



Infinitive Absolute in Hispanic and Ladino Translations of Biblical Motion Verbs

El infinitivo absoluto en las traducciones hispánicas y ladinas de verbos de movimiento bíblicos

Ora (Rodrigue) Schwarzwald

Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel

ora.schwarzwald@biu.ac.il

ORCID: 0000-0001-9653-6958

Cómo citar este trabajo | How to cite this paper

Schwarzwald (Rodrigue), Ora. (2025). Infinitive Absolute in Hispanic and Ladino Translations of Biblical Motion Verbs. *Meldar: Revista internacional de estudios sefardíes*, 6, 95-122. <https://doi.org/10.46661/meldar.12178>

Abstract

This paper analyzes the biblical infinitive absolute (IA) of motion verbs in medieval Hispanic and post-medieval Judeo-Spanish (Ladino) Bible translations. The study examines eight verbs meaning 'go/walk', 'come', 'go out/leave', 'return', 'move', 'travel', 'run', and 'pass'. It explores the syntactic and semantic functions of IA in Hebrew and its translations. Syntactically, IA can be attached to a verb of the same root, to a different root, or to none. It functions as a modal intensifier verb, an imperative, and more. IA may precede, follow, or stand independently from a conjugated verb. The verb *halak* ('go/walk') exhibits significant variations in both Hebrew and its translations. Medieval Hispanic translations (E3, E5/E7, E19, Arragel) show greater variability in IA translation than post-medieval Ladino versions (Ferrara, Constantinople/Salonica), though E3 bears some resemblance to the latter. Despite their word-for-word nature, post-medieval Ladino translations display subtle differences in IA rendering. This paper explores these variations and their possible explanations.

Key words: Infinitive absolute; Bible translations; Spanish; Ladino.

Resumen

Este artículo analiza el infinitivo absoluto (IA) bíblico de los verbos de movimiento en las traducciones españolas medievales y en las judeoespañolas (ladinas) posmedievales de la Biblia. El estudio examina ocho verbos con los significados de 'ir/caminar', 'venir', 'salir/partir', 'volver', 'moverse', 'viajar', 'correr' y 'pasar'. Asimismo, explora las funciones sintácticas y semánticas del IA en hebreo y en sus traducciones. Desde el punto de vista sintáctico, el IA puede aparecer unido a un verbo de la misma raíz, de una raíz diferente o a ninguno. Puede funcionar como intensificador modal del verbo, como imperativo, entre otros usos. El IA puede preceder, seguir o aparecer de forma independiente respecto de un verbo conjugado. El verbo *halak* ('ir/caminar') presenta variaciones significativas tanto en hebreo como en sus traducciones. Las traducciones españolas medievales (E3, E5/E7, E19, Arragel) muestran una mayor variabilidad en la traducción del IA que las versiones ladinas posmedievales (Ferrara, Constantinopla/Salónica), aunque E3 presenta cierta semejanza con estas últimas. A pesar de su carácter literal o palabra por palabra, las traducciones ladinas posmedievales muestran diferencias sutiles en la manera de verter el IA. Este artículo examina estas variaciones y sus posibles explicaciones.

Palabras clave: infinitivo absoluto; traducciones bíblicas; español; ladino.

Recepción: 11.06.2025

Aceptación: 25.03.2026

Publicación: 15.12.2025

1. INTRODUCTION

The infinitive absolute (IA) is one of three biblical infinitives, alongside the simple infinitive and the infinitive construct (Kautzsch, 1910; Waltke and O'Connor, 1990; Joüon and Muraoka, 2011). The simple infinitive, prefixed with *l-*, functions as 'to' + verb (e.g., *li-šmor* 'to guard'). The infinitive construct generally appears with prepositions or pronominal suffixes (e.g., *be-šomr-am* 'while they were guarding'). The IA form of this verb is *šamor*.

Morphologically, IA depends on root type (strong vs. weak) and verb pattern (*binyan*).¹ Strong roots retain all consonants (e.g., *šamar* 'guarded', *li-šmor* 'to guard'), while weak roots lose some (e.g., *halak* 'went', *la-leket* 'to go'). IA primarily occurs in active verb patterns.

Previous research on IA in the Hebrew Bible has examined its syntax, semantics, and pragmatics (Goldenberg, 1971; Waltke and O'Connor, 1990; Kim, 2009; Callahan, 2010; Van der Merwe, 2013; Hatav, 2017, 2020, 2021). However, little research has focused on IA in biblical translations.

Recently, Enrique-Arias and Gerhalter (2026) studied IA in medieval and early post-medieval Spanish biblical translations, analyzing cases where IA occurs with a verb of the same root (e.g., *mot tamut* 'you will certainly die' → *morir morirás*, Gen 2:17). Their corpus includes 12 translations spanning the 13th-16th centuries, mostly Hebrew-based, except for two 13th-century Vulgate-derived versions. They observed that Spanish independently developed the literal IA structure (infinitive + verb) rather than adopting it from biblical translation.

This study focuses on IA in eight motion verbs, particularly *halak* ('go/walk'),² in medieval Hispanic and Jewish Ladino 16th-century translations. It compares translation techniques, literacy levels, syntactic structures, and IA functions across texts. It also examines stylistic elements in the Hebrew Bible and their impact on translations, distinguishing medieval Hispanic renderings from post-biblical Jewish diaspora versions.

¹ Biblical Hebrew has seven verb patterns (*binyanim*): *paʿal*, *niʿfal*, *piʿel*, *puʿal*, *hitpaʿel*, *hiʿfil*, *huʿfal* and several rare ones (Kautzsch, 1910: 116; Joüon and Muraoka, 2011: 114).

² The verb *halak* was not included in Enrique-Arias and Gerhalter's study (fn. 7), stating that the verb conveys a meaning of continuation of an action rather than emphatic intensification, based on Gesenius (1910: 467).

2. THE CORPUS

2.1. The translations

This study examines four 15th-century medieval Iberian translations and two 16th-century post-medieval Ladino (Judeo-Spanish) translations. Several medieval Hispanic translations were produced by Jewish translators under Christian supervision, though most translators remain unidentified. One exception is the Alba Bible, translated by Rabbi Moshe Arragel of Guadalajara under the supervision of Luis González de Guzmán (Schonfield, 1992; Pueyo Mena, 2008: 213-215). According to Littlefield (1992: xxiii), some translations were intended for Jewish audiences, others for Christian readers, while E3 and the Arragel Bible were designed for both.

The selected medieval Hispanic translations are E3, E19, E5/E7,³ and Arragel (AR). The manuscripts E3, E19, E5/E7 were found in the Escorial monastery, and were copied – along with Arragel and others – in the monumental project directed by Enrique-Arias and Pueyo Mena in *Corpus Biblia Medieval* (and later in *Corpus Biblias Hispánicas*). In this study, E3, E19, E5/E7 and AR are sourced from the *Corpus Biblia Medieval*,⁴ focusing on manuscripts considered the most Jewish in nature based on prior research. These translations also appear in Enrique-Arias and Gerhalter (2026) and are detailed in Pueyo Mena (2008), Enrique-Arias (2013), and Pueyo Mena and Enrique Arias (2013). Notably, E19 is incomplete, containing only the Pentateuch and First Prophets, with several missing chapters.⁵

Two Ladino⁶ (Judeo-Spanish) Bible translations were published in the mid-16th century, following the expulsion of Jews from Spain: the Constantinople-Salonica Bible (CS), written in Hebrew letters, and the Ferrara Bible (FB), in Latin letters. The Ladino translations analyzed here are extracted from Lazar's transliteration of CS and a copy of FB (Lazar, 1992; Lazar, 2000).

CS includes the 1547 Constantinople Pentateuch (CP), which also features a Judeo-Greek translation. Other Ladino translations – except Chronicles – were published in Constantinople and Salonica from the 16th century onward (Hacker, 1972, no. 144; Lazar, 2000; Cohen, 2021: 37-39), with the Ladino text written in Hebrew vocalized script alongside the Hebrew text.

³ The manuscript lacks the beginning chapters of Genesis.

⁴ *Corpus Biblia Medieval*, <https://corpus.bibliamedieval.es/>, was consulted from 2022 to 2025.

⁵ Only in 27 of the 68 examined verses below, does it show translations of IAs. In some cases, it is identical to E3.

⁶ Ladino is defined by scholars as the rigid Judeo-Spanish translations of liturgical texts from Hebrew (Sephiha, 1973: 39-74; Revah, 1970).

