

English Abstracts

Nahem Ilan

The Farḥi *Haggadah* (Cairo, First Half of the Twentieth Century): The Fine Line between Text and Translation

The Farḥi *Haggadah* was printed in Egypt five times during the first half of the twentieth century. While printed in Hebrew with a literal Arabic translation by its side, it also included comments and instructions in Arabic by Dr. Hillel Farḥi, as well as special footnotes containing historical evidence as to the Egyptian slavery and exodus, as described in the Torah. Farḥi downplayed his contribution in the introduction to the *haggadah*. He did not only translate the *haggadah*, but also often added much more than the original text included.

Farḥi's comments and additions place a text within a text: in the framework of a traditional *haggadah* translated into Arabic, another text is hidden, one that is aimed at an audience for whom the *haggadah* was no longer a canonical text. The way Farḥi chose to insert his additions is significant. The two texts are not of the same importance. To him, the framework and general appearance are those of yet another *haggadah*, translated into Arabic. A thorough investigation reveals Farḥi's underlying text, interwoven into the consecutive *haggadic* text and instructions.

Ruven Enoch

Has Hebrew Influenced Georgian?

The paper attempts to present linguistic evidence supporting the hypothesis that the Hebrew language has exerted influence on the Georgian language already at an early stage of the latter's development, contrary to the prevailing view in Georgian scholarly literature. Several roots (e.g. *kal*, *gv*) which may have been borrowed from Hebrew are discussed in the paper.

Grammatical data are extremely important in an attempt to prove the influence of one language on another. Thus, the paper shows that the Hebrew converted tenses may have helped establish the *mca*-particle construction in the Georgian language.

Cyril Aslanov

The Translation of the 1557 *Escamot* into Provençal: Preservation or Blurring of the Jewish Linguistic Identity?

This paper deals with the translation into Provençal of the 1557 *escamot* (i.e. *haskamot* "agreements") that ruled the inner life of the Jewish community of Carpentras. It is a document intended for a non-Jewish readership (the pontifical authorities that represented the Pope in Comat Venaissin). Since the text deals with a considerable amount of Jewish realia, it is interesting to investigate how they have been transposed into

Provençal. The tendency of the translators was to adopt, whenever possible, the Christian equivalents for the names of the Jewish holidays and other Jewish practices. No taboos prevented them from adopting blatant Christianisms in their terminology. On the other hand, some taboos did function with regard to terms of death, curses, and excommunication. In addition to the interesting case of linguistic strategy it provides, this document also hints at the sociolinguistic hierarchizing of the French, Latin, and Hebrew high languages on the one hand, and the Judeo-Provençal vernacular with its merged Hebrew component on the other.

Natali Akun

Translation of the “Tenses” of Biblical Hebrew into French according to the Translations of the Book of Ruth

This article examines the translation of the Biblical Hebrew “tenses” פֻּעַל and יִפְעַל into French. It is based on three modern translations of the Book of Ruth into French: the Christian translation by Edouard Dhorme, and the Jewish translations by Zadoc Kahn and Henri Meschonnic. The study identifies the constraints of the source and target languages on the choice of tense in translation.

Moshe Bar-Asher

Parallel Traditions of the Oral *Sharḥ* in the Maghreb and Their Transformations

Parallel traditions of the *sharḥ* (the translation of the Bible and other literatures) were common in many of the Jewish communities in the Orient and the Maghreb. This article examines this subject in the Maghreb, more precisely, it is based on the findings in the Tafilalet communities in south-eastern Morocco. In short, in almost all of the local communities there was one tradition that split into sub-traditions distinguished from each other only in minor details. In Tafilalet, for example, two traditions were differentiated through their translation of the infinitive **לאמר**: one tradition translated it into Arabic as **qaylan** (קאילן) – based on Sa'adia Gaon's *Tafsir*, whereas the other tradition translated it as **l-iqul** (ליקול), which is closer to the vernacular dialects.

