

---

**MARKED NOMINAL FORMS IN *TARGUM MALACHI***


---

**Gudrun Lier**

University Of Johannesburg  
 Department of Applied Communicative Skills  
 P.O. Box 524  
 Auckland Park Campus  
 2006  
 E-mail: gelier@uj.ac.za

(Received 05/04/2017: accepted 09/05/2017)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25159/1013-8471/3115>

---

**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 Kutty (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.<sup>1</sup> Various studies show that over time the use of formally marked and unmarked forms changed.<sup>2</sup>

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

---

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

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Kutty (2005:187–201); Kutty (2010: 19–21).

Semitic languages.<sup>3</sup> 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).<sup>4</sup> But in other languages the use of the marker may be different.

In linguistic terminology, nominal forms in Aramaic with final A (e.g., ܐܘܪܝܢܐ) are referred to as “emphatic”. In Eastern Aramaic, nouns with the addition of final A became *semantically* unmarked (cf. CAL 2017; Kaufman 2014a).<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> 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 Kutty (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

<sup>3</sup> As per e-mail correspondence with Kaufman (2014a).

<sup>4</sup> Rosenthal (2006:28) submits that the definite article is a demonstrative element.

<sup>5</sup> For an overview on determination in Aramaic, see Kutty (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.

<sup>6</sup> Abbreviations for Targumim follow the *SBL handbook of style* (2014). Flesher and Chilton (2011:275–276) define JLAtg as a more formal subdialect of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic and point out that Kaufman (1993:363–382) and Cook (1986) see JLAtg as an artificial, scholarly creation. Cf. also Kottsieper (2014:17–53).

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 Kutty (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. Kutty 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 Kutty 2010:20–21).<sup>7</sup>

## 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.

---

<sup>7</sup> “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 substantivally, proper, and vocative. The description noun “forms” refers to the form of a noun in the plural or singular.<sup>8</sup>

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.<sup>9</sup> 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

<sup>8</sup> 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).

<sup>9</sup> 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 + *ḏ* + noun), Type B (noun + *ḏ* + 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 *ḏ* 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.*<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup> 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.

<sup>10</sup> 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.”

<sup>11</sup> 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*.<sup>12</sup>

### Nouns in *d*-relation with the theonym יי

In every instance in *Tg. Mal.* where a common noun stands in the *d*-relation with the theonym יי “the Lord” it occurs in the determined state and is semantically marked.<sup>13</sup> פְּתִיגְמָא יְיִי “the word of the Lord” (*Tg. Mal.* 1:1); יְקָרָא יְיִי “the glory of the Lord” (*Tg. Mal.* 1:5); פְּתִנְרָא יְיִי “the table of the Lord” (*Tg. Mal.* 1:7; 1:12); “the sanctuary of the Lord” (*Tg. Mal.* 2:12); מְדִבְחָא יְיִי “the altar of the Lord” (*Tg. Mal.* 2:13) and דְּחֻלְיָא יְיִי “the worshippers of the Lord” (twice at *Tg. Mal.* 3:16).<sup>14</sup>

### 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., עִזְרָא סַפְרָא “Ezra, the scribe” (*Tg. Mal.* 1:1); אֶלְיָהּ

<sup>12</sup> 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.

<sup>13</sup> The theonym יי is the equivalent of the Tetragrammaton יהוה in *Tg. Neb.* See also Kutý’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.

<sup>14</sup> In his study on *Tg. Sam.*, Kutý notes (2010:106, V.1) that the noun יי “the Lord” ranks highest amongst the parameters that favour the *d*-relation.

אֱלִיָּהוּ “Elijah, the prophet” (*Tg. Mal.* 3:23) and יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ “the Lord God” where אֱלֹהֵינוּ “the God” is regarded as unique (*Tg. Mal.* 1:9; 2:16; cf. 2:17).<sup>15</sup>