The Ferrara Bible (FB), published in 1553 in Latin letters, includes Bible translation without the Hebrew text (Hassán and Berenguer Amador, 1994). It was issued in both Jewish and Christian versions; this study focuses on the Jewish edition. Both versions are believed to have been authored by ex-conversos (*anusim*) who returned to Judaism, with only minor variations between them.⁷

2.2. The translated verbs

This study examines the translation of motion verbs in Biblical Hebrew, which can indicate the use of IA and reflect the strategies employed in medieval and post-medieval translations. Motion verbs form a distinct semantic category, widely discussed in linguistic literature. Numerous studies analyze the semantic, pragmatic, grammatical, and lexical aspects of these verbs, particularly ‘go’ and ‘come’ (e.g., Talmy, 1975; Fillmore, 1966, 1983; Langacker, 1986; Levin and Rappaport Hovav, 1992; Slobin, 1999; Morimoto, 2001; Cifuentes-Férez, 2009; Matlock, 2010; Shyldkrot, 2018; Papafragou and Selimis, 2023).⁸

The study investigates all IA forms of the following Hebrew motion verbs⁹: *halak* (‘go/walk’, ×45), *ba(?)* (‘come’, ×8), *yaša(?)*¹⁰ (‘go out/leave’, ×8), *šab* (‘return’, ×7), *naš* (‘move’, ×2), *nasaš* (‘travel’, ×1), *raš* (‘run’, ×1), and *šabar* (‘pass’, ×1). These 73 forms appear in 68 verses, as *nasaš*, *raš*, and *šab* co-occur with other motion verbs. Notably, IA forms of *šaf* (‘fly’), *haša* (‘cross’), and *šaḥa* (‘swim’) do not appear in the Bible. The verbs *ba*, *halak*, *šab*, and *yaša* rank among the most frequently used in the Bible, according to Brooke Lester (2011),¹¹ making them representative of IA usage in translations.

Occurrences of these IA forms were examined in medieval Hispanic translations and compared to post-medieval Ladino translations. The following sections describe their distribution.

⁷ One notable difference arises from the interpretation of the Hebrew word *šalmā*, translated as *moça* [mosa] ‘young woman’ in the Jewish FB and as *virgen* ‘virgin’ in Isaias 7:14 in the Christian one (Orfali, 1994: 232).

⁸ There are many more studies on motion verbs in Hebrew, e.g. Henkin (1998), Dattner (2008), Botosh (2021), Trommer, Gvura and Manor (2022).

⁹ I use the following special conventions for transcribing the Hebrew words: *ʔ* = alef (only when followed by a vowel; otherwise, unmarked), *b* = bet, *ḅ* = bet rafa (phonetic *v*), *h* = he (only when pronounced), *w* = vav, *ḥ* = het (like Spanish *j* in *hijo*), *ṭ* = tet, *k* = kaf, *ḵ* = kaf rafa, *s* = samekh, *ʕ* = ayin, *š* = tsadi, *q* = qof, *š* = shin, *ś* = sin, *ə* = shwa mobile. The transcription of Ladino follows Spanish orthography, except for *ǰ* representing phonetic *ǰ* in CS (Spanish *j* or *g* before *e* and *i*). A list of grammatical abbreviations is listed before the references.

¹⁰ Because *ʔ* (*aleph*) and *h* (*he*) are quiescent at the end of words in all cases, they will be omitted from here on in the verbs *ba(?)* and *yaša(?)*, and in other occurrences of final *he*.

¹¹ Each of these verbs occur in more than 1000 forms in the Bible.

3. THE FINDINGS

3.1. The translations of IA

Table 1 presents the number of IA forms translated across the various versions.

Hebrew – Spanish	E3	E19 ¹²	E5/E7 ¹³	AR	FB	CS
<i>ba</i> – <i>venir, entrar (haber)</i>	8	3	5	5	8	8
<i>yāša</i> – <i>salir, ir</i>	5	3	2	2	7	7
<i>šab</i> – <i>tornar, volver (convertir)</i>	4	1	5	3	8	7
<i>naš</i> – <i>mover/esmover, mecer, desvariar</i>			2	1	2	2
<i>nasaš</i> – <i>mover</i>	1		1	1	1	1
<i>raš</i> – <i>correr</i>				1	1	1
<i>šabar</i> – <i>pasar</i>	1	1			1	1
<i>halak</i> – <i>andar, ir (moverse, ajuntarse)</i>	43	15	32	30	40	41 ¹⁴
Total	62	23	47	43	68¹⁵	68

Table 1: The number of IA translations.

The post-medieval FB and CS translations are the only versions that consistently translate all IA forms (see Table 3 below and the discussion). They also employ a single verb for each Hebrew motion verb: *venir* for *ba* ('come'), *mover/esmover*¹⁶ for *naš* ('move'), and *andar* for *halak* ('go'). In contrast, medieval translations vary in their renderings, incorporating synonyms such as *entrar* ('enter') for *ba*, *volver*, and once *convertir* for *šab*, *mecer* or *desvariar* for *naš*, and *ir* for *halak*. Some medieval versions also occasionally use the copulative verb *haber* ('have'). The use of *moverse* and *ajuntarse* occur only once in Jud 9:8 instead of 'go' in E19 and E5/E7, respectively.

Not all IA forms are represented in medieval translations. E19 translates 23 out of 27 IA cases (85 %), while E3 translates 62 out of 68 (91 %). E5/E7 (47/65 cases, 72 %), and AR (43/68 cases, 63 %) exhibit even lower translation rates, indicating that IA was not consistently rendered in medieval versions.

¹² Translations are missing in about 60 % of the verses examined.

¹³ Translations are missing in 4 verses because there is no translation of the beginning of Genesis.

¹⁴ One example does not exist because there is no Ladino translation of the book of Chronicles.

¹⁵ In one case IA was translated by a conjugated verb, *anduvo*, in the translation of *halok le-hargiš-o Yisraʔel* (Jer 31:1).

¹⁶ CS and FB use the derivative of *mover*, *esmover*, in Ps 109:10, and CS uses it also in Is 24:20 for the verb *naš*.

The most common translation method involved the use of either the gerundive or the infinitive. In certain constructions, the imperative form was employed (see 3.4.2.1.). Action nouns or adjectives derived from verbs were rarely used, appearing only in E5/E7 and AR (e.g., *venida* for *venir/viniendo*, *salida* for *salir/saliendo*, *movida* for *mover/moviendo*, *andado* for *andar/andando*). The next section examines the word order of IA in the translations.

3.1. The word order of IA used in translations

A key question in analyzing IA translations is whether they follow the biblical word order or deviate from it. Table 2 summarizes these deviations.

Hebrew – Spanish	E3	E19	E5/E7 ¹⁷	AR	FB	CS
<i>ba</i> – <i>venir, entrar (haber)</i>	1	1	4	1	2	
<i>yasa</i> – <i>salir, ir</i>			1			1
<i>šab</i> – <i>tornar, volver (convertir)</i>						
<i>naš</i> – <i>mover/esmover, mecer, desvariar</i>				1		
<i>nasaš</i> – <i>mover</i>					1	
<i>raš</i> – <i>correr</i>						
<i>šabar</i> – <i>pasar</i>						
<i>halak</i> – <i>andar, ir (moverse, juntarse)</i>	1		4	10	1	
Total	2	1	9	12	4	1

Table 2: The number of deviations from the biblical word order.

E3 deviates twice from the biblical order.¹⁸ In Genesis 37:10, the copulative verb (*haber*) precedes the infinitive (*venir*) instead of the conjugated verb ‘to come’, differing from the Hebrew IA-first structure. In Psalm 126:6, the translation introduces a conjugated verb (in 1st person rather than in 3rd) before two gerundives, altering the original sequence in which the conjugated verb occurs between the two IA forms. Despite these two cases, E3 largely preserves biblical order in cases IA occurs next to another verb.

E19 exhibits the same word order deviation as E3 in Genesis 37:10.

E5/E7 deviates nine times from the biblical structure.¹⁹ Although it obtains the words as in Hebrew, the word order is rearranged. For example, in Leviticus 14:48, *venir* appears before *entrar* (*viniere aentrar* ‘he’ll come to enter’), reversing the Hebrew IA-first structure. In

¹⁷ Translations do not exist in 2 verses because the beginning of Genesis is missing.