The article traces the transformations of the two traditions in the transmission of a specific informant. His acquaintance with two traditions led to inconsistency: in some verses he uses one form and in others he uses its alternative. Only when paying careful attention to his transmission, or if the person listening to the *sharḥ* corrected him, did he make sure to give the two variants (and sometimes even three). Our findings from the informant in Tafilalet were corroborated by other informants in other Moroccan communities.

We believe that this study establishes a model for the research of parallel traditions of texts.

Michal Held

A Preliminary Study of a Judeo-Spanish Translation
of *Shir ha-Shirim* from Morocco

The paper is devoted to the presentation and preliminary analysis of an early 19th century manuscript from Meknes, Morocco of *Shir ha-Shirim* translated into Judeo-Spanish. A close reading of the opening verses raises the following questions:

* Does the manuscript confirm the fact that Judeo-Spanish was in use in Meknes in the 19th century, and if so, what does it reveal about this language?

* As far as the manuscript's degree of originality is concerned, is it an original, independent, translation of *Shir ha-Shirim*, a copy of an earlier translation, or merely a written version of an oral tradition that had not been written down before?

* Does the manuscript imply that the Moroccan version is a direct continuation of a tradition originating in pre-expulsion Spain and not necessarily in the Sefardic communities that sprung up in the Ottoman Empire after the expulsion of the Jews from the Iberian Peninsula in 1492?

* Does the comparison of this translation with earlier Judeo-Spanish translations of *Shir ha-Shirim* show that the scribe presents a unique commentary of the book?

Yehudit Henshke

Twentieth Century Hebrew Journalism in Tunisian Judeo-Arabic Translation

Examination of Arabic translations by Djerban Jews of two stories from the early twentieth century Hebrew press sheds light on linguistic issues related to the translation of Hebrew of the revival period. Singled out here is the encounter between old and new, between the traditional Hebrew component embedded in the spoken Arabic of Tunisian Jews and the modern Hebrew of the source as reflected in the translations. The first story, *Sedaqah tasil mi-mavet* by Yosef Meyuhās, appeared in the 1936 Rosh Hashanah (16 Sept.) edition of *Ha'aretz*. Rendered into Judeo-Arabic by Rabbi David Idan (1873–1955), it appeared in book form as *Sefer Ma'aseh ha-Sedaqah* (Djerba, 1941). Idan, a learned individual and ardent Zionist, served as president of the Djerban community and founded the first Hebrew press there (1912). The second story, *Mosheleh Sheli* by Sarah Glusman, appeared in *Hadoar*, Sivan 1947. Translated into Arabic by Rabbi Mqeḳes Hashsheli, a leading Djerban sage who was also a literary translator, it appeared as *Ma'aseh Mosheleh al-Poloni* (Djerba, 1948).

Comparison of the two translations with respect to their use of the Hebrew component shows that whereas *Ma'aseh ha-Sedaqah* makes extensive use of Hebrew words from different semantic fields, *Ma'aseh Mosheleh* utilizes little Hebrew. Moreover, the Hebrew found in *Ma'aseh ha-Sedaqah* appears not only under the influence of the source, but also independently of the original Hebrew text. On the other hand, even the few Hebrew expressions used in Rabbi Hashsheli's translation appear forced, in striking contrast to the *derashah* that follows the story in which the Hebrew component of Tunisian Judeo-Arabic appears in its usual proportions. Hebrew words avoided in the translation occur naturally and profusely in the *derashah*. As a professional translator, Hashsheli's

reliance on a specific literary tradition fostered minor use of the Hebrew component, on the one hand, and major reliance on literary, and not on spoken, Arabic, on the other.

A second aspect of the issue explored touches upon the translator's awareness of the distinctiveness of the Hebrew component in spoken Tunisian Judeo-Arabic in relation to the printed Hebrew text being translated. Hebrew words that underwent semantic change in the spoken language test the translator's faithfulness to the original text as well as his awareness of the singularity of the Hebrew component in his spoken language. My findings were that the translators avoided Hebrew words whose meaning had shifted in their Judeo-Arabic, lest they be misunderstood by the reader; this indicates not only their awareness of the uniqueness of their spoken Judeo-Arabic but also their ability to maneuver between acceptable Hebrew words and potentially misleading ones. Also considered here is the attitude of each of these translators to modern Hebrew neologisms.