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 noun אָח “brother” in the *Vorlage* (הֲלוֹא־אָח עִשָׂו לְיַעֲקֹב) “Is not a brother Esau for Jacob?”) with the marked form אָחֵךְ (הֲלוֹא־אָחֵךְ עִשָׂו לְיַעֲקֹב) “Is not the brother, Esau, for Jacob?”. By marking the noun אָחֵךְ at *Tg. Mal.* 1:2, the Targumist specifies the unique position Esau occupied in the history of Israel.<sup>16</sup> 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”.<sup>17</sup> The above argument may be substantiated from a KWIC search of the CAL, which reveals that in JLA<sub>Tg</sub> the noun אָח also occurs in the unmarked state (see for instance אָחֵךְ “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 אָחֵךְ occurs together with the preposition עַד in the phrase עַד אָחֵךְ (cf. van Staaldue-Sulman 2002:172). Although אָחֵךְ is in the emphatic state when it follows the preposition עַד, the corresponding phrase עד-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.<sup>18</sup> Similarly, at *Tg. Mal.* 3:4, אָחֵךְ is marked in the expression כִּי־וַיִּמְיָ עָלְמָא, whereas it is unmarked in the *Vorlage* כִּי־מִי עוֹלָם “like the days of

<sup>15</sup> The marked use of the noun אֱלֹהֵינוּ “[the] God” in apposition to the theonym יְיָ “the Lord” is generic throughout *Tg. Neb.* Cf. also Kutzy’s discussion (2010:84–85) on the use of אֱלֹהֵינוּ “god” in *Tg. Sam.*

<sup>16</sup> Segert (1990:334) notes: „Durch die Determination werden Personen oder Gegenstand als bereits bekannt oder erwähnt gekennzeichnet.“ Cf. also Solomon (2006:9).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Kutzy (2010:25) for indeterminate nouns in apposition.

<sup>18</sup> This is in agreement with Kutzy (2010:45).

eternity”. This also applies at *Tg. Mal.* 3:6, where עֲלָמָא is preceded by the preposition מן in the phrase דְּמִן עֲלָמָא “which is from eternity”. The same rule applies when עלם is preceded by other prepositions, e.g., על עלמא, e.g., בעלמא.<sup>19</sup>

However, in the plural form and also when the singular form עלם is used in idiomatic association with other nouns, עלם is unmarked in Targum, e.g., קיים עלם “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); מְאַרְתָּא “ruination” (*Tg. Mal.* 2:2);<sup>20</sup> five abstract nouns at *Tg. Mal.* 2:6 אֲוִרְתָּא דְּקִשְׁטָא הָוֵת בְּפִימְיָה וְשִׁקְרָא לָא אִשְׁתְּכַח לָא בְּסִפּוּתְיָה בְּשִׁלְמָא וּבִתְרִיצוּתָא הִלִּיד קְדָמִי וְסִגְיָאִין אֲתִיב מְחֻבָּא: “The law of truth was in his mouth and deceit was not found on his lips; in wholeness and uprightness he walked before me and many he turned from sin”; תּוֹעִיבְתָא “abominations” (*Tg. Mal.* 2:11); אֲסוּתָא “healing” (*Tg. Mal.* 3:20); דִּינָא “justice” (*Tg. Mal.* 2:17); הַטָּאָה “evil” (*Tg. Mal.* 3:15); דּוּכְרָנָא “remembrance” (*Tg. Mal.* 3:16); סְגוּלְתָא “treasure” (*Tg. Mal.* 3:17); and אֲסוּתָא “healing” (*Tg. Mal.* 3:20). However, in English, the two marked abstract nouns in the phrase צְדִיקָא וְרָשָׁעִיא “[between] the righteous and the wicked” (*Tg. Mal.* 3:18) are translated semantically definite.

## Vocatives

The common noun plural קְהֵנָא “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., מְשִׁיחָא “O anointed one” (*Tg. Mic.* 4:8); כְּנִשְׁתָּא “O congregation” (*Tg. Mic.* 4:10; *Tg. Zeph.* 3:14); קָרְתָא “O city” (*Tg. Mic.* 4:14); עַמְמָא “O nations” (*Tg. Nah.* 1:9); מְלָכָא “O king” (*Tg. Nah.* 1:14; 3:18); and חֲטָא “O seducer” (*Tg. Zech.* 3:2).<sup>21</sup>

<sup>19</sup> See also, חַיִּי עֲלָמָא “eternal life” (*Tg. I Sam* 25:29) in van Staalduine-Sulman (2002:172).

<sup>20</sup> 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 מְאַרְתָּא by extension to “poverty” (based on Jastrow 1996:724).