¹⁸ In the Spanish translations, I copy consonantal *u* by *v* and the letters *j* and *y* by *i* or *y* as in conventional Modern Spanish way. The sign & ‘and’ in the translations is represented here by *e*.

¹⁹ Lev 14:48, 2Sam 5:10, 16:13, Jer 35:13, 36:29, 38:17, Hab 2:3, Ps 126:6 (×2).

Jeremiah 35:13, IA is rendered as an imperative. It also comes with additional verbs (*anda e ve e di* 'go and come and say!', instead of 'go and say').²⁰

AR deviates 12 times from the word order of the biblical text, often paraphrasing it.²¹ For example, in Judges 14:9, the conjugated verb (*iva lo*) is inserted between two gerundives, (*en andando ivalo comiendo* 'while going he was going eating it' unlike the Hebrew biblical order '[he] went on, eating and going'). In 2Sam 3:16, the conjugated verb is moved to the end of the phrase, omitting the use of go.IA, thus altering the structure (*E su marido con ella llorando iva* 'And her husband with her crying went' instead of 'And her husband went with her, going and crying').

FB deviates four times, mainly by placing the gerundive before the conjugated verb, as seen in Daniel 11:10, 13 (*viniendo verna* 'coming he will come'). This differs from Hebrew, where the conjugated verb precedes IA. A similar inversion occurs in 2Kg 5:11 (*saliendo saldra* 'leaving he will leave') and in Jer 41:6 (*andando andava* 'going he went') where the Hebrew version had the verb first and IA second.

CS deviates only in 2Kg 5:11 by placing the infinitive first followed by a conjugated verb, instead of the verb followed by IA (*salir salra* 'to leave he will leave').

Overall, most medieval translations attempt to maintain Hebrew word order when IA is represented. However, E5/E7 and AR exhibit the most deviations, often paraphrasing rather than translating literally. In contrast, E3, FB, and CS remain more faithful to the biblical structure, with FB's few deviations largely due to internal consistency in translating *ba* ('come').

The next sections will compare post-medieval translations before assessing IA representation across all translations.

3.3. Comparison of post-medieval translations FB and CS

Previous studies indicate that the Ladino translations of FB and CS often resemble each other due to their calque nature, maintaining Hebrew syntactic structures. However, they differ in these key aspects: (a) Orthography: FB uses Latin letters, while CS is written in Hebrew script; (b) Use of Hebrew Words: CS includes more Hebrew words than FB (*šofar* vs. *corneta*, *ḥayot* vs. *alimañas*); (c) CS contains more Judeo-Spanish vocabulary, while FB leans toward standard Spanish (*ungir* vs. *untar*, *endurecer* vs. *enfortecer*); (d) Grammatical

²⁰ See 3.4.2.1. below.

²¹ Gen 31:30, 37:10, Jud 14:9, 1Sam 6:12, 19:23, 2Sam 3:16, 13:19, 2Kg 2:11, Is 3:16, 24:20, Jer 23:14, 50:4.

forms: FB uses more standardized Spanish forms while CS uses Judeo-Spanish ones (Sephaha 1973:39-74; Revah 1970; Schwarzwald 1989:6-15, 2010, 2012).

CS and FB vary in the translation of IA, as presented in Table 3.

Hebrew IA	CS infinitive	FB infinitive	FB gerundive	CS Imperative	FB Preterit	FB Preterit
<i>bo</i>	venir (8)	venir (2)	viniendo (4)			
<i>yašo</i>	salir (7)	salir (2)	saliendo (5)			
<i>šob</i>	tornar (7)	tornar (1)	tornando (6)			
<i>noaš</i>	esmoer (2)		moviendo (1)			
<i>nasoaf</i>	mover (1)		moviendo (1)			
<i>*roš (rašo)</i>	correr (1)		corriendo (1)			
<i>šabor</i>	pasar (1)		pasando (1)			
<i>halok</i>	andar (32) ²² andad ²³ (1)	andar (3)	andando (27)	anda (9)	anda (13)	anduvo (1)
Total	58 (+1)	8	47	9	13	1

Table 3: IA forms in FB and CS translations.

CS overwhelmingly prefers infinitives (58 + 1 cases), whereas FB favors gerundives (47 cases). In nine verses, both translate IA as an imperative. Only in one case does FB use the preterit *anduvo* instead of representing IA (Jer 31:1). Despite their similarities, FB and CS align in only 8 % of IA translations, highlighting systematic differences between them.

These findings emphasize that although post-medieval translations preserved IA representation more consistently than medieval versions, they maintained distinct translation strategies.

3.4. Medieval and post-medieval translations compared

As Enrique-Arias and Gerhalter (2026) note, Hebrew IA appears alongside a conjugated verb of the same root in 59 % of occurrences. In my study of motion verbs, this ratio is 68 %. The remaining 32 % of IA cases – primarily involving *halak* ('go'), with isolated instances of *raš* ('run') and *šab* ('return') – are discussed in section 3.4.2. and 3.4.3. Section 3.4.1. examines IA occurrences with verbs other than *halak* 'go', while 3.4.2. focuses on *halak* itself.

²² The book of Chronicles was not translated into Ladino in CS, hence the example from 1Chr 11:9 is missing.

²³ The verb is copied as *andad* instead of *andar* in Jer 35:2, perhaps because of the resemblance of the Hebrew letters *dalet* (ד) and *resh* (ר).

3.4.1. IA with Conjugated Verb of the Same Root (Except 'go')

The translation of IA varies across translations. In the case of *ba* ('come'), the translations use *venir* or *entrar*, and rarely *haber venir*, rather than *venir*. Of the eight occurrences of the verb *ba* 'come', in six verses IA preceded a future form in the Hebrew Bible.²⁴ In Genesis 37:10, Hebrew version has *ha-bo nabo* (Question mark-come.IA we shall come) 'Shall we indeed come?' The translations are: *si avemos de venir* 'if we have to come' (E3, E19, AR), *commo avenir avemos* 'as to come we have' (E5/E7), while FB and CS translate literally as *si venir veniremos/vernemos* 'if to come we shall come'. In Habakuk 2:3, AR, and CS follow the biblical structure using the infinitive (*venir verna*), FB represents IA with a gerund, and E5/E7 rephrase it as *venida ha de venir* 'coming has to come.'

In two verses of the verb *ba*, IA follows the conjugated verb (Daniel 11:10, 13).²⁵

Examples (1-2) demonstrate the various translations of these cases.

<p>(1) H: <i>u-ba</i> and-come.INV.PST3SG 'and he shall come on'</p> <p>E3: <i>E verna viniendo</i> 'and he'll come coming.GRN'</p> <p>E5/E7: <i>E entrara</i> 'and he'll enter'</p> <p>AR: <i>E de venida verna</i> 'and of coming he'll come'</p> <p>FB: <i>y viniendo verna</i> 'and coming.GRN he'll come'</p> <p>CS: <i>y verna venir</i> 'and he'll come come.INF'</p>	<p><i>bo</i> (Dan 11:10) come.IA</p>	<p>(2) H: <i>ya-bo</i> 3M.SG-come-FUT 'he shall come on'</p> <p>E3: <i>entrara entrando</i> 'he'll enter enter.GRN'</p> <p>E5/E7: <i>verrná</i> 'he'll come'</p> <p>AR: <i>verna de venida</i> 'he'll come of coming'</p> <p>FB: <i>viniendo verna</i> 'come.GRN he'll come'</p> <p>CS: <i>verna venir</i> 'he'll come come.INF'</p>	<p><i>bo</i> (Dan 11:13) come.IA</p>
--	--	--	--

These examples highlight that only CS strictly follows the biblical order, while E3 and FB adhere to it with minor deviations. Other medieval translations diverge in word order, verb choice, and the use of gerund vs. infinitive forms.

²⁴ Gen 37:10, Lev 14:48, 1Sam 9:6, Jer 36:29, Hab 2:3, Ps 126:6. E19 is missing in many cases because of the incomplete text.

²⁵ See section 3.2. above, regarding the deviation of the word order in FB. Most English translations were retrieved from The Jerusalem Bible 1917.