Rachel Hitin-Mashiah & Tamar Lavi

Neot Midbar – Puns Marked by Quotation Marks
in the Poetry of Monsonyego

The collection *Neot Midbar* by Rafael Aharon Monsonyego (1760–1840) of Fez contains eighty-three poems and *piyyuṭim* full of puns. Many of these puns are marked by quotation marks intended to attract the reader's attention to the unique usage of the word. Monsonyego uses known words and common phrases taken from Jewish literature to create

new meanings, relying on his audience's knowledge and creative imagination.

A simple statistical analysis reveals that plays on words appear in more than half of Monsonyego's poems, mostly in poems of praise, dirges for the deceased, exhortations, and dirges for Tisha B'Av. On the whole we found 203 puns with quotation marks (= 1.7% of the words in his poems), which form 141 different lexical items.

In order to understand the range of this phenomenon, we edited a mini-dictionary of these quotation marks puns as found in Monsonyego's poems and *piyyuṭim*. To accentuate the inter-textual connections, we present both the basic traditional meaning of the word and the extra-textual meaning it receives in the new context.

Hezy Mutzafi

An Eighteenth Century Poem on David and Goliath in Jewish Neo-Aramaic and Hebrew

This article presents an epic poem on David and Goliath, widespread in various versions throughout Neo-Aramaic-speaking Jewry. The present version was written in Koy Sanjaq, Iraqi Kurdistan, in the second half of the eighteenth century by the head of the Jewish community of that town, Rabbi Yosef son of Rabbi Yahuda. The poem originally included no less than seven pages, of which only four are preserved.

The poem is part of a manuscript which was kept by the late Nissim Eliyahu, the last rabbi of Koy Sanjaq, and is now in the library of the Babylonian Jewry Heritage Center in Or Yehuda, Israel.

The manuscript comprises mainly hymns, prayers and matters of Jewish mysticism and religious law, composed or copied by several sages, primarily Rabbi Yosef. Most of the book is written in Hebrew, but there are also some sections in classical Jewish Aramaic and two literary pieces in Hebrew with a free translation into modern Aramaic: the poem discussed in the present paper and a translation of a poem by Yehuda ha-Levi (Spain, eleventh century).

The original Hebrew and Neo-Aramaic parts of the poem are followed by a transcription of the Neo-Aramaic and a translation of this into modern Hebrew, which is required due to the very loose relationship between the Hebrew and the Neo-Aramaic.

The Neo-Aramaic text allows us a glimpse into the Jewish dialect of Koy Sanjaq (JKS) approximately 220 years before the first scholarly study thereof was published and is the earliest record of Trans-Zab Jewish Neo-Aramaic, to wit, the Jewish Neo-Aramaic dialect-group located east and south-east of the Greater Zab River. The most prominent archaic feature evinced by the text is the use of intra-conjugational object affixes in the preterite, not only in the third person, as in contemporary JKS and Trans-Zab as a whole, but also in the second person, e.g. in the forms *šədrətte* (< *mšudrətle) 'he sent you (sg.m.)' and *mirətiti* (< *mirətli) 'I told you (sg.m.)'.

Although the language of the text is clearly related to JKS, it exhibits a few alien traits characteristic of the Trans-Zab dialect-cluster of Iranian Kurdistan, e.g. *gézna* 'I (m.) will go' vs. JKS *gezézn(a)*. The explanation for the occurrence of such features in the text appears to be an intense exposure of the author to this dialect-cluster.

