Tarsee Li

The Verbal System of the Aramaic of Daniel

An Explanation in the Context of Grammaticalization

The Verbal System
of the Aramaic of Daniel

Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture

VOLUME 8

The Verbal System
of the Aramaic of Daniel

An Explanation in the Context
of Grammaticalization

By

Tarsee Li

BRILL

To Alida:
te iubesc

CONTENTS

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I first began to notice puzzling issues in the Aramaic of the book of Daniel as a graduate student in Hebrew Union College. However, I did not actively pursue this topic until after I finished my degree. In 2004, I had the privilege of attending an NEH summer seminar on Aramaic in Post-Biblical Judaism and Early Christianity at Duke University. It was there that, with the guidance and encouragement of Paul Flesher, Eric Meyers, and Lucas Van Rompay, I first tested some of the ideas presented in this research. This was followed by a paper on the active participle presented at the Aramaic section of the Society of Biblical Literature in Philadelphia 2005, and another paper on the non-active participles presented at the Language and Linguistics section of the international meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Vienna 2007.[1] I wish to thank the questions and responses of those who were present, especially some informal remarks by Douglas Gropp after the presentation in Philadelphia. Portions of these earlier studies on the participles were revised and incorporated into this monograph. I also want to thank Oakwood University for granting me a semester sabbatical in the spring of 2007 to work on this monograph.

I am also grateful to several individuals who read portions of earlier drafts of this study and gave valuable comments and suggestions. Lucas Van Rompay read portions of this study in its early stages and made helpful suggestions on Aramaic issues. Stephen Kaufman kindly read an early draft of the book and made some useful critical comments on methodology. Martin Haspelmath also read a draft of the book and double-checked my references to and use of the literature in linguistics. Paul Flesher, the editor of this series, not only read earlier drafts but also provided feedback at many stages of this project. Also, an unnamed editorial reader made some useful suggestions that helped improve the clarity of the presentation and its accessibility to readers. The views articulated here and any shortcomings are my own.

Thanks are also due to individuals who helped me with access to the secondary literature. Paulette Johnson and Elizabeth Mosby of the Eva B. Dykes Library at Oakwood University were very accommodating to

---

my interlibrary loan requests, especially considering that it is a small library in a historically black institution with limited resources. Norbert Cristea and Russell Seay helped me to obtain some hard to get items from other libraries. John Cook generously provided me with copy of his dissertation on grammaticalization in the Biblical Hebrew verbal system (Cook 2002, a portion of which appeared in Cook 2001).

It goes without saying that this research would not have been possible without the instruction of my Aramaic teachers, including my first Aramaic teacher, Johann Erbes, my Aramaic teachers during the course of my doctoral studies, Stephen Kaufman, Isaac Jerusalmi, and Jerome Lund, as well as many others from whom I have learned and am still learning Aramaic in less formal settings. Although I cannot expect my teachers to agree with everything written here, it is my hope that this monograph will, at least, not be a discredit to their scholarship or teaching.

Last but not least, I want to express my appreciation to my wife, Alida, for her encouragement in this enterprise, and both to her and our daughter, Christen, for also giving me reasons to relax and divert my mind from it.

This book was prepared in camera-ready format using the following fonts: Gentium for languages using Latin characters, words transliterated into Latin characters, and for Greek; SBL Hebrew for Hebrew and Aramaic dialects that share the same script; Estrangelo Edessa for Syriac; and Times New Roman for Arabic.

Except where otherwise noted, abbreviations conform to those set forth in the Society of Biblical Literature style handbook.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

1QapGen: 1Q Genesis Apocryphon (= 1Q20)
3fp: third person feminine plural
3mp: third person masculine plural
3ms: third person masculine singular
4QPrNab ar: 4Q Prayer of Nabonidus (= 4Q242)
AbrNSup: Abr-Nahrain Supplement
abs.: absolute
AOAT: Alter Orient und Altes Testament
AOS: American Oriental Series
ArOr: Archiv Orientální
AS: Aramaic Studies
BETL: Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
BHS: Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia
Bib: Biblica
BN: Biblische Notizen
BO: Bibliotheca Orientalis
BSOAS: Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies
C stem: the causative stem (e.g., Hebrew Hiphil, Aramaic Haphel/Aphel)
Cp: C stem passive (e.g., Hebrew/Aramaic Hophal/Huphal)
CSCO: Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium
D stem: the stem characterized by the doubling of the middle radical
    (e.g., Hebrew Piel, Aramaic Pael)
Dan.: Daniel
Dp: D stem passive (e.g., Hebrew/Aramaic Pual)
DSD: Dead Sea Discoveries
G stem: the simple/basic stem (e.g., Hebrew Qal, Aramaic Peal)
Gen.: Genesis
Gp: G stem passive (e.g., Aramaic Peil)
HdO: Handbuch der Orientalistik
HSS: Harvard Semitic Studies
IOS: Israel Oriental Studies
IOS: Israel Oriental Studies
JANES: Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society
JAOS: Journal of the American Oriental Society
JBL: Journal of Biblical Literature
JNES: Journal of Near Eastern Studies

JNSL: *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*
JSOT: *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSOTSup: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
JSS: *Journal of Semitic Studies*
LXX: Septuagint
masc.: masculine
MT: Masoretic Text
OG: Old Greek
Or: *Orientalia*
p(p).: page(s)
pl.: plural
RevQ: *Revue de Qumran*
sg.: singular
STDJ: Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
TAD: *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt* (Porten and Yardeni 1986, 1989, 1993, 1999)
tD: the t-stem pattern of the D stem (e.g., Hebrew/Aramaic Hitpael)
tG: the t-stem pattern of the G stem (e.g., Aramaic Hitpeel)
Theod.: Theodotion
v(v).: verse(s)
VT: *Vetus Testamentum*
VTSup: Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
ZAH: *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik*
ZAW: *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*

INTRODUCTION

A. The Aim of the Present Study

Extant texts of ancient Aramaic dialects span two millennia, and Aramaic survives in spoken dialects to this day. Thus, Aramaic is a window into three millennia of human history, culture, and tradition, as well as a wonderful resource for the study of historical linguistics. Within this corpus, the Aramaic of the biblical book of Daniel (Daniel 2:4b-7:28) is especially relevant, because most scholars locate it at the crossroads between two major periods of Aramaic, i.e., Imperial Aramaic, when Aramaic served as the international language of the neo-Assyrian, neo-Babylonian, and Persian empires, and Middle Aramaic, when many distinct local dialects became attested. Further-more, in terms of content, "but few books have been more influential in western history" (Collins 2001:1) than the book of Daniel, both because it served as a background to important New Testament concepts and because of the influence of its history of interpretation throughout western history.[1] Yet, notwithstanding its relevance, the verbal system of the Aramaic of Daniel has been among the most difficult to explain.

The aim of this study is to explain the verbal system of the Aramaic of Daniel in the context of grammaticalization phenomena. In particular, this study focuses on the morphosyntactic function of the verb. Whereas "morphology" is the study of word formation, e.g., verb conjugation or noun declension, and "syntax" is the study of sentence formation, e.g., word order rules, "morphosyntax" is the study of grammatical categories or linguistic units whose properties are definable by both morphological and syntactical criteria, e.g., tense, aspect, and modality. Also, although I use the term "explanation" in a general, non-technical sense, it is more than simply "description." Heine (1994:258) adopts three common goals of linguistic explanation as:

---

[1] Montgomery (1927:78) called it "the connecting hinge" between the Hebrew Canon and later Apocalyptic literature.

> a. to describe a phenomenon as an example of a more general phenomenon [citing Fischer-Jørgensen],
> b. to view facts in a wider context or in a larger pattern [citing Givón],
> c. to impart organized knowledge, i.e., knowledge of relations between various facts [citing Scriven].

Thus, this present study will not only describe a specific verbal system, but will also attempt to explain it in the framework of a larger context, especially our current knowledge of grammaticalization. Grammaticalization will be discussed immediately below. As used in the present study, grammaticalization is part of a broader field known as historical linguistics, which, in turn, denotes the study of language variation and change over time. Thus, the present study attempts to explain the verbal system of the Aramaic of Daniel in a way that is coherent with the historical development of Aramaic as well as the observable tendencies in the development of human languages in general.

B. GRAMMATICALIZATION

Grammaticalization denotes the study of how certain lexical terms and constructions come to serve grammatical functions and how grammatical items develop new grammatical functions. Lexical terms are words such as "table," "accept," "blue," which denote an entity, action, attribute, etc. By contrast grammatical or function words, such as "of," "and," "to," indicate grammatical relationships. Thus, grammaticalization occurs when a lexical word assumes characteristics of a function word. For example, the English verb "to go" originally denoted only motion in space (e.g., "I am going to the store"), but has acquired an additional function as an auxiliary in a verb phrase expressing the immediate future (e.g., "I am going to wash my car"). Therefore, the English verb "to go" can be said to have grammaticalized from a main verb (a lexical word) into an auxiliary verb (a function word). Grammaticalization also refers to how grammatical items develop new functions, which will be illustrated throughout the remainder of this study. Although the use of the term itself goes back to Meillet in 1912, studies in grammaticalization did not flourish until the beginning of the 1980's (see Hopper and Traugott 2003:19-38), and its application to the study of Ancient Near Eastern languages is even

more recent.[2] It is not my purpose here to give a full introduction to grammaticalization. Other works have done this quite well (e.g., Heine, Claudi, and Hünnemeyer 1991; Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994; Heine and Kuteva 2002a, 2002b, 2005; Hopper and Traugott 2003). However, it is useful here to explain some of the basic concepts relating to grammaticalization phenomena that will be relevant to the present study. The examples used are those of the authors cited, unless otherwise noted. In the concluding chapter, I will return to this topic and give examples from the corpus under study.

1. *Unidirectionality*

First, there is the hypothesis of "unidirectionality," i.e., items tend to become more grammatical, not less grammatical. That is, phenomena associated with grammaticalization tend to occur in a specific direction that is generally irreversible, and this direction is the same across languages. For example, certain types of words may develop into grammatical morphemes, but grammatical morphemes do not tend to develop into words. Thus, it is common for personal pronouns to become clitics and then verbal affixes, but not for verbal affixes to become personal pronouns. Although it is generally accepted that the West Semitic suffix conjugation originally developed from the addition of pronominal clitics to a verbal adjective as reflected in East Semitic in the so called Akkadian "stative" *paris*, the reverse is not true, i.e., the Semitic personal pronouns did not develop from verbal conjugation affixes.

The hypothesis of unidirectionality does not mean that grammatical entities inevitably move through all stages of development, or that these cannot fall into disuse at any stage along the way, but simply that changes tend to occur in a predictable direction. There are sporadic counter-examples (hence, unidirectionality is a tendency, rather than a theoretical absolute), but these are vastly outnumbered in the empirical data. For more detail, see Hopper and Traugott 2003:99-139.

_____

[2] The most complete study of grammaticalization in Semitic was done by Rubin (2005). His short list of studies that include discussions of grammaticalization in Semitic (2005:8) attests to how few studies in Semitic languages have taken grammaticalization into consideration. Another study that appeared after Rubin's book is Anstey 2006 on the Masoretic diacritics in Tiberian Hebrew.

2. *Layering and Persistence*

Two related concepts that are relevant for this present study are "layering" and "persistence" (Hopper 1991). Layering means that new layers of functions are continually emerging, and older layers may remain to coexist with and interact with the newer layers. Thus, at any synchronic moment, more than one technique may be available to express similar or even identical functions. For example, in the English past tense there is an archaic layer of vowel alternations, e.g., "drive/drove," "take/took," which co-exists with a more recent layer that uses the suffix /t/ or /d/, e.g., "notice/noticed," walk/walked." Persistence refers to individual forms rather than layers of functions. That is, as a form develops along the path of grammaticalization, traces of earlier functions or lexical meanings tend to persist. Hopper cites Bybee and Pagliuca's example of the present-day English future marker "will," which not only expresses a prediction (i.e., simple future), but also the earlier Old English modal notions of willingness (e.g., "someone who will sign for . . .") and intention (e.g., "I'll put them in the post today"). Thus, at any synchronic point in time, a given form may have more than one function (i.e., "persistence"), and two or more grammatical forms may overlap in expressing the same function (i.e., "layering"). When a form begins to express the meaning already expressed by another existing form, the process is called "renewal" (Hopper and Traugott 2003:122-124). The concepts of layering and persistence also imply that grammaticalization does not necessarily occur because other forms ceased to fulfill a given morphosyntactic function, but rather newly grammaticalized forms "compete with existing constructions" (Hopper and Traugott 2003:126), and eventually replace them.[3]

The combination of the hypothesis of unidirectionality and the phenomena of layering and persistence suggests that diachronic developments can be reconstructed on the basis of the multiple functions of the same form (Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994:9-22). Moreover, according to Heine (1994:281), the framework of grammaticalization "not only provides an account of the genesis of"

---

[3] However, some have suggested that renewal and grammaticalization occur because older forms gradually cease to fulfill some of their earlier communicative functions, such as clarity, vividness, extravagance, etc. (see Haspelmath 1999 and the literature cited there).

grammatical constructions "but also of their further development and synchronic behavior and, since this development is uni-directional [sic], it would also provide a way of predicting what the next stage in this development is likely to be," though, of course, predictions are "probabilistic" in nature.

3. *Reanalysis and Analysis/Rule Generalization*

Other important concepts are "reanalysis" and "analysis/rule generalization" (Hopper and Traugott 2003:50-70). Reanalysis means that the hearer understands a form to have a structure/meaning different from the speaker. An example is the reanalysis of "back of the barn," from "[back] [of the barn]" (head noun + dependent noun) to "[back of] [the barn]" (complex preposition + head noun). Analysis/rule generalization refers to the spreading of a rule from a relatively limited domain to a broader one. For example, the English plural *-s* extended its application from words such as "stone: stones" to "shoe: shoes" (replacing the older plural "shoen"). Once a reanalysis has occurred, it will normally be followed by rule generalization. Whereas reanalysis is covert in that it occurs in the minds of listeners, analysis is overt, and provides the demonstrable evidence that a reanalysis has occurred. Grammaticalization always involves reanalysis and analysis/rule generalization, but not all cases of reanalysis or rule generalization result in grammaticalization.

4. *Other Phenomena*

Grammaticalization involves concurrent semantic, phonological, and syntactic changes. There is at first a shift or redistribution of semantic meaning, followed in later stages by a weakening or loss of its original semantic content (also called "bleaching"), accompanied by phonological reduction (a form becomes shorter and/or less stressed) (see Hopper and Traugott 2003:94-98, 100-106, and Bybe, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994:4-9, 19-21). Thus, for instance, periphrastic expressions are younger than inflected words where the morphemes are already fused to the words due to phonological reduction. Concurrent with these changes, there is a generalization of grammatical function. That is, grammatical forms tend to be used in a larger and larger range of morphosyntactic functions. For example, the English "going to" at one time referred primarily to movement in space, but "going to/gonna" in future expressions is no longer restricted to that spatial sense. Along

with a semantic shift and phonological reduction, there is also "an increasing rigidification of the syntactic position" of a construction (Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994:7). For example, the syntax of lexical items is less restricted than that of inflectional morphemes. Thus, in English, whereas a past time action can be stressed by means of the word "did" (e.g., "I certainly *did* wash the car."), the past tense morpheme *-ed* cannot be stressed or modified (*"I certainly wash*ed* the car" is not possible).[4]

The above list is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather represents some of the most relevant concepts for the present study. I will refer to them again where pertinent in the course of this study. Although the bulk of the research in grammaticalization involves the origin of grammatical functions from lexical sources, there are also several scholars who have extensively explored how grammatical constructions develop new grammatical functions (e.g., Bybee, Haspelmath, Heine, and others). Since the present study focuses more on the development of grammatical constructions than of lexical items, I have relied heavily on the work of such scholars, especially Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994), a typological study of cross-linguistic trends in the evolution of selected verbal grammatical constructions in seventy-six languages.

5. *Limitations of Grammaticalization*

There are also limitations to grammaticalization. The chief limitation is that grammaticalization involves tendencies, not inviolable rules. This is one of the reasons why grammaticalization theory has been criticized (including an entire issue of a journal, Campbell 2001a). Critics view it as an epiphenomenon that can be explained by other factors that occur in language change. However, Hopper and Traugott (2003:132-133) counter that grammaticalization is a functionalist theory, which focuses on the interaction of language and use, in contrast to formal theories, which explore "invariant properties of the mind" or "structure independent of context and use." Thus, grammaticalization is "a theory of the relationship between structure and use, and of emergent properties of language." And "the

---

[4] Here and elsewhere in this book, an asterisk (*) in front of a quotation or example indicates that it is ungrammatical or incorrect, but is used to highlight the contrast between it and the expected correct expressions.

fact that many of the changes discussed are tendencies, not rules that operate 100 percent of the time, is irrelevant."

Interestingly, the label "epiphenomenon" is significant, because critics of grammaticalization theory acknowledge thereby that the theory brings to light some undeniable, albeit allegedly apparent, cross-linguistic tendencies, and that these must then be explained by some other means. For example, Dahl (2004:passim, esp. 119-156) suggested the alternative concept of "grammatical maturation." He proposed that a lexical item comes to serve a grammatical function only when it becomes a fixed part of a grammatical pattern, e.g., when the English verb "to go" becomes part of the construction "be going to." The lexical item as used in the construction then becomes "trapped in the pattern," and "its further destiny is dependent on what happens to that construction" (p. 119). Consequently, although Dahl rejects the theory of grammaticalization and the hypothesis of unidirectionality, he does not deny the apparent general tendency that it is more likely that certain lexical items will acquire grammatical function than vice-versa. Thus, the cross-linguistic tendencies (whether real or apparent) highlighted by grammaticalization theory seem to be well attested, regardless of whether they ought to be ascribed to grammaticalization or to some other explanation. Therefore, although it is beyond the scope of the present study to evaluate theoretical and/or philosophical issues related to grammaticalization, it does employ the insights concerning cross-linguistic tendencies brought to light by grammati-calization research.

Another limitation is, obviously, that not all developments in a language involve grammaticalization. Thus, the present study is not restricted to grammaticalization, but consists of an explanation of a specific synchronic verbal system within the context historical development, with special focus on grammaticalization.

C. Previous Studies

In order to avoid unnecessary repetition, I have chosen to interact with the secondary literature in the course of the ensuing chapters, rather than to present a detailed overview of each previous study. Neverthe-less, I should mention that, although various aspects of the Aramaic of Daniel have been subject of numerous studies, only few exhaustive studies on the verbal system focusing on verb morphosyntax have appeared in the last century. The monumental work of Bauer and

Leander (1927) remains to this day the last complete reference grammar of Biblical Aramaic.[5] Their approach was based on the best historical linguistics current in their day. However, they did not distinguish the Aramaic of Daniel from that of Ezra, since this distinction had not yet become commonly recognized. Next, it was Rosén's (1961) exhaustive study of the verb in Daniel that underscored its distinction from that of Ezra. However, the conclusions of this "brilliant revolutionary article" (Kutscher 1977:379) were not universally accepted, chiefly because Rosén did not attempt to explain the verbal system in light of other Aramaic dialects. Another major study was done by Cohen (1984:335-577, esp. 393-432), who included a chapter on Aramaic in his book on Semitic linguistics. One of his contributions was that he paid special attention to the distinction between direct speech and narrative. However, since his study was done before many of the significant advances in grammaticalization, his diachronic conclusions are based on the description of Aramaic corpora as a series of static synchronic snapshots with neatly balanced temporal/aspectual oppositions, a situation which recent advances in grammaticalization demonstrate to be an idealized rather than an actual description of natural languages. More recently, Gzella's (2004) study of the verbal system of Imperial Aramaic, including Biblical Aramaic, follows the current trend of rejecting one to one correspondences between verbal forms and basic functions. That is, verbal forms are not limited within rigid categories of tense, aspect, or modality, but serve different functions under different contexts, a perspective shared by the present study. However, the greater attention paid by the present study to grammaticalization results in some important differences from Gzella's conclusions, which will become apparent in the ensuing chapters.

A recent contribution by Rubin (2005:26-46, 129-52) on grammaticalization in Semitic languages includes a discussion of several aspects of the Semitic verb and a chapter on the present tense marker in modern dialects of Aramaic and Arabic. However, Rubin did not try to describe the verbal system of any one language or dialect. Thus, a description of the verbal system of the Aramaic of Daniel (and other

---

[5] Grammars prior to Bauer and Leander, such as Luzzatto (1865), Kautzsch (1884), or Strack (1905), are hardly mentioned anymore.

forms of Aramaic) that pays attention to grammaticalization is yet to be undertaken.

D. DESCRIPTION OF THE PRESENT RESEARCH

Recent advances in linguistics, especially in grammaticalization, show that languages develop not as a series of static synchronic situations with neatly balanced aspectual oppositions, but as a dynamic process. Languages are continually undergoing changes in which words expressing content acquire grammatical functions (i.e., become grammaticalized), and grammatical constructions take on new functions and eventually lose old ones. As the phenomena of layering and persistence suggest, different grammatical constructions develop new functions at different rates, which may result in functional overlap followed by regularization. It may also result in unbalanced aspectual oppositions, e.g., one verbal construction may develop from expressing aspect to expressing tense while another continues to express aspect. Moreover, at any given synchronic moment more than one form can express the same function, and the same form may have multiple functions. These overlaps and multiple functions are, in part, the reason for the differences of opinion concerning the verbal system of the Aramaic of Daniel. Nevertheless, understood correctly, the manifold functions of the verb should not cause confusion, but can rather help us to locate each verbal form along its path of grammaticalization. Thus, when we deal with a corpus such as the Aramaic of Daniel, we have one synchronic point within a process of continuous diachronic development.

   The present study attempts to explain the verbal system of the Aramaic of Daniel by locating each verbal construction along its path of grammaticalization. Although the hypothesis of unidirectionality does have sporadic counterexamples, it provides a good starting point for analysis. That is, since the various functions of each verbal construction developed during its history of diachronic change, the hypothesis of unidirectionality allows us to plot the most likely sequence of development of these functions in the light of cross-linguistic typological tendencies. Based on a preliminary count, there are 897 clauses in the Aramaic portion of Daniel, containing 857 verbs and

verbals (the latter are also referred to as nonfinite verb forms). [6] The function of each verb or verbal will be analyzed and classified on the basis of the context in terms of tense (e.g., past, present, future), aspect (e.g., perfective or imperfective), and modality. Where relevant, I will also discuss the interplay between the tense/aspect/modality and the situation aspect[7] of verbs and/or stems[8] attested in the corpus. Also, evidence from other forms of Aramaic serves to confirm and/or explain my conclusions. This will result in a synchronic analysis that is informed by both diachronic evidence and cross-linguistic typological evidence. After this introductory chapter, the next seven chapters discuss the functions of specific verbal conjugations. The order of these chapters is based on what I consider to require the least amount of repetition, and, therefore, the easiest for readers to follow. They are followed by a chapter on auxiliaries and a concluding chapter with an overview of the verbal system as a whole.

The terminology used for verbal functions is that of traditional grammars, and most terms do not need a lot of explanation. Further, as is clear from the above discussion, as a given construction progresses in its path of grammaticalization, the lines of distinction between tense, aspect, and modality can be somewhat fluid. Therefore, I will not

---

[6] The total number of clauses is only approximate, because the exact clause boundaries of many verbless clauses is open to question. Also, in tally of the number of verbs and verbals, instances of *Ketiv/Qere* were counted as single instances.

[7] Situation aspect (also referred to as lexical aspect, *Aktionsart*, or event structure) is an internal or inherent property of a verb, to be contrasted with viewpoint aspect (i.e., "aspect") which is external, e.g., perfective vs. imperfective aspect. Whereas the latter is generally expressed grammatically, by the use of morphological inflections or auxiliaries, situation aspect is a property of the verb itself, rather than the grammatical construction. An example of situation aspect is the distinction between verbs denoting stative and dynamic situation aspects, which is especially important in Semitic languages (e.g., Dobbs-Allsopp 2000). The first is an unchanging situation, which will continue unless something happens to change it (e.g., "to sleep"), whereas the latter involves some sort of change (e.g., "to die").

[8] Like other ancient Semitic languages, Aramaic has a set of patterns called "stems," which lexicalize verbs with a variety of nuances from a common root. These are commonly labeled by Semitists as "G," "D," and "C" (Peal, Pael, and Haphel/Aphel), along with forms built upon these bases, such as t-stems, a morphological inflection characterized by a prefixed or infixed syllable containing the consonant /t/ that expresses passive/reflexives voice, of which "tG" and "tD" ("Hithpeel" and "Hithpaal") are attested in Daniel, and internal passives, characterized by certain vowel patterns within a word, "Gp," "Dp," and "Cp" (Peil, Pual, Huphal). In the ensuing chapters, I will use the shorter Semitic labels, rather than the common Aramaic names of these stems.

discuss the theoretical issues regarding these broader categories, but will discuss more specific functions (e.g., resultative, imperfective, etc.) where relevant in the course of the ensuing chapters.

The primary intended audience of this study consists of Semitists and Aramaists. In addition, I expect that this study will also be useful to biblical scholars with interest in the book of Daniel, and since many of the latter may not be familiar with some of the terminology used here, I have added a glossary as an appendix to the book. Finally, although this study presents no new linguistic insights, linguists with interest in historical linguistics may find here some useful examples of well known cross-linguistic phenomena. Therefore, aside from a few explanations about Aramaic in this introductory chapter that may seem superfluous to Semitists and Aramaists, the layout and presentation of this research is directed toward its primary audience.

Texts are cited in the consonantal Aramaic script (un-pointed/unvowelled) and according to the versification of the Hebrew Bible rather than English translations. Therefore, the letters שׁ and שׂ are unpointed (i.e., שׁ) in passages cited or discussed, since the consonantal text does not distinguish them. However, an exception is made when I refer to a verbal root or a dictionary entry, in which case the letters are pointed (i.e., שׁ or שׂ), inasmuch as the distinction between the two sibilants is lexically relevant. Related to the topic of citing dictionary entry forms, although third weak verbal roots can be cited in a variety of ways, i.e., with final yod, he, or aleph, for the sake of consistency, all final weak roots in the corpus under study are cited with a final he, unless an original final aleph is consistently retained by a word in the corpus. Since the corpus consists of part of the Bible, it is also assumed that those who wish can easily find a vowelled text or a transliteration. Although the interpretation of verbal forms based on the Masoretic vowelling is used as a starting point, the consonantal text allows for easier recognition and discussion of ambiguous instances (e.g., many forms could be analyzed as either G stem masculine singular absolute active participles or 3rd masculine singular suffix conjugation forms).

The examples cited are taken at random, except for those cited because they require special comment. Since many verses contain more than one instance of the same verbal form, which in turn do not always have the same function, they are distinguished where necessary by the order of occurrence with the addition of a letter after the verse number (e.g. 5:5a). However, each construction is numbered separately.

Thus, for instance, in 6:5, the two active participles are listed as 1 instance of the complex verb phrase הוה + *participle* and 1 instance of the participle alone, not as 6:5a and 6:5b.

It is expected that there will be disagreements with my interpretation of some passages cited in the ensuing chapters. Nevertheless, it is hoped that this study will be deemed accurate both in its general approach and in its conclusions. As already mentioned, my aim is not to settle the interpretation of all passages, but the elucidation of the verbal system. I also hope that this study will demonstrate that grammaticalization is relevant for the analysis of the verbal systems of other forms of Aramaic.

E. Some Presuppositions

In a small, limited corpus, one cannot completely evade subjectivity. Passages can be understood in more than one way, and I cannot prove that my analysis is correct in every passage, though I do argue that what I propose is at least a viable alternative. I also recognize that there is more than one possible and defensible explanation of the verbal system of the Aramaic of Daniel (though I might add that the same is true even for living languages!). In the final analysis, I do not claim that the explanation offered here is the only one possible, but I do think that it is the most consistent with the diachronic development of Aramaic and with cross-linguistic typological evidence.

Since most passages are subject to various interpretations, some assumptions/presuppositions may be mentioned here. First, a linguistic analysis of a text corpus may be described as either "bottom-up" or "top-down." A bottom-up approach begins with the catalogue of the surface features extant in a text, and proceeds to infer grammatical function from the data. A top-down approach begins with a hypothetical grammar and proceeds to analyze the text according to whether or not it matches the expectations of the hypothetical grammar. As applied to the verbal system of the Aramaic of Daniel, an example of a bottom-up approach is Shepherd (2006, 2008) and an example of a top-down approach is Toews (1993), both of which are discussed below. A bottom-up approach has a definite advantage in terms of accuracy. However, the disadvantage is that a reasonably large corpus (larger than usually attested in ancient languages) is necessary before a bottom-up approach can yield significant results. A top-down approach is not dependant on the size of a corpus, but incurs a greater

risk of inaccuracy. In reality, very rarely is an explanation of a dead language completely bottom-up or top-down. And some have argued that a combination of both approaches results in an even more accurate interpretation of the text. For example, Rau and Jacobs (1988) described a computer program using artificial intelligence to interpret texts (called SCISOR, i.e., The System for Conceptual Information Summarization, Organization, and Retrieval) that begins with a bottom-up approach, but also uses top-down information to fill in the gaps inevitably left by the bottom-up approach.

The present study incorporates elements of both bottom-up and top-down approaches. I used a bottom-up approach to the extent that I entered the text into a database and tagged it for relevant surface features as a starting point for analysis. However, the corpus is too small to yield significant results from a strict bottom-up approach. Therefore, this study employs primarily a top-down approach in the sense that diachronic and typological considerations influenced my decisions concerning the functions of individual verbal forms. For example, I allowed the functions of the conjugations in other forms of Aramaic to influence my decisions concerning the Aramaic of Daniel, i.e., I did not assume that the functions must be the same, but I did assume a diachronic relationship in the attested functions.

In fact, even a "bottom-up" approach cannot completely avoid subjectivity. Compare the following two sentences:

1. I went to the lake with the ducks.
2. I went to the lake with my mother.

The surface level syntax of the two sentences above is the same. Yet, unless there is contextual evidence to the contrary, a reader or listener would most likely conclude that, whereas in sentence 1 "the ducks" were at the lake, in sentence 2 "my mother" went with me, though a bottom-up purist might insist that such a conclusion is unwarranted on the basis of the limited data. Alternatively, one may explain the difference by recourse to semantic distinctions. Nevertheless, such semantic distinctions do not always arise from visible grammatical phenomena, but are often necessitated by our knowledge of extra textual information, e.g., in this instance, the fact that we know that ducks often live near lakes. The point of these examples is not to question the validity of bottom-up approaches, but to point out that no approach can claim absolute objectivity (or even absolute "bottom-up"-ness).

A second assumption/presupposition involves the interpretation of two or more verbal conjugations occurring in the same context. When more than one conjugation is used in the same context, I entertain the possibility of differences in function, unless there is evidence for rhetorical or stylistic reasons to the contrary. As is obvious from the above discussion on grammaticalization, I do not assume that different verbal conjugations in the same context must have different functions. For rhetorical, poetic, and/or other reasons, two different verbal conjugations may be used in the same context to express the same function, and conversely, the same conjugation may be used to express different functions in the same context. However, when more than one conjugation is used in one context and several interpretative options are possible, I at least explore the possibility that they may serve different functions. Therefore, although Buth (1987) and Cook (1986) have clearly demonstrated a relationship between word order and the temporal sequence of the narrative, it does not follow that two or more verb conjugations with the same word order in the same context must have the same function. The following passage from Daniel 3 will serve as an example.

Dan. 3:1-3

1 נבוכדנצר מלכא עבד צלם די־דהב . . . אקימה בבקעת דורא במדינת בבל 2 ונבוכדנצר מלכא שלח למכנש . . . וכל שלטני מדינתא למתא לחנכת צלמא 3 . . . באדין מתכנשין . . . וכל שלטני מדינתא לחנכת צלמא . . . וקאמין לקבל צלמא

King Nebuchadnezzar made [suffix conjugation] a statue of gold. . . . He set it up [suffix conjugation] in the plain of Dura[9] in the province of Babylon. And King Nebuchadnezzar sent [suffix conjugation] to gather . . . all the rulers of the provinces to come to the dedication of the statue . . . . Then, . . . all the rulers of the provinces were being gathered together [participle] for the dedication of the statue . . . , and were standing [participle] before the statue.

In the above example, although sentence initial verbs include both suffix conjugation verbs (e.g., אקימה v. 1) and participles (e.g., וקאמין v. 3), it does not follow that both types of verbs express the simple past just because they both occur at the beginning of the sentence. Further discussion is found in the ensuing chapters.

A third assumption/presupposition involves backgrounded or circumstantial clauses. Though not explicitly stated, it appears that

[9] Or, "in the plain of the wall" (Cook 1989).

some proposed explanations assume that unmarked (not introduced by a subordinating marker) backgrounded or circumstantial clauses never precede but only follow main clauses (e.g., Cohen 1984, Gzella 2004). This may appear to be case with most verbless circumstantial clauses, but not necessarily so with clauses containing verbs and verbals. Therefore, I do not subscribe to this presupposition. In fact, Diessel's (2001) cross-linguistic study suggests that there are only two main patterns for the placement of adverbial clauses: some languages rigidly place an adverbial clause before its main clause (restricted to certain OV languages), and others allow for its placement either before or after the main clause (attested in both OV and VO languages).[10] The rigid use of adverbial clauses only after main clauses does not seem to be attested. Segert (1975:430) gave some examples of circumstantial clauses before main clauses in Aramaic, including *TAD* B2.6 lines 17-18,[11] from the Mibtahiah/Miptahiah (מבטחיה/מפטחיה) archive.[12]

TAD B2.6:17-18

מחר או יום א[חר[ן ימות אסחור ובר דכר ונקבה לא איתי לה מן מפ[ט]חיה אנתתה מפטחיה הי שליטה

Should Ashor die tomorrow or another day, having no child male or female from Miptahiah his wife, Miptahiah is entitled to . . .

Though Segert's citation of the above example focuses on the inserted ("einlegte") nominal circumstantial clause (i.e., "having no child . . ."), the clause with the prefix conjugation ימות is also translated as subordinate (i.e., "wenn Ashor stirbt") to a subsequent main clause, though not formally marked by a subordinating conjunction.

In addition, I can suggest the following as an example from Daniel of a clause that is semantically subordinate to a subsequent main clause, without a subordinating marker:

Dan. 2:42

---

[10] On the notation, "OV" and "VO," see the glossary appendix under "Syntax."

[11] Instead of the citation method used in Segert's original, references to Egyptian Aramaic documents here and throughout the book are given according to the *TAD* numbering (Porten and Yardeni 1986, 1989, 1993, 1999).

[12] Segert also cites a circumstantial clause in Daniel 4:28 that occurs before the main clause. However, it occurs with a subordinating marker.

ואצבעת רגליא מנהון פרזל ומנהון חסף מן־קצת מלכותא תהוה תקיפה ומנה תהוה תבירה

> *And as the toes of the feet were part of iron and part of clay,* part of the kingdom will be strong, and part of it will be brittle.

In the above example, the first clause is semantically subordinate to the following clauses, though not overtly marked as subordinate. Other examples will be found throughout this book.

F. Morphosyntax and Discourse Analysis/Textlinguistics

Whereas the study of morphosyntactic function focuses primarily on meanings expressed on the sentence level, discourse analysis and/or textlinguistics assume that the proper understanding of any language involves the analysis of units longer than the sentence. That is, the same verbal form may have different functions depending on the discourse type or register, and the function of at least some verbal forms are explained in terms that transcend simply tense, aspect, or mood. However, the fact that verbal forms have different functions in different contexts does not in itself deny morphosyntactic categories. Quoting Muraoka (Joüon and Muraoka 2006:xviii):

> In actual speech, . . . there are grammatically well-formed, self-contained and complete utterances containing just one verb. The tense form of such a verb must have a value of its own, which does not have to be derived from the value it would have when used in conjunction with another verb or verbs in a flow of speech.

Therefore, discourse/textlinguistic and morphosyntactic explanations are complementary, rather than complete alternatives or replacements. As Joosten pointed out, "discourse factors alone cannot explain all the features" of the verb (1997:51).[13]

   Although the present study does not address discourse and/or textlinguistic issues, I have consulted the works of Cook (1986) and Buth (1987) on word order, as well as the more comprehensive studies of Toews (1993) and Shepherd (2006, 2008). Toews applied Robert Longacre's discourse approach to the Aramaic sections of Daniel, including useful insights on various sections of Daniel, especially his

---

[13] Both Muraoka and Joosten were writing in the context of the study of the Biblical Hebrew verbal system. Nevertheless, their observations are correct in general terms.

observations concerning the interplay of paragraph markers and word order in narrative. Shepherd, applying primarily the textlinguistic insights of Wolfgang Schneider and Wolfgang Richter, concluded, based on frequency of occurrence, that the suffix conjugation is the primary verbal form for narration and the prefix conjugation the primary verbal form for discourse (2008:133-140 and passim). As for the active participle, it is not primarily a verbal form, though it is primary for poetry as a verbal adjective (2006:115). He correctly observed that Biblical Aramaic is a dead language, which cannot be as fully described as a living language, and highlighted the distinction between discourse analysis, which includes the study of extra-textual phenomena and does not necessarily involve texts, and textlinguistics, which is limited to the study of factors internal to the text. However, his argumentation appears to suggest a dichotomy whereby the verbal system of a living language expresses tense, aspect, and/or *Aktionsart*, but that of a dead language does not, but is limited to the opposition between narration and discourse. In fact, there is no reason why the distinction between narration and discourse cannot occur in living languages, or why tense, aspect, and *Aktionsart* could not exist in dead languages. Thus, although descriptions of morphosyntactic function in dead languages are always tentative to some degree, discourse and textlinguistic observations cannot suffice as alternatives, but do serve as important complements to them.

G. Issues of Date and Provenance

The present study does not address issues of date and provenance. However, since it pays attention to language change, a brief statement here is in order. For a summary of views and issues concerning the linguistic date of the Aramaic of Daniel, see Koch 1980:34-54, Stefanovic 1991, and Collins 1993:13-20. Many factors combine together as evidence for the date of an inscriptional text, such as the location of the find or the shape of the letters, etc. However, in the case of a biblical corpus, not only is some of this evidence no longer available, but one must also reckon with additional factors, such as later scribal and/or editorial activity. Furthermore, it is my opinion that the book of Daniel must be primarily dated on the basis of the interpretation of the contents, to which the language evidence only plays a secondary supporting role. Since the present study focuses on a very narrow

spectrum of its language, i.e., the function of the verb, it would be rather pretentious to address here issues of date and provenance.

Current scholarly opinion holds that the prophetic chapters are later than the narrative ones in Daniel (e.g., Koch 1980:55-77, Collins 1993:26-38, Seow 2003:7-9), though, as Collins suggests, single chapters are too short to yield significant evidence for differences in language. Not only are single chapters too short to yield such differences, but it is reasonable to assume that compilers are usually also composers.[14] For example, many scholars hold that the Prayer of Nabonidus (4QPrNab ar) is an earlier version of the story of Daniel chapter 4.[15] The similarities include the fact that a Babylonian king was struck by illness for seven years, and was afterwards healed by God and encouraged by a Jew of the exile to write a declaration of praise to God. Nevertheless, there are also differences, such as the location (Teman vs. Babylon), the king (Nabonidus vs. Nebuchadnezzar), the illness (skin disease vs. mental illness), and other details (e.g., the tree dream in Daniel 4). Thus, if the two stories in any way go back to a common original, one must posit a considerable amount of rewriting. See also the study by Albertz (1988), who compared the differences between the Aramaic and the Greek versions of Daniel 4-6, concluding that the differences among the texts reflect differing theological perspectives.[16] Therefore, it is my working hypothesis that the final consonantal form of the Aramaic of Daniel represents a single form of Aramaic, or at least one that would be understood by the original readers as belonging to the same dialect,[17] and I do not attempt to describe or explain grammatical features in any of its real or hypothetical sources.

---

[14] E.g., Polak (1993:265) called the author of Daniel a "palimpsestic author."

[15] For some recent discussions, see Koch (1993) and Coxon (1993). For a contrary opinion, see Steinmann (2002).

[16] For a more recent assessment of the relationship among the Greek texts and the *MT*, see McLay (1997).

[17] Thus, for example, Wesselius' (1988:208) argument for the unity of chapters 2-6 as a separate cycle from chapters 1 and 7-12 based on the use of the phrase כל־קבל די results in stylistic differences, but not separate dialects of Aramaic.

H. Issues of Interpretation

Although an understanding of the language is crucial to the interpretation of a text, the focus of this study is on the language rather than the interpretation. Therefore, I have not tried to resolve interpretative issues. However, inasmuch as Daniel is part of the Hebrew Bible, and numerous commentaries have been written on it, I have consulted several commentaries that discuss grammatical issues (including among others Montgomery 1927, Lacocque 1979, Collins 1993, Péter-Contesse and Ellington 1993, as well as important collections of articles in Woude 1993 and Collins and Flint 2001).

THE SUFFIX CONJUGATION

A. Preliminary Discussion of Concepts and Issues

The present chapter examines the functions of the most frequently attested verbal conjugation in the Aramaic of Daniel, the suffix conjugation. In what follows, I will use the labels "suffix conjugation" and "prefix conjugation" instead of the more common "Perfect" and "Imperfect," in order to avoid confusion between names of the verbal forms and names of aspectual/temporal functions. It is common knowledge that the West Semitic suffix conjugation developed from an early Semitic verbal adjective (Rubin 2005:26-28). There is also widespread agreement that the suffix conjugation in the Aramaic of Daniel can express the simple past. However, there is some disagreement as to the full scope of its functions. Kautzsch (1884:132-134) described the basic function of the suffix conjugation as expression of completed actions, i.e., it is an atemporal perfective. Bauer and Leander (1927:284-288) listed its functions as resultative perfect (though their terminology may not completely match ours—see below), historical perfect (i.e., simple past), and pluperfect. According to Rosén (1961:192-203), suffix conjugation verbs do not occur with linear verbs, but only with point verbs, where their basic function is that of being a subordinative, which includes both "anterior" (186) and "pluperfect"/"plupreterite" (187). He admits both a subordinative and a simple past function only for passive verbs (203). Gzella (2004:302-304) includes other functions besides past time related functions, such as performative and future conditional. On the other hand, for Segert (1975:375-376; also Cohen 1984:402-405), the uses of the suffix conjugation other than for simple past time, such as pluperfect, can be explained as due to context (thus also, the future occurs only in conditional sentences).

Before delving into this part of the study, it is important to discuss some terms and concepts that will be important for the rest of the chapter. First, there are several functions associated with what is normally called "perfect" that can be diachronically related, including, inter alia, "completive," "anterior," and "resultative." According to

Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:53-55), a "completive" denotes doing something thoroughly and to completion, e.g., "to eat up," an "anterior" denotes a past action with current relevance, and a "resultative" denotes a state that was brought about by some action in the past. The distinction between a resultative and an anterior is that only the resultative "consistently signals that the state persists at reference time" (63), i.e., "the resultative points to the state resulting from the action while the anterior points to the action itself" (65). They offer the following examples (63):

> Resultative: 1) He is gone. 2) The door is closed.
> Anterior: 1) He has gone. 2) The door has closed.

A resultative is more restricted than an anterior in that it is "only compatible with a predicate that indicates a change of state or an action that produces a change of state" (65), e.g., "discover," "learn," "persuade," and "compel" (69). As resultatives develop, they come to be used with other types of verbs, i.e., verbs that do not necessarily denote a change of state, and eventually become anteriors. In the early stages of development, the function of anteriors (and completives and resultatives) interacts more with situation aspect, i.e., the semantics of the verb itself. In languages that allow stative anteriors, they are either compatible with a present state or are inchoative, i.e., they signal a change of state (74-75). In the later stages, this distinction fades away. Completives and resultatives tend to develop into anteriors, and anteriors tend to develop into perfectives or simple pasts.

Next, it is also important to discuss the distinction between a perfective and a simple past. Since both perfectives and simple pasts are used for narrating sequences of past events, they can easily be confused. A perfective views a situation as bounded temporally, i.e., as "a single, unified, discrete situation" (Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994:83), whereas a simple past denotes an event which occurred before the moment of speech (55). The latter is also to be distinguished from grammatical forms that express both past time and some type of aspect, such as past progressive or past habitual. That is, the simple past is semantically more general than a past perfective or past imperfective, because it expresses only that an event occurred before the moment of speech, without specifying any other concomitant meanings. In the absence of a past imperfective construction in a language, the simple past expresses all pasts, perfective or imperfective. Since perfectives tend to occur mainly in past time, one major indicator of the existence of a perfective is the presence of a past

imperfective in the language (83). Put another way, although there are languages with past imperfectives and no corresponding perfectives, there are none with a past perfective without a corresponding past imperfective. That means that an anterior can only develop into a perfective when a past imperfective already exists in a language, otherwise it will develop into a simple past (91). Another indicator is how perfectives interact with statives. That is, whereas a simple past with a stative verb expresses a past state, a perfective stative normally signals a present state, not a past one (92).

