תוכן העניינים

Contents

Contents

Addresses of the contributors to the present volume

Dr. Adam Bin-Nun, Orot Israel College of Education and The Academy of the Hebrew Language, adam.bin100@gmail.com | Dr. Ibrahim Bassal, The Arab Academic College for Education in Israel – Haifa, ibbassal@gmail.com | Prof. Moshe Bar-Asher, Department of Hebrew Language, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem and The Academy of the Hebrew Language, moshe.bar-asher@mail.huji.ac.il | Dr. Mor Daniel, 43/16 Hashofet Haim Cohen St., Jerusalem 9350002, mordaniel1982@gmail.com Dr. Yaffa Israeli, The David Yellin Academic College of Education, yaffai@dyellin.ac.il Dr. Shay Matsa, 8 Israel Shmid St., Ness Ziona 7402431, shay.matsa@mail.huji.ac.il Dr. Zahi Abbas, Beit Berl College and Al-Qasemi Academic College of Education, zahi_2@walla.co.il | Prof. Paul B. Fenton, Département d'Études arabes et hébraïques, Université Paris-Sorbonne (Paris IV), paul.fenton@sorbonne-universite.fr | Prof. Michael Ryzhik, Department of Hebrew and Semitic Languages, Bar-Ilan University and The Academy of the Hebrew Language, mryzhik76@gmail.com | Prof. Ora (Rodrigue) Schwarzwald, Department of Hebrew and Semitic Languages, Bar-Ilan University, ora.schwarzwald@biu.ac.il | Dr. Mor Shemesh, The Academy of the Hebrew Language, morshem@post.bgu.ac.il

English Abstracts

The Development of a Tradition: The Affinity between the Yemenite Version of the Torah and Maimonides

Adam Bin-Nun

From the 12th century onwards, all scholars of the Massorah described the version of Ben-Asher as the accepted and authoritative version of the Torah. Maimonides, too, wrote: "The copy on which I relied is the well-known Egyptian codex […] which was examined by Ben Asher, who closely studied it for many years." The Yemenite Jews, who fervently followed the teachings of Maimonides, also viewed Ben-Asher's version as an exemplary one. Moreover, the words of Maimonides even caused them to abandon the Babylonian tradition in favor of Ben-Asher's Tiberian tradition.

According to a tradition mentioned by Yemenite sages, and subsequently also by various modern scholars, the Yemenite version of the Torah as found in Torah scrolls and in the ancient copies of the Torah known as *tījān*, was copied directly from the Torah scroll that Maimonides wrote for his own use. Additionally, relying on a sentence that the scribes were wont to write at the end of the *tījān*, learned men connected the *tījān* to the tradition of Ben-Asher: "It is entirely in accordance with the copy that was in Egypt, which Ben-Asher examined and closely studied for many years, as has been testified."

The article reveals the beginning of this tradition, examines its ancient sources, and proves that it is fundamentally wrong. The tradition has its origin in a faulty understanding of the abovementioned "scribal

testimony," which led to the addition of a certain detail to an historical fact. It is a known fact that the Yemenite Jews sent scribes to copy the works of Maimonides — *Mishne Torah* and the commentary on the *Mishnah* — but to this was added the "fact" that at the same time they also copied the Torah itself from the scroll written by Maimonides.

It turns out that the Yemenite version of the Torah is based on an accurate Tiberian version that reached Yemen. But the Yemenite scribes did not leave this version untouched; rather, they continued to correct it and to purify it in accordance with the words of Maimonides in *Mishne Torah* and inquiries sent to his descendants, who possessed his Torah scroll. In this way the Yemenite Jews brought their own version closer to the version of the Torah scroll of Maimonides and the version of Ben-Asher (who served as the source of Maimonides) without directly copying from them.

