in association with

---

\(^{32}\) Determination in the construct relation in *Tg. Mal.* does not concur with Kuty’s rules (2010:43) for determination in the construct relation in *Tg. Sam.*
Israel. However, in this verse אַرعָא “the land” is highlighted for prominence in the context of a rebuke.

At Tg. Mal. 2:11, the B term מִבְנָתָא עַמְמַיָא “daughters of the nations” is marked for definiteness. As pointed out earlier, the noun עַמְמַיָא occurs in the emphatic state throughout Tg. Mal. It is always used in reference to the heathen nations (see Cathcart and Gordon 1989:233, fn. 17).

Semantics and discourse perspective

The markedness of a number of nouns in Targum Malachi cannot be explained from grammar and syntax. However, it is possible to argue the influence of anaphora, cognitive availability and discourse salience on the distribution of the emphatic state of such nouns.

Tg. Mal. 1:6 renders the unmarked nouns בֵן, אָב, and עֶבֶד in the Vorlage, emphatic; respectively, as בְרָא, אַבָא and עַבדָא in the sentence הנא על ברא קמַר לְאָבָא בֵן אָבָא [עֶבֶדָא] “Behold, concerning the son it is said to honour the father, and the servant to fear from before his master.” Significantly, in the same verse, the noun אָב occurs in the unmarked state while the nouns בֵן and עֶבֶד also occur in the unmarked state in JLAtg. It may therefore be argued that the prominence of these count nouns in the Targumic discourse above can be attributed to the authoritative complement הנא על ... Aaron “Behold …it is said” which has reference to a particular commandment in the Decalogue (i.e., Exod 20:12 and Deut 5:16).

At Tg. Mal. 1:12, the markedness of the plural count noun מַתְנָתָא “the gifts” in the phrase וּבְסִירָן מַתְנָתָא מִנֵיה “and despicable are the gifts from it” derives from its anaphoric reference to פָתֻורָא דַיוי “the table of the Lord” (cf. Kuty 2005:189; Garr 1990: 229–230).

The markedness of the two nouns אוֹרָיתָא “the law” and אוֹרָה “the way” at Tg. Mal. 2:8 (וְאַתֻן סְטֵיתוֹן מִן אוֹרָה אַתקֵילתוּן סַגִיאִין בְאוֹרָיתָא “But you have strayed from the way; you have caused many to stumble in the law”) can be attributed to their cognitive

---

33 It also occurs in the unmarked state in Targum, e.g., Gen 15:13; 17:8; 20:1 etc.

At Tg. Mal. 2:15, the emphatic state of the noun אוֹרחָא is not formal in JLA. In this context its definiteness in the explanatory insertion "from whom the world was created" can be ascribed to its cognitive availability as an entity of thought which is well-known in the addressee’s knowledge of the world (cf. Palmer 1981:129).

Tg. Mal. 2:17 renders the construct relation in the question "Where is the God of Justice?" with an interpretative $d$-relation "Where does God do justice?". Thereby the construct noun אֲלָהָא in the Vorlage is rendered with the marked noun אוֹרחָא in Targum. The change from the genitive to the $d$-relation modifies the vague inquiry "Where is the God of Justice?" into a contrastive question, where the marked noun אוֹרחָא “the God” is the identifiable performer (cf. Garr 1990:219–220).

Tg. Mal. 3:2 renders the unmarked noun אש in the simile "like refining fire" with a marked noun אִישׁ [like] the fire [melting]; similarly, the simile in the Vorlage "and as soap bleaching" is circumscribed with a $d$-relation וֻּכְבוֹרִיתָא דִמחַוְרִין [and like] the soap which bleaches”. The unmarked noun ברית in the Vorlage “the soap” is rendered marked as בוֹרִיתָא in Targum. The change from unmarked to marked, together with the introduction of the $d$-phrase, serves to highlight the verse-internal topic of purification.