Although the path of development is clear, most grammatical expressions can have more than one function. Therefore, Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:104-105) adopt a concept that they call "perfage," which consists of 5 stages of development for grammatical constructions having these functions.[1] Perfage 1 consists of completives; perfage 2 consists of young anteriors, i.e., anteriors that have no other functions; perfage 3 consists of old anteriors, i.e., anteriors that are more developed and, therefore, have a wider range of functions, including resultative and past/perfective; perfage 4 consists of perfectives that no longer have an anterior/resultative function; and perfage 5 consists of simple pasts, i.e., preterites that no longer have an anterior/resultative function. On the basis of the attested functions of the suffix conjugation in the Aramaic of Daniel, I will argue below that it best fits in perfage 3.

The present chapter analyzes the function of all instances of suffix conjugation main verbs. Although Bauer and Leander (1927:288-290) distinguished the active suffix conjugation from its passive counterpart due to their different origins, they observed no difference in function other than the distinction between active and passive voice. There are, of course, some ambiguous instances, since, as is well known, the Gp stem suffix conjugation 3ms is identical with the G stem passive participle in the absolute state, except for final weak verbs. Thus, out of

---

[1] I could not find any explanation for how the term "perfage" was coined. Since in an earlier study Bybee and Dahl (1989:67-77) used the term "perfect" instead of "anterior" to describe the development of functions closely associated with the anterior function, and since their various paths of development generally include the anterior function, I suspect that the "perf-" in "perfage" comes from the word "perfect," even though it was later replaced by the word "anterior" in the writings of Bybee and her associates. Similarly, in an early study Bybee, Pagliuca, and Perkins (1991) also coined the term "futage" for different stages of constructions that could grammaticalize into expressing future meaning. However, the latter term was not used in later publications.

16 ambiguous instances, 11 have been analyzed as Gp suffix conjugation forms,[2] and the remaining 5 instances were provisionally grouped with passive participles.[3] Furthermore, of the provisional total of 319 instances of suffix conjugation verbs (here and elsewhere instances of *Ketiv/Qere* were counted as single instances), at least 13 belong to the complex verb phrase הוה + *participle*,[4] and 16 to the complex verb phrase *participle* + הוה. The remaining 290 instances may be categorized as follows.

B. Present Anterior/Resultative

Bauer and Leander (1927:285-286, 288) explained several instances in the Aramaic of Daniel (and some in Ezra) as perfect or resultative perfect.[5] Rosén (1961:186-187) also cited a number of instances of "anterior function," which he equates with "logical subordination."[6] Since our limited corpus does not belong to a living form of a language, it is often difficult to distinguish anteriors from resultatives. Therefore, these categories are grouped and discussed together in this section.

It is easier to demonstrate that a form is not resultative than that it is. That is, if the results of an event no longer continue into the present, the verb is clearly not resultative, but the fact that the results continue do not necessarily prove that the verb is resultative. Furthermore, sometimes the resultative or anterior/perfect meaning may be inherent in the target language of translation, rather than in the Aramaic. Thus, Segert's (1975:375-376) contention that functions of the suffix conjugation other than simple past, such as pluperfect, were due to the context is partially correct. For example, this ambivalence is

---

[2] These instances include טריד (4:30; 5:21), שליח (5:24), רשים (5:24, 25; 6:11), קטיל (5:30), יהיב (7:4, 6, 14, 22). See the discussion in chapter 4 on the non-active participles.

[3] But see the discussion on 6:4 (עשית) in chapter 4.

[4] As discussed below in chapter 5, the instance in 7:19 has been analyzed as the suffix conjugation of the verb הוה followed by a predicative participle, rather than as the complex verb phrase הוה + *participle*.

[5] 2:9, 10b, 25c, 26; 3:12b, 15, 28a, 29; 4:6a, 32; 5:14a, 16, 22a, 23a, 26a, b, 27a, 28a, b; 6:13b, 21b; 7:27.

[6] These include at least 2:35f, g; 3:29, 32a; 4:25, 28b; 5:14a, 18, 20c, d, 22a, 23d, 26a, b, 27a, b, 28a, b; 6:2b, 5, 8, 13a, b, 23c, 24c, d, 25e, f, g; 7:4, 8, 12b, 15, 16a, 27.

reflected in the Old Greek translation of 2:41 (albeit the wording of the Old Greek is not exactly the same):

> Dan. 2:41
>
> ודי*חזיתה* רגליא ואצבעתא מנהון חסף די־פחר ומנהון פרזל מלכו פליגה תהוה ומן־נצבתא די פרזלא להוא־בה כל־קבל די *חזיתה* פרזלא מערב בחסף טינא
>
> Inasmuch as *you saw* the feet and toes part of potter's clay and part of iron, it will be a divided kingdom. And some of the strength of iron will be in it, just as *you saw* iron mixed with earthenware.

> Dan. 2:41 (LXX OG)
>
> καὶ ὡς ἑώρακας τοὺς πόδας αὐτῆς μέρος μέν τι ὀστράκου κεραμικοῦ μέρος δέ τι σιδήρου, βασιλεία ἄλλη διμερὴς ἔσται ἐν αὐτῇ, καθάπερ *εἶδες* τὸν σίδηρον ἀναμεμειγμένον ἅμα τῷ πηλίνῳ ὀστράκῳ
>
> As *you have seen* its feet part of pottery earthenware and part of iron, another bipartite kingdom will be in it, just as *you saw* the iron mixed with clay earthenware.

In the above passage, the verb חזיתה occurs twice, and the Old Greek renders the first instance with the perfect ἑώρακας and the second with the aorist εἶδες.

Nevertheless, the context does at times seem to preclude a simple past meaning. For example:

> Dan. 5:14
>
> ונהירו ושכלתנו וחכמה יתירה *השתכחת* בך
>
> [Resultative:] . . . light and insight and abundant wisdom *are found* in you.
> [Anterior:] . . . light and insight and abundant wisdom *have been found* in you.
> [Past:] . . . light and insight and abundant wisdom *were found* in you.

In the above example, where the king is speaking of Daniel's present abilities, though it may be difficult to choose between resultative and anterior, the simple past option is rather awkward. If the suffix conjugation only expressed the simple past, it seems more likely that king would have expressed the statement with a present tense form.

Therefore, at least 36 instances of suffix conjugation forms in our corpus are best understood as present anterior/resultative (2:9, 10b, 23a, b, d, 25c, 28, 29b, 30, 37, 38a, b, 45d; 3:10, 12b; 4:19a, b, c, d, 21, 27, 28b, 32; 5:14b, 16, 22a, 23a, b, c, d, 26a, b, 27a, b, 28a, b).

> Dan. 4:28

לך אמרין נבוכדנצר מלכא מלכותה *עדת* מנך

> "To you it is said, king Nebuchadnezzar, the kingdom *has departed* from you."

The above example cannot be a simple past, since the event had not yet occurred, i.e., the kingdom had not yet departed from Nebuchadnezzar. Rather, it may be construed as a sentence of judgment that had already been pronounced, but whose binding force continues through and beyond the moment of speech. Similarly, the instances in the interpretation of the writing on the wall, 5:26a, b, 27a, b, 28a, b, are also not simply "past tense" instances (Rogland 2003:425), but more likely resultative instances.

Also, some instances of suffix conjugation verbs that could be translated as expressing the present are better understood as resultatives—in fact, the appropriateness of a translation as present may be a possible evidence for a present resultative function. Among these are instances of performative perfects. Performatives are acts of speech that entail the actions contained in the speech act.[7] In English, performatives are generally expressed with the present tense, e.g., "I now pronounce you man and wife," "I hereby declare . . . ," etc. Rogland (2003:423-424) denied any connection between performatives and tense, and questioned the existence of performative suffix conjugation forms in Biblical Aramaic.[8] However, the widespread use of the suffix conjugation in expressing performatives in early West Semitic languages, and the fact that later Aramaic and Hebrew generally expressed performatives with active participles (Rogland 2003:427; Gzella 2007:93-94) may be evidence that the suffix conjugation earlier expressed a present resultative function which was later lost.[9] Among these performative perfects are some instances of what Kutscher (1969:148-151) called the *passivum majestatis*, which he demonstrated to

---

[7] Pardee and Whiting (1987) distinguished the epistolary perfect, in which an individual writes in the past tense from the perspective of the receiver of a letter, from a performative perfect, in which an individual performs an action by means of a speech act, and which Koschmieder called, *Koinzidenzfall.*

[8] For a discussion of performatives with the active participle, see chapter 3.

[9] Elsewhere, Rogland (2001) argued that the normal expression of performatives in Syriac consisted of present tense participles in texts that were not translations. Weninger (2000) argued that it is the perfect in Ethiopic Geez.

be of Persian origin.[10] These are royal edicts in which the king speaks in a passive voice. According to Kutscher (150), they occur in Daniel only when the king is quoted in the 1st person.[11] Since this and a similar other expression involved a Persian passive participle used with a present perfect function (Kutscher 1969:135), the Aramaic instances may justifiably be analyzed as passive participles (e.g., Gzella 2004:184, 309). However, sporadic non-G stem instances in Aramaic show finite verbs (e.g., יתשם Ezra 4:21). Also, the active forms that occur when the king is not quoted are active suffix conjugation forms (e.g., Daniel 3:10; see also 3:12; 6:14).

Dan. 3:10

אנתה מלכא *שמת* טעם

You, o king, *have issued* a decree that . . .

Compare and contrast the following two examples (Ezra 5:13, 17):

Ezra 5:13

כורש מלכא שם טעם

Cyrus the king *issued* a decree that . . .

Ezra 5:17

מן־כורש מלכא שים טעם

A decree *was issued* by Cyrus the king that . . .

In the above parallel examples, since the active expression in Ezra 5:13 employs the suffix conjugation, it is reasonable to conclude that the passive counterpart in v. 17 also employs a passive suffix conjugation form. Therefore, I prefer to analyze instances of שׂים in expressions involving the *passivum majestatis* as Gp suffix conjugation forms, though I acknowledge that the issue is not completely settled. There are at least 3 instances of the *passivum majestatis* in Daniel (3:29; 4:3; 6:27),[12] of

---

[10] See also Folmer (1995:380-391). Alternatively, Muraoka and Porten (1998:315-316) find the notion of *passivum majestatis* "not very convincing," and prefer to analyze such a construction as "an imperfectly transformed passive structure."

[11] However, see the discussion of the possible occurrence in 6:4 in chapter 4.

[12] Kutscher also suggests the instances of אזדה in 2:5, 8, as well as passive verbs used of the deity 5:24a; 6:23d; but on the latter, cf. 5:12a.

which 2 instances (3:29; 6:27)[13] fit well the category of performative perfect.

Dan. 3:29

ומני שים טעם

And a decree has been issued by me that . . .
[Or, And I *have made a decree* that . . .]

A few other instances of suffix conjugation verbs that could possibly be rendered as presents deserve comment. Two similar instances occur in 3:12b and 6:14b.

Dan. 3:12

גבריא אלך לא־שׂמו *עליך מלכא טעם*

These men *have disrespected* you, o king.

Dan. 6:14

דניאל די מן־בני גלותא די יהוד *לא־שׂם עליך מלכא טעם*

Daniel, who is from the captives of Judah, *has disrespected* you, o king.

Aside from the fact that the above examples are best understood as resultatives, they bear an interesting relationship to the *passivum majestatis* discussed above. Though they involve the same vocabulary (the combination of שׂים and טעם), they are syntactically the reverse, i.e., they are active instead of passive, and negative instead of affirmative.

Another instance that deserves comment occurs in 4:6a.

Dan. 4:6

אנה *ידעת* די רוח אלהין קדישין בך וכל־רז לא־אנס לך

I *have learned* that the spirit of the holy gods is in you and that no mystery is too difficult for you.

English Bible translations typically render ידעי above as a present, i.e., "I know" (see also 5:22, though the latter is best understood as either anterior/resultative or simple past).[14] However, the fact that it may

---

[13] The instance in 4:3 is best understood as a simple past.

[14] Bauer and Leander classified both the instances in 4:6 and 5:22 as resultative perfect.

denote a present situation does not mean that it is a present tense. The present tense function of the apparently past conjugation of some stative verbs is attested in some Semitic languages, such as Hebrew (Joüon and Muraoka 2006:331-332) and Akkadian (Testen 2000). This may be explained by the fact that since the resultatives/anteriors of stative verbs often express a present state, it is expected that certain commonly used stative verbs might retain the present function even after the verbal conjugation no longer expresses an ante-rior/resultative meaning. For example, Testen (2000) argued that the present tense meaning of *idû* "to know" and *išû* "to have" in Akkadian may be attributed to the close connection between the resultative and present meanings.[15] In any event, this development appears not to be general, but limited to certain frequently used stative verbs, and, although the same development may have occurred in some forms of Aramaic, it has been argued that the Aramaic counterparts are in fact resultatives.[16] Since the distinction between a present resultative state and a full-fledged present tense is not always clear, a present tense suffix conjugation ידע cannot be ruled out in the Aramaic of Daniel, but the instance in question is equivocal. The possibility of ידעת being a present tense in the example above in 4:6 must be contrasted with instances of a G active participle of ידע employed to express the present (2:8; 5:23)[17] and the past or anterior/resultative function of the remaining instances of G stem suffix conjugation ידע (5:21, 22; 6:11).[18] Also, the fact that the instance in 4:6 can be interpreted as a simple past is demonstrated by the Greek version of Theodotion, which renders it

---

[15] Testen suggested that the Akkadian preterite developed from a simple past to include a resultative meaning. However, from the perspective of grammaticalization, it is more likely that the resultative function preceded the simple past function. See Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca's (1994:77-78) discussion of the Germanic Preterite. Nevertheless, Testen's observation of the close connection between a present resultative state and a present tense is sound.

[16] "Such a Perfect, expressing the result of a prior occurrence has often for us the appearance of a Present" (Nöldeke 1904:202). See also Muraoka 2005:65.

[17] The context suggests that the ידע אנה in 2:8 expresses the actual present, whereas ידעין in 5:23 expresses the general present (so also ידע in 2:22, though the latter may have a nominal in function, as in 2:21). However, the distinction between general and actual present is not as clear with stative verbs.

[18] Bauer and Leander classify the instance in 6:11 as pluperfect.

with the aorist ἔγνων.[19]   Thus, the Aramaic ידעת in Daniel 4:6 is probably either a past inchoative, "I learned/came to know,"[20] or a present resultative, "I have learned/come to know." However, the English translation as a present "I know" may be appropriate in the context due to the constraints of English style, since the English "I knew" can imply nuances not present in the context (i.e., "I knew that . . . [, but . . .]," or "I knew [already] . . . ," etc.).

   One more instance that deserves comment occurs in 2:8.

   Dan. 2:8

      מן־יציב ידע אנה די עדנא אנתון זבנין כל־קבל די *חזיתון* די אזדא מני מלתא

   Certainly, I know that you are buying time because *you have seen* that the matter has been decreed by me . . .

The foregoing discussion on the suffix conjugation of ידע is also applicable to חזה. Typically, the example above is translated as a present, "you see." However, since none of the other instances of suffix conjugation חזה can be construed as present (2:26, 41a, b, 43, 45a; 4:2, 6b, 15, 17a, 20; 7:1a), it is best to understand this instance as an anterior/resultative, "you have seen."

   In addition, in at least 21 other instances, suffix conjugation verbs could be analyzed either as anterior or as simple past (2:47; 3:5, 12a, c, 14, 15, 18, 28a, b; 5:1, 14a, 22b; 6:8, 13b, 14c, 21b, 23c, d, e, 28; 7:5). For example:

   Dan. 6:21

      ענה מלכא ואמר לדניאל דניאל עבד אלהא חיא אלהך די אנתה פלח־לה בתדירא
      היכל לשיזבותך מן־אריותא

   The king answered and said to Daniel, "Daniel, servant of the living God, your God, whom you serve continually, *has he been able/was he able* to deliver you from the lions?

Although היכל in the above example seems to have a resultative sense, "has he been able to . . . ?," a simple past, "was he able to . . . ?," may also be possible.

―――――――――

   [19] All suffix conjugation instances of ידע are translated with aorists in Theod. and the only instance translated in the OG (6:11) is also an aorist

   [20] Compare with the use of the Hebrew cognate ידע in Gen. 9:24, when Noah awoke and "knew" (i.e., "came to know" or "found out"/"learned") what Ham had done.

C. Past Anterior/Resultative

Bauer and Leander (1927:287, 289) cited at least 8 instances of suffix conjugation verbs with a pluperfect function (3:2b, 27a; 5:2b, 3b; 6:11a, b, 15a, 24e).[21] To these could be added instances that continue (3:27b, c, d) or are parallel to those cited (3:3a, b, 7), as well as some other possible instances (2:14b, 24b, 35e; 3:22a; 4:1, 8a, b, 30c; 5:12b, 19, 20a, b; 6:25c, e). A close inspection reveals that most of these instances occur either in (syntactically or semantically) subordinate clauses or in clauses that continue a subordinate clause.[22] Therefore, the past anterior/resultative function of the suffix conjugation is attributable to its syntactical environment. Sometimes, it may also be so translated due to considerations relevant to the target languages. Thus, although Bauer and Leander considered כדי ידע in 6:11 as pluperfect, they vacillated between translating it as a pluperfect, "als er erfahren hatte" (p. 287), and as a simple past, "als er erfuhr" (p. 289).

Dan. 6:11

ודניאל כדיידע *דירשים* כתבא על לביתה

Daniel, when *he knew* [or, after *he came to know*] that the document *had been published* [or, *was published*], went in to his house.

In the above example, the past anterior meaning (i.e., pluperfect) of רשים is due to the fact that it occurs in an object clause introduced by ־די, which in turn complements the כדי ידע clause expressing a temporally anterior event, "after . . . ." Alternatively, רשים could also be a passive participle, "was published."

Having argued that not all pluperfects in translation are pluperfects in Aramaic, I nevertheless agree with Bauer and Leander that the suffix conjugation in Daniel can have a pluperfect (i.e., past anterior/resultative) function, with the caveat, however, that this occurs only in certain contexts in restricted syntactic environments, i.e., in

---

[21] Rosén (1961:187) cited as examples of pluperfect 5:1, 5; 6:7, but this is due to his claim that they are subordinate to prefix conjugation verbs.

[22] In the case of 6:25f, one could argue that the formal and notional hierarchy of the instances in מטו (6:25e) and שלטו (6:25f) are reversed. That is, although the sentences are often translated notionally, "*They had not reached* the bottom of the pit, when the lions *overpowered* them," formally, the narrative says, "*They did not reach* the bottom of the pit, when the lions *had overpowered* them." Either way, the (formally or notionally) dependant clause is past anterior.

subordinate clauses occurring in past time contexts. The fact that the pluperfect meaning is contextually determined does not deny its existence, but is further evidence that the suffix conjugation does have an anterior/resultative function, i.e., the anterior/resultative becomes a past anterior/resultative in a past time context. That is, the past anterior/resultative is not an entirely separate function of the suffix conjugation, but simply the anterior function restricted to a past time context. The following is a comparison of the same expression involving the C stem of the verb קום in three different contexts:

Dan. 3:2

ונבוכדנצר מלכא *שלח* למכנש לאחשדרפניא סגניא ופחותא אדרגזריא גדבריא
דתבריא תפתיא וכל *שלטני* מדינתא למתא לחנכת צלמא די *הקים* נבוכדנצר מלכא

Nebuchadnezzar sent to gather the satraps, prefects, and governors, the counselors, treasurers, judges, magistrates, and all the officials of the provinces to come to the dedication of the statue that Nebuchadnezzar the king *had set up.*

Dan. 3:5

בעדנא די־תשמעון קל קרנא משרוקיתא קיתרוס סבכא פסנתרין סומפניה וכל זני
זמרא תפלון ותסגדון לצלם דהבא די *הקים* נבוכדנצר מלכא

At the time that you hear the sound of the horn . . . and all kinds of music, you shall fall down and worship the statue of gold that Nebuchad-nezzar the king *set up* [or *has set up*].

Dan. 3:18

לאלהיך לא־איתינא פלחין ולצלם דהבא די *הקימת* לא נסגד

We do not serve your gods, and we will not worship the image of gold that *you have set up* [or *you set up*].

In the past time subordinate context of 3:2 above, the verb קום can be appropriately rendered as a pluperfect (past anterior/resultative), "had set up." In the future time context of 3:5 and in the present time context of 3:18, it is either a present perfect (i.e., present ante-rior/resultative) or a simple past.

D. Future Anterior/Resultative

Since the anterior/resultative function of the suffix conjugation can become a past anterior/resultative in some past time contexts, it is possible that the suffix conjugation could express a future anterior/resultative function in some future time contexts. However, there are no unequivocal examples in the corpus. A possible instance occurs in 7:27, though it can be otherwise interpreted.

Dan. 7:27

ומלכותה ושלטנא ורבותא די מלכות תחות כל־שמיא *יהיבת* לעם קדישי עליונין

And the kingdom and the dominion and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole sky *will be given* to the people of the saints of the Most High.

Strack (1905:25) called the above example "Perfectum confidentiae (propheticum)," i.e., "prophetic perfect." Since Strack used the label "Perfectum" as the name of the suffix conjugation rather than for its function, "prophetic perfect" did not mean future anterior/resultative, but simply the employment of the suffix conjugation to express the future in prophetic contexts. For a refutation of alleged instances of prophetic perfects in the Aramaic of Daniel (especially 5:26-28; 6:6; 7:27), see Rogland (2003:424-426). In the instance in 7:27, Rogland explained that it either "refers to God's past decree" or "indicates a future perfect" (426). Both of these explanations involve some type of resultative meaning (so also Bauer and Leander 1927:288 and Rosén 1961:187).

E. Simple Past

Rosén's claim that the suffix conjugation of point verbs has a subordinative function would lead us to expect most instances to be either "anterior" (1961:186) or "pluperfect"/"plupreterite" (187). However, that is not borne out by the data. The vast majority of instances of suffix conjugation verbs are best understood as simple pasts.[23]

_____

[23] The list includes 2:7, 10a, 12a, b, c, 13a, b, 14a, 15, 16a, b, 17a, b, 19a, b, 23c, 24a, c, d, 25a, b, 26, 29a, 34a, b, c, 35a, b, c, d, f, g, 41a, b, 43, 45a, b, c, 46a, b, c, 48a, b, c, 49a, b; 3:1a, b, 2a, 8a, b, 9, 13a, b, 16, 19a, b, 20, 21a, b, 22b, 23, 24a, b, c, 26, 28c, d, e, 30, 32a, b; 4:2, 3,

Dan. 2:35

באדין דקו כחדה פרזלא חספא נחשא כספא ודהבא *והוו* כעור מן־אדרי־קיט *ונשא*
המון רוחא וכל־אתר לא*השתכח* להון ואבנא די־מחת לצלמא *הות* לטור רב *ומלת*
כל־ארעא

Then the iron, the clay, the copper, the silver, and the gold *were shattered*
as one, and *became* as chaff of the summer threshing floor, and the wind
took them away. And no place *was found* for them. And the stone that had
struck the image *became* a great mountain, and *filled* the whole earth.

In the above example, Rosén's suggestion that the suffix conjugation
verbs are anteriors or pluperfects seems rather forced—even if we
allow for his caveat that passive instances could be narrative
(1961:203)—(i.e., "Then . . . *were shattered* . . . , and the wind *had taken*
them away. . . . *was found* . . . . And the stone . . . *had become* a great
mountain, and *had filled* the whole earth.").

F. STATIVE SUFFIX CONJUGATION VERBS

As mentioned above, there are two major indicators of whether a past
time form is perfective or simple past. One is that a past imperfective
must exist before a perfective can develop—I will return to this later in
this book. Another indicator is the interaction between grammatical
construction and situation aspect. Although Cohen (1984:395-397)
criticized Rosén's approach because it results in tense and aspect being
expressed lexically rather than through the verb system, the latter was
ahead of his time in recognizing the relevance of situation aspect. And
though Rosén's conclusions are not borne out by the data, neither is
Cohen's dismissal of situation aspect for the understanding of the
verbal system. As mentioned earlier, cross-linguistic typological
evidence suggests that a simple past with a stative verb denotes a past
state, whereas a perfective stative normally designates a present state.
In the Aramaic of Daniel, suffix conjugation stative verbs generally
denote a past time state. In fact, Bauer and Leander (1927:289)
suggested that verbs with a durative *Aktionsart* express not completed
past acts, but "eine Dauer in der Vergangenheit." Instances of past time

---

5a, b, 6b, 15, 16, 17a, b, c, 20, 23, 25, 28a, 30a, b, 31a, b, c, d, 33a, b; 5:2a, 3a, c, 4a, b, 5, 6,
10a, b, c, 11a, b, 12a, 13a, b, 15, 18, 20c, d, 21a, b, c, 24a, b, 25, 29a, b, c, 30; 6:1, 2a, b, 5, 7,
10, 11, 12a, b, 13a, 14a, 15b, c, 16, 17a, b, c, 18a, b, c, 19a, b, c, d, 20, 21a, 22, 23a, b, 24a, b,
c, d, 25a, b, d, f, g, 26, 29; 7:1a, b, c, 4a, b, c, d, 6, 8a, b, 9a, b, 10a, b, 11a, b, c, 12a, b, 13a, b,
14, 15, 16a, b, 19a, b, 20a, b, 22a, b, c, d, 23, 28.

stative verbs in the corpus include verbs of emotion (בנס 2:12a; קצף 2:12b; באש 6:15b; טאב 6:24a; שפר 3:32b; 6:2a; תוה 3:24a) or description (רום 5:20a; תקף 4:8b, 17c, 19b; 5:20b).[24]

Dan. 2:12

כל־קבל דנה מלכא בנס *וקצף* שגיא ואמר להובדה לכל חכימי בבל

Therefore, the king *was angry* and very *furious*, and commanded to destroy all the wise men of Babylon.

Dan. 6:24

באדין מלכא שגיא *טאב* עלוהי

Then the king *was very glad*.

Most past time statives, such as the examples above, could be alternatively analyzed as inchoative, i.e., denoting a change of state ("became angry," "became glad," etc.), which is perhaps why Rosén analyzed them as "point" verbs. The change from stative to inchoative is typical of anteriors in some languages, "since for an entity to have achieved a certain state may imply that it is still in that state" (Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994:76). Others instances, however, are best understood as simply past time states (e.g., רחץ 3:28c; יכל 2:47; 6:21b), such as the following example.

Dan. 3:28

בריך אלההון די־שדרך מישך ועבד נגו די־שלח מלאכה ושיזב לעבדוהי די *התרחצו* עלוהי

Blessed be the God of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego, who sent his angel and delivered his servants who *trusted* in him.

In the above example, התרחצו is not inchoative, "came to trust," but is simply a past time stative, "trusted." In fact, the same verb may in one context be inchoative and in another context past stative. Compare, for example, the following instances of the verb הוה.

Dan. 2:35

באדין דקו כחדה פרזלא חספא נחשא כספא ודהבא *והוו* כעור מן־אדרי־קיט . . . ואבנא די־מחת לצלמא *הות* לטור רב

---

[24] The verbs ידע (4:6a; 5:21c, 22b; 6:11) and חזה (2:8, 26, 41a, b, 43, 45a; 4:2, 6b, 15, 17a, 20; 7:1a) were discussed above.

Then the iron, clay, bronze, silver, and gold were crushed, and *became* as the chaff of the summer threshing-floor. . . . And the stone that hit the image *became* a great mountain.

Dan. 7:19

על חיותא רביעיתא די *הות* שניה מן כלהון

Concerning the fourth animal, which *was* different from all of them

In the above examples, 2 instances of the verb הוה in 2:35 have an inchoative sense, "to become," but the instance in 7:19 is simply a past stative "was."

The fact that the suffix conjugation stative verbs generally expresses past time states suggests that it has a simple past function, not past perfective, when used as the mainline verb in narrative sequences. On the other hand, the fact that the suffix conjugation can turn otherwise stative verbs into past time inchoatives may reflect the fact that the suffix conjugation has not yet lost its anterior function.

G. Modality

Modality will be discussed more extensively in chapter 6. Here, I will limit myself to discussing those modalities that have been claimed for the suffix conjugation in the Aramaic of Daniel.

1. *Hypothetical/Conditional*

There is at least 1 instance of a suffix conjugation verb introduced by a subordinating particle להן expressing a hypothetical condition (6:6).

Dan. 6:6

אדין גבריא אלך אמרין די לא נהשכח לדניאל דנה כל־עלא להן *השכחנה* עלוהי בדת אלהה ס

Then these men said, "We will not find any pretext against this Daniel, except *we find* it against him concerning the law of his god.

The above instance has been cited as a future function (e.g., Kautzsch 1884:134). Strack 1905:25 called it "Futurum exactum" in a conditional clause. However, this instance is probably best described as a "modal past" (Palmer 2001:13-14, 203-221), i.e., the use of the past tense form to express certain nuances of modality, in this case a hypothetical condition.

According to Folmer, the use of the suffix conjugation in dependent clauses becomes less and less frequent in Achaemenid Aramaic in favor of the prefix conjugation, though it "was never completely ousted" (1995:412). Biblical Aramaic seems to accord with this tendency (see also her discussion of Daniel 6:6 and 4:24 on pp. 412-414).

2. *Epistemic*

Gzella (2007:274-276) discussed several types of epistemic modality, and cited a suffix conjugation verb in 2:23 as an example of the "*deklarative*" subcategory of epistemic modality, i.e., expressing a degree of certainty.

Dan. 2:23

חכמתא וגבורתא יהבת לי

Weisheit und Kraft hast du mir ja gegeben!

However, though his explanation of the various nuances of epistemic modality is well done, the correlation between these modalities and the verbal conjugations used is not always clear. In fact, Gzella admitted that in interrogative sentences, included under "*dubitativer*" epistemic modality, the verbal conjugation used determines not the modality, but the temporal sphere of the question. Thus, the suffix conjugation in the example cited above is probably chosen not because of the nuance of epistemic modality, but for its temporal/aspectual function.

Dan. 2:23

חכמתא וגבורתא *יהבת* לי

You have given me wisdom and strength.

For further discussion on epistemic modality, see chapter 6.

3. *Evidential*

Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:95-97) observed that in some languages there is a diachronic development of resultatives/anteriors into evidentials. Evidentials indicate the source of the information that the speaker asserts, which in turn can be subdivided into direct evidence, i.e., the speaker was a witness, and indirect evidence, i.e., the speaker was not a witness. The latter type of evidential can be further subdivided into reported evidence, i.e., the speaker received the information from someone else, and inferred evidence, i.e., the speaker

inferred the information from the results or by reasoning. According to Palmer (2005:8-9), epistemic and evidential modality constitute the two main types of propositional modality. Whereas epistemic modality expresses the speaker's judgment about the factual status of the proposition, evidential modality indicates the evidence for its factual status.

The development of resultatives/anteriors into evidentials appears to constitute a separate path of grammaticalization from that which results in simple pasts/perfectives (Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994:95-97). At first, the evidential develops from the resultative, which denotes the results of a past action, and the evidential expresses the fact that the past action is inferred from present results. Eventually, the use of the evidential can be expanded to include all kinds of indirect evidence. These "pasts of indirect evidence" tend not to develop into simple pasts or perfectives, at least not right away, but only restrict existing simple pasts/perfectives to reporting situations arising from direct evidence. Therefore, the frequent attestation of the suffix conjugation in the Aramaic of Daniel as a simple past suggests that it is not developing into an evidential.

Furthermore, the examples cited for evidentials in the Aramaic of Daniel could be otherwise explained. Gzella (2004:276-280) included among evidentials, complements of verbs of cognition or finding (e.g., the active participle in Daniel 6:12), as well as expressions reporting visions, the latter usually with the deictic particle ארו/אלו followed by an active participle (e.g., 7:2-3) or a suffix conjugation verb (e.g., 7:8).[25] However, although complements of verbs of seeing, speaking, finding, etc., might fit the classification of evidential modality, they beg the question of whether modality is explicitly expressed in the source language or only inferred by modern readers. Also, since Gzella acknowledges that past time evidential clauses with ארו/אלו can employ either the participle or the suffix conjugation, it seems to me that evidential modality is expressed lexically, outside of the verbal system, whereas the verbal conjugation is chosen to specify the aspect/tense of the clause. For example:

Dan. 2:31

ואלו צלם חד שגיא

---

[25] Similarly, Gianto (2005:145-149) discussed the Hebrew particle והנה in Daniel 8-12 as an evidential particle in reporting visions.

Look, there was a great statue.

Dan. 7:8

ואלו קרן אחרי זעירה *סלקת*

Look, another little horn *came up.*

Dan. 7:2

וארו ארבע רוחי שמיא *מגיחן*

Look, the four winds of heaven *were striving.*

Dan. 7:13

וארו עם־ענני שמיא כבר אנש *אתה הוה*

Look, with the clouds of heaven, one like a human being was coming.

As the examples above show, the particle ארו/אלוּ can introduce a verbless clause (2:31; 4:7; 7:6, 7), a suffix conjugation clause (7:8), a participial clause (7:2), or a *participle + הוה* clause (7:13), as well as some clauses that could be analyzed either as verbless or participial (4:10; 7:5). In short, evidentiality, though possibly expressed lexically, is not a grammatical category in the Aramaic of Daniel.

H. Summary

In terms of Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca's classification, the suffix conjugation in the Aramaic of Daniel appears to be an old anterior, at perfage 3 evolving into perfage 5, i.e., it is in transition from being an old anterior to a simple past. The fact that stative suffix conjugation verbs express past states indicates that their past time function is that of a simple past rather than a perfective. The classification as an "old anterior," an anterior that is becoming a simple past, does not mean that it is not primarily a simple past. In fact, since its most frequent function is that of a simple past, its anterior/resultative function can be understood as a vestige of an earlier stage, when it was a true anterior/resultative. At the stage of the language attested in the Aramaic of Daniel, the suffix conjugation is primarily a simple past, but it has yet not grammaticalized to the point of completely shedding its anterior/resultative function.

THE ACTIVE PARTICIPLE

A. Preliminary Discussion of Concepts and Issues

The active participle in the Aramaic of the biblical book of Daniel has a wide range of functions, ranging from an aspectual progressive to an allegedly aspectless simple past, making it one of the most intriguing elements of the verbal system of this form of Aramaic.

Kautzsch (1884:138-141) described the active participle as primarily a nominal form expressing a state, though he does give examples depicting actions in the past, present, or future, or serving as the complement of the verb הוה. According to Bauer and Leander (1927:290-296) the active participle has partly taken over the functions of the prefix conjugation, and can function as present, future, or imperfective past. Its temporal relevance can be strengthened or highlighted by איתי or a conjugated form of הוה. In addition, the participle can also express the simple past. Rosén (1961) distinguished "linear" verbs from "point" verbs. For "point" verbs, the participle is the past time narrative tense, whereas for "linear" verbs, the participle denotes the present, and the compound tense containing הוה, is both subordinative and future-volitive. According to Rosenthal (1961:55), the participle was used for expressing the "immediate present," which led to its use for an "action that is simultaneous with the main action," and its frequent use in past time eventually "led further to the free use of the participle as a narrative tense." In addition, it was also used to express continuous and habitual action. Muraoka (1966:157-160) suggested that the participle in Biblical Aramaic is "more or less indifferent to time," i.e., its temporal reference is determined by the context. That is, the participle may refer to the past, present, or future, depending on the context. Where the context does not specify a temporal reference, the participle is atemporal. Segert (1975:381-383) observed that this is also the case of the participle in Old Aramaic, but only in Daniel does it denote independent past time actions. Cohen (1984:393-432) proposed that the active participle has a durative function. By itself it expresses the durative present, and the addition of הוה adds the tense, durative past with a suffix conjugation הוה and

durative future with the prefix conjugation הוה. In discussing the distinction in the past time functions of the participle and the suffix conjugation, he allowed that the participle by itself can function as a historical present in narrative contexts (as suggested by Bauer and Leander 1927:294-295), but claimed that this use always follows a suffix conjugation verb (Cohen 1984:413, 477). According to Blau (1987:6-10), the participle, the prefix conjugation, and verbless clauses all mark simultaneity in past time after a suffix conjugation form or a temporal adverbial, "without visible functional difference," and reflects the "blend of two systems," "the earlier one with the imperfect and the later one with the participle." Gzella (2004:306-308) listed the functions of the participle as present, performative, future, and narrative past. In contrast, the participle in combination with הוה is an imperfective, i.e., with a suffix conjugation הוה, it is the imperfective counterpart to the suffix conjugation, and with a prefix conjugation הוה, it is the imperfective counterpart to the prefix conjugation or the participle by itself (Gzella 2004:308-309). Thus, although there is widespread agreement that the active participle can express the present as well as the past and the future, the nature of its function in these temporal spheres and the diachronic sequence in which these functions developed remain to be explored.

Of special relevance to this study is the relationship between progressive and imperfective grammatical constructions. Progressive, sometimes also called "durative," is a subset of imperfective aspect. According to Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:125-126), a progressive "views an action as ongoing at reference time," whereas an imperfective can express a wider range of meanings, including habitual, iterative, frequentative, etc., as well as ongoing actions. Progressives generally occur with dynamic rather than stative predicates. This is because a stative denotes a state that will continue indefinitely unless something puts an end to it, whereas a progressive denotes an action that continues because it is sustained by a constant input of energy. They offer the following two sentences as examples (126):

　　1. Sara is reading.
　　2. *Sara *is knowing* the answer.

Sentence 1 contains a progressive construction with a dynamic verb. Sentence 2 uses a stative verb in a progressive construction, and is ungrammatical.

At the risk of oversimplification, I would like to further illustrate the relationship between progressive and imperfective with the following examples:

    3. Sara was reading the novel.
    4. Sara used to read novels.
    5. Sara kept on reading the novel.

Sentences 3 to 5 illustrate some varieties of imperfective aspect. Of these, only sentence 3 is progressive, expressing an action in process at reference time. Sentence 4 is habitual, indicating a customary or habitual action, rather than an action in process. And sentence 5 is, depending on context, either iterative, expressing repetition, or continuative, expressing the deliberate continuance of an action. Thus, in languages with an imperfective, i.e., a grammatical construction capable of expressing most or all shades of imperfective aspect, the imperfective construction can express any of the meanings of sentences 3 to 5, with the exact shade of meaning being determined by context. Of course, an all-inclusive imperfective can, and often does, coexist with grammatical constructions for more specific types of imperfectivity, such as progressives, habituals, iteratives, etc. As Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:126) pointed out, imperfectives are often restricted to the past, as in the Spanish and French imperfect tenses, but may also be applicable to present and the future, as in Russian. They also consider the present to be a type of imperfective, because present tense forms can usually also express present habitual and gnomic situations (126).[1]

Progressive expressions originate from a limited number of sources, and most of the progressives in the world derive from locative expressions (Heine 1994). According to Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:125-175), progressives develop into presents or imperfectives. More specifically, "a progressive restricted to the present by the existence of a past imperfective will become a present tense," while one that is not so restricted will become a general imperfective (Bybee 1994:250). This path of development is due to the fact that, when a new grammatical entity develops, it is at first more specific than the ones already in use. As the original constrictions gradually erode, the new

---

[1] Bybee (1994:236) does allow for exceptions. The present can be perfective in performatives or in the narration of ongoing events, such as a sports event. Otherwise, presents are imperfectives.

grammatical expression becomes appropriate in more and more
contexts. Thus, a construction that was at first restricted to the
expression of a subset of imperfective aspect, e.g., the progressive, can
eventually expand its range of functions to include the entire
imperfective aspect.

Since the active participle originated very early in Semitic, we
cannot verify whether or not it originated from a locative expression.
However, it is safe to say that at some point in time in the development
of ancient Northwest Semitic languages, the active participle came to
have a progressive function, as for example in Biblical Hebrew (Hatav
1997:89-116). Many of the progressives attested in the languages
surveyed by Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca consist of the verb "to be" in
combination with a nonfinite verbal form. However, since the verb "to
be" is not obligatory in Semitic nominal clauses, it is easy to see how
the active participle by itself could function as a progressive.

It has also been observed that the active participle eventually took
over the functions of the prefix conjugation in later Aramaic, as
reflected, for example, in its wide range of functions in Syriac (Nöldeke
1904:211-218). Nöldeke recognized that the Syriac active participle
began to be used "in room of the Impf. [*sic*]" (216). The process by
which the active participle eventually takes over the functions of the
prefix conjugation is not an isolated Aramaic, or even Semitic,[2]
phenomenon, but is part of a more widespread phenomenon common
to many languages, i.e., progressives can eventually become
imperfectives or presents.

There are 219 instances of active participles in the Aramaic portions
of Daniel. For the purpose of this chapter, this number excludes the t-
stem participles, i.e., Hithpeel and Hithpaal, which are discussed under
the category of non-active participles in the next chapter. At least 39 of
the instances occur in combination with הוה or איתי, and will be
discussed separately. In the remainder of this chapter, I will analyze
and classify the function of each active participle on the basis of the
context, distinguishing nominal and verbal functions, the latter in
terms of tense, aspect, and modality. For obvious reasons, the
discussion of aspectual functions will be more extensive.

---

[2] E.g., Caubet (1991) gives examples of participles with a present, present perfect, and
future meanings in modern Arabic dialects.

Also, the consonantal text allows many G stem active participles to be understood as suffix conjugation verbs. Nevertheless, although these will be noted in passing where it may alter some statistics (e.g., see below under formulaic expressions), the basic conclusions remain unaffected.

B. Nominal Functions

Since participles are verbal nouns, it is no surprise that they have nominal as well as verbal functions. In 20 instances, an active participle functions substantivally, i.e., as if it were a noun. These may occur as (part of) the subject (2:27d, 29; 4:4b, 32a; 5:12a, b), the direct object (5:7b), the indirect object (2:21e; 4:16e), the predicate of a verbless sentence (2:21a, b, c, d, 22a, b, 28, 47c), or in some other nominal phrase (4:32c; 5:11; 7:16).

Dan. 2:47

מן־קשט די אלהכון הוא אלה אלהין ומרא מלכין *וגלה* רזין

Of a truth, your god is a god of gods, and a lord of kings, and *a revealer* of secrets.

Some of these participles could be alternatively analyzed as general presents (e.g., see Muraoka 1966:158 on 2:22).

In at least 13 instances, active participles function adjectivally, either as attributives (3:6, 11, 15, 17c, 20, 21, 23, 26a; 7:3b, 5a, 9) or as predicates (2:15c; 3:22).[3]

Dan. 3:6

ומן־די־לא יפל ויסגד בה־שעתא יתרמא לגוא־אתון נורא *יקדתא*

And whoever does not fall down and worship, at that moment he will be thrown into the *burning* fiery furnace.

C. The Active Participle in Formulaic Expressions

Turning to verbal uses of the active participle, many instances involve verbs of speaking, generally introducing direct speech. Of these, 55

---

[3] In addition, I would also include under this category another instance where the participle should be analyzed as the predicate of the verb "to be" (7:19a), as explained below in chapter 5 (on participles with the verb הוה).

instances (all in main clauses) belong to a special category because of their formulaic nature.[4] Typically, the first verb of this formula is an asyndetic active participle (there are also 2 instances introduced by באדין, 5:17; 6:14), though there are also 5 instances where the formula begins with a suffix conjugation verb (2:7, 10; 3:9, 16a; 5:10). The second verb is almost always a participle (the only exception occurs in 5:10, where both verbs are suffix conjugation forms). In the majority of cases, the verbs in question are ענה and אמר.[5]

Dan. 2:5

ענה מלכא ואמר לכשדיא

The king *answered and said* to the Chaldeans, . . .

No distinction in nuance could be detected between occurrences of this formula with a suffix conjugation form as the first verb and those with a participle as the first verb. However, Tropper (1997:117-18) has argued that in the majority of the instances, the first verb in this formula should be emended to a suffix conjugation form.

Additionally, 9 active participles introduce direct speech by themselves, without another verb (3:4a, b; 4:20b, 28a; 6:6, 7, 13a, 16; 7:5b). Conversely, there are also instances of single participles of verbs of speaking in clauses that do not introduce a direct speech, including אמר (4:4c) and קרא (5:7a) (see also מלל in 7:8, 11, 20).

It is not easy to explain the formulaic use of the active participle with verbs of speaking. I will attempt an explanation in my discussion of the historical present below. In this section, I will limit myself to the following observations. Cohen (1984:414) observed that the verb אמר means "command" in the suffix conjugation, but "say" as a participle.[6] However, such a distinction does not explain why other verbs of speaking are also often used as participles. It is possible that the

---

[4] The list is as follows: 2:5a, b, 7, 8a, b, 10, 15a, b, 20a, b, 26b, c, 27a, b, 47a, b; 3:9, 14a, b, 16a, 19a, b, 24a, b, c, d, 25, a, b, 26a, b, 28a, b; 4:11a, b, 16a, b, c, d, 27a, b; 5:7b, c, 13a, b, 17a, b; 6:13b, c, 14a, 17a, b, 21a, b; 7:2a, b. The fact that this use belongs to a special category is widely recognized; e.g., Bauer and Leander (1927:295) and Segert (1975:383).

[5] In a few instances, the formula ענה + אמר does not introduce a direct quotation (e.g., 3:19).