A Syriac Christian Arabic Adaptation
of Saadiah Gaon's *Tafsīr* of the Torah

Ibrahim Bassal

This article deals with MS Cairo, COP, Bible 20 Syriac Arabic-Christian adaptation of Rabbi Saadiah Gaon's *Tafsīr* of the Torah. The translation technique constitutes an attempt to combine Saadiah's *Tafsīr* and a Syriac Arabic-Christian tradition that relies on the *Peshīṭta*. It is reasonable to assume that the changes in Saadiah's text made by the author of the adaptation can be associated with theological-cultural and linguistic-didactic motives. The anonymous scribe does not adopt Saadiah's *Tafsīr* version in its entirety, but rather processes it in a calculated and selective way in order to adapt it to the Syriac tradition, both religiously and didactically. Manuscript notes in MS Cairo, COP, Bible 20 teach us that the text was also used for educational purposes. MS Cairo, COP, Bible 20

does not tell us whether the copyist represents a church tradition or a particular institution associated with the church. Is it the result of an initiative by an independent scholar, who took it upon himself to bring the text to his congregation? We have no written evidence of the Syriac Church adopting the text of Saadiah's *Tafsīr*, as it exists in the Coptic Church.

Conservative Linguistic Features
in the Oral *Sharḥ* of the Maghreb

Moshe Bar-Asher

The exegetical value of the Maghrebian *Sharḥ* (the Judeo-Arabic translation of the Bible and some other literary works) is rather limited, as I have shown in the past. Its main value is in its language. It should be kept in mind that this genre includes important works such as *Leshon Limmudim* to the entire Bible, by Rabbi Raphaël Berdugo. Also, the additional treatise of *Leshon Limmudim* to the Haftarot as well as the *Sharḥ* in the tradition of Fez contained in the MS Ibn Danan (MS Fez) do not present a continuous translation of the biblical text but rather selected words and expressions from each chapter. These *Sharḥs* present translations of complete biblical verses only to a very limited extent.

However, the *Sharḥ* of Tafilalt and Todgha (as well as the tradition of *Sharḥ* of the Mellaḥ of Ksar-es-Souk which has some unique features) to some biblical books and other texts are complete, continuous translations. The complete, continuous *Sharḥ* includes the entire Pentateuch (all 187 chapters) as well as the books of Proverbs, Job and Daniel (85 chapters), the Scrolls of Ruth, Song of Songs, Lamentations and Esther (27 chapters), and selected chapters from the books of the prophets read as Haftarot, with a few Psalms (about 70 chapters). All together more than 360 chapters of biblical text; the two aforementioned *Sharḥ* traditions also include

translations of three extra-biblical texts — the tractate Avot (Chapters of the Fathers), the Passover Haggadah and the *piyyut* (liturgical poem) מי כמוך by Rabbi Judah Halevi.

Essentially, *Sharḥ* is a strictly literal, consistent translation that follows the word order of the biblical verse, without additions. I called this phenomenon 'the Bible as it is attired' (המקרא כלבושו). It is apparent that the *Sharḥ* reflects several layers, with three being the most evident: (A) the most ancient layer includes features drawn from the *Tafsir* of Saadiah Gaon. After the *Tafsir* was no longer used as a text in schools nor as a text used by adults in Bible reading in the Maghreb, the sages who composed the *Sharḥ* incorporated features from the *Tafsir* when they were deemed necessary. The *Tafsir* provided the terminology for the rite of the Tabernacle. For example, the phrase אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד is translated as כבא למחצ׳ר (Leviticus 1, 12), as in Saadiah Gaon's *Tafsir*. Similarly, terms for fauna such as זֶמֶר (Deuteronomy 14, 5) which is translated as זראפא, as in the *Tafsir*, which is known to us as 'giraffe'. This is also the case in other areas. Saadiah Gaon's *Tafsir* also provided grammatical forms that the redactors of the *Sharḥ* did not find in their spoken vernacular. For example, the word מְאֹד is translated as גדא/*zədda* (or גדאן/*zəddan*), and the infinitive form לֵאמֹר is translated as the participle קאילאן. (B) The second layer reflects the time of the crystallization of the Maghrebian *Sharḥ* hundreds of years ago, in my opinion no later than the 15th century. High Maghrebian Judeo-Arabic is evident in this layer in addition to features from the standard spoken Arabic known from the past few centuries. (C) The third layer is expressed by the switching of high linguistic elements with elements from the spoken Arabic vernacular. This brought about the decreased use of these elements in the high language; for example, the abandonment of the word כיף/*kif* and its replacement by the word פחאל/*f-ḥal* in several places in the *Sharḥ* to the Pentateuch and to Job, as in the case of כָּמֹהוּ (Job 1, 8), which was translated as פחאלו (and not כיפו).