E3 uses the same constructions of future tense followed by gerundive to represent IA, all be it in different verbs, *venir* ‘come’ in (1) and *entrar* ‘enter’ in (2). E5/E7 ignores IA and uses the future form, *entrará* ‘will enter’ in (1) and *verrná* ‘will come’ in (2). AR rearranges the order, placing the noun *venida* before *verrná*, *de venida verrná* in (1), and *verrná de venida* in (2), where the noun *venida* echoes IA preceded by *de* ‘of.’ FB does not follow the biblical order in these two cases and uses gerundive forms followed by the conjugated verb *verna* ‘will come’, as in the six other cases of this verb where IA precedes the verb. Only CS consistently translates the verb *verrná* followed by the infinitive form *venir* which represents IA, as in the Hebrew structure. Despite their proximity in the Hebrew text, these two verses reveal variation in medieval translations, possibly reflecting stylistic preferences to avoid repetition. In contrast, post-medieval translations remain consistent. As previously noted, FB follows the pattern of six other ‘to come’ translations where go.IA precedes the conjugated verb.

For *ṣabar* (‘pass’) and *yaša* (‘leave’), E3 and CS generally mirror the biblical structure, using an infinitive for IA followed by a future verb, but not the other translations. For example, in 2Sam 17:16, FB employs the gerundive and retains word order, while E5/E7 and AR often omit IA, replacing it with adverbs or reinterpreting the phrase, e.g., *que pase allende* ‘that pass forward’ (E5/E7) and *e passate adelante* ‘and you pass forward’ (AR) instead of ‘and-also pass you’ll pass’. In 2Sam 18:2, E3, E19 and CS share the same translation: *salir saldré/salré* ‘to leave I’ll leave’, and FB uses the gerundive for IA (*saliendo saldré*) while E5/E7 translates: *quiero yo salir* ‘I want I to leave’, and AR: *quiero con vos otros ir* ‘I want with you.pl to go’ where the reflection of the verb *salir* ‘leave’ is missing altogether.

E3 and CS share the same infinitive *salir* for the translation of IA, and a future form of the same verb follows it (*saldré, salré*).²⁶ FB uses the gerundive for IA and the same word order and conjugated verb as they appear in Hebrew. E5/E7 and AR interpret the expression: E5/E7 uses the verb *salir* like the others, but only AR uses the verb *ir* ‘go’, but they deviate from the syntactic structure of Hebrew by avoiding the use the IA forms.

The example in Gen 8:7 highlights a case where two IA forms attached to one conjugated verb convey repetition (*wa-y-eše yašo wa-šob* ‘and it [the raven] went forth to and fro’, which AR alters significantly. It reinterprets it as ‘and it left and did not return anymore’ (*e salló e mas non tornó*) opposite the original meaning, omits the first IA and turns the second one into a conjugated verb.

Overall, post-medieval translations consistently reflect IA, whereas medieval translations – especially E5/E7 and AR – frequently rephrase or omit it. Among medieval

²⁶ The discussion of the future forms is beyond the scope of this paper. The various forms represent the variations in the inflection across time (Penny, 2002: 152-240).

texts, E3 is closer to post-medieval translations but still diverges syntactically and morphologically.

While Hebrew IA forms sometimes intensify verb meaning, in other cases, they appear tautological. Post-medieval translations rigidly adhere to IA structures, whereas medieval ones show flexibility. Among medieval versions, E3 closely resembles post-medieval translations but differs in morphology and syntax. E5/E7 and AR frequently rephrase, omit, or reinterpret IA, sometimes altering meaning.

3.4.2. *The translations of go. IA*

With 45 instances, IA of *halak* 'go' appears in various syntactic constructions, categorized as follows:

1. Go.IA + inverted perfect of a different root (*halok wə-ʔamatra*) (×13)
2. Conjugated *go* with go.IA and another IA (*holek halok wə-taqaof*) (×10)
3. Conjugated *go* with go.IA (*halok halku*) (×6)
4. Conjugated *go* with go.IA and another conjugated verb (*holek halok uboke*) (×6)
5. Conjugated verb + go.IA + another IA (*wayisaʕ halok wənasoaʕ*) (×3)
6. IA of different roots + go.IA + complementizer (*naʔof wəhalok baʕeqer*) (×2)
7. Conjugated *go* verb + go.IA + adjective (*wayelek halok warab*) (×2)
8. Miscellaneous cases (×3)

3.4.2.1. Go.IA + Inverted perfect of a different root

This Hebrew construction consists of go.IA (*halok*) followed by a connective particle and an inverted perfect – a past tense verb form referring to the future – always in the second person and from a different root. It appears 13 times with the following verbs: *say* (×5), *talk* (×2), *call* (×2), *buy* (×2), *wash* (×1), and *stand* (×1).²⁷ These instances occur in divine commands delivered by the prophets Gad, Elisha, Isaiah, and Jeremiah. The inverted perfect always addresses a singular subject required to perform the action.

Post-medieval translations render *halok* as *anda* (imperative of *andar* 'go'),²⁸ while medieval translations, especially AR, use either *ve* (imperative of *ir* 'go') or *vete*, often next to *anda*.

²⁷ These are the verses: 2Sam 24:12, 2Kg 5:10, Is 38:5, Jer 2:2, 3:12, 13:1, 17:19, 19:1, 28:13, 34:2, 35:2, 35:13, 39:16.

²⁸ Except CS in Jer 2:2, 3:12, and 39:16 which uses *andar*, and Jer 35:2 which uses *andad* (see Table 3, fn. 24).

For the second person inverted perfect verbs, most translations use the future (*hablarás* ‘talk’, *dirás* ‘say’, *comprarás* ‘buy’, *estarás* ‘stand’), though E5/E7 and sometimes AR prefer imperatives (*di*, *pregona*, *conpra*, *parate*). *Wə-raḥaštá* (‘wash’, 2Kg 5:10) is rendered variously: *lávate* (‘wash yourself!’) in E3 and E5/E7, *bañar* (‘bath’) in AR, and *lavarteas* (‘you should have washed yourself’) in FB and CS.

This construction of ‘go.IA + inverted perfect verb’ is most prevalent in *Jeremiah* (10 of 13 occurrences), aligning with other stylistic markers of the book (Hoffman, 2001: 46).

3.4.2.2. Conjugated go with go.IA and another IA

In ten verses the conjugated verb *halak* ‘go’ appears alongside go.IA and another IA verb of a different root. These second IA verbs include *taqaš* ‘blow (a horn)’ (Jos 6:9), *ʔakal* ‘eat’ (Jud 14:9), *gaša* ‘moo’ (1Sam 6:12), *baqa* ‘cry’ (2Sam 3:16, Ps 126:6, Jer 50:4), *diber* ‘talk’ (2Kg 2:11), and *tafaf* ‘walk mincingly’ (Is 3:16), *gadal* ‘increase’ (2Sam 5:10, 1Chr 11:9).²⁹

In seven verses the construction starts with the conjugated verb. In two cases, go.IA appears first, and the conjugated verb comes at the end (Is 3:16, Jer 50:4). In one verse, the conjugated verb appears between the IAs (Ps 126:6). In four verses AR ignores go.IA, while E5/E7 ignores it in two verses. The other translations relate to both IAs.

Example (3) from Jos 6:9, shows the variance in the translations of the relevant structure.

- (3) H: *wə-ha-məʔasef holek ʔaḥarey ha-ʔaron halok wə-taqaš b-a-šofar-ot*
 and-the-rearguard go after the-ark go.IA and-blow.IA with-the horn-s
 ‘And the rearward went after the ark, [the priests] blowing with the horns continually’
- E3: *E el recogedor iba tras el arca andando e tocando con.las cornetas*
 ‘And the withdrawer went after the ark go.GRN and play.GRN with.the horns’
- E19: *E los que andavan en.la rreguarda andavan enpos de la arca andando*
 ‘And those that went in.the back.guard went after the ark go.GRN
 e *taniendo* con.las bozinas
 and play.GRN with.the horns’
- E5/E7: *E los que andavan enla rreguarda andavan enpos de la arca*
 ‘And those that went in.the back.guard went after the ark
andavan e tañian las bozinas
 went and played the horns’

²⁹ See discussion above regarding word order.

AR: *E la reguarda ivan en pos del archa **taniendo** e **andando** con.las bozinas*
 ‘And the backguard went after the ark play.GRN and go.GRN with.the horns’

FB: *y el apañan andan empos la arca **andando** y **tañiendo** con cornetas*
 ‘and the collector go after the ark go.GRN and play.GRN with horns’

CS: *y el apañan andan tras de la arca **andar** y **tañer** con los šofarot*
 ‘And the collector go after the ark go.INF and play.INF with the horns’

Most translations render go.IA and play.IA as gerunds (*andando, tañendo*) (E3, E19, AR, FB). E5/E7 uses the imperfect preterit (*andavan, tañían*), and CS uses the infinitive (*andar, tañer*).