[6] He acknowledges exceptions, however. For instance, he concedes that the participle אמר in 3:19 means "command," and the suffix conjugation of אמר in 5:10 means "say." As further examples of the latter, I would add the instances of the suffix conjugation אמר in 2:25 and 7:23, perhaps also 7:1, 16.

participle is the preferred form for introducing a direct quotation in some forms of Aramaic, and that this usage spread to other instances of verbs of speaking. Moreover, since the infinitive למאמר is only attested with a telic function in Daniel, it is possible that the participle אמר as the second member of the above formula may have a function similar to the Hebrew infinitive לאמר. The preference of the participle of אמר in introducing direct speech is not limited to the Aramaic of Daniel. According to Muraoka and Porten (1998:204), many instances of אמר in past time in Egyptian Aramaic may actually be participles. Cohen (1984:451) also observed that in Targum Neofiti the participle of אמר following another suffix conjugation verb is often used to translate the Hebrew imperfect consecutive ויאמר. Nöldeke (1904:215) noted a similar use of the participle of the verb ܐܡܪ in Syriac, which he calls a "historical present," and which "scarcely ever" occurs with other verbs. Finally, although the formulaic participles in Daniel are usually translated as simple pasts, some of them also have one of the imperfective functions described below. Regardless of how one might explain the frequent use of the active participle in expressions introducing direct speech, the recognition of the formulaic nature of such expressions, and the concomitant less frequent use of participles in non-formulaic clauses, suggests that it does not occur frequently enough to support Rosén's (1961) claim that it is the narrative tense.

D. Imperfective

Aside from occurrences in formulaic expressions introducing direct speech, there are 87 remaining instances of active participles functioning verbally without הוה or איתי. The majority of these could be analyzed as having some type of imperfective function.

1. *Past Progressive*

The apparently atemporal nature of the active participle (e.g., Muraoka 1966:157-60) is in keeping with the nature of progressives, since the reference time of progressives is indicated by the context. Some participles with a progressive function occur in main independent clauses (2:31; 3:3, 26d, 27; 5:5a, b, 6; 7:2c, 3a, 10a, b, 21a, b). When these occur in a series, the actions/events denoted are often simultaneous or overlapping.

Dan. 5:5

בה־שעתה נפקו אצבען די יד־אנש *וכתבן* לקבל נברשתא על־גירא די־כתל היכלא די
מלכא ומלכא *חזה* פס ידה די כתבה

> At that moment, the fingers of a human hand came out. And they *were writing* opposite the lampstand on the plaster of the wall of the royal palace, and the king *was watching* the back of the hand that was writing.

Buth (1987:483-84) observed that foreground clauses in Daniel are verb initial, though an animate narrative topic may precede the verb. Thus, the two participles cited in the above example are in temporal succession, since the order of the clauses is irreversible. That is, the hand started writing before the king started watching it. However, the overlapping nature of the participles is clear from the fact that the king started watching while the fingers were still writing on the wall. Another example occurs in 3:3, where the participles (both active and t-stem) are typically translated as simple pasts.

Dan. 3:3

באדין מתכנשין אחשדרפניא סגניא ופחותא אדרגזריא גדבריא דתבריא תפתיא וכל
שלטני מדינתא לחנכת צלמא די הקים נבוכדנצר מלכא *וקאמין* לקבל צלמא

> Then the satraps, prefects, and governors . . . and all the officials of the province were gathering together for the dedication of the statue that king Nebuchadnezzar had set up, and *were standing* before the statue

Bauer and Leander (1927:294) cited the above verse as one of the examples of active participles denoting single (non-repetitive) past time events. Similar to the previous example, the participial clauses are irreversible. That is, the officials had to gather together before they could stand before the statue. However, the fact that the order of the sentences is irreversible does not preclude them from being temporally overlapping. Since the subject of the verbs is plural, it is reasonable to conclude that the officials did not first finish gathering together before they began to stand before the statue. Thus, the overlapping nature of the actions suggests that these participles are better understood as progressives than as simple pasts. Notice also that the progressive function is expressed by both the active participle and the t-stem participle (see also 3:26, 27)—the significance of this observation will become apparent in the discussion of t-stem participles in the next chapter.

Often, progressive participles occur in clauses that are either marked as subordinate, such as relative clauses (5:5c), or that are semantically dependent on other clauses, such as circumstantial clauses (5:9).

Dan. 5:5

ומלכא חזה פס ידה די *כתבה*

The king was watching the back of the hand that *was writing.*

Dan. 5:9-10

9 אדין מלכא בלשאצר שגיא מתבהל וזיוהי *שנן* עלוהי ורברבנוהי משתבשין 10 מלכתא לקבל מלי מלכא ורברבנוהי לבית משתיא עללת

Then, *as* king Belshazzar was greatly alarmed, his complexion *was altered*, and his nobles were perplexed, the queen entered the banquet hall because of the words of the king and his nobles.

In the above example, the active participle and 2 t-stem participles form a series of participial clauses conveying the circumstances attending the ensuing suffix conjugation verb.

Not all semantically dependent clauses are circumstantial. I would describe the remaining progressive instances as adverbial for lack of a better definition (3:25d; 4:10, 20a; 6:12; 7:7a, b, c, 19a, b, c).[7]

Dan. 3:25

הא־אנה חזה גברין ארבעה שרין *מהלכין* בגוא־נורא

Look, I see four men loose, *walking* in the fiery furnace.

Finally, a few instances of formulaic participles introducing direct speech are also progressive in function (e.g., 4:11a, b, 20b).

Dan. 4:10-11

ואלו עיר וקדיש מן־שמיא נחת 11 *קרא* בחיל וכן *אמר*

Look, there was a watcher and holy one from heaven coming down, *calling* with a loud voice, and *saying* thus: . . .

In spite of the fact that the active participle so often has a progressive function, more often than not it is impossible to ascribe a progressive meaning to it. There are two evidences that the active participle in Daniel is more than a progressive, and has become an imperfective. First, active participles are often formed from stative

---

[7] In some instances where the participle is adverbial to a nominal clause, there could be some ambiguity in the analysis (e.g., 4:10, 20a; 7:7a, b, c). That is, the participle could be analyzed either as an adverbial participle in a nominal clause or as a progressive participle in a verbal main clause (compare, however, the instances in 7:7 with those in 7:19).

verbs (e.g., שנה 7:3; דמה 3:25; 7:5; ידע 2:8; 5:23; יכל 2:27; 3:17; 4:15, 34; 6:5; כהל 2:26; 4:15; 5:8, 15). Second, active participles often have imperfective functions beyond the progressive, as explained below.

2. Past Habitual or Iterative/Frequentative

In a few instances, active participles are habitual or iterative/frequentative. The term habitual refers to customarily repeated actions, iterative refers to repeated actions that have a well-defined end point, and frequentative refers to actions that occur frequently in a specific period of time (Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994:127). Since distinguishing among these three functions is difficult in a dead dialect with a limited corpus, I have grouped together the discussion of possible instances. Habitual participles occur both in the past (6:11a, b, c) and in the present (6:14b), though a present habitual should be classified as a general present, as will be explained later.

> Dan. 6:11
>
> וזמנין תלתה ביומא הוא *ברך* על־ברכוהי *ומצלא ומודא* קדם אלהה
>
> And three times a day he *kept on kneeling* on his knees, *and praying, and giving thanks* before his God.

The participles above describe repeated or customary actions (e.g., "three times a day") rather than actions in process. Thus, they are examples of non-progressive imperfective aspect. The use of a progressive construction to express habitual action is a "major step" toward its development into either present or imperfective (Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994:141).

In at least 4 instances, active participles could be analyzed either as iterative or progressive (3:7a, b, c; 5:8a). Bauer and Leander (1927:293) cited כדי שמעין in 3:7 as an example of repetition in the past, "whenever they would hear" ("So oft alle Völker . . . hörten"). However, it is more likely that this expression is a progressive, parallel to the later Syriac ܟܕ + participle, "as they were hearing."

> Dan. 3:7
>
> כל־קבל דנה בה־זמנא כדי *שמעין* כל־עממיא קל קרנא משרוקיתא קיתרס שבכא פסנטרין וכל זני זמרא *נפלין* כל־עממיא אמיא ולשניא *סגדין* לצלם דהבא די הקים נבוכדנצר מלכא
>
> Therefore, as all people *were hearing* the sound of the horn, pipe, lyre, trigon, harp, and all kinds of music, all the peoples, nations, and languages *were falling down worshipping* the golden image which Nebuchad-

nezzar the king set up.
[or, "whenever . . . *would hear* . . . , . . . *would fall down* (and) *worship* . . .]

Kutscher (1976:51-58) drew attention to this expression, which he called "predicative," which occurs in Targum Onkelos as כד + participle, in the Babylonian Talmud as כי + participle, and in Galilean Aramaic as מן + participle. In the present corpus, the imperfective force of the expression כדי + participle in the above example can be contrasted with the expression כדי + suffix conjugation, which is not imperfective (6:11, 15).

In at least 1 instance the active participle could be either iterative or inceptive (4:4a). See below.

3. *Past Inceptive*

There are 2 possible instances where the active participle is inceptive, i.e., it depicts the beginning of an action, though both instances could be otherwise analyzed. The inceptive function is also called ingressive or inchoative in some grammars. I use "inceptive" here to distinguish it from an "inchoative" situation aspect, which refers to a change of state. One possible instance occurs in Daniel 5:1.

> Dan. 5:1-2
>
> 1 בלשאצר מלכא עבד לחם רב לרברבנוהי אלף ולקבל אלפא חמרא *שתה* 2 בלשאצר אמר בטעם חמרא להיתיה למאני דהבא וכספא די הנפק נבוכדנצר אבוהי מן־היכלא די בירושלם וישתון בהון מלכא ורברבנוהי שגלתה ולחנתה
>
> Belshazzar the king made a great feast for his thousand nobles and before the thousand *he began to drink* wine. Belshazzar commanded when drunk to bring the vessels of gold and silver which Nebuchadnezzar his father had brought out from the temple which was in Jerusalem, so that the king, his nobles, his concubines and maid servants might drink with them.

Though other explanations are possible, an inceptive function fits the sequence of verbs in v. 1-2: the king עבד "made" (suffix conjugation) a great feast . . . , and שתה "began to drink" (participle); when he was drunk (or after he had tasted the wine), he אמר "commanded" (suffix conjugation) to bring the vessels from the temple, וישתון "so that they might drink" (prefix conjugation) with them.[8]

Another possible inceptive participle occurs in Daniel 4:4a.

---

[8] See also the discussion of this passage in chapter 6.

Dan. 4:4-5

4 באדין *עללין* חרטמיא אשפיא כשדיא וגזריא וחלמא אמר אנה קדמיהון ופשרה
לא־מהודעין לי 5 ועד אחרין על קדמי דניאל

> Then the magicians, exorcists, Chaldeans, and psychics *began to come in.*
> And as I was telling them the dream, and they could not make known its
> interpretation, finally Daniel came in before me.

The switch in the tenses of the verb עלל from a participle in v. 4 to a
suffix conjugation in v. 5 suggests a switch in aspectual function from
imperfective to perfective/past. Thus, the magicians and others "began
to come in" (participle) . . . until finally Daniel came in (suffix
conjugation). It is also possible that this participle is iterative, i.e., the
magicians and others "were coming in" (one by one) . . . until finally
Daniel came in, and a progressive interpretation cannot be ruled out,
i.e., "as they were coming in . . . ."

4. *General Present*

As mentioned above, presents are considered a subset of the
imperfective. Just like the imperfective, the present tense can be
subdivided into progressive and non-progressive (habit-
ual/gnomic/generic). That is, for most verbs in most discourse
contexts, the actual present can be characterized as a present
progressive, and the general present as a present habitual/imperfective
(Bybee 1994:236-238). Whereas the actual present expresses events
occurring at the moment of speech, general presents are statements of
timeless facts or general habitual actions. Furthermore, the habitual is
the default function of the present (246). That is, it is normal for a form
that expresses the habitual (general) present to also express the
progressive (actual) present, except in cases where a progressive
present becomes obligatory to express that meaning.

In at least 21 instances, active participles function as general
presents. That is, they express factual statements, statements of states
that are generally true, or habitually occurring actions that are not
necessarily occurring at the moment of speech. The list includes at
least 2:38, 40a, b, c; 3:16b, 17a, 25e, 31; 4:6, 32b, 34d; 5:23b, c, d; 6:14b,
17c, 21c, 26, 28a, b, c. Many of these instances occur in poetic contexts
or in relative clauses. Additionally, some instances of participial forms

of כהל/יכל (including at least 2:27e; 3:17b; 4:15a, b, 34e)[9] should also be viewed as general presents, though these also express an element of modality (see chapter 9, section D).

Dan. 5:23

ולאלהי כספא־ודהבא נחשא פרזלא אעא ואבנא די לא־*חזין* ולא־*שמעין* ולא *ידעין* שבחת

And you praised the gods of silver, gold, bronze, iron, wood, and stone, who neither *see* nor *hear* nor *know.*

Dan. 6:14

וזמנין תלתה ביומא *בעא* בעותה

Three times a day, *he makes* his petitions.

As can be seen from the above examples, these participles denote either timeless facts or habitual occurrences, rather than actions in process at the moment of speech. That is, they are general presents rather than actual (progressive) presents.

5. *Actual Present*

In a number of instances, the active participle expresses the actual present (2:8c, d, 11, 23a, b, 27c; 3:12a, b, 25c; 4:34a, b, c).

Dan. 4:34

כען אנה נבוכדנצר *משבח ומרומם ומהדר* למלך שמיא

Now, I Nebuchadnezzar *do praise, exalt, and glorify* the king of heaven.

Admittedly, it may occasionally be difficult to distinguish between a general and an actual present (e.g., 3:12a, b?).

6. *Performative Present*

As mentioned in chapter 2, there was a shift in Aramaic and Hebrew from the earlier use of the suffix conjugation to the later use of the active participle for expressing performatives. Gzella (2004:205-214, 307; 2007:93-94) suggested that performative participles are first attested in Biblical Aramaic. Rogland (2003:426-427) also gave examples

---

[9] The instance in 3:17 has also been analyzed as part of a complex verb phrase *איתי* + *participle* (see chapter 5).

of performatives with participles in Biblical, Egyptian, and other forms
of Aramaic. However, 2 of the Biblical Aramaic examples involve the
participle אמרין (Daniel 3:4; 4:28), and, as argued above, participial
constructions involving verbs that introduce direct speech are
formulaic in nature, and cannot be used to determine the function of
other participles in the corpus. As for the other instances (Daniel 2:23;
4:34; Ezra 4:16; 7:24), Rogland acknowledged that they "could
conceivably be referring to the action as an ongoing process," which is
tantamount to saying that they could be simply actual presents. In fact,
a performative present is a type of actual present! Nevertheless,
although the instances cited are disputable, Rogland is probably correct
that the period of Aramaic attested in "texts from Egypt and Qumran,"
which includes Biblical Aramaic, belongs to a phase in which the shift
from the earlier suffix conjugation performatives to the later active
participle performatives was "underway but not yet complete"
(2003:427).

7. *Historical Present*

Besides formulaic expressions introducing direct speech, there are a
number of other instances where the active participle allegedly
functions as a simple past, or a "historical present," the common name
given to the employment of the present to express past events in
languages where this function is attested (mostly Indo-European
languages). However, every one of these instances could be otherwise
explained, and some were discussed above under other categories.
Nevertheless, there are 3 instances of participles of the auxiliary verbs
כהל (5:8, 15) and יכל (6:5) that deserve further comment. Two of these
are better understood as past imperfectives (5:8; 6:5), and the
remaining instance is probably a general present (5:15).

> Dan. 5:8
>
> אדין עללין כל חכימי מלכא ולא*כהלין* כתבא למקרא ופשרא להודעה למלכא
>
> Then all the wise men of the king were coming in, but *were* not *able* to
> read the writing or make known the interpretation to the king.

Rosén (1961:185) included the above instance in his examples of the
participle as a simple past, but the Greek translation cited in support
consists of the imperfect (Old Greek ἠδύνατο, Theodotion ἠδύναντο). In
fact, the participle כהלין may simply express the continuation of the
function of the previous participle *עללין*. That is, both are either

iterative (i.e., they "kept coming in and not being able to . . .") or progressive (i.e., "they were coming in, but were not able to . . .").

Dan. 6:5

אדין סרכיא ואחשדרפניא הוו בעין עלה להשכחה לדניאל מצד מלכותא וכל־עלה ושחיתה לא־*יכלין* להשכחה

Then the supervisors and satraps were seeking to find a pretext against Daniel in regards to the kingdom, but *were* not *able* to find any pretext or corruption.

For some unknown reason, Rosén (1961:185), in his citation of the above instance, appealed to the Old Greek translation (which is very free in this passage) with the imperfect ηὕρισκον rather than Theodotion's aorist εὗρον, which would have better supported his case. Perhaps the disagreement in the Greek translations is suggestive. Although the participle יכלין could be analyzed as a simple past, it could also be understood as continuing the function of the previous participial expression הוו בעין (i.e., "they were seeking to . . . but not able to . . ."). The resulting imperfective notion could be either progressive (untranslatable, because English modal verbs lack participial or progressive forms) or iterative (i.e., they were repeatedly unable to).

Dan. 5:15

וכען העלו קדמי חכימיא אשפיא די־כתבה דנה יקרון ופשרה להודעתני ולא־*כהלין* פשר־מלתא להחויה

And now, the wise men and magicians were brought in before me to read this writing and make known to me its interpretation, but *they cannot* make known the interpretation of the matter.

In the above example, though the participle could be understood as a simple past, it also makes perfect sense as a general present in the context of the king's address to Daniel. Notice the parallel use of כען in v. 15-16: וכען . . . ולא־כהלין . . . כען הן תוכל "And now . . . , but they cannot . . . . But . . . , now if you can . . . ." Therefore, there is no reason not to interpret the instance in the above cited example as a general present. Thus, it appears that the only undisputable instances of simple past time active participles in the corpus are restricted to formulaic expressions involving verbs of speaking.

In passing, a word must be said concerning Gzella's (2004:120-131) long discussion of the participle as a historical present or "Erzählform," which he presents as a feature of Imperial Aramaic. As it turns out, the

only instance that he cites as a clear example outside of Biblical Aramaic, other than verbs introducing direct speech, is the following:

> *TAD* B2.8:4-5
>
> <div dir="rtl">אדין מומאה מטאה עליכי וימאתי לי</div>
>
> da *kam* der Eid zu dir und du hast mir geschworen. [italics mine]

The above example comes from one of the documents of the Mibtahiah archive, and the context is a divorce quit-claim between her and a man named **פיא**. Gzella's interpretation seems to be at least partly based on the assumptions that the conjunction **אדין** must be immediately followed by a perfective/simple past and that participial circumstantial clauses do not precede main clauses. However, there is no reason why the non-verb initial participial clause in the above example cannot be circumstantial to the following suffix conjugation verb. Thus, a valid alternative translation could be:

> Then, *as* an oath *was imposed* upon you, you swore to me.

Therefore, other than verbs introducing direct speech, there are no unequivocal examples of the participle functioning as a historical present or narrative tense in Imperial Aramaic outside the book of Daniel.[10]

Finally, the label "historical present" may be inaccurate for Aramaic participial expressions introducing direct speech. The appeal to the category of "historical present" is useful for those who see the active participle as primarily a present tense (e.g., Bauer and Leander, 1927:294-295; Rosenthal 1961:55; Johns 1972:25; Cohen 1984:413, 477; Rogland 2003:430-432). However, the fact that the majority of instances of active participles function in past time suggests that it is not a present tense, but a general imperfective that can also express the present as part of its imperfective function. Furthermore, Goodwin (1889:17) noticed that in classical Greek, in "such expressions as *he said, he commanded*," "the action is of such a nature that it is not important to distinguish its duration from its occurrence." That is, the aspectual opposition between the Greek aorist (i.e., the past perfective/simple past) and the imperfect (i.e., the past imperfective) was sometimes irrelevant for verbs introducing direct speech, and both aspects could

---

[10] Gzella's (2004:130) examples from Ezra 6:14 can likewise be translated as imperfectives, בנין ומצלחין "they continued building and prospering."

be used interchangeably, their distinction being "occasionally indifferent" (Goodwin 1900:270). It is possible that this phenomenon occurs in other languages, including some forms of ancient Aramaic. If so, the use of the active participle with verbs introducing direct speech at this stage of Aramaic should not be classed as the historical present, but as the "occasionally indifferent" use of the imperfective aspect in expressions introducing direct speech. That is, the active participle of אמר and other verbs introducing direct speech were originally employed instead of the suffix conjugation in past time narrative not as historical presents, but because the aspectual difference between simple past and past imperfective was often irrelevant for such expressions. Then, in later Aramaic, when the participle became more clearly a present tense, this function persisted as a vestige of earlier usage.

E. Non-Imperfective Functions that Overlap with the Prefix Conjugation

There are a few instances of the active participle that are best explained not as imperfective, but as the result of the active participle taking over the functions of the prefix conjugation. In at least 3 instances, all occurring in poetic contexts, the participle denotes future events that are not necessarily imperfective (4:22a, b, 29).

Dan. 4:22

ולך *טרדין* מן־אנשא ועם־חיות ברא להוה מדרך ועשבא כתורין לך יטעמון ומטל שמיא לך *מצבעין*

> And you *will be driven* away from mankind, and with the wild animals will be your dwelling, and you will be fed grass like oxen, and you *will be drenched* with the dew of heaven.[11]

It is interesting to observe in the example above the poetic parallelism between participles and prefix conjugation verbs. Toews (1993:305-306) distinguishes mainline predictions with the prefix conjugation from background predictions with the active participle. If so, the latter would have a future progressive/imperfective function as classified in the present study. However, though Toews' suggestion is possible, the

---

[11] I translate impersonal plurals as passive because there is no parallel expression in English. See the discussion of the generalized subject constructions in the next chapter.

few instances where they both occur together in predictive discourse make his case difficult to prove.

It is possible that the active participle has also begun to take over the prefix conjugation's function of expressing modality, though examples are sparse (excluding participial occurrences of the verb "to be able" 2:26, 27; 3:17; 4:15(2x), 34; 5:8, 15; 6:5) and could be otherwise interpreted.[12] One instance occurs in 4:4d.

Dan. 4:4

וחלמא אמר אנה קדמיהון ופשרה לא*מהודעין* לי 5 ועד אחרין על קדמי דניאל

As I was telling them the dream, and *they were* not *making known* [or, *they could* not *make known*] its interpretation, finally Daniel came in before me.

In the above example, מהודעין, in addition to continuing the progressive or iterative sense of the previous clause(s), may possibly (though not necessarily) also express ability, i.e., "could make known."

The participle in 5:23a is probably best understood as expressing purpose.

Dan. 5:23

ועל מרא־שמיא התרוממת ולמאניא די־ביתה היתיו קדמיך ואנתה ורברבניך שגלתך ולחנתך חמרא *שתין* בהון

And you have raised yourself against the Lord of heaven, and the vessels of his temple were brought before you, *so that* you, your nobles, your consorts, and your concubines *might drink* wine with them.

Compare the participle in the above example with the parallel expression in 5:2, cited above, containing the prefix conjugation verb instead of the participle. Alternatively, שתין could be understood as circumstantial to the following suffix conjugation verb שבחת, i.e., "and as you were drinking wine . . . , you praised . . . ." Also possible is Gzella's (2004:195-196) suggestion that it denotes a present, though "schon länger andauert," i.e., "you have been drinking," though less likely, because the suffix conjugation verbs both before and after the participle suggest that the context is a narration of past time events.

---

[12] For a discussion of other alleged examples of participles expressing modality, see chapter 2, section G, subsection 3.

F. Summary

Among the many observable phenomena that are widely common in the historical development of languages, two are especially relevant for the active participle in the Aramaic of Daniel—first, a progressive construction may eventually take over the function of the imperfective or the present, and second, new grammatical constructions begin with a restricted range of functions and eventually acquire a wider range of functions. In the Aramaic of Daniel, the active participle continues to function nominally and as a progressive expressing ongoing actions, but has in addition acquired many other imperfective functions, and it is possible that it even occasionally expresses modality. A special function of the participle occurs in formulaic expressions introducing direct speech. Though the participle is frequently used in the expression of the present (general and actual present), the fact that the majority of instances active participles function in past time suggests that it is not a present tense, but a general imperfective that can also express the present as part of its imperfective function. Therefore, the active participle in the Aramaic of Daniel may be characterized as an imperfective that arose from an earlier progressive. As such, it has become a full-fledged member of the verbal system. In chapter 5, it will be demonstrated that the imperfective function of the active participle is being renewed by the complex verb phrase הוה + *participle*, and as a result, the participle by itself will eventually be restricted to expressing the present.

THE NON-ACTIVE PARTICIPLES

A. Preliminary Discussion of Concepts and Issues

Voice describes the relationship between the verb and the participants in a clause. A verb is typically described as active when its subject is the agent or actor. By contrast, a verb is said to be passive when the subject does not perform the action, but is the patient, target, or undergoer of the action. Besides active and passive, voice describes many other types of relationships between the verb and the participants. For example, the English middle voice is characterized by an active intransitive verb functioning semantically as a passive, e.g., "the car drives well." In Semitic languages, many C stem verbs have a causative voice, i.e., the verb has two actor participants, one of which is an oblique actor. Similarly, the Semitic t-stems can be characterized as expressing a range of non-active voices, including, inter alia, the reflexive voice, i.e., the actor and patient are the same, e.g., "he watched himself in the mirror," and the reciprocal voice, i.e., each of the participants is both agent and patient in relation to each other, e.g., "they watched each other in the mirror."[1]

Haspelmath's (1990:28) study of passive morphology (which was based on the same language sample used by Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994) observed that it is more likely for a language to lack a passive than to have one, and that some languages have more than one way of marking the passive. Whereas in some languages, such as ancient Greek, participles inflect for voice and can express both active and passive (and middle) voices, in most languages there is no exact morphological passive counterpart of the active participle, though it can be expressed in other ways. For example, in English, the passive of the present participle, "doing," is not the past participle, "done," but the complex verb phrase, "being done." By contrast, ancient Aramaic

---

[1] This traditional description of voice is adequate for the present study, and probably for the study of ancient Semitic languages in general. However, there are other ways of explaining voice, which are more cross-linguistically applicable. For example, see Klaiman 1991, who opts for a valence approach in his explanation of voice.

appears to have two forms to express the passive of the active participle. That is, not only do the active stems possess both an active and a passive participle, but the t-stems, which can express the passive voice, also possess a participle. In this present chapter, it will be demonstrated that, at the diachronic stage of the language attested in the corpus, the so-called passive participle is primarily a verbal adjective that is developing into a resultative participle, whereas the t-stem participle is the true passive (and reflexive) counterpart to the active participle.[2]

Kaufman (1974:129-130) argued that, since only the prefix conjugation passive but not the suffix conjugation is attested in Old Aramaic, the "gradual disappearance of the internal passive in Aramaic and its replacement by the reflexive forms was a general Aramaic development," but the preservation of the Gp suffix conjugation and the G passive participle in Imperial Aramaic are due to Akkadian influence. As for the origin of the forms, Fox (2003:196) suggested that the Gp suffix conjugation consists of the G stem passive participle with the addition of pronominal affixes, and that both of these together with the *qattīl* type words are formed from the common Aramaic *qatīl* base, which in turn developed from the Protosemitic stative/passive *qatil*, from which also the G stem suffix conjugation pattern of stative verbs developed. Whatever may be the historical relationship between the Gp stem suffix conjugation and the G stem passive participle, the existence of counterparts in the D and C stems (i.e., D and C passive participles distinguishable from Dp and Cp suffix conjugations, i.e., Pual and Huphal) indicates that, possibly as early as in Old Aramaic (see Segert 1975:159-259), the two forms were already separate entities. Therefore the analysis of Rosén (1961:201-203) is inaccurate, because he ignored the distinction between the G passive participle and the Gp suffix conjugation, lumping them together into what he calls the *qtīl*. His suggestion that the *qtīl* of "linear" verbs expresses the passive present and that of "point" verbs the passive narrative past tense may be better

---

[2] Incidental or parenthetical statements in the treatment of some other forms of Aramaic imply a similar conclusion. E.g., according to Muraoka and Porten (1998:201), in Egyptian Aramaic, the passive participle indicates "the result of an action," in contrast to the t-stem participle, which "indicates an action;" Nöldeke (1904:218) commented in passing that an example cited shows "the difference between the Passive Participle and the Reflexive Participle with the effect of the Active." In what follows, I attempt to give a more detailed explanation, with special attention to its diachronic significance.

explained as the distinction between the G passive participle and the
Gp suffix conjugation.

B. The Passive Participle/Verbal Adjective

Since the Aramaic grammatical construction typically called the
"passive participle" is derivationally related to some other adjectives,
and since, as will be shown below, its basic function in the Aramaic of
Daniel is adjectival, the passive participle is in fact a verbal adjective,
though both labels will be used interchangeably hereafter, because the
former is more common.

An accurate tally of passive participles/verbal adjectives is crucial in
this small corpus, since an incorrect inclusion or exclusion of instances
can easily alter the conclusions. Besides instances commonly
recognized as passive participles, I have also included a number of
words classified as adjectives in some dictionaries, because they are
passive participles in form. These include at least עתידין 3:15; שלה 4:1;
עציב 6:21; נקא 7:9. Gai (2005:23) also includes the substantivized עירין/עיר
4:10, 14, 20. I suspect that their classification as adjectives or nouns is a
matter of expedience due to the lack of finite verbal forms from these
roots attested in Biblical Aramaic. Nevertheless, since finite verbal
forms are attested in other forms of Aramaic, there is no reason why
these words should not be counted as passive participles.[3] On the other
hand, as alluded to above, it is important to distinguish the G stem
passive participle from the Gp stem suffix conjugation, even though the
Gp 3rd masculine singular suffix conjugation form is indistinguishable
from the G masculine singular absolute passive participle, except for
final weak ("Lamed He") verbs.[4] Fortunately, in most cases the context
makes the distinction clear. Thus, although 21 out of 47 potential
instances are morphologically ambivalent forms,[5] at least 16 of these

---

[3] Again, Rosén's analysis is inadequate, because he ignored most of these instances
(1961:201-203).

[4] E.g., compare Gp suffix conjugation גלי in 2:19 with G passive participle שרא in 2:22.

[5] The 26 morphologically clear forms occur in 2:9, 20, 22a, b, 41a, b, 42, 43, 45; 3:15, 19,
22, 23, 24, 25; 4:1, 10, 14, 20, 32; 6:5a, b, c, 11; 7:7a, b, 9, 19. Of these, 11 are derived stem
passive participles (2:20, 22a, 41b, 42, 43, 45; 3:23, 24, 25; 6:5b; 7:7b). The remaining G
stem forms are either not masc. sg. abs. (2:9, 41a; 3:15; 4:14, 32; 6:5a, c, 11; 7:7a, 19) or are
from final weak roots (2:22b; 3:19, 22; 4:1; 7:9).

can be clearly analyzed based on context. That is, 2 instances are clearly G passive participles because of their substantival function (עיר 4:10, 20; cf. עירין 4:14), and 14 instances are clearly Gp suffix conjugation verbs because the context favors a passive past time verb rather than a timeless verbal adjective (טריד 4:30; 5:21; שליח 5:24; רשים 5:24, 25; 6:11;[6] קטיל 5:30; יהיב 7:4, 6, 14, 22; שים 3:29; 4:3; 6:27).[7] For example:

Dan. 7:4

מריטו גפיה ונטילת מן־ארעא ועל־רגלין כאנש הקימת ולבב אנש יהיב לה

Its wings were plucked up, it was lifted up from the ground, it was made to stand on two feet like a human being, and a human heart *was given* to it.

In the above example, יהיב continues a series of morphologically unambiguous passive suffix conjugation verbs, and there is no reason to interpret יהיב differently. The remaining 5 ambivalent instances are provisionally included in the tally of passive participles, and will be discussed on a case by case basis as necessary.[8]

In passing, a word must be said concerning the *qattīl* type words (e.g., יציב, תקיף, שגיא), especially since the consonantal text does not differentiate between these and G stem passive participles. Gai (1986:8-14) suggested that the distinction between the two forms is that *qattīl* is used for stative verbs, whereas the more common passive participle form can be used for either dynamic or stative verbs, but is more common with the former. Be that as it may, since there is no question as to the stative/adjectival function of these words (also substantivized, e.g., עתיק in 7:9), I have not included them in this study.

1. *From Verbal Adjective to Resultative Participle*

The traditional categorization of Semitic participles as either active or passive glosses over the fact that non-active participles may be characterized by a variety of possible functions. Goldenberg (1992:114-115) described passive participles as "perfect/passive," though his use of the term "perfect" essentially means "resultative," i.e., a form that

---

[6] See the discussion of 5:25 in Bauer and Leander (1927:288).

[7] The 3 instances of שים occur in what Kutscher (1969:148-151) called the *passivum majestatis*, which was discussed in chapter 2.

[8] דחיל (2:31), ידיע (3:18), בריך (3:28), עשית (6:4), עציב (6:21).

expresses a resulting state. That is, Semitic passive participles may be not only both resultative and passive, but also either resultative without being passive or passive without being resultative. Moreover, the opposition between active and passive participles is "practically neutralized" in some instances of "stative-inchoative" verbs. For example, both participles of the root קנה may mean "owner, possessor." According to Haspelmath (1994), passive participles are direct-object oriented (e.g., the Russian past passive participle, which can only be formed from transitive verbs), whereas the orientation of resultative participles depends on the situation aspect of the root word (e.g., the English past participle: in "abused child," the participle has patient orientation, whereas in "wilted dandelion," there is only one single participant). He also suggested that the origin of passive participles can be traced to resultative participles. A slightly different explanation was offered by Gai (2005), who distinguished Semitic non-active participles as either stative or passive. Non-active participles that refer to the undergoer of the verb are passive, whereas those that may refer to either the actor or undergoer are stative. Since passives generally cannot be derived from intransitive and stative verbs, non-active participles that can be derived from these sources are stative, whereas those that cannot are passive. He concluded that the Aramaic non-active participle was originally passive, and its stative function is due to Akkadian influence. Although Gai explained stative in primarily resultative terms ("the state stemming from the act"), much of his discussion contrasted between "dynamic and stative"--a detail worth noting, because a simple (non-dynamic) stative, e.g., an adjective or a stative verb, does not necessarily entail a previous event that produced a given state, though both the adjectival/stative and the resultative functions could conceivably be subsumed under a somewhat looser, imprecise definition of "stative." Nevertheless, though Gai's "stative" function is more encompassing than Goldenberg's "per-fect"/resultative, it may in fact suggest that the function of non-active participles needs to be described in terms of more than only two possibilities. In addition to passive and resultative participles, Haspelmath also discussed "non-past/modal" participles, which characterize an entity not by means of a state resulting from an event, but "by means of a potentiality for an event that is conceived as inherent in the entity" (1994:163). An example of a modal participle is the English verbal adjective with –*able*, e.g., "washable," perishable." Thus, it is clear that participles other than active participles can be

variously characterized, and are not always limited to the distinction between passive and stative/resultative.

Of the possible 33 instances of passive participles, at least 9 instances express a resultative sense. These include: מסתרתא "hidden things" (2:22a); שרא "encamped/loosed" (2:22b); פליגה "divided" (2:41a); מערב "mixed" (2:41b, 43); ידיע "known" (3:18); מכפתין "bound" (3:23, 24); חשיבין "considered" (4:32). For example:

> Dan. 3:23
>
> נפלו לגוא־אתון־נורא יקדתא *מכפתין*
>
> They fell down *bound* into the furnace of burning fire.

To these may be added עשית "resolved" (6:4), though as will be explained below, this instance may actually be a Gp suffix conjugation form.

In the majority of instances, however, the passive participle does not have a resultative sense. A number of passive participles of transitive verbs denote not a state resulting from a concluded action, but potential or habitual/customary situations. A potential situation is one that could or is likely to happen, and a habitual/customary situation is one that usually or often happens. Both types of situations share the characteristic that they may not be actually happening at a specific reference time. Both fit Haspelmath's (1994:162-163) classification of "modal" participle. For example, although מהימן, the passive participle of the C stem/quadriliteral verb "to trust," may denote the state of having received trust, in 2:45 it means a potential receiver of trust, i.e., a "trustable/trustworthy" interpretation of a dream. Also, חזה (3:19) from the root "to see" does not denote the state of having been "seen," but what one customarily sees, hence the translation, "customary/proper" or "seemly."

> Dan. 3:19
>
> ענה ואמר למזא לאתונא חד־שבעה על די *חזה* למזיה
>
> He answered and commanded to heat the furnace seven times more than it was *customary* to heat it.

Similarly, תבירה (2:42) from the root "to break" does not mean "broken," but "breakable" or "brittle/fragile," and דחיל (2:31)/ דחילה (7:7a, 19) from the root "to fear" does not denote a state resulting from having been "feared," but the condition of being "fear-able," i.e., "frightening/dreadful."

A number of instances of passive participles are best described as stative/adjectival. These include passive participles of both transitive and intransitive verbs. Instances derived from intransitive verbs include the following: עציב (6:21) means "sad/grieving," rather than "saddened/grieved" or "capable of being sad;" נקא (7:9) means "pure/clean," rather than "purified/cleaned" or "potentially pure/clean;" שלה (4:1), if the traditional vocalization is correct,[9] means "at ease," rather than "made at ease/quieted" or "potentially at ease." The substantival עיר (4:10, 20)/עירין (4:14), angelic "watcher/watchers," are neither resultative, i.e., "those who were woken up," nor modal, i.e., "those who are awake-able," but simply stative, i.e., "those who are awake/vigilant." שחיתה (6:5a, c) means "corruption/corrupt deed," not "corrupted deed," nor "corruptible deed;" or (in 2:9) "corrupt," rather than "spoiled/corrupted" or "corruptible." Passive participles derived from transitive verbs include the following: משניה (7:7b) from the transitive D stem verb "to change" does not mean "changed/altered" or "changeable," but is simply stative, "different."

Dan. 7:7

והיא *משניה* מן־כל־חיותא די קדמיה

It was *different* from all the animals that were before it.

Similarly, מהימן (6:5b) from the transitive C stem/quadriliteral verb "to trust," does not denote a state resulting from having been trusted, but a permanent quality, i.e., "faithful."

Finally, there are a few instances that could be debated. מברך (2:20)/בריך (3:28) could be either resultative, i.e., "blessed," or potential, i.e., "praiseworthy." אזה (3:22) could be understood either as "heated" (resultative) or "hot" (stative) (see below). Does שרין (3:25) mean "loosed" (resultative) or simply "free/unfettered" (stative)? As for פתיחן (6:11), it is probably stative, "open," though the context might allow for a resultative, "opened." And although עתידין (3:15) could mean "prepared" (resultative), it functions as an auxiliary meaning "ready/willing to."

Haspelmath (1994:167) observed that participles arise from adjectival affixes that "come to be used so regularly that the deverbal

---

[9] Here and subsequently, I assume the traditional vocalization of the majority of manuscripts for this word as a passive participle, but recognize that it could actually be an active participle, שָׁלֵה, as attested in the vocalization of some manuscripts.

adjective can be called a participle," and thus participles result from analogy but not from grammaticalization. Therefore, though the various semantic meanings of the passive participle may be explained by its origin as a verbal adjective, one cannot plot them into a diachronic path of development based on grammaticalization alone. The attested resultative instances suggest that the so called passive participle is in the process of developing from a verbal adjective to a resultative participle, but, given the fact that non-resultative instances outnumber resultative instances, the resultative function is still in the early stages of development, and will be more pronounced in later Aramaic (e.g., Nöldeke 1904:218 explained the function of the passive participle in Syriac as resultative).

   Although the origin of the passive participle may not necessarily be due to grammaticalization, once it becomes a resultative participle, its further development can be ascribed to grammaticalization phenomena. According to Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:51-105), the general tendency in languages is that resultatives, which express a resulting state, eventually become anteriors, which denote a past action with current relevance, and these in turn develop into perfectives or simple pasts (see also Goldenberg 1992:113). This is illustrated in the development of the Semitic verbal adjective into the West Semitic suffix conjugation (Rubin 2005:26-28). It is also attested in Neo-Aramaic. For example, as early 1895, MacLean (1895:85-87) observed that the preterite in several dialects of Neo-Aramaic is formed by the former passive participle with the addition of ܠ- + pronominal affixes. See also Bergsträsser's (1983 [orig. 1928]: 102, 112) observations concerning the pluperfect in the Western Neo-Aramaic dialect of Maʿlula and his description of the West Neo-Aramaic dialect of Urmia, as well as Goldenberg (1992:113-133) on the development of the passive participle into the preterite in Eastern Neo-Aramaic. See also Hopkins (1989), Hoberman (1989), and Khan (1999, 2000).

   In passing, it should be remarked that, since the use of the syntagm ܠ- + pronominal suffix to express the subject of the passive participle resulted in a situation where the subject of a verb in one conjugation was expressed in the same way as the object of a verb in another conjugation, some have suggested that Neo-Aramaic retains the remains of a split ergative system (e.g., see the discussions in Jastrow

1996; Mengozzi 2002:37-49; Khan 2007:13-14).[10] However, Mengozzi acknowledges that the term ergative is not used in the strictest linguistic sense. See "ergative" in the glossary. In any event, at the stage of the language attested in the Aramaic of Daniel, there is no evidence of ergativity.

2. *Nominal Functions*

The vast majority of the possible 33 instances of passive participles/verbal adjectives in the Aramaic of Daniel are clearly non-verbal in function.

2.1. *Predicate Adjective*

The most frequently attested function of passive participles is that of a predicate adjective (at least 13 instances: 2:20, 31, 42, 45; 3:15, 18, 19, 28; 4:1, 32; 6:5b; 7:7b, 19).[11] Most of the instances occur in verbless sentences, but 4 of them are accompanied by the verb הוה (2:20, 42; 3:18; 4:1) and 1 by the copula איתי (3:15), and these will be discussed more in detail in the next chapter.

   As for the instances of the predicate passive participle without הוה or איתי, their temporal reference is derived from the context. Thus, some instances occur in timeless general present contexts (2:45; 3:28; 4:32) and others occur in past time contexts (2:31; 3:19; 6:5b; 7:7b, 19). Here is an example of the same passive participle in two different temporal contexts:

Dan. 2:45

ויציב חלמא *ומהימן* פשרה

The dream is certain, and its interpretation is *trustworthy*.

Dan. 6:5

וכל־*עלה* ושחיתה לא־יכלין להשכחה כל־קבל די־*מהימן* הוא

They could not find any pretext or corruption, because he was *faithful*.

_____

[10] Müller (1985, 1995) suggested that there was split-ergativity also in Akkadian, Hebrew, and Egyptian.

[11] These include some of the ambiguous instances mentioned above (2:31; 3:18, 28), and it is possible that some are Gp 3ms suffix conjugation verbs.

The passive participle מהימן occurs in both examples above. However, the context in the first instance is general present, but past time in the second instance.

2.2 *Attributive*

In at least 6 instances, the passive participle functions attributively (2:9, 41a; 6:11, 21; 7:7a, 9).[12] The following example needs no further comment:

Dan. 7:7

חזה הוית בחזוי ליליא וארו חיוה רביעיה *דחילה* ואימתני ותקיפא יתירא

I was looking in the visions of the night, and look, there was a fourth, *fearful*, dreadful, and very strong animal.

2.3. *Substantival*

As is generally the case with adjectives in Semitic languages, an adjective can be substantivized, and function as a noun. That is also the case with the passive participle in the Aramaic of Daniel. There are at least 6 instances attested (2:22a; 4:10, 14, 20; 6:5a, c).

Dan. 6:5

וכל־עלה *ושחיתה* לא־יכלין להשכחה כל־קבל די־מהימן הוא וכל־שלו *ושחיתה* לא השתכחת עלוהי

They could not find any pretext or *corruption*, because he was faithful, and no negligence or *corruption* was found in him.

2.4. *Adjunct/Complement*

There are 5 instances of the passive participle that function as part of sentence adjuncts/complements (2:41b, 43; 3:23, 24, 25).[13]

Dan. 2:41

---

[12] It is possible to analyze פליגה in 2:41a (מלכו פליגה תהוה) as either as attributive, i.e., "it will be a divided kingdom," or as the adjectival predicate of the verb הוה, i.e., "a kingdom will be divided." I prefer the former interpretation.

[13] In linguistics, a complement is a sentence element that is necessary to complete the meaning of the sentence. In contrast, an adjunct is an optional sentence element. The first cannot be removed without rendering the sentence ungrammatical or altering its core meaning, whereas the latter can be removed without rendering the sentence ungrammatical. I group these instances together as adjuncts/complements, because in some cases it is difficult to distinguish complements from adverbial adjuncts.

ומן־נצבתא די פרזלא להוא־בה כל־קבל די חזיתה פרזלא *מערב* בחסף טינא

> Some of the firmness of iron will be in it, inasmuch as you saw the iron *mixed* with wet clay.

In the above example (and in 2:43), "the iron" is the direct object of the verb, followed by an adjunct/complement, "mixed [מערב] with wet clay," which in this case consists of an adjectival predicate of the object. That is, the above sentence is equivalent to, ". . . you saw that the iron was mixed with wet clay."