We can say that the timeline for when the various materials entered the *Sharḥ* seems quite strange yet also understandable. Concerning the affinity to other biblical commentators, Saadiah Gaon is paramount since his work has been absorbed into the earliest layer of the *Sharḥ*.

The *Sharḥ* has borrowed a comprehensive lexicon and grammatical forms from Saadiah Gaon's work, which was composed in the 10th century. The *Sharḥ* has also borrowed interpretations from Targum Onkelos, which dates from the Tanaaitic period. However, the elements borrowed from Targum Onkelos entered the *Sharḥ* hundreds of years after Saadiah Gaon's *Tafsir* was composed, when the *Sharḥ* developed as an alternative to the *Tafsir*. The affinity to Rashi also seems to date from the period of the *Sharḥ*'s composition.

It should be kept in mind — I made this discovery many years ago — that all traditions of the *Sharḥ* in Morocco stem from one tradition that developed hundreds of years ago. This tradition was transmitted orally and was thus open to changes, or to be more precise, was prone to changes. Some changes were made unintentionally, while others, and there were many like this, were made intentionally by sages. These sages wanted the *Sharḥ* to be comprehensible to children and to laymen. They therefore exchanged lexical items and grammatical features lacking in the spoken vernacular with items and features familiar to those who studied and listened to the *Sharḥ*. Herein lies the difference between the *Sharḥ* of Tafilalt and Todgha as opposed to the *Sharḥ* of *Leshon Limmudim* and MS Fez — the latter traditions underwent extensive revision by sages.

In this paper I will concentrate on the phenomena of ancient traditions in the language of the *Sharḥ* in the traditions of Tafilalt and Todgha; clearly peripheral regions. These phenomena are not attested in the other *Sharḥ* compendia from Morocco — *Leshon Limmudim* of Rabbi Raphaël Berdugo and the tradition of Fez transmitted in MS Ibn Danan. The oral *Sharḥ* traditions of Tafilalt and Todgha contain quite ancient linguistic traditions. These traditions reflect a lexicon used hundreds of years ago which was not in use in the last few generations. Sages in the major cities were aware of the difficulties in understanding the ancient *Sharḥ*. They therefore emended them by removing words no longer known to schoolchildren or to the public and replacing them with words from the spoken Arabic vernacular of the past two hundred fifty years. In this paper I deal only with a few examples that indicate ancient elements retained in the periphery. In this abstract I deal with one example in depth.

The Translation of the Word אַלּוּף in Proverbs

The noun אַלּוּף is attested in the Pentateuch 44 times. It is translated in the *Sharḥ* of Tafilalt and Todgha as כביר/*kbir* (='big/great'), for example אַלּוּף תֵּימָן (Genesis 36, 15) — כביר תימן, אַלּוּפֵי אֱדוֹם / *kbir Timan* (Exodus 15, 15): כבאר אדום / *kbaṛ Idum* (='great ones of Edom'), אַלּוּפֵיהֶם (Genesis 36, 19): כבארהום/*kbaṛ-hum* (='their great ones'). כביר is also the translation of אַלּוּף in *Leshon Limmudim* and in MS Ibn Danan of Fez. This translation is like Onkelos or, to be more exact, we could say that following Onkelos who translated the above forms as רַבְרְבָנֵיהוֹן, רַבְרְבֵי, רַבָּא (רַבָּה), Rashi (to Genesis 36, 15) explained the word אַלּוּף as ראש (='head'), as is clear from his comment: אלה אלופי בני עשו – ראשי משפחות.

The noun אַלּוּף occurs also three times in the Book of Proverbs. These are the occurrences: וְנִרְגָּן מַפְרִיד אַלּוּף ('and a whisperer separateth chief friends', 16, 28), וְשֹׁנֶה בְדָבָר מַפְרִיד אַלּוּף ('but he that repeateth a matter separateth very friends', 17, 9), and once in the construct state הָעֹזֶבֶת אַלּוּף נְעוּרֶיהָ ('Which forsaketh the guide of her youth', 2, 17). *Leshon Limmudim* offers a translation to only one occurrence: אַלּוּף נְעוּרֶיהָ – סייד סגורהא ('the master of her youth'). MS Ibn Danan brings a similar form word with a slightly different pronunciation in two verses (2, 17; 17, 9): סייאד. These two sources, by employing the word סייד/סייאד translated the noun differently than in Genesis.