<sup>21</sup> See also Shinan (1991:353–364); cf. Muraoka (1966:151–152). The determined state is also used for vocatives in biblical Aramaic (Steinmann 2004:297).



## 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): הרב־תא “[the] ruins” (*Tg. Mal.* 1:4);<sup>22</sup> דִּמְעָתָא “[the] tears” (*Tg. Mal.* 2:13);<sup>23</sup> אִישָׁתָא “[the] fire” and בּוֹרִיתָא “[the] alkali” (*Tg. Mal.* 3:2);<sup>24</sup> מַעֲסָרִיא “[the] tithes” and תְּרוּמָתָא “[the] offerings” (*Tg. Mal.* 3:8); קֶשֶׂא “[the] chaff” (*Tg. Mal.* 3:19); and קֶטְמָא “[the] ashes” (*Tg. Mal.* 3:21).

## Nouns governed by הַד

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 אָבָא is marked at *Tg. Mal.* 2:10 where it is followed by the cardinal number הַד “one”: הַד לְכוּלָּנָא: “Is not one father for all of us?”<sup>25</sup> However, in the same verse the hieronym אֱלֹהַ “God” is not marked for definiteness: הַד בְּרָא יְתֻנָּא “Did not one God create us?” It appears though that the discourse here treats אֱלֹהַ as proper noun.<sup>26</sup> According to Michael Sokoloff (2002:59), the noun אֱלֹהַ 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).

<sup>22</sup> הרב־תא is generically determined in Targum.

<sup>23</sup> דִּמְעָתָא generally appears in the emphatic state in Targum.

<sup>24</sup> Cathcart and Gordon (1989:235), translate the marked targumic rendering semantically unmarked with “like fire and (is) like soap”.

<sup>25</sup> Kuty (2010:56–57) found that the numeral הַד/הַדָּא in *Tg. Sam.* does not seem to exert a noticeable influence on the formal determination of the noun it modifies.

<sup>26</sup> Kuty (2010:85) remarks that in *Tg. Sam.* the hieronym אֱלֹהַ “god” displays morphosyntactic behaviour analogous to that of anthroponyms. Cf. Segert (1990:334).

## The collective noun עַמְמִיָּא

In JLA<sub>tg</sub> the masculine plural noun עַמְמִיָּא 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 כֹּל

In *Tg. Mal.*, common nouns (singular and plural, masculine and feminine) modified by כֹּל are in the emphatic state: כֹּל עַמָּא “all the people” (*Tg. Mal.* 2:9); כֹּל מַעֲסָרָא “all the tithe” (*Tg. Mal.* 3:10); כֹּל עַמְמִיָּא “all the nations” (*Tg. Mal.* 3:12); כֹּל רְשִׁיעֵיָּא “all the evil-doers” (*Tg. Mal.* 3:19); and כֹּל אֶרְעָא “all the land” (*Tg. Mal.* 3:24) (cf. Kuty 2010:26, 48).<sup>27</sup> Grammatically, when the proper name יִשְׂרָאֵל “Israel” appears in apposition with the modifier כֹּל as in כֹּל יִשְׂרָאֵל “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 הַדָּן “this” has the function of pointing out the noun תְּפִקִּידְתָּא “commandment” as a particular identifiable item in the context. Similarly, at *Tg. Mal.* 3:6, the demonstrative pronoun הַדָּן “this” specifies the noun עֲלָמָא “world” in the phrase בְּעֲלָמָא הַדָּן “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

<sup>27</sup> In three of these instances, at *Tg. Mal.* 2:9 כֹּל עַמָּא “all the people”, at *Tg. Mal.* 3:10 כֹּל מַעֲסָרָא “all the tithe” and at *Tg. Mal.* 3:12 כֹּל עַמְמִיָּא “all the nations”, the markedness of the Aramaic nouns following כֹּל 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 גבול רשעה “border of wickedness” in the *Vorlage*, expansive with a *d*-relation as תְּחוּמָא דְעַמִּיָּה רְשִׁיעָא “lit. the territory whose people are the wicked [ones]”.<sup>28</sup> 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 Kutty’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 אֲוִרִיתָא דְקִשְׁטָא renders the genitive relation תּוֹרַת אֱמֶת “law of truth” in the *Vorlage*. In the *d*-relation אֲוִרִיתָא דְקִשְׁטָא “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 אֲוִרִיתָא is identifiable and referential, referring to אֲוִרִיתָא “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 אֲוִרִיתָא 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

<sup>28</sup> The marked noun תְּחוּמָא occurs in Targum 63 times in 53 verses whereas the unmarked state תְּחוּמָא occurs 93 times in 84 verses.

noun קְשָׁטָא “truth” falls into the category of abstract nouns and for this reason comes with final A (cf. Garr 1990:219, 222; Khan 1984:468–500; Khan 1988:xxxvi–xxxix; Kutu 2010:108–110).