3. *Verbal Functions*

In general, a verbal adjective can be said to function as a finite verb when the expression of tense, aspect, and/or modality supersedes its usual nominal/adjectival functions. Bauer and Leander (1927:297) suggested a general present meaning for passive participles of verbs with a durative character, and present or gerundive for the others. However, as explained above, the general present (atemporal) meaning of the former substantiates their adjectival nature, and the only examples they give for the latter are t-stem participles. Although in principle there is no reason why passive participles could not function as finite verbs, all potential instances in the Aramaic of Daniel can be otherwise explained.[14] At least 3 instances deserve special comment. First, according to Gai (2005:22) the passive participle אזה in 3:22 functions as a passive finite verb.

> Dan. 3:22

כל־קבל דנה מן־די מלת מלכא מחצפה ואתונא *אזה* יתירא

> Therefore, because the command of the king was urgent and the furnace *was heated* excessively [or, was extremely *hot*], . . .

Though it is possible to ascribe a finite verb function to the above instance, it is also possible that it is the predicate of a verbless sentence. That is, the passive participle translated verbally, "*was heated*," could in fact be a predicate adjective (either resultative, "was excessively *heated*," or stative, "was extremely *hot*"). Admittedly, the

---

[14] The difficulty in distinguishing the passive participle's verbal and non-verbal predicate functions is similar to the situation of the parallel Akkadian form, the so-called "stative" *paris*. For a discussion of the literature, see Huehnergard (1987) and Kouwenberg (2000).

distinction between the verb phrase "*was heated*" and the predicate adjective "was *heated*[*/hot*]" is subtle, and, since both functions are predicate, it is not always easy to distinguish them. Moreover, as the passive participle becomes more extensively employed as a finite verb, eventually replacing the suffix conjugation as the primary means of expressing the resultative aspect, this line of distinction will eventually be erased. However, the distinction between a resultative verbal adjective (e.g., the English past participle, "The damage was *done* ") and a finite verb (phrase) expressing resultative aspect (e.g., the English perfect, "George *has done* some damage") appears to be still valid for the Aramaic of Daniel.

Bauer and Leander (1927:297) cited Nöldeke's (1904:220) observation that some Syriac passive participles have an active function. However, as Goldenberg (1992:118) pointed out, this occurs mainly with verbs signifying "'take, hold, carry' or the like."[15] At first sight, 2 instances of passive participles appear to have an active function. The first instance is שרא (2:22b) (Segert 1975:384).

Dan. 2:22

ידע מה בחשוכא ונהירא עמה *שרא*

He knows what is in obscurity [= darkness], and light is *encamped* [*/loosed*] with him.

Although it is defensible to translate the passive participle שרא above as an active verb (i.e., "dwells"), its function could also be understood as predicative adjectival (i.e., "encamped/loosed"). Since the root שרה is also used in 5:12, 16, where it carries the sense of loosening knots or resolving problems, this verse probably contains a word play in which "darkness" denotes what is obscure or hidden, i.e., God knows what is obscure and what is not obscure (light) is simple (loosed/resolved) for him (cf. Collins 1993:160). Rosén (1961:203) appealed to Theodotion's translation of שרא with ἐστιν as evidence for a present tense function. However, this Greek translation could also be understood as reflecting the fact that שרא is the predicate adjective of a verbless sentence. Furthermore, the Old Greek renders it with the noun κατάλυσις.

Finally, the form עשית in 6:4 is also ambiguous on several levels.

---

[15] Nöldeke (1904:220) explained it as follows: "This arises partly from the circumstance that the verbs concerned may be doubly transitive, and partly from the influence of the analogy of forms allied in meaning. Thus ܛܥܝܢ 'laden with' = 'bearing.'"

Dan. 6:4

ומלכא *עשית* להקמותה על־כל־מלכותא

> The king *intended* [or, was *resolved*] to promote him over the entire kingdom.

In the above example, the distinction between the active "*intended*" and the passive "*was resolved*" may be a matter of translation rather than the Aramaic meaning. Also, it is possible to analyze עשית either as a Gp suffix conjugation verb or as a verbal adjective functioning as a predicate of a verbless sentence (Bauer and Leander 1927:297 apparently favored the latter). The distinction between "*was resolved*" (i.e., "*intended*") and "*was resolved*" captures the distinction between a verbal function and a predicate adjectival function. See the discussion above on אזה in 3:22. Finally, it is possible that this instance may be a counter-example to Kutscher's (1969) suggestion that the *passivum majestatis* only occurs in Daniel in 1st person citations.[16]

C. The T-Stem Participle

In the Aramaic of Daniel, whereas the active stems have both an active participle and a passive participle, t-stems have only one participle. The latter generally functions verbally with a passive/reflexive voice, and may also have an adjectival function (like all participles). I suggest, therefore, that, instead of the passive participle/verbal adjective, the t-stem participle is the true passive (and reflexive) counterpart of active participle. Since, it was demonstrated in the previous chapter that the active participle in the Aramaic of Daniel expresses primarily an imperfective aspect when functioning as a finite verb, the t-stem participle is a passive/reflexive imperfective.

1. *Passive/Reflexive Voice*

As is well known, the t-stems can express either the passive or the reflexive/reciprocal voices (Bauer and Leander 1927:275-276). It is possible that the grammaticalization path from reflexive to passive, which Haspelmath (1990:42-46) proposed as from reflexive to anticausative (i.e., a process occurs without an implied agent, sometimes called medio-passive) to passive, corresponds to the

---

[16] Discussed in chapter 2, section B.

development of passive meaning in the Semitic t-stems. Heine and Kuteva (2002b:252-254) also list several examples of reflexives becoming anticausative, middle, passive, and reciprocal. However, the origin of the t-stems in early Semitic is beyond the scope of this study.[17]

There are 12 t-stem participles attested in our corpus.[18] Of these, 4 instances are definitely passive and not reflexive (2:13; 5:6, 9a, b). For example:

Dan. 2:13

ודתא נפקת וחכימיא *מתקטלין*ובעו דניאל וחברוהי להתקטלה

The decree went out, and the wise men *were about to be killed*, and they sought to have Daniel and his friends killed.

In the above example, the t-stem participle definitely cannot be reflexive (i.e., "were killing themselves") or reciprocal ("were killing each other"), but is simply passive. The same can be said of the infinitive להתקטלה in the following clause. Of the remaining instances of t-stem participles, 4 are best analyzed as having a reflexive sense (6:4, 12, 15; 7:8).

Dan. 6:4

אדין דניאל דנה *הוא מתנצח* על־סרכיא ואחשדרפניא

Then this Daniel *was distinguishing himself* above the administrators and satraps.

In the 4 remaining instances, the t-stem participle could be analyzed either as passive or reflexive (2:43a, b; 3:3, 27).

Dan. 3:3

באדין *מתכנשין* אחשדרפניא סגניא ופחותא אדרגזריא גדבריא דתבריא תפתיא וכל שלטני מדינתא לחנכת צלמא די הקים נבוכדנצר מלכא

Then the satraps, governors and counselors, the treasurers, judges, and magistrates, and all the officials of the provinces *were being gathered* for the dedication of the statue that king Nebuchadnezzar set up.

---

[17] Likewise, it is also possible that the Semitic internal passive stems followed a similar path, though this is also beyond the scope of this study. Blake (1901) proposed a connection between internal passives and the prefix conjugation intransitive.

[18] The list is as follows: מתקטלין (2:13), מתערבין (2:43a), מתערב (2:43b), מתכנשין (3:3), הוא (6:12) מתחנן (6:4), הוא מתנצח (5:9b) משתבשין (5:9a), מתבהל (5:6), משתרין (3:27), משתדר (6:15), משתכל הוית (7:8).

In the above example, the t-stem participle may be either passive (i.e., "were being gathered") or reflexive (i.e., "were gathering themselves," translated as intransitive, "were gathering"), though I favor the former since the context is the fulfillment of a royal command.

2. *Imperfective*

In addition to expressing voice, t-stem participles functioning verbally also express imperfective aspect. Of the 12 instances of t-stem participles, 4 occur as part of a complex verb phrase consisting of a participle and the verb הוה (2:43; 6:4, 15; 7:8),[19] and will be discussed in the next chapter.

Of the instances of t-stem participles not in combination with הוה, most function as finite verbs, expressing some type of imperfective aspect. For example:

Dan. 2:13

ודתא נפקת וחכימיא *מתקטלין* ובעו דניאל וחברוהי להתקטלה

The decree went out, and the wise men *were about to be killed*, and they sought to have Daniel and his friends killed.

In the above example, the t-stem participle is either imminent/impending, i.e., it denotes an action soon to take place,[20] or tendential, i.e., it denotes an attempted but not (yet) completed action. These are imperfective functions, since actions are viewed before completion. Most of the remaining instances are imperfectives expressing actions in progress, i.e., they are progressives (3:3, 27; 5:6, 9a, b; 6:12). For example:

Dan. 3:3

באדין *מתכנשין* . . . וקאמין לקבל צלמא

Then . . . [the officials] *were being gathered* and were standing before the statue.

----

[19] The instance in 2:43, מתערבין להון, may alternatively be a t-stem participle functioning as an adjectival predicate with the verb הוה, rather than the complex verb phrase *participle + הוה*. See the discussion below.

[20] Nöldeke (1904:215) explained that the active participle in Syriac may denote "something on the point of happening in the past."

In the above example, two plural participles (t-stem מתכנשין and active קאמין) can be construed as temporally sequential but overlapping, since the officials did not first finish gathering together as a group before they began to stand before the statue. Therefore, they are imperfectives expressing actions in progress.

3. *Predicate Adjective*

There is at least 1 possible instance of a t-stem participle in 2:43 (מתערב) that may function as a predicate adjective, though a verbal function is also possible.

Dan. 2:43

די חזית פרזלא מערב בחסף טינא מתערבין להון בזרע אנשא ולא־להון דבקין דנה
עם־דנה הא־כדי פרזלא לא *מתערב* עם־חספא

Since you saw the iron mixed with wet clay, they will mix themselves with human seed, but they will not stick one with another, just as the iron is not *mixed* [or *does* not *mix*] with clay.

Since the above verse also contains the passive participle מערב, with a clearly adjectival function, one could consider the switch to the use of the t-stem participles as intentionally denoting a verbal idea. This view is not only defensible, but also supports other conclusions of this research concerning these grammatical constructions. However, in all fairness, it is also instructive to observe how the Greek versions and Syriac Peshitta translate the 3 instances of ערב in this verse, which are summarized as follows:

Aramaic of Daniel	Syriac Peshitta	Greek (OG)	Greek (Theod.)
מערב	ܚܠܝܛ	ἀναμεμειγμένον	ἀναμεμειγμένον
מתערבין להון	ܢܬܚܠܛܘܢ	συμμειγεῖς ἔσονται	συμμειγεῖς ἔσονται
מתערב	ܡܬܚܠܛ	δύναται συγκραθῆναι	ἀναμείγνυται

As can be seen above, the Syriac Peshitta translates these instances of ערב with corresponding grammatical expression based on the root ܚܠܛ "to mix," except that the expression מתערבין להון was rendered with a prefix conjugation form ܢܬܚܠܛܘܢ. On the other hand, both Greek translations rendered the passive participle מערב as ἀναμεμειγμένον

(i.e., perfect middle-passive participle from ἀναμίγνυμι "to mix"), and the t-stem participle מתערבין as an adjective, συμμειγεῖς (predicate of verb "to be"). The t-stem participle מתערב was rendered as δύναται συγκραθῆναι in the Old Greek and ἀναμείγνυται in Theodotion (though divergent in the last instance, both Greek versions seem to agree on a present tense, reflecting a general present verbal notion).

Therefore, it is also possible that the verse cited above contains another instance of a t-stem participle functioning as a predicate adjective, מתערבין, though I prefer to include מתערבין להון among instances of *participle + הוה*. As can be seen from the above, whereas the Peshitta translator(s) of Daniel most likely understood the expression מתערבין להון as a simple future, the Greek translators understood it not as a verb phrase, but as an adjectival participle followed by the verb "to be." My reason for mentioning the ancient versions is not because these translations determine the meaning of the Aramaic, but because they show that the relationship between the passive participles and t-stem participles is not restricted to the distinction between verbal and non-verbal functions, but allows for a wide range of options, especially in regards to the t-stem participles.

All attested instances of t-stem participles function as sentence predicates, either verbally or as predicates of verbless sentences, though, since the corpus is limited, that does not preclude the possibility of (unattested) attributive or substantival functions.

D. The Syntax of the Passive Participle and the T-Stem Participle Contrasted

It is instructive to highlight the contrast in syntactical environments in which the passive participle/verbal adjective and the t-stem participle occur. Whereas the passive participle often occurs in combination with other adjectives, the t-stem participles often occur in combination with active participles functioning verbally.

Instances where passive participles are syntactically equivalent to other adjectives in the context underscore the adjectival nature of the passive participle. Examples can be cited both in combination with הוה and without it.

Dan. 2:42

מן־קצת מלכותא תהוה תקיפה ומנה *תהוה תבירה*

Part of the kingdom will be strong and part of it *will be brittle.*

In the example above, there are two parallel expressions consisting of
הוה + *qattīl* adjective and הוה + passive participle. The following is an
example of a parallel without הוה:

Dan. 2:45

ויציב חלמא *ומהימן* פשרה

The dream is certain, and its interpretation is *trustworthy*.

In the example above, there are two verbless clauses containing
predicate adjectives, the last of which is a passive participle. Finally,
there is an instance where הוה is used only once but applies to both the
passive participle and a subsequent adjective.

Dan. 4:1

אנה נבוכדנצר *שלה הוית* בביתי ורענן בהיכלי

I Nebuchadnezzar *was at ease* in my house and flourishing in my palace.

In the above example, both שלה and the subsequent adjective רענן
together constitute a compound predicate of הוית.

 Since all participles are verbal adjectives in origin, it is expected that
the passive and active participles can also overlap in syntactic function.
However, in the attested instances the passive participle does not
function as a main clause finite verb.

Dan. 3:25

הא־אנה חזה גברין ארבעה *שרין מהלכין* בגוא־נורא

Look, I see four men *untied, walking around* in the fire.

In the above example, the words שרין מהלכין occur as part of an
adverbial sentence adjunct, i.e., "untied [and] walking around . . . ."
Alternatively, the passive participle could be simply attributive, i.e., "I
see four untied men walking around . . . ," in which case, the passive
participle is not syntactically equivalent to the active participle.
However, based on the parallel with the syntax of מכפתין in v. 23, 24, it
is preferable to analyze שרין in the above example as an adjunct. Either
way, it is not the finite verb of a main clause. Nor is it a passive
counterpart of the active participle. That is, it is not a passive
progressive, i.e., "being untied [and] walking around . . ."

 On the other hand, instances where t-stem participles are
syntactically equivalent to active participles functioning verbally
underscore the fact that t-stem participles are the passive/reflexive
counterparts to active participles.

Dan. 5:9-10

9 אדין מלכא בלשאצר שגיא *מתבהל* וזיוהי שנין עלוהי ורברבנוהי *משתבשין* 10
מלכתא לקבל מלי מלכא ורברבנוהי לבית משתיא עללת

Then, *as* king Belshazzar *was greatly alarmed*, his complexion was altered,
and his nobles *were perplexed*, the queen entered the banquet hall because
of the words of the king and his nobles.

The series of participial clauses in the above example includes the
active participle שנין between two t-stem participles. Together, they
convey the circumstances attending the ensuing suffix conjugation
verb.

Dan. 6:12

והשכחו לדניאל בעא *ומתחנן* קדם אלהה

They found Daniel seeking and *making supplication* before his God.

In the example above, both the active participle בעא and the t-stem
participle מתחנן share the same syntactic function, expressing actions
in progress within a complement clause.

Therefore, both the functions and the distribution of the attested
instances suggest that the t-stem participle is a better candidate to be
the passive (and reflexive) counterpart to the active participle than the
so-called passive participle.

E. ACTIVE PARTICIPLES IN GENERALIZED SUBJECT CONSTRUCTIONS

In passing, mention should be made of generalized subject construc-
tions. Generalized-subject constructions involve impersonal subjects,
such as indefinite pronouns, and often occur in the 3rd person plural
form. Estelle (2006:45-57) argued that impersonal expressions are a
form of deferential language, sometimes expressing politeness, at other
times highlighting the ultimate agent, God or a king. However, his
examples do not distinguish a passive expression with unspecified
agent (2:5, 30; 3:29; 6:22, 24) from an impersonal active expression
(4:22). The Aramaic of Daniel makes frequent use of generalized subject
constructions, which are usually translated as passive in English. If
these are fully equivalent to passives, then active participles in
impersonal constructions should be considered another type of
"passive" participle.

Generalized subject constructions also comprise another common
source for the grammaticalization of passives (Haspelmath 1990:38-50).

The path of grammaticalization involves two steps. First, the subject marker of the verb can lose its participant status (i.e., it becomes "desubjective") and an agent phrase can be added. Next, the direct object is reanalyzed as the subject. See also Heine and Kuteva (2002b:235-237).

At the stage of the language attested in the corpus, however, it is not clear whether impersonal constructions have developed into full-fledged passives, since there is no unequivocal evidence that an agent phrase can be added to it. That is, a fully passive construction involving a passive verb can have an agent expression:

> Dan. 4:3
>
> ומני שים טעם
>
> And a decree was issued *by me*.

But a generalized-subject construction normally does not have an agent expression. Thus, the expressions such as the following do not normally occur with an agent expression, מן "by" (+ agent): לך אמרין (4:28) "to you it is said," עשבא כתורין לך יטעמון (4:29) "you will be fed grass like oxen." Furthermore, instances where מן occurs do not necessarily express agency. For example, ולך טרדין מן־אנשא (4:22) means, "You will be driven away from mankind" not "by mankind." It is possible that ומטל שמיא לך מצבעין (4:22) contains an agent expression, "by the dew of heaven." However, the correspondence between מן and ב in parallel statements, e.g., ומטל שמיא (4:20) and ובטל שמיא יצטבע גשמה יצטבע (5:21), suggests that the preposition מן in these expressions denotes not an agent, but the source, "from" (perhaps as Collins 1993:210 translates it, "and you will be bathed from the dew of heaven"), or means, "by means of" (i.e., "with the dew of heaven"). Thus, I conclude that impersonal expressions in the Aramaic of Daniel remain generalized subject constructions, without any clear evidence that they have grammaticalized into true passive constructions.

F. Summary

The so-called passive participle in the Aramaic of Daniel is basically a verbal adjective that is developing into a resultative participle. As any Semitic adjective, it can be a predicate, an attribute, a substantive, or even a sentence complement. A few instances could possibly be analyzed as functioning as finite verbs, but all of these can also be

otherwise explained. Finite verbal functions are more clearly recognized in t-stem participles, which, therefore, are the true passive (and reflexive) counterparts to the active participle. Thus, Goldenberg's (1992:114) bipartite division of participles into present/active and perfect/passive should be expanded into a tripartite division for ancient Aramaic, i.e., active participle, t-stem participle, and verbal adjective. The latter was developing into a resultative participle, which, as Goldenberg demonstrated, would later become the base of the past tense in Neo-Aramaic, whereas the t-stem participle was the passive/reflexive counterpart of the present/imperfective active participle.

Since the passive participle/verbal adjective functions most frequently as an adjectival predicate, there is some overlap in function between the t-stem participle with a passive voice and the verbal adjective with a predicate function. In some Semitic languages the internal passive stems retained their passive function and the t-stems were restricted to primarily a reflexive/reciprocal function (e.g., Hebrew and classical Arabic). In Aramaic, however, the opposite is the case, i.e., the internal passive stems underwent a process of eventually falling into disuse (e.g., Syriac does not have internal passive stems) and the t-stems retained/acquired the passive function. Furthermore, in Semitic languages with fully developed internal passive stems, each stem possesses only one participle, i.e., active participles belong to active stems, and passive participles belong to passive stems (with the possible exception of the Hebrew Qal passive participle). However, since the internal passive stems in ancient Aramaic were in the process of dropping out of the language and the passive participle survived as part of the active stem paradigm, one must explain the development of the Aramaic participle in terms of a tripartite participial system. Moreover, in the context of this tripartite system, at the stage of the language attested in the Aramaic of Daniel, the so-called passive participle is primarily a verbal adjective that is developing into a resultative participle.

PARTICIPLES WITH הוה OR איתי

A. Preliminary Discussion of Issues

Although the explanations vary, there is a general consensus that the combination of active participle and הוה expresses some type of imperfective function (see Bauer and Leander 1927:293-294, Rosén 1961:184-185, Muraoka 1966:158-160, Cohen 1984:431-432, Gzella 2004:308-309, 327).

In the previous chapter, it was demonstrated that the t-stem participles are the passive/reflexive counterparts to the active participles and appear to have the same range of temporal/aspectual functions as their active counterparts. Therefore, this chapter includes the few attested instances of t-stem participles with הוה together with the corresponding expressions with active participles. Also, as will be explained below, the combination of הוה and the passive participle does not yet constitute a complex verb phrase in the present corpus. Therefore the word "participle" in complex verb phrases, e.g., *הוה* + *participle*, is assumed to refer only to active or t-stem participles, but not passive participles, unless otherwise specified. For the sake of clarity, I should also explain that throughout this study, *הוה* + *participle* refers to the sequence where the verb "to be" precedes the participle, and that *participle* + *הוה* refers to the sequence where the participle precedes the verb "to be."

There are 37 instances of active and t-stem participles that occur in connection with הוה.[1] In at least 1 of these instances, the participle should be analyzed as the predicate of the verb "to be" (הות שניה in

––––––––––

[1] The number includes 2 instances where the auxiliary function of the verb הוה is extended to a second participle (5:19; 6:27), i.e., they form a continuation of the complex verb phrase *הוה* + *participle*, and function not as independent participles but as part of that syntagm, and 1 instance with words intervening between the participle and הוה (6:3), introduced by the subordinating relative די. Although there are no other examples of words intervening within a *הוה* + *participle* syntagm in Biblical Aramaic, it is not extraordinary, since such instances also occur in Biblical Hebrew (e.g., 2 Kings 17:41; 18:4).

7:19).[2] The remaining instances consist of 19 occurrences of *הוה* +
participle (including 2 instances where הוה combines with two
participles) and 17 occurrences of *participle* + *הוה.* Additionally, there
are up to 4 instances of *איתי* + *participle* that should be considered
together with *הוה* + *participle* for reasons that will be explained below.[3]
The "periphrastic imperative" attested in some other forms of Aramaic,
consisting of an imperative of the verb הוה in combination with the
participle (Greenfield 1969), does not occur in the Aramaic of Daniel.

   In passing, mention should be made of a study by Thacker (1963).
Based on the assumption that Egyptian and Semitic finite verbs mark
aspect rather than tense, he suggested that the verb "to be" acts as a
marker of tense when combined with other finite verbs. Likewise, the
verb "to be" is a "time-indicator" when combined with the Egyptian
infinitive or with a Semitic active participle.

   Below, I will argue that, although the addition of הוה to the participle
originally functioned as a tense marker, the expression became
grammaticalized at the stage of the language attested in the corpus as a
complex verb phrase consisting of the renewal of the imperfective. The
variation in the order of constituents is due to the fact that the
expression is in the early stages of grammaticalization.

B. THE COMPLEX VERB PHRASE *הוה* + *PARTICIPLE*

1. *Progressive*

Instances of *הוה* + *participle* occur in both subordinate and main clauses,
as well as with a variety of verbs, both dynamic and stative, transitive
and intransitive. They also have a broad range of functions. There is an
instance in 6:4 of *הוה* + *participle* that could be analyzed as either
progressive or inceptive.

   Dan. 6:4

אדין דניאל דנה *הוא מתנצח* על־סרכיא ואחשדרפניא

---

[2] Perhaps also מתערבין להון in 2:43. See chapter 4, section C, subsection 3.

[3] The number includes an instance where the auxiliary function of איתי may be
extended to a second participle (3:14a, b). Although the repetition of the negative
particle לא before the second participle may call this interpretation into question, the
absence of an explicit subject of the second participle suggests that the two participles
may form a compound sentence.

Then this Daniel *was distinguishing himself* [or *began to distinguish himself*] over the supervisors and satraps.

2. *Habitual or Iterative/Frequentative*

In at least 4 instances, *הוה* + *participle* has a habitual or iterative meaning (5:19a, b; 6:11, 15).[4]

Dan. 6:11

וזמנין תלתה ביומא הוא ברך על־ברכוהי ומצלא ומודא קדם אלהה כל־קבל די־*הוא עבד* מן־קדמת דנה

And three times a day he kept on kneeling on his knees, praying, and giving thanks to his god, just as *he used to do* before this.

Additionally, a series of 8 instances of *הוה* + *participle* in 5:19 may also be habitual or iterative (5:19c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j).

Dan. 5:19

די־הוה צבא הוא קטל ודי־הוה צבא הוה מחא ודי־הוה צבא הוה מרים ודי־הוה צבא הוה משפיל

Whom he wished he would kill, whom he wished he would keep alive, whom he wished he would exalt, and whom he wished he would abase.

It is instructive to compare the instances in 5:19 above with similar constructions in 4:14, 22, 29; 5:21 where prefix conjugation verbs are used instead of participles. The clearest observable difference is that whereas the instances with prefix conjugation verbs are timeless, the occurrences with suffix conjugation *הוה* + *participle* are set in a past time context. Alternatively, these participles could be analyzed as 4 pairs of *הוה* + *participle*,[5] in which the first clause in the pair is hypothetical, i.e., "whomever he wished," or as in more colloquial English, "whoever he happened to want to," and the second clause expresses ability, i.e., "he could". Perhaps this ambiguity is related to the fact that both interpretations involve some type of irrealis, since, as Palmer points out, "the habitual past does not relate to specific actions in the past, but to a tendency to act" (2001:179, see also 55, 190-191).

---

[4] In 5:19 הוה governs two participles

[5] That is, although the first clause in each pair is syntactically a simple relative clause, it functions semantically as if it were a protasis.

3. *Inceptive*

Muraoka (1966:159) cited an instance in 6:5 as "inchoative," i.e., inceptive, though it is also possible to understand it as iterative (as in Stevenson, 1924:58 §22, 4).

Dan. 6:5

אדין סרכיא ואחשדרפניא *הוו בעין* עלה להשכחה לדניאל מצד מלכותא

Then the administrators and satraps *began trying* [or, *kept trying*] *to find* a pretext against Daniel with reference to the kingdom.

Another possible instance of an inceptive occurs in 6:4, though a progressive function is also possible (cited above).

4. *Future*

There is 1 instance of prefix conjugation *הוה* + *participle* with a future function (2:43).

Dan. 2:43

די חזית פרזלא מערב בחסף טינא מתערבין להון בזרע אנשא ולא*להון דבקין* דנה עם־דנה הא־כדי פרזלא לא מתערב עם־חספא

And inasmuch as you saw iron mixed with wet clay, they will be mixed in human seed, but they *will* not *(continue to) stick together* one with the other, just as iron is not mixed with clay.

It is possible that the above instance expresses an imperfective future, i.e., in this case a continuous future. Gzella (2007:97) cites an instance of prefix conjugation *הוה* + *participle* with future durative or iterative function in Qumran Aramaic (1QapGen 22:22). However, this single instance in Daniel is insufficient to determine whether or not the expression denotes imperfectivity in the future.

5. *Modality*

In a number of instances, the complex verb phrase prefix conjugation *הוה* + *participle* expresses modality. There are 2 instances in purpose clauses (6:3a, b).

Dan. 6:3

שפר קדם דריוש והקים על־מלכותא לאחשדרפניא מאה ועשרין די להון בכל־מלכותא 3 ועלא מנהון סרכין תלתא די דניאל חד־מנהון די*להון* דיל*הון* אחשדרפניא אלין *יהבין* להון טעמא ומלכא לא*להוא נזק*

It pleased Darius to appoint over the kingdom a hundred and twenty

satraps to be over the entire kingdom, and over them three adminis-
trators, of whom Daniel was one, *so that* the satraps *might report* to them,
so that the king *might not suffer loss.*

There are at least 2 instances where prefix conjugation *הוה* +
participle occur in clauses expressing the complement of a command
(6:27a, b, להון governs two participles).

Dan. 6:27

מן־קדמי שים טעם די בכל־שלטן מלכותי *להון זאעין ודחלין* מן־קדם אלהא די־דניאל

And it is decreed by me that in all my royal dominion *they must tremble
and fear* before the god of Daniel.

The above example shows that the function of a prefix conjugation *הוה*
+ *participle* can overlap that of the prefix conjugation by itself, since the
complement of a royal command is generally expressed with the latter.
For example:

Dan. 5:29

והכרזו עלוהי די־*להוא* שליט תלתא במלכותא

They made a proclamation concerning him *that he should be* the third
ruler in the kingdom.

For a more detailed discussion of commands and complements, see the
next chapter.

Additionally, there is a series of 8 instances of suffix conjugation *הוה*
+ *participle* grouped in 4 pairs (5:19c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j), in which the first
clause in the pair may be hypothetical and the second clause expresses
ability ("could"). See above under habitual or iterative/frequentative.

C. The Complex Verb Phrase *איתי* + *Participle*

There are at least 4 instances of the complex verb phrase *איתי* +
participle. Of these, at least 1 is clearly a general present (2:26).[6]

Dan. 2:26

האיתיך כהל להודעתני חלמא די־חזית ופשרה

"*Are you able* to make known to me the dream that I saw and its interpre-
tation?"

---

[6] See footnote 3.

Gzella (2004:197, 203-204) argues that איתי distinguishes the actual present from the general present, or "Extratemporalis." That is, it marks the participial expression as actual present rather than general present. Thus, he translates the above instance as, "Kannst du mir jetzt . . . ?" However, in the context, the king is not asking whether Daniel is "now" able to interpret the dream as opposed to yesterday or tomorrow, but rather whether Daniel is able to interpret it in contrast to the other wise men who were not able to. Therefore, the addition of איתי to the active participle does not distinguish between general and actual present, nor does it make the participle "emphatic" (Johns 1972: 25; see also Bauer and Leander 1927:331 and Rosenthal 1961:41), but rather it makes explicit the temporal reference of a participle, which would otherwise have to be inferred from the context. That is, it serves as a present tense marker. It is doubtful, however, whether it distinguishes between general and actual present.

The remaining instances are probably also general presents (3:14a, b, 18), though other interpretations are possible. The instances in 3:14 are probably general presents, but could be understood as actual presents.

Dan. 3:14

ענה נבכדנצר ואמר להון הצדא שדרך מישך ועבד נגו לאלהי לא איתיכון פלחין
ולצלם דהבא די הקימת לא סגדין

Nebuchadnezzar answered and said to them, "Is it true, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, do *you* not *serve* my gods, nor *worship* the image of gold that I made?"

The remaining instance (3:18), which is continued in the following clause by a prefix conjugation verb, could be understood as a future, but is probably also a general present.

Dan. 3:18

לאלהיך לא־*איתינא פלחין* ולצלם דהבא די הקימת לא נסגד

We do not serve your gods, nor worship the statue of gold that you set up.

That a general present function in the above example is at least possible is supported by the fact that both the said expression and the following prefix conjugation verb are translated with a present indicative in the LXX, as Muraoka (1966:158) observed. A general present function also fits the context and matches the function of other instances of this syntagm.

Additionally, there may be another instance in 3:17. However, that is subject to various interpretations (see Bloch 1991 for a brief discussion of some views).

Dan. 3:17

הן *איתי* אלהנא די־אנחנא פלחין *יכל* לשיזבותנא

If our God, whom we serve, *is able* to deliver us . . .
[or, If *it is so*, our God, whom we serve, is able to deliver us . . .]

If the above example belongs to the list of *איתי* + *participle* phrases, it also expresses the general present. All other instances occur with a pronominal suffix attached to *איתי*, i.e., *איתי* + *pronominal suffix* + *participle*, but if this instance should be included, the actual verb phrase is *איתי* + *subject* + *participle*. However, the interpretation of this instance is disputed.

D. THE COMPLEX VERB PHRASE *PARTICIPLE* + *הוה*

In contrast to Ezra, where there are no instances of *participle* + *הוה*, i.e., all instances are *הוה* + *active participle* (Ezra 6:8, 9, 10; 7:25, 26), in the Aramaic of Daniel, *הוה/איתי* + *participle* outnumbers *participle* + *הוה* by only a few instances. However, the distribution of the latter is much more restricted. Since only 5 lexemes are attested with this syntagm (חזה 2:31, 34; 4:7, 10; 7:2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11a, b, 13, 21; הלך 4:26; שכל 7:8; אתה 7:13; ערב 2:43),[7] it is not possible to decide what types of verbs can occur in this construction.[8] They are attested only in main clauses, and all can be interpreted as having a progressive function.

1. *Progressive*

Although all instances of *participle* + *הוה* can be interpreted as having a progressive function, some instances could also be otherwise interpreted. In at least 5 instances the progressive function is clear and needs no further comment (2:31; 4:7, 26; 7:2, 13b).

---

[7] But see the discussion on מתערבין להון in 2:43 in chapter 4, section C, subsection 3.

[8] Also, the complex verb phrase *participle* + *הוה* only occurs in chapters that narrate prophetic visions, i.e., chapters 2, 4, and 7. However, the significance of this fact is limited, since one expects expressions such as חזה הוית (whether in the form of 1cs הֲוֵית or 2ms הֲוַיְתָ) to be more characteristic of prophetic visions.

Dan. 4:7

<div dir="rtl">

וחזוי ראשי על־משכבי חזה הוית ואלו אילן בגוא ארעא ורומה שגיא
</div>

As for the visions of my head on my bed, *I was looking*, and look, there was a tree in the middle of the earth, whose height was great.

2. Reiteration and/or Other Functions

Most of the remaining instances of *participle +* הוה could be interpreted either as reiterations of earlier progressives or as continuatives (2:34; 4:10; 7:4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11a, b, 13a, 21). For example:

Dan. 2:31-34

<div dir="rtl">

31 אנתה מלכא חזה הוית ואלו צלם חד שגיא צלמא . . . 34 חזה הוית עד די התגזרת אבן די־לא בידין ומחת לצלמא על־רגלוהי די פרזלא וחספא והדקת המון
</div>

As for you, o king, you were looking, and look, there was a great image. . . . *You kept on/were looking*, until . . .

In the above example, the phrase חזה הוית in v. 34 could be a reiteration of the same phrase in v. 31, which has a progressive function. Alternatively, it could be understood as having a continuative function, i.e., "you kept on looking." Although both options are valid, I favor the first one based on discourse considerations. To begin with, a number of instances of *participle +* הוה are followed by temporal clauses introduced by עד די (at least 2:34; 7:4, 9, 11b). Although עד די generally introduces subordinate temporal clauses, in some instances these temporal clauses actually contain the main thought of the sentence. For example:

Dan. 6:25

<div dir="rtl">

ולא־מטו לארעית גבא עד די־שלטו בהון אריותא
</div>

They had not (even) reached the bottom of the pit, *when the lions overpowered them*.

From a discourse perspective, the juxtaposition of the clauses, "They had not reached . . . , when the lions . . ." is equivalent to, "Before they reached . . . , the lions . . . ." That is, these subordinate temporal clauses seem to be part of the foreground, even though they occur in syntactically subordinate clauses. The same is true of instances of *participle +* הוה followed by עד די.

Dan. 7:2-9

<div dir="rtl">

חזה הוית בחזוי עם־ליליא וארו ארבע רוחי שמיא מגיחן לימא רבא 3 וארבע חיון רברבן סלקן מן־ימא שנין דא מן־דא 4 קדמיתא כאריה . . . חזה הוית עד די־ . . . 5
</div>

וארו חיוה אחרי תנינה . . . 6 באתר דנה *חזה הוית* וארו אחרי . . . 7 באתר דנה *חזה הוית* בחזוי ליליא וארו חיוה רביעיה . . . 8 *משתכל הוית* בקרניא ואלו . . . 9 *חזה הוית* עד די . . .

> *I was looking* in my vision by night, and look, there were the four winds of heaven stirring up the great sea, and four great animals coming up out of the sea, different from each other. The first one . . . . *I was looking* until . . . . And look, another second animal . . . . After this *I was looking*, and look, another one . . . . After this *I was looking* in the visions of the night, and look, a fourth . . . . *I was considering* the horns, and look . . . . *I was looking* until . . .

As can be seen from the above example, the expression חזה הוית functioning as a reiteration, notwithstanding that it occurs in syntactically main clauses, is equivalent to an unmarked circumstantial clause in terms of the discourse. That is, "I was looking, until/and . . ." is equivalent to, "As I was looking, . . ." Therefore, I prefer to interpret sequences of the phrase *participle + הוה*, especially when followed by עד די, as an initial instance with a progressive function followed by one or more instances of reiteration or repetition to segment the narrative and thereby move it forward, similar to backreferencing[9] or resumptive repetition.[10] There is no need to ascribe to these reiterations/repetitions a different aspectual function than the initial occurrence that is being reiterated.[11]

   As for the remaining instances of *participle + הוה* that are not followed by עד די, they tend to be followed either by וארו "look" (7:6, 7, 13a) or

---

[9] Backreferencing, also called "tail-head linkage," is a means of providing discourse cohesion between separate narrative segments. The expression is here used somewhat loosely, since technically it means that "something mentioned in the last sentence of the preceding paragraph is referred to by means of back-reference in an adverbial clause in the following paragraph" (Thompson and Longacre 1985:209).

[10] The expression "resumptive repetition" was first coined by H. W. Wiener in 1929 (for more details, see Talmon 1978:12-17; reprinted in 1993:117-122). It is a common feature of Semitic narratives that, after an interruption, the main line of thought is picked up again by repeating the last clause(s) before the interruption (Bar-Efrat 1989:155, 215-216).

[11] In addition to the instances followed by עד די listed above the instance in 7:21 could be interpreted as a longer description introduced by *participle + הוה* and followed by עד די in verse 22. Also, the two instances in 7:11a, b could be understood as essentially one reiteration. That is, the first *participle + הוה* is followed by an explanatory clause, which is then repeated by the second instance of *participle + הוה* and followed by עד די.

ואלו "look" (4:10; 7:8),[12] which also continue the foreground of the narrative.

Dan. 4:7-10

7 וחזוי ראשי על־משכבי חזה הוית ואלו אילן . . . 10 *חזה הוית בחזוי ראשי*
על־משכבי ואלו . . .

As for the visions of my head on my bed, I was looking, and look, . . . *I was looking in the visions of my head on my bed, and look,* . . .

In the above example, entire phrases are repeated, though not with the same word order.

Finally, the words מתערבין להון in 2:43 deserve special comment.

Dan. 2:43

די חזית פרזלא מערב בחסף טינא *מתערבין להון* בזרע אנשא ולא־להון דבקין דנה
עם־דנה הא־כדי פרזלא לא מתערב עם־חספא

Since you saw the iron mixed with wet clay, they will *be mixed/mix themselves* with human seed, but they will not stick one with another, just as the iron is not mixed with clay.

There are several reasons why this instance deserves comment. First, as already discussed (see chapter 4, section C, subsection 3), although I have chosen to analyze the participle מתערבין להון in the above passage as a complex verb phrase *participle + הוה*, it is also possible to analyze מתערבין as an adjectival predicate of the verb "to be," i.e., "they will be mixed" rather than "they will mix themselves." Second, aside from this possible instance, the construction *participle + הוה* is attested only with suffix conjugation forms of הוה. Third, if it is an instance of *participle + הוה*, it is an instance that is not necessarily progressive (though a future progressive function is not precluded). In addition, and more significantly, the parallel between מתערבין להון and the following להון דבקין could be evidence that the order of the constituents in this expression is not yet fixed, supporting the conclusion that it is still in the early stages of grammaticalization (see further below).

---

[12] It is possible that משתכל הוית in 7:8 is not part of the chain of reiterations, since a different verb is used. If so, it is simply another progressive instance, perhaps in a circumstantial clause.

E. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN איתי/הוה + PARTICIPLE AND PARTICIPLE + הוה

Since the active participle is an imperfective in the Aramaic of Daniel, and may have already become so even previous to Daniel, the addition of הוה/איתי does not make it continuous/habitual, etc. (see also Muraoka 1966:158). Rather the addition of איתי/הוה originally functioned as the addition of a tense marker. That is, a suffix conjugation הוה adds the specification of past time, a prefix conjugation הוה adds the specification of either future time or modality, and איתי adds the specification of the present, including general present.

The distinction between *הוה/איתי + participle* and *participle + הוה* in the Aramaic of Daniel has sometimes been ignored (e.g., Muraoka 1966:157-160; Cohen 1984:passim) or denied (e.g., Rowley 1929:99).[13] Bauer and Leander (1924:293-294) proposed that 3rd person forms of הוה occur in front of the participle, whereas other persons occur after the participle. However, the instance in 4:26 (מהלך הוה) is a counter example, and their explanation does not account for non-3rd person instances of *איתי + participle* (2:26; 3:14, 18). Greenfield considered the sequence *participle + הוה* to be exceptional, because the order *הוה + participle* "is expected," but was perceptive enough to notice that "stylistic grounds" do not suffice to explain the reversed order (1969:206). Indeed, the order of the elements is significant in other forms of Aramaic. For example, according to Muraoka and Porten (1998:205-208), Egyptian Aramaic uses primarily *הוה + participle*, whereas *participle + הוה* is reserved primarily for internal passives and some statives and expresses not iteration, but a resulting state.[14] Likewise, the construction attested in the 1QapGen is *הוה + participle* with nothing intervening (Muraoka 1972:34). In the Aramaic of Onkelos and Jonathan, the construction occurs as *הוה + participle*, except where it is imitating the Hebrew word

---

[13] Likewise, there is also hardly any discussion of the complex verb phrase in Toews (1993) or in Shepherd (2006, 2008). In the case of the latter, it is because he considers the participle a nominal form.

[14] For Rowley (1929:99), the distinction between *הוה + participle* and *participle + הוה* existed neither in Egyptian Aramaic nor in Biblical Aramaic. Muraoka (1966:157-60) follows Rowley on this point only in regards to Biblical Aramaic. Neither Rowley nor Muraoka distinguished instances with the active participle from those with the passive participle. Coxon (1977:109) argues against Rowley, and asserts that, at least for prefix conjugation forms of הוה, both Biblical and Egyptian Aramaic normally use *הוה + participle*, reserving *participle + הוה* for passive and reflexive participles.

order (Gropp, forthcoming: chapter 29). Furthermore, in Syriac there is also a distinction between ܗܘܐ + *participle* and *participle* + ܗܘܐ (Muraoka 2005:68), though their respective functions are not the same as in the western Aramaic dialects. Therefore, comparative evidence urges at least an attempt to explain the relationship between הוה/איתי + *participle* and *participle* + הוה in the Aramaic of Daniel.

In terms of simple frequency, the sequence הוה/איתי + *participle* outnumbers the sequence *participle* + הוה by only a few instances. However, since, as was argued above, the majority of instances of the latter are cases of reiteration/repetition, and since the few attested instances of איתי + *participle* (i.e., איתי + subject/pronominal suffix + participle) do not seem to show any variation in word order, I suggest that the sequence הוה/איתי + *participle* is the more common one for the Aramaic of Daniel.

Nevertheless, grammaticalization often results in a restriction of syntactic position, and the "possibility of more than one position may indicate a lesser degree of grammaticalization" (Bybee and Dahl 1989:61). Therefore, one can posit that, in the early stages, the position of הוה in relation to the active participle was free, but after the syntagm was reanalyzed as a complex verb phrase, the position of the two words eventually became fixed as הוה + *participle* in western Aramaic.[15] Thus, the co-existence of the expressions הוה/איתי + *participle* and *participle* + הוה may be evidence that the expression has not yet grammaticalized to the point where the order of the constituents became fixed. This may mean either that the expression has not yet become a complex verb phrase, i.e., הוה/איתי is still only a temporal marker of the imperfective participle, or more likely that a reanalysis has occurred but is still in its early stages.

This explanation is supported by the fact that the complex verb phrase consisting of the verb הוה in combination with the participle

---

[15] Biblical Hebrew attests to a similar phenomenon at an early stage of grammaticalization. Muraoka (1999:199-200) noted that the use of the periphrastic verb phrase היה in combination with the participle was optional in Biblical Hebrew and Qumran Hebrew, and that whereas the order of the constituents was fixed in Qumran Aramaic, it was not in Biblical Hebrew, where there was no functional distinction between the two. Muraoka (1999:200-201) also argued that since this construction existed in early biblical Hebrew, its existence in late Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew cannot be due to Aramaic influence, though it may have been later reinforced by Aramaic.

was a development of Official Aramaic and was not attested earlier.[16] Therefore, Kaddari's (1983:45) suggestion that "the order of constituents with *hwh* was not yet fixed" in Imperial (or Biblical) Aramaic, cannot be ignored, because new grammatical expressions in the early stages tend to be less restricted in syntactic position.[17] Also, the one attested instance where words intervene between הוה and the participle (6:3), if correctly understood, may be further evidence that the order of the constituents is not yet fixed.[18]

F. An Optional Grammatical Construction

Another possible evidence that *הוה* + *participle* in Daniel is still in its early stages of grammaticalization is that the use of הוה in *הוה* + *participle* appears to be optional, though the instances in Daniel are too few to make a solid case.[19] For example, it seems that both the simple participle and *הוה* + *participle* can express a similar range of functions.

Dan. 4:4-5

4 באדין *עללין* חרטמיא אשפיא כשדיא וגזריא וחלמא אמר אנה קדמיהון ופשרה לא־מהודעין לי 5 ועד אחרין על קדמי דניאל

Then the magicians, exorcists, Chaldeans, and psychics *began to come in.* And as I was telling them the dream, and they could not make known its interpretation, finally Daniel came in before me.