It should be pointed out that the translation of אַלּוּף in these two *Sharḥ* traditions are not dependent on the Aramaic Targum: אַלּוּף נְעוּרֶיהָ – מרביתא דטליותהא ('the increaser of her youth'), אַלּוּף – רָחֲמֵהּ ('his friend', 16, 28), רָחֲמָא ('friend', 17, 9). It is also not dependent on the *Tafsir* of Saadiah Gaon which translates אַלּוּף as אליף (2, 17), אלאלפא (16, 28; 17, 9). Neither is it dependent on Rashi's commentary. Rashi comments in two occurrences of אַלּוּף that it refers to God: מפריד אלוף – אז מפריד ממנו אלופו של עולם שהוא הקדוש ברוך הוא (17, 17).

Similarly, the *Sharḥ* traditions of Tafilalt and Todgha did not translate the noun אַלּוּף in Proverbs as it was translated in the Pentateuch as the adjective כביר. In the *Sharḥ* of Tafilalt all three occurrences of the noun אַלּוּף in Proverbs are translated the same way. The absolute form (16, 28; 17, 9) is translated by the definite form *l-qənd* לקנד/(*l-kənd*) and the construct

form (2, 17) is translated as expected by the indefinite form קנד/*qənd* (*kənd*). The Todgha *Sharḥ* uses לחביב/*l-ḥbib* (16, 28; 17, 9), חביב/*ḥbib* (2, 17).

The word *ḥbib* is well known and means 'dear', 'beloved'. However, the word *kənd* was not known in the previous few generations. The main informant, when asked what the meaning of the word was, told me *qənd huwa bn-adm kbir u-muqqəṛ* ('*qənd* is a great and honorable man'). I recently checked my notes and found that in another conversation the informant said *qənd huwa ḥakm kbir* ('*qənd* is a great ruler'). He even commented that he is familiar with the word only from the *Sharḥ*; he never heard it in actual speech.

I asked dozens of knowledgeable people from Morocco, both Jews and Muslims, and none of them were familiar with the word *qənd*. However, when I was in Errachidia, that is Ksar-es-Souk, in October 2018, I had the good fortune to meet a learned Muslim. I asked him: *as nhiya l-kəlma qənd* ('Do you know the meaning of the word *qənd*?'). He replied 'Where did you fall upon it [i.e. Where did you encounter this word]? This is an ancient word. I know it from one book written a long time ago. It means a special ruler, like the sultan. Only the king is greater than him.'

Indeed, it turns out that the word *qənd* was common in the Maghreb hundreds of years ago. It is attested and explained in Reinhart Dozy's dictionary. The form *qənd* evolved into the local dialect as the word قند (*qund* = 'nobleman, count') written with *qāf* which appears in Dozy's dictionary. Dozy refers there to the entry كند (*kund*) in his dictionary written with *kāf*. He indicates there that it is the Latin noun "conte" which is reflected in Spanish as the word "conde" with the meaning 'count'. In Arabic this word was changed into the form *qund*. In the Jewish and Muslim spoken dialects of Maghrebian Arabic the short vowel [u] was apocopated, as like all short vowels. The word was pronounced by the informant as *qənd* or as *kənd* with a shortened vowel instead of the vowel [u] that disappeared.

Dozy brings evidence of the existence of this noun from a glossary published in Andalusia in 1505. It seems that the word entered the *Sharḥ* hundreds of years ago at the time of its crystallization. The word was known in that period to the sage who redacted the *Sharḥ*. This tradition

reached the Tafilalt region centuries ago and was kept alive by the transmitters of the *Sharḥ* until the final generation of Jewish residence in the region. The informant continued to transmit this tradition until his death in November 2002, as attested in a manuscript that he left behind. It seems that in the course of time the noun was forgotten and disappeared from the spoken language many generations ago. However, the word continued to exist in the *Sharḥ* tradition of Tafilalt which is known to be a conservative tradition. In the traditional schools of the region there was an ancient version of the *Sharḥ* that had crystallized hundreds of years ago. This copy was meticulously transmitted by sages and the teachers taught it to their pupils. We thus see that the *Sharḥ* tradition of the Mellaḥ of Tafilalt, in a peripheral area of the country, provides another example of the preservation of an ancient tradition.