All versions maintain the original order of verbs except AR, which reverses their order (*tañendo, andando*), E3 and AR translations use *ir* (*ival/ivan* ‘went-SG/PL’) for the conjugated verb ‘go’, while post-medieval FB and CS and E19 use *andar*. Noticeable are the lexical variations in the translations of *ʔaharey* ‘after’ – *tras, empos/enpos*, and *šofarot* ‘horns’ – *cornetas, bozinas, šofarot*.

The use of *go* with go.IA conveys continuation, with the second IA verb carrying the main action (*blowing continuously, crying, mooing, increasing, etc.*). The continuation meaning in this structure parallels other *go* + go.IA constructions discussed later.

Word order is kept in all the translations except AR, which puts the verb first in Jer 50:4 and ignores go.IA in four other cases. The IAs are represented by the gerundive forms, except for CS that opts for the infinitive. The medieval translations use the verb *ir* (*fue* ‘went’) or *andar* for the conjugated verb *go* when they do translate it, while FB and CS use only *andar*. E5/E7 rarely ignores IAs in this structure. FB and CS translate the Hebrew present tense forms by the apocopated participial form, *andan* in Jos 6:9 and with the plural ending *andantes* in 2Kg 2:11.³⁰

3.4.2.3. Conjugated *go* with go.IA

This structure resembles most of the other motion verbs discussed in section 3.4.1., but only in six verses does the conjugated verb *go* occur with go.IA. In four verses IA precedes the conjugated verb and in two the conjugated verb precedes it.³¹ Here is an example where IA precedes the conjugated verb.

³⁰ Apocopated participial forms are common in Ladino translation of the Hebrew present tense, e.g., *andan* for *anda* ‘go.PRS3SG’, *dicien* for *dize* ‘says.PRS3SG’, *aborrecientes* for *aborrecen* ‘hate.PRS.PL’.

³¹ The four cases occur in Gen 31:30, Jud 4:9, 9:8, Jer 37:9; the two cases are: 2Sam 3:24, Zac 8:21.

- (4) H: *halok halk-u ha-ʕeṣ-im li-mšoaḥ ʕal-eyhem meleḵ* (Jud 9: 8)
 go.IA went-PL the-tree-s to-anoint on-them king
 ‘The trees went forth on a time to anoint a king over them’
- E3: *fueron-se los lennos a unguir sobre ellos rrey*
 ‘went.PL-RFL the woods to anoint on them king’
- E19: *movieron-se los arboles para ungir sobre si rrey*
 ‘moved.PL-RFL the trees to anoint on them king’
- E5/E7: *E ayuntaron se los arboles para ungir sobre si rrey*
 ‘and joined RFL the trees to anoint on them king’
- AR: *asi es que los fustes fueron a ungir sobrellos rey*
 ‘so (it) is that the woods went to anoint on.them king’
- FB: *Andando anduvieron los arboles para ungir sobre ellos rey*
 ‘go.GRN went the trees to anoint on them king’
- CS: *Andar anduvieron los arboles por untar sobre ellos rey*
 ‘go.INF went the trees to anoint on them king’

In all the medieval translations there is no mention of IA; instead, they all use a simple verb rather than the IA-verb construction: *fueronse*, *movieronse*, *ajuntaron*, and *fueron*. E3 and AR use the verb *ir* ‘go’ for *halak*, unlike other medieval structures that prefer *andar*. E5/E7 adds the connective particle *e*, absent in the Hebrew text, while AR includes *asy es que* meaning ‘so that’s that’ at the verse’s beginning.

Post-medieval translations adhere to the Hebrew structure, expressing IA with an infinitive (CS) or gerundive (FB). CS uniquely uses *untar* instead of *ungir* ‘anoint’.

In this category, the medieval translations rarely translate IAs: E3 represents it four times out of six: *andar anduviste*, *ir ire*, *se fue yendo*, *vamos andando*, while others do so less frequently (E5/E7: *andar anduviste*, *ir yo contigo ire*, *vamos a.ir*; AR: *yo ir iria*, *vamos vayamos*).³² Post-medieval translation maintain IA forms with gerundive in FB or infinitive in CS, but with different conjugated forms and different word order: *andando andamos* ‘go.GRN let’s go’ in FB vs. *andaremos andar* ‘we will go go.INF’ in CS in Zac 8:21. Elsewhere, both FB and CS follow the Hebrew word order using *andar* with gerundive (FB) or infinitive (CS).

Although *halak* appears where IA occurs with a conjugated verb of the same root (also seen in 3.4.2.2., 3.4.2.4., and 3.4.2.7.), these instances are fewer than other occurrences of *halak*. These cases should have been the most frequent per Enrique-Arias and Gerhalter

³² E19 occurs in two verses. In Jud 9:8 it uses the verb *movieronse* ‘moved themselves’ instead of *ir* or *andar* without representing IA, while in Jud 4:9 the expression is represented by *ir yo ire* ‘to go I’ll go’ with reference to IA.

(2026), where IA appears with the same root, supported by findings in 3.4.1. Other verbs, such as *ba* ‘come’, *yaša* ‘leave’, and *šabar* ‘move’, align with this pattern. However, in this section, *halak* ‘go’ is a minority case, while in other constructions, IA forms are more prevalent.

These examples and others in this category show that medieval translations generally ignore IA forms treating the consecutive verb as the primary predicative form. Consequently, the modal meaning in Hebrew is often lost in the translation (Callahan, 2010).

3.4.2.4. Conjugated *go* with *go.IA* and another conjugated verb

This construction, like 3.4.2.2., features a conjugated verb *go* followed by *go.IA* and another conjugated verb in six verses.³³ The other verbs include *taqaš* ‘blow (a horn)’, *hitnabe* ‘prophesy’, *zašaq* ‘shout’, *baka* ‘cry’, *qarab* ‘approach’, and *qilel* ‘curse.’ An example is presented in (5).

(5) H: *wa-y-elek halok wa-y-itnabe* (1Sam 19:23)
 And-3-go.INV.FUT *go.IA* and-3-prophesied.INV.FUT
 ‘and he went on, and prophesied’

E3, E19: *E andudo andando e profetizando*
 ‘And he went *go.GRN* and *prophesy.GRN*’

E5/E7: *E fue yendo e profetizando*
 ‘And he went *go.GRN* and *prophesy.GRN*’

AR: *E en yendo yva prophetizando*
 ‘And while *go.GRN* he went *prophesy.GRN*’

FB: *y anduvo andando y prophetizo*
 ‘And he went *go.GRN* and *prophesies*’

CS: *y anduvo andar y profetizo*
 ‘And he went *go.INF* and *prophesies*’

All the medieval translations use the gerundive forms both for *go.IA* and for the second conjugated verb, except AR in Jer 41:6 which does not refer to *go.IA*, and uses the phrase *e iva llorando* ‘and he went on crying’, for the Hebrew expression *holek halok uboke* ‘(and Ishmael the son of Nethaniah) went forth, weeping all along as he went’. E19 uses the form *andantes* once in Jos 6:13, like FB and CS, for the translation of *holkim* ‘go.3PL’.

³³ Jos 6:13, 1Sam 19:23, 2Sam 13:19, 16:13, 18:25, Jer 41:6.

In Gen 26:13, *gadal* ('grow') is rendered differently: *crecer*, *engrandecer*, and *pujar*. E3 and FB use gerundives but with lexical variation: *creciendo* vs. *engrandeciendo*. E5/E7 omits the first IA and paraphrases: *e fue cabo adelante engrandesciendo* ('and went finally forward growing'). AR uses synonyms: *iva mas creciendo e pujando* ('went more growing and raising'). CS deviates by using an infinitive for the first IA and an apocopated present participle: *engrandeciense* ('grows oneself').