---

[16] See Muraoka's (1999:201 n.42) comment on Greenfield's citation from the Sefire inscription.

[17] Kaddari also argued in the same study that in both Imperial and Biblical Aramaic, the unmarked word order was for the verb הוה to precede the head word, which includes participles, because it can occur in both main and subordinate clauses, whereas the marked word order, participle + הוה, only occurs in main clauses. Muraoka (1999:200) disagrees, and doubts that one syntagm is more marked than the other.

[18] An alternative possible explanation is that, since *הוה* + *participle* expresses a wide range of imperfective functions and *participle* + *הוה* appears to consistently expresses the progressive, the first may be a renewal of the imperfective and the latter a renewal of the (past) progressive. However, I prefer the view proposed above, because a progressive complex verb phrase *participle* + *הוה* is not attested in any other form of Aramaic (though it is possible for grammaticalized expressions to fall into disuse instead of further grammaticalizing).

[19] The same can be said for איתי in *איתי* + *participle*, though the instances are even fewer there.

Dan. 6:4

אדין דניאל דנה *הוא מתנצח* על־סרכיא ואחשדרפניא

Then this Daniel *was distinguishing himself* [or *began to distinguish himself*] over the supervisors and satraps.

The examples above were discussed earlier in the book. Though these examples could be variously interpreted, both עללין in 4:4 and הוא מתנצח in 6:4 seem to have a similar range of possibilities (e.g., progressive, inceptive, etc.), with no apparent difference in meaning between the simple participle *הוה* + participle.

Also, it is difficult to distinguish the meaning of simple participles from *הוה* + participle in instances that express the past habitual.

Dan. 6:11

וזמנין תלתה ביומא הוא *ברך* על־ברכוהי *ומצלא ומודא* קדם אלהה כל־קבל די־*הוא עבד* מן־קדמת דנה

And three times a day he *kept on kneeling* on his knees, *praying, and giving thanks* to his god, just as *he used to do* before this.

In the above example, notice the concurrence of simple participles and *הוה* + participle in the same verse. Both grammatical constructions have a past habitual function, with no apparent difference in meaning. However, it is possible to disregard the Masoretic pointing of הוא in הוא ברך and reinterpret it as the verb "to be" rather than as a pronoun (cf. הוא עבד above), though one must also assume a unique situation where the auxiliary governs three participles.

Similarly, it is difficult to tell a difference in meaning between simple participles and *הוה* + participle in instances that express future time.

Dan. 4:22

ולך *טרדין* מן־אנשא ועם־חיות ברא להוה מדרך ועשבא כתורין לך יטעמון ומטל שמיא לך *מצבעין*

And you *will be driven* away from mankind, and with the wild animals will be your dwelling, and you will be fed grass like oxen, and you *will be drenched* with the dew of heaven.

Dan. 2:43

די חזית פרזלא מערב בחסף טינא מתערבין להון בזרע אנשא ולא־*להון דבקין* דנה עם־דנה הא־כדי פרזלא לא מתערב עם־חספא

And inasmuch as you saw iron mixed with wet clay, they will be mixed in

human seed, but they *will* not *stick together* one with the other, just as iron is not mixed with clay.

In the above examples, the participles טרדין and מצבעין in 4:22 and the expression in להון דבקין 2:43 both express the future. The addition of להון in 2:43 makes the temporal sphere explicit (i.e., future) rather than dependant on context, but a case can scarcely be made for a distinction in meaning.

Although the above examples suggest that the addition of הוה in *הוה + participle* is optional, there are some functions that are only attested for the simple participle alone, such as the formulaic use of verbs of speaking to introduce direct speech or the expression כד + participle.

G. The Passive Participle/Verbal Adjective in combination with איתי/הוה

According to Goldenberg (1992:114-133) the employment of passive participles in what he called "periphrastic perfects" consists of two types of constructions, predicative and possessive. The latter involves the use of a possessive expression, such as the English auxiliary "to have" or the Semitic preposition ל used in a possessive sense. Its development was originally discussed by Kutscher (1969:135-148). This type of resultative complex verb phrase does not occur in the Aramaic of Daniel, though it does occur in Syriac and Eastern Neo-Aramaic. The predicative type of construction usually involves the auxiliary "to be," though, as in all Semitic languages, a predicate can also be expressed without the verb "to be." I will discuss below the instances of the passive participle with הוה/איתי, and suggest that at the stage of the language attested in the corpus this expression has not (yet) grammaticalized into a complex verb phrase.

There are at least 4 instances of passive participles/verbal adjectives accompanied by the verb הוה (2:20, 42; 3:18; 4:1) and 1 instance by the copula איתי (3:15).[20] Bauer and Leander (1927:296) suggested that the passive participle in combination with the suffix conjugation הוה functions as a pluperfect (see also Gzella 2004:176, 308), but they only gave an example from Ezra. Though possible, the pluperfect sense is most likely derived from the suffix conjugation הוה rather than from the passive participle. Thus, הוה is added in 4:1 because the passive

---

[20] For a discussion of another possible instance in 2:41, see chapter 4, footnote 12.

participle by itself does not express tense, and the clause begins a past time narrative.

Dan. 4:1

<div dir="rtl">אנה נבוכדנצר שלה הוית בביתי ורענן בהיכלי</div>

I Nebuchadnezzar *was/had been at ease* in my house and flourishing in my palace.

That the possible pluperfect meaning in the above example is derived from the suffix conjugation הוה and not from the passive participle שלה is clear from the correspondence between the latter and the subsequent adjective רענן, i.e., together they constitute a compound predicate of הוית. It is also supported by the fact that 2 instances of the passive participle combined with a prefix conjugation הוה express some type of modality (2:20; 3:18), which is not inherent in the passive participle.

Dan. 3:18

<div dir="rtl">ידיע להוא־לך מלכא</div>

Let it be known to you, o king.

According to Folmer (1995:391-393), the construction exemplified in the above example is a polite expression of wish, less polite than the same wish expressed with a t-stem prefix conjugation verb + ל, but more polite than a simple active stem prefix conjugation verb. The other example expressing modality is in 2:20.[21]

Dan. 2:20

<div dir="rtl">להוא שמה די־אלהא מברך מן־עלמא ועד־עלמא</div>

May the name of God *be blessed* from eternity to eternity.

This last example is similar to the previous one, except for the absence of the prepositional phrase with ל. In the remaining instance, a prefix conjugation הוה is supplied due to the need to express future time, though poetic meter may also be a factor (2:42).

Dan. 2:42

---

[21] Additionally, בריך in a verbless sentence in 3:28 may be understood as an elliptic expression of modality with הוה elided ("May the God of . . . be blessed"), though a general present meaning (i.e., a statement of fact, "Blessed is the God of . . .") cannot be ruled out.

מן־קצת מלכותא תהוה תקיפה ומנה *תהוה תבירה*

> Part of the kingdom will be strong and part of it *will be brittle.*

Therefore, the temporal or modal meaning of constructions where the passive participle occurs with the verb הוה is derived from the verb הוה rather than the passive participle, which contradicts the ascription of temporal values to the latter.[22]

There is also 1 instance of a passive participle preceded by the copula איתי (3:15).

Dan. 3:15

כען הן *איתיכון עתידין* די בעדנא די־תשמעון קל קרנא משרוקיתא קיתרס שבכא פסנתרין וסומפניה וכל זני זמרא תפלון ותסגדון לצלמא די־עבדת

> Now, if *you are ready*, at the time that you hear . . . , to fall down and worship the statue that I made.

In the above example, the copula איתי expresses the actual present,[23] albeit a single instance is insufficient to make generalizations. This instance is also unique, because the passive participle עתידין seems to have an auxiliary function, "be ready to . . ."[24]

The sole occurrence of a suffix conjugation הוה with a passive participle (4:1) and the instances with the prefix conjugation הוה do not show a clear ordering of elements, i.e., הוה precedes the passive participle in 2:20, 42 and follows it in 3:18; 4:1 (and there are not sufficient instances of these constructions to conjecture on the distinction in function, if any, due to the order of the elements). More significantly, there is no difference in meaning between הוה with the passive participle and הוה with other adjectives. Therefore, I conclude that the occurrences of הוה with the passive participle consist of the verb "to be" with an adjectival predicate. At the stage of the language

---

[22] E.g., Rosén (1961:201-203) argued that, for "linear" verbs, the *qtīl* form expresses the present by itself, the future-volitive in combination with a prefix conjugation הוה, and the subordinative with a suffix conjugation הוה. For "point" verbs, the *qtīl* form expresses the narrative when standing alone and the present when in combination with איתי, whereas the prefix conjugation tG stem expresses the future-volitive. However, Rosén's analysis is flawed, because the temporal meaning of these expressions derives from the verb הוה.

[23] The actual present is to be distinguished from the general present, which consists of timeless statements.

[24] A fuller discussion of the auxiliary function of עתיד is given in chapter 9.

attested in the corpus, this expression has not yet grammaticalized into a complex verb phrase.

H. Summary

In a previous chapter, it was demonstrated that the active participle in the Aramaic of Daniel may be characterized as an imperfective that arose from an earlier progressive. According to Bybee (1994:250), "a progressive restricted to the present by the existence of a past imperfective will become a present tense, while a progressive that is not so restricted will become an imperfective—expanding to cover as many functions as possible." Thus, the active participle was a general (i.e., temporally unrestricted) progressive that developed into a general imperfective rather than a present, since there was no previous past imperfective. It is in the process of replacing the prefix conjugation which, as will be demonstrated in the following chapter, was the old general imperfective.

　　Since the participle by itself was not restricted in time, הוה and איתי were used to temporally locate the imperfective, but this new syntagm was eventually reanalyzed from הוה/איתי [temporal marker] + participle to a complex verb phrase הוה + *participle*, at which stage, a past imperfective came to exist in Aramaic. That is, the syntagm "suffix conjugation הוה + participle" was reanalyzed from הוה [past] + participle [imperfective] to הוה + *participle* [past imperfective]. However, the fact that the active participle still functions as a general imperfective in the Aramaic of Daniel is indicated by the fact that the majority of instances occur in the past time rather than the present. That is, although one expects vestiges of earlier functions to remain, the past imperfective function of the active participle cannot be vestigial if it is attested more often than the newer הוה + *participle*. Also, the frequent occurrence of the reverse word order, *participle* + הוה, may be evidence that the order of the constituents has not yet become fixed, and, therefore, the combination of הוה and the active participle as a complex verb phrase is still in its early stages of grammaticalization. Similarly, the fact that the use of הוה in הוה + *participle* appears to be optional suggests not only that the construction is in its early stages of grammaticalization, but also that there is a semantic overlap between הוה + *participle* and the simple participle.

　　Nevertheless, the new past imperfective, i.e., *suffix conjugation הוה + participle*, will eventually replace the past imperfective function of the

active participle, which in turn will eventually be restricted to primarily the present tense. That is, if we could project the development of the verbal system of the Aramaic of Daniel forward in time, *suffix conjugation הוה + participle* would become the standard construction for the past imperfective, and the active participle by itself would become the present tense, which is exactly what we find in some later forms of Aramaic. Rubin (2005:31-32) gave examples of how the active participle, after becoming the present tense, could take an enclitic pronoun in later forms of Aramaic. The enclitic pronoun was eventually fused to the participle, and the new form became a fully conjugated present tense verb in Neo-Aramaic. Also, once the active participle became the new present tense, the addition of איתי became superfluous.[25]

Finally, it appears that, at the stage of the language attested in the corpus, the verb הוה in combination with the passive participle still functions as the verb "to be," or at best as a temporal indicator, and the expression has not yet grammaticalized into a complex verb phrase.

---

[25] A quick search through Targum Onkelos and Jonathan yielded אית + participle only in instances of literal translation of the Hebrew copula יֵשׁ followed by the participle. Also, according to Wertheimer (2002:13-14), the Syriac copula or particle of existence ܐܝܬ does not occur with predicative participles.

THE PREFIX CONJUGATION

A. Preliminary Discussion of Concepts and Issues

The function of the prefix conjugation in the Aramaic of Daniel has been explained in different ways. According to Kautzsch (1884:135-137), its basic function is to express incomplete actions, i.e., it is an atemporal imperfective. Similarly, Bauer and Leander (1927:278) explained its basic meaning as that of a present participle that can function as a present, future, or past imperfective, and at times has modal meanings. According to Rosén (1961:191-192), the prefix conjugation of "point aspect verbs" is future-volitive, whereas with "linear aspect verbs" it is narrative-constative. For Segert (1975:377, 379-380), the prefix conjugation generally expresses present and future, but only in Daniel it also expresses dependent action or background circumstances in the past. Cohen (1984:416-421) claimed that the prefix conjugation expresses the future and the modal, but not the present. He further observed that it never expresses past time in direct speech, but only in apocalyptic passages describing visions or songs, where it has either a descriptive (imperfective) or a consecutive function, which he ascribed to Hebrew influence (424-425). For Bombeck (1996:5-6), the prefix conjugation expresses primarily modality. He compared its function to its counterpart in Syriac, and suggested that it denotes a desired or possible situation, or even an obligatory prediction, since in Daniel everything is subject to God's will. As for a past time function, it generally occurs only if the past time is marked by a suffix conjugation verb, but some instances are due to the author's stylistic device, attempting to imitate the Akkadian preterite of the king of Babylon, either in direct speech or in instances where he is the explicit or implicit subject or object of the verb (8). According to Gzella (2004:304-305), the prefix conjugation can express the past (background events), present, future, and modality, and some types of subordination.

In what follows, I will demonstrate that the prefix conjugation in the Aramaic of Daniel has a wide variety of functions, including the expression of the future, modality, general present, and past

imperfective. I will also argue that these functions are diachronically related, and result from the development of the prefix conjugation along the path of grammaticalization.

There are a total of 189 instances of prefix conjugation forms in the Aramaic of Daniel. Most of the time, the jussive and the long imperfect cannot be distinguished, though at least 4 instances are clearly jussive, in view of the negation by אל and/or the presence of a pronominal suffix that differentiates jussives and long imperfects (2:24; 4:16; 5:10a, b). Also, though one cannot rule out the possibility that some past time instances of the prefix conjugation are remnants of the early Semitic *yaqtul* preterite (or "short imperfect," contrasted with the "long imperfect" *yaqtulu*), there are no unequivocal examples.[1] Therefore, in what follows, the label "prefix conjugation" refers to either the long imperfect or to forms where the latter cannot be distinguished from the jussive or the *yaqtul* preterite, whereas "jussive" refers to only jussives. In addition, 5 instances of prefix conjugation הוה in combination with a participle (2:43a, b; 6:3a, b, 27) are considered a separate complex verb phrase, which was discussed in the previous chapter.[2] As for the remaining 180 instances, most of them express either the future or some type of modality. Indeed, in some instances, it is difficult to determine whether the verb in question expresses the future or a modality.

B. Non-Modal Functions

Since the central functions of the future are "intention and prediction," it could be argued that it belongs more to the category of a modality rather than tense (Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 280; see also Palmer 2001:104-106). Therefore, it is relevant for our understanding of the nature of the prefix conjugation to distinguish between functions that express modality and those that do not. That is, it is useful to distinguish whether the prefix conjugation is a future that expanded its functions to express other types of modality or a form that is limited to

---

[1] The label "preterite" is a common designation for this early Semitic grammatical construction. I use it hereafter without any intended implication concerning whether it functioned as a preterite or a perfective.

[2] For a discussion of מתערבין להון in 2:43, see chapter 4 (section C, subsection 3).

the expression of modality including the future. We will return to this
discussion later.

1. *Simple Future*

Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:244) defined the future as "a
prediction on the part of the speaker that the situation in the
proposition, which refers to an event taking place after the moment of
speech, will hold." According to them, it is not uncommon for
languages to have more than one way to express the future. Futures
develop from two basic sources, i.e., "primary futures" develop from
lexical sources, such as verbs of movement, markers of obligation,
desire, and ability, and temporal adverbs, whereas "aspectual futures"
develop from markers of the present tense or perfective or imper-
fective aspect. Aspectual futures are more grammaticalized and evolve
through a different path from primary futures, i.e., they do not develop
explicit future semantics, such as immediate future, expected future,
etc. (Bybee, Pagliuca, and Perkins 1991). The attested non-modal
functions of the prefix conjugation indicate that it was earlier a general
imperfective, remnants of which persist in a few instances of general
present and past imperfective functions (see below). As the active
participle began to take over the functions of the prefix conjugation,
the latter became restricted to expressing primarily the future. Thus,
the prefix conjugation fits the category of an "aspectual future."

In at least 47 instances, the prefix conjugation verb expresses the
simple future (2:28, 29a, b, 36, 39a, b, 40a, b, c, 41a, b, 42a, b, 44a, b, c, d,
e, f, 45; 4:22a, b, c, 29a, b; 5:17b, c; 7:17, 18a, b, 23a, b, c, d, e, 24a, b, c, d,
25a, b, c, d, 26a, b, 27a, b). By "simple future," I mean instances that
predict actions or events after the moment of speech without any other
explicit modal implications. That is, I exclude from this list those
instances that are deemed to primarily express modality regardless of
time of occurrence.

> Dan. 7:23
>
> חיותא רביעיתא מלכו רביעיא *תהוא* בארעא די *תשנא* מן־כל־מלכותא *ותאכל*
> כל־ארעא *ותדושנה ותדקנה*
>
> As for the fourth animal, *there will be* a fourth kingdom on the earth
> which *will be different* from all the kingdoms. And it *will devour* all the
> earth. And it *will trample* it down, and *break* it in pieces.

There are also a number of ambiguous instances that could be
analyzed either as simple futures or otherwise. These are discussed

below under other categories. In passing, it may be of interest that 11 of the 47 instances of prefix conjugation verbs with a simple future function in Daniel consist of the verb הוה "to be" (2:28, 29a, b, 40a, 41a, b, 42a, b, 45; 4:22a; 7:23a).

2. *General Present*

There are a number of instances where the prefix conjugation expresses neither the future nor a type of modality, but must be understood as vestiges of earlier functions. These include a few instances of the gnomic or general present. There are no instances in the Aramaic of Daniel of the prefix conjugation with an actual present function, but only with a general present function. In contrast, the participle is employed for both the actual and the general present. There are at least 13 instances of prefix conjugation verbs with a gnomic or general present function. In 10 of these instances, the general present function is indicated by the fact that they occur in contexts that parallel nominal clauses (4:14b, c, d, 22e, f, 29d, e; 5:21c, d)[3] or *איתי* + *participle* (3:18b).

> Dan. 4:14
>
> עד־דברת די ינדעון חייא די־שליט עליא במלכות אנושא ולמן־די *יצבא יתננה* ושפל אנשים *יקים* עליה
>
> so that the living may know that the Most High is ruler over the kingdom of man, and to whoever *he wishes he gives it*, and lowest of men *he sets up* over it.
> [or, *giving* it to whoever *he wishes*, and *setting up* over it the lowest of men . . .]

In the context, the above instances most likely state not what God will do in the future (as claimed by Cohen 1984:417), but that which he does customarily. That is, since the clauses with prefix conjugation verbs elaborate on the content expressed by the initial atemporal nominal clause, i.e., that "the Most High is ruler over the kingdom of man," they make good sense as general presents. The instance in the following example parallels the complex verb phrase *איתי* + *participle*:

> Dan. 3:18
>
> לאלהיך לא־איתינא פלחין ולצלם דהבא די הקימת לא *נסגד*

_____

[3] 4:22, 29; 5:21 are loose citations of 4:14.

We do not serve your gods nor *do we worship* the image of gold that you set up.

In the above example, although it may be possible to infer a temporal contrast, where a complex verb phrase *איתי* + *participle* expresses the general present and the subsequent prefix conjugation expresses the future, i.e., "we do not serve your gods, and we will not worship . . . ," it is preferable to analyze them both as general presents, because the verbs פלח and סגד often occur in parallelism in the context (3:12, 14, 18, 28) functioning as a pair.

There are also 3 instances of the modal verb יכל that can also be described as general present in function (2:10; 3:29d; 5:16a).

Dan. 3:29

כל־קבל די לא איתי אלה אחרן די־*יכל* להצלה כדנה

For there is no other god who *is able* to deliver like this.

Dan. 2:10

לא־איתי אנש על־יבשתא די מלת מלכא *יוכל* להחויה

There is no man on the earth who *is able* to make known the matter of the king.

Another clear instance of a general present occurs in 6:16.

Dan. 6:16

דע מלכא די־דת למדי ופרס די־כל־אסר וקים די־מלכא *יהקים* לא להשניה

Know, O king, that it is a law to the Medes and Persians that any prohibition or statute that the king *establishes* cannot be changed.

Cohen compares the above instance with parallels in 6:9c, 13c (discussed elsewhere above), which he interprets as futures (1984:417). However, it makes better sense to analyze 6:16 not as a future event, but as general present in the sense of timeless habitual/customary actions. Alternatively, it could be interpreted as a type of hypothetical modality, since it denotes not actual actions, but potential actions.

Additionally, there are 4 instances that can be analyzed as either future or general present (3:18b; 6:27; 7:14b, c).

Dan. 7:14

ולה יהיב שלטן ויקר ומלכו וכל עממיא אמיא ולשניא לה יפלחון שלטנה שלטן עלם
די־לא *יעדה* ומלכותה די־לא *תתחבל*

His dominion is an eternal dominion that *will* not *pass away*, and his kingdom one that *will* not *be destroyed.*

The instances above could be understood either as a prediction that God's kingdom will not pass away or as a statement of fact that it does not pass away.

3. *Past Imperfective*

The most problematic cases of prefix conjugation verbs are those that appear to function in past time. From a comparative diachronic perspective, these past time instances of the prefix conjugation in the Aramaic of Daniel are remarkable, because, according to Muraoka and Porten, in Egyptian Aramaic no prefix conjugation verb "has been identified which indicates an action in the past, whether punctiliar or durative/iterative/habitual" (1998:195).[4] Segert (1975:379-380) likewise acknowledged no other past time instances in Old Aramaic, except for what he called the consecutive imperfect in the Zakur inscription (377). The absence of a past imperfective prefix conjugation in Egyptian Aramaic may be attributed to the paucity of narrative in the extant corpus of Egyptian Aramaic. As for Old Aramaic, the fragmentary nature of our knowledge is illustrated by the fact that, in spite of 3 instances of the *yaqtul* preterite in the Zakur inscription, discovered in 1903, it was not until after the 1967 discovery of the Deir Alla inscription and the 1993 discovery of the Tel Dan inscription that scholars began to generally acknowledge the possibility that the *yaqtul* preterite may have been commonly used in at least some regional dialects of Old Aramaic.[5] Although the discovery of the *yaqtul* preterite does not constitute evidence for a past time *yaqtulu* long imperfect, it highlights the fact that our knowledge concerning Old Aramaic remains incomplete. On the other hand, the past time prefix conjugation is not unique to the Aramaic of Daniel. For example, it occurs in past time circumstantial clauses in 1QapGen.

1QapGen 2:13

באדין אנסת רוחהא ועמי *תמלל* ולי *תאמר*

---

[4] They continued as follows: "The latter function is marked by the periphrastic construction hwh + ptc.act."

[5] For a brief survey of the literature, see Li 2004.

>   Then her spirit was troubled, *as she was speaking* with me and *saying* to me
>   . . .

Bauer and Leander (1927:281-282) appealed to parallels in Akkadian and Arabic, where the present-future tense expresses past time circumstances subordinate to the past tense verb. Although there is general agreement that some past time instances of the prefix conjugation fit their explanation, other instances have been explained in a variety of ways. Joüon (1941) analyzed the instances that Strack (1905:26) listed as non-imperfective exceptions and an additional instance, and concluded that all instances denote some sort of subordination, expressing a secondary action, and that this function disappeared from later Aramaic (see also Rogland 2003:429-430). According to Rosén (1961:191-192), the prefix conjugation of "linear aspect verbs" is narrative-constative. Cohen explains consecutive instances as a result of Hebrew influence (1984:419-425). Bombeck suggested that some instances are due to the author's stylistic device, attempting to imitate the Akkadian preterit of the king of Babylon, either in direct speech or in instances where he is the explicit or implicit subject or object of the verb (1996:8). For Gzella (2004:136-151, 304-305), past time prefix conjugation verbs are not aspectually different but function as background to suffix conjugation verbs. Below, I will argue that instances of prefix conjugation verbs that occur or appear to occur in past time may be categorized either as past imperfective or under one of the categories of modality.

Cohen's (1984:416-418) observation that past time instances of prefix conjugation verbs are virtually absent from direct speech, and occur mainly in poetic and/or apocalyptic contexts is significant, because it is expected that more archaic functions tend to appear in contexts where poetry or a high literary style are present, notwithstanding his denial in this case (424-425).

There is at least a general agreement that many instances of past time prefix conjugation verbs occur in connection with suffix conjugation verbs, and that at least some of these denote actions or events that are simultaneous with that of a suffix conjugation verb. Of instances without intervening subordinating markers, the prefix conjugation occurs both before the suffix conjugation (4:31, 33a, b, c; 6:20; 7:10a, b, 28a, b) and after it (4:2a, b, 8, 16, 17, 30a, b; 5:2, 6, 21; 7:14a, 15, 16a, b). Some contexts are past time descriptive rather than

narrative, including at least 4:8, 16, 17; 7:10a, b.[6] In these instances the prefix conjugation has a progressive function, but may not necessarily be subordinate or circumstantial. For example, in 7:10, the juxta-position is due to poetic aesthetics.

Dan. 7:10

נהר די־נור נגד ונפק מן־קדמוהי אלף אלפים *ישמשונה* ורבו רבון קדמוהי *יקומון* דינא יתב וספרין פתיחו

A stream of fire was flowing and coming out from before him. A thousand thousands *were ministering to him*, and a myriad myriads *were standing* before him. The court sat, and the books were opened.

In the above example, there are 2 participles followed by 2 prefix conjugation verbs followed by 2 suffix conjugation verbs. Since the context is a poetic past time description, the prefix conjugation verbs are past progressive but not necessarily subordinate.

Even in narrative contexts, the combination of suffix and prefix conjugation does not necessarily entail subordination. For example, the instances in 4:30a, b; 5:21a, b are probably iterative/habitual, and will be discussed below.

Among instances involving subordination, some instances of the sequence suffix conjugation + prefix conjugation may involve the employment of the latter to express purpose (5:2a, b; 7:14a) or result (4:2a, b). These will be discussed below under modality.

Of the remaining instances of prefix conjugation verbs in combination with suffix conjugation verbs, at least 9 instances occur in circumstantial clauses, and can be considered progressive (4:31, 33a, b, c; 5:6; 6:20; 7:15, 16a, b). Of these, at least 4 instances occur after the suffix conjugation (5:6; 7:15, 16a, b). Consider, for example, the series of three sequences in 7:15-16.

Dan. 7:15-16

15 אתכרית רוחי אנה דניאל בגוא נדנה וחזוי ראשי *יבהלנני* 16 קרבת על־חד מן־קאמיא ויציבא *אבעא*־מנה על־כל־דנה ואמר־לי ופשר מליא *יהודענני*

As for me, Daniel, my spirit was distressed within me, as the visions of my head *were frightening me*. I approached one of those standing by, *requesting* from him something reliable concerning all this. And he spoke to me, *making known to me* the interpretation of the matters.

---

[6] 4:17 is a loose quotation of 4:8.

In the above example, there are 3 instances of the sequence suffix conjugation + prefix conjugation. Though Cohen (1984:421) considered them consecutive, the circumstantial nature of the prefix conjugation clauses may be supported by their non-verb initial word order in contrast with the verb initial word order of the suffix conjugation clauses.

In 5 instances, the prefix conjugation circumstantial clause precedes the main clause (4:31, 33a, b, c; 6:20). For example:

Dan. 6:20

באדין מלכא בשפרפרא *יקום* בנגהא ובהתבהלה לגבא די־אריותא אזל

Then the king at dawn, *rising up* at daylight, went with haste to the lions' den.

Joüon (1941:23) suggested that יקום in the above example is atemporal, being situated in past time by the connective באדין (analogous to the Hebrew אז + prefix conjugation) and the prepositional phrase (also Rogland 2003:429). However, באדין is better understood as a discourse marker introducing clause clusters (Toews 1993:64 and passim) rather than a temporal marker, i.e., it transitions the narrative to the episode after the king's sleepless night (v. 19). The atemporal nature of the prefix conjugation verb is due to its progressive function. Though not necessarily simultaneous to the following suffix conjugation verb, it is part of a circumstantial clause, and it is therefore progressive. Toews suggests that the series of non-verb initial clauses in 6:20-21 marks a "slowing down" and "creating tension in the story" (1993:116-17). Gzella (2004:146-147) suggests, instead, that the use of the prefix conjugation is intended to avoid the connotation of an auxiliary, "he began to," which the suffix conjugation would denote. Although the auxiliary function of the verb קום is not attested this corpus, his suggestion in itself does not contradict the circumstantial interpretation offered here.[7]

There is another instance that requires comment.

Dan. 4:31

ולקצת יומיה אנה נבוכדנצר עיני לשמיא נטלת ומנדעי עלי *יתוב* ולעליא ברכת ולחי עלמא שבחת והדרת

---

[7] However, Gzella's claim that background occurrences of the prefix conjugation can only occur after the suffix conjugation is not borne out by the evidence. There is no reason why circumstantial clauses cannot occur before main clauses.

At the end of the days, I Nebuchadnezzar lifted my eyes to heaven. And *as* my understanding *was returning* to me, I blessed the Most High and praised and honored the One who lives forever.

Bauer and Leander (1927:281) suggested that יתוב in the above example denotes a gradual event simultaneous to preceding the suffix conjugation נטלת. Joüon (1941:22) suggested instead that it expresses the result of the previous suffix conjugation verb. That is, Nebuchadnezzar repented, i.e., he lifted up his eyes to heaven, and as a result, his reason was restored. Cohen (1984:420-421) cited it as an example of a "consecutive." However, it is also possible to analyze the instance as circumstantial to the following suffix conjugation ברכת, i.e., as his reason was returning to him, he praised God. This is even more likely when the resumptive repetition of the prefix conjugation clause (with no preceding suffix conjugation verb) in v. 33 is analyzed in connection with this verse.

Dan. 4:33

בה־זמנא מנדעי *יתוב* עלי וליקר מלכותי הדרי וזוי *יתוב* עלי ולי הדברי ורברבני *יבעון* ועל־מלכותי התקנת ורבו יתירה הוספת לי

At that time, *as* my understanding *was returning* to me, and my dignity and appearance *were returning* to me for the glory of my kingdom, and my officials and chiefs *were seeking* me, I was established over my kingdom, and abundant greatness was added to me.

In v. 33, the first prefix conjugation verb, יתוב (4:33a), is an instance of resumptive repetition of the same in v. 31, after an interruption consisting of a poetic praise to God, and therefore, the phrase בה־זמנא (v. 33), "at the time," denotes the same temporal reference as ולקצת יומיה (v. 31), "at the end of the days." The resumptive repetition of יתוב in v. 33 also entails the resumption of the function of this and the following prefix conjugation verbs as circumstantial/backgrounded to a following suffix conjugation verb, התקנת.[8] The pattern can be plotted as follows:

Dan. 4:31-33

---

[8] It is possible that יבעון (4:33c) carries an inceptive notion, "began to seek," which may also be reflected in the fact that Theodotion translated it with a Greek imperfect, but all other verbs in 4:33 with aorists (however, there are textual problems in that verse and its context).

31 ולקצת יומיה . . . ומנדעי עלי *יתוב* . . . ברכת . . . שבחת והדרת . . .

. . . .

33 בה־זמנא מנדעי *יתוב עלי* . . . *יתוב* . . . *יבעון* . . . התקנת . . . הוספת

At the end of the days, . . . *as* my understanding *was returning* to me, I blessed . . . and praised and honored . . . [praise interlude]

. . . .

At that time, *as* my understanding *was returning* to me, and my dignity and appearance *were returning* to me for the glory of my kingdom, and my officials and chiefs *were seeking* me, I was established over my kingdom, and abundant greatness was added to me.

Although three successive fronted circumstantial/background clauses seem unusual (יתוב . . . יתוב . . . יבעון), it may not be out of character for a chapter that contains so much poetry. Furthermore, the fact that the ensuing suffix conjugation verbs in v. 33 are non-sentence initial and passive suggests the possibility of a descriptive rather than narrative discourse context.

Finally, 2 instances of prefix conjugation verbs in combination with suffix conjugation verbs are best understood either as progressive or continuative, though other possibilities cannot be ruled out (7:28a, b).

Dan. 7:28

עד־כה סופא די־מלתא אנה דניאל שגיא רעיוני *יבהלנני* וזיוי *ישתנון* עלי ומלתא בלבי נטרת פ

Thus far is the end of the matter. As for me Daniel, as my thoughts *were frightening me* greatly and my appearance *was changed* over me, I kept the matter in my mind.

The precise function of the prefix conjugation verbs in the example above depends to some extent on the meaning of the following clause. If the latter means that Daniel did not forget the matter, the prefix conjugation verbs may be progressive in circumstantial clauses, as translated above. On the other hand, if the last clause means that Daniel kept the matter to himself, the prefix conjugation clauses may be concessive clauses, and the prefix conjugation verbs may be either progressive or continuative, as translated below:

As for me Daniel, although my thoughts *were frightening me* [or, *continued to frighten me*] greatly and my appearance *was changed* [or, *remained altered*] over me, I kept the matter to myself [or, in my heart].

As mentioned above, not all past time prefix conjugation verbs occur in circumstantial clauses. Nor do they all occur in conjunction with suffix conjugation verbs, nor are they all progressive in function. In at

least 9 instances, prefix conjugation verbs have a habitual/iterative or customary function (4:9a, b, c, 18a, b, 30a, b; 5:21a, b).⁹

Dan. 4:9

עפיה שפיר ואנבה *שגיא* ומזון לכלא־בה תחתוהי *תטלל* חיות ברא ובענפוהי *ידרן* צפרי שמיא ומנה *יתזין* כל־בשרא

Its foliage was beautiful, its fruit plentiful, with food for all in it. Under it the wild animals *used to nest*, in its branches the birds of the sky *used to dwell*, and from it all flesh *used to feed.*

The instances in the above example occur in the context of descriptive verbless clauses in poetry, and they describe past time habitual/customary actions rather than single actions in the past.

Dan. 4:30-31

בה־שעתא מלתא ספת על־נבוכדנצר ומן־אנשא טריד ועשבא כתורין *יאכל* ומטל שמיא גשמה *יצטבע* עד די שערה כנשרין רבה וטפרוהי כצפרין 31 ולקצת יומיה אנה נבוכדנצר עיני לשמיא נטלת

At that moment, the matter was fulfilled upon Nebuchadnezzar, and he was driven from mankind. *He used to eat* grass like oxen, and his body *used to be drenched* with the dew of heaven, until his hair had grown like eagles [i.e., eagles' feathers], and his nails like birds [i.e., birds' claws]. And at the end of the days, I Nebuchadnezzar lifted my eyes to heaven.

In the above example, the events depicted by the prefix conjugation verbs cover seven years, i.e., from "at that moment" (v. 30) to "at the end of the days" (v. 31). Thus, a past time habitual/iterative function seems to fit best. Furthermore, the descriptive rather than narrative nature of these prefix conjugation clauses is supported by the fact that they are preceded by a nominal clause in the loose quotation in 5:21, ועם־ערדיא מדורה "his dwelling was with wild donkeys."

Other instances sometimes cited as instances of past time prefix conjugation verbs are discussed under various other categories.

C. Modality

There is no universally accepted definition of modality. According to Palmer (2001:1-4), modality involves a non-asserted proposition. On the

---

⁹ The instances in 4:18 are a loose quotation of 4:9 and those in 5:21 are a loose quotation of 4:30.

other hand, Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:176) suggested that modality is impossible to define, and proposed instead that it is "a set of diachronically related functions" (See also Bybee 1998).[10] There is also no consensus on the classification of different types of modality. Traditionally, modality has been subdivided into *deontic* and *epistemic* modalities. However, Palmer (2001:8) divided it primarily into two broad groups, propositional modality (including epistemic and evidential), which is "concerned with the speaker's attitude to the truth-value or factual status of the proposition," and event modality (including deontic and dynamic), which refers to "events that are not actualized, events that have not taken place but are merely potential," with the addition of a number of "other" categories (10-22, passim). On the other hand, Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:176-181) classified various types of modalities into four main groups, i.e., agent-oriented, speaker-oriented, epistemic, and subordinating. I have chosen to follow primarily Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca's classification, because this study involves attention to the phenomena of grammaticalization. However, it is beyond the scope of this study to settle issues concerning the fundamental nature of modality.[11]

1. *Agent-Oriented Modalities*

Agent-oriented modality "reports the existence of internal and external conditions on an agent with respect to the completion of the action" (Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994:177). It includes obligation (reporting the existence of external set of social conditions compelling the action), necessity (reporting the existence of physical conditions), ability (reporting the existence of internal enabling conditions), desire (reporting the existence of internal volitional conditions), root possibility (reporting the existence of general enabling conditions, not restricted to internal condition of ability). Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:181) also suggested that constructions that express agent-oriented modality gradually develop into epistemic and speaker-oriented modality, and later come to be employed in certain

---

[10] Their reasons are more extensively explained in an earlier work (1991).

[11] See also Palmer's (2001:84-85) critique of Bybee's classification of modality.

subordinate clauses. The latter function is followed by the gradual loss of this grammatical form from the language (213-214).[12]

1.1. *Obligation*
See the discussion under speaker-oriented modalities below.

1.2. *Ability*
In at least 5 instances, prefix conjugation verbs express ability (2:9d, 11, 25; 4:32a, b).

> Dan. 2:11
>
> ומלתא די־מלכה *שאל* יקירה ואחרן לא איתי די *יחונה* קדם מלכא להן אלהין די מדרהון עם־בשרא לא איתוהי
>
> And the matter which the king *asks* is difficult and there is not another who *can reveal* it before the king, except the gods whose dwelling is not with flesh.

Although instances such as the above example can be translated as simple futures, it is clear that the king's servants are not stating that the gods will reveal the king's dream, but that only the gods are able to do so. It is also a backhanded way of saying that the task is beyond human ability.

1.3. *Root Possibility*
There is at least 1 instance where the prefix conjugation verb expresses root possibility (general enabling conditions) rather than ability (internal enabling conditions) (6:6).

> Dan. 6:6
>
> לא *נהשכח* לדניאל דנה כל־עלא להן השכחנה עלוהי בדת אלהה
>
> *We cannot find* any cause against this Daniel, unless we find it in the law of his God.

---

[12] Haspelmath (1998) offered a slightly different account of the rise of futures and subjunctives. He suggested that punctual telic verbs develop future and/or subjunctive meaning first. He also suggested that the old present becomes a future "as a side effect of the rise of a new present," but it develops into a subjunctive when a future already exists (35-36), though these functions can overlap (56-58). However, he did not explore the application of this hypothesis to the development from general imperfectives to futures/subjunctives.

In the above example, the issue is not the administrators' capability, but the fact that Daniel's faithfulness made it impossible for them to have a case against him.

2. *Speaker-Oriented Modalities*

Speaker-oriented modalities "do not report the existence of conditions on the agent, but rather allow the speaker to impose such conditions on the addressee" (Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994:179). That is, speaker-oriented modality is used when a speaker imposes conditions on the addressee. Thus, whereas agent-oriented modality may state the existence of an obligation, speaker-oriented modality imposes an obligation. Contrast the following examples (cited in Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994:177, 179 from Coates).

> All students *must* obtain the consent of the Dean.
> You *must* play this ten times over.

The first of the two sentences above reports the existence of an obligation, and thus expresses agent-oriented modality, whereas the second sentence imposes an obligation, and thus expresses speaker-oriented modality. Speaker-oriented modality includes all directives, such as commands, demands, requests, entreaties and warnings, exhortations, and recommendations. These are classified as imperative (direct commands), prohibitive (negative commands), optative (wish or hope expressed in a main clause), hortative (encouraging or inciting someone to action), admonitive (issuing a warning), and permissive (granting permission). Because of the need to discuss them together, I have grouped all instances into affirmative directives and prohibition.

2.1. *Affirmative Directives*
In a number of instances, prefix conjugation verbs function as directives (i.e., they have a deontic function involving obligation or permission). It is generally accepted that the use of the prefix conjugation is more polite than the imperative, though it is not clear to what extent its use could be equivalent to or at least overlaps the imperative. Toews (1993:249-258) follows Longacre in dividing hortatory discourse into four subgroups, unmitigated, partially mitigated, completely mitigated, and deferential hortatory discourse, and suggests that the imperative is the unmarked form, which is more frequent in the less mitigated discourse types. Though the distinctions may not be as clear-cut as Longacre suggested, it stands to reason that,

unless there are contextual evidences to the contrary, the use of the prefix conjugation in directives consists of a polite indirect expression of speaker-oriented modality (command), i.e., it is a polite indirect command/request. That is the case in at least 2 instances of polite requests (6:9a, b), and 1 instance of respectful address (3:18a).

Dan. 6:9

כען מלכא *תקים* אסרא *ותרשם* כתבא

Now, o king, *you should establish* the prohibition, and *sign* the document.

Dan. 3:18

ידיע *להוא*-לך מלכא

Let it be known to you, o king.

Folmer (1995:391-393) categorized three levels of politeness in the use of prefix conjugation directives as follows, in order of most polite to least polite: 1) a 3ʳᵈ person t-stem prefix conjugation verb + ל, 2) the passive participle + prefix conjugation הוה + ל (3:18),[13] and 3) a simple active stem 2ⁿᵈ person prefix conjugation verb (6:9). To Folmer's list, one may also add what Muraoka (1966:163-164) called an "indirect imperative," where the 3ʳᵈ person (active stem) is used instead of the 2ⁿᵈ person (2:7a; 5:12a, b).[14]

Dan. 2:7

מלכא חלמא *יאמר* לעבדוהי

Let the king *tell* his servants the dream.

Perhaps the above example is equivalent to Folmer's first level of politeness, since both use the 3ʳᵈ person as a means of avoiding directly addressing a superior in the 2ⁿᵈ person. Notice the next example, which involves both t-stem and active 3ʳᵈ person forms (5:12a, b).

Dan. 5:12

כען דניאל *יתקרי* ופשרה *יהחוה*

---

[13] Contrast the example in 3:18 above with the use of the imperative in 6:16, דע מלכא ("Know, o king").

[14] Muraoka also cited the use of the 1ˢᵗ person pl. נאמר in 2:36 instead of the sg. as another example of indirectness.

And now, *let* Daniel *be called*, and *let him make known* the interpretation.

It is also possible that in at least 2 instances a 3rd person prefix conjugation form is a polite introduction to an ensuing imperative (4:24a; 5:17a).

Dan. 4:24

להן מלכא מלכי *ישפר* עליך

Therefore, o king, *let* my counsel *be pleasing* to you.

Finally, it is not impossible that at least some instances of polite address may be interpreted as the use of the future or agent-oriented modality in indirect directives. For a broader discussion of deferential language beyond the expression of directives in Egyptian and Biblical Aramaic, see Estelle (2006).

Nevertheless, as it turns out, a number of instances do have contextual grounds for being classified as direct expressions of speaker-oriented modality without deferential nuance. Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca observed that the "imperative is the most commonly occurring other use for futures" (1994:273). "In a situation in which the speaker has authority over the addressee, a 2nd person prediction . . . is interpreted as a command" (Bybee, Pagliuca, and Perkins 1991:28). Thus, at least 7 instances occur in the context of 2nd person royal commands (2:5b, c, 6b; 3:5b, c, 6c, 15e).[15] Since these are royal commands, it is not necessary to interpret them as instances of deferential language.

Dan. 3:5

בעדנא די־תשמעון קל קרנא משרוקיתא קיתרוס סבכא פסנתרין סומפניה וכל זני זמרא *תפלון ותסגדון* לצלם דהבא די הקים נבוכדנצר מלכא

At the time that you hear the sound of . . . *you shall fall down and worship* the image that I Nebuchadnezzar the king set up.

Dan. 3:15

והן לא תסגדון בה־שעתה *תתרמון* לגוא־אתון נורא יקדתא

---

[15] Some contexts involve both 2nd and 3rd person forms. Additionally, there are a number of royal commands that occur in the 3rd person, either because they are citations of previous commands or because they are complements of expressions of command. These instances are discussed below under subordinate modalities.

But if you do not worship it, at that moment *you shall be thrown* into a furnace of burning fire.

At least 4 other instances occur in royal commands issued in both 2nd and 3rd persons depending on the context (3rd person in 5:7c, d and 2nd person in 5:16c, d).

Dan. 5:7

כל־אנש די־יקרה כתבה דנה ופשרה יחונני ארגונא *ילבש* והמונכא די־דהבא
על־צוארה ותלתי במלכותא *ישלט*

Anyone who reads this writing and reveals its interpretation *shall wear* purple, with a chain of gold on his neck, and *shall rule* as third in the kingdom.

Dan. 5:16

כען הן תוכל כתבא למקרא ופשרה להודעתני ארגונא *תלבש* והמונכא די־דהבא
על־צוארך ותלתא במלכותא *תשלט*

Now, if you can read this writing and make known its interpretation, *you shall wear* purple, with a chain of gold on your neck, and *you shall rule* as third in the kingdom.