This example teaches several important lessons. I will point out three of them: (A) The four *Sharḥ* compilations (*Leshon Limmudim*, MS Fez, the tradition of Tafilalt, the tradition of Todgha) do not translate the noun אַלּוּף in the book of Proverbs as in the Pentateuch. In the Pentateuch all *Sharḥ* traditions translate the noun as כביר/*kbir* (='big/great'). In Proverbs they translate the noun differently: סייד (*Leshon Limmudim*), סייאד (MS Fez), חביב (Todgha), קנד (Tafilalt). (B) Can we assume that the sage who composed the *Sharḥ* to Proverbs is not the same one who translated the Pentateuch? Or perhaps the same sage translated the two works yet distinguished between the translation of the noun אַלּוּף in the Pentateuch and in Proverbs. I am inclined to accept the former assumption. (C) As we have seen, the *Sharḥ* according to the tradition of the Mellaḥ of Tafilalt translated the Hebrew word with an Arabic word used hundreds of years before the local *Sharḥ* was established. It is quite possible that *Leshon Limmudim* and the *Sharḥ* of Fez reflect a tradition wherein the noun *qənd* (='nobleman, count'), which had become rare and was no longer in use, was exchanged with the noun סייאד/סייד ('master', 'lord'), a near synonym of *qənd*; both nouns belong to the field of "authority, rule". There is no reason not to believe that this is what happened in the case of the original tradition of Todgha. In that tradition the noun *qənd* was exchanged with

XVI

חביב (='dear', 'beloved'). This noun does not refer to a 'ruler'. However, it seems to me that the *Sharḥ* of Todgha reflects a tradition that understood the noun אַלּוּף to mean 'beloved' based on the phrase from Proverbs הָעֹזֶבֶת אַלּוּף נְעוּרֶיהָ ('Which forsaketh the guide of her youth', 2, 17). Clearly, in this context a woman leaves the 'beloved of her youth'. Based on this translation an early transmitter of the *Sharḥ* transferred the translation חביב to the other two verses in the Book of Proverbs. In short, even if we do not agree with the assumptions concerning the exchanges of *qənd* with other words in the other *Sharḥ* traditions, the uniqueness of the *Sharḥ* tradition of Tafilalt as a tradition that preserves elements of ancient language is clear.

In conclusion, even though the peripheral *Sharḥ* traditions have an affinity to spoken Arabic they nevertheless preserve linguistic features, both in their lexicon and in their grammar, that were in use hundreds of years ago. These features have disappeared from the *Sharḥ* traditions of the cities mentioned above. An illustrative example of this phenomenon is the use of the noun *qənd* as the translation of the biblical noun אַלּוּף in its three occurrences in the Book of Proverbs in the *Sharḥ* tradition of Tafilalt. The noun *qənd* is not known from the *Sharḥ* traditions of the main cities of Jewish settlement in Morocco (Meknes, the place of origin of *Leshon Limmudim* I, and Fez, the place of origin of Ms. Ibn Danan) in the books used to teach children nor in the biblical books read before adults — the Pentateuch and the Book of Proverbs.

Pluralization in the Judeo-Arabic Press of Tunis (1885–1940)

Mor Daniel

The Judeo-Arabic press of Tunis (1878–1940) clearly reflects the lifestyles and spiritual worlds of Tunisian Jewry in the modern era. Enlightened community members cultivated this rich treasure trove as part of the

broader project they undertook to create high-quality, distinctive and inspirational Judeo-Arabic literature. Amongst the Jewish communities in Islamic lands, Tunisia is the community that produced the most Jewish newspapers. Between 1878 and 1961, 143 Jewish newspapers and journals were published in Tunisia: 79 were written in Judeo-Arabic, 48 in French, and 16 in Hebrew. The distinctiveness of the Tunisian Judeo-Arabic press is expressed not only in quantity but also in the unique journalistic language employed.

This study analyzes the various ways of forming the plural in the Judeo-Arabic press of Tunis (1885–1940). The examination of masculine and feminine *sound plural*, *broken plural*, *dual* and *pseudo-dual*, as well as the existence of the *combined plural* expose the linguistic layers of the newspapers' language. These layers include literary Arabic, Tunisian Jewry's spoken dialect; the layer of the spoken Judeo-Arabic of Tunis, and the layer of the Muslim Arabic dialect of Tunis. One of the main questions raised in this article is the reason why Tunis Maskilim use the combined plural in their writings. This rare method of plural formation indicates the creativity and diversity of the language in the Tunis Judeo-Arabic press. Conversely, it might indicate the writers' lack of proficiency in literary Arabic. Writers aspired to use high-register language, and combined it with linguistic forms from the spoken language. The existence of the combined plural can often be seen as a particular stage in a process of language change.