Simone Mrejen-O'Hana

Hebrew in Carpentras and the Surrounding Area (Part 2)

This survey analyses Hebrew as it was written and spoken in Carpentras and its environs (Cavaillon, Isle-sur-Sorgue and Avignon) by the Papal Jews, drawing on first-hand sources, both Jewish and non-Jewish, such as the eighteenth century *pinqassim* de Carpentras kept by Elie Crémieux, which are old public registry office ledgers and legal deeds. In particular, Hebrew and Aramaic terms and expressions are to be found there, some of which appear to be specific to these communities, such as ...נתחבר האוהל להיות אחד... to designate marriage (probably to mark its sacredness); יום שיר השירים, a title given to the eighth day of Passover; עשה שורה, which here takes on a different sense from that known up to that point (mourning); התממר, which refers to a novice; מוכיח, for preacher. Other terms are common to other Jewish communities of the Diaspora: בעולתא, as opposed to בתולה, refers to a loose woman, as attested in the *Responsa*; חודש מנחם, in place of the month of אב, an expression which can also be found in the Southwest of France, in Bordeaux, or in Italy, in Padua; ברורי הקהל, refers to community leaders as judges, attested in Italy as well as in Spain; סנדקת (godmother), which is a neologism that demonstrates the influence of the surroundings, interesting also because of the pronunciation: סדקת, סדק. Other words demonstrate the pronunciation of certain consonants such as פקע instead of פקה.

As for notarial and community sources, they attest to Hebrew terms or expressions transcribed into French and into Judeo-Provençal, which inform us about their way of talking, such as: *Cassuva* or *quessuba* (כתובה), *simatora* or *cinhaïtera* (שמחת תורה), *yom ha-hasgar* (יום ההסגר), “the day of reclusion”, referring to the imprisonment of Jews during Easter. Certain

other Hebrew expressions have entered the language of non-Jews, such as *messilah* (מסילה “ghetto”), *cadessar* (קידושין “to marry according to Hebrew custom”) or *sagater* (לשחזת “sacrificial ritual”).

Michael Ryzhik

The Judeo-Italian Translations of *ba-Me Madliqin* and *Piṭṭum ha-Qṭoret* in Italian Prayer Books

Two different translations into Judeo-Italian of *ba-Me Madliqin* and *Piṭṭum ha-Qṭoret* are compared: one found in the printed prayer book *Ritual di Fano* (1506) and the other from a 17th century north Italian manuscript. The language of the former is more literal, preserving several ancient Italian linguistic features and is close to the southern Italian dialects. The language of the 17th century manuscript is replete with glosses and clearly shows signs of development in the direction of literary Italian in its northern variety.

Nurit Reich

The Names of the Accent *Shalsholet*

The study discusses rare names of the accent *shalsholet*: *qšy*, *mtšnym*, *zqp*². The discussion and renewed investigation into various manuscripts makes it apparent that the true form of the Babylonian accent *šyry*³ (paralleling the Tiberian accent *sgwl*) is actually *šdy*² – with a *daleth* – and derives from the root *šdy* ‘to throw’.

Shifra Schnoll

A Mishnaic Hebrew Glossary in Judeo-Greek from the Cairo Geniza

The study is a reedition of a glossary of Mishnaic Hebrew (*Pe'a*, *Shabbat*, *Eruvin*, *Pesaḥim*) from the Cairo Geniza written in Judeo-Greek. The glossary was initially published by Nicholas De Lange in 1996. A commentary, linguistic description, and lexicon are included.