Cathcart and Gordon (1989:236–237) do not echo the marked form of the noun דִינָא “the judge” at Tg. Mal. 3:8 in their English translation of this verse. Instead, they render it semantically unmarked: “will a man provoke before a judge? The marked noun דִינָא “the judge” occurs in this specific form in Tg. Neb. only at Tg. Mal. 3:8. In this context, its inflection for definiteness can be ascribed to its anaphoric reference to Tg. Mal. 3:5 [דִינָא “judgement”] and to Tg. Mal. 3:6 [דִינֵיה “his judgement”] (cf. Kuty 2005:189).

In JLAtg, the marked noun טובָא refers to a specific goodness, namely, rain/precious moisture. In Targum, when it occurs in association with השמַיָא “the heavens” it always is in the determinate state. In the discourse at Tg. Mal. 3:10 where טובָא refers back to השמַיָא its markedness hinges on this referential role to the goodness that comes from heaven (cf. Garr 1990:229–230; Palmer 1981:129).

At Tg. Mal. 3:17, the noun גֻברָא is marked with final A in the comparison just as the man who has mercy on his son” while in the Vorlage, the noun “man” is unmarked in the Hebrew simile: just as a man has pity on his son.” From a discourse perspective, the contrast between the marked form גֻברָא at Tg. Mal. 3:17 and the unmarked form גְבַר at Tg. Mal. 3:8 (Will a man provoke before the judge?) is remarkable. It demonstrates that the markedness of גֻברָא is intentional: to take on the function of foregrounding the figure of divine-human (father-child) relations in the context of Tg. Mal. 3:17 (cf. also Tg. Mal. 1:6).36

Tg. Mal. 3:20 renders דברָה בכנפַּה in the Vorlage with a similar phrase וְאַס וּתָא בְכַנפַּה except that the two nouns אַס וּתָא “healing” (an abstract noun) and כַנפַּה “wings” are both marked. The expression דברָה בכנפַּה “with healing in his wings” is metaphoric for a particular healing, namely, the supernatural touch of God. The markedness of כַנפַּה in this context therefore responds to discourse needs (cf. Garr 1990:213–231).

The B term in the genitive relation כעגלי מרבק in the Vorlage “like calves of the stall” (Tg. Mal. 3:20) is marked as opposed to the unmarked B term in the genitive relation כעגלי רמבק in the Vorlage. This example concurs with Kuty’s finding in Tg. Sam. that the B term (if it is singular) of a construct relation in which the A term is a plural noun, is “systematically formally determinate” (Kuty 2010:43).

At Tg. Mal. 3:24, the B term בְנַיָא “the sons” in the construct relation דְחָאֵיס גֻברָא עַל בְרֵיה “just as the man who has mercy on his son” while in the Vorlage, the noun איש “man” is unmarked in the Hebrew simile: just as a man has pity on his son.” From a discourse perspective, the contrast between the marked form גֻברָא at Tg. Mal. 3:17 and the unmarked form גְבַר at Tg. Mal. 3:8 (Will a man provoke before the judge?) is remarkable. It demonstrates that the markedness of גֻברָא is intentional: to take on the function of foregrounding the figure of divine-human (father-child) relations in the context of Tg. Mal. 3:17 (cf. also Tg. Mal. 1:6).

The markedness of כַנפַּה in this context therefore responds to discourse needs (cf. Garr 1990:213–231).

The B term in the genitive relation כעקלי מרבק in the Vorlage “like calves of the stall” (Tg. Mal. 3:20) is marked as opposed to the unmarked B term in the genitive relation כעקלי מ裁定 in the Vorlage. This example concurs with Kuty’s finding in Tg. Sam. that the B term (if it is singular) of a construct relation in which the A term is a plural noun, is “systematically formally determinate” (Kuty 2010:43).

At Tg. Mal. 3:24, the B term בְנַיָא “the sons” in the construct relation דְחָאֵיס גֻברָא עַל בְרֵיה “just as the man who has mercy on his son” while in the Vorlage, the noun איש “man” is unmarked in the Hebrew simile: just as a man has pity on his son.” From a discourse perspective, the contrast between the marked form גֻברָא at Tg. Mal. 3:17 and the unmarked form גְבַר at Tg. Mal. 3:8 (Will a man provoke before the judge?) is remarkable. It demonstrates that the markedness of גֻברָא is intentional: to take on the function of foregrounding the figure of divine-human (father-child) relations in the context of Tg. Mal. 3:17 (cf. also Tg. Mal. 1:6).