At *Tg. Mal.* 2:8, the *d*-relation in the clause קְנִמָּא דְעָם לְוִי “the covenant that is with Levi” circumscribes the construct relationship בְּרִית הַלְוִי “[the] covenant of Levi” in the *Vorlage*. Similarly, at *Tg. Mal.* 2:10, the *d*-relation קְנִמָּא דְעָם אֲבֹתֵינוּ “the covenant that is with our fathers” circumscribes the construct relationship בְּרִית אֲבֹתֵינוּ “[the] covenant of our fathers” in the *Vorlage*. In both the above construct relationships in the *Vorlage*, the respective determined nouns הַלְוִי and אֲבֹתֵינוּ 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. Kutu 2010:41–42).<sup>29</sup>

The *d*-relation is used in the repetitive construction אֲגֵרָא דְאֲגִירָא “[the robbers of] the wages that are the hireling’s” (*Tg. Mal.* 3:5) to render the idiomatic Hebrew genitive relation שְׂכָר־שְׂכִיר “[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.<sup>30</sup>

At *Tg. Mal.* 3:11, the marked *d*-relation אֵיבָא דְאַרְעָא “the produce, that of the land” renders the genitive relation אֶת־פְּרֵי הָאֲדָמָה “the fruit of the land” in the *Vorlage*. The determined noun הָאֲדָמָה 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 (Kutu 2010:41–42).

At *Tg. Mal.* 3:20, only the A term שְׁמֶשׁ “the sun” in the *d*-relation שְׁמֶשׁ דְּזָכוּ “the sun of righteousness” is marked. In the *Vorlage*, שְׁמֶשׁ occurs as construct noun in the genitive relation שְׁמֶשׁ צְדָקָה “sun of righteousness”.<sup>31</sup> Although the noun זָכוּ is an abstract noun, it always is typically unmarked when it occurs in the *d*-relation in *Tg.*

<sup>29</sup> 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.

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

<sup>31</sup> This example does not agree with Kutu’s categorisation (2010:41–42) of *d*-relations and determination.

*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 שמש in the *d*-relation שמש 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 אֲרֵי תֹרַת מֹשֶׁה “the Torah that of Moses” renders the genitive relation תֹרַת מֹשֶׁה 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 אֲרֵי 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.<sup>32</sup>

At *Tg. Mal.* 1:11, the B term שמש in the genitive relation מִמִּדְנַח שְׁמֶשׁ “from the rising of the sun” is marked for definiteness. In the *Vorlage*, the noun שמש is unmarked in the genitive relation מִמִּזְרַח-שֶׁמֶשׁ “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 אֲרֵעָא כְּעֵלְתָא “the increase of the land” is an expansive rendering of the direct object אֲתֵהוּזְרַע “the seed” in the *Vorlage*. The markedness of the B term אֲרֵעָא “the land” in the construct relation אֲרֵעָא כְּעֵלְתָא is determined by its cognitive availability as a land of blessing in association with

<sup>32</sup> Determination in the construct relation in *Tg. Mal.* does not concur with Kutyl's rules (2010:43) for determination in the construct relation in *Tg. Sam.*

Israel.<sup>33</sup> However, in this verse ארעא “the land” is highlighted for prominence in the context of a rebuke.