It is clear that in the above examples, the use of the 3rd person in 5:7 is not deferential, but simply a 3rd person decree, since the same royal command is repeated in the 2nd person in 5:16, where the king addresses a specific individual.

Also, 6 instances occur in angelic decrees (4:11, 12, 13a, b, c, 20a)[16] within the context of imperatives. Here, the reason for the use of the prefix conjugation is that these are 3rd person commands.

Dan. 4:11

גדו אילנא וקצצו ענפוהי אתרו עפיה ובדרו אנבה *תנד* חיותא מן־תחתוהי וצפריא
מן־ענפוהי

Cut down the tree and cut off its branches. Strip its foliage, and scatter its fruit. *Let* the animals *flee* from under it, and the birds from its branches.

Additionally, there are at least 4 instances of prefix conjugation verbs with an optative function (2:20; 3:31; 6:17, 26).

Dan. 3:31

---

[16] 20a is a citation.

שלמכון *ישגא*

> *May* your peace *increase*!

Both the optative and agent-oriented desire modalities express a wish. The difference is that whereas agent-oriented desire reports the existence of a desire on the part of an agent (e.g., "I would like your peace to increase"), an optative expression imposes the desire on an addressee or some other entity (e.g., "May your peace increase"). Admittedly, the same wish could be expressed either way. Nevertheless, there is a difference in the type of modality expressed. Here is another example (6:17).

> Dan. 6:17

אלהך די אנתה פלח־לה בתדירא הוא *ישיזבנך*

> Your God whom you serve continually, *may* he *deliver* you.

The above example cannot be a simple future, since on the next morning the king asks Daniel in a distressed or sad tone whether God was able to deliver him (6:21). Thus, it is probably an optative expression of a wish.

Finally, since the jussive cannot always be distinguished from the long prefix conjugation, it is possible that some instances of prefix conjugation directives may in fact be jussives.

2.2. Prohibition

In 2 instances the prefix conjugation expresses prohibition (i.e., "may not"), though a general present cannot be ruled out (6:9c, 13c).[17]

> Dan. 6:9

כען מלכא תקים אסרא ותרשם כתבא די לא להשניה כדת־מדי ופרס די*לא תעדא*

> Now, let the king establish a prohibition and sign a document so that it may not change according to the law of the Medes and the Persians which *may not pass away* [or, *does not pass away*].

The expression לא תעדא in the above example is similar to the infinitive expression לא להשניה in v. 16 (and in the same verse, v. 9), and probably has a similar range of meaning.

> Dan. 6:16

---

[17] The instance in 6:13c is a repetition of 6:9c.

דת למדי ופרס די־כל־אסר וקים די־מלכא יהקים *לא להשניה*

The Medes and Persians have a law that any prohibition or statute that the king establishes *is not to change* [i.e., = "*may not change*"].

3. *Epistemic Modalities*

Epistemic modality "applies to assertions and indicates the extent to which the speaker is committed to the truth of the proposition" (Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994:179). It includes possibility (that the proposition may possibly be true), probability (indicating a greater likelihood than possibility that the proposition is true), inferred certainty (indicating certainty rather than only probability that the proposition is true), and counter-factual (contrary to fact, e.g., "I should have mailed this yesterday, but I forgot" (180)). The only attested examples of prefix conjugation forms expressing epistemic modality are a couple equivocal instances.

3.1. *Possibility*

Whereas agent-oriented root possibility indicates general (including external) enabling conditions with respect to the agent's completing of an action, epistemic possibility deals with the possibility that the proposition is true. Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:178-180) cited the following examples from Coates to illustrate the contrast (cited here in abbreviated form).

> Root possibility: "I couldn't finish reading it, because . . . ."
> Epistemic possibility: "I may have put them down on the table."

The first example above expresses the agent's ability/possibility (or lack thereof), whereas the second example expresses the speaker's assertion that the proposition is possible.

   In 1 instance, the prefix conjugation verb probably expresses epistemic possibility, though one cannot rule out ability or even a simple future (3:15f).

> Dan. 3:15

ומן־הוא אלה די *ישיזבנכון* מן־ידי

> And who is the god who *might deliver* [or, *can/will deliver*] you from my hands?

In the example above, it is possible that the king is questioning the possibility of a divine intervention (i.e., the possibility of the

proposition), rather than the ability of the God of the Hebrews, though the latter cannot be ruled out.

3.2. *Inferred Certainty*

The other instance of a prefix conjugation verb that possibly expresses epistemic modality occurs in 3:17, where it could be analyzed as expressing certainty.

> Dan. 3:17
>
> הן איתי אלהנא די־אנחנא פלחין יכל לשיזבותנא מן־אתון נורא יקדתא ומן־ידך מלכא ישיזב
>
> If it is so, our God, whom we serve, is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace. And *he will (surely) deliver* us from your hand, O king. [or If our God . . . is able to . . .]

However, it is also possible to translate ישיזב in the above example as a continuation of the conditional protasis introduced by הן, if one follows Wesselius' (2005:262-264) suggestion that the apodosis in v. 16 precedes the protasis in v. 17.

> We do not need to answer you . . . , if our God . . . is able to deliver us . . . and (if) *he delivers* us. But if not (i.e., "in any case") . . .

4. *Subordinate/Subjunctive Modalities*

Subordinate verbal functions are also a type of modality, though they are not always classified as such in the literature. Palmer (2001:108) referred to Jespersen's 1924 observation that "one of the functions of the subjunctive is simply that of being subordinate." However, as Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:236) observed, subjunctives "do not uniformly cover the same set of uses across languages, because other devices exist to fulfill some of the same linguistic functions." Subordinating modality includes complement, concessive, and purpose clauses (180). Many of the prefix conjugation verbs that express modality also occur in subordinate clauses. However, not all types subordinate modality are formally marked as subordinate in Semitic languages.

4.1. *Hypothetical/Conditional*

There are at least 6 instances of prefix conjugation verbs in conditional clauses introduced by הן (2:5a, 6a, 9a; 3:15d; 4:24b; 5:16b).[18] According to Folmer (1991), there was a diachronic development in Aramaic from the earlier use of the suffix conjugation in a conditional protasis to the more widespread use of the prefix conjugation. Since futures are not commonly used in hypothetical or temporal subordinate clauses with future time reference (Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994:274), the shift from suffix conjugation to prefix conjugation was probably not due to the future function of the latter, but rather because it was becoming more clearly associated with the expression of modality.

> Dan. 5:16
>
> כען הן *תוכל* כתבא למקרא ופשרה להודעתני ארגונא תלבש והמונכא די־דהבא
> על־צוארך ותלתא במלכותא תשלט פ
>
> Now, if *you can* read this writing and make known its interpretation, you shall wear purple with a chain of gold around your neck, and shall rule as third in the kingdom.

Additionally, at least 10 other instances not introduced by הן could also be hypothetical. These are introduced by כל־די (6:8a), כל־אנש די (3:10a; 5:7a, b; 6:13a), ומן־די (3:6a, b, 11a, b), or a variation of these expressions (3:29a).[19]

> Dan. 3:5-6
>
> 5 בעדנא די־תשמעון קל קרנא משרוקיתא קיתרוס סבכא פסנתרין סומפניה וכל זני
> זמרא תפלון ותסגדון לצלם דהבא די הקים נבוכדנצר מלכא 6 ומן־די־לא *יפל ויסגד*
> בה־שעתא יתרמא לגוא־אתון נורא יקדתא
>
> At the time when you hear the sound of the horn, flute, lyre, trigon, harp, accompaniment, and all kinds of music, you shall fall down and worship the image of gold that Nebuchadnezzar the king set up. And whoever *might* not *fall down* and *worship*, at that hour he shall be thrown into the furnace of burning fire.

Although it is possible to analyze instances such as in the above example as general present or future, a hypothetical function is at least

---

[18] In 4:24b, the conjunction הן is often translated "perhaps," but one could argue that the latter meaning is simply an extension of its conditional function. See also Ezra 5:17, where it functions as a marker of indirect question, "whether."

[19] The expressions in 3:11a, b are indirect quotations of 3:6a, b; 6:13a is a loose quotation of 6:8a.

a valid possibility, because these instances denote neither timeless habitual events nor predictable future events, but only potential ones.

4.2. Temporal subordinate clauses

As already noted earlier, futures are not commonly used in conditional (i.e., "if") or temporal (i.e., "when") subordinate clauses (Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994:274). Therefore, temporal clauses with prefix conjugation verbs should be understood as having a subordinate, not future, function. An interesting confirmation of this cross-linguistic typological observation is that Theodotion translates the 4 instances of עד די + prefix conjugation (2:9b; 4:20b, 22d, 29c) with ἕως οὗ + subjunctive (the Old Greek also has a subjunctive in 2:9, but does not translate the other instances), whereas עד די + suffix conjugation is translated with an indicative (e.g., 4:30).

> Dan. 4:20
>
> ובטל שמיא יצטבע ועם־חיות ברא חלקה עד די־שבעה עדנין *יחלפון* עלוהי
>
> Let him be drenched with the dew of heaven, its portion being with the wild animals, until seven times *pass over* him.

The inappropriateness of a translation *"until . . . will pass over him" for the above example is not a quirk of the English language, but a cross linguistic phenomenon, i.e., a simple future tense is usually not appropriate in such contexts.

In addition to constructions with עד די, prefix conjugation verbs occur in other subordinate temporal clauses. In 1 instance, the temporal clause is introduced by מן די (4:23), and in 2 instances, the temporal nature of the relative clause introduced by די is made explicit by the context, i.e., "at the time when" (3:5a, repeated in v. 15a).[20]

> Dan. 3:5
>
> 5 בעדנא די־*תשמעון* קל קרנא משרוקיתא קיתרוס סבכא פסנתרין סומפניה וכל זני זמרא תפלון ותסגדון לצלם דהבא די הקים נבוכדנצר מלכא
>
> At the time when *you hear* the sound of the horn, flute, lyre, trigon, harp, accompaniment, and all kinds of music, you shall fall down and worship the image of gold that Nebuchadnezzar the king set up.

---

[20] Nevertheless, the indirect quotation of 3:5a in 3:10a is not a temporal clause.

4.3. *Complement*

Another subordinate function of prefix conjugation verbs in the Aramaic of Daniel is that of being the complement of another verb. Deutscher defined finite complements as "clauses which are arguments of predicates" (2000:9). That is, the complement clause is semantically, though not necessarily syntactically, dependant on/embedded within another clause. Although Deutscher's work focused primarily on Akkadian, his brief theoretical discussion (see 7-16) is appropriate for Semitic languages in general.

Although די often introduces relative clauses, די followed by one or more prefix conjugation verbs can also function as finite complement clauses. Instances include complements of verbs of knowing (2:9d),[21] hearing (5:16a), or requesting (2:16). In 2 instances, the prefix conjugation verbs function as the complement of "to be ready" (3:15b, c).[22]

> Dan. 3:15
>
> כען הן איתיכון עתידין די בעדנא די־תשמעון קל קרנא משרוקיתא קיתרס שבכא
> פסנתרין וסומפניה וכל זני זמרא *תפלון ותסגדון* לצלמא די־עבדת
>
> Now, if you are ready . . . *to fall down and worship* the statue that I made, . . .

Also a number of instances involve verbal expressions of issuing royal commands. Some of these complements occur in citations of previous royal commands (3:10b, c, 11c; 6:13b). Others report the content of the royal commands (3:29b, c; 5:29; 6:8b). It is interesting to compare the expression ומני שים טעם followed by a complement in the following two examples.

> Dan. 3:29
>
> ומני שים טעם די כל־עם אמה ולשן די־יאמר שלה על אלההון די־שדרך מישך ועבד
> נגוא הדמין *יתעבד* וביתה נולי *ישתוה*
>
> And a decree has been issued by me *that* any people, nation, or tongue that speaks amiss against the god of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego *shall be cut* into pieces, and his house *shall be turned into* a dunghill.

---

[21] It is also possible that 4:14c, d and its loose quotations in 4:22f, 29e are continuations of verbless clauses serving as complements of verbs of knowing.

[22] See also the discussion in chapter 9, section E on the instances in 3:15.

Dan. 4:3

ומני שים טעם *להנעלה* קדמי לכל חכימי בבל

And a decree was issued by me *to bring up* before me all the wise men of Babylon.

In the first instance above, ומני שים טעם is followed by prefix conjugation verbs, and in the second by an infinitive, with very little noticeable semantic difference.[23]

I suggest that in the Aramaic of Daniel the various expressions used in royal commands may be categorized in two ways. A royal command + complement (i.e., infinitive or די + prefix conjugation verb) expresses a command and the content of the command, whereas a royal command + suffix conjugation verb consists of an elliptical command (i.e., where the content is not expressed) followed by its fulfillment.[24] The latter usually involves the verb אמר, whereas the former includes a variety of expressions. Both are illustrated in the same verse in 5:29.

Dan. 5:29

באדין אמר בלשאצר והלבישו לדניאל ארגונא והמונכא די־דהבא על־צוארה והכרזו
עלוהי *די־להוא* שליט תלתא במלכותא

Then Belshazzar commanded, and they clothed Daniel in purple with a chain of gold on his neck, and they made a proclamation concerning him *that he should be* the third ruler in the kingdom.

In the above example, אמר + suffix conjugation verb expresses an elliptical command followed by its fulfillment, whereas די־להוא + והכרזו expresses the content of the proclamation.

4.4. *Purpose*

According to Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:229-230), the grammatical constructions expressing purpose most frequently develop from constructions expressing intention, either directly or by way of prediction (i.e., future) as an intermediate step. Therefore, the use of the prefix conjugation in expressing purpose could be ascribed

---

[23] There could possibly be another parallel with אמר + די + prefix conjugation in 5:7c, d, though there the particle די is better understood as a marker of direct speech. Otherwise, the complement of a royal command is normally expressed with an infinitive (e.g., אמר + infinitive 2:12, 46; 3:13, 19a, 20a; 4:23; 5:2; 6:24; קרא + infinitive 5:7; שלח + infinitive 3:2). See chapter 8 on the infinitive.

[24] Similarly, בעה occurs elliptically without complement in 2:49.

to an extension of its future function. There are 10 attested instances that are either introduced by די or follow another clause introduced by it (2:18, 30a, b; 3:28a, b; 4:3, 14a; 5:15; 6:2, 18).

Dan. 2:30

2:30 ואנה לא בחכמה די־איתי בי מן־כל־חייא רזא דנה גלי לי להן על־דברת די פשרא
למלכא *יהודעון* ורעיוני לבבך *תנדע*

And as for me, not because of any wisdom that is in me more than any living being is this secret revealed to me, but in order that the interpretation *might be made known* to the king, and *that you may know* the thoughts of your mind.

Dan. 5:15

וכען העלו קדמי חכימיא אשפיא די־כתבה דנה *יקרון* ופשרה להודעתני

And now, the wise men and enchanters were brought up before me *to read* [or, *that they might read*] this writing and make known to me its interpretation.

Notice in the example above the parallel use of both the prefix conjugation (יקרון) and the infinitive (להודעתני) in purpose clauses.

In addition to purpose clauses introduced by די, there may be other instances that express purpose without an overt marker. The clearest instance occurs in a past time narrative context (5:2).

Dan. 5:2

בלשאצר אמר בטעם חמרא להיתיה למאני דהבא וכספא די הנפק נבוכדנצר אבוהי
מן־היכלא די בירושלם *וישתון* בהון מלכא ורברבנוהי שגלתה ולחנתה

Belshazzar commanded when drunk to bring the vessels of gold and silver which Nebuchadnezzar his father had brought out from the temple which was in Jerusalem, *so that* the king, his nobles, his concubines and maid servants *might drink* with them.

Although וישתון in the above example is sentence initial and not introduced by די, it is best to interpret it as expressing purpose, because the next verse (v. 3) reports the fulfillment of the king's command:

Dan. 5:3

באדין היתיו מאני דהבא די הנפקו מן־היכלא די־בית אלהא די בירושלם ואשתיו בהון
מלכא ורברבנוהי שגלתה ולחנתה

Then they brought the vessels of gold that they brought out of the temple of God which was in Jerusalem, and the king, his nobles, his

concubines and maid servants drank with them.

Therefore, the interpretation of the prefix conjugation form in v. 2 as expressing purpose results in a smooth narrative sequence. That is, 1) the king commanded to bring the vessels, [+ purpose] so that they might drink from them; then 2) they brought them, and 3) they drank from them. An alternative interpretation would result in an awkward narrative sequence: i.e., 1) the king commanded to bring the vessels, and 2) they drank from them; then 3) they brought them, and 4) they drank from them.

In 5 other unmarked instances, the prefix conjugation verb could express either future or purpose (2:4, 7b, 9c, 24; 7:14a).

Dan. 2:4

אמר חלמא לעבדיך ופשרא *נחוא*

Tell your servants the dream, *so that we may make known* [or, *and we will make known*] its interpretation.

Dan. 2:9

להן חלמא אמרו לי *ואנדע* די פשרה תהחונני

Therefore, tell me the dream, *so that I may know* [or, *and I will know*] that you can make known to me the interpretation.

Dan. 7:14

ולה יהיב שלטן ויקר ומלכו וכל עממיא אמיא ולשניא לה *יפלחון*

To him was given authority and honor and a kingdom, *so that* all nations and peoples and tongues *might serve* him.

In the examples above the prefix conjugation verb could be interpreted as expressing purpose, though one could also argue that they are simple futures whose notion of purpose is neither expressed nor implied, but only inferred by modern readers, who are non-native Aramaic speakers.

4.5. *Result*

Palmer (2001:83, 136) suggested that the relationship between purpose, result, and indirect commands has typological implications, due to their notional overlap. That is, purpose and indirect commands express an intended effect, whereas result expresses an actual effect. There are

at least 2 instances of prefix conjugation verbs that can be understood as expressing result (4:2a, b).[25]

Dan. 4:2

חלם חזית *וידחלנני* והרהרין על־משכבי וחזוי ראשי *יבהלנני*

I dreamed a dream, *so that it frightened me* and the imaginations on my bed and the visions of my head *scared me*.

The above instances are sometimes cited as examples of past time prefix conjugation verbs,[26] and more than one interpretation is possible. I suggest that at least one option is to understand them as expressing result in past time.

D. JUSSIVE

As already mentioned, the jussive and the long imperfect cannot be distinguished, except in 4 instances that are clearly jussive, because of the negation by אל and, in most cases, the presence of a pronominal suffix that differentiates jussives and long imperfects. Although none of the instances are direct commands, they all, nevertheless, fit the classification of speaker-oriented modality. All 4 instances of clear jussives are negative, expressing either a (negative) request (2:24) or a (negative) exhortation (4:16; 5:10a, b).

Dan. 2:24

לחכימי בבל אל *תהובד*

Do not *destroy* the wise men of Babylon!

The above example is addressed to a superior. However, it is impossible to determine whether it involves politeness or not, because the imperative cannot be used in negative commands.

Dan. 5:10

אל־*יבהלוך* רעיונך וזיויך אל־*ישתנו*

Do not let your thoughts *frighten* you, nor let your countenance *change*!

---

[25] See also the discussion of the instance in 4:31 above under past imperfective function.

[26] E.g., Bauer and Leander (1927:281); Bombeck (1996:7, 8).

Toews (1993:250, 256-257) cited the above example as the only instance of "mitigated hortatory discourse," i.e., "a mixture of imperatives and non-imperative/command mood forms." That is, the 3rd person negative commands are equivalent to imperatives, which cannot be used in this grammatical environment, and are then subsequently followed by a prefix conjugation "pseudo-command." However, since the speaker could have used a 2nd person form, if she had wished to, the context fits better Toews' definition of "deferential hortatory discourse," where 3rd person forms are used in order to avoid 2nd person forms (1993:251). Furthermore, since it is improbable that someone could command another to stop being afraid, the instances in the above example should be understood as hortative, i.e., expressing an exhortation or encouragement, rather than as a negative command.

Additionally, Rosenthal (1961:44, 52) cited the spelling of יתקרי in 5:12 as a possible indication that it is a jussive. It is also possible that some of the other instances of prefix conjugation verbs expressing directives are jussives.

E. The Prefix Conjugation Form of the Verb הוה

Instances of 3rd person (other than 3rd feminine singular) prefix conjugation forms of the verb הוה "to be," which have the prefix ל instead of י, deserve additional comment.[27] For example:

Dan. 2:28

מה די להוא באחרית יומיא

What *will be* at the end of the days.

Kautzsch (1884:79) ascribed the prefix ל to the same origin as the Arabic particle ل /li-/, which can be attached to the jussive or the subjunctive. Other scholars recognized that this ל first came to be used on the jussive form and later replaced the regular morpheme for the prefix conjugation in some forms of Eastern Aramaic, and that its use with this verb in Biblical Aramaic is due to later scribal attempt to differentiate it from the divine name יהוה (summarized in Strack

---

[27] There are 17 instances attested in Daniel, consisting of: 3ms (2:20, 28, 29(2x), 41, 42, 45; 3:18; 4:22; 5:29; 6:3), 3mp (2:43(2x); 6:2, 3, 27), 3fp (5:17).

1905:34).[28] It is now also commonly recognized that ל prefix was originally a precative particle whose reflex in Akkadian was *lu-*, or *liprus* in combination with the preterite (summarized in Kaufman 1974:124-126). Although the precative particle is attested very early in Aramaic, "the replacement of the simple non-*l*- jussive by the composite *l*- forms may well have been influenced by the Akkadian precative construction" (Kaufman 1974:126). The development of the ל prefix is an instance of grammaticalization in later Eastern Aramaic, i.e., the precative particle developed from a lexeme into a morpheme. Although Akkadian influence was probably responsible, Heine and Kuteva (2005) have demonstrated that contact induced language changes follow the same grammaticalization paths as non-contact induced changes. On the other hand, in Biblical Aramaic, the prefix ל is not an instance of grammaticalization, but is to be attributed to later scribal activity.

F. SUMMARY

According to Bybee Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:244), futures develop from two basic sources, i.e., "primary futures" develop from lexical sources, such as verbs of movement, markers of obligation, desire, and ability, and temporal adverbs, whereas "aspectual futures" develop from markers of the present tense or perfective or imperfective aspect. The attested functions of the prefix conjugation suggest a path of development from an earlier general imperfective to an aspectual future. Remnants of earlier functions are attested in a few instances of general presents and past imperfectives. There are no instances attested of the prefix conjugation expressing the actual present. Since most types of modality expressed by the prefix conjugation can be explained as likely extensions of the future (e.g., directive, subordinate), the attested functions of the prefix conjugation suggest that the future function preceded the expression of modality.

Bybee Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:230-236) also argued that new grammatical constructions arise primarily in main indicative clauses, and that subordinate clauses tend to be more conservative. "Since in these contexts the surrounding semantic material has modal content,

---

[28] However, both Kautzsch and Strack had already recognized that, the occurrence of the ל prefix in Biblical Aramaic does not express a special meaning.

the old indicative forms themselves come to be associated with modality" (231). That is, indicative verbs do not acquire modality innately, but by association with contexts expressing modality. Therefore, given the fact that in a significant portion of attested cases, the modality of the prefix conjugation is expressed by other constituents in the context, I conclude that the prefix conjugation is still in the process of "acquiring" modality.

As the active participle began to take over some of the functions of the prefix conjugation, the latter became limited to the expression of the future and of modality. However, it is possible that the prefix conjugation had already begun to express modality before the participle encroached on its functions. That is, although its future function preceded the expression of modality, it does not follow that it ever functioned as a pure future, without any modal functions.

Finally, there may be a relationship between the development from future to modality and the gradual identification of the two prefix conjugations, the long form ("imperfect") and the short form ("jussive"), which is not yet complete in this form of Aramaic.

THE IMPERATIVE

A. Introductory Remarks

The imperative is a volitional mood of 2nd person affirmative clauses. Bauer and Leander (299-300) listed the following as its functions: command, wish in salutation to a king, and in a modal sense. Muraoka (1966:160-164) explained the imperative as a direct expression of the speaker's will. This is contrasted with the prefix conjugation, which is indirect and general in nature.

There are 26 instances of imperatives in the Aramaic of Daniel. The most frequent use of the imperative is in directives, such as giving commands or permission. The following are the attested functions.

B. Command

Absent contextual indications to the contrary, when a superior, such as God or the king, addresses a subordinate, the imperative is either a direct command, or a statement of permission. In at least 11 instances, it is a command (2:6; 4:6, 11a, b, c, d, 12, 15, 20a, b, c). The example below needs no comment:

Dan. 2:6

להן חלמא ופשרה *החוני*

Therefore, *tell me* the dream and its interpretation.

C. Permission

There are at least 2 instances of the imperative used as a permissive directive (7:5a, b). That is, it is used not to issue a direct command, but to express permission. Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:193) considered certain expressions of permission to be "a special instance of root possibility." However, since they allowed for exceptions, it is not clear whether that is suggestive of the path of development of the imperative.

Dan. 7:5

7:5 וארו חיוה אחרי תנינה דמיה לדב . . . וכן אמרין לה *קומי אכלי* בשר שגיא

Look there was another second animal like a bear. . . . Thus they said to it, "*Arise, eat* much flesh"

The imperatives above are directed at a symbolic bear. Since a bear is an animal of prey, it does not need to be commanded to do what it normally does by nature. Rather, permission seems to fit better than command. This also fits into the overall theme of divine control in the chapter.

Additionally, in 2 instances, the imperative could be analyzed as expressing either command or permission (3:26a, b).

Dan. 3:26

שדרך מישך ועבד־נגו עבדוהי די־אלהא עליא *פקו ואתו*

Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego, servants of the Most High God, *come out and come here*!

In the above example, one could ask whether the command to three Hebrews is in fact a permission for them to come out of the furnace into which they were thrown.

D. REQUEST

Absent contextual indications to the contrary, one can assume that when an imperative is addressed to a superior, such as a king, it is a request rather than a command. However, the fact that it is a request rather than a command does not in itself imply the use of politeness. Toews (1993:249-258) considers such cases to be unmitigated hortatory discourse, i.e., without recourse to politeness or deferential language. There are at least 3 instances of such requests (2:4b, 24; 6:16).

Dan. 2:4

מלכא לעלמין חיי *אמר* חלמא לעבדיך ופשרא נחוא

O king, may you live forever. *Tell* your servants the dream and we will make known the interpretation.

Toews (1993:251-252) depicts the use of the imperative in the above example as a case of "routine encounter."

In addition, there are at least 2 instances where context may imply a degree of politeness, because the request involves the use of both the prefix conjugation and the imperative (4:24; 5:17).

Dan. 5:17

באדין ענה דניאל ואמר קדם מלכא מתנתך לך להוין ונבזביתך לאחרן *הב*

Then Daniel answered and said before the king, "Let your gifts be yours, and *give* your rewards to someone else.

Citing the imperative in the above example, Bauer and Leander called this a modal sense, but did not elaborate on the exact modality. A better explanation is that, once politeness was expressed by the use of the prefix conjugation and/or the 3rd person, the deferential tone is implicit when the subordinate continues to address the superior with the imperative in subsequent clauses. These examples may be called partially mitigated hortatory address, following Toews' 1993:250 description, i.e., "a mixture of imperatives and non-imperative/command mood forms," though the larger discourse context is not hortatory.

E. OPTATIVE

By the term "optative" I mean an imperative that is used not to give directions, but to express a wish. There are 5 instances where it occurs as part of the formula for addressing the king (2:4a; 3:9; 5:10; 6:7, 22).

Dan. 2:4

מלכא לעלמין *חיי*

O king, *may you live* forever.

F. SUMMARY

Most languages of the world have an imperative. The imperative in Aramaic, and indeed Semitic, is not exceptional in its functions. Its most frequent function is as a directive, both obligatory (including commands and requests) and permissive. It also has an optative function, expressing a wish, in a royal address formula. As in other ancient Semitic languages, it only expresses affirmative commands. Negative commands are expressed by the jussive/prefix conjugation. The attested functions of the imperative fall under the broader

category of speaker-oriented modality. According to Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:181), agent-oriented modalities tend to grammaticalize into epistemic and speaker-oriented modalities. However, since the functions of the imperative attested in the Aramaic of Daniel appear even in the earliest attested Semitic texts, I prefer not to speculate here on the origins of the imperative.

THE INFINITIVE

A. Preliminary Discussion of Concepts and Issues

Stinespring (1962) argued that some active infinitives have passive meaning.[1] However, infinitives are verbal nouns. Therefore, I prefer to say that an infinitive is neutral in terms of voice when functioning nominally. For example, when the king commanded the "destruction (להובדה) of all the wise men of Babylon" (2:12), the distinction is not strictly between active and passive voice, but between whether the noun phrase that follows it is perceived to be an object or a subject.

Of related interest is Kaufman's (1974:133) suggestion that the word order *object + l- + infinitive*, which becomes common in Imperial Aramaic, is due to Persian rather than Akkadian influence. He cites the following as an example:

Ezra 5:9

ביתא דנה למבניה

to build this temple

This word order is also attested in the Aramaic of Daniel, as can be seen in examples cited below.

Haspelmath (1989) has demonstrated that infinitives develop from nominal forms that denote purpose. That is, along the path of grammaticalization, purpose markers tend to develop into markers of complements of various types of verbs, such as directive verbs,[2] potential verbs, verbs of thinking, and verbs of cognition, each type being increasingly different from the earlier purposive meaning, until

---

[1] For a critique of Stinespring, see Kutscher 1977:123-124.

[2] Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:230) likewise observed a strong tendency for verbal constructions expressing purpose to also function as complements of verbs of wanting and ordering.

finally they are recognized as markers of the infinitive rather than purpose markers.[3]

B. NOMINAL FUNCTIONS

The infinitive is a verbal noun. Of the 59 instances in the Aramaic of Daniel, there are at least 7 instances where it functions as a noun with a prefixed preposition, forming an adverbial phrase (2:25; 3:24; 4:24, 32; 5:20; 6:20, 21a).[4]

Dan. 5:20

וכדי רם לבבה ורוחה תקפת *להזדה*

And when his heart was lifted up and his spirit was *arrogantly* hardened . . .

Dan. 6:20

באדין מלכא בשפרפרא יקום בנגהא *ובהתבהלה* לגבא די־אריותא אזל

Then the king rose up at early dawn, and went *hastily* to the den of lions.

Among these instances, there is one in which the infinitive functions in a temporal clause reminiscent of Biblical Hebrew (6:21a).

Dan. 6:21

וכמקרבה לגבא לדניאל בקל עציב זעק

And when he came near to the den, he called out to Daniel with a loud voice.

In 2 instances, the infinitive could be analyzed either as nominal in an adverbial phrase or as expressing purpose/result (7:26a, b).

Dan. 7:26

---

[3] Perhaps, this phenomenon is also related to why in later Syriac the infinitive never occurs by itself, but is always prefixed by the preposition ܠ /l-/ (Muraoka 2005:42).

[4] Another possible substantival instance is אחוית in 5:12, which Kautzsch (1884:111) explained as a C stem (Aphel) infinitive. On the other hand, Baumgartner, the editor of the Daniel text of the *BHS*, suggested in the textual apparatus that the participles in the context could be vowelled as infinitives (מְפַשַּׁר instead of מְפַשַּׁר, and וּמִשָׁרֵא instead of וּמְשָׁרֵא). If so, the resulting series of infinitives could be alternatively analyzed as purpose clauses. i.e., "to interpret dreams, to declare riddles, and to loosen knots."

ודינא יתב ושלטנה יהעדון *להשמדה ולהובדה* עד־סופא

And the judgment will sit, and his dominion will be taken away, *eradicating and destroying* [or, *in order/so as to eradicate and destroy*] it forever.

C. Verbal Functions

1. *Complement*

Virtually all of the verbal instances of the infinitive occur in either explicit subordinate clauses, or clauses that are semantically subordinate. In 43 instances, it functions as a complement, such as to verbs of speaking/commanding, intending/seeking/desiring, or being able to (2:9, 10, 12, 13, 24, 26, 27, 46, 47; 3:2a, b, 13, 16, 17, 19a, b, 20a, 29, 32; 4:3, 15, 23, 34; 5:2, 7, 8a, b, 15b, 16a, b, c, d; 6:4, 5a, b, 8a, b, 15a, b, 21b, 24; 7:19, 25). As Bauer and Leander (1927:300) already noted, most of these may also be analyzed as expressing the goal or purpose of the main verb.

Dan. 2:12

כל־קבל דנה מלכא בנס וקצף *שגיא* ואמר *להובדה* לכל חכימי בבל

Therefore, the king was angry and very furious, and he commanded *to destroy* all the wise men of Babylon.

Among these instances, there are at least 4 examples of two infinitives complementing one main verb (5:8a, b, 16a, b, 16c, d; 6:8a, b).

Dan. 5:16

ואנה שמעת עליך די־תוכל פשרין *למפשר* וקטרין *למשרא* כען הן תוכל כתבא *למקרא*
ופשרה *להודעתני* ארגונא תלבש והמונכא די־דהבא על־צוארך ותלתא במלכותא
תשלט פ

I heard concerning you that you are able *to explain* interpretations and *to solve* difficulties. Now, if you are able *to read* the writing and *to make known to me* its interpretation, you will be clothed in purple with a chain of gold on your neck, and you will rule as the third in the kingdom.

2. *Purpose*

In 5 instances, the infinitive does not function as a complement, but does express purpose (2:14, 16, 18; 3:20b; 5:15a).[5] As explained above, the expression of purpose probably preceded the infinitive's complement functions.

Dan. 2:16-18

16 ודניאל על ובעה מן־מלכא די זמן ינתן־לה ופשרא *להחויה* למלכא פ 17 אדין דניאל לביתה אזל ולחנניה מישאל ועזריה חברוהי מלתא הודע 18 ורחמין *למבעא* מן־קדם אלה שמיא על־רזה דנה

And Daniel came in and requested from the king that he might give him time, *so that he might make known* the interpretation to the king. Then Daniel went to his house and made known the matter to Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, his companions, *so that they might seek* mercy from the God of heaven concerning this mystery.

3. *Prohibition*

It is of interest that the possible instances of infinitives expressing a function not necessarily restricted to subordinate clauses occur in subordinate clauses introduced by די. Bauer and Leander (1927:302) explained two instances in 6:9, 16 as expressing prohibition. It is possible that this function of the infinitive is an extension of its function as a complement of directive verbs, e.g., the complement of a verb of command occurring elliptically, expressing only the content of the command rather than the entire proposition.

Dan. 6:16

דע מלכא די־דת למדי ופרס די־כל־אסר וקים די־מלכא יהקים לא *להשניה*

Know, O king, that the Medes and Persians have a law that any prohibition or statute that the king might establish *may not change.*

In the above example, although the infinitive is not the complement of a directive verb, it occurs in a clause stating the content of "a law." Bauer and Leander also observed that the infinitive in 6:9 occurs in a relative clause that functions attributively.

Dan. 6:9

---

[5] Muraoka (1966:156-157) interpreted the instance in 3:20b not as purpose, but as and asyndetic continuation of the complement function of the previous infinitive: אמר לכפתה . . . למרמא "he commanded to bind . . . (and) to throw."

כען מלכא תקים אסרא ותרשם כתבא די לא להשניה

Now, let the king establish a prohibition and sign a document that *may not change* [= an *unchangeable* document].

Alternatively, the above examples could be analyzed as nominal phrases with a negated attributive/adverbial function, i.e., the expression in question could simply mean, "unchangeable."

D. Summary

The infinitive originated as a verbal noun. A few instances with a nominal function restricted to occurrences with prefixed prepositions are vestiges of an earlier stage when the nominal function was more prominent.[6] The few instances where the infinitive expresses purpose are also residual of an earlier stage in the development of the infinitive. They attest to a common path of grammaticalization, whereby purpose markers can eventually develop into infinitives. At the stage of the language attested here, the primary function of the infinitive is to serve as a complement of a finite verb.

─────────

[6] In fact, the infinitive generally occurs only with a preposition in the Aramaic of Daniel. Possible exceptions may occur in 5:12; see footnote number 4. In Ezra, there is 1 instance (out of 24) without a prefixed preposition (התנדבות Ezra 7:16).

AUXILIARIES

A. Introductory Remarks

Grammaticalization refers to the study of both how lexical items come to serve grammatical functions and how these grammatical items then develop to express new grammatical functions. Since this book is focused on the function of verb forms, most of it has been devoted to the study of the latter. In the present chapter, some consideration will be given to the more basic phenomena of grammaticalization, i.e., words that develop grammatical functions. The development from lexeme to morpheme involves what has been called a "cline" (Hopper and Traugott 2003:6-7), in which content words develop into grammatical words, then into clitics, and finally into inflectional affixes. Below is a discussion of some of words attested in the Aramaic of Daniel that have undergone the first stage of grammaticalization, and have become auxiliary verbs.

B. The Auxiliary הוה

The verb הוה can function either as the verb "to be" or as an auxiliary. The discussion of complex verb phrases in which it functions as an auxiliary is found in chapter 5, and need not be repeated here. Its subsequent development along the grammaticalization cline can be illustrated in Syriac, where the verb ܗܘܐ is not only an auxiliary, but can also be a clitic. That is, as a clitic, it has a reduced phonological realization in a restricted syntactical position (i.e., immediately following another word).

C. The Copula איתי

Muraoka (1985:77-81) objected to the label "copula" for איתי. According to him, Syriac is unique among ancient Semitic languages in having a particle that behaves as a true copula, ܐܝܬ, a phenomenon that may have been reinforced by the influence of Greek. As for other Semitic

languages including forms of Aramaic prior to Syriac, the words labeled as copula are employed to ascertain and confirm a statement, i.e., what he calls the "asseverative-confirmative" function. However, he also admitted that Biblical Aramaic shows "the weakening of the particle into a simple copula," citing Daniel 3:14, 15, 18 as examples (80-81). Therefore, though Muraoka may be correct that in some instances איתי had an emphatic function, its function as "copula" is clearly attested, and cannot be denied. For a brief discussion of the notion of "copula" in the context of Semitic languages, see Goldenberg (1998[translation of 1985 Hebrew original]:158-167).

In terms of grammaticalization, the word איתי was originally an existential particle, but developed into a copula (see also Rubin 2005:44-46), and then further into an auxiliary. There are 15 attested instances. Of these, 8 instances occur with its lexical existential meaning, "there is" (2:10, 11a, 28; 3:12, 25, 29; 4:32; 5:11).

Dan. 5:11

אִיתַי גבר במלכותך

There is a man in your kingdom.

In the remaining instances, איתי functions as a copula or an auxiliary, losing some of its lexical meaning as a particle of existence. This function is especially common with pronominal suffixes. In at least 2 of the instances, it functions as a simple copula, i.e., not as an auxiliary (2:11b, 30). The following passage contains the word in both its lexical and grammatical functions.

Dan. 2:11

ומלתא די־מלכה שאל יקירה ואחרן לא אִיתַי די יחונה קדם מלכא להן אלהין די מדרהון עם־בשרא לא אִיתוהִי

The matter which the king asks is difficult, and *there is* not another one who can make it known before the king, except the gods, whose dwelling *is* not with flesh.

In the above example, the first instance of איתי (2:11a) functions as a particle of existence. The second instance (2:11b) is a simple copula connecting a subject, the "dwelling" of the gods, and a locative prepositional phrase, "with flesh."

There is a special instance of איתי in combination with the modal auxiliary passive participle עתיד where the syntagm expresses the actual present (3:15). See below under עתיד.

The remaining instances show that איתי has been further grammati-
calized beyond the function of copula to also function as an auxiliary
with the active participle, expressing the general present (2:26; 3:14,
18).[1] In this role, it supplements the auxiliary הוה, which does not
expresses the present.

Dan. 3:14

לאלהי לא *איתיכון פלחין* ולצלם דהבא די הקימת לא *סגדין*

Do you not *serve* my gods nor *worship* the golden statue that I set up?

In the above example, איתי probably serves double duty as an auxiliary
to 2 participles, since the second participle does not have an explicit
subject. A fuller discussion of its auxiliary function can be found in
chapter 5.

D. The Auxiliaries כהל and יכל

At the stage of the language attested in Daniel, it is not clear whether
there is a difference in meaning between the auxiliaries יכל and כהל.
Both express the modality of ability, i.e., "to be able to."

There are 12 instances of יכל, all but one of which are accompanied
by an infinitive complement. From the one instance where it does not
function as an auxiliary (7:21), it is clear that the basic meaning of the
verb יכל is "to overcome, prevail over."

Dan. 7:21

וקרנא דכן עבדה קרב עם־קדישין *ויכלה* להון

This horn was making war with the holy ones, and *was overcoming* them.

It is also clear that the word has become grammaticalized into a modal
auxiliary, whose meaning is, "to be able to." Although instances of the
consonantal spelling יכל (3:17, 29; 4:15, 34; 6:21) could be interpreted in
a number of ways (יִכֵּל, יְכֵל, יִכַּל), its aspectual function in different
conjugations is reasonably clear. Instances of both the active participle
(2:27; 3:17; 4:15, 34) and the prefix conjugation (2:10; 3:29; 5:16a) overlap
in the expression of the general present. Compare the two examples
below:

---

[1] The function of איתי in 3:17 depends on one's interpretation of the passage, and has
been discussed elsewhere in the study.

Dan. 2:10

לא־איתי אנש על־יבשתא די מלת מלכא *יכל* להחויה

There is no man on earth who *can* make known the matter of the king.

Dan. 2:27

רזה די־מלכא שאל לא חכימין אשפין חרטמין גזרין *יכלין* להחויה למלכא

The secret that the king asks *can* no wise man, enchanter, magician, or exorcist make known to the king.

In the first example above (2:10), the auxiliary יכל occurs as a prefix conjugation verb, whereas in the second example (2:27), it is a participle. However, both express the general present, without any noticeable difference in function.

Also, in at least 1 instance a prefix conjugation יכל occurs in a conditional protasis (5:16b; perhaps also 3:17?).

Dan. 5:16

הן *תוכל* כתבא למקרא ופשרה להודעתני

If *you are able* to read this writing and to make known to me its interpretation, . . .

As for past time instances, there is 1 instance of an active participle with a past imperfective sense (6:5), which has already been discussed in chapter 3. The other instances are suffix conjugation forms.

Dan. 6:21

אלהך די אנתה פלח־לה בתדירא *היכל* לשיזבותך מן־אריותא

Your God whom you serve continually, *has he been able* to deliver you from the lions?

The suffix conjugation form יכל in the above example could be analyzed as a simple past, but is more likely a resultative. The remaining past time instance of a suffix conjugation form occurs in a causal clause and also has a resultative function (2:47).

Dan. 2:47

די־*יכלת* למגלא רזה דנה

because *you have been able* to reveal this secret.

As for the auxiliary כהל, there are 4 instances, of which 3 occur as simple active participles (4:15; 5:8, 15) and 1 occurs in the complex verb

phrase *איתי* + *participle* (2:26). As with יכל, most instances of כהל have an
infinitive complement, except for 1 instance that is probably elliptic
(4:15). Two of the instances have a general present function:

Dan. 4:15

ואנתה בלטשאצר פשרא אמר כל־קבל די כל־חכימי מלכותי לא־יכלין פשרא
להודעתני ואנתה *כהל* די רוח־אלהין קדישין בך

You, Belteshazzar, tell me the interpretation, inasmuch as none of the
wise men of my kingdom are able to make known to me the inter-
pretation, but *you are able to*, because the spirit of the holy gods is in you.

Dan. 2:26

האיתיך כהל להודעתני חלמא די־חזית ופשרה

Are you able to make known to me the dream that I saw and its interpre-
tation?

The remaining 2 instances occur in negated past time contexts (5:8, 15).
It is possible to read them as simple pasts, but as explained in chapter 3,
the instance in 5:8 is probably a past time imperfective, and the
instance in 5:15 is probably a general present.

Dan. 5:8

אדין עללין כל חכימי מלכא ולא־*כהלין* כתבא למקרא ופשרא להודעה למלכא

Then all the king's wise men were coming in, but *were* not *able* to read the
writing or to make known the interpretation to the king.

Dan. 5:15

ולא־*כהלין* פשר־מלתא להחויה

They cannot make known the interpretation of the matter.

From the above discussion, it is clear that the words יכל and כהל have
grammaticalized into modal auxiliaries expressing ability, and their
occurrence in various conjugations reflect some of the regular
functions of the respective conjugations. That is, the active participle is
attested expressing the present or past imperfective, the prefix
conjugation expressing the general present or in a subordinate
conditional clause, and the suffix conjugation expressing a resultative.
There are no instances of future time יכל or כהל, which may be due to
their modal nature.

E. The Auxiliary עתיד

The passive participle עתיד comes from the root verb meaning "to be prepared." In later Aramaic, it becomes a full fledged auxiliary for the expression of the future. Although its only attested occurrence in Daniel (3:15) does not express the future, it may be analyzed as having taken its first step in grammaticalization, because it serves as an auxiliary with a prefix conjugation complement clause introduced by די. In the attested instance, the complement actually consists of two prefix conjugation clauses.

> Dan. 3:15
>
> כען הן איתיכון *עתידין* די בעדנא די־תשמעון קל קרנא משרוקיתא קיתרס שבכא פסנתרין וסומפניה וכל זני זמרא תפלון ותסגדון לצלמא די־עבדת
>
> Now, if you are *ready* . . . to fall down and worship the statue that I made, . . .