3.4.2.6. IA of different roots followed by go.IA and a complementizer

In two verses (Jer 7:9 and 23:14), the IA form of the verb *halak* 'go' (*halok*) appears at the end of a series of IA verbs, followed by a complementizer. Below is the second example:

(7) H: *u-bi-nbiḏey yerušalayim raḏi-ti šašarura naḏof*
 And-in-prophets.CNS Jerusalem saw-PST.1SG scandal commit adultery.IA
wə-halok b-a-šeqer (Jer 23: 14)
 and-go.IA in-the-lie
 'But in the prophets of Jerusalem I have seen a horrible thing: They commit adultery, and walk in lies'

E3: *En.los profetas de iherusalem vide negregura fornicar e*
 'In.the prophets of Jerusalem I saw wickedness commit adultery.INF and
andar en.la falsedad
 go.INF in.the falsity'

E5/E7: *En.las prophetas de iherusalem vi escureza fornicar e*
 'In.the prophets of Jerusalem I saw darkness commit adultery.INF and
andar en falsedat
 go.INF in falsity'

AR: *E en.los prophetas de jerusalem vi viscosidat e adulterio*
 'And in.the prophets of Jerusalem I saw viscosity and commit adultery.INF
e en mentira andar
 and in lie go.INF'

FB: *Y en prophetas de Yerusalaïm vide fealdad fornicando y*
 'And in prophets of Jerusalem I saw ugliness commit adultery.GRN and
andando en falsedad
 go.GRN in falsity'

CS: *Y en profetas de Yerušalaim vide negrura fornicar y*
 'And in prophets of Jerusalem I saw wickedness commit adultery.INF and
andar con la falsedad
 go.INF with the falsity'

The AR translation uses the infinitive only for the final verb, translating the preceding one as an abstract noun (*adulterio* ‘adultery’). E3, E5/E7, and CS employ infinitive forms for both verbs, while FB uses the gerundive forms.

In Jer 7:9, AR treats IA verbs as regular conjugated verbs, whereas E3, E5/E7, and CS use infinitives, and FB uses gerundives. Because the Hebrew verse starts with the Y/N question particle *ha-*, E3 inserts *si pensades* ‘if you think’ before the series of infinitive forms, while AR uses *o si vos esta en razon que* ‘or if it is reasonable to you that’ followed by conjugated verbs in the second person. This suggests that the translators of E3 and AR felt the IA forms alone were insufficient for understanding the verse, prompting them to add introductory phrases. As before, the word order is not kept in AR.

3.4.2.7. Conjugated go with go.IA and an adjective of another root

Only two verses fit this category (Jud 4:24 and 1Sam 14:19). This pattern is like 3.4.2.4., but instead of a verb of another root, go.IA is followed by an adjective.

(8) H: *wa-t-elek yad bney yiśraʔel halok wə-qaša* (Jud 4:24)

And-2.F-go.INV.FUT hand.CNS sons.CNS Israel go.IA and-hard.ADJ.F

‘And the hand of the children of Israel prevailed more and more’

E3: *E fue el poderio de.los hijos de ysrrael andando e endureſciendo*

‘And went the power of.the children of Israel go.GRN and harden.GRN’

E19: *E andovo el poder de.los hijos de ysrrael andando e endureſciendo*

‘And went the strength of.the children of Israel go.GRN and harden.GRN’

E5/E7: *E andudo el poder de.los hijos de ysrrael andando e endureſciendo*

‘And went the power of.the children of Israel go.GRN and harden.GRN’

AR: *E desde adelante fue el poderio de.los hijos de israel todavia*

‘And from there forward was the power of.the children of Israel still

mas fuerte

more strong’

FB: *Y anduvo mano de hijos de Ysrael andando y endureciendo*

‘And went hand of children of Israel go.GRN and harden.GRN’

CS: *Y anduvo poder de hijos de Yiśrāʔel andar y enfortecer*

‘And went power of children of Israel go.INF and strengthen.INF’

All translations except AR treat the adjective *qaša* ‘hard’ as an IA, translating it as gerundives, *endureciendo* ‘hardening’, or infinitive in CS, as *enfortecer* ‘to harden’. AR is the only translation that renders it as an adjective (*fuerte* ‘strong’).

In 1Sam 14:19, translations of *warab* (‘and numerous’) vary. E3, E19, and AR use gerundive forms (*creciendo* ‘growing’ and *multiplicando* ‘multiplying’), FB translates it as a verb (*y muchiguavase* ‘it multiplied’), CS uses an infinitive (*mochiguar*), and E5/E7 interprets the phrase as *e ivan fuyendo muchas gentes* (‘many people were running away’), which deviates from the original meaning. In both cases the adjectives are treated as if they were IA forms with one exception in AR, and one in E5/E7.

3.4.2.8. Miscellaneous

This section includes three cases of *halok* ‘go.IA.’ They could not fit into the above classifications, and they are unique both morphologically and syntactically.

(9) H: *wə-ha-mayim hay-u halok wə-ħasor* (Gen 8:5)

And-the-water.PL were-PL go.IA and-be miss.IA

‘And the waters decreased continually’

E3: E *las aguas fueron andando e menguando*

‘And the waters were go.GRN and lessen.GRN’

AR: E *las aguas ivan andando e menguando*

‘And the waters were go.GRN and lessen.GRN’

FB, CS: Y *las aguas fueron andar y menguar*

‘And the waters were go.INF and lessen.INF’

Medieval translations (E3, AR) use gerundives, while post-medieval ones (FB, CS) prefer infinitives. E3 and AR differ slightly in translating *hayu* (‘were’), with E3 using *fueron* and AR using *iban*. All of them use *aguas* in the plural form reflecting the Hebrew plural form *mayim*.

(10) H: *wa-y-aśás ken halok ġarom wə-yaħef* (Is 20: 2)

And 3-do.INV.FUT so go.IA naked and-barefoot

‘And he did so, walking naked and barefoot’

E3: E *fizo así; e andudo desnudo e descalço*

‘And he did so and go.PRT.3SG naked and barefoot’

E5/E7: *E fizo.lo así, e andudo desnudo e descalço*
 ‘And he did.it so and go.PRT.3SG naked and barefoot’

AR: *E fizo.lo así, que andava desnudo e descalço*
 ‘And he did.it so that go.PRT.3SG naked and barefoot’

FB: *Y fizo assí andando desnudo y descalço*
 ‘And he did so go.GRN naked and barefoot’

CS: *Y hizo así andar desnudo y descalço*
 ‘And he did so go.INF naked and barefoot’

Medieval translations render IA *halok* as a conjugated verb while the post-medieval ones use gerundive (FB) or infinitive (CS).

In one verse go.IA in Hebrew functions as an infinitive complementizer of another verb: *wa-lo ʔab-u bi-draka-w halok* (Is 42:24) ‘And in whose ways they would not walk’ (lit: and not want in his ways go.IA).

In this verse, all translations except E5/E7 represent go.IA as *andar* (‘to walk’). E5/E7 ignores *ʔabu* (‘they wanted’) and changes the structure and the meaning: *y non anduvieron en sus carreras* ‘and they did not go in their ways.’.

These examples show no consistent structural pattern for go.IA, resulting in diverse translation approaches.

3.4.2.9. Concluding remarks about go.IA

When *halok* (go.IA) frequently appears alongside other verbs in IA forms, especially conjugated verbs, the medieval translations, especially E5/E7 and AR tend to ignore go.IA and relate only to the other components as the main verbs. It suggests a preference for explicit finite constructions in earlier translations. This choice maintains the verb’s general meaning but removes the immediate aspectual force of continuation or modality. However, IA is systematically translated in all the versions by an imperative form only in the construction of go.IA + inverted past forms presented above in 3.4.2.1. In all the other constructions, only the post-medieval translations adhere to representing go.IA methodologically. The medieval translations, especially E5/E7 and AR, vary, either by ignoring IA or rephrasing the contents of the verses.

3.4.3. IA with no conjugated verb

This most striking structure occurs in Ez 1:14, where two IA forms (*rašo wa-šob*, ‘run.IA and return.IA’) appear without a conjugated verb, as in (11). The medieval translations

generally supply conjugated verb forms (*corrían e tornaban* [E3, AR], *corrien e bolvien* [E5/E7]), while the post-medieval ones lean as before toward infinitives or gerundives (*correr y tornar* [CS], *corriendo y tornando* [FB]).