The B term in the genitive relation כעקלי מרבק in the Vorlage “like calves of the stall” (Tg. Mal. 3:20) is marked as opposed to the unmarked B term in the genitive relation כעקלי מ裁定 in the Vorlage. This example concurs with Kuty’s finding in Tg. Sam. that the B term (if it is singular) of a construct relation in which the A term is a plural noun, is “systematically formally determinate” (Kuty 2010:43).

At Tg. Mal. 3:24, the B term בְנַיָא “the sons” in the construct relation דְחָאֵיס גֻברָא עַל בְרֵיה “just as the man who has mercy on his son” while in the Vorlage, the noun איש “man” is unmarked in the Hebrew simile: just as a man has pity on his son.” From a discourse perspective, the contrast between the marked form גֻברָא at Tg. Mal. 3:17 and the unmarked form גְבַר at Tg. Mal. 3:8 (Will a man provoke before the judge?) is remarkable. It demonstrates that the markedness of גֻברָא is intentional: to take on the function of foregrounding the figure of divine-human (father-child) relations in the context of Tg. Mal. 3:17 (cf. also Tg. Mal. 1:6).36

Tg. Mal. 3:20 renders דברָה בכנפַּה in the Vorlage with a similar phrase וְאַס וּתָא בְכַנפַּה except that the two nouns אַס וּתָא “healing” (an abstract noun) and כַנפַּה “wings” are both marked. The expression דברָה בכנפַּה “with healing in his wings” is metaphoric for a particular healing, namely, the supernatural touch of God. The markedness of כַנפַּה in this context therefore responds to discourse needs (cf. Garr 1990:213–231).

The B term in the genitive relation כעקלי מרבק in the Vorlage “like calves of the stall” (Tg. Mal. 3:20) is marked as opposed to the unmarked B term in the genitive relation כעקלי מ裁定 in the Vorlage. This example concurs with Kuty’s finding in Tg. Sam. that the B term (if it is singular) of a construct relation in which the A term is a plural noun, is “systematically formally determinate” (Kuty 2010:43).

At Tg. Mal. 3:24, the B term בְנַיָא “the sons” in the construct relation דְחָאֵיס גֻברָא עַל בְרֵיה “just as the man who has mercy on his son” while in the Vorlage, the noun איש “man” is unmarked in the Hebrew simile: just as a man has pity on his son.” From a discourse perspective, the contrast between the marked form גֻברָא at Tg. Mal. 3:17 and the unmarked form גְבַר at Tg. Mal. 3:8 (Will a man provoke before the judge?) is remarkable. It demonstrates that the markedness of גֻברָא is intentional: to take on the function of foregrounding the figure of divine-human (father-child) relations in the context of Tg. Mal. 3:17 (cf. also Tg. Mal. 1:6).36

See Fishbane (2002:260); cf. also Kuty’s discussion (2010:49–50) of גבר in Tg. Sam.
function of foregrounding. The markedness of בְּרָא “the son” (Tg. Mal. 1:6) and בְנַיָא “the sons” (Tg. Mal. 3:24) does not strictly conform to semantic and syntactic factors but is governed by discourse perspective.

CONCLUSION

This study reveals that marked rendering in Tg. Mal. did not happen in an arbitrary fashion. In instances where Tg. Mal. renders the text in a literal manner, it retains the marked nominal forms in the Vorlage.

Apart from formal and semantic determination, the identification of various lexical, morphological, and syntactic factors for the marked rendering of unmarked Hebrew nominal forms, demonstrates the versatile use of marked forms in Tg. Mal.

Not least, discourse perspective plays a decisive role in conveying meaning. This is particularly evident when it comes to explanatory or expansive rendering. When the markedness of nouns in Tg. Mal. does not conform to strictly semantic and syntactic factors, it hinges on the condition of prominence. This means that in certain instances nouns are marked in Tg. Mal. because they respond to discourse needs.

Finally, in the greater context of Tg. Neb., the study shows that determination in Targum Malachi does not always conform to the rules for determination in Targum Samuel.
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