In the above example it is easy to see the close semantic proximity between "being ready to" and "being willing to." Thus, one could say that עתיד expresses willingness, which Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca characterized as agent-oriented modality. Furthermore, they cited at least 3 languages in their database where modal words expressing desire have developed into futures (1994:252). Heine and Kuteva (2002b:310) listed examples from English, Latin, Romanian, Greek, and Mandarin Chinese. Thus, the attested instance above shows the word having begun to serve as a modal auxiliary, which will eventually develop into a future tense auxiliary.

F. The Alleged Auxiliary בעה

Behrman (1894:10) suggested that the verb בעה in 2:13 should be understood as "to be about to . . . ," citing as evidence the Targum of Jonah 1:4, אלפא בעיא לאתברא "the ship was about to be broken." This view was followed by Strack in his glossary section (1905:*44), who in turn was cited by Rosén (1961:191).

> Dan. 2:13
>
> ודתא נפקת וחכימיא מתקטלין *ובעו* דניאל וחברוהי להתקטלה
>
> And the decree went out, and the wise men were to be killed, and Daniel and his friends *were sought* to be killed. [or "Daniel and his friends *were about to* be killed"]

As can be seen in the above example, the translation of the t-stem infinitive may be awkward; hence, the motivation for this explanation, as well as attempts to emend the text, is the translation of the infinitive. On the other hand, Bauer and Leander (followed by Muraoka 1966:156) understood the expression as an impersonal 3ʳᵈ person plural, which is a relatively frequent phenomenon in Daniel (see the discussion on generalized subject constructions in chapter 4, section E). In any event, although the verb בעה may have an auxiliary function in later Aramaic, one cannot be certain that it does in Daniel on the basis of this instance alone.

G. Summary

In the Aramaic of Daniel, several lexical items have acquired auxiliary functions, including איתי, הוה, יכל, כהל , and עתיד. Of these, הוה is the most frequently attested, and איתי is the most interesting, because, not only has it grammaticalized from a particle of existence into a copula, but has in addition also grammaticalized as an auxiliary verb supplementary to הוה. The fact that the auxiliaries other than איתי/הוה express agent-oriented modalities accords with Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca's (1994:181) claim that the latter tend to be more often expressed by auxiliaries than other types of modality. When these auxiliaries are conjugated, they bear the tense/aspectual values of the complex verb phrases in which they are used. There are also a number of attested instances of an auxiliary with more than one complement, resulting in compound complex verb phrases.

OVERVIEW AND IMPLICATIONS

A. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

As stated in chapter 1, one of the presuppositions of this study is that languages develop not as a series of static synchronic situations with neatly balanced temporal/aspectual oppositions, but in a dynamic process of gradual incremental change. The phenomena of layering and persistence suggests that at any given synchronic moment there may be unbalanced oppositions (e.g., one verbal construction expresses tense while another expresses aspect), and not only can one form have multiple functions, but more than one form can express the same function. Recent research in grammaticalization suggests that these overlapping layers and multiple persistent functions can help us to locate verbal forms along their path of diachronic development. In this chapter, I would like to first give an overview of the verbal system as a whole, then list some ways in which grammaticalization phenomena are illustrated in the corpus, and finally discuss briefly some implications for the prominence it gives to tense and aspect.

B. OVERVIEW

Previous chapters discussed specific verbal expressions in the Aramaic of Daniel and their attested functions. In what follows, I will summarize the attested functions and the verbal forms that express them. Since many examples were given in previous chapters, I will refrain from citing examples here.

1. *Anterior/Resultative*

The anterior/resultative function was discussed in chapter 2. It is common knowledge among Semitists that the West Semitic suffix conjugation developed from an early Semitic verbal adjective, at first expressing a resultative function and eventually becoming a past tense. In the Aramaic of Daniel, the suffix conjugation verb retains some of its residual expression of the anterior/resultative, though it is developing

into a simple past. Meanwhile, the passive participle/verbal adjective is in the process of developing into a resultative participle (see chapter 4). In later Aramaic, the passive participle will become more consistently a resultative construction, and in Neo-Aramaic it will form the base of the new past tense. Furthermore, as explained in chapter 5, the combination of the verb הוה and the passive participle has not yet grammaticalized into a complex verb phrase, since, not only is the ordering of the elements semantically inconsequential, but also, and more importantly, the combination of הוה with the passive participle appears to be morphosyntactically equivalent to הוה with other adjectives.

2. *Simple Past vs. Past Perfective*

The simple past and the past perfective were discussed in chapter 2. Since perfectives usually serve as the main verb in past time narration, the distinction between simple past and past perfective is very slight. One difference is that, since the simple past is aspectually neutral, it can express the past time even for situations viewed as imperfective (Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994:84). Another difference is that perfectives of stative predicates denote present states rather than past states (92).

In chapter 2, it was argued that, although the suffix conjugation is not yet a preterite, i.e., it is not yet restricted to the expression of the past tense, it is developing from an anterior/resultative into a simple past. In fact, the expression of the simple past is the most common function of the suffix conjugation. Furthermore, in chapter 3, it was argued that the active participle does not normally express the simple past, but can be so employed in formulaic expressions that introduce direct speech.

In this section, I want to briefly discuss some broader cross-linguistic typological trends and their possible implications. Aspectual and tense oppositions in languages typically have a tripartite pattern (see Dahl 1985 and Bybee and Dahl 1989:85-89). That is, the basic distinction is between perfective and imperfective. Perfectives generally, though not exclusively, refer to the past, whereas imperfectives are often distinguished for past and non-past. This could be illustrated as follows:

| perfective | past imperfective |
| | non-past imperfective |

As mentioned in chapter 2, an anterior tends to develop either into a perfective or a past, and the presence or absence of a past imperfective determines the direction of development. That is, if a past imperfective exists, the anterior will tend to develop into a perfective, otherwise it will tend to develop into a simple past (Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994:91).

Thus, the fact that the past time function of the suffix conjugation in the Aramaic of Daniel is primarily that of a simple past (though it is still an "old anterior") rather than a perfective suggests that this development started before the emergence of a past imperfective (i.e., *suffix conjugation הוה + participle*), which is clearly a latecomer into the verbal system. On the other hand, it is possible that the existence of a newly formed past imperfective could influence the further development of the suffix conjugation. However, the Aramaic suffix conjugation continued to retain its vestigial anterior/resultative function for many centuries,[1] and, since the passive participle eventually became the base form of the preterite in Neo-Aramaic, the development of the suffix conjugation into a simple past may have never reached complete culmination in Aramaic (i.e., it may have never lost its vestigial anterior/resultative function).

Alternatively, Bhat (1999:181-183) suggested that the difference in the direction of grammaticalization (perfect to perfective vs. past, progressive to imperfective vs. present) reflects the greater prominence given by languages to either aspect or tense. That is, in tense prominent languages, the anterior develops into a past and the progressive into a present, whereas in aspect prominent languages, the anterior develops into a perfective and the progressive into an imperfective. Nevertheless, Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca's more complex explanation is more applicable to the Aramaic of Daniel, because its verbal system seems to be in transition from being aspect prominent to tense prominent. Thus, in the Aramaic of Daniel, the

---

[1] For example, Nöldeke (1904:202-207) listed other functions of the suffix conjugation in Syriac that could be categorized as anterior/resultative and modal.

anterior/resultative (the suffix conjugation) is in the process of developing into a simple past, whereas the former progressive (the active participle) developed first into an imperfective, and will later become a present.

3. *Imperfective*

The imperfective aspect and its subsets, such as progressive, habitual, etc., were discussed in chapter 3. The old general imperfective is the prefix conjugation, which still shows some vestiges of this function. The corpus of the Aramaic of Daniel gives evidence to at least two renewals of the imperfective. First, the expression of the imperfective was renewed by the active participle, which functioned earlier as a progressive. Second, the syntagm הוה + *participle* originally expressed the addition of a tense marker on the participle, but was eventually reanalyzed as a complex verb phrase, resulting in another renewal of the imperfective. It will eventually take over the imperfective function of the participle, resulting in *suffix conjugation* הוה + *participle* as the past imperfective and the active participle as the present.

3.1. *Progressive*
The imperfective is normally subdivided into progressive and habitual/customary/iterative for dynamic verbs. The prefix conjugation still expresses both progressive and non-progressive past time imperfective functions. The active participle also continues to express the progressive, but has expanded to express other imperfective notions as well. There are no grammatical constructions attested in our corpus that express the habitual/customary/iterative without also expressing the progressive, at least not in past time.

3.2. *General Present*
As explained in chapter 3, since grammatical forms that express the actual present usually also express the general present, presents are considered a subset of the imperfective. Whereas the actual present expresses events occurring at the moment of speech, general presents are statements of timeless facts or present habitual events. Thus, for most verbs in most discourse contexts, the actual present can be characterized as a present progressive, and the general present as a present habitual/imperfective (Bybee 1994:236-238). The prefix conjugation, as the old imperfective, also expressed the present. Its use in the expression of the general present is vestigial. The active

participle has taken over most of the imperfective functions of the prefix conjugation, including the expression of the present. The addition of איתי to the active participle consists of the addition of a present tense marker to the imperfective. Although all of these expressions can express the general present, there are no attested instances of the prefix conjugation expressing the actual present (or instances where the complex verb phrase *איתי + participle* is unequivocally an actual present).

3.3. *Actual Present*

The particle איתי expresses the actual present in combination with the auxiliary passive participle עתיד in a hypothetical clause in 3:15 (see chapter 5). It is also possible that *איתי + participle* expresses the actual present in 3:14, though it is more likely a general present (see chapter 5). Aside from these instances that could be explained as the expression of the present by lexical means, the active participle is the only attested form that expresses the actual present in the corpus. The prefix conjugation is not attested with an actual present function, though it is attested with a general present function. This situation is remarkable, since, as Bybee (1994:246) observed, the habitual is the default function of the present tense (see also Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994:151-154).[2] That is, it is normal for a form that expresses the habitual (general) present to also express the progressive (actual) present, and the only time a form is restricted to expressing the habitual present is when it becomes a "zero."[3] In other words, when the form that expresses the progressive (actual) present becomes

---

[2] Though remarkable, it is by no means unique. Joosten (2002) demonstrated that the prefix conjugation in Biblical Hebrew expresses the general present but not the actual present. Although a discussion of Biblical Hebrew is beyond the scope of this study, it is worth noting that in both Aramaic and Hebrew, the active participle was in the process of taking over the functions of the prefix conjugation (see Joosten 2005 on the process in Biblical Hebrew).

[3] In linguistics, the term "zero" refers to a constituent realized by a null marker or to the lack of an element that might otherwise be present. For example, in the expression "I come," the verb has a zero morpheme, in contrast to the 3rd person sg. morpheme -*s* ("he comes"). Thus, in reference to aspect and tense, a zero is a construction that expresses the absence of a specific meaning. However, Bybee (1994:252) has argued that zeros are not without meaning. "As an overt marker becomes more frequent, the hearer can infer that its absence is intentional and meaningful, leading to the development of zero grams."

obligatory to express that meaning, the form that is not marked for that expression becomes a "zero" and expresses the lack of that meaning, i.e., it is non-progressive, and therefore a habitual (general) present. A possible example might be the situation of the English present with dynamic verbs, i.e., "I am studying English" (actual/progressive non-habitual present) vs. "I study English" (general/habitual non-progressive present). However, since the active participle in the Aramaic of Daniel expresses both types of present, the fact that the prefix conjugation only expresses the general present cannot be attributed to this "zero" phenomenon. A possible explanation for the non-attestation of prefix conjugation actual presents is that the forms in question are not true present tense forms, but general imperfectives. That is, the active participle is taking over the functions of a former a general imperfective rather than those of a true present tense, and the vestigial functions of a former general imperfective are predictably more restricted than those of the new one.

Furthermore, although it is indisputable that the Aramaic active participle developed from a progressive into a present, the evidence from the Aramaic of Daniel suggests that the path of development was not direct, but the active participle first became a general imperfective. In chapter 5, the argument that the participle had not yet completed the transition to a present was made on the basis of comparing the distribution of הוה + *participle* and the simple participle as follows. First, the majority of instances of the active participle occur in the past rather than the present, and past imperfective instances of the active participle outnumber those of the *suffix conjugation* הוה + *participle*), suggesting that the past time function of the participle is more than simply vestigial. In addition, the fact that the use of הוה in הוה + *participle* appears to be optional also suggests a semantic overlap between הוה + *participle* and the simple participle. Finally, the fact that the syntagm איתי + *participle* is still used to temporally locate the participle is additional evidence that the verbal function of the simple participle is not limited to expressing the present tense. In addition to the observations presented in chapter 5, one may add the discussion of the previous paragraph, i.e., the relation between the attested forms that express the general present and the actual present do not conform to the typological expectations of multiple grammatical expressions for the present tense. Although each of these observations could be explained in some other way, the simplest explanation that accounts for all of them is that the participle in the Aramaic of Daniel is still a

general imperfective that has not yet completed its development into a present.

4. *Future*

The future function was discussed in chapter 6. The future is expressed primarily by the prefix conjugation. As the active participle began to take over the functions of the prefix conjugation, the latter became restricted to expressing mostly the future and modality. The process of the participle taking over the functions of the prefix conjugation appears to be continuing, since there are sporadic instances of futures expressed by the active participle or by a prefix conjugation הוה + *participle.*

5. *Modality*

Modality was discussed in chapter 6. As already mentioned, because the active participle was taking over the functions of the prefix conjugation, the latter became restricted to expressing primarily the future and modality. Agent-oriented modalities, such as obligation, ability, root possibility, and desire, are expressed by the prefix conjugation and by the modal auxiliaries יכל, כהל , and עתיד. Speaker-oriented modalities, which include directives, such as commands, prohibitions, hortatives, and optatives, are expressed by the imperative, the jussive, and the prefix conjugation. The latter includes some instances of polite address. The prefix conjugation may also be attested in 2 instances of epistemic modality in the corpus, expressing possibility and inferred certainty, though both could be otherwise interpreted. Perhaps, the dearth of instances of verb forms expressing epistemic modality is due to the types of discourses attested, which are mostly narrative or predictive.

Subordinate modality is well attested. The prefix conjugation expresses hypothetical/conditional and temporal modality. Possibly, the complex verb phrase הוה + *participle* also expresses a hypothetical function. Prefix conjugation forms, the infinitive, and prefix conjugation הוה + *participle* are used in complement and purpose clauses. The prefix conjugation is also attested in result clauses, though the instances could be otherwise explained.

Finally, the gradual merging of the long imperfect and the jussive into one single prefix conjugation in Aramaic may parallel the gradual restriction of the latter to primarily the expression of modality.

6. *Summary*

At the synchronic stage of the language attested in the Aramaic of Daniel, the verbal system contains grammatical constructions that express at least the following functions: anterior/resultative, simple past, general imperfective (including present), past imperfective, future, and modality. The main grammatical constructions that express these functions may be summarized as follows. The suffix conjugation expresses both the anterior/resultative and the simple past, though more often the latter. The passive participle also has limited resultative function, which is expected to become more pronounced at a later stage of Aramaic. The prefix conjugation is the old general imperfective whose imperfective function has been renewed by the active participle, and is now limited to primarily expressing the future and modality. In addition to the prefix conjugation, several auxiliaries are also used to express certain types of agent-oriented modalities, and the imperative and jussive are used primarily to express directives. In the meantime, the imperfective is again being renewed, this time by the complex verb phrase הוה + *participle*, resulting in *prefix conjugation* הוה + *participle* expressing a similar range of meanings as the prefix conjugation (the instances are too few for more detailed inferences) and *suffix conjugation* הוה + *participle* becoming the new past imperfective. At the stage of the language attested in the corpus, *suffix conjugation* הוה + *participle* and the active participle by itself both express the past imperfective, but it is expected that the latter will eventually become restricted to primarily the present tense. Once the active participle becomes a full fledged present tense, it is also expected that the syntagm איתי + *participle* will come into disuse as a complex verb phrase. Also, the variation in word order between *participle* + הוה and הוה + *participle* is due to the fact that this complex verb phrase is still in the early stages of grammaticalization.

C. Grammaticalization and the Verb in the Aramaic of Daniel

This book began with a very brief introduction to some cross linguistic trends related to grammaticalization. Therefore, it is appropriate to return to these phenomena, and mention how they can be illustrated by examples from the verbal system of the Aramaic of Daniel.

1. *Unidirectionality*

According to the hypothesis of "unidirectionality," as a language develops, items tend to become more grammatical, not less grammatical, and, therefore, phenomena associated with grammaticalization tend to occur in a specific direction that is generally irreversible. Among the attested cross linguistic tendencies, at least two paths of developments are relevant for the verbal system of the Aramaic of Daniel, i.e., the path from resultative to anterior and then perfective/simple past and the path from progressive to imperfective/present.

The path from resultative/anterior to perfective/simple past is illustrated by the development of the suffix conjugation, which retains some of its earlier resultative/anterior function, but has become primarily a simple past. Further, although the passive participle is still in the process of becoming a resultative in the corpus under study, its development in later Aramaic, eventually becoming the base of a new past tense in Neo-Aramaic, is another example of this path of development.

The path of development from progressive to imperfective or present is illustrated by the development of the active participle, which has to a large extent replaced the prefix conjugation for the expression of the general imperfective, and is in the process of becoming a present tense.

As grammatical expressions develop and become more broadly applicable, they tend to displace older constructions, which in turn become more restricted in usage. As it turns out, some of the older grammatical constructions also follow certain common cross linguistic tendencies on how they become restricted and eventually fall into disuse. An example of this process can be seen in the path of development of the prefix conjugation. According to Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:244), futures develop from two basic sources. That is, the "primary futures," develop from lexical sources, whereas the "aspectual futures," develop from markers of the present tense or perfective or imperfective aspect. The attested functions of the prefix conjugation indicate that it is an aspectual future, vestiges of whose earlier general imperfective function persist, e.g., a few instances of general present and past imperfective (see chapter 6). Its future function is the result of the fact that the active participle is in the process of taking over the functions of the prefix conjugation, and the

latter is becoming restricted to expressing primarily the future and various types of modality.

Although the numerous types of modality involve many complex paths of development, Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:230-236) suggested that new grammatical constructions arise primarily in main indicative clauses, and acquire modal functions by association with contexts expressing modality. Since in a significant portion of attested cases, the modality of the prefix conjugation is expressed by other constituents in the context (e.g., subordinating conjunctions, such as די or הן, etc.), it is an example of a grammatical construction whose modal functions originated from its context, but can in some instances express modality without lexical markers of modality (see chapter 6). Another example of unidirectionality occurs in complex verb phrases, i.e., auxiliary + main verb, such as *הוה + participle*. A verb is grammaticalized when, in addition to its lexical meaning, it also acquires a grammatical function as an auxiliary. Not only in Aramaic, but in any language, one normally concludes that auxiliary verbs originally functioned as lexical/main verbs and developed their auxiliary function in the course of time, not that they originated as auxiliaries and then developed their meaning as a main verb. Examples of changes in the reverse direction are very rare. Thus, for instance, it is more likely that the verb יכל originally functioned as a main verb, "to overcome, prevail over," (Daniel 7:21) and then acquired an auxiliary function, "to be able to," rather than the other way around.

2. *Layering and Persistence*

The phenomena of layering and persistence are also illustrated in the Aramaic of Daniel. Layering refers to layers of functions, whereas persistence refers to the functions of individual forms. Thus, as new layers of functions emerge (i.e., new ways of expressing the same grammatical function), older layers may remain to coexist with and interact with the newer layers. Meanwhile, as a specific word or construction develops along the path of grammaticalization, traces of some of its earlier functions or lexical meanings tend to persist.

One of the clearest examples of layering and persistence in the corpus consists of the expression of the imperfective. As a result of at least two attested renewals, the Aramaic of Daniel exhibits three layers of imperfective function. The first is detectable because it is also an example of persistence, where the prefix conjugation continues to have past imperfective and general present functions as a vestige of earlier

usage. The second layer consists of the active participle, which developed from the earlier nominal and progressive functions, to also function as a general imperfective. As in the case of the prefix conjugation, the active participle also illustrates persistence in that it continues to have nominal functions. The third and most recent layer consists of the complex verb phrase *הוה + participle*, which resulted from a reanalysis of the syntagm הוה + participle from the phrase [temporal marker] + [participle] to a complex verb phrase [auxiliary + main verb]. This third layer of imperfective function will eventually replace the past (and future?) imperfective function of the active participle, which in turn will become restricted to expressing the present tense. Cases of complex verb phrases also illustrate persistence, because, in addition to its grammaticalized auxiliary function, the auxiliary verb usually also retains its earlier lexical meanings. Thus, the auxiliary הוה, in addition to its grammaticalized auxiliary function, also retains its earlier lexical meaning, "to be" (the same is true of the auxiliaries איתי and יכל).

Another likely example of layering and persistence consists of the resultative. Although the primary function of the suffix conjugation is that of a simple past, its function as a resultative persists in some contexts. Meanwhile, the passive participle is developing from a verbal adjective into a resultative participle, which will then serve as a second layer of resultative function.

The combination of unidirectionality, layering, and persistence allow a synchronic description of a verbal system to also observe diachronic patterns. Thus, for instance, if a given grammatical form expresses several functions, one can conclude that at least some of these came into existence before others, and that the older functions continue to exist due to persistence. Then, barring evidence to the contrary, one can venture an explanation of their diachronic relationship on the basis of the hypothesis of unidirectionality. Therefore, since the suffix conjugation in the Aramaic of Daniel expresses both resultative and simple past meanings, I have concluded that the resultative function preceded the simple past function. Likewise, since the active participle expresses inter alia both the present tense and a past progressive aspect, the progressive function must have preceded the present function.

3. *Reanalysis and Analysis/Rule Generalization*

Grammaticalization always involves reanalysis and analysis/rule generalization, though not all cases of reanalysis or analysis result in

grammaticalization. Reanalysis means that the hearer understands a form to have a structure/meaning different from the speaker. Eventually, reanalysis can be followed by analysis, which refers to the spreading of a rule from a relatively limited domain to a broader one. Reanalysis often occurs in the development of complex verb phrases, where the expression is reanalyzed from [verb] + [complement] to [auxiliary + main verb]. An example is the complex verb phrase הוה + *participle*, where the combination [suffix conjugation הוה] + [active participle] was reanalyzed from [past temporal marker] + [imperfective] to [past imperfective]. Once this reanalysis occurred, a new grammatical construction came into existence, which, as a result of analysis, began to function in a way that was equivalent to single verbs in the verbal system. This new grammatical construction then competes with and will eventually displace older constructions that express a past imperfective function.

4. *Other Remarks*

In chapter 1, it was stated that grammaticalization involves concurrent semantic, phonological, and syntactic changes. It begins with a shift or redistribution of semantic meaning, followed later by a weakening or loss of its original semantic content ("bleaching"), phonological reduction, and a generalization of grammatical function. Thus, new grammatical constructions begin with a restricted range of usage, and as they expand the range of contexts in which they can function, they also tend to become shorter and/or less stressed or become more rigid in syntactic position. In the process, their original semantic meaning eventually becomes weakened. For instance, periphrastic expressions tend to develop into inflected words where the morphemes are already fused to the words due to phonological reduction. In the Aramaic of Daniel, the complex verb phrase הוה + *participle* appears to be in the early stages of grammaticalization, because the order of the constituents appears to be not yet fixed. In later forms of Aramaic, the order will be more significant, and eventually this auxiliary will become an enclitic, e.g., the Syriac verb ܗܘܐ.

The fact that a grammatical construction can develop so as to function in a wider range of contexts does not always mean that it will thereby acquire more functions. For example, it is because a resultative/anterior expands its range of usage beyond dynamic verbs and becomes applicable with stative verbs that it eventually loses its resultative/anterior meaning, and becomes a simple past. This is

illustrated in the development of the suffix conjugation verb (see chapter 2).

As stated in the introduction, one of the reasons why there is no consensus on the verbal system of the Aramaic of Daniel is that several grammatical expressions have a wide-ranging spectrum of functions and often the same function can be expressed by several grammatical constructions. As can be seen from the foregoing, grammaticalization phenomena offer insights that explain this state of affairs on the basis of widely attested cross linguistic trends. That is the reason I have relied so heavily on grammaticalization in this explanation of the verbal system of the Aramaic of Daniel. Having said that, it must also be acknowledged that grammaticalization alone cannot explain everything about the verbal system. For example, it was mentioned in chapter 4 that the development of verbal nouns/adjectives into participles cannot be ascribed to grammaticalization. However, once a verbal adjective becomes an active participle or a resultative participle, its ensuing path of development can very nicely be explained by grammaticalization.

D. THE PROMINENCE OF TENSE AND ASPECT

Although I stated earlier that languages do not always have neatly balanced temporal/aspectual oppositions, I did not mean that such oppositions are not significant, but simply that languages are constantly changing. In this section, I would like to discuss the implications of the foregoing study on the prominence of tense and aspect in the verbal system of the Aramaic of Daniel. This discussion must of necessity be brief, due to its tentative nature.

A useful cross linguistic typological study on the prominence of tense, aspect, and mood was done by Bhat (1999), who suggested that "languages generally do not give equal prominence" to tense, aspect or mood, but instead, "select one of them as the basic category and express distinctions connected with it in great detail; they represent the other two categories in lesser detail and further, they use peripheral systems like the use of auxiliaries, or other indirect means, for representing these latter categories" (91). Of course, the degree of prominence that languages attach to these categories also varies, and not all languages might fit this classification (92, 97). Bhat further suggested four main criteria for determining the prominence that a category receives in a given language, the degree of grammatical-

ization, obligatoriness, systematicity (or paradigmatization), and pervasiveness (95-97). In this context, the criterion of grammatical- ization refers to the degree to which the markers of tense, aspect, and/or mood are grammatical rather than just lexical. Obligatoriness means that the expression of the prominent category tends to be obligatory, not optional, for finite verb forms. "They must also agree with the adverbials that occur with them in finite sentences" (108). Thus, in tense prominent languages such as English, one cannot say, *"He came from Mysore tomorrow." Systematicity refers to the completeness of a verbal paradigm. For example, tense prominent languages tend to have a complete paradigm for at least past vs. non- past, aspect prominent languages for perfective vs. imperfective, and mood prominent languages for realis vs. irrealis. Pervasiveness means that grammatically prominent notions tend not to be restricted but to extend to large areas of grammar. For example, participles, adjectives, etc. may also be marked for tense, aspect, and/or mood.

According to Bhat (1999:182-183), when aspect prominent languages develop into tense prominent languages, they develop into either a two-way past/non-past distinction or a three-way past/present/future distinction, whereas when mood prominent languages develop into tense prominent languages, they develop primarily a future/non- future distinction. The Aramaic of Daniel appears to be an example of a language in transition from an earlier aspect prominent language to a tense prominent language with a three-fold distinction: past, present, and future/modal.[4]

Although the Aramaic of Daniel is clearly not a mood prominent language (i.e., the expression/non-expression of modality is neither obligatory nor a systematic part of verbal morphology), its expression of tense and aspect presents a somewhat complex situation. The prefix conjugation, though grammaticalized as a future/modal, still retains some vestigial functions as a former general imperfective, which could function in past, present, or future. Similarly, the active participle developed from an atemporal progressive into a general imperfective, which is attested in past, present, and future, with the auxiliaries איתי/הוה originally added to make the temporal reference explicit. The suffix conjugation is primarily a simple past, but it still retains its

---

[4] Rundgren 1961 also proposed that the Aramaic verbal system developed from being aspectual to temporal.

earlier anterior/resultative function as both present and past anterior/resultative and perhaps also as future anterior/resultative. Thus, at least at an earlier stage of the language, the expression of aspect was more consistent than that of tense. On the other hand, the Aramaic of Daniel also shows signs of being in transition from aspect prominent to tense prominent. The newest grammatical construction, the complex verb phrase הוה + *participle*, is much more consistent in its expression of tense than the older grammatical constructions. That is, *suffix conjugation* הוה + *participle* consistently occurs as an imperfective in past time, while *prefix conjugation* הוה + *participle* consistently occurs in non-past time contexts, expressing either imperfectivity or modality. Furthermore, since the prefix conjugation has become a future/modal, the suffix conjugation is mostly a simple past, and the active participle is on its way to becoming a present tense, it appears that these grammatical constructions are grammaticalizing into tense forms. Therefore, I would tentatively conclude that the Aramaic of Daniel is in transition from being an aspect prominent language to a tense prominent language. Possibly, this transitional period started in Imperial Aramaic (the period when the complex verb phrase הוה + *participle* is first clearly attested), but it may not have been completed until after the end of the Middle Aramaic period. Since this study only examined the corpus of the Aramaic of Daniel, this conjecture needs to be either corroborated or disproved by a study of other ancient Aramaic corpora.

E. Conclusion

The foregoing study attempted to explain the verbal system of the Aramaic of Daniel in the context of grammaticalization. More specifically, it is a synchronic analysis of verb function in the light of diachronic cross-linguistic typological evidence, especially our current knowledge of the phenomena of grammaticalization. I have not tried to resolve every issue or to settle the interpretation of every disputed passage. Furthermore, though I acknowledge that the explanation of the verbal system offered here is not the only one possible, it is coherent, both synchronically and diachronically. The Aramaic of Daniel is a distinctive form of Aramaic, as are all other attested forms of ancient Aramaic, but it is not unique. In the process, I hope that I have also demonstrated that cross-linguistic typological evidence, especially

grammaticalization phenomena, can serve as a useful explanatory tool in the study of individual languages.

GLOSSARY

This glossary is intended to help biblical scholars that may not be familiar with some of the relevant grammatical or linguistic terminology used in the present study. It is not exhaustive, since I assumed that those who will read this book do not need an explanation of some of the most common grammatical terms, e.g., "verb" or "noun," and I have not attempted to include the most up to date references for recent discussions in the linguistic literature. Since this book deals with the verbal system, the terminology listed in this glossary is explained in the context of verbal function, unless otherwise stated. Each word/phrase is given a short explanation, followed by references to the chapter(s) of the book where the reader can find a more extensive discussion with examples. I have attempted to give more extensive explanations for terms that are not further discussed in the main body of the book.

Actual present: The actual present denotes actions or events occurring at the moment of speech. For further discussion, see chapters 3 (section D, subsection 4) and 10 (section B, subsections 3.2 and 3.3). See also *general present*, *present*.

Affix: An affix is a bound *morpheme*, i.e., it is attached to a root/stem to form a word. An affix that occurs in front of a word is called "prefix," one that occurs at the end of a word is a "suffix," one that occurs in the middle of a word is an "infix," and one that occurs discontinuously in more than one position in a word is sometimes called a "transfix" (there are also other types of affixes that are less relevant for the present study). For example: the typical marker of the plural of nouns in West Semitic is a suffix (e.g., the Aramaic masculine plural ‏ין‏–, which in most attested forms of Aramaic can also be accompanied by phonological changes within the word); the marker of Semitic t-stems may be either prefixed, e.g., the Hebrew tD stem Hitpael, where the /t/ affix normally occurs before the first letter of the verbal root, or infixed, such as the Akkadian Gt stem, where the affix /ta/ occurs after the first letter of the verbal root, e.g., Gt present-future *iptarras*; and Semitic verbs are normally conjugated with transfix type affixes, where discontinuous vowel patterns along

with possible prefixes and/or suffixes are superimposed on a triconsonantal root (e.g., the Biblical Hebrew prefix conjugation 3mp יִקְטְלוּ, from the root קטל). Affixes may be "inflectional," i.e., they carry grammatical information (e.g., the comparative *-er* in "soon*er*"), or "derivational," i.e., they create/derive new *lexemes* (e.g., the suffixes *-al* and *-ize* in "person*al*" and "personal*ize*"). The affixes of verbal conjugations in Semitic and in languages in general serve as examples of inflectional affixes. On the other hand, the Aramaic noun מדינה contains a derivational affix, consisting of the prefix מ along with a certain vowel pattern superimposed on the verbal root דין/דון. See also *clitic*, *inflection*, *lexeme*, *morpheme*, *morphology*.

Agent-oriented: Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:176-181) divided *modality* into four main types, i.e., agent-oriented, *speaker-oriented*, *epistemic*, and *subordinate*. Agent-oriented modality "reports the existence of internal and external conditions on an agent with respect to the completion of the action" (177). For further discussion, see chapter 6 (section C, subsection 1). See also *epistemic*, *modality*, *speaker-oriented*, *subordinate*.

Aktionsart: see *situation aspect*.

Analysis: Analysis, also called "rule generalization," refers to the spreading of a grammatical rule from a relatively limited domain to a broader one. For further discussion, see chapters 1 (section B, subsection 3) and 10 (section C, subsection 3). See also *grammaticalization*, *reanalysis*.

Anterior: An anterior verb (phrase) denotes a past action with current relevance. For further discussion, see chapter 2 (section A). See also *perfect*, *resultative*.

Aspect: Both aspect and *tense* describe an event or situation in terms of time. However, whereas *tense* describes the relationship between the event and some other point in time, "aspect" describes how its internal temporal structure is viewed. That is, aspect may describe a portion of the time of occurrence (beginning, middle, or end), or the frequency of occurrence, etc. Aspectual functions are usually classified under the broad categories of *perfective* and *imperfective*. For example, in the following sentence, "John was reading the book, when I entered" (Comrie 1976:4-5), the last verb can be said to be *perfective* in that the action is viewed as a single whole, whereas the verb phrase "was reading" is *imperfective*, because it makes an explicit reference to a portion of the action, i.e., in this case, the act

of "reading" is described in the middle, excluding the beginning and the end of the action. Some languages have verb forms that contrast between *perfective* and *imperfective* aspects. See also *imperfective*, *perfective*, *situation aspect*, *tense*.

Clitic: A clitic is a grammatically independent word that is phonologically dependant on another word. Thus, a clitic is not an *affix*, but acts phonologically like one. To illustrate the contrast in English, whereas the ending -*s* in "he writes" is an affix that indicates a 3rd person sg. form of the verb, the contracted auxiliary in "he'll write" (i.e., -*'ll* for "will") is not an affix but a clitic, inasmuch as -*'ll* is a contracted form of a separate word, not a conjugated affix of the verb "to write." Typically, a clitic that precedes the main word is called a "proclitic," whereas one that follows the main word is called an "enclitic." Some clitics are in the process of being grammaticalized from a word to an affix. See also *affix*, *morpheme*.

Completive: Discussed under *perfect*.

Content word: see *lexical word*.

Deontic: Deontic modality refers primarily to directives, i.e., expressions of command or permission. For example: "You may/can go now," "You must go now" (Palmer 2001:71). Traditionally, deontic and *epistemic* were considered the major subdivisions of *modality*. Palmer (2001:9-10) preferred to classify deontic and *dynamic* as the major subdivisions of "event modality," the basic distinction being that deontic modality involves an obligation or permission imposed externally, whereas dynamic modality expresses the ability or willingness of the individual. The label "deontic" is not used by Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:176-181), who opted instead for labels such as "*speaker-oriented*" modality, where the speaker imposes conditions on an addressee, and "obligation," a type of *agent-oriented* modality that reports the existence of external, social conditions compelling an agent to complete an action. For further discussion, see chapter 6 (section C, subsection 2). See also *agent-oriented*, *dynamic*, *epistemic*, *modality*, *speaker-oriented*.

Durative: See *progressive*.

Dynamic: The term "dynamic" has been used to refer to a type of *modality* as well as to a type of *situation aspect*. Palmer (2001:9-10) subdivided "event modality" into dynamic and *deontic*. Whereas the latter involves an obligation or permission imposed externally, dynamic modality expresses the ability or willingness of the individual. As a type of situation aspect, dynamic contrasts with

stative. Whereas stative denotes a situation that continues unless something happens to change it (e.g., "to have"), dynamic involves some sort of change (e.g., "to get"). See also *deontic*, *modality*, *situation aspect*, *stative*.

Epistemic: Epistemic modality refers to the conveyance of the speaker's attitude toward the factualness of a proposition. Sentences such as "John may be in his office" or "Mary could be at school by now" (Palmer 2001:26, 32) are examples of the expression of epistemic modality. Traditionally, epistemic and *deontic* were considered the major subdivisions of *modality*. Palmer (2001) preferred to classify epistemic and *evidential* as the major subdivisions of "propositional modality." According to Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:176-181), epistemic is one of four major types of *modality*, along with *agent-oriented*, *speaker-oriented*, and *subordinate*. For further discussion, see chapters 2 (section G, subsection 2) and 6 (section C, preliminary discussion and subsection 3). See also *agent-oriented*, *deontic*, *evidential*, *modality*, *speaker-oriented*, *subordinate*.

Ergative: According to Dixon (1994), an ergative (or "ergative-absolutive") language is one that expresses the object of a transitive verb and the subject of an intransitive verb in the same way (i.e., by an absolutive marker), but expresses the subject/agent of a transitive verb differently (i.e., by an ergative marker). This can be contrasted with an "accusative" (or "nominative-accusative") language, which expresses the subject/agent of both intransitive and transitive verbs in the same way, but distinguishes them from the object of a transitive verb. Many languages employ ergative systems only partially, i.e., only in certain grammatical context, and are therefore also called split ergative. Examples of primarily ergative-absolutive languages are Sumerian and Basque. By contrast, languages such as Latin and German are primarily nominative-accusative. Since the replacement of accusative constructions by ergative ones and vice versa is widely attested in both directions (Dixon 1994:185-186), such a development does not involve *grammaticalization*.

Event structure: see *situation aspect*.

Evidential: According to Palmer (2005:8-9), evidential and *epistemic* modality constitute the two main types of "propositional modality." Whereas epistemic modality expresses the speaker's judgment about the factual status of the proposition, evidential modality indicates

the evidence for its factual status. For further discussion, see chapter 2 (section G, subsection 3). See also *epistemic*, *modality*.

Frequentative: Discussed under *habitual*.

Function word: A function word, also called a *grammatical word*, is a word or construction that expresses a grammatical relation. Examples of function words include auxiliaries (e.g., "must," "could"), prepositions (e.g., "of"), conjunctions (e.g., "and"), pronouns (e.g., "it"), articles (e.g., "the"), etc. In contrast to function words, *lexical words* express not grammatical relationships, but independent meaning. Function words are usually described as "closed" classes of words, because there is a finite number of them and new function words are not readily created in the course of speech. However, the fact that these are closed classes does not mean that no changes can occur. *Grammaticalization* involves the development of a *lexical word* into a function word. For further discussion, see chapter 1 (section B). See also *grammaticalization*, *lexeme*, *lexical word*.

Future: Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:244) defined the future as "a prediction on the part of the speaker that the situation in the proposition, which refers to an event taking place after the moment of speech, will hold." The future has been described both as a *tense* and as a type of *modality*. For further discussion, see chapter 6 (section B, subsection 1). See also *modality*, *tense*.

General present: The general present, also known as "gnomic" or "habitual present," denotes not something occurring at the moment of speech, but timeless facts or habitual actions. For further discussion, see chapters 3 (section D, subsection 4) and 10 (section B, subsections 3.2 and 3.3). See also *actual present*, *present*.

Grammatical word: see *function word*.

Grammaticalization: In its simplest definition, grammaticalization, formerly also called "grammaticization," denotes "the steps whereby particular items become more grammatical through time" (Hopper and Traugott 2003:2). That is, it denotes the phenomena whereby certain lexical items develop over time to serve grammatical functions and certain grammatical items develop new grammatical functions. In addition, the term is also applied to the branch of language study that researches these phenomena. For further discussion, see chapters 1 (section B) and 10 (section C). See also *analysis*, *function word*, *layering*, *lexical word*, *persistence*, *reanalysis*, *renewal*, *unidirectionality*.

Habitual: Habitual is a subset of *imperfective*. It refers to customarily repeated actions. Some closely related terms are *iterative*, which refers to repeated actions that have a well-defined end point, and *frequentative*, which refers to actions that occur frequently in a specific period of time. In a limited corpus, such as the Aramaic of Daniel, it is not possible in every case to distinguish these functions. For further discussion, see chapter 3 (section D, subsection 2). See also *imperfective*.

Historical present: The historical present is the common name given to the employment of the present to express past events in languages where this function is attested. For further discussion, see chapter 3 (section D, subsection 7). See also *present*.

Imperfective: *Aspect* is usually subdivided into *perfective* and "imperfective." According to Comrie (1976:4), "the perfective looks at the situation from outside, without distinguishing any of the internal structure of the situation, whereas the imperfective looks at the situation from the inside." Comrie (1976:24-25) also subdivides the imperfective aspect into *habitual* and "continuous," the latter including *progressive*. However, Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:137-139) observed that, although examples can be found of grammatical forms expressing *habitual*, *progressive*, and *imperfective* aspects, there are no examples in cross-linguistic data of a non-progressive continuous. Thus, they subdivide imperfective aspect into *habitual* and *progressive*. For further discussion, see chapter 3 (section A). See also *aspect*, *habitual*, *imperfective*, *perfective*, *present*, *progressive*.

Inceptive: The terms inceptive, *ingressive*, and *inchoative* are sometimes used interchangeably in grammatical studies for different concepts. In order to avoid ambiguity, the term "inceptive" is used in this book for *aspect*, as a grammatical form that depicts the beginning of an action or situation (e.g., "he began to read"), whereas "inchoative" is used for words or expressions that denote a change of state. The term "ingressive" is not used. For further discussion, see chapter 3 (section D, subsection 3). See also *aspect*, *inchoative*.

Inchoative: The terms *inceptive*, *ingressive*, and inchoative are sometimes used interchangeably in grammatical studies for different concepts. In order to avoid ambiguity, the term "inchoative" is used in this book for words or expressions that denote a change in state, i.e., entering into a state (e.g., "to ripen," "to thaw," "to rust"), whereas "inceptive" is used for a grammatical form denoting the beginning of

an action or situation (e.g., "to begin to ripen"). For further discussion, see chapter 2 (sections A and F). See also *inceptive*, *situation aspect*.

Inflection: Inflection refers to how words change form to indicate changes in tense, person, gender, number, etc. For example, the verb "to think" is inflected as "thinks" for the present 3rd person singular (i.e., "He thinks so") and as "thought" for the simple past tense (i.e., "I thought about it yesterday"). See also *affix*, *lexeme*, *morpheme*, *morphology*.

Ingressive: See *inceptive*.

Iterative: Discussed under *habitual*.

Layering: Layering means that new layers of functions are continually emerging, and older layers may remain to coexist with and interact with the newer layers. Thus, at any synchronic moment, more than one technique may be available to express similar or even identical functions. For further discussion, see chapters 1 (section B, subsection 2) and 10 (section C, subsection 3). See also *grammaticalization*, *persistence*, *renewal*.

Lemma: Discussed under *lexeme*.

Lexeme: A lexeme can be roughly explained as an abstract unit of language that carries semantic meaning and that may be realized in a set of forms generated by inflectional rules. It can be distinguished from a word in that a lexeme includes all its inflected forms. Thus, for instance, although "see," "sees," "saw," "seeing," and "seen" are separate words, they belong to a single lexeme. Also, lexemes may include a combination of words, such as multi-word verbs, e.g., "to catch up with." A lexeme is typically cited by a *lemma*, which in turn is a grammatical form of a lexeme chosen by convention to stand for the lexeme. For example, English verbs are usually cited by the infinitive form, ancient Aramaic verbs by the 3rd person masculine singular suffix conjugation form, etc. A lexeme, then, can be viewed as a distinct abstract unit of vocabulary, and a lemma is the form by which it is cited. For more information, see Carter 1998. See also *affix*, *function word*, *inflection*, *lexical word*, *morpheme*.

Lexical aspect: see *situation aspect*.

Lexical word: A lexical word, also called a *content word*, is a word or construction that has independent meaning, i.e., it denotes an entity, action, attribute, etc. Examples of content words include nouns (e.g., "chair"), verbs (e.g., "to love"), adjectives (e.g., "green"), and most adverbs (e.g., "profusely"). In contrast to lexical words, *function words*

express not independent meaning, but grammatical relationships. Lexical words are usually described as "open" classes of words, because new lexical words, such as slang, technical words, foreign words, etc., are readily created in the course of speech. Grammaticalization involves the development of a lexical word into a *function word*. For further discussion, see chapter 1 (section B). See also *function word*, *grammaticalization*, *lexeme*.

Modality: There is no universally accepted definition of modality. According to Palmer (2001:1-4), modality relates to the non-asserted status of a proposition. On the other hand, Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:176) considered modality impossible to define, and suggested instead that it is "a set of diachronically related functions" (see also Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1991; Bybee 1998). There is also no consensus on the classification of different types of modality. Traditionally, modality has been subdivided into *deontic* and *epistemic* modalities. However, Palmer (2001) suggested subdividing modality into "propositional" and "event" modalities, the first of which deals with the speaker's attitude to the truth-value or factualness of a proposition, and the latter refers to events that have not taken place but are merely potential. Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:176-181) divided modality into four main groups, which they called *agent-oriented*, *speaker-oriented*, *epistemic*, and *subordinate*. Without trying to settle issues concerning the fundamental nature of modality, this book follows primarily Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca's classification, because they explain the various types of modality in terms of *grammaticalization* phenomena. For further discussion, see chapter 6 (section C). See also *agent-oriented*, *deontic*, *dynamic*, *epistemic*, *evidential*, *speaker-oriented*, *subordinate*.