- (11) H: *wə-ha-ḥay-ot rašo³⁶ wa-šob kə-marʔe ha-bazaq*
 And-the-animal-s run.IA and-return.IA as-sight.CNS the-lightening
 ‘And the animals ran and returned as the appearance of lightning’
- E3: *E las bestias corrian e tornavan como fayçion del rrelanpago*
 ‘And the beasts run.IMPF.PRT and return.IMPF.PRT as form of.the lightning’
- E5/E7: *E las bestias corrien e bolvien como vision de Relanpago*
 ‘And the beasts run.PRTC and turn.PRTC as sight of lightning’
- AR: *E las animalias corrian e tornavanse asemeiança del*
 ‘And the animals run.IMPF.PRT and return.IMPF.PRT.REF similar of.the
relanpago que va e torna
 lightning that goes and returns’
- FB: *Y las alimañas corriendo y tornando como vista del relámpago*
 ‘And the animals run.GRN and return.GRN as sight of.the lightning’
- CS: *Y las ḥayot correr y tornar como vista del relampago*
 ‘And the animals run.INF and return.INF as sight of.the lightning’

Medieval translators are more likely to use full conjugation, ensuring syntactic clarity while post-medieval translators preserve a non-finite verbal aspect, leaving the structure obscure as in Hebrew. Notably, CS copies the Hebrew word for animals as in Judeo-Spanish *ḥayot*.³⁷

4. CONCLUSION

The analysis of Infinitive Absolute (IA) forms in motion verbs across various Bible translations reveals distinct differences between the translations. A few key observations from the comparison are summarized below.

³⁶ The Hebrew form *rašo* ‘run.IA’ is exceptional in Hebrew, because it is conjugated as if the root is *ršʔ* rather than *rws*.

³⁷ Cf. the use of *šofar* in (3) and *darom* in (6).

4.1. Medieval vs. Post-Medieval Translations

The most prominent difference between medieval and post-medieval translations is the frequent use of IA in the latter. Every IA form of motion verbs in the Hebrew Bible has a corresponding translation in the post-medieval translations, but not always in the medieval ones.

The post-medieval translations preserve the constituent order of the original Hebrew in almost all cases, with minimal exceptions. In contrast, medieval translations exhibit more flexibility in word order.

The literateness of the post-medieval translations is also demonstrated in the verbs chosen for the translation of motion IAs. Each of the eight verbs in this study is translated by one cognate, whereas the medieval ones opt for more than one for each verb, as demonstrated in 3.1.

4.2. Distribution of IA Forms

Translation							
Medieval					Post-medieval		Total
Form	E3	E19	E5/E7	AR	FB	CS	
Gerundive	30	15	19	14	47		125
Infinitive	19	7	14	11	8	59	118
Imperative	13	1	12	13	13	9	61
Action noun			2	4			6
Adjective				1			1
Total	62	23	47	43	68³⁸	68	

Table 4: *The distribution of IA in each translation.*

The most common translation of IA is the gerundive, appearing in all translations except CS. The infinitive is also widely used, especially in CS, while the imperative is utilized in specific cases (as discussed in section 3.4.2.1.). Adjective and action nouns appear only in E5/E7 and AR, indicating more free or interpretive translations.

The absence of any translation for IA occurs most notably in E5/E7 and AR.

³⁸ As recalled, in one case FB translates go.IA by a preterit form. See Table 3 and the discussion afterwards.

4.3. Translation Strategies

Post-medieval translations are more literal, maintaining fidelity to the IA forms found in the Hebrew text. CS often opts for infinitives, while FB prefers gerundives. FB occasionally deviates in word order, whereas CS adheres more strictly to the Hebrew structure.

Medieval Translations are less consistent in their representation of IA forms. In many cases, IAs are omitted, especially when paired with verbs of the same root. This is notably true for go.IA forms.

4.4. Interpretive Additions and Free Translations

AR stands out as the freest in its translation style, deviating significantly from the original Hebrew both in word order and interpretation. This includes adding words that are not present in the original text (e.g., *e passate adelante* instead of 'and-also pass you'll pass'), or: *quiero con vos otros ir* 'I want to go with you' (2Sam 18:2) instead of 'I'll certainly leave' (Hb lit: leave.IA leave.1SG.FUT).

E5/E7 also shows a tendency for free translation but is somewhat more restrained than AR. It occasionally omits IA forms, changes word order, and introduces interpretive additions, e.g., *quiero yo salir* 'I want to leave' without IA (2Sam 18:2).

4.5. Medieval Translations' Hierarchy

Among the medieval translations, there is a hierarchy in terms of fidelity to the original text. AR is the freest, followed by E5/E7, E19, and E3, which is the most literal of the group. However, even E3 sometimes adds interpretations or changes word order (e.g., adding *si pensades* 'if you think' in Jer 7:9).

E19, which is considered an intermediary between E3 and E5/E7, occasionally reflects the word-for-word translation style of E3,³⁹ but with some variations in how IA forms are represented.⁴⁰ According to the assumed dates of publication, E19 preceded E3 in time, therefore it is not reasonable that it was copied from E3. The resemblance to it might be accidental (e.g., Enrique-Arias and Gerhalter, 2026: 8-10).⁴¹

³⁹ It is also identical to E3 in the following verses as well: Jud 14:9, 19, 1Sam 3:16, 6:12, 9:6, 14:19, 2Sam 3:16, 5:10, 13:19, 16:13, 18:25, 2Kg 2:11.

⁴⁰ It also resembles E3, E5/E7, AR, and FB in the translation of IA in Jos 6:13.

⁴¹ The other verses with IA include Gen 31:30, Lev 14:48, Jos 6:13, Jud 4:9, 24, 9:8. They all show independent translations, sometimes related to E5/E7 in the use of IAs, and rarely to FB.

4.6. Ladino Translations and Sephardic Tradition

The post-medieval translations, particularly those in the Ladino tradition, show more consistency in the representation of IAs, adhering to a word-for-word translation style. These translations are based on a tradition of strict adherence to the Hebrew original, found in the Sephardic communities before and after the expulsion from Spain.

The use of gerundives in FB and infinitives in CS indicates a different tradition than that of the medieval translations. The distinction between FB and CS likely reflects regional differences and the influence of local dialects (e.g., Judeo-Spanish in Turkey and Greece vs. communities in Italy, with close ties to Spain and Spanish).

4.7. Vocabulary and Word Choice

The vocabulary used in CS of the post-medieval translations is more aligned with everyday Judeo-Spanish usage, with frequent incorporation of Hebrew-origin words. This contrasts with the medieval translations, as well as FB, which are influenced by the earlier, more Latinized vocabulary.

The choice of gerundives over infinitives, especially in FB, is an important feature of the Ladino Italian translation tradition, which aimed for a more natural flow in the target language, rather than the strict literalism seen in CS.

4.8. Final Thought

Based on the data and analysis presented, it seems clear that the medieval translations did not directly influence Ladino post-expulsion translations. While both traditions share some similarities, the post-medieval translations, with their more consistent representation of IA forms and adherence to a word-for-word translation method, reflect a different tradition rooted in the Hispanic oral translation practices, which were formalized in written form only after the expulsion (Gutwirth, 1988; Bunis, 1994, 1996). This distinction underscores the evolution of translation practices among Jewish communities across different regions and time periods.

GRAMMATICAL ABBREVIATIONS

ADJ = adjective

CNS = construct state

DIREC = directionality

F = feminine

FUT = future

GRN = gerund

IMPR = imperfect

INF = infinitive

INV = inverted

LIT = literally

M = masculine

PL = plural

PRS = present

PRT = participle

PST = past

REF = reflexive

SG = singular

REFERENCES

- Avni, Haïm. (1982). *The history of Jewish immigration to Argentina*. Jerusalem: Magnes press – The Hebrew University.
- Botosh, Noah. (2021). *Changes in the Semantic Field of ‘Come’ in Modern Hebrew: Its Position among Goal Verbs in Journalistic Language between the Years 1900 and 2000 as a Case Study* [PhD Thesis]. Ben-Gurion University [in Hebrew].
- Brooke Lester, Garrett. (2011). Frequency List for Biblical Hebrew. <https://www.scribd.com/document/427970303/Frequency-List-for-Biblical-Hebrew-pdf> (consulted July 2024).
- Bunis, David M. (1994). Tres formas de ladinar la Biblia en Italia en los siglos XVI-XVII. In Iacob M. Hassán and Ángel Berenguer Amador (eds.), *Introducción a la Biblia de Ferrara* (pp. 315-345). Madrid: Comisión Nacional Quinto Centenario.
- Bunis, David M. (1996). Translating from the head and from the heart: The essentially *oral* nature of the *Ladino* Bible-translation tradition. In Winfried Busse and Marie-Christine Varol-Bornes (eds.), *Hommage á Haïm Vidal Sephiha* (pp. 337-357). Berne: Peter Lang.
- Callahan, Scott C. (2010). *Modality and the Biblical Hebrew Infinitive Absolute* (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, 17). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