At *Tg. Mal.* 2:11, the B term מְבָנִת עַמְמֵיָא “daughters of the nations” is marked for definiteness. As pointed out earlier, the noun עַמְמֵיָא 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 בֶּן, אָב, and עֶבֶד in the *Vorlage*, emphatic; respectively, as בְּרָא, אָבָא and עֶבְדָּא in the sentence הָא עַל בְּרָא אָמִיר לִיקְרָא יְת אָבָא וְעֶבְדָּא “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 אב occurs in the unmarked state while the nouns בֶּר and עֶבֶד also occur in the unmarked state in JLA*tg.* It may therefore be argued that the prominence of these count nouns in the Targumic discourse above can be attributed to the authoritative complement הָא אָמִיר...עַל “Behold ...it is said” which has reference to a particular commandment in the Decalogue (i.e., Exod 20:12 and Deut 5:16).<sup>34</sup>

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

The markedness of the two nouns אורחא “the way” and אוריחא “the law” at *Tg. Mal.* 2:8 וְאַתּוֹן סְטִיתוֹן מִן אֹרְחָא אַתְקִילתוֹן סְגִיִּין בְּאֹרְחֵיָתָא “But you have strayed from the way; you have caused many to stumble in the law”) can be attributed to their cognitive

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

<sup>34</sup> As suggested by Cathcart and Gordon (1989:229, fn. 12); cf. Garr (1990:229–230).

availability as established religious expressions in Jewish belief (cf. *Tg. Mal.* 3:1 אֹרְחָא, *Vorlage* פְּנֵה־דְרָךְ) (cf. Palmer 1981:129).

At *Tg. Mal.* 2:15, the emphatic state of the noun עֲלָמָא is not formal in JLA. In this context its definiteness in the explanatory insertion עֲלָמָא אֶתְכֵרִי “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 איה המשפט “Where is the God of Justice?” with an interpretative *d*-relation אֵיכָא דְעֵבִיד אֶלְהָא דִּינָא “Where does God do justice?”<sup>35</sup> Thereby the construct noun אלהי “the God of” in the *Vorlage* is rendered with the marked noun אֶלְהָא in Targum. The change from the genitive to the *d*-relation modifies the vague inquiry איה המשפט “Where is the God of Justice?” into a contrastive question, where the marked noun אֶלְהָא “the God” is the identifiable performer (cf. Garr 1990:219–220).

*Tg. Mal.* 3:2 renders the unmarked noun אש in the simile כּאש מצרף “like refining fire” with a marked noun אִישְׁתָּא “[like] the fire [melting]”; similarly, the simile in the *Vorlage* וכברית מכבסים “and as soap bleaching” is circumscribed with a *d*-relation וּכְבוֹרִיתָא דְמַחְוֵרִין “[and like] the soap which bleaches”. The unmarked noun ברית in the *Vorlage* is rendered marked as בוֹרִיתָא “the soap”. 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 דִּינָא “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 דִּינָא “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 [דִּינָא “judgement”] and to *Tg. Mal.* 3:6 [דִּינִיָּה “his judgement”] (cf. Kutty 2005:189).

<sup>35</sup> For the translation of proclitic ך cf. Lier (2016:83–101).

In JLA<sub>tg</sub>, the marked noun טוֹבָא refers to a specific goodness, namely, rain/precious moisture. In Targum, when it occurs in association with שְׁמַיָא “the heavens” it always is in the determinate state. In the discourse at *Tg. Mal.* 3:10 where טוֹבָא refers back to שְׁמַיָא 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 גְּבֵרָא is marked with final A in the comparison כְּמָא בְּרִיָּה “just as the man who has mercy on his son” while in the *Vorlage*, the noun אִישׁ “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 גְּבֵרָא at *Tg. Mal.* 3:17 and the unmarked form גְּבֵר at *Tg. Mal.* 3:8 (הִירְגִיז) “Will a man provoke before the judge?”) is remarkable. It demonstrates that the markedness of גְּבֵרָא 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).<sup>36</sup>

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

The B term in the genitive relation כְּעַגְלֵי רְבָקָא “like calves of the stall” (*Tg. Mal.* 3:20) is marked as opposed to the unmarked B term in the genitive relation כְּעַגְלֵי מְרַבָּק in the *Vorlage*. This example concurs with Kutý’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” (Kutý 2010:43).