Morpheme: A morpheme is the smallest unit of language that carries meaning. Morphemes may be classified as either "free" or "bound." Free morphemes can stand alone, as in some base words, such as "dog" or "bark," whereas bound morphemes never occur as separate words. Examples of bound morphemes include grammatical affixes, such as the verb past tense "*-ed*" or the noun plural "*-s*" (e.g., dog*s*, bark*ed*). Some bound morphemes are "inflectional," whereas others are "derivational" (see under *affix* for further explanation and examples). See also *affix*, *inflection*, *lexeme*, *morphology*.

Morphology: Morphology in a broad sense is the study of morphemes. More specifically, it is the study the patterns or rules of word formation. These include inflectional rules, e.g., the English plural is

normally formed by adding the affix *-s*, as in "dogs," or derivational rules, e.g., the English affix *un-* generally creates a word with opposite meaning, "undo." See also *affix*, *inflection*, *morpheme*, *morphosyntax*.

Morphosyntax: Whereas *morphology* is the study of word formation, and *syntax* is the study of sentence formation, morphosyntax is the study of grammatical categories or linguistic units whose properties are definable by both morphological and syntactical criteria. For example, the expression of person in English involves both morphology, e.g., the addition of a *-s* suffix in most 3rd person sg. present forms, and syntax, e.g., the agreement of a 3rd person sg. subject with that verb. Also, the study of verb function is morphosyntactic in nature inasmuch as *tense*, *aspect*, and *modality* are morphosyntactic categories. See also *morphology*, *syntax*.

Past: See *simple past*.

Perfage: Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:104-105) used the label "perfage," for the stages in the grammaticalization of constructions that develop into or from a *perfect* or *anterior*. The "perf-" in "perfage" probably comes from the word "perfect," since in an earlier study Bybee and Dahl (1989:67-77) used the term "perfect" instead of "anterior" in describing the development of these functions, though it was later replaced by the word "anterior" in the writings of Bybee and her associates. Perfage 1 is assigned to *completives*; perfage 2 is assigned to young anteriors, i.e., anteriors that have no other functions; perfage 3 is assigned to old anteriors, i.e., anteriors that are more developed and, therefore, have a wider range of functions, including *resultative* and *past/perfective*; perfage 4 is assigned to perfectives that no longer have an anterior/resultative function; and perfage 5 is assigned to *simple pasts* that no longer have an anterior/resultative function. For further discussion, see chapter 2 (section A). See also *anterior*, *grammaticalization*, *perfect*, *resultative*.

Perfect: One must distinguish between perfect as function and perfect as a verbal form/tense. Some languages have a verbal form or phrase named "perfect" (e.g., the English, "I have done"). However, in terms of morphosyntactic function, "perfect" serves either as a synonym for *anterior* or as an umbrella term for several types of related functions, including *completive*, *anterior*, and *resultative*. According to Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:53-55), a "completive" denotes doing something thoroughly and to completion, e.g., "to eat up," an *anterior* denotes a past action with current relevance, and a *resulta-*

tive denotes a state that was brought about by some action in the past. In order to avoid ambiguity, this book uses the label "suffix conjugation" for the Aramaic verbal conjugation that is often called "perfect." For further discussion, see chapter 2 (section A). See also *anterior*, *resultative*.

Perfective: Perfective aspect views a situation as a single whole. For further discussion, see chapters 2 (sections A and F) and 10 (section B, subsection 2). See also *aspect*, *imperfective*, *simple past*.

Performative: Performatives are acts of speech that entail the actions contained in the speech act, e.g., the English expression "I now pronounce you man and wife." For further discussion, see chapters 2 (section B) and 3 (section D, subsection 6). See also *actual present*, *present*.

Persistence: Persistence refers to the fact that, as a form develops along the path of *grammaticalization*, traces of earlier functions or lexical meanings tend to persist. For further discussion, see chapters 1 (section B, subsection 2) and 10 (section C, subsection 2). See also *grammaticalization*, *layering*, *renewal*.

Present: The term "present" is used for various grammatical expressions that denote actions or events occurring at the moment of speaking, i.e., *actual present*. It is also applied to grammatical expressions that denote actions or events that may not necessarily occur at the moment of speaking, such as statements of timeless facts (i.e., "gnomic") or habitual actions. These latter functions can be subsumed under the umbrella of *general present*. Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:126) argue that the present is a subset of *imperfective*, because present tense forms that express the *actual present* can usually also express the *general present*. That is, since present tense forms denote progressive ("actual") and/or habitual/non-progressive ("general") events in the present, they are, in fact, "present imperfectives." For further discussion, see chapters 3 (section D, subsection 4) and 10 (section B, subsections 3.2 and 3.3). See also *actual present*, *general present*, *imperfective*.

Preterite: One must distinguish the use of the term "preterite" as a name of a verbal conjugation in some languages from its use to denote a specific verbal function. As an example of its use as a label for a verbal conjugation, the short prefix conjugation form in Akkadian is called a "preterite" (e.g., G stem "preterite" *iprus*, in contrast to "present-future" *iparras* and "perfect" *iptaras*). However, the fact that a conjugation is called a "preterite," does not necessarily mean

that the form expresses a preterite function. As a label for a verbal function, "preterite" is another name for *simple past*, which denotes an event that occurred before the moment of speech. See *simple past*.

Progressive: Progressive, sometimes also called "durative," is a subset of *imperfective* aspect. A progressive grammatical expression views an action as ongoing at reference time. Progressives generally occur with dynamic rather than *stative* predicates, because a stative denotes a state that continues indefinitely unless something puts an end to it, whereas a progressive denotes not a state, but an action or a process that is not yet complete at reference time. For further discussion, see chapter 3 (section A). See also *imperfective*.

Reanalysis: Reanalysis means that the hearer understands a form to have a structure/meaning different from the speaker. Whereas reanalysis is covert in that it occurs in the minds of listeners, *analysis* is overt, and provides the demonstrable evidence that a reanalysis has occurred. *Grammaticalization* always involves reanalysis and analysis, but not all cases of reanalysis or analysis result in grammaticalization. For further discussion, see chapters 1 (section B, subsection 3) and 10 (section C, subsection 3). See also *analysis*, *grammaticalization*.

Renewal: When a form begins to express the meaning already expressed by another existing form, the process is called "renewal." If Meillet (1912; cited by Dahl 2004:135) was correct that renewal occurs because an older form loses expressive value, not because of its disappearance, renewal results in a gradual rather than instantaneous replacement of older forms. The process by which a word or expression acquires the meaning expressed by another may involve *grammaticalization*. However, Heine and Kuteva (2005:168-169) observed that renewal itself is not grammaticalization, since renewal involves etymological discontinuity (i.e., a new expression replaces an older one), whereas grammaticalization involves etymological continuity (i.e., it entails the development of a word or construction to serve a more grammatical function). Nevertheless, it is often the initial stage of the process. See also *grammaticalization*, *layering*, *persistence*.

Resultative: a resultative verb (phrase) denotes a state that was brought about by some action in the past. For further discussion, see chapter 2 (section A). See also *anterior*, *perfect*.

Rule generalization: See *analysis*.

Simple past: A simple past, also called a *preterite*, is a verb that denotes an event which occurred before the moment of speech, without specifying any other concomitant meanings. In this book, I used the label "simple past" instead of "past," in order to distinguish it from grammatical constructions that express other meanings in addition to past time, such as habitual past, past imperfective, etc. For further discussion, see chapters 2 (sections A and F) and 10 (section B, subsection 2). See also *perfective*, *preterite*, *tense*.

Situation aspect: Situation aspect (also referred to as *lexical aspect*, *Aktionsart*, or *event structure*) is an internal or inherent property of an action or event. It is different from viewpoint aspect (i.e., *aspect*) in that, whereas the latter is expressed by the speaker, e.g., by the use of morphological inflections or auxiliaries to denote *perfective* or *imperfective* viewpoints, situation aspect is invariable, since it describes certain properties of the event itself. Vendler (1957) distinguished four types of verbs, which he described as expressing "activity," "accomplishment," "achievement," and "state." Comrie, who described situation aspect as "inherent meaning" (1976:41-51), added another type of verb, which he called "semelfactive." For Semitic verbs, the distinction between *stative* and "dynamic" (i.e., non-stative) verbs is the most important (see Dobbs-Allsopp 2000). Stative verbs denote a situation that is expected to continue unless something happens to change it (e.g., "to know" denotes a situation that normally does not change, unless some other event changes it), whereas dynamic verbs presuppose either a punctual event (e.g., "to cough") or some kind of change, such as an end point (e.g., "to drown"). See also *aspect*, *dynamic*, *inchoative*, *stative*.

Speaker-oriented: Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:176-181) divided *modality* into four main types, i.e., *agent-oriented*, speaker-oriented, *epistemic*, and *subordinate*. Speaker-oriented modalities are so named because they "allow the speaker to impose conditions on the addressee" (179). For further discussion, see chapter 6 (section C, subsection 2). See also *agent-oriented*, *deontic*, *epistemic*, *modality*, *subordinate*.

Stative: One must distinguish between "stative" as an inherent property of a situation (i.e., a *situation aspect*) and "stative" as a class of verbs in Semitic languages with a slightly different morphological inflection. In terms of situation aspect, stative verbs denote a situation that is expected to continue unless something happens to change it. It is possible that all Semitic verbs of the stative inflec-

tional class originally expressed a stative situation aspect, but that is not always the case at the various stages of the languages that are attested by surviving extant texts. In this book, "stative" is used primarily to refer to situation aspect. For further discussion, see chapters 2 (sections A and F) and 3 (section A). See also *dynamic*, *situation aspect*.

Subjunctive: Subjunctive is a mood that is used in certain types of dependent clauses. Palmer (2001:108) referred to Jespersen's 1924 observation that "one of the functions of the subjunctive is simply that of being subordinate." However, as Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:236) observed, subjunctives "do not uniformly cover the same set of uses across languages." For further discussion, see chapter 6 (section C, subsection 4). See also *modality*, *subordinate*.

Subordinate: A subordinate clause is a dependent clause, i.e., one that does not stand alone or express a complete thought by itself. It is dependent on a main or independent clause. In English, a sentence that contains both a main clause and dependent clauses is called a "complex sentence" (e.g., "We can go, if you are finished"), whereas one that contains more than one main clause is called a "compound sentence" (e.g., "He is the cook, and she is the waitress"). However, since Semitic languages are sparse in employing subordinating conjunctions, the concepts of compound and complex sentences are not as relevant to the present study. That is, a clause in a Semitic language may be semantically subordinate to another without necessarily being introduced by a subordinating conjunction (e.g., verbless circumstantial clauses). Subordinate verbal functions are also a type of *modality*, though they are not always classified as such in the literature. According to Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994:176-181), subordinating modality is one of four major types of *modality*, along with *agent-oriented*, *speaker-oriented*, and *epistemic*. For further discussion, see chapter 6 (section C, subsection 4). See also *agent-oriented*, *epistemic*, *modality*, *speaker-oriented*, *subjunctive*.

Syntagm: As used in this book, a syntagm refers to a sequence of words in some syntactic relationship, which in turn is part of a larger unit. For example, a phrase or clause could be called a syntagm within a larger sentence. See also *syntax*.

Syntax: Syntax refers to the rules of how words are arranged in a sentence. For example, the fact that adjectives in English precede the nouns they modify is a rule of syntax. In the discussion of syntax, sentences are often described by the position of subject (S),

verb/verb phrase (V), and object (O). Thus, for example, an SVO language typically has the word order subject + verb + object (e.g., English), whereas a VSO language typically has the word order verb + subject + object (e.g., Biblical Hebrew), etc. Verbless/nominal clauses are typically described by the position of subject (S) and predicate (P), e.g., verbless clauses are either SP or PS. See also *morphosyntax.*

Tense: Tense refers to the temporal location of a situation or event in relation to some other reference point, such as the speech act. When the reference point is the moment of utterance, it is called "absolute tense," whereas when the reference point is some other time, it is called "relative tense." Comrie (1976:2) illustrates it with the following two sentences:

> (a) When walking down the road, I often meet Harry.
> (b) When walking down the road, I often met Harry.

In both examples, the tense of the English present participle "walking" is relative to the time of the subsequent clause, and can thus be described as relative present. On the other hand, both examples above contain absolute tense in the second clause, because the verb forms "meet" and "met" are present and past respectively with reference to the moment of speech. In this book, the term "tense" applies to absolute tense, unless otherwise stated. The number of tenses that languages express varies. Some languages do not express tense grammatically, though they do have words that can specify the time of the event. Other languages may express two tenses (e.g., past and non-past), three tenses (e.g., English past, present, and future), or even more (e.g., some languages express degrees of remoteness for past or future tenses). See also *aspect.*

Unidirectionality: Unidirectionality is the hypothesis that items tend to become more grammatical, not less grammatical. That is, phenomena associated with *grammaticalization* tend to occur in a specific direction that is generally irreversible, and this direction is the same across languages. There are sporadic counter-examples (hence, unidirectionality is a tendency, rather than a theoretical absolute), but these are vastly outnumbered in the empirical data. For further discussion, see chapters 1 (section B, subsection 1) and 10 (section C, subsection 1). See also *grammaticalization.*

Voice: Voice describes the relationship between the verb and the participants in a clause. For example, a verb is typically described as "active" when its subject is the agent or actor, whereas it is said to be "passive" when the subject does not perform the action, but is the

patient, target, or undergoer of the action. For further discussion, see chapter 4 (section A).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albertz, Rainer. 1988. *Der Gott des Daniel: Untersuchungen zu Daniel 4-6 in der Septuagintafassung sowie zu Komposition und Theologie des aramäischen Danielbuches*. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 131. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk GmbH.

Anstey, Matthew P. 2006. The Grammatical-Lexical Cline in Tiberian Hebrew. *JSS* 51:59-84.

Arnold, Bill T. 1993. Wordplay and Narrative Techniques in Daniel 5 and 6. *JBL* 112:479-485.

Bar-Efrat, Shimon. 1989. *Narrative Art in the Bible*. Trans. Dorothea Shefer-Vanson (from Hebrew second edition of 1984). JSOTSup, 70; Bible and Literature Series 17. Sheffield: Almond Press.

Bauer, Hans, and Pontus Leander. 1927. *Grammatik des biblisch-Aramäischen*. Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer.

Bergsträsser, Gotthelf. 1983. *Introduction to the Semitic Languages: Text Specimens and Grammatical Sketches*. Trans. with notes P. T. Daniels. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns [orig. 1928]

Behrmann, Georg. 1894. *Das Buch Daniel*. Göttingen: Venderhoek & Ruprecht.

Bhat, D. N. S. 1999. *The Prominence of Tense, Aspect and Mood*. Studies in Language Companion Series, 49. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Binnick, Robert I. 1991. *Time and the Verb: A Guide to Tense and Aspect*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Blake, Frank R. 1901. The Internal Passive in Semitic. *JAOS* 22:45-54.

Blau, Joshua. 1987. Minutiae Aramaicae. In *Perspectives on Language and Text: Essays and Poems in Honor of Francis I. Andersen's Sixtieth Birthday, July 28, 1985*, ed. Edgar W. Conrad and Edward G. Newing, 3-10. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.

Bloch, Ariel A. 1991. Questioning God's Omnipotence in the Bible: A Linguistic Case Study. In *Semitic Studies in Honor of Wolf Leslau on the Occasion of His Eighty-Fifth Birthday November 14th, 1991*, 2 vols., ed. Alan S. Kaye, 1:174-188. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Bombeck, Stefan. 1996. Die Verwendung der Präformativkonjugation im Aramäischen des Buches Daniel. *BN* 83:5-8.

Buth, Randall John. 1987. Word Order in Aramaic from the Perspectives of Functional Grammar and Discourse Analysis. Ph.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles.

—. 1990. ʾĕdayin/Tote--Anatomy of a Semitism in Jewish Greek. *Maarav* 5-6:33-48.

Bybee, Joan L. 1998. "Irrealis" as a Grammatical Category. *Anthropological Linguistics* 40:257-271.

—. 1994. The Grammaticalization of Zero: Asymmetries in Tense and Aspect Systems. In *Perspectives on Grammaticalization*, ed. William Pagliuca, 235-254. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Bybee, Joan L., and Östen Dahl 1989. The Creation of Tense and Aspect Systems in the Languages of the World. *Studies in Language* 13:51-103.

Bybee, Joan L., and William Pagliuca. 1985. Cross-Linguistic Comparison and the Development of Grammatical Meaning. In *Historical Semantics: Historical Word Formation*, ed. Jacek Fisiak, 59-83. Berlin: Mouton.

Bybee, Joan L., William Pagliuca, and Revere Perkins. 1991. Back to the Future. In *Approaches to Grammaticalization; Volume 2: Focus on Types of Grammatical Markers*, ed. Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine, 17-58. Typological Studies in Language, 19:2. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Bybee, Joan L., Revere Perkins, and William Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World.* Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Campbell, Lyle. 2001a. Grammaticalization: A Critical Assessment. *Language Sciences* 23, numbers 2-3.

—. 2001b. What's Wrong with Grammaticalization? *Language Sciences* 23:113-161.

Campbell, Lyle, and Richard Janda. 2001. Introduction: Conceptions of Grammaticalization and Their Problems. *Language Sciences* 23:93-112.

Carter, Ronald. 1998. *Vocabulary: Applied Linguistic Perspectives.* 2nd ed. London and New York: Routledge.

Caubet, Dominique. 1991. The Active Participle as a Means to Renew the Aspectual System: A Comparative Study in Several Dialects of Arabic. In *Semitic Studies: in Honor of Wolf Leslau on the Occasion of his 85th Birthday*, ed. Alan S. Kaye, 1:209-224. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Chalker, Sylvia and Edmund Weiner. 1994. *The Oxford Dictionary of English Grammar.* Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Cohen, Daniel Ronnie. 1975. Subject and Object in Biblical Aramaic: A Functional Approach Based on Form-Content Analysis. *Afroasiastic Linguistics* 2:1-23.

Cohen, David. 1984. *La phrase nominale et l'évolution du système verbal en sémitique: Études de syntaxe historique.* Leuven and Paris: Éditions Peeters.

Collins, John J. 1993. *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel.* Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

—. 2001. Current Issues in the Study of Daniel. In *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, ed. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint, 1:1-15. Leiden: Brill.

Collins, John J. and Peter W. Flint, eds. 2001. *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception.* 2 vols. VTSup, 83. Leiden: Brill.

Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect.* Cambridge Univ. Press.

Cook, Edward M. 1986. Word Order in the Aramaic of Daniel. *AAL* 9.3:111-126 [= pp. 1-16 internal].

—. 1989. "In the Plain of the Wall" (Dan 3:1). *JBL* 108:115-116.

—. 1992. Qumran Aramaic and Aramaic Dialectology. *AbrNSup* 3:1-21.

Cook, John A. 2001. The Hebrew Verb: A Grammaticalization Approach. *ZAH* 14:117-143.

—. 2002. The Biblical Hebrew Verbal System: A Grammaticalization Approach. Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Coxon, Peter W. 1977. The Syntax of the Aramaic of Daniel: A Dialectal Study. *HUCA* 48:107-122.

—. 1993. Another Look at Nebuchadnezzar's Madness. In *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*, ed. Adam S. van der Woude, 211-12. BETL, 106. Leuven: Peeters.

Dahl, Östen. 1985. *Tense and Aspect Systems.* Oxford: Blackwell.

—. 2004. *The Growth and Maintenance of Linguistic Complexity.* Studies in Language Companion Series, 71. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Dempsey, D. A. 1990. The "Epistolary Perfect" in Aramaic Letters. *BN* 54:7-11.

Deutscher, Guy. 2000. *Syntactic Change in Akkadian: The Evolution of Sentential Complementation.* Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Di Lella, Alexander A. 1981. Daniel 4:7-14: Poetic Analysis and Biblical Background. In *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles*, ed. A. Caquot and M. Delcor, 247-258. AOAT, 212. Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Becker.

—. 1982. Strophic Structure and Poetic Analysis of Daniel 2:20-23, 3:31-33, and 6:26b-28. In *Studia Hierosolymitana III: Nell'Ottavo Centenario Francescano (1182-1982)*, ed. Giovanni Claudio Bottini, 91-96. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press.

Diessel, Holger. 2001. The Ordering Distribution of Main and Adverbial Clauses: A Typological Study. *Language* 77:433-55.

Dixon, R. M. W. 1994. *Ergativity.* Cambridge Studies in Linguistics, 69. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Dobbs-Allsopp, F. W. 2000. Biblical Hebrew Statives and Situation Aspect. *JSS* 45:21-53.

Driver, S. R. 1900. *The Book of Daniel: With Introduction and Notes.* Cambridge: University Press.

Duval, Rubens. 1884. Le passif dans l'araméen biblique et le palmyrénien. *Revue des études juives* 8(1884)57-63.

Emerton, J. A. 1960. The Participles in Daniel v.12. *ZAW* 72:262-263.

Eshel, Esther. 2001. Possible Sources of the Book of Daniel. In *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, 2 vols., ed. John Joseph Collins and Peter W. Flint, 2:387-394. VTSup, 83. Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill.

Estelle, Bryan. 2006. The Use of Deferential Language in the Arsames Correspondence and Biblical Aramaic Compared. *Maarav* 13 :43-74.

Fassberg, Steven Ellis. 1989. The Origin of the Ketib/Qere in the Aramaic Portions of Ezra and Daniel. *VT* 39:1-12.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 2004. *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20): A Commentary*. 3rd ed. Biblica et Orientalia, 18/B. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.

Folmer, Margaretha L. 1991. Some Remarks on the Use of the Finite Verb Form in the Protasis of Conditional Sentences in Aramaic Texts from the Achaemenid Period. In *Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic Syntax: Presented to Professor J. Hoftijzer on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed.. K. Jongeling, H. L. Murre-van den Berg, and Lucas Van Rompay, 56-78. Leiden, New York, København: Köln: E.J. Brill.

—. 1995. *The Aramaic Language in the Achaemenid Period: A Study in Linguistic Variation.* Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, 68. Leuven: Peeters en Departement Oosterse Studies.

Fox, Joshua. 2003. *Semitic Noun Patterns.* Harvard Semitic Studies, 59. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.

Gai, Amikam. 1986. The Non-Active Participles in the Ancient Semitic Languages. *ZDMG* 136:8-14.

—. 2005. The *Signifié* of the Non-Active Participle in Semitic Languages. *ZDMG* 155:9-23.

Gianto, Agustinus. 2005. Some Notes on Evidentiality in Biblical Hebrew. In *Biblical and Oriental Essays in Memory of William L. Moran*, ed. Agustinus Gianto, 133-53. Biblica et Orientalia, 48. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.

Ginsberg, H. Louis. 1948. *Studies in Daniel.* Texts and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 14. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

Goldenberg, Gideon. 1992. Aramaic Perfects. *IOS* 12:113-137.

—. 1998. *Studies in Semitic Linguistics: Selected Writings.* Jerusalem: The Magnes Press.

Goodwin, William W. 1889. *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb.* Rewritten and enlarged. Mcmillan and Co. [Reprinted in Eugene, Oreg.: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2003]

—. 1900. *A Greek Grammar.* Revised & enlarged ed. Boston: Ginn & Company.

Greenfield, Jonas C. 1969. The "Periphrastic Imperative" in Aramaic and Hebrew. *IEJ* 19:199-210.

Gropp, Douglas M. [Forthcoming]. The Aramaic of Targums Onkelos and Jonathan: An Introduction.

Gzella, Holger. 2004. *Tempus, Aspekt und Modalität im Reichsaramäischen.* Veröffentlichtungen der Orientalischen Kommission, 48. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

—. 2007. The Use of the Participle in the Hebrew Bar Kosiba Letters in the Light of Aramaic. *DSD* 14:90-98.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1989. From Purposive to Infinitive. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 10:287-310.

—. 1990. The Grammaticalization of Passive Morphology. *Studies in Language* 14:25-72.

—. 1994. Passive Participles across Languages. In *Voice: Form and Function*, ed. Barbara Fox and Paul J. Hopper, 152-177. Typological Studies in Language, 27. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

—. 1998. The Semantic Development of Old Presents: New Futures and Subjunctives without Grammaticalization. *Diachronica* 15:29-62.

—. 1999. Why Is Grammaticalization Irreversible? *Linguistics* 37:1043-1068.

—. 2004. On Directionality in Language Change with Particular Reference to Grammaticalization. In *Up and Down the Cline: The Nature of Grammaticalization*, eds. Olga Fischer, Muriel Norde, and Harry Perridon, 17-44. Typological Studies in Language, 59. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Hatav, Galia. 1997. *The Semantics of Aspect and Modality: Evidence from English and Biblical Hebrew.* Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Heine, Bernd. 1994. Grammaticalization as an Explanatory Parameter. In *Perspectives on Grammaticalization*, ed. William Pagliuca, 235-254. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Heine, Bernd, Urike Claudi, and Friederike Hünnemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Heine, Bernd and Tania Kuteva. 2002a. *Common Grammaticalization Processes in the Languages of the World.* Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

—. 2002b. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

—. 2005. *Language Contact and Grammatical Change.* Cambridge Approaches to Language Contact. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Hoberman, Robert D. 1989. *The Syntax and Semantics of Verb Morphology in Modern Aramaic: A Jewish Dialect of Iraqi Kurdistan.* AOS, 69. New Haven, Conn.: American Oriental Society.

Hopkins, Simon. 1989. Neo-Aramaic Dialects and the Formation of the Preterite. *JSS* 34:413-432.

Hopper, Paul J. 1991. On Some Principles of Grammaticalization. In *Approaches to Grammaticalization; Volume 1: Focus on Theoretical and Methodological Issues*, ed. Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine, 17-35. Typological Studies in Language, 19:1. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Hopper, Paul J. and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization*. 2nd ed. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Huehnergard, John. 1987. "Stative," Predicative Form, Pseudo-Verb. *JNES* 47:215-32.

—. 1995. What Is Aramaic? *Aram* 7:265-286.

Jastrow, Otto. 1996. Passive Formation in Ṭuroyo and Melaḥsô. In *Studies in Modern Semitic Languages*, ed. Shlomo Izre'el and Shlomo Raz, 49-57. IOS, 16. Leiden: Brill.

Johns, Alger F. 1972. *A Short Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*. 2nd ed. Andrews University Monographs, 1. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews Univ. Press.

Joosten, Jan. 1992. Biblical Hebrew *wᵉqātal* and Syriac *hwā qātel* Expressing Repetition in the Past. *ZAH* 5:1-14.

—. 2002. Do the Finite Verbal Forms in Biblical Hebrew Express Aspect? *JANES* 29:49-70.

—. 2005. The Distinction between Classical and Late Biblical Hebrew as Reflected in Syntax. *Hebrew Studies* 46:327-339.

Joüon, Paul, and Takamitsu Muraoka. 2006. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Subsidia Biblica 27. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.

Kaddari, M. Z. 1983. The Existential Verb *HWH* in Imperial Aramaic. In *Arameans, Aramaic and the Aramaic Literary Tradition*, ed. Michael Sokoloff, 43-46. Bar-Ilan Studies in Near Eastern Languages and Culture. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan Univ. Press.

Kaufman, Stephen A. 1974. *Akkadian Influences on Aramaic*. Assyriological Studies, 19. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

—. 1992. Aramaic. In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 6 vols., ed. D. N. Freedman et al., 4:173-178. New York: Doubleday.

Kautzsch, Emil Friedrich. 1884. *Grammatik des biblisch-Aramäischen: Mit einer kritischen Eröterung der aramäischen Wörter im neuen Testament*. Leipzig: F. C. W. Vogel.

Khan, Geoffrey. 1999. The Neo-Aramaic Dialect Spoken by Jews from the Region of Arbel (Iraqi Kurdistan). *BSOAS* 62:213-25.

—. 2000. The Verbal System of the Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Arbel. *JAOS* 120:321-332.

—. 2007. The North-Eastern Neo-Aramaic Dialects. *JSS* 52:1-20.

Klaiman, M. H. 1991. *Grammatical Voice*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics, 59. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Koch, Klaus. 1980. *Das Buch Daniel*. Erträge der Forschung, 144. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

—. 1993. Gottes Herrschaft über das Reich des Menschen: Daniel 4 im Licht neuer Funde. In *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*, ed. Adam S. van der Woude, 77-119. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 106. Leuven: Peeters.

Kouwenberg, N. J. C. 2000. Nouns as Verbs: The Verbal Nature of the *Akkadian Stative*. *Or* 69:21-71.

Kutscher, Eduard Yechezkel. 1969. Two "Passive" Constructions in Aramaic in the Light of Persian. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Semitic Studies held in Jerusalem, 19-23 July 1965*, 132-151. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities. [Reprinted in Kutscher 1977, pp. 70-89.]

—. 1970. The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I. *Or* 39:178-183.

—. 1976. *Studies in Galilean Aramaic.* Translated from the Hebrew original and annotated with additional notes from the author's handcopy by Michael Sokoloff. Bar-Ilan Studies in Near Eastern Languages and Culture. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University. [Hebrew original dated 1950-1951]

—. 1977. *Hebrew and Aramaic Studies.* Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University.

Lacocque, André. 1979. *The Book of Daniel.* Trans. David Pellauer. Atlanta: John Knox Press.

Li, Tarsee. 2004. The Tel Dan Inscription: History, Language, and Biblical Studies. In *The Word of God for the People of God: A Tribute to the Ministry of Jack J. Blanco*, ed. Ronald A. G. du Preez et al., 95-109. Collegedale, Tenn.: The School of Religion, Southern Adventist University.

—. 2008 Non-Active Participles in the Aramaic of Daniel. *AS* 6:111-136.

—. [2009]. The Function of the Active Participle in the Aramaic of Daniel. In *Aramaic in Post-Biblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from the 2004 NEH Summer Seminar at Duke University*, ed. P. Flesher and E. Meyers. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns. [In press]

Lieberman, Stephen J. 1986. The Afro-Asiatic Background of the Semitic N-Stem: Toward the Origins of the Afro-Asiatic Verb. *BO* 43:578-628.

Luzzatto, Samuel Davide. 1865. *Elementi grammaticali del caldeo Biblico e del dialetto Talmudico babilonese.* Padova: A. Bianchi.

MacLean, A. J. 1895. *Dialects of Vernacular Syriac: As Spoken by Eastern Syrian of Kurdistan, North-west Persia and the Plain of Mosul: With Notices of the Vernacular of the Jews of Azerbaijan and of Zakhu near Mosul.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McLay, Tim. 1997. *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel.* SBLSCS 43. Atlanta: Scholars.

Makujina, John. 1999. Dismemberment in Dan 2:5 and 3:29 as an Old Persian Idiom, 'To Be Made into Parts.' *JAOS* 119:309-312.

Marti, Karl. 1896. *Kurzgefasste Grammatik der Biblisch-Aramäischen Sprache: Literatur, Paradigmen, kritisch berichtigte Texte und Glossar.* Berlin: Reuther & Reichard.

Mastin, B. A. 1992. The Meaning of *Hᵃlāʾ* at Daniel iv 27. *VT* 42:234-247.

Meadowcroft, Tim J. 1995. *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison.* JSOTSup, 198. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Mengozzi, Alessandro. 2002. *Israel of Alqosh and Joseph of Telkepe: A Story in a Truthful Language: Religious Poems in Vernacular Syriac (North Iraq, 17ᵗʰ Century): Edited with Introduction and Translation.* CSCO, 590; Scriptores Syri, 231. Leuven: Peeters.

Montgomery, James A. 1927. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel.* International Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Morrow, William S., and Ernest G. Clarke. 1986. The *Ketib/Qere* in the Aramaic Portions of Ezra and Daniel. *VT* 36:406-422.

Müller, Hans-Peter. 1985. Ergativelemente im akkadischen und althebräischen Verbalsystem. *Bib* 66:385-417.

—. 1995. Ergative Constructions in Early Semitic Languages. *JNES* 54:261-71.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. 1966. Notes on the Syntax of Biblical Aramaic. *JSS* 11:151-167.

—. 1972. Notes on the Aramaic of the Genesis Apocryphon. *RevQ* 29:7-51.

—. 1983. On the Morphosyntax of the Infinitive in Targumic Aramaic. In *Arameans, Aramaic and the Aramaic Literary Tradition*, ed. Michael Sokoloff, 75-9. Bar-Ilan Studies in Near Eastern Languages and Culture. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan Univ. Press.

—. 1985. *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew*. Jerusalem and Leiden: Brill.

—. 1993. Further Notes on the Aramaic of the Genesis Apocryphon. *RevQ* 61:39-48.

—. 1995. Linguistic Notes on the Aramaic Inscription from Tel Dan. *IEJ* 45:19-21.

—. 1998. Again on the Tel Dan Inscription and the Northwest Semitic Verb Tenses. *ZAH* 11:74-81.

—. 1999. The Participle in Qumran Hebrew with Special Reference to Its Periphrastic Use. In *Sirach, Scrolls, and Sages: Proceedings of a Second International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Ben Sira, and the Mishnah, Held at Leiden University, 15-17 December 1997*, ed. Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde, 188-204. STDJ 33. Leiden: Brill.

—. 2000. An Approach to the Morphosyntax and Syntax of Qumran Hebrew. In *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*, ed. Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde, 193-214. STDJ, 36. Leiden: Brill.

—. 2005. *Classical Syriac: A Basic Grammar with a Chrestomathy*. 2nd rev. ed. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Muraoka, Takamitsu, and Bezalel Porten. 1998. *A Grammar of Egyptian Aramaic*. HdO, 1.32. Leiden: Brill.

Naudé, J. A. 1994. The Verbless Clause with Pleonastic Pronoun in Biblical Aramaic. *Journal for Semitics* 6:74-93.

Nöldeke, Theodor. 1904. *Compendious Syriac Grammar*. Trans. James A. Crichton. London: Williams & Norgate. [Translated from the 2nd ed., 1898]

Palmer, F. R. 2001. *Mood and Modality*. 2nd ed. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Pardee, Dennis, and Robert M. Whiting. 1987. Aspects of Epistolary Verbal Usage in Ugaritic and Akkadian. *BSOAS* 50:1-31.

Péter-Contesse, René and John Ellington. 1993. *A Handbook on the Book of Daniel*. UBS Handbook Series. New York: United Bible Societies.

Peursen, Wido Th. van. 1997. Periphrastic Tenses in Ben Sira. In *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Proceedings of a Symposium Held at Leiden University 11-14 December 1995*, ed. Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde, 158-73. STDJ, 26. Leiden: Brill.

Pfann, Stephen. 1991. The Aramaic Text and Language of Daniel and Ezra in the Light of Some Manuscripts from Qumran. *Textus* 16:127-137.

Polak, F. H. 1993. The Daniel Tales in Their Aramaic Literary Milieu. In *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*, ed. A. S. van der Woude, 249-65. BETL, 106. Leuven: Peeters.

Porten, Bezalel, and A. Yardeni. 1986. *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt Newly Copied, Edited and Translated into Hebrew and English: 1. Letters (Appendix: Aramaic Letters from the Bible)*. Department of the History of the Jewish People. Texts and Studies for Students. Jerusalem: Hebrew Univ. Press.

—. 1989. *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt Newly Copied, Edited and Translated into Hebrew and English. 2: Contracts.* Department of the History of the Jewish People. Texts and Studies for Students. Jerusalem: Hebrew Univ. Press.

—. 1993. *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt Newly Copied, Edited and Translated into Hebrew and English. 3: Literature, Accounts, Lists.* Department of the History of the Jewish People. Texts and Studies for Students. Jerusalem: Hebrew Univ. Press.

—. 1999. *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt Newly Copied, Edited and Translated into Hebrew and English. 4: Ostraca & Assorted Inscriptions.* Department of the History of the Jewish People. Texts and Studies for Students. Jerusalem: Hebrew Univ. Press.

Prinsloo, G. T. M. 1993. Two Poems in a Sea of Prose: The Content and Context of Daniel 2.20-23 and 6.27-28. *JSOT* 59:93-108.

Qimron, Elisha. 1993. *ארמית מקראית.* Biblical Encyclopedia Library, 10. Bialik Institute.

Rau, Lisa F. and Paul S. Jacobs. 1988. Integrating Top-Down and Bottom-Up Strategies in a Text-Processing System. In *Proceedings of the Second Conference on Applied Natural Language Processing* (Austin, Texas, February 9-12, 1988), pp. 129-135. Morristown, NJ: Applied Natural Language Conferences. Association for Computational Linguistics. [DOI= http://dx.doi.org/10.3115/974235.974259]

Rogland, Max. 2001. Performative Utterances in Classical Syriac. *JSS* 46:243-250.

—. 2003. Remarks on the Aramaic Verbal System. In *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Martin F. J. Baasten and Wido Th. van Peursen, 421-432. Leuven: Peeters.

Rosén, H. B. 1961. On the Use of the Tenses in the Aramaic of Daniel. *JSS* 6:183-203.

Rosenthal, Franz. 1961. *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic.* Porta Linguarum Orientalium. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

—. 1995. *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic.* 6th rev. ed. Porta Linguarum Orientalium, Neue Serie, 5. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Rowley, H. H. 1929. *The Aramaic of the Old Testament: A Grammatical and Lexical Study of Its Relations with Other Early Aramaic Dialects.* London: Oxford Univ. Press.

Rubin, Aaron D. 2005. *Studies in Semitic Grammaticalization.* HSS. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Rundgren, Frithiof. 1960. Der aspektuelle Charakter des altsemitischen Injunktivs. *Orientalia Suecana* 9:75-101.

—. 1961. Das altsyrische Verbalsystem: Vom Aspekt zum Tempus. In *Språkvetenskapliga Sällskapets i Uppsala Förhandlingar--Acta Societatis Linguisticae Upsaliensis--Jan. 1958-Dec. 1960*, 49-75. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.

—. 1963. *Erneuerung des Verbalaspekts im Semitischen: Funktionell-diachronische Studien zur semitischen Verblehre.* Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis; Acta Societatis Linguisticae Upsaliensis, nova series, 1:3. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.

—. 1974. Réflexions sur le participe actif du sémitique. In *Actes du premier congrès international de linguistique sémitique et chamito-sémitique: Paris 16-19 juillet 1969*, ed. André Caquot and David Cohen, 195-202. Janua Linguarum, Series Practica, 159. The Hague, Paris: Mouton.

Segert, Stanislav. 1975. *Altaramäische Grammatik: mit Bibliographie, Chrestomathie und Glossar*. Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie.

—. 2002. Aramaic Poetry in the Old Testament. *ArOr* 70:65-79.

Seow, Choon Leong. 2003. *Daniel*. Westminster Bible Commentaries. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.

Stevenson, Wm. B. 1924. *Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Second ed. with an appendix on the numerals by J. A. Emerton published in 1962.]

Shepherd, Michael B. 2006. The Verbal System of Biblical Aramaic: A Distributional Approach. Ph.D. diss., Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, N.C.

—. 2008. *The Verbal System of Biblical Aramaic: A Distributional Approach*. Studies in Biblical Literature, 116. New York: Peter Lang.

Stefanovic, Zdravko. 1991. *The Aramaic of Daniel in the Light of Old Aramaic*. JSOTSup, 129. Sheffield: Academic Press.

Steinmann, Andrew. 2002. The Chicken and the Egg: A New Proposal for the Relationship between the *Prayer of Nabonidus* and the *Book of Daniel*. *RQ* 20:557-570.

Stinespring, W. F. 1962. The Active Infinitive with Passive Meaning in Biblical Aramaic. *JBL* 81:391-394.

Strack, Hermann Leberecht. 1905. *Grammatik des biblisch-Aramäischen: Mit den nach Handschriften berichtigten Texten und einem Wörterbuch*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichts'sche Buchhandlung.

Talmon, Shemaryahu. 1978. The Presentation of Synchroneity and Simultaneity in Biblical Narrative. In *Studies in Hebrew Narrative Art throughout the Ages*, eds. Joseph Heinemann and Shmuel Werses, 9-26. Scripta Hierosolymitana, 27. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University. [Reprinted in Talmon (1993), pp. 112-133.]

—. 1993. *Literary Studies in the Hebrew Bible: Form and Content. Collected Essays*. Jerusalem and Leiden: The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University and Brill.

Taylor, Richard A. 1994. *The Peshiṭta of Daniel*. Monographs of the Peshiṭta Institute Leiden, 7. Leiden, New York, Köln: Leiden: Brill.

Testen, David. 2000. Conjugating the "Prefixed Stative" Verbs of Akkadian. *JNES* 59:81-92.

Thacker, T. W. 1963. Compound Tenses Containing the Verb "Be" in Semitic and Egyptian. In *Hebrew and Semitic Studies: Presented to Godfrey Rolles Driver*, ed. Winton D. Thomas and W. D. McHardy, 156-71. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Thompson, S. A. and R. E. Longacre. 1985. Adverbial Clauses. In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description: Volume II: Complex Constructions*, ed. T. Shopen, 171-234. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Toews, Brian Gregory. 1993. A Discourse Grammar of the Aramaic in the Book of Daniel. Ph.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles.

Tropper, Josef. 1997. Lexikographische Untersuchungen zum Biblisch-Aramäischen. *JNSL* 23:105-128.

Van Rompay, Lucas. 1991. Some Reflections on the Use of Post-Predicative *hwā* in Classical Syriac. In *Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic Syntax: Presented to Professor J. Hoftijzer on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed.. K. Jongeling, H. L. Murre-van den Berg, and Lucas Van Rompay, 210-219. Leiden, New York, København, Köln: E.J. Brill.

Vendler, Zeno. 1957. Verbs and Times. *The Philosophical Review* 66:143-60.

Weinrich, Harald. 1964. *Tempus: Besprochene und erzählte Welt.* Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag.

Weninger, Stefan. 2000. On Performatives in Classical Ethiopic. *JSS* 45:91-101.

Wertheimer, Ada. 2002. Syriac Nominal Sentences. *JSS* 47:1-21.

Wesselius, Jan-Wim. 1988. Language and Style in Biblical Aramaic: Observations on the Unity of Daniel ii-vi. *VT* 38:194-209.

—. 2001. The Writing of Daniel. In *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, ed. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint, 2:291-310. Leiden: Brill.

—. 2005. The Literary Nature of the Book of Daniel and the Linguistic Character of Its Aramaic. *Aramaic Studies* 3:241-283.

Williams, James G. 1964. A Critical Note on the Aramaic Indefinite Plural of the Verb. *JBL* 83:180-182.

Woude, A. S. van der, ed. 1993. *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings.* BETL, 106. Leuven: Peeters.

Ziegler, Joseph, ed. 1954. *Susanna. Daniel. Bel et Draco.* Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum, 16, 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

LIST OF PASSAGES CITED AS EXAMPLES

LIST OF WORDS

The present index contains a list of words or phrases in primary source languages mentioned or discussed in this book, grouped by language. However, since it is obvious that the passages cited as examples (see index one) contain the words that occur in those passages, the said passages are excluded from this index, though the words occurring in the discussion of those passages are included.

A. Aramaic

1. Biblical Aramaic

2. General Aramaic

3. *Egyptian Aramaic*

אדין
  אדין 54
אמר
  אמר 45
הוה
  participle + הוה 89
  הוה *+ participle* 89

מבטחיה
  מבטחיה 15
  מפטחיה 15
מות
  ימות 15
פיא
  פיא 54

4. *Qumran Aramaic*

הוה
  הוה *+ participle* 89

5. *Targum Onkelos and Jonathan*

אית
  אית 97
אלף
  אלפא 143
בעה
  בעיא 143

הוה
  הוה *+ participle* 89
כד
  כד 49
תבר
  לאתברא 143

6. *Targum Neofiti*

אמר
  אמר 45

7. *Galilean Aramaic*

מן
  מן 49

8. *Babylonian Talmud*

כי
  כי 49

9. *Syriac*

10. *Neo-Aramaic*

B. Hᴇʙʀᴇᴡ

C. Aʀᴀʙɪᴄ

D. Aᴋᴋᴀᴅɪᴀɴ

E. Semitic

F. Greek

LIST OF AUTHORS

STUDIES IN
THE ARAMAIC INTERPRETATION
OF SCRIPTURE

1. STAALDUINE-SULMAN, E. VAN, *The Targum of Samuel*. 2002.
   ISBN 90 04 12164 1
2. FLESHER, P.V.M. (ed.), *Targum and Scripture*. Studies in Aramaic Translation and Interpretation in Memory of Ernest G. Clarke. 2002.
   ISBN 90 04 12677 5
3. BRADY, C.C.M., *Rabbinic Targum of Lamentations*. Vindicating God. 2003.
   ISBN 90 04 12163 3
4. MORTENSEN, B.P., *The Priesthood in Targun Pseudo-Jonathan*. Renewing the Profession. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14582 6
5. DRAY, C.A., *Translation and Interpretation in the Targun to the Book of Kings*. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14698 9
6. COOK, E.M., *A Glossary of Targum Onkelos*. According to Alexander Sperber's Edition. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 14978 6
7. HO, A. *The Targum of Zephaniah*. Manuscripts and Commentary. 2009.
   ISBN 978 90 04 17180 0
8. LI, T. *The Verbal System of the Aramaic of Daniel*. An Explanation in the Context of Grammaticalization. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17514 3