- Cifuentes-Férez, Paula. (2009). *A Crosslinguistic Study on the Semantics of Motion Verbs in English and Spanish*. München: LINCOM Studies in Semantics.
- Cohen, Dov. (2021). *Thesaurus of the Ladino Books 1490-1960*. Jerusalem: The Ben-Zvi Institute – Misgav Yerushalayim [in Hebrew].
- Dattner, Elitzur. (2008). *Lower Transitivity Constructions in Hebrew: The Case of Motion Verbs* [MA Thesis]. Tel Aviv University. [in Hebrew].
- Enrique-Arias, Andrés. (2013). Insights from a parallel corpus of Spanish medieval Bible translations. *Corpus Linguistics and Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Language*, 3: 105-115.
- Enrique-Arias, Andrés, and Gerhalter, Katharina. (2026). Morir morirás ‘for certain you will die’: Strategies for Translating the Hebrew Infinitive Absolute in Medieval and Early Modern Spanish Biblical translations. *Journal of Historical Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jhl.24029.enr>
- Enrique-Arias, Andrés, and Pueyo Mena, Francisco Javier. (2008-). *Corpus Biblia Medieval*. <http://www.bibliamedieval.es> (Consulted 2023-2024).
- Fillmore, Charles J. (1966). Deictic Categories in the semantic of ‘come’. *Foundation of Language*, 2, 219-227.
- Fillmore, Charles J. (1983). How to know whether you are coming or going. In Gisa Rouch (ed.), *Essays on Deixis* (pp. 219-228). Tübingen: Gunter Nar.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm. (1910). *Hebrew Grammar* (Emil Kautzsch, ed.; Arthur Ernst Cowley, trans.). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Goldenberg, Gideon. (1971). Tautological Infinitive. *Israel Oriental Studies*, 1, 36-85.
- Gutwirth, Eleazar. (1988). Religión, historia y las biblias romanceadas. *Revista Catalana de Teologia*, 13, 115-134.
- Hacker, Joseph. (1972). Defuse Kušta bame’a hašeš šešre [Constantinople’s printhouses in the 16th century]. *Areshet*, 5, 482-483.
- Hassán, Iacob M., and Berenguer Amador, Ángel (eds.). (1994). *Introducción a la Biblia de Ferrara*. Madrid: Comisión Nacional Quinto Centenario.
- Hatav, Galia. (2017). The infinitive absolute and topicalization in Biblical Hebrew. In Adina Moshavi and Tania Notarios (eds.), *Advances in Biblical Hebrew linguistics* (pp. 185-207). Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbraun.
- Hatav, Galia. (2020). Verb Phrase Secondary Predication: Biblical Hebrew as a Case study. *Linguistics*, 58(2), 363-378. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2020-0044>
- Hatav, Galia. (2021). The Nature of the Infinitive Absolute. In Robert D. Holmstedt (ed.), *Linguistic Studies on Biblical Hebrew* (pp. 125-143). Leiden: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004448858_008
- Henkin, Roni. (1998). Movement translated in Hebrew. *Lešonenu*, 61, 313-337 [in Hebrew].
- Hoffman, Yair. (2001). *Jermiah: Introduction and Commentary*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved and Magnes Press.
- Joüon, Paul, and Muraoka, Takamitsu. (2009). *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (2 vols.). Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.
- Kim, Yoo-Ki. (2009). *The Function of the Tautological Infinitive in Classical Biblical Hebrew*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004370067>

- Langacker, Ronald W. (1986). Abstract motion. *Proceedings of the 12th annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 12, 455-471. <https://doi.org/10.3765/bls.v12i0.3317>
- Lazar, Moshe (ed.). (1992). *The Ladino Bible of Ferrara [1553]*. Culver City: Labyrinthos.
- Lazar, Moshe, (ed.) (2000). *The Ladino Scriptures: Constantinople - Salonica [1540-1572]* (vols. I-II). Lancaster, CA.: Labyrinthos.
- Levin, Beth, and Rappaport Hovav, Malka. (1992). The Lexical semantics of verbs of motion: The perspective from unaccusativity. In Iggy M. Roca (ed.), *Thematic structure: Its role in grammar* (pp. 247-269). Berlin: Foris. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110872613.247>
- Littlefield, Mark G. (1992). *Escorial Bible I.ii.19*. Madison: The Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies.
- Matlock, Teenie. (2010). Abstract motion is no longer abstract. *Language and Cognition*, 2(2), 243-260. <https://doi.org/10.1515/langcog.2010.010>
- Morimoto, Yuko. (2001). *Los verbos de movimiento*. Madrid: Visor Libros
- Orfali, Moisés. (1994). Contexto teológico y social de la *Biblia de Ferrara*. In Jacob M. Hassán and Ángel Berenguer Amador (eds.), *Introducción a la Biblia de Ferrara* (pp. 229-249). Madrid: Comisión Nacional Quinto Centenario.
- Papafragou, Anna, and Selimis, Vasileios. (2023). The Syntax-Semantics Interface of Motion Verbs: Evidence from Greek. *Lingua*, 270, 103-124.
- Penny, Ralph. (2002). *A History of the Spanish Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pueyo Mena, Francisco Javier. (2008). Biblias romanceadas y en ladino. In Elena Romero (ed.), *Sefardíes: Literatura y Lengua de una Nación Dispersa* (pp. 193-263). Cuenca: Ediciones de la Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha.
- Pueyo Mena, Francisco Javier, and Enrique-Arias, Andrés. (2013). Los romanceamientos castellanos de la Biblia hebrea compuestos en la Edad Media: manuscritos y traducciones. *Sefarad*, 73(1), 165-224. <https://doi.org/10.3989/sefarad.013.006>
- Revah, Israel S. (1970). Hispanisme et judaïsme des langues parlées et écrites par les Sefardim. In Jacob M. Hassán (ed.), *Actas del primer Simposio de Estudios Sefardíes* (pp. 233-241). Madrid: Instituto Arias Montano.
- Schonfield, Joseph (ed.). (1992). *La Biblia de Alba in the collection of the Palacio de Liria*. Madrid – London: Fundación Amigos de Sefarad.
- Schwarzwald, Ora (Rodrigue). (1989). *The Ladino Translations of Pirke Aboth*. Jerusalem: Magnes [in Hebrew].
- Schwarzwald, Ora (Rodrigue). (2010). On the Jewish nature of Medieval Spanish biblical translations: Linguistic differences between medieval and post exilic Spanish translations. *Sefarad*, 70(1), 117-140. <https://doi.org/10.3989/sefarad.010.004>
- Schwarzwald, Ora (Rodrigue). (2012). The Relationship between Ladino Liturgical Texts and Spanish Bibles. In Jonathan Decker and Arturo Prats (eds.), *The Hebrew Bible in Fifteenth-Century Spain: Exegesis, Literature, Philosophy and the Arts* (pp. 223-243). Leiden – Boston: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004232495_012
- Sephiha, Haim Vidal. (1973). *Le Ladino: Deutéronome*. Paris: Centre de Recherches Hispaniques.

- Shyldkrot, Bat-Zeev Hava. (2018). *Venir à – venir de: concurrence ou complémentarité?* In Céline Vaguer (ed.), *Quand les formes prennent sens: grammaire, prépositions, constructions, système: hommage à Danielle Leeman* (pp. 271-283). Limoges: Lambert-Lucas.
- Slobin, Dan I. (1999). Two ways to travel: Verbs of motion in English and Spanish. In Masayoshi Shibatani and Eandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Grammatical constructions: Their form and meaning* (pp. 195-220). Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198235392.003.0008>
- Talmy, Leonard. (1975). Semantics and syntax of Motion. In John P. Kimball (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics* (vol. 4, pp. 181-238) New York: Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368828_008
- The Jerusalem Bible. (1917). <https://archive.org/details/thejerusalem Bible1966/page/n359/mode/2up?view=theater> (consulted July-August 2024).
- Trommer, Pnina; Gvura, Avi, and Manor, Rama. (2022). *Motion Verbs in Contemporary Hebrew*. Tel Aviv: Mofet [in Hebrew].
- Van der Merwe, Christo H. J. (2013). The infinitive absolute reconsidered: Review article. *Journal of northwest semitic languages*, 39(1), 61-84.
- Waltke, Bruce K., and O'Connor, Michael. (1990). *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.