**Chapter Ten: Particles**

In this chapter we review various particles used in CJA. As we will see, the use of certain particles is unique to the *šarḥ* and distinguishes CJA from the colloquial language, whereas others can be found in both registers. We will not discuss here the free uses of these particles but confine our study to their function in the translation presented in the *šarḥ*.

I have divided the chapter according to the main types of particles: negation, interrogation, cause and purpose, possession, prepositions, comparisons, conditions, and so forth. I also discuss the translation of the Hebrew particle את.

[10.1] Particles of Negation

The sole particle of negotiation in the *šarḥ* to the Psalms is ליש, consistently pronounced *layš*.[[1]](#footnote-1) This particle, which has its origins in the CA لَيْسَ, is fossilized and does not decline according to person. Its process of fossilization is already documented in Christian Arabic from the first millennium, Medieval Judeo-Arabic, and Early-Middle Muslim Arabic.[[2]](#footnote-2) This process probably began in verbal sentences in which the person, gender, and number were already marked on the verb. Later, ליס also appeared as an undeclined particle in nominal sentences.[[3]](#footnote-3)

In our *šarḥ*, this particle translates the various Hebrew particles of negation: לא, אין, אל, and בל as these appear before nouns, adjectives, verbal forms and prepositional phrases, without distinction. For example:

לא: ליש משא (לֹ֥א הָלַךְ֮, Ps 1:1), ליש נזוול (לֹֽא־אָסִ֥יר, Ps 18:23), ליש טאייק מצג;רץ' (לֹ֤א אֵֽל־חָפֵ֘ץ, Ps 5:5), ליש תתרךּ (לֹֽא־תַעֲזֹ֣ב, Ps 16:10), ליש יסכן מעאךּ דוני (לֹ֖א יְגֻֽרְךָ֣ רָֽע, Ps 5:5).

אין: ליש מג;יתא ליה (אֵ֤ין יְֽשׁוּעָ֓תָה לּ֬וֹ, Ps 3:3), אין ליש פ'למות דכרךּ (כִּ֤י אֵ֣ין בַּמָּ֣וֶת זִכְרֶ֑ךָ, Ps 6:6), ליש עאמל מליח (אֵ֣ין עֹֽשֵׂה־טֽוֹב, Ps 14:1), ליש חתא ואחד (אֵ֝֗ין גַּם־אֶחָֽד, Ps 14:3), ליש אילאה (אֵ֥ין אֱ֝לֹהִ֗ים, Ps 10:4).

When the Hebrew word אין appears with an enclitic pronoun, ליש also includes the analogous pronoun: ליישו (*layš-u*) (אֵינֶ֑נּוּ, Ps 37:36), וליישו (*u-layš-u*) (וְאֵינֶֽנּוּ, Ps 37:10), וליישי (*u-layš-i*) (וְאֵינֶֽנִּי, Ps 39:14), לישהום (*layš-hum*) (אֵינָ֗ם, Ps 104:35).

אל: ליש בחרג'ךּ תוובכ'ני (אַל־בְּאַפְּךָ֥ תֽוֹכִיחֵ֑נִי, Ps 6:2), ליש יקוא אנסאן (אַל־יָעֹ֣ז אֱנ֑וֹשׁ, Ps 9:20), ליש יחכמו פ'ייא (אַֽל־יִמְשְׁלוּ־בִ֣י, Ps 19:14), ליש תנסא לואטיין (אַל־תִּשְׁכַּ֥ח עניים (עֲנָוִֽים), Ps 10;12), וליש תכ'טאו (וְֽאַל־תֶּ֫חֱטָ֥אוּ, Ps 4:5).

בל: ליש נצ'ר (בַּל־רָאָ֥ה, Ps 10:11), ליש יקדרו (בַּל־יוּכָֽלוּ, Ps 21:12), ליש עליךּ (בַּל־עָלֶֽיךָ, Ps 16:2), ליש מנעת (בַּל־מָנַ֥עְתָּ, Ps 21:3), ליש תוג'ד (ַל־תִּמְצָֽא, Ps 10:15).

When Hebrew particles of negation are accompanied by an enclitic preposition such as כאין or בלא they are translated by the equivalent Arabic preposition + ליש. Thus, we find: ג'עלת אייאמי ווקתי כיף ליש קבאלתךּ (נָ֘תַ֤תָּה יָמַ֗י וְחֶלְדִּ֣י כְאַ֣יִן נֶגְדֶּ֑ךָ, Ps 39:6), אצצנת צלאתי בליש שוארב כ'דיעא (הַֽאֲזִ֥ינָה תְפִלָּתִ֑י בְּ֝לֹ֗א שִׂפְתֵ֥י מִרְמָֽה, Ps 17:1).

The Hebrew word בלי is also translated בליש (*b-layš*): בליש נסמע צותהום ((בְּ֝לִ֗י נִשְׁמָ֥ע קוֹלָֽם, Ps 19:4).

The conditional particle לולא, which includes an element of negation, is translated by יא לוכאן ליש: יא לוכאן ליש אמנת לינצ'ר פ'י כ'יר אללאה (לׅׄוּׅׄלֵׅ֗ׄאׅׄ הֶֽ֭אֱמַנְתִּי לִרְא֥וֹת בְּֽטוּב־יְהוָ֗ה, Ps 27:13).

The use of the particle ליש raises various interesting issues, not least the question of its pronunciation. Although this particle has its origins in لَيْسَ, it is consistently pronounced *layš* with [š] in the *šarḥ*. This is particularly noteworthy since CJA maintains a clear distinction between the phonemes /s/ and /š/ and exchanges between the two are extremely rare. Accordingly, it is reasonable to wonder about the origins of the consistent pronunciation of the \*s in this word as *š*. We should add that this particle is written ליס with ס in the Passover Haggadah *Zeved Tov*.[[4]](#footnote-4)

A further issue concerning the use of this particle is unique to CJA: in addition to the *šarḥ* to the Psalms, we also found it in the *šarḥ* to the Passover Haggadah. In the *šarḥ* to Ecclesiastes and in the translations of Rashi’s commentaries on the Pentateuch, which were translated into Judeo-Arabic by Rabbi Yosef Renassia, the archaic particle ליש is used alongside the dialectal particles of negation.

In other works by Rabbi Yosef Renassia, such as his commentary on the Psalms, *Zikhron Tov*, and his translation and commentary on the Mishnah *Nishmat Kol Chai*, he uses several other particles of negation:

The main morpheme of negation for verbal forms is מא ... ש; for example: מא בדקש (לא בדק, Pesahim 1:3), יא לוכאן מא תתקבלש צלאתך עווד קווה לשית (*Zichron Ya’acov*, commentary on 27:14, וקוה).

When a series of negations appears in a single sentence, the ש may be omitted,[[5]](#footnote-5) for example: מא נשויו פסח לא על אספ'פ'וד ולא על אלמשווא (אין תולין את הפסח לא בשיפוד ולא על האסכלה, Pesahim 7:2).

The form מושי (*mawši*), comprising of ma + huwa + ši, serves as a fossilized form in Rabbi Renassia’s writings.[[6]](#footnote-6) It is used in these texts to negate participles, nouns, adjectives, and even prepositional clauses, for example: ובשרט מושי פ'י בית למיית (*Zichron Ya’acov*, commentary on Psalm 31, p. 103), מן צ'אר אללי מושי מבדוקה לצ'אר מבדוקה (*Nishmat Kol Chai*, Pesahim 1:2). In *Nishmat Kol Chai*, the shortened form מוש is also used in the same circumstances. In *Nishmat*, the particle לא is also used to negate nouns; this appears to be confined mainly to sequences of negations.

The particles of negation used by Rabbi Renassia in these texts are dialectal ones drawn from the colloquial language. ליש is not used in their spoken language, but מא ... ש for negating the verb is commonplace.[[7]](#footnote-7) In replying to yes/no questions, the speakers use the particle *la*; the word מושי (מוש) is also found in their language.

As noted, the dialectal particles of negation do not appear in the printed *šarḥ* and, even when reading the text, the rabbis were careful to use the form ליש exclusively. By contrast, when translating freely from the Hebrew source, two of the rabbis[[8]](#footnote-8) used the dialectal forms of negation. The third rabbi used only the particle of negation ליש even when translating freely.

Although the use of the particle ליש is unique to the *šarḥ* among the Jews of Constantine and distinguishes this linguistic register from lower ones, it is not unique to it and also appears in the šarḥ register in other Jewish dialects. The form ליס in its various realizations serves to translate the Hebrew particle אין in Passover Haggadot from Algiers and Baghdad[[9]](#footnote-9) and is also used in the literary writings of the members of these communities.[[10]](#footnote-10) In the translation of the western Issachar Ben Susan, ליס serves as one of the principal particles of negation[[11]](#footnote-11) and it is also used in the *šarḥ* of the Jews of Tafilalat.[[12]](#footnote-12) The preservation of ליס in the various translations may reflect the influence of the translation of Sa’adia Ben Gaon, although Ben Gaon also used other classical particles of negation in his texts. As we have seen, in the translation that is the subject of our study ליש is used to the exclusion of the other particles.

In conclusion, the particle ליס, which has disappeared from the living speech of the modern dialects, appears in the language of the *šarḥ* in various Arabic-speaking Jewish communities. In CJA, its unique feature is the pronunciation with *š*, as well as its exclusive use for the particle of negation. Since it is used to translate the Hebrew particle of negation, it appears according to the sequence of words in the Hebrew sentence, accompanied by pronouns or prepositions when present in the Hebrew source.

[10.2] The Interrogative Particles

The following interrogative particles were used to translate their Hebrew counterparts:

[10.2.1] The Particle *aš* and Its Combinations

The particle אש (*aš*) is used in CJA to translate the Hebrew interrogative particles מה [[13]](#footnote-13) and הֲ-:[[14]](#footnote-14)

**מה**: אש אינסאן אין תדכרו (מָֽה־אֱנ֥וֹשׁ כִּֽי־תִזְכְּרֶ֑נּוּ, Ps 8:5), אין אסיסאן (למצידאת) ינהדמו עאדל אש פ'עאל (כִּ֣י הַ֭שָּׁתוֹת יֵהָֽרֵס֑וּן צַ֝דִּ֗יק מַה־פָּעָֽל, Ps 11:3), וקייאסאת אייאמי אש הייא נערף אש נאקץ וקת אנא (וּמִדַּ֣ת יָמַ֣י מַה־הִ֑יא אֵֽ֝דְעָ֗ה מֶֽה־חָדֵ֥ל אָֽנִי, Ps 39:5).

**הֲ-**: אש פ'איידא (מנפ'עא) פ'י דמי פ'י הבוטי אילא חופ'רא אש ישכרךּ תראב אש יכ'בבר חקקךּ (מַה־בֶּ֥צַע בְּדָמִי֮ בְּרִדְתִּ֪י אֶ֫ל שָׁ֥חַת הֲיֽוֹדְךָ֥ עָפָ֑ר הֲיַגִּ֥יד אֲמִתֶּֽךָ, Ps 30:10), לינצ'ר אש תממא כייס יפ'תש אילא אללאה (לִ֭רְאוֹת הֲיֵ֣שׁ מַשְׂכִּ֑יל דֹּ֝רֵ֗שׁ אֶת־אֱלֹהִֽים, Ps 14:2).

The word אש has its origins in the CA أَيُّ شَيْءٍ.[[15]](#footnote-15) It seems that, at first, the form אי שי was found in Christian Arabic from the first millennium[[16]](#footnote-16) and in Medieval Judeo-Arabic; later the form איש developed from the earlier form, becoming very common from as early as the Middle Ages.[[17]](#footnote-17) Blau suggests that the use of אש/ איש in living speech spread alongside the growing use of מא as a particle of negation[[18]](#footnote-18) that could no longer carry such a heavy functional load and hence “relinquished” its function as an interrogative particle.[[19]](#footnote-19)

The form אש is usually regarded as a characteristic of the Maghrebi dialects[[20]](#footnote-20) and, indeed, this and similar forms are found in many of these dialects, but also elsewhere, as we will see below. In the Maghreb, אש serves as a principal interrogative particle in the colloquial dialect of the Jews of Algiers;[[21]](#footnote-21) it is also found in western Algeria, Tunisia, and Morocco.[[22]](#footnote-22) אש is also found in the expositions in the *šarḥ* of Issachar Ben-Susan to the Torah.[[23]](#footnote-23) In Egypt, too, the Jews in particular preserved the interrogative particle אייש and still used it in their speech until at least the end of the seventeenth century.[[24]](#footnote-24)

The form אש and similar forms are also found in the Mashriq and sundry variants can be found in the Baghdad dialects[[25]](#footnote-25) and in some of the *qǝltu* dialects of Mesopotamia.[[26]](#footnote-26)

Thus, the distribution of this interrogative particle in its numerous variants – with or without a contracted diphthong, with or without the palatal element – is extremely widespread, extending from west to east. As we have seen, it is also used in the written language. By contrast, Sa’adia Ben Gaon translates the Hebrew particle מה by means of its CA counterparts, based on his understanding of the question in the relevant verse.

The *šarḥ* to the Psalms also includes several compound interrogative particles containing the component *aš*,[[27]](#footnote-27) as follows:

The Hebrew למה is translated by עלאש – *ˁlāš*, which has its origins in على أيّ شيء and is found in numerous modern dialects.[[28]](#footnote-28) Examples: עלאש נג'מעו אומום (לָ֭מָּה רָֽגְשׁ֣וּ גוֹיִ֑ם, Ps 2:1), עלאש יא אללאה תוקף פ'לבעיד (לָמָ֣ה יְ֭הוָה תַּֽעֲמֹ֣ד בְּרָח֑וֹק, Ps 10:1), עלאש תרכתיני (לָמָ֣ה עֲזַבְתָּ֑נִי, Ps 22:2).

A “separated” version of the components עלא אש – *ˁla aš* – is used to translate the Hebrew על מֶה: עלא אש חממק צ'אלם (עַל־מֶ֤ה ׀ נִאֵ֖ץ רָשָׁ֥ע, Ps 10:13).

Similarly, the phrase עד מֶה is translated as חתא אש – *ḥatta (ḥtta) aš*; for example: ולאד ראג'ל חתא אש וקארי ללחשומא (עַד־מֶ֬ה כְבוֹדִ֣י לִ֭כְלִמָּה, Ps 4:3).

The interrogative particle כמה is translated as קדאש *qdāš*: יא אללאה קדאש תנצ'ר (אֲדֹנָי֮ כַּמָּ֪ה תִ֫רְאֶ֥ה, Ps 35:17). This word has its origins in قدّ (a word denoting quantity or measure) + ايش (>أي شيء).

[10.2.2] Other Interrogative Particles

מן – *mǝn* – is used in the *šarḥ* to translate the Hebrew interrogative particle מי; for example: מן יוררינא מליח (מִֽי־יַרְאֵ֪נ֫וּ ט֥וֹב, Ps 4:7), מן סייד לינא (מִ֖י אָד֣וֹן לָֽנוּ, Ps 12:5), מן האדא אלראג'ל כ'אייף אללאה (מִי־זֶ֣ה הָ֭אִישׁ יְרֵ֣א יְהוָ֑ה, Ps 25:12).