Dan D. Y. Shapira

Linguistic Adaptation in Judeo-Turkic Bible Translations of the Karaites

This paper examines the processes of linguistic adaptation of a relatively fixed skeleton of a Turkic version of the Biblical text to different Turkic idioms current among the Eastern European, Crimean and Ottoman Karaites. As is well known, it was common for the interpreter to read aloud the Torah translation during the service, though it is arguable whether this was done by heart or by simultaneous translation of the Hebrew original. The consequence was the emergence of a tradition of fixed blocks of translation-bids, capable of linguistic adaptation even to another Turkic idiom, and this was later the case with Karaite translations transferred into Crimean Tatar or even vernacular Ottoman Turkish. At the same time, in accordance with the imperative of individual search in the Holy Writ, new translations/commentaries emerged, in which the translator/exegete felt free to render difficult passages, verses or words in his own way. This emphasis on Bible study by means of a *peshat / derash* rendering as fixed though changeable blocks on the one hand, together with the lack of an authorized translation obliging all the community on the other hand, combined with a very different, and not systematic, form of Biblical exegesis (as compared with that of the Rabbanites who relied heavily on the *midrash*, *aggadah*, *qabbalah*, etc.) brought about the skeleton translation and – as in many other Jewish diasporas – a special archaic “language of translation” came in existence. This language was unnatural, copying Hebrew modes and syntax, but it enjoyed a high status. Several grammatical features of Hebrew, such as a calque of the Hebrew genitive form, the *nota accusativa eth*, and the definite article – all of them totally foreign to Turkic – became characteristic marks of this learned language of translation. The

article includes Biblical passages translated into different Karaite Turkic dialects, which are compared and analyzed.

Joseph Tedghi

Translation of Hebrew Prayers into Judeo-Arabic
by Shmuel Malka

The article discusses the linguistic nature of the translation of Hebrew prayers into Judeo-Arabic by Shmuel Malka (b. 1881 or 1882, d. 1944). The translation, which comes from Fes, was written down in school notebooks bound together and numbers 470 pages. It includes a considerable number of prayers recited throughout the year. Linguistic features of the translation discussed are the free syntax, the translation of the Hebrew verb, the present tense **אנ**+verb, translation doublets, glosses, avoidance of personification, dialectal identification, the Hebrew component, the relationship of the language of the prayers to the language of *Leshon Limmudim* by Rabbi Raphael Berdugo, and the relationship of the Judeo-Arabic *maḥzor* previously published to the Judeo-Arabic *maḥzor* of Shmuel Malka. The article concludes with two sample texts.

Ofra Tirosh-Becker

An Algerian Judeo-Arabic Translation of the *Piyyuṭ*
Mi Khamokha by Rabbi Yehuda ha-Levi

Piyyuṭ Mi Khamokha for *Shabbat Zakhor* by Rabbi Yehuda ha-Levi, which tells the story of the Purim *Megillah* in 82 strophes, was popular in Jewish communities in the East. It was translated into several Jewish languages, primarily into different varieties of Judeo-Arabic. In this study we discuss a Judeo-Arabic translation (*sharḥ*) of this *piyyuṭ* from Constantine (East Algeria), which was put into writing by Rabbi Yosef Renassia in the book *Yaldah Milkah* (Constantine 1934). Like many other *shuruh* the syntax of the translation closely follows the original Hebrew source except for the marker of the determinate direct object *ʿet* (את) which was not translated, and a few minor adjustments to conform to Arabic syntax. Approximately a quarter of the strophes include alternative translations, some presenting literary or colloquial synonyms, while others offer a different interpretation of the original Hebrew word. Only rarely is a Hebrew or a French word presented as an alternative translation, in line with the limited use of the Hebrew component in this *sharḥ*. In some cases the Judeo-Arabic translation does not follow the plain meaning of the Hebrew word (*pəshaṭ*). For example, the proper name Hadassah was translated אלריחאנה, the verb טעם was translated אמר, and the phrase בימי חרפי was rendered פי איים סוגרי. In the realms of morphology, morpho-syntax and lexicon, this translation offers a mixture of archaic and colloquial features side by side. This is observed for instance, in the translation of the infinitive forms, the representation of the passive voice, the forms of the demonstrative pronouns and the negation particles. In addition, the translation of embedded Biblical verses, which are abundant in this *piyyuṭ*, was studied in comparison with available Biblical *shuruh* from Constantine. All in all, while the language

English Abstracts

of the Constantinian *sharḥ* to *piyyuṭ Mi Khamokha* is not as elevated as that of the Constantinian *sharḥ* to the Book of Psalms, it is nonetheless significantly removed from the language of everyday discourse of the Jewish community of Constantine.