The Translation of the Book of Jonah
into Three Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialects

Yaffa Israeli

The Book of Jonah, in the Minor Prophets, which is recited as an additional reading (*haftarah*) in the afternoon prayer on the Day of Atonement (Megila 31:71), has been translated into many Jewish languages, including

Jewish Neo-Aramaic. In this article the book of Jonah is presented in three different Jewish Neo-Aramaic dialects: those of Urmi (Iranian Azerbaijan), Saqqiz (Iranian Kurdistan), and Rawanduz (Iraqi Kurdistan). Although the three translations have a great deal in common, there are still a number of differences because of the different dialects. This is due to the fact that there were different translators, and different references. We can note the differences when we compare the different dialects with the original Hebrew text and when we compare the different dialects with each other. Such a comparison between the original Hebrew version of the Book of Jonah and different dialects of Neo-Aramaic was never undertaken previously.

The Last Jewish Translator of the Bible in Aleppo: The Biblical Translations of *Ḥākām* Edmond Cohen z"l (1920–2006)

Shay Matsa

Ḥākām Edmond Cohen was a well-known figure in the Jewish community in Aleppo in the last decades of its existence. During the 1980's he published pamphlets in the community about the weekly Parashah, moral issues and religious laws. His pamphlets, which were later collected in a book, are full of biblical verses that he translated into Arabic himself. Another innovation found in Cohen's pamphlets was his use of Arabic characters as opposed to the usual Judeo-Arabic practice of using Hebrew letters. As is demonstrated in this paper, Cohen's translations were written in a fine Modern Standard Arabic style, and show little correlation to the traditional *Sharḥ* of Aleppo or to Saadiah Gaon's translation. In some cases, Cohen used phrases that are not commonly found in other Jewish Arabic Bible translations. Cohen's translation style ranges from word-to-word translation while preserving a normative Arabic style, to somewhat free paraphrases. This paper examines his translations and the ways he chose

to deal with various linguistic problems. Cohen tried to give his audience a clear, readable translation of the Biblical verses and stories, as a part of a comprehensive moral and educational concept. Unfortunately, Cohen was the last Bible translator in the long history of the Jewish community of Aleppo.

Unique Characteristics of Language and Style in Rasag's Translation of the Pentateuch

Zahi Abbas

This study shows that the language of Rabbi Saadiah Gaon's translation of the Pentateuch is characterized by special features in the fields of syntax, morphology, and lexicon. Some of these features can be seen as reflections of the spoken language as it existed in Rasag's period. The syntactic elements are the most prominent ones: the study shows irregular syntactic structures that are not found in classical Arabic, such as agreement. Irregularities are also found in morphology and the lexicon; some of these, too, can be attributed to influence from the contemporaneous spoken language.

Three Historical Laments in Judeo-Arabic from the Maghreb

Paul B. Fenton

The dearth of historical chronicles dealing with the fate of Jews under Islam in the Maghreb can be partially remedied by certain rare liturgical poems of an historical nature. These are occasionally to be found in the

form of *Qissât*, or historical narratives in poetic cast which were recited on the 9th of Ab, when the national disaster of the Destruction of the Temple was mournfully recalled together with the tragedies that had visited various communities. These laments are of significant historical and linguistic importance, especially when they originate from remote areas.

Three such rare and hitherto unpublished poems discovered in manuscript sources are presented in this article together with their translations and a literary and linguistic analysis. The first, *qissat mellâh Tafilalet*, was composed by the 18th-century poet and scholar Sulayman Ben Hamu from Tafilalet, an oasis in the Atlas range in Southern Morocco. The author relates a hitherto unknown event. Following the death of the Moroccan Sultan, Mawlay 'Ismail, the mellaḥ was savagely attacked by Berber and Arab tribes on the 16th of December 1728. The Jewish inhabitants fled to the desert while their homes were totally looted and destroyed. The second, *qissat Golmima*, is by Mimûn Dahhan, a 19th century poet from Golmima, also known as Ghris, likewise in the Tafilalet region. Despite its remoteness, Golmima harboured a community of scholars in the 19th century and boasted an important regional library. The lament also relates an unknown calamity when the local community was attacked by the Ait Ata Berber tribe. They plundered the Jews, stole their belongings and jewelry, emptied their granaries, burnt down their synagogues, and destroyed their books. The third poem, *qissat al-fay*, the 'Tale of the Plunder', by an anonymous author, describes in moving terms the violent attack on *hara*, the Jewish quarter of Algiers which took place on the Sabbath, 29th June, 1805. The pogrom, which left many dead, was perpetrated by the Janissaries and local Muslim population following the assassination of Naftali Bujnah, the Head of the Jewish community. In the aftermath of this tragic occurrence many Algerian Jews emigrated.

XXI

"Literatural" Judeo-Italian in the 20th Century:
Norm, Tradition and Affinity for the Unusual

Michael Ryzhik

The language of several theater pieces written in the 1980s in the Judeo-Italian (Judeo-Romanesco) dialect is discussed. The pieces are written by Mirella Calò and several other young authors from Rome. They include a somewhat long piece about life in the ghetto of Rome in the 19th century and several short scenes from the life of Roman Jews in post-war Rome. The language of the long piece is more archaic, but all of the pieces contain archaic forms and phenomena, such as *ajo* = ho (1sg. of the verb *avere*), *fio* = figlio 'son', but also some relatively new traits, such as *l>r* before a consonant, e.g., *berva* = belva 'wild animal', *arzateve* = alzatevi 'come up'. This later trait is absent in 'classical modern Judeo-Romanesco' as it is present in the sonnets of Crescenzo del Monte. This and other linguistic facts testify that the authors of the discussed pieces tried to reflect the real spoken Judeo-Romanesco and not its normative, 'grammatical' form. The language of these texts is important as the chronologically last testimony of the Jewish dialects of Italy.

Ladino in Cyrillic Letters:
The Uniqueness of the Haggadah from Sofia

Ora (Rodrigue) Schwarzwald

Several identical editions of a Ladino Haggadah were published in 1928, 1935 and 2012 in Sofia, Bulgaria. The Hebrew text is missing in this Haggadah and it is entirely written in Cyrillic letters. The short Hebrew blessings are transliterated in Cyrillic letters and the entire text is translated into Ladino. Comparison to other Ladino Haggadot shows that the Ladino translation is quite free, some paragraphs of *Maggid* (the story of the Exodus from Egypt) and *Hallel* (Praising God) are skipped,

but the ten plagues are described in detail based on the biblical story and the *Midrash*. *Birkat Hamazon* (The grace after the meal) is placed at the end of the Haggadah in a shortened version after the two Ladino songs, *Quien supiense* (who knows one) and *Un kavretiko* (one kid), rather than immediately after the meal. Of special interest is an original prayer in Ladino, placed after *Betset Israel mimitsrayim* (When Israel went out of Egypt) which does not exist in any other Hebrew source. The unique features of this Haggadah are described in detail with special emphasis on the special prayer. It seems that the secularization of Bulgarian Jewry led to this publication. They kept the Masoretic text but conveyed it according to the Jewish Bulgarian tradition.

The Whole Plural in the Late Ashkenazi Tradition

Mor Shemesh

The paper studies one phenomenon in the grammar of the Mishnah reading tradition in Ashkenaz: the whole plural, also known as the "Aramaic plural"; that is, the nominal plural patterns *qaṭlīm*, *qiṭlīm*, *quṭlīm* and so on – patterns which deviate from the regular plural pattern of segholate nouns in Hebrew, *qᵉṭālīm*. This issue is revealed to be intriguing in the Ashkenazi tradition, as these noun patterns are relatively common in this tradition. The paper surveys all the nouns found in these patterns in 19th-century printed editions of the Mishnah whose vocalization clearly reflects an Ashkenazi reading tradition. The vast evidence (over forty nouns) enables a thorough investigation of the extent of the phenomenon and of its causes.

After the discussion of the said nouns, the paper studies various possibilities for their creation in the Ashkenazi tradition. The reasons are not definite, and these nominal forms could be formed due to various factors: under a lexical or morphological influence of Aramaic, under the influence of the phonetic environment, or for lexical reasons.