In their colloquial dialect, the Jews of Constantine also use *mǝn* in the sense of “from.” For “who” they use *aškūn* and *mǝnhu* alongside *mǝn*.[[29]](#footnote-29)

The Hebrew interrogative particle מתי is translated in the *šarḥ* to the Psalms by איימתא – *(ˀ)aymta*, which has its origins in the CA أيّ متى, for example: איימתא ימות ויצ'יע אסמו (מָתַ֥י יָ֝מ֗וּת וְאָבַ֥ד שְׁמֽוֹ, Ps 41:6).

The phrase עד מתי is translated by חתא אימתא – *ḥatta (ḥtta) ˀaymta*, for example: ואנתא יא אללאה חתא אימתא (ואת (וְאַתָּ֥ה) יְ֝הוָ֗ה עַד־מָתָֽי, Ps 6:4).

Similarly, the phrase עד אנה is translated by חתא לאיין [[30]](#footnote-30) *ḥatta lāyǝn*; for example: חתא לאיין יא אללאה תנסאני ללאבד חתא לאיין תכ'פי אילא וג'הך מני (עַד־אָ֣נָה יְ֭הוָה תִּשְׁכָּחֵ֣נִי נֶ֑צַח עַד־אָ֓נָה ׀ תַּסְתִּ֖יר אֶת־פָּנֶ֣יךָ מִמֶּֽנִּי, Ps 13:2).

The word כיף – *kīf* – is used in the *šarḥ* to translate the Hebrew interrogative particle איך; for example: כיף תקולו לרוחי (אֵ֭יךְ תֹּֽאמְר֣וּ לְנַפְשִׁ֑י, Ps 11:1). The rabbi who translates independently used the word *kīfaš[[31]](#footnote-31)* here and this word also appears in the commentary *Zichron Ya’acov*, for example: ורב אזולאי ולדו פ'ססר לאיין כיפ'אש יקדרו ישראל יתבתו אתורה כלהא... (p. 75). It would therefore appear that *kīfaš* serves as the dialectal counterpart of *kīf* in the sense of the Hebrew איך. The principal use of *kīf* is comparative, as we will see in Section 10.8.

[10.3] Particles of Cause and Purpose

The particle אין *in* translates in the *šarh* the Hebrew causative כי; for example: אין האודא אצ'אלמין יעפ'סו קוץ (כִּ֤י הִנֵּ֪ה הָֽרְשָׁעִ֡ים יִדְרְכ֬וּן קֶ֗שֶׁת, Ps 11:2), אין ליש תתרךּ רוחי ללקבר (כִּ֤י ׀ לֹֽא־תַעֲזֹ֣ב נַפְשִׁ֣י לִשְׁא֑וֹל, Ps 16:10).[[32]](#footnote-32)

The phrase גם כי is translated by חתא אין – *ḥatta (ḥtta) in*: חתא אין נמשי פ'י וטיית צ'ל למות (צ'למא) ליש נכ'אף (מן) אדוני אין אנתא מעאייא (חתא אין נמשי פ'י וטיית צ'ל למות (צ'למא) ליש נכ'אף (מן) אדוני אין אנתא מעאייא, Ps 23:4).

The rabbi who translates independently often uses the word *lāyən* to translate כי.[[33]](#footnote-33) This particle is used to translate כי in the *šarh* to Ecclesiastes (e.g., 1:18).

The particle כי is also translated as אין in the *šarḥ* to the Bible of the Jews of Tafilalat,[[34]](#footnote-34) the *šarḥ* to the Torah of the western Issachar Ben-Susan,[[35]](#footnote-35) and the Algiers Haggadah. It is possible that the translation of כי by אין is a typically Maghrebi feature since, in the Baghdad Haggadah and in other Judeo-Arabic writings from Baghdad, אד' (*aδ*) serves in this function.[[36]](#footnote-36)

This אין can probably be explained as a “substitute” for the CA לאן, which means "because." In Medieval Judeo-Arabic, אَןْ, אِןَّ and אَןَّ all merged and אן became the commonest subjugating conjunction.[[37]](#footnote-37) As such it may replace לאן. This phenomenon can already be observed in CA, Christian Arabic, and Medieval Judeo-Arabic.[[38]](#footnote-38) It is reasonable to assume that the אין that appears in the above-mentioned texts has its origins in this אן.

The particle לסבב (לסבבת) *l-sǝbbǝt* is used in the *šarḥ* to translate the Hebrew למען, for example: יא אללאה צוקני בעדלתךּ לסבבת נאצ'ריני (יְהוָ֤ה ׀ נְחֵ֬נִי בְצִדְקָתֶ֗ךָ לְמַ֥עַן שֽׁוֹרְרָ֑י, Ps 5:9), מן פ'ום סג;אר וראצ'עין לססת קווא לסבת צ'אייקינךּ (מִפִּ֤י עֽוֹלְלִ֨ים ׀ וְֽיֹנְקִים֮ יִסַּ֪דְתָּ֫ עֹ֥ז לְמַ֥עַן צֽוֹרְרֶ֑יךָ, Ps 8:3).

One of the ways in which the Hebrew word עקב is translated in the *šarḥ* is בסבת *b-sǝbbǝt*: יכ'לאו (ינפ'נאו) איג'ארת חשמתהום (בסבת חשמתהום)... (יָ֭שֹׁמּוּ עַל־עֵ֣קֶב בָּשְׁתָּ֑ם, Ps 40:16).

The phrase *ˁla sǝbbǝt* is found in the translation of Ps 7:1: עלא סבת כוש בן ימיני (עַל־דִּבְרֵי־כ֝֗וּשׁ בֶּן־יְמִינִֽי).

The phrases לסבת, בסבת, עלא סבת are formed from a preposition + the word *sǝbba*, which serves in Maghrebi dialects both as an independent word meaning “cause” and in phrases such as فِي سبة and بسبة in the sense of “because.”[[39]](#footnote-39) In the instance we discuss here, the choice of the preposition that is added to *sǝbba* to form a compound phrase would appear to be influenced by the Hebrew: למען – לסבת, על דברי – על סבת.[[40]](#footnote-40)

The particle of purpose *bāš* (באש) does not appear in the printed *šarḥ*. We heard it only from the rabbi who translates directly from the Hebrew text, when translating the Hebrew form לפעל.[[41]](#footnote-41) This word appears frequently in other texts written by Rabbi Yosef Renassia in which he adopted a more dialectal register, for example in his translation and commentary on the Mishnah and in *Zichron Ya’acov*, his commentary on the Psalms.

[10.4] Particles of Possession

One of the characteristics of CJA is the preservation of syntactical structures, such as the use of enclitic pronouns[[42]](#footnote-42) and construct chains. By contrast, in the spoken dialect of the Jews of Constantine there is a documented tendency, familiar in many modern dialects, to prefer analytical forms to synthetic ones, so that each word expresses only a single concept. In keeping with this tendency, the particles *dyāl* and *(n)tāˁ* are used to express possession in the spoken language, both in separated construct chains and with the accompaniment of enclitic pronouns. According to the rabbis, דיאל and נתאע are free alternatives with no distinction. The rabbis use these forms as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| dyāl: |  | *dyāl-i* |  | *dyāl-na* |
|  |  | *dyāl-ək* |  | *dyāl-kum* |
|  |  | *dyāl-u* |  | *dyāl-hum* |
|  |  | *dyāl-ha* |  |  |

For example: s-səddūr dyāl-hum (“their book”), kəlb dyāl-kum (“your (pl.) dog”),[[43]](#footnote-43) *dyāl mən hāda? dyāl-i* (“whose is this?” – “mine”), *r-rəkb-a dyālək* (“your knee”).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *:ntāˁ* |  | *ntāˁ-i* |  | *ntāˁ-na* |
|  |  | *ntāˁ-ək* |  | *ntāˁ-kum* |
|  |  | *ntāˁ-u* |  | *ntāˁ-hum* |
|  |  | *ntāˁ-ha* |  |  |

For example: *ntāˁ mən hāda? ntāˁ-i* (“whose is this?” – “mine”), *l-qləm ntāˁ-ha* (“her pen”), *l-bayt ntāˁ-kum* (“your (pl.) house”).

This particle is often used without the *n*: *kəlb tāˁ-kum* (“your (pl.) dog”), *kəlb tāˁ-na* (“our dog”), *kəlb tāˁ-ək* (“your dog”).

Among the informants who use the particle *(n)tāˁ*, usually without the *n*, the shift ˁ-h > ḥḥ occurs when the particle is accompanied by the third-person feminine singular and third-person plural enclitic pronouns: tāˁ-ha > tāḥ-ḥa, tāˁ-hum > tāḥ-ḥum.

The rabbi who was born in Ein Beida uses the particle *mtāˁ* in these contexts (alongside *dyāl*):[[44]](#footnote-44) *kəlb mtāˁ-i* (“my dog”); *kəlb mtāˁ-u* (“his dog”); *l-kəlb mtāˁ-ək* (“your dog”).

The forms (נ)תאע and דיאל are absent from the written *šarḥ*. However, due to their prevalence in the spoken language, these forms were used in rare instances in the reading of the *šarḥ* and particularly during independent translation.[[45]](#footnote-45) In these instances, a distinction can be seen between the two words: דיאל is used mainly together with enclitic pronouns, while *tāˁ* appears separately in construct chains, for example:

דיאל: *ḍ-ḍaw dyāl-i u-mġītət-i* (אוֹרִ֣י וְ֭יִשְׁעִי: צ'וואתי ומג;יתתי, Ps 27:1),[[46]](#footnote-46) *fi l-qṣəṛ dyāl-u* (בְּהֵֽיכָלֽוֹ: פ'י קצרו, Ps 27:4), *l-ḥdād-a dyāl-i* (קִצִּ֗י: חדאדתי, Ps 39:5).

תאע: As mentioned, the particle *tāˁ* appeared several times within the synthetic construct chains that appear in the šarḥ, for example: *əš-šukrān tāˁ yisraˀel* (תְּהִלּ֥וֹת יִשְׂרָאֵֽל: שכראן ישראל, Ps 22:4), *kīf l-momo tāˁ l-ˁayn* (כְּאִישׁ֣וֹן בַּת־עָ֑יִן: כיף ממו בנת עין, Ps 17:8), *l-aḥbāl tāˁ l-qbəṛ* (חֶבְלֵ֣י שְׁא֣וֹל: חבאל לקבר, Ps 18:6).

The form דיאל, both with enclitic pronouns and in construct chains, is extremely common in *Zichron Ya’acov*, Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s commentary on the Psalms. We also found it in other texts he authored that adopt a more dialectal register than the *šarḥ*, such as his commentary and translation of the Mishnah (*Nishmat Kol Chai*), his translation of Rashi’s commentary on Deuteronomy, *Sefer Ha-Azharot*, his commentary on the Song of Songs (*Shir Ben David*), and *Sefer Ha-Rif*.

The form *ntāˁ* also appears in texts of this type (written נתע / נתאע), though less frequently.

We should discuss briefly the origins of these dialectal particles:

\* – the word *dyāl* probably emerged as a combination of *di* (which originated from ذِي, i.e. ذُو in the genitive case) + a dividing vowel + the particle *ǝlli* (which originated from الذي).[[47]](#footnote-47)

\* – the word *ntāˁ* was created due to an m/n exchange in the word *mtāˁ*. The latter has its origins in the CA مَتَاع, whose initial meaning is “chattels, objects, tools.”[[48]](#footnote-48) This word began to be used to express relations of proximity and possession, and appears occasionally in popular Medieval Judeo-Arabic texts.[[49]](#footnote-49) The word בתאע developed from מתאע and was later understood as a type of adjective qualifying the preceding noun; accordingly, it agrees with this noun in gender and number.[[50]](#footnote-50)

In many dialects, including the Jewish dialect of Constantine, an m/n exchange occurred in the form *mtāˁ* and it is now used in the variant *ntāˁ*. In some dialects the *n* is omitted, leaving the form *tāˁ*.[[51]](#footnote-51)

To summarize the use of the particles *(n)tāˁ* and *dyāl* in the colloquial dialect of the Jews of Constantine, we can thus state that the forms *dyāl* and *(n)tāˁ[[52]](#footnote-52)* are used interchangeably, both with enclitic pronouns and in analytical construct chains. We cannot define any conditions for the use of one or the other of these words and the informants themselves do not discern any difference between them.[[53]](#footnote-53) The form *di*, which is used alongside *dyāl* in many dialects, does not seem to be used by the Jews of Constantine.[[54]](#footnote-54)

The use of a variety of words denoting possession is not exclusive to the Jews of Constantine and is found throughout the Constantine Province. In the settled dialects of the Philippeville district to the north of Constantine, four forms are in use: *ntāˁ*, *dyāl*, *di*, and *li*.[[55]](#footnote-55) In the Edough region to the northeast of Constantine, *ntāˁ* is used, while in El-Milia to the northwest the forms *di*/*dyāl* are used.[[56]](#footnote-56)

A similarly complex picture is found regarding the settled dialects of the Algiers area, including the Jewish dialect of Algiers itself.[[57]](#footnote-57) The word *ntāˁ* alone is used to denote possession in various Algerian dialects, including those of Tlemcen[[58]](#footnote-58) and Ouled Brahim,[[59]](#footnote-59) and the same is true of the Jewish dialect of Tunis.[[60]](#footnote-60) In Sousse, however, the form used is *mtāˁ*.[[61]](#footnote-61)[[62]](#footnote-62)

[10.5] Prepositions

This section will review the Judeo-Arabic prepositions used to translate their Hebrew counterparts in the *šarḥ* to the Psalms:

The particle מן *mən*is used in the *šarḥ* to translate the Hebrew single-letter preposition מ-; for example: מן קצרו (מֵהֵֽיכָל֣וֹ, Ps 18:7), מן מייתין (מִ֥מְתִֽים, Ps 17:14), מנךּ (מִ֭מְּךָ, Ps 21:5), מני (מֶֽנִּי, Ps 18:23).

[B-C] ב – *b(i)* translates the Hebrew single-letter preposition ב, alongside פ'י (פ') – *fi*.[[63]](#footnote-63) When the Hebrew ב- appears as a preposition governed by a verb, the preference will be to translate it as ב or פ'י according to the customary use with the equivalent Judeo-Arabic verb, for example: נתכל ביה, Ps 18:3.

ב-: אנא בלעדל ננצ'ר וג'הךּ (אֲנִ֗י בְּ֭צֶדֶק אֶֽחֱזֶ֣ה פָנֶ֑יךָ, Ps 17:15), האולאי בלמרכב והאולאי בלכ'יול וחנא ביסם אלאה אילאהנא נדכרו (אֵ֣לֶּה בָ֭רֶכֶב וְאֵ֣לֶּה בַסּוּסִ֑ים וַֽאֲנַ֓חְנוּ ׀ בְּשֵׁם־יְהוָ֖ה אֱלֹהֵ֣ינוּ נַזְכִּֽיר, Ps 20:8), אתאכלין ביה (הַֽחֹסִ֬ים בּֽוֹ, Ps 18:31).

פ'י: ועייטתי קודאמו תג'י פ'י ודנו (וְ֝שַׁוְעָתִ֗י לְפָנָ֤יו ׀ תָּב֬וֹא בְאָזְנָֽיו, Ps 18:7), פ'י מצ'רב (מנזל) לכ'צאר (לחשיש) יבררכני (בִּנְא֣וֹת דֶּ֭שֶׁא יַרְבִּיצֵ֑נִי, Ps 23:2), חתא כ'דימךּ שתחרז פ'יהום פ'י חריזהום איג'ארא (רכ'לא) כבירא (גַּֽם־עַ֭בְדְּךָ נִזְהָ֣ר בָּהֶ֑ם בְּ֝שָׁמְרָ֗ם עֵ֣קֶב רָֽב, Ps 19:12).