At *Tg. Mal.* 3:24, the B term בְּנֵיָא “the sons” in the construct relation וְלֵב בְּנֵיָא “and the heart of the sons” is marked for definiteness. The inflection for definiteness of the B term can be attributed to the prominence that the narrative context gives to the right relationship of a son to his father. In *Tg. Mal.* “sons” are topicalised and take on the

<sup>36</sup> See Fishbane (2002:260); cf. also Kutý’s discussion (2010:49–50) of גְּבֵר in *Tg. Sam.*



function of foregrounding. The markedness of אֲבִיבִי “the son” (*Tg. Mal.* 1:6) and אֲבִיבִים “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*.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aarts, B, Chalker, S and Weiner, E 2014. *The Oxford dictionary of English grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bar-Asher, M et al. (eds) 1993. *Moshe Goshen-Gottstein—In Memoriam*. Studies in Bible and Exegesis 3. Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University.
- Cal1.cn.huc.edu. 2017. *The comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon*. Available: <http://cal1.cn.huc.edu/>. [Accessed 2017/02/13.] (CAL)
- Cathcart, K J and Gordon, R P 1989. *The Targum of the Minor Prophets*. The Aramaic Bible 14. Collegeville, Minnesota: Michael Glazier.
- Cook, E 1986. *Rewriting the Bible: the text and language of the Pseudo-Jonathan Targum*. PhD dissertation. University of California at Los Angeles.
- Fishbane, M 2002. *Haftarot*. JPS Bible Commentary. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.
- Flesher, P V M and Chilton, B 2011. *The Targums*. Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press.

- Garr, W R 1990. On the alteration between construct and *dī* phrases in Biblical Aramaic, *JSS* XXXV/2 (Autumn):213–231.
- Golomb, D 1985. *A grammar of Targum Neofiti*. Chico, California: Scholars Press.
- Ho, A 2009. *The Targum of Zephaniah*. Leiden: Brill.
- Jastrow, M 1996. *A dictionary*. New York: Judaica Press.
- Kaufman, S A 1993. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and Late Jewish Literary Aramaic, in Bar-Asher 1993:363–382.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2013. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and Late Jewish Literary Aramaic, *AS* 11:1–26.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2014a. *Determination*. [E-mail correspondence.]
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2014b. *Eastern Aramaic*. [E-mail correspondence.]
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2014c. *Different dialects in TJ*. [E-mail correspondence.]
- Khan, G A 1984. Object markers and agreement pronouns in Semitic languages, *BSOAS* 47:468–500.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1988. *Studies in Semitic syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kottsieper, I 2014. Das Aramäische als Schriftsprache und die Entwicklung der Targume, in Legrand and Joosten 2014:17–53.
- Kutsko, J, Buller, B and Collins, B 2014. *The SBL Handbook of Style*. 2nd ed. Atlanta, Georgia: SBL Press.
- Kuty, R J 2005. Determination in Targum Jonathan to Samuel, *AS* 3/2:187–201.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2010. *Studies in the syntax of Targum Jonathan to Samuel*. ANES 30. Walpole, MA: Peeters.
- Legrand, T and Joosten, J (eds) 2014. *The Targums in the light of traditions of the Second Temple period*. Leiden: Brill.
- Lier, G E 2016. ה followed by proclitic ו in Targum Latter Prophets: a standard rendering of Hebrew הווי? *JNSL* 42/2:83–101.
- Muraoka, T 1966. Notes on the syntax of Biblical Aramaic, *JSS* XI/2:151–152.
- Palmer, F R 1981. *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenthal, F 2006. *A grammar of Biblical Aramaic*. Seventh expanded edition. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Schuele, A 2012. *An introduction to Biblical Aramaic*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Segert, S 1990. *Altaramäische Grammatik mit Bibliographie, Chrestomathie und Glossar*. Leipzig: Verlag Enzyklopädie.
- Shinan, A 1991. Echoes from ancient synagogues: Vocatives and “Emendations” in the Aramaic Targums to the Pentateuch, *JQR* 81/3.4:353–364.
- Sokoloff M 2002. *A dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic*. 2nd edition. Ramat-Gan, Israel: Bar Ilan University.
- Solomon, Z S 2006. The definite and indefinite articles in Assyrian Aramaic, *JAAS* 20/2:1–12.
- Steinmann, A E 2004. *Fundamental Biblical Aramaic*. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Academic Press.
- Stevenson, W B 1999 [1924]. *Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Van Staaldleine-Sulman, E 2002. *The Targum of Samuel*. Leiden: Brill.
- Winer, G B 1882. *Chaldäische Grammatik für Bibel und Targumim*. Leipzig: Verlag von Johann Ambrosius Barth.