[D-E]: ל – *l(i)* is used in the *šarḥ* to translate the Hebrew ל-, while the Hebrew אֶל is translated אילא *ila*.

ל-: תוג'ד ידךּ לג'מיע עודייאנךּ (תִּמְצָ֣א יָֽ֭דְךָ לְכָל־אֹֽיְבֶ֑יךָ, Ps 21:9), אללאה יתמסכ'ר ליהום (אֲ֝דֹנָ֗י יִלְעַג־לָֽמוֹ, Ps 2:4), ויכ'לליו שייאמתהום לסג;ארהום (וְהִנִּ֥יחוּ יִ֝תְרָ֗ם לְעֽוֹלְלֵיהֶֽם, Ps 17:14).

אילא: נבאייאע אילא קצר קודשךּ (אֶשְׁתַּֽחֲוֶ֥ה אֶל־הֵֽיכַל־קָ֝דְשְׁךָ֗, Ps 5:8), חין יתכללם אילהום (אָ֤ז יְדַבֵּ֣ר אֵלֵ֣ימוֹ, Ps 2:5), אלפ'אהם אילא ג'מיע פ'עאיילהום (הַ֝מֵּבִ֗ין אֶל־כָּל־מַֽעֲשֵׂיהֶֽם, Ps 33:15).

These examples emphasize the subservience of the translation to the Hebrew source: a single-letter Hebrew preposition is translated by its single-letter Judeo-Arabic counterpart, while an independent preposition (אל) is translated by a Judeo-Arabic particle.

As we shall see below, the Judeo-Arabic particle אילא *ila* is also used in the *šarḥ* to translate the Hebrew accusative particle את; thus, this particle bears a heavy functional load.[[64]](#footnote-64)

The preposition עלא – *ˁla (ˁal*) is used to translate the Hebrew particle על (עלי); for example: ללמדאח בנג;מאת עלא אתאמנא (לַמְנַצֵּ֣חַ בִּ֭נְגִינוֹת עַֽל־הַשְּׁמִינִ֗ית, Ps 6:1), יתרפ'ע ראצי עלא עודייאני (יָר֪וּם רֹאשִׁ֡י עַ֤ל אֹֽיְבַ֬י, Ps 27:6), נור ובהג' תשתוי עליה (ה֥וֹד וְ֝הָדָ֗ר תְּשַׁוֶּ֥ה עָלָֽיו, Ps 21:6).

The shortened form על appears only a handful of times in the printed *šarḥ*: קעדת על לכרסי (יָשַׁ֥בְתָּ לְ֝כִסֵּ֗א, Ps 9:5), חמקת (על) לאומום (גָּעַ֣רְתָּ ג֭וֹיִם, Ps 9:6), ויכ'ללץ על אזייאדא[[65]](#footnote-65) (וּמְשַׁלֵּ֥ם עַל־יֶ֝֗תֶר, Ps 31:24). However, it was sometimes pronounced by the informants when reading the text;[[66]](#footnote-66) thus, we find: *ˁal əl-ma* (עַל־הַ֫מָּ֥יִם, Ps 29:3), *ˁal ət-tāmn-a* (עַֽל־הַשְּׁמִינִ֗ית, Ps 6:1), *ˁal əl-ḥbəl* (עַל־יֶ֑תֶר, Ps 11:2).

The particle *ˁal-*, the shortened form of *ˁla*, is common in the spoken language of the Jews of Constantine and appears before nouns accompanied by the definite article.[[67]](#footnote-67) It appears frequently alongside עלא in the works published by Rabbi Yosef Renassia that adopt a more dialectal register, such as his *Zichron Ya’acov* commentary on the Psalms.[[68]](#footnote-68)

The particle מעא *mˁa* serves in the *šarḥ* to translate both the Hebrew particle עם and the particle את when this has the sense of “with,”[[69]](#footnote-70) for example: מעא אלטאהר תתטאהר (עִם־חָסִ֥יד תִּתְחַסָּ֑ד, Ps 18:27), ונתמתל מעא האבטין חופ'רא (וְ֝נִמְשַׁ֗לְתִּי עִם־י֥וֹרְדֵי בֽוֹר, Ps 18:1), וכונת צאפי מעו (וָֽאֱהִ֣י תָמִ֣ים עִמּ֑וֹ, Ps 18:24), אין אנתא מעאייא[[70]](#footnote-71) (כִּֽי־אַתָּ֥ה עִמָּדִ֑י, Ps 23:4).

The rabbis pronounced the particle חתא in two ways: *ḥtta* or *ḥatta*.[[71]](#footnote-72) This particle is used in the *šarḥ* to the Psalms to translate the Hebrew preposition עד and the conjunctions גם and אף.[[72]](#footnote-73) Examples of the use of חתא to translate עד: וליש נרג'ע חתא פ'ניהום (וְלֹֽא־אָ֝שׁ֗וּב עַד־כַּלּוֹתָֽם, Ps 18:38), חתא אדואם (עַד־הָֽעוֹלָֽם, Ps 28:9), חתא ליש עדאד (עַד־אֵ֬ין מִסְפָּ֗ר, Ps 40:13). The word חתא is also used to translate such phrases as עד אנה and עד מתי, as illustrated above.[[73]](#footnote-74)

The particle קודאם – *quddām*[[74]](#footnote-75) translates the Hebrew preposition לפני in its spatial sense. When the Hebrew particle is accompanied by the prepositional מ – מלפני or מפני – the equivalent CA particle מן is added: יכונו לרצ'א קואל פ'ומי ומנטק קלבי קודאמךּ (יִ֥הְיֽוּ לְרָצ֨וֹן ׀ אִמְרֵי־פִ֡י וְהֶגְי֣וֹן לִבִּ֣י לְפָנֶ֑יךָ, Ps 19:15), מן קודאמךּ חכמי (שרעי) יכ'רג' (מִ֭לְּפָנֶיךָ מִשְׁפָּטִ֣י יֵצֵ֑א, Ps 17:2), מן קודאם אצ'אלמין (מִפְּנֵ֣י רְ֭שָׁעִים, Ps 17:9).

We should note that the ל in the Hebrew word לפנים is not manifested in the *šarḥ*, so that in this respect the literal character of the translation is not maintained. By contrast, in the *šarḥ* of the Jews of Tafilalat, לפני is always translated לקדאם, despite the fact that קדאם alone is used in the colloquial.[[75]](#footnote-76)

The word *quddām* is presented as an alternative translation of the Hebrew פנים in the phrase את פניך.[[76]](#footnote-77) For example: שבעת לפ'רחאת אילא וג'הךּ (קדאמךּ) לדדאת פ'י ימינךּ ללאבד (שֹׂ֣בַע שְׂ֭מָחוֹת אֶת־פָּנֶ֑יךָ נְעִמ֖וֹת בִּימִֽינְךָ֣ נֶֽצַח, Ps 16:11), תפ'ררחו בפ'רחא אילא וג'הךּ (קדאמךּ) (תְּחַדֵּ֥הוּ בְ֝שִׂמְחָ֗ה אֶת־פָּנֶֽיךָ, Ps 21:7).

The word לורא / ללורא – *lawṛa* / *li-lawṛa* appears three times in the corpus as the translation of אחור in its adverbial function: יתוכ'רו לורא וינחשמו (יִסֹּ֣גוּ אָ֭חוֹר וְיִכָּֽלְמ֑וּ, Ps 40:15), פ'י רג'וע עודייאני ללורא (בְּשׁוּב־אֽוֹיְבַ֥י אָח֑וֹר, Ps 9:4), מפ'תשין רוחי יתוכ'רו ללורא (מְבַקְשֵׁ֪י נַ֫פְשִׁ֥י יִסֹּ֣גוּ אָח֣וֹר, Ps 35:4).

The form *li-lawṛa* would appear to have been created under the influence of the Hebrew לאחור, with which Rabbi Yosef Renassia would certainly have been familiar, despite the fact that the original verses here used אחור without the ל.

The word קבאלת – *qbālət* is used in the šarḥ to translate the Hebrew particle נגד / לנגד; for example: ליש יתוקפ'ו ג'אהלין קבאלת עייניךּ (לֹֽא־יִתְיַצְּב֣וּ הֽ֭וֹלְלִים לְנֶ֣גֶד עֵינֶ֑יךָ, Ps 5:6), שתוית אללאה קבאלתי דאיים (שִׁוִּ֬יתִי יְהוָ֣ה לְנֶגְדִּ֣י תָמִ֑יד, Ps 16:8), מן אצ'או קבאלתו צחאבו ג'אזו (מִנֹּ֗גַהּ נֶ֫גְדּ֥וֹ עָבָ֥יו עָֽבְר֑וּ, Ps 18:13).

In the translation of the phrase לְנֶ֣גֶד עֵינָֽיו (Ps 36:2), the reading *l-qbālət ˁaynī-h*  was also heard, reflecting formal subservience to the Hebrew word לנגד. However, in the printed *šarḥ* לנגד is translated as קבאלת, without the initial ל and, indeed, the form *qbālət* on its own is sufficient to translate this Hebrew form.

The Judeo-Arabic word תחת *taḥt* is used in the *šarḥ* to translate the Hebrew תחת with the sense of “under, underneath.” Examples: כלשי[[77]](#footnote-78) ג'עלתי תחת רג'ליה (כֹּ֝֗ל שַׁ֣תָּה תַֽחַת־רַגְלָֽיו, Ps 8:7), וצ'באב תחת רג'ליה (וַֽ֝עֲרָפֶ֗ל תַּ֣חַת רַגְלָֽיו, Ps 18:10), תטייח (תבררךּ) קאיימיני (עודייאני) תחתי (תַּכְרִ֖יעַ קָמַ֣י תַּחְתָּֽי, Ps 18:40).

The Arabic word עוץ' / עווץ' *ˁawād[[78]](#footnote-79)* translates the Hebrew תחת in the sense of “instead (of)”: יכ'לצוני דונייא עוץ' מלאחא (יְשַׁלְּמ֣וּנִי רָ֭עָה תַּ֥חַת טוֹבָ֗ה, Ps 35:12), ומכ'לצין דונייא עווץ' מלאחא יחאשפ'וני עווץ' מתבעי למליח (וּמְשַׁלְּמֵ֣י רָ֭עָה תַּ֣חַת טוֹבָ֑ה יִ֝שְׂטְנ֗וּנִי תַּ֣חַת רדופי־ (רָֽדְפִי־) טֽוֹב, Ps 38:21).

The phrase פ'י וסט *fi wusṭ* translates the Hebrew בתוך: כיף אשמע מדווב פ'י וסט מצארני (כַּדּוֹנָ֑ג נָ֝מֵ֗ס בְּת֣וֹךְ מֵעָֽי, Ps 22:15), פ'י וסט קלבי ( בְּת֬וֹךְ לִבִּ֗י, Ps 40:11), פ'י וסט ג'מאעא אנשכרךּ (בְּת֖וֹךְ קָהָ֣ל אֲהַלְלֶֽךָּ, Ps 22:23).

The prepositional combination מן ענד *mən ˁand* is used to translate the Hebrew preposition מאת (which similarly is formed from מ + את): וחדא טלבת מן ענד אללאה (אַחַ֤ת ׀ שָׁאַ֣לְתִּי מֵֽאֵת־יְהוָה֮, Ps 27:4), ירפ'ד ברכא מן ענד אללאה (יִשָּׂ֣א בְ֭רָכָה מֵאֵ֣ת יְהוָ֑ה, Ps 24:5), מן ענדךּ שכרתי פ'י ג'מאעא כבירא (מֵ֥אִתְּךָ֗ תְּֽהִלָּ֫תִ֥י בְּקָהָ֥ל רָ֑ב, Ps 22:26).

The phrase *mən ˁand* is already found in ancient Arabic[[79]](#footnote-80) and is in use in Maghrebi dialects;[[80]](#footnote-81) thus it does not constitute an artificial calque of the Hebrew phrase.

The Arabic particle כ'לף – *xəlf* is used in the *šarḥ* to the Psalms to translate the Hebrew particle זולתי. In the following verse, the phrase מן כ'לף *men xəlf* is used to translate מבלעדי; the *mən* reflects formal subservience to the Hebrew מ: אין מן אילאה מן כ'לף אללאה ומן קוי כ'לף אילאהנא (כִּ֤י מִ֣י אֱ֭לוֹהַּ מִבַּלְעֲדֵ֣י יְהוָ֑ה וּמִ֥י צ֝֗וּר זֽוּלָתִ֥י אֱלֹהֵֽינוּ, Ps 18:32).

[10.6] The Conjunctions

The particle כ'לאף *xlāf* is used to translate the Hebrew conjunctions אך and רק, for example: כ'לאף למליח ולפ'צ'ל יתבעוני (אַ֤ךְ ׀ ט֤וֹב וָחֶ֣סֶד יִ֭רְדְּפוּנִי, Ps 23:6), כ'לאף פ'צ'למא (בשביהא) יתמשא ראג'ל כ'לאף הווא יג'מעו (יתהוולו) (אַךְ־בְּצֶ֤לֶם ׀ יִֽתְהַלֶּךְ־אִ֗ישׁ אַךְ־הֶ֥בֶל יֶֽהֱמָי֑וּן, Ps 39:7), כ'לאף לפ'ייצ'ת (תעוים) מייא כתאר (רַ֗ק לְ֭שֵׁטֶף מַ֣יִם רַבִּ֑ים, Ps 32:6).

The particle חתא *ḥtta* / *ḥatta* is used to translate the Hebrew conjunctions גם and אף. The uses of this particle to translate עד and its appearance in particle combinations were described above.[[81]](#footnote-82) Examples of its use to translate גם and אף:

גם: ליש עאמל מליח ליש חתא ואחד (אֵ֤ין עֹֽשֵׂה־ט֑וֹב אֵ֝֗ין גַּם־אֶחָֽד, Ps 14:3), חתא ג'מיע מצרג'ינךּ ליש יחשמו (גַּ֣ם כָּל־קֹ֭וֶיךָ לֹ֣א יֵבֹ֑שׁוּ, Ps 25:3), חתא אין נמשי פ'י וטיית צ'ל למות (צ'למא) (גַּ֤ם כִּֽי־אֵלֵ֨ךְ בְּגֵ֪יא צַלְמָ֡וֶת, Ps 23:4).

אף: חתא וראתא חסנת עלייא (אַף־נַֽ֝חֲלָ֗ת שָֽׁפְרָ֥ה עָלָֽי, Ps 16:6), חתא ליאלי אדבוני כלאוייא (אַף־לֵ֝יל֗וֹת יִסְּר֥וּנִי כִלְיוֹתָֽי, Ps 16:7), חתא מן קאיימיני תרפ'פ'עני (אַ֣ף מִן־קָ֭מַי תְּרֽוֹמְמֵ֑נִי, Ps 18:49).

The particle קבל – *qbǝl* is mainly used in the šarḥ to the Psalms to translate the Hebrew conjunction פן, and accordingly we have included it here:[[82]](#footnote-83) קבל יפ'רס כיף אציד רוחי (פֶּן־יִטְרֹ֣ף כְּאַרְיֵ֣ה נַפְשִׁ֑י, Ps 7:3), קבל ננעס אלמות (פֶּן־אִישַׁ֥ן הַמָּֽוֶת, Ps 13:4), קבל תסכת מני (פֶּן־תֶּֽחֱשֶׁ֥ה מִמֶּ֑נִּי, Ps 28:1).

The particle *qbǝl* in the *šarḥ* to the Psalms also translates the Hebrew word טרם:[[83]](#footnote-84) קבל נואג'ב אנא ג;אלט (טֶ֣רֶם אֶֽ֭עֱנֶה אֲנִ֣י שֹׁגֵ֑ג, Ps 119:67). The phrase בקבל *b-qbǝl* reflects subservience to the Hebrew particle combination בטרם and is used to translate the latter: אתרכ'ף מני ונתקווא בקבל נמשי וליישי (הָשַׁ֣ע מִמֶּ֣נִּי וְאַבְלִ֑יגָה בְּטֶ֖רֶם אֵלֵ֣ךְ וְאֵינֶֽנִּי, Ps 39:14).

/w/ is always used for the conjunction “and.” See Section [2.3] regarding the rules of realization of this particle.

[10.7] The Translation of the Hebrew Particle את

The Hebrew accusative particle את, which has no counterpart in CA, is translated in the *šarḥ* to the Psalms by אילא *ila*.[[84]](#footnote-85) Thus we find, for example: מן אסמא מקקן אללאה נצ'ר אילא ג'מיע ולאד בן אדם (מִ֭שָּׁמַיִם הִבִּ֣יט יְהוָ֑ה רָ֝אָ֗ה אֶֽת־כָּל־בְּנֵ֥י הָֽאָדָֽם, Ps 33:13), אין אצ'רבת אילא ג'מיע עודייאני (כִּֽי־הִכִּ֣יתָ אֶת־כָּל־אֹֽיְבַ֣י, Ps 3:8), נבארךּ אילא אללאה אלדי צ'בבר עלייא (אֲבָרֵ֗ךְ אֶת־יְ֭הוָה אֲשֶׁ֣ר יְעָצָ֑נִי, Ps 16:7).

When את is accompanied by an enclitic pronoun, אילא also appears with the equivalent pronoun: אין יפ'תש דמום אילהום פ'תכר... (כִּֽי־דֹרֵ֣שׁ דָּ֭מִים אוֹתָ֣ם זָכָ֑ר, Ps 9:13), וחדא טלבת מן ענד אללאה אילהא נפ'תש (אַחַ֤ת ׀ שָׁאַ֣לְתִּי מֵֽאֵת־יְהוָה֮ אוֹתָ֪הּ אֲבַ֫קֵּ֥שׁ, Ps 27:4), פ'י נהאר פ'ךּ אללאה אילו מן כף ג'מיע עדיאנו (בְּי֤וֹם הִֽצִּיל־יְהוָ֘ה אוֹת֥וֹ מִכַּ֥ף כָּל־אֹֽ֝יְבָ֗יו, Ps 18:1), אין אנתא אילאה מג;יתתי אילך צרג'ית (כִּֽי־אַ֭תָּה אֱלֹהֵ֣י יִשְׁעִ֑י אֽוֹתְךָ֥ קִ֝וִּ֗יתִי, Ps 25:5).

Although the *šarḥ* generally translates every את with אילא, it is not overly pedantic; when את has the sense of "with," it is translated מעא – *mˁa*; for example: באטל יתכלמו ראג'ל מעא צאחבו שארב רטובאת (שָׁ֤וְא ׀ יְֽדַבְּרוּ֮ אִ֤ישׁ אֶת־רֵ֫עֵ֥הוּ שְׂפַ֥ת חֲלָק֑וֹת, Ps 12:3), כברו לאללאה מעאייא ונרפ'עו אסמו ג'מיע (גַּדְּל֣וּ לַֽיהוָ֣ה אִתִּ֑י וּנְרֽוֹמְמָ֖ה שְׁמ֣וֹ יַחְדָּֽו, Ps 34:4).

When translating biblical verses independently, including verses from books other than the Psalms, one of the rabbis translated את as *ila*. The other two rabbis translated the word in some instances but ignored it in others, although they consistently read it when reciting from the written *šarḥ*.

There are only a few instances in which a Hebrew את preceding a definite object in the accusative was translated by a particle other than אילא; the reason in these cases appears to be the agreement of the Arabic verb. Thus, we found: לֹֽא־אִ֘ירָ֤א רָ֗ע כִּֽי־אַתָּ֥ה עִמָּדִ֑י (Ps 23:4) – ליש נכ'אף (מן) אדוני אין אנתא מעאייא,[[85]](#footnote-86) אַשְׁרֵי־אִ֭ישׁ יָרֵ֣א אֶת־יְהוָ֑ה (Ps 112:1) – אסקל אלראג'ל כ'אייף מן אללאה.[[86]](#footnote-87)

The particle את is also found in the translation of the Torah by the western Issachar Ben-Susan,[[87]](#footnote-88) which uses אייאת for this purpose, and in the translations in the Algiers[[88]](#footnote-89) and Baghdad Haggadot, which I examined, it is translated using אילא / אלא. In all these three translations, as in CPA, את is translated as מעא in cases when it means “with.”

The translation of את as אלא is one of the hallmarks of the literary Judeo-Arabic dialect of Baghdad. This אלא appears mainly in the *šaruḥ* – translations of Scripture and liturgical texts – although it occasionally also emerges in non-*šarḥ* texts.[[89]](#footnote-90)

Doron claims that the translation of את by אלא reflects a Mashriqi translation tradition that emphasizes literal rendition and notes that he found no equivalent of את in his examination of later vernacular Maghrebi texts.[[90]](#footnote-91) However, in the Maghrebi translations I examined – our translation of the Psalms here, the *Or Ne’erav* translation of the Torah,[[91]](#footnote-92) and the translated in the Algiers Haggadah – אילא clearly and consistently serves to translate את. It is true that in some Maghrebi translations, את = ø,[[92]](#footnote-93) that is, it is not rendered in the translation. This is true, for example, in most of the biblical *šarḥ* traditions among the Jews of Morocco.[[93]](#footnote-94) However, it may be assumed that the translation of את by any term in general, and by אילא in particular, is not a distinctly Mashriqi feature. It is certainly found in the Mashriq (in the Baghdad Haggadot and in the manuscripts mentioned in Doron’s article[[94]](#footnote-95)), but it is also found in Algeria and perhaps elsewhere in the Maghreb.

The translation of את as אילא (אלא) imposes a significant functional burden on this word in Judeo-Arabic texts, since this particle is used to translate both את and אל [[95]](#footnote-96) (and in certain texts also ל and אלא).[[96]](#footnote-97) Accordingly, the word אילא may appear several times in the same sentence in its various functions. The reader relies on the context, the circumstances, and/or the adjacent Hebrew original in order to understand which Hebrew word is being translated by אלא in each specific instance.

The rendition of את in the translation in almost all instances reflects a number of tendencies. The first is maximum adhesion to the original text, including an effort to provide a translated equivalent for each morpheme in the original, even if there is no readily available CA counterpart. Although this creates a largely artificial language, it prevents the loss of even a “drop” of the original. The western Issachar Ben-Susan explains this in his second introduction to his translation of the Torah, and his comments may reflect a general approach on this subject among the translators: “The purpose of the word אייאת in the verses is to emphasize the sense and ensure precision in the thing to which it refers…And since in our translation seeks only to present the Arabic against the Hebrew, in order to appreciate and benefit from even the smallest matter… and so I saw that we should not omit any word written in the Torah without translating it… And so the Targum [Onkelos] almost always translate את by ית.”[[97]](#footnote-98) The strict attention to translating this word would also seem to reflect the frequency with which it occurs in the Bible.

The second tendency, I would argue, is that the translation of את is consistent with a general desire to draw away from the synthetic model and adopt a more analytical language.[[98]](#footnote-99) Denoting the direct object with ל or ב, or even with a “preemptive” demonstrative pronoun, reflects an analytical approach; few examples of this approach can be found in CA, but it becomes increasingly common in later Medieval Arabic.[[99]](#footnote-100) Thus, for example, ל is used to denote the direct object in the colloquial Jewish dialect of Baghdad[[100]](#footnote-101) and in other dialects.

Blau notes that in some of the dialects reflected in Judeo-Arabic, ל and אלי may have unified.[[101]](#footnote-102) It seems possible to me that אלי may have subsequently begun to serve to denote a direct object, and accordingly its use to translate את may have been regarded as unremarkable, given that this is the Hebrew particle denoting a definite direct object.[[102]](#footnote-103)

Accordingly, I believe that the idea to reflect the Hebrew source precisely and the tendency in the spoken language to employ an external marker to denote the direct object (given the loss of the cases) encouraged the consistent translation of את in certain renditions. We may add to this the influence of Onkelos’s use of ית to translate את. I would add in this context that in the translation of the Bible into Jewish Neo-Aramaic, too, את is consistently translated by the particle אאל(ד), whereas in the spoken language it is usually seen as superfluous.[[103]](#footnote-104)

Sa’adia Ben Gaon does not, of course, translate the particle את and, accordingly, his translation certainly did not influence those discussed above in this regard.

In short, this issue reflects the desire to maintain fully the transmission of the sacred original text, without omitting any word, even when this requires the creation of a linguistic usage virtually *ex nihilo*.

[10.8] Comparative Particles

The commonest comparative particle in the *šarḥ* to the Psalms is כיף *kīf*, which serves regularly to translate the Hebrew comparative כ.[[104]](#footnote-105) Examples: אחכמני (שאראעני) יא אללאה כיף עדלי וכיף צפ'אותי עלייא (שָׁפְטֵ֥נִי יְהוָ֑ה כְּצִדְקִ֖י וּכְתֻמִּ֣י עָלָֽי, Ps 7:9), שביהתו כיף אציד ישתהי ליפ'רס וכיף (פ'רך) אסבע קאעד פ'למכ'פ'ייאת (דִּמְיֹנ֗וֹ כְּ֭אַרְיֵה יִכְס֣וֹף לִטְרֹ֑ף וְ֝כִכְפִ֗יר יֹשֵׁ֥ב בְּמִסְתָּרִֽים, Ps 17:12), והווא כיף לערוס כ'ארג' מן כ'בתו (חג'לתו) (וְה֗וּא כְּ֭חָתָן יֹצֵ֣א מֵֽחֻפָּת֑וֹ, Ps 19:6).

In the examined corpus (the first 41 Psalms), the word בחאל *bḥāl* is used only twice to translate the Hebrew comparative כמו; both instances occur in a single verse: ונגגזהום בחאל לעג'ל לבנון ושריון בחאל ולד ארים (וַיַּרְקִידֵ֥ם כְּמוֹ־עֵ֑גֶל לְבָנ֥וֹן וְ֝שִׂרְיֹ֗ן כְּמ֣וֹ בֶן־רְאֵמִֽים, Ps 29:6).

An examination of the Psalms outside the corpus shows that the Hebrew word כמו is translated in some instances as בחאל and others as כיף with no apparent consistency, even in consecutive verses.[[105]](#footnote-106) Conversely, in Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s commentary on the Psalms (*Zichron Ya’acov*), the word בחאל is usually preferred; it would appear to have a more dialectal character than its twin, *kīf*.[[106]](#footnote-107) By way of comparison, we may note that in the *šarh* to the Bible of the Jews of Tafilalat, כיף is the only particle used to translate the Hebrew comparative particle כ, although in their spoken dialect *fḥāl* is used.[[107]](#footnote-108) However, the word פ'חאל penetrates the translations of the Jews of this region in extra-biblical texts.[[108]](#footnote-109)

The particle *ki* was sometimes used by the rabbi who translates directly from the Hebrew source to translate the Hebrew כ,[[109]](#footnote-110) though this form is not documented in the printed *šarḥ*. This fact, as well as the common distribution of *ki*  in the surrounding dialects, suggests that *ki*  may also be used in this sense in the colloquial dialect of the Jews of Constantine.[[110]](#footnote-111)

We should note that we did not find any evidence of the use of the particle מתל in the printed *šarḥ* or in the rabbis’ translations.[[111]](#footnote-112)

[10.9] Conditional Particles

The conditional particle אידא *ida* translates the Hebrew conditional particle אם. Examples: אללאה אילאהי אידא עמלת האדי אידא תמא עווג' פ'י כפ'ופ'י (יְהוָ֣ה אֱ֭לֹהַי אִם־עָשִׂ֣יתִי זֹ֑את אִֽם־יֶשׁ־עָ֥וֶל בְּכַפָּֽי, Ps 7:4), אידא ליש ירג'ע סייפ'ו ימצ'צ'י (אִם־לֹ֣א יָ֭שׁוּב חַרְבּ֣וֹ יִלְט֑וֹשׁ, Ps 7:13), ואידא ג'א לינצ'ר באטל יתכללם קלבו (וְאִם־בָּ֤א לִרְא֨וֹת ׀ שָׁ֤וְא יְדַבֵּ֗ר לִבּ֗וֹ, Ps 41:7).

The Hebrew phrase כי אם in the sense of “but rather” (אֶלָא) is translated in the *šarḥ* as אין אידא *in ida*: אידא פ'י שריעת אללאה ג;רצ'ו (כִּ֤י אִ֥ם בְּתוֹרַ֥ת יְהוָ֗ה חֶ֫פְצ֥וֹ, Ps 1:2).

Rabbi Yosef Renassia also uses אידא in his translation of the Mishnah, for example: ואומר אם אני הוא הטמא – ויקול. אידא אנא הווא אטמא (Nazir 8:1). In some instances, he adds this particle to a Hebrew asyndetic conditional sentence: ניטלה אחת תולין... – ואידא תרפ'דת וחדא יעללקו (Pesahim 1:5). The translation of אם by אידא *ida* is also found in the *šarḥ* to the Bible of the Jews of Tafilalat, whereas in their colloquial dialect *ila* is used.[[112]](#footnote-113)

The phrase יא לוכאן ליש *ya lūkān layš* is used to translate the Hebrew conditional particle לולא: יא לוכאן ליש אמנת לינצ'ר פ'י כ'יר אללאה פ'י ארץ' לחייא (לׅׄוּׅׄלֵׅ֗ׄאׅׄ הֶֽ֭אֱמַנְתִּי לִרְא֥וֹת בְּֽטוּב־יְהוָ֗ה בְּאֶ֣רֶץ חַיִּֽים, Ps 27:13), יא לוכאן ליש אללאה מעוונא לייא (לוּלֵ֣י יְ֭הוָה עֶזְרָ֣תָה לִּ֑י, Ps 94:17).

Outside the corpus, we found that לו is translated as יא לוכאן: יא לוכאן קומי סאמע לייא (ל֗וּ עַ֭מִּי שֹׁמֵ֣עַֽ לִ֑י, Ps 81:14).

This particle is used in a conditional sense in many other dialects; for example, the phrase יא לוכאן is also used to translate the Hebrew אילו in the Algiers Haggadah.[[113]](#footnote-114) Similarly, *lūkǟn* is used in the spoken language of the Jews of Algiers in conditional sentences whose realization is extremely doubtful.[[114]](#footnote-115) It is also documented in the Muslim dialect of Tlemcen,[[115]](#footnote-116) in the dialect of Takrouna,[[116]](#footnote-117) and in the Jewish dialect of Tunis.[[117]](#footnote-118)

The phrase לו כאן can be found from as early as Medieval Judeo-Arabic;[[118]](#footnote-119) it was created by way of analogy to the phrases אן כאן and אד'א כאן, and like these phrases it is fossilized and does not decline.[[119]](#footnote-120) The כאן element in these phrases is no longer regarded as an ancillary verb but as part of the expression denoting the condition.[[120]](#footnote-121)

[10.10] Additional Words

We will review here briefly several words that were not discussed under the other headings, most of which serve as adverbs in the šarḥ.

The word בלחאק *b-ǝl-ḥaqq* is used in the *šarḥ* to the Psalms to translate the Hebrew conjunction לכן: בלחאק פ'ראח קלבי וזהא וקארי (לָכֵ֤ן ׀ שָׂמַ֣ח לִ֭בִּי וַיָּ֣גֶל כְּבוֹדִ֑י, Ps 16:9).

Outside the corpus, this particle also appears once as בלחאק (Ps 119:119), but elsewhere other Arabic words are preferred; for example: עלא האכד (לדאלךּ) קלדתהום אלטג;וא (לָ֭כֵן עֲנָקַ֣תְמוֹ גַֽאֲוָ֑ה, Ps 73:6), לדאלךּ ירד קומו הנא (מכצור) (לָכֵ֤ן ׀ ישיב (יָשׁ֣וּב) עַמּ֣וֹ הֲלֹ֑ם, Ps 73:10).

In one instance, בלחאק translates the Hebrew word אכן: בלחאק סמעת צות תצ'ריעאתי... (אָכֵ֗ן שָׁ֭מַעְתָּ ק֥וֹל תַּֽחֲנוּנַ֗י, Ps 31:23).

The word מוג'וד *moğūd* / *mawğūd* translates the Hebrew adverb מאד; for example: ורוחי דהשת מוג'וד (וְ֭נַפְשִׁי נִבְהֲלָ֣ה מְאֹ֑ד, Ps 6:4), מן ג'מיע צ'ייקיני כונת מעיירא ולג'יראני מוג'וד (מִכָּל־צֹֽרְרַ֨י הָיִ֪יתִי חֶרְפָּ֡ה וְלִ֥שְׁכֵנַ֨י ׀ מְאֹד֮, Ps 31:12). According to the rabbis, the word *bəzzāf* would appear to serve in this function in the spoken language.[[121]](#footnote-122)

The phrase כיף שואי *kīf šway*, which comprises the particle *kīf* and the dialectal diminutive form of شيء *ši*,[[122]](#footnote-123) translates the Hebrew כמעט, which it mimics in form:[[123]](#footnote-124) ותצ'יעו אטריק אין ישעל כיף שואי חרג'ו (וְתֹ֬אבְדוּ דֶ֗רֶךְ כִּֽי־יִבְעַ֣ר כִּמְעַ֣ט אַפּ֑וֹ, Ps 2:12), כיף שואי נזלת סכתת רוחי (כִּמְעַ֓ט ׀ שָֽׁכְנָ֖ה דוּמָ֣ה נַפְשִֽׁי, Ps 94:17).

The Arabic word חין *ḥīn* is used in the *šarḥ* to the Psalms to translate the Hebrew adverb אז;[[124]](#footnote-125) for example: חין נתצפ'פ'א ונתברא מן ג'רם כביר (אָ֣ז אֵיתָ֑ם וְ֝נִקֵּ֗יתִי מִפֶּ֥שַֽׁע רָֽב, Ps 19:14), חין קולת הודא ג'ית (אָ֣ז אָ֭מַרְתִּי הִנֵּה־בָ֑אתִי, Ps 40:8).

*ḥīn* also translates the Hebrew particle כי in its temporal sense; for example: חין ננצ'ר סמאואתךּ פ'על צואבעךּ קמר ונג'ום אלדי צאוובת (כִּֽי־אֶרְאֶ֣ה שָׁ֭מֶיךָ מַֽעֲשֵׂ֣ה אֶצְבְּעֹתֶ֑יךָ יָרֵ֥חַ וְ֝כֽוֹכָבִ֗ים אֲשֶׁ֣ר כּוֹנָֽנְתָּה, Ps 8:4).

The word *dāyɪm* is used by the rabbis to translate the Hebrew words סלה and תמיד. See Section [3.6] for details regarding the pronunciation and uses of this particle.

The word דלוקת (in its various spellings) is pronounced by the rabbis as *d-əl-waqt*, *d-əl-waq* or *d-ər-waq*,[[125]](#footnote-126) and has its origins in هذا الوقت. This word is used to translate the Hebrew words עתה and נא;[[126]](#footnote-127) for example: עתה: דלווקת נקום יקול אללאה (עַתָּ֣ה אָ֭קוּם יֹאמַ֣ר יְהוָ֑ה, Ps 12:6), רג'לנא דלווק צ'אורונא (אַ֭שֻּׁרֵינוּ עַתָּ֣ה סבבוני (סְבָב֑וּנוּ), Ps 17:11), דלוקת ערפ'ת אין ג;את אללאה (עַתָּ֤ה יָדַ֗עְתִּי כִּ֤י הוֹשִׁ֥יעַ ׀ יְהוָ֗ה, Ps 20:7). נא: יכממל דלוקת דוני אצ'אלמין (יִגְמָר־נָ֬א רַ֨ע ׀ רְשָׁעִים֮, Ps 7:10).

M. Cohen reports that the word *dǟbä*, which is common with this meaning in the Jewish dialect of Algiers, is unknown among the Jews of Constantine.[[127]](#footnote-128)

The phrase *dāyɪr sāyɪr* is used in the *šarḥ* to the Psalms to translate the Hebrew adverb סביב; for example: ליש נכ'אף מן רבואת קום אלדי דאייר סאייר ג'עלו עלייא (לֹֽא־אִ֭ירָא מֵֽרִבְב֥וֹת עָ֑ם אֲשֶׁ֥ר סָ֝בִ֗יב שָׁ֣תוּ עָלָֽי, Ps 3:7), דאייר סאייר צ'אלמין יתמשאו (סָבִ֗יב רְשָׁעִ֥ים יִתְהַלָּכ֑וּן, Ps 12:9). This phrase is used with the same meaning in other Maghrebi dialects.[[128]](#footnote-129)

The word תממא (תמא) *tǝmma* is used in the šarḥ to the Psalms to translate the Hebrew words שם and יש; for example: שם: תממא טאחו פ'עלין אזור נג'זזו וליש קדרו ליקום (שָׁ֣ם נָֽ֭פְלוּ פֹּ֣עֲלֵי אָ֑וֶן דֹּ֝ח֗וּ וְלֹא־יָ֥כְלוּ קֽוּם, Ps 36:13), תממא כ'אפו כ'וף אין אללאה פ'י ג'יל עאדל (שָׁ֤ם ׀ פָּ֣חֲדוּ פָ֑חַד כִּֽי־אֱ֝לֹהִ֗ים בְּד֣וֹר צַדִּֽיק, Ps 14:5). יש: אידא תמא עווג' פ'י כפ'ופ'י (אִֽם־יֶשׁ־עָ֥וֶל בְּכַפָּֽי, Ps 7:4), לינצ'ר אש תממא כייס יפ'תש אילא אללאה (לִ֭רְאוֹת הֲיֵ֣שׁ מַשְׂכִּ֑יל דֹּ֝רֵ֗שׁ אֶת־אֱלֹהִֽים, Ps 14:2).

The connection between שם and יש as terms denoting reality is well known; Maimonides also used the Hebrew word שם with the sense of יש, under the influence of the Arabic.[[129]](#footnote-130) In Medieval Judeo-Arabic texts, the sense of reality is conveyed by the word תם.[[130]](#footnote-131)

The word ג'מיע – *ǧmīˁ* is used in the *šarḥ* to the Psalms to translate the Hebrew כל (in a construct chain), while the form אג'מיע – *ǝğ-ğmīˁ* is used to translate יחד and יחדו,[[131]](#footnote-132) for example: כל-: אש ג'ליל אסמך פ'י ג'מיע אלארץ' (מָֽה־אַדִּ֥יר שִׁ֝מְךָ֗ בְּכָל־הָאָֽרֶץ, Ps 8:10), יעטי ליךּ כיף קלבךּ וג'מיע צ'בארתךּ יכממל (יִֽתֶּן־לְךָ֥ כִלְבָבֶ֑ךָ וְֽכָל־עֲצָתְךָ֥ יְמַלֵּֽא, Ps 20:5).

However, when the Hebrew word כל appears independently (not in a construct chain), it is translated in the *šarḥ* by כל שי *kull ši*, for example: כל שי זאל (מן אטריק למליחא) אג'מיע תהלכו (הַכֹּ֥ל סָר֮ יַחְדָּ֪ו נֶֽ֫אֱלָ֥חוּ, Ps 14:3), ג'עלתי תחת רג'ליה (כֹּ֝֗ל שַׁ֣תָּה תַֽחַת־רַגְלָֽיו, Ps 8:7). This practice is also found in the *šarḥ* to the Bible of the Jews of Tafilalat, as well as in Rabbi Rafael Birdugo’s *Leshon Limudim*: זמיע is used to translate כל in construct chains, while independent instances of כל are translated by *b-kəll-si*.[[132]](#footnote-133)

יחד / יחדו: יתוקפו צלאטין ארץ' וקויאד תסארכו אג'מיע (יִ֥תְיַצְּב֨וּ ׀ מַלְכֵי־אֶ֗רֶץ וְרֽוֹזְנִ֥ים נֽוֹסְדוּ־יָ֑חַד, Ps 2:2), בלעאפ'ייא אג'מיע נרקד וננעס (בְּשָׁל֣וֹם יַחְדָּו֮ אֶשְׁכְּבָ֪ה וְאִ֫ישָׁ֥ן, Ps 4:9), אג'מיע עלייא יתכ'אלאו ג'מיע כארהינני (יַ֗חַד עָלַ֣י יִ֭תְלַֽחֲשׁוּ כָּל־שֹֽׂנְאָ֑י, Ps 41:8).

The Judeo-Arabic word זייאדא zyād-a, which was originally a *masdar* form of the verb *zād* in Form I, serves in the *šarḥ* to the Psalms to translate the Hebrew word עוד; for example: ליש יזיד זייאדא ליכצצר אינסאן מן אלארץ' (בַּל־יוֹסִ֥יף ע֑וֹד לַֽעֲרֹ֥ץ אֱ֝נ֗וֹשׁ מִן־הָאָֽרֶץ, Ps 10:18), אצרג'י לאללאה אין זייאדא נשכרו (הוֹחִ֣לִי לֵֽ֭אלֹהִים כִּי־ע֥וֹד אוֹדֶ֗נּוּ, Ps 42:6).

This word also translates the Hebrew יֶתֶר in Ps 31:24: ויכ'ללץ על אזייאדא (חבל) (חב יקול מדה כנגד מדה) (טג;ווא) עאמלין אטג;ווא (וּמְשַׁלֵּ֥ם עַל־יֶ֝֗תֶר עֹשֵׂ֥ה גַֽאֲוָֽה).

Sa’adia Ben Gaon already used זיאדה occasionally to translate the Hebrew עוד, and this usage in the *šarḥ* may reflect his influence. The western Issachar Ben-Susan uses various words to translate עוד, including several from the root ז.ו.ד (זאד, זיאדה, באלזאיד).[[133]](#footnote-134) In the Jewish dialect of Tunis, a participle form from the same root – *žä́yəd* – is used to mean “more.”[[134]](#footnote-135)

[10.11] Closing Comments

In this chapter, we discussed various participles used in CJA as reflected in the *šarḥ* to the Psalms. These particles are not used freely in the text: their position in the sentence is dictated by the position of their counterparts in the Hebrew source. A Judeo-Arabic word is presented for each Hebrew word, and even the particle את is translated consistently. These particles effectively serve as a reflection of the Hebrew particles, although the parallelism is not exaggerated. In most instances the Judeo-Arabic words have an accepted Arabic form, and only occasionally were phrases formed on the basis of the Hebrew (such as מבלעדי).[[135]](#footnote-136) An Arabic word with an equivalent meaning was consistently used, although some of these words are no longer in use in the spoken dialect and are confined to the language of the *šarḥ*. The most prominent example of this is ליש. In most cases, a given Hebrew particle was translated into its Arabic equivalent in every instance, although for certain particles a number of variants were found.

In conclusion, we offer an example of the close affinity between the Judeo-Arabic particles and their Hebrew counterparts:[[136]](#footnote-137) The Hebrew verb בטח is translated into CJA as *tkǝl*. When the Hebrew verb appears together with the preposition ב-, it was translated by the Arabic *bi-*, and when the verb was accompanied by the preposition על, the Judeo-Arabic עלא was used in the *šarḥ*, despite the fact that the two prepositions convey an identical meaning, for example: ביךּ תכלת ליש נחשם (בְּךָ֣ בָ֭טַחְתִּי אַל־אֵב֑וֹשָׁה, Ps 25:2), ואנא עליךּ תכלת יא אללאה (וַֽאֲנִ֤י ׀ עָלֶ֣יךָ בָטַ֣חְתִּי יְהוָ֑ה, Ps 31:15).[[137]](#footnote-138)

Deviations from the subservience to the Hebrew source are rare. Some examples:

\* – the Hebrew אל was translated by עלא rather than אילא in these verses: ללמדדאח עלא (אלג'וואק) אנחילות (לַמְנַצֵּ֥חַ אֶֽל־הַנְּחִיל֗וֹת, Ps 5:1), מן צואב סוכנאנו מקקן עלא ג'מיע סוכאן אלארץ' (מִֽמְּכוֹן־שִׁבְתּ֥וֹ הִשְׁגִּ֑יחַ אֶ֖ל כָּל־יֹֽשְׁבֵ֣י הָאָֽרֶץ, Ps 33:14).

\* – the phrase אָב֣וֹא בֵיתֶ֑ךָ (Ps 5:8) was translated in the *šarḥ* as נדכ'ל לבייתךּ.

\* – instances in which the verb ירא את was translated as *xāf mən* were presented above.[[138]](#footnote-139)

**Part Three: The Position of CJA**

**Chapter Eleven: The Language of the Šarḥ and the Other Registers of the Language**

[11.1] Key Registers of the Language

It is an accepted axiom that in any language there is a sharp distinction between the written and spoken varieties. A written language used for the translation of sacred scriptures is particularly distinct in this regard from the vernacular. This principle applies to Judeo-Arabic in general and to the language of the Jews of Constantine in particular, as we will see below.

The difference between the written language of the *šarḥ* and the spoken language of any given Jewish community provides fertile ground for research, with attention to that in recent years. By way of example, Bar-Asher found that the language of the *šarḥ* of the Moroccan Jews differed from their colloquial language in every linguistic sphere: phonology, morphology, syntax, and vocabulary.[[139]](#footnote-140)

In my own study of the various components of the language of the *šarḥ* to the Algiers Haggadah,[[140]](#footnote-141) the origins of which go back to ancient Arabic, Medieval Judeo-Arabic, the local vernacular dialects, and “literary” dialectal elements, I found that it is possible to speak of a “literary idiom” among the Jews of Algiers, to use the term Blanc coined for the Judeo-Arabic language reflected in the literary texts of the Jews of Baghdad.[[141]](#footnote-142)

During my study of the language of the *šarḥ* to the Psalms of the Jews of Constantine, as presented in writing by Rabbi Yosef Renassia in his book *Zichron Ya’akov*, I also reviewed additional works from his extensive fields of activity, especially *Nishmat Kol Chai*, his translation and commentary on the Mishnah.[[142]](#footnote-143)

My studies led me to conclude that there are three registers in the Judeo-Arabic of Constantine: the language of the šarḥ to the Psalms; an intermediate language of an essentially literary and didactic character, including several later *šarḥ* works; and the spoken language. The first of these has special features due to being a register used to translate a sacred text, including a strongly literal tendency, syntactic subservience to the source, archaic leanings, and a distinct vocabulary.

The intermediate register includes at least two types of texts: *šarḥ* works that apparently reflect a younger tradition than that of the Psalms, since their language includes a higher proportion of local elements, examples being the šarḥ to Ecclesiastes, *Bnei Eliyahu ve-Zichron Aharon*, the *šarḥ* to the Passover Haggadah *Zeved Tov*, and the *translation* of the Mishnah in *Nishmat Kol Chai*; and texts that include didactic and exegetic works written by Rabbi Renassia in order to expand his congregants’ knowledge of the Jewish sources and to allow them to study these texts in a language close to their own colloquial dialect, examples being the *commentary* on the Psalms in *Zichron Ya’acov*, the *commentary* on the Mishnah in  *Nishmat Kol Chai*, the commentary on the Song of Songs *Shir Ben David*,[[143]](#footnote-144) the translation of Rashi’s commentary on Deuteronomy,[[144]](#footnote-145) and the Shavuot *Sefer Ha-Azharot*.[[145]](#footnote-147)

We might anticipate that both types would evince a distinctive use of language, that even the later *šarḥ* works would include many of the features seen in the earlier *šarḥ*, and would not be very close to the free written language. However, it emerges that the gap between the language of the *šarḥ* to the Psalms and the language of the later *šarḥ* works is greater than that between those later works and Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s didactic and exegetic texts. Thus, over time, the *šarḥ* works evidently moved significantly toward the colloquial language.

Accordingly, we decided to include these latter two types of works in a single category in light of their linguistic similarities. These texts reflect an intermediate register between the *šarḥ* and the colloquial; this register features a very high measure of internal variance dictated by the relative proportion of vernacular or “literary” elements in any given text. Thus, each text essentially reflects its own distinct language and each of the books written by Rabbi Yosef Renassia contains a blend of features that differs at least partially from that of any of his other works.

It is important to add that in works that constitute a translation of a non-biblical Hebrew source (as well as in the *šarḥ* to Ecclesiastes), the above-mentioned intermediate register is again used, although the syntax and phraseology naturally show a strong affinity to those of the Hebrew source. Thus, as noted, I found a difference in *Nishmat Kol Chai* between the language of the translations and the language of the exegetical sections. However, the similarities between these two strands are greater than the differences and most of the latter are due to the inherent difference between a translation and a commentary. The translation of the Mishna essentially presents a Mishnaic discussion in Arabic words, studded with Hebrew terms, since the Hebrew syntax leaves a strong mark on the text. Accordingly, the Judeo-Arabic reflected in the translation is artificial and unnatural. Conversely, the exegetical sections in the work have a more fluent and freer quality reflecting the author’s personal and societal style.

Thus, the linguistic differences we find in Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s extensive non-biblical literary writings do not reflect distinct registers, but rather sub-registers within the broad language type we defined, varying according to the proximity of the language to the local colloquial dialect. As noted, this register comprises mainly works intended to enable the members of the Constantine community to understand post-biblical Hebrew sources. Accordingly, they were written in a language that belongs to the didactic register, which was used for the study of diverse sources: Mishnaic, Talmud, liturgical, doctrinal, and so forth.[[146]](#footnote-148) It is reasonable to assume that the historical and prose works authored by Rabbi Yosef Renassia, such as *Histoire dil-Yahud*, belong to this intermediate register. However, it is also possible that they may reflect a slightly different language than that of the exegetical works. I anticipate that the difference is due to the inherent difference in the character of the works, rather than a full-fledged difference of register, but this assumption requires further examination.

The third register is the spoken Judeo-Arabic language of the Jews of Constantine. I have not studied this language in its own right but, through my meetings with the informants and the questions I presented them, I have been able to ascertain at least some of its characteristics. I also reviewed the articles of Cantineau and his students on the dialects of Constantine and the surrounding area,[[147]](#footnote-149) although these make almost no reference to the Jewish dialects. The spoken language of the Jews of Constantine differs from Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s literary language, although there are many similarities, given the penetration of vernacular elements into the second register. The difference between the spoken language and the language of the *šarḥ* is even more apparent, although even the latter includes a number of dialectal elements due to its proximity to the local language community over the generations. These conclusions will be explained below.

The following diagram describes the relative position of the three registers defined above:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Šarh* to the Psalms | Later *šarḥ* literature  Didactic literature | Spoken language |

Before discussing the various characteristics of these three registers, we should note two additional significant differences: the first relates to the time of composition and the second to our informants or witnesses. The first register, reflected in the *šarḥ* to the Psalms, was recorded in writing by a single individual, Rabbi Yosef Renassia, in the 1920s.[[148]](#footnote-150) However, this rabbi is not the creator of the *šarḥ*, which constitutes the product of a translation tradition extending back many generations. Regarding the second register, we should return to the distinction presented above: on the one hand, this register includes younger *šarḥ* works that were recorded in writing by Rabbi Yosef Renassia in the second half of the twentieth century. Conversely, the numerous exegetic and didactic works he authored reflect extensively his own language and forms of expression as he directs his language to a contemporary audience based on his own considerations. The third register is the spoken language of the entire community as reflected by contemporary speakers.

In this book, we have discussed the spoken dialect on the basis of data provided by three male informants, two of whom are learned rabbis, and one female informant whose father, brother, and husband are all rabbis. However, the spoken dialect of the Jews self-evidently includes not only the sociolect of the rabbinical elite to which our informants belong, but also a sociolect of non-rabbinical men and a women’s sociolect. This book does not present a comparison between the various sociolects within the spoken dialect, a subject that deserves independent study.

The review of the differences between the language of the *šarḥ* and the other registers is organized according to phonology, morphology, vocabulary, and syntax.

[11.2] Differences in the Field of Phonology[[149]](#footnote-151)

In this field almost no differences were found between the language of the *šarḥ* and the spoken language of the informants from Constantine. Nevertheless, we will note several minor differences:

\* – in the reading of the *šarḥ*, /q/ was only realized as [g] in a handful of words (e.g., *msǝggǝm* “honest”), whereas in the spoken language this realization was more common (e.g. *gəmṛa* “moon”; *bəgṛa* “flower”) ([2.2.9]). The spoken language would seem to be more prone to the influence of the nomadic dialects around Constantine.[[150]](#footnote-152)

\* – the realization of the /ˀ/ as a glottal stop [ˀ] may be more common in the language of the *šarḥ* than in the spoken language; in the *šarḥ* we find this realization in verbs whose first root letter is א in the *kǝttǝb* verb form and in the color pattern *ˀabyaḍ* (*Shir Ben David* also has אביץ'); this contrasts with *byəḍ* in the spoken dialect. However, we found the glottal stop in the spoken language, as in the *šarḥ*, in the names of family members (*ˀax*, *ˀuxt*). If the glottal stop is indeed realized more regularly in the *šarḥ* than in the spoken language (an impression that requires further examination), we may explain the greater realization of [ˀ] in the *šarh* by way of various phonetic and morphophonemic factors, alongside the sociolinguistic feature we have already noted that the *šarḥ*, as a high register, has an inherent tendency to scholasticism and conservatism in Section [2.2.11].

\* – the conservative and “intellectual” character of the language of the *šarḥ* may also influence the very rare realization of ض as [ṭ] in this register. Ostoya-Delmas notes that the realization of this phoneme as [ḍ] is considered a more educated one in the settled dialects of the Constantine Province (Section [2.2.3]).[[151]](#footnote-153) Similarly, the [ḍ] realization of \* ض and \* ظ in the šarḥ of the Jews of Tafilalat, in contrast to the [ṭ] realization in their spoken language, is one of the key phonological distinctions between these two registers, despite the fact that [ḍ] is not entirely absent from the colloquial.[[152]](#footnote-154)

\* – the clear distinction between the phonemes /s/ and /š/ is found both in CJA and in the spoken dialect of the Jews of Constantine. However, in a few words that include these phonemes, a difference can be heard between the language of the *šarḥ* as reflected in Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s orthography and the informants’ spoken language. In the spoken language, the Arabic words for “sun” and “tree” are pronounced without dissimilation as *šǝmš* and *šǝğr-a*, respectively; when reading the *šarḥ*, however, the informants usually pronounced *sǝmš* and *sǝğr-a*, perhaps under the influence of the printed orthography of the *šarḥ*: סמש and סג'רא (see section [2.2.4]).

\* – in general, the system of consonantal and vocal phonemes described in this book is shared by the language of the šarḥ and the spoken language, with the exception of those differences we have just reviewed. In any case, there are no acute and consistent differences in the realization of any particular phoneme.[[153]](#footnote-155)

\* – the phenomenon of permanent metathesis distinguishes CJA from the spoken dialect. In the *šarḥ*, the verb ואג'ב is almost always used in the sense of “answer,” whereas in the spoken language ג'אוב is preferred ([2.7]). The form ג'אוב appears in other works by Rabbi Yosef Renassia that we classify in the second register.[[154]](#footnote-156)

\* – in the reading of the *šarḥ*, the form *dāymən* appeared several times as the translation of the Hebrew סלה or תמיד. This form, a remnant of *tanwin*, may be characteristic of CJA, since it is also found in various other Maghrebi translations of the Bible (See Section [3.6]). The phenomenon of residual *tanwin* is also found in the literary dialect of the Jews of Baghdad, although Blanc notes that this usage is also not entirely alien to their colloquial language.[[155]](#footnote-157) Indeed, remnants of *tanwin* are also documented for modern Bedouin dialects in normal speech.[[156]](#footnote-158) Accordingly, there can be no certainty that this phenomenon is unique to CJA, although in our study we found no evidence of its presence in the spoken language of the Jews of Constantine.

[11.3] Differences in the Field of Morphology

In this section we will note the differences between the registers in the morphology of the verb and in pronouns and particles.

The verb conjugation forms found in the *šarḥ* to the Psalms are largely consistent with those in the spoken language. However, there are a number of differences:

\* – One difference that deserves note is that between the imperative form for the second-person feminine, which appears once in the *šarḥ* with the ending [i] – אתחרכי (נ֝֗וּדִי, Ps 11:1). In the spoken dialect of the Jews of Constantine there is no distinct form for the feminine imperative, though they occasionally quote such a form under the influence of the Muslim dialect of their city (See Section [7.2.1.3]).

\* – CJA maintains a distinction between the masculine plural and feminine plural in the active participle of the verb, under the influence of the Hebrew source. In the spoken language these two forms have been unified (See Section [7.2.1.4]).

We may also suggest some possible differences in terms of the distribution of the various verb forms:

\* – In CJA, a handful of participle forms appeared for the causative Form IV. Since this form has disappeared from use in most of the Maghrebi dialects, it is reasonable to assume that it is even less common in the spoken language of the Jews of Constantine than in their *šarḥ*. In other dialects, too, the use of participles for Form IV verbs is explained as the influence of the literary language ( See Section [7.6]).

\* – in CJA, passive and repetitive action is usually conveyed by the *n-* verb form (the successor to the CA Form VII). However, we found six instances in which dialectal forms beginning with *t/tt* penetrated the language of the *šarḥ*. As we hypothesized in Section [7.9.1], it seems that both *t/tt* and *n* forms are used in the spoken language, though it is possible that *n* forms are in retreat. While this is conjecture, the *n* form is certainly dominant in CJA, while it does not enjoy exclusive dominance in the spoken language. The fact that *t/tt* forms have penetrated the *šarḥ* shows that this form is not rare in the spoken language and may even be the dominant form.[[157]](#footnote-159)

\* – several instances of the *smān* form in our corpus show that this dialectal form has also penetrated the language of the *šarḥ* (See Section [7.5]).

Regarding tenses, the main distinction between the registers we have already delineated is clear. In CJA, the tenses are not used freely but are tied to the tenses that appear in the relevant Hebrew verbs. These are strictly preserved to the extent that even “inverted” biblical tense forms are translated into the analogous Arabic tense. Only in a few participle forms did we find the penetration of the dialectal construct “אלי + future” (See Section [7.12]).

By contrast, Rabbi Yosef Renassia employed a free language in his exegetical and didactic works, using the tenses in the normal manner of Judeo-Arabic without any formal subservience to the Hebrew.

\* – we have noted the use in the spoken language of declined forms of the participle *qāˁəd* when this is used before a verb in the future tense to denote the continuous present in Section [7.12.1]. There is no sign of such a usage in CJA.

\* – a further difference between CJA and the colloquial and intermediate registers regards the use of the participle באש. In the spoken language and in the intermediate register, this particle is used before a verb in the future tense to denote purpose.[[158]](#footnote-160) This participle is not found in the *šarḥ*[[159]](#footnote-161) and the Hebrew declined infinitive, whether with the sense of the subject or to express the object, is conveyed by means of the phrase “ל + third person masculine singular of the future tense. This usage is found in other *šarḥ* traditions: In the *šarḥ* to the Algiers Haggadah, in the *Or Ne’erav* translation of the Bible, in the translation by the western Issachar Ben-Susan of the Torah, in the *šarḥ* of the Jews of Tafilalat, and even in the Mashriq, in the literary language of the Jews of Baghdad (See Section [7.12]). We should add that in the *translation* of the Mishnah in *Nishmat Kol Chai*, which is a later work, “ל + third person masculine singular of the future tense” is used, under the influence of the translated Hebrew form.[[160]](#footnote-162)

Thus, this feature distinguishes between texts that are translations of a Hebrew source and “autonomous” texts composed by a Judeo-Arabic speaker. This explains why the older and later *šarḥ* texts are similar in this respect.

The various pronouns expose several differences between CJA and the spoken dialect.

\* – the independent second-person masculine singular pronoun is אנתא – *ǝnta* in the šarh; no feminine counterpart appeared in the text. In the spoken language, by contrast, the form *ǝnti* is used both for the masculine and feminine second-person singular. אנתי also appears in various works that belong to the intermediate register, such as the *Zichron Ya’acov* commentary on the Psalms, the *Shir Ben David* commentary on the Song of Songs, the *Zeved Tov* Passover Haggadah, and so forth. However, in his translation of Rashi’s commentary on Deuteronomy, Rabbi Yosef Renassia translated אתה as אנתא (See Section [8.1]).

\* – A further difference between CJA and the spoken dialect concerns the second person plural pronoun. In the *šarḥ* to the Psalms, the pronoun אנתום is used for this person, whereas in the colloquial the form *əntūma(n)* is used. We also found the dialectal form נתומאן in the *Zichron Ya’acov* commentary (p. 50).

\* – In CJA, only enclitic possessive pronouns are used. By contrast, in the spoken language possession is expressed by means of the particle *dyāl* or *(n)tāˁ*, to which the pronouns are attached. In texts representing the intermediate register, דיאל is the main form used, although נת(א)ע [CHECK should it be (נ)תאע] is also found ([8.2.1], [10.4]).

\* – The enclitic accusative pronoun for the third person masculine singular is –u for nouns ending in a consonant and –h for nouns ending in a vowel; this is written as ו and ה, respectively, in the *šarḥ* to the Psalms (like the possessive pronoun for the same person) (See Section [8.2.3]). Conversely, in *Shir Ben David* and *Sefer Ha-Azharot* the enclitic accusative pronoun is written –הו.[[161]](#footnote-163)

\* – a key difference between the language of the šarḥ, on the one hand, and the spoken language and intermediate register, on the other, is the attachment of the preposition with its accompanying enclitic pronouns directly on the verb. This phenomenon is extremely rare in CJA, and only a single example was found: קדרתלו (יְכָלְתִּ֑יו, Ps 13:5). Conversely, such forms are found abundantly in the spoken language and in various other works by Rabbi Yosef Renassia (See Section [8.2.2]).[[162]](#footnote-164)

\* – The behavior of the proximal demonstrative pronouns in CJA is interesting. In the singular, these pronouns are the same as in the spoken language: האדא, האדי, and האד; the latter is used when the demonstrative pronoun appears before a noun with the definite article. Thus, the dialectal form האד clearly penetrated the language of the *šarḥ*. By contrast, the plural proximal demonstrative pronoun used in CJA האולאי *hāwlay*is archaic (See Section [8.3]); in the spoken language and in the intermediate register, the dialectal form האדו *hādu* is used.[[163]](#footnote-165) The archaic form האולאי is also used in some other biblical translations, such as that of the western Issachar Ben-Susan, while other texts prefer the dialectal form האדו, such as the *šarḥ* of the Jews of Tafilalat.

\* – the Hebrew demonstrative particle כן is translated in CJA by האכדאך. The counterpart of this word in the spoken language would appear to be the shortened version *hākda* ([8.3.3]). In the intermediate register, we sometimes found ה(א)כדאךּ (e.g., in *Shir Ben David*, p. 18b) and sometimes האכדא or האכד: *Nishmat Kol Chai* (Pesahim 1:1-2) or הכדא: *Zeved Tov*, p. 22b.

\* – a further difference between CJA and the spoken language is the use of the relative pronoun אלדי *ǝldi* in the former and of *ǝlli* in the latter (See Section [8.4.1]). In the intermediate register, we found some work in which the pronoun אלדי was used (*Shir Ben David*, *Zeved Tov*) and other in which אלי was prefer (the commentary in *Zichron Ya’acov*, *Nishmat Kol Chai*, and the translation of Rashi’s commentary on Deuteronomy). In the *šarḥ* to Ecclesiastes, both אלדי and אלי are used. The situation among the Jews of Tunis is similar: they use *ǝlli* in their spoken dialect and *əldi* in their literary language.[[164]](#footnote-166)

[11.4] Differences in Vocabulary

This study did not include a comparison between the vocabulary of CJA and that of the spoken dialect. However, our discussion of the various particles enables us to note several differences between the registers in this field. We will also note the broad difference in the frequency of Hebrew words used in the different registers, as well as the extent to which French words penetrated the intermediate register.

11.4.1 Arabic Words

\* – A clear difference is evident in the particles of negation: In CJA, a single word is used consistently: *layš* (ליש). However, this word is absent from the spoken language, which uses various particles, each with their own use: מא...ש is used to negate verbs; מושי/ מושserves to negate nouns, adjectives, participles, and pronouns; לא is used in response to yes/no questions and in chains of negatives. These particles of negation are also used in the intermediate register in Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s exegetic and didactic works. However, in the later *šarḥ* texts we still found ליש in use: in the Passover Haggadah (*Zeved Tov*) only ליס is used, while in the *šarḥ* to Ecclesiastes (*Bnei Eliahu ve-Zichron Aharon*) and in the translation of Rashi’s commentary on Deuteronomy, ליש is used alongside other particles of negation.

Thus, we can see that the particle of negation ליש serves to distinguish between *šarḥ* texts (both early and late) and other writings. The use of ליש / ליס as a particle of negation would seem to be a basic feature of the *šarḥ* literature; this usage is not confined to CJA and is also found in both Maghrebi and Mashriqi *šarḥ* texts.[[165]](#footnote-167) The unique character of the *šarḥ* in our study is the exclusive use of this particle and its pronunciation with *š*.

\* – A clearly distinct feature of CJA as opposed to the other registers is the translation of the Hebrew accusative particle את by אילא *ila*, both when it appears before a noun with the definite article and when it is accompanied by an enclitic pronoun. In the *šarḥ* to the Passover Haggadah (*Zeved Tov*) and the *šarh* on Ecclesiastes, the Hebrew particle את is not translated; the same is true in the translation of the Mishnah (*Nishmat Kol Chai*). The translation of this particle is a feature of the *šarḥ* texts and is found in both Maghrebi and Mashriqi translations of biblical texts, albeit not always. Naturally there is no remnant of this practice in spontaneous speech or writing, though it would be interesting to examine whether the spoken language of the Jews of Constantine features a marker for the direct object.[[166]](#footnote-168)

\* – several particles used in CJA have different or alternative counterparts in the spoken dialect:

In CJA, the Hebrew question particle מי is translated by מן *mǝn*, while in the spoken language the particles *mǝn*, *mǝnhu*, and *aškun* are used. The question particle איך is translated in the *šarḥ* by כיף – *kīf*, while in the spoken language and the intermediate register כיפ'אש – *kīfaš* is used (see Section [10.2.2]).

The preposition עלא (*ˁla*) is almost always used in CJA in its full form, even when it precedes a noun with the definite article. This contrasts with the situation in the spoken language and the intermediate register (for example, in the commentary in *Zichron Ya’acov*), where על *ˁal* is used before a noun with the definite article and *ˁla* in other circumstances (see Section [10.5]).

The typical comparative particle in CJA is כיף *kīf*; on occasions, however, the dialectal counterpart בחאל penetrated the šarḥ to the Psalms. In the spoken language *bḥāl* is probably used alongside *kīf* and *ki*; the latter two forms were documented for one of the informants and are used in spoken dialects in the wider vicinity of Constantine (Jijli, for example). In his other works, Rabbi Yosef Renassia generally uses בחאל, although not always; in the *šarḥ* to the Passover Haggadah, for example, he prefers כיף (See Section [10.8]).

In CJA, the word מוג'וד *mowğūd* is used to translate the Hebrew מאד. In the spoken language, this meaning is conveyed by the word *bəzzāf*. In the *šarḥ* to Ecclesiastes, *yāsər* is used to translate the Hebrew הרבה (Ps 1:16); this word is also documented in Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s trilingual dictionary as the equivalent of מאד and הרבה (See Section [10.10]).

Regarding the pronunciation of the word for “now,” a slight difference can be seen between *d-əl-waq(t)* in CJA and *d-əl-waq / d-ər-waq* in the spoken language (See Section [10.10]).

\* – The verb used in CJA for seeing is נצ'ר – *nḍr*, while in the spoken language *šūf* is used. However, in the *šarḥ* to Ecclesiastes both roots are used interchangeably.

11.4.2 Hebrew Words

One of the main differences between the *šarḥ* to Psalms and Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s exegetical and didactic works regards the integration of Hebrew words in these two registers.

Only a handful of Hebrew words occur in the *šarḥ* to the first 41 Psalms,[[167]](#footnote-169) most of which appear in the introductory rubric in the Psalms describing musical instruments, types of singing, and so forth. The following Hebrew words appeared in the corpus: אנחילות (Ps 5:1), אלגתית (Ps 8:1), טפש (נָבָ֣ל, Ps 14:1), אילת השחר (Ps 22:1),[[168]](#footnote-170) משכיל (Ps 32:1), לידותון (Ps 39:1), תהום (Ps 33:7), ברבית (Ps 15:5).[[169]](#footnote-171) In addition, several Hebrew place and personal names appeared in the corpus: ציון (e.g. Ps 9:12), בשן (Ps 22:13), לבנון (Ps 29:5),[[170]](#footnote-172) קדש (Ps 29:8), אבימלך (Ps 34:1), אבשלום (Ps 3:1), לדוד (Ps 31:1).

In this respect, the *šarḥ* of the Jews of Constantine to Ecclesiastes is similar to the *šarḥ* to the Psalms. However, the *Zichron Ya’acov* commentary on the Psalms and the *Nishmat Kol Chai* include numerous Hebrew words embedded in the Judeo-Arabic sentences.

A similar picture is documented for the Jews of Tafilalat. The Hebrew element in their *šarḥ* to the Mishnah is vastly greater than in the *šarḥ* to the Bible. In the case of the Passover Haggadah, however, a difference is apparent: the *šarḥ* of the Jews of Tafilalat includes numerous Hebrew elements,[[171]](#footnote-173) whereas the number of Hebrew loanwords in the *šarḥ* to *Zeved Tov* of the Jews of Constantine is much smaller.

The difference between the number of Hebrew words in the *šarḥ* on the Bible and in the *šarḥ* on the Mishnah can be explained in terms of the inherent nature of each of these translations. Bar-Asher explains the paucity of Hebrew words in the *šarḥ* on the Bible as a reflection of the underlying model that requires each Hebrew word to be translated by an Arabic counterpart.[[172]](#footnote-174) This approach is readily apparent in our *šarḥ*, where even the particle את is allotted a Judeo-Arabic equivalent. Just a handful of Hebrew words penetrated the biblical *šarḥ* due to an occasional tendency to draw closer to the colloquial language.

In contrast to the *šarḥ* to the Bible, the non-biblical *šarḥ* texts are not subject to such a binding model. These texts, which were also composed later, adopt a less literal translation technique and are more open to the influences of the local colloquial dialect, through which a large number of Hebrew words were transmitted.[[173]](#footnote-175)

We should add that our examination of the first chapter of the Pesahim tractate of the Mishnah[[174]](#footnote-176) found that the integration of the Hebrew component in the translation of the text and in the commentary is extremely similar. The distinction is that the large majority of the Hebrew words that appear in the translation of the Mishnah are found in the original text of the Mishnah itself. By contrast, only around half of the Hebrew words in the commentary appear in the sections of the original text to which the commentary relates. This distinction reflects the difference between translation and exegesis: in his commentary, Rabbi Yosef Renassia is not bound by an extant text he seeks to reflect precisely, and accordingly he can draw on his entire repertoire of Hebrew words.

Thus, we find embedded Hebrew word particularly in Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s exegetic and didactic works, which reflect his language in free discourse, without any subservience to a Hebrew source. On the general rule, the quantity and usage of Hebrew words in a Judeo-Arabic text may vary according to the author’s social class and accordingly the sociolect he employs, as well as according to the register adopted in any particular work. Rabbi Yosef Renassia belongs to the rabbinical elite, whose members are the most prone to use Hebrew words and expressions.[[175]](#footnote-177) The sociolect of these rabbis is characterized not only by the relatively large number of Hebrew words it includes, but also by the character of these words, which largely relate to the sources and form part of the scholastic language of rabbis and Talmudic students.[[176]](#footnote-178) These characteristics are manifested in Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s active use of Hebrew words in his works.

11.4.3. French Words

The *šarḥ* on the Psalms does not employ French words: we found only a single instance in which a French word – *taupe* – was added in parentheses as one of four alternative translations for the Hebrew word אֵ֝֗שֶׁת (Ps 58:9). French words are also absent from the *šarḥ* on Ecclesiastes and the *šarḥ* on the Passover Haggadah. The same is true of most of the texts that belong to the second register, in which Rabbi Yosef Renassia also employed only a few French words. He presented these in parentheses if he found that they offered the most succinct explanation of a word or term that was difficult to explain by another means.

Thus, the French words presented in parentheses served as an “emergency tool” for the student or reader and appear mainly where a given Hebrew or Judeo-Arabic word might not be understood. Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s primary goal was to encourage his students to engage with the original Hebrew texts and, at the same time, to expand their familiarity with the higher, scholastic register of Judeo-Arabic. This would seem to explain why he only rarely included French words in his text.

Despite this, we found that Rabbi Yosef Renassia included entire sections written in French in some of his books, presumably as he reconciled himself to the needs of the time. Examples of this practice can be found in *Sefer Zichron David*, *Sefer Alfei Menashe*, and other works.

We should not forget that, at least for the younger generation of his congregants, French was familiar as the language of speech and instruction in the general schools. In order to help them to understand the Hebrew and Judeo-Arabic sources he had prepared for them, Rabbi Yosef Renassia went to the trouble of preparing bilingual and trilingual dictionaries in which one of the languages was French (an Aramaic-French dictionary and his French-Hebrew-Arabic dictionary).

[11.5] Syntax and Style

It is hardly surprising that a fundamental difference can be seen between the language of the *šarḥ* texts (whichever the specific translation) and the language found in free, original writing. By its nature and by the prevailing tendency to literalism and to subservience to the sacred original source, the language of the šarḥ largely reflects the syntax and phraseology of that source. Thus, the *šarḥ* to the Psalms is tied to the word order and forms of expression found in each Hebrew verse.[[177]](#footnote-179) For example, the Hebrew enclitic pronoun is translated by a Judeo-Arabic enclitic pronoun; the accusative particle את is consistently translated, despite the fact that it has no original Arabic equivalent; and a synthetic Hebrew construct chain is not broken down during its translation into Arabic. The result is a largely artificial language, but one that maintains the translation norm of this genre. Conversely, Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s independent texts reflect as free, flowing language in terms of syntax and manifest his individual style.

Similarly, the language used by the western Rabbi Issachar Ben-Susan in his Arabic introduction and in the *bayan* in his work differs from the language in his translation of the Torah; the former is free of the shackles of literalism and has a more vernacular character.[[178]](#footnote-180)

[11.6] Conclusion

Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s extensive *œuvre* includes dozens of texts of different types,[[179]](#footnote-182) reflecting different linguistic registers relating to their source, character, and goal.

On the basis of the examination of the language of the *šarḥ* on the Psalms – a translation tradition reduced to writing by Rabbi Yosef Renassia – and a sample of his other works provides a clear picture regarding the principal registers of Judeo-Arabic reflected in this vast repertoire.

The characteristics described above in detail reveal three registers:

\* – CJA: the language of the *šarḥ* on the Psalms. This register is elevated significantly above the colloquial language and reflects a relatively ancient translation tradition that preserves a significant proportion of archaic features, although it has also been penetrated from a number of vernacular elements. By its nature this register is subservient to the Hebrew source in its syntax and forms of expression.

\* – The interim register. This register extends over a broad spectrum, varying in terms of the proportion of vernacular and literary components woven into a single fabric. As noted, this register includes two types of works; while these show differences due to the distinction between a translation and free writing, they reflect a similar Judeo-Arabic language. The first of these types includes the later *šarḥ* works (on Ecclesiastes, the Passover Haggadah, and the Mishnah), while the second includes exegetical and study texts written by Rabbi Yosef Renassia in the second half of the twentieth century. The language exemplified in both types of texts includes numerous dialectal elements that are absent from the higher CJA register, although it is certainly not lowered to the point of a truly colloquial language.

Vernacular elements that are documented to a varying degree in the different types of texts included in the intermediate register include, for example: the use of dialectal particles of negation; the second person masculine singular pronoun אנתי; the relative pronoun אלי; the plural demonstrative pronoun האדו; " באש+ future tense” as the equivalent of the Hebrew לפעל; the use of the root שוף for “to see.” While in the exegetic and didactic texts the level of integration of these vernacular elements is consistent, the later *šarḥ* texts evince a measure of ambivalence between such terms and their archaic counterparts, even within a single verse. The later *šarḥ* texts can be differentiated in terms of the level of integration of these elements. Of the works I reviewed, the Passover Haggadah is the closest to the language of the *šarḥ* on the Psalms, the *šarḥ* on Ecclesiastes is further removed, and the translation of the Mishnah is the closest to the colloquial language.

In the later *šarḥ* works, this intermediate register blends with the familiar features of the *šarḥ* genre, such as subservience to the Hebrew source and the use of several archaic forms (the remnants of ליש, for example). The most prominent difference, however, is the fact that in the later words the Hebrew particle את is not translated. An interesting feature that is common both to the early and late *šarḥ* works, and which distinguishes both these types from independent writings, concerns the reflection of the Hebrew element. In all *šarḥ* texts, the Hebrew component is evident in syntax and phraseology in particular. In independent texts, the Hebrew influence is apparent mainly in the embedding of Hebrew words, and not in sentence structure.

In general, the later *šarḥ* works present an admixture. The overall template used for the translations they present is literal, as is typical of the *šarḥ* genre, but the language cast in this template is the Judeo-Arabic of the intermediate register. This combination has led us to include the later *šarḥ* texts alongside the exegetic and didactic genre in a single register.

\* – The third register is the language reflected in the dialectal speech of the Jews of Constantine, as used by them in their daily life in the city.

These three registers provide a portrait of the gradual distancing of spoken Judeo-Arabic from CJA. This distancing created a situation in which the language of the *šarḥ* is to a large degree no longer comprehensible to members of the community who are not Talmudic scholars. Accordingly, it would not be surprising if one might hear among the Constantine community the same criticism that Bar-Asher quotes from students in Tafilalat: “So, we have translated the Hebrew into the language of the *šarḥ*; but who will translate the *šarḥ* into our Arabic?”[[180]](#footnote-183)

The situation encapsulated in this remark may have been one of the factors that motivated Rabbi Yosef Renassia to present – alongside the language of the *šarḥ* to the Psalms – translations of the traditional commentators written in the intermediate register, which is significantly closer to the colloquial. Thus, students could draw on the various commentaries in understanding texts that inherently demand exegesis and all the more so when they are written in a language that has largely become alien.

The addition of the commentary *Zichron Ya’acov*, in its second edition in 1960, may reflect a similar desire to enable his students to cope with their studies of the Psalms, whose traditional translation had become an alienating text. Although *Zichron Ya’acov* presents an allegorical exegesis that creates its own difficulties in comprehension, it is written in a language that is familiar to the reader, and hence encourages study of the text.[[181]](#footnote-184)

**Chapter Twelve: CJA against the Background of the Overall Dialectal Picture**

In this chapter, we will consider the position of the Judeo-Arabic dialect of Constantine against the background of the overall dialectal picture in the eastern Maghreb, based on a comparison to the surrounding Arabic dialects. However, the attempt to compare the language of the *šarḥ* with the modern dialects raises a methodological difficulty. As we saw in the previous chapter,[[182]](#footnote-185) there are numerous differences between a language used to translate a biblical text and everyday spoken languages. However, like other *šarḥ* traditions, the language of the *šarḥ* of the Jews of Constantine gradually grew closer to the local spoken language over the generations and, accordingly, reflects commonalities with it.[[183]](#footnote-186)

The discussion of the material for this study of CJA and the contact with the informants also produced a partial insight into the spoken language, including identification of features common to both registers that we will discuss here. In other words, this chapter expands our examination of the dialectal component of CJA in a way complementary to the previous chapter, in which we concentrated on the *šarḥ* dimension of this language.

It would have been preferable to compare CJA to the languages of the parallel *šarḥ* texts of other Jewish communities in the eastern Maghreb, or to compare the colloquial dialect of the Jews of Constantine to those surrounding it, but the scope of this book does not permit us to do so exhaustively. However, the material available to us at this point seems to allow us to provisionally position CJA in relation to those other dialects.

The Judeo-Arabic dialect of Constantine is, in the broadest terms, a sedentary Maghrebi dialect and embodies the chief characteristics of the Maghrebi dialects, such as a future tense form נכתב for the first-person singular and נכתבו for the first person plural (see Section [7.2.1.2]), the singular proximal demonstrative pronouns האדא, האדי, and האד- (see Section [8.3.1]), *sursaut* (see Section [5.3.3]) and *ressaut* (see [5.3.4]),[[184]](#footnote-187) and the division of the phoneme /\*r/ into a regular /r/ and the emphatic /ṛ/ (see Section [2.2.5]).

CJA has the familiar characteristics of the sedentary Maghrebi dialects, such as the assimilation of the interdental fricatives to their plosive counterparts (see Section [2.2.3]), the unvoiced realization of /q/ (see Section [2.2.9]), and the almost total lack of *amālah* seen in the sedentary rather than nomadic dialects of the Constantine area (see Section [3.2.4]). It also features the elimination of the distinction between the masculine and feminine genders in the second-person singular forms of the verb and in the pronouns (see Sections [7.2.1.1], [7.2.1.2], and [8.1]); and the diphthong ending –īw / –āw in the future tense forms of the plural person in verbs with the first root letter ו or י (*yəmšīw*, *yəzhāw*) in the sedentary dialects, in contrast to –u in the nomadic dialects (*yəmšu*) (see Section [7.2.5]).

CJA also exhibits typical dialectal features of the region. Typical features of the sedentary dialects of the Constantine Provinceinclude the diverse realizations of the phoneme /t/, and particularly [t, ty, ts, tš] (see Section [2.2.3]), the future tense form *nkətbu* for the plural persons in Form I verbs (see Sections [5.3.4] and [7.2.1.2]), the future tense form *iwərtu* for the plural persons in verbs with the first root letter ו, and one of the models of the conjugation of the single persons in these verbs – *tāqəf* (see Section [7.2.3.2]).

This Judeo-Arabic dialect is also characterized by certain particularities, some of which distinguish it from adjacent dialects. For example, the conservative tendency of CJA, not confined to the *šarḥ* register, typifies the dialect of the Jews of Constantine in general, including in the colloquial. In some instances, this conservatism is more apparent in the *šarḥ*,[[185]](#footnote-188) but it can be seen elsewhere. This conservatism may reflect the geographical location of Constantine, on a high plateau in the center of the eastern Atlas mountains; moreover, the city was for centuries surrounded by a wall. Constantine only opened up and became an important regional commercial center at a relatively late stage.

One manifestation of this conservative tendency in the spoken language is the clear distinction between the phonemes /s/ and /š/, which have been unified in many other Maghrebi dialects, as well as the similar distinction between /ğ/ and /z/ ([2.2.4]). The conservative nature of the dialect is also manifested in the pronunciation of /q/ as the unvoiced uvular plosive [q], the pronunciation of /k/ as the unvoiced velar plosive [k] – with the exception of a few words showing the influence of the nomadic dialects – see below) (see Sections [2.2.8] and [2.2.9] – and the pronunciation of /h/ as an unvoiced glottal fricative [h] (see Section [2.2.11]). In many dialects, the pronunciation of all these consonants has weakened or changed. The frequent presence of the glottal stop [ˀ] may be further evidence of the dialect’s conservative character (see Section [2.2.11], as may the presence of a conjugation pattern for verbs with first root letter א in the *kǝttǝb* form (e.g., *ˀaddeb*) whereas, in almost all the Maghrebi dialects, such verbs have shifted to a declension with first root letter ו (see Section [7.3.4]). This conservative tendency is also reflected in the preservation of the vowel [u] on the second root letter, reflecting the ـُ of CA, in the future tense of Form I verbs with three whole root letters (see Section [7.2.1.2]). The relatively strong presence of diphthongs is a further conservative feature of the dialect (see Section [4.2]). Even when diphthongs are contracted, the dialect differs from others in the eastern Maghreb (such as the dialects of Tunis, Jijli, and Algiers) in that the contracted vowel is /ō/ (for *aw*) or /ē/ (for *ay*), whereas in many dialects the direction of contraction is from *ū* to *ī* ([4.3]). A further feature of this dialect is the tendency to split consonantal clusters with an epenthetic vowel ([3.4]).

A prominent feature of the Constantine dialect is the morpheme *–tīw*, used for the second person plural of all verb forms and types in the past tense. This form, which was created by way of analogy to the second person singular form ending in *–ti*,[[186]](#footnote-189) is also documented for some other dialects in Constantine Province (see Section [7.2.1.1]).

A further characteristic that is typical of the spoken dialect of the Jews of Constantine is the use of the relative pronoun *ǝlli*; interesting, most of the dialects in this province prefer *di* in its various forms (see Section [8.4]).

CJA attracts particular interest due to the geographical location of its community, situated between the Tunisian dialects to the east and the Algerian dialect region to the west. Constantine Province is a complex area in general dialectal terms. Much of the province features transitional dialects that show multiple and diverse characteristics. Cantineau and his students list several key types of dialects in this region: sedentary dialects in the cities (“S dialects”), transitional sedentary dialects (SC), Tunisian nomadic dialects that have a significant influence in this province (“E dialects”), transitional nomadic dialects (CS), and other transitional dialects influenced by the nomadic “A dialects” of the Algerian Sahara and type B and C nomadic dialects.[[187]](#footnote-190) Moreover, Constantine Province also lies between two very large areas where Berber dialects are spoken: Kabylie and Aures. However, we did not find any evidence that these have influenced the dialect of the Jews of Constantine.

The location of this dialect at such a linguistic crossroads is reflected in many of its characteristics. We find numerous crossroad features resulting from the city’s location on the seam between different realizations of various linguistic phenomena. The city’s location is also apparent in the fact that its Jewish dialect shows the influence of typical Tunisian phenomena alongside Algerian influences. For the purpose of this discussion, we addressed only those phenomena that shape the distinction between the two dialect types,[[188]](#footnote-191) as I clarify below.

Interesting “crossroads” phenomena found in our dialect include:

\* – The free variants for the realization of the phoneme /ğ/ – [ğ] and [ž] – illustrate the location of Constantine on the isogloss delineated by Cantineau between the area in which this phoneme is consistently realized as [ğ] and the area where it is realized as [ž] (see Section [2.2.7]).

\* – The same phenomenon of the presence of two alternative forms, each representing different dialects in the province, is also found in the Jewish dialect of Constantine in the conjugation forms for the second person singular in the past tense. Constantine lies on the border between the dialect area in which this form is *ktǝbt* and that where *ktǝbti* is used in the same function. Accordingly, we find that the Jews of the city use both these forms by way of free variants (see Section [7.2.1.1]).

\* – The use of both *n* and *t* forms to convey the passive and repetitive sense may also reflect this crossroads location. Constantine lies between the eastern dialect area (Tunis), where the *t-* verb form is dominant in this function, and the dialect area to the west (central and western Algeria), where *n-* forms predominate. Corroboration for this hypothesis may be found in the fact that an admixture of forms beginning *n-*, *t-*, *nt-* and *tn-* are found in the dialect of Jijli, close to Constantine (see Section [7.9]).

\* – The use of the possessive particles *dyāl* / *ntāˁ* places the Jewish dialect in an intermediate position even within the Constantine Province: *ntāˁ* appears to be the preferred form in the northeast of the province, while in the northwest *di* and *dyāl* predominate (see Section [10.4]).

\* – The presence of certain phenomena in the Jewish dialect of Constantine may be attributed to the influence of the *Algerian dialects* further to the west. For example, the preservation of the distinction between /s/ and /š/, which is found in the dialect, is also documented for numerous Algerian dialects (such as the Jewish dialect of Algiers, the dialects of Jijli and Tlemcen, and the Arba’a dialect). Conversely, in Tunisian dialects *s* and *š* have merged into a single phoneme (for example, in the Jewish dialects of Tunis[[189]](#footnote-192) and Djerba) (see Section [2.2.4]).

Similarly, our dialect uses the *st-* prefix for Form X verbs, as do the Algerian dialects; the Tunisian form *št-* penetrated the dialect in just a single root (see Section [7.10]).

The pattern for colors used in the spoken language of the Jews of Constantine is *byǝḍ*; this form is also used in various Algerian dialects. Conversely, the form *abyaḍ*, maintaining the initial vowel, is used in the Jewish dialect of Tunis (see Section [2.2.11]).[[190]](#footnote-193)

The independent first-person plural pronoun *ḥna* in the dialect of the Jews of Constantine is typical of the Algerian-type dialects (such as the Jewish dialect of Algiers and the Arba’a and Tlemcen dialects). In the Tunisian dialects forms with an initial vowel are used, such as *ǝḥna* (in the Jewish dialect of Tunis and the Sousse dialect, among others) (see Section [8.1]).

Turning to the east, we find Tunisian influenceson the Jewish dialect of Constantine. Thus, for example, a second person plural imperative form with an initial vowel, such as *ǝktbu* in our dialect, is found mainly in the Tunisian-type dialects (for example in Tunis and Sousse). In the Algerian dialects, a form without this vowel is more typical (see Section [7.2.1.3]).[[191]](#footnote-194)

The presence of such an initial vowel in the imperative of the *tkǝttǝb* verb form among the Jews of Constantine was described above (see Section [7.7]). We found documentation of this form for the Jewish dialect of Tunis, but not for any of the Algerian dialects.

The relatively strong presence of diphthongs in the Jewish dialect of Constantine may also reflect the influence of various Tunisian dialects, whether the Jewish dialect of Tunis, which shares this feature, or the Tunisian nomadic dialects, which also maintain the diphthongs and whose influence extends as far west as the Constantine Province. Conversely, in the Algiers dialect, for example, the diphthongs tend to contract (see Section [4.2]).[[192]](#footnote-195)

In the spoken dialect of the Jews of Constantine, the participle form *qāˁəd* is used to denote the durative present. We found documentation of this usage in the Jewish dialect of Tunis, but not among the Jews of Algiers (see Section [7.12.1]).

We also found that in the Jewish dialect of Constantine the *l* of the definite article may assimilate to an initial /ğ/ in the word that is made definite. This phenomenon is found in various dialects in the Constantine Province (such as those of the Edough area and Philippeville, for example), as well as in the Jewish dialect of Tunis. However, M. Cohen expressly notes that this feature is not found in the Jewish dialect of Algiers; neither is it found in Tlemcen (see Section [9.1]).

An intermediate picture (not necessarily due to geographical location) can also be seen in the system of phonemic short vowels in the Jewish dialect of Constantine. As we described above in detail (see Section [3.3.1]), our dialect may be positioned between the group of dialects characterized by a binary short vowel system – /u/, /ǝ/ (such as the Jewish dialect of Tunis)[[193]](#footnote-196) and dialects characterized by a system with a single phonemic short vowel /ǝ/ (such as the Jewish dialect of Algiers).

The complexity of this dialectal picture is compounded by the influence of the nomadic dialects. Several features in the Jewish dialect of Constantine probably reflect the influence of Tunisian Es-type nomadic dialects.[[194]](#footnote-197)

For example, the use of several words in which /q/ is realized as [g], although the principal realization of this phoneme in our dialect is [q], may be explained as the penetration of these words from the surrounding nomadic dialects (see Section [2.2.9]).

The relatively strong presence of diphthongs in the Jewish dialect of Constantine may also be attributed to the influence of the nomadic dialects; in the eastern Maghreb, this phenomenon is one of the chief characteristics of these dialects [see Section 4.2].[[195]](#footnote-198) The assimilation of the *l* of the definite article to /ğ/ is characteristic of the nomadic dialects, and possibly under their influence it is found occasionally in the speech of the Jews of Constantine (see Section [9.1]).

Cantineau states that the penetration of influences from the nomadic dialects can be found in all the Algerian sedentary dialects, including those of the Oran and Constantine Provinces. However, he notes a unique feature regarding the Constantine Province, where the influence between the nomadic and sedentary dialects is mutual.[[196]](#footnote-199) We should recall in this context that the influence of the Bedouin dialects on the dialects across North Africa began as early as the eleventh century, with the invasion of Bedouin tribes from the east.[[197]](#footnote-200)

It seems probable that the nomadic dialects exerted a greater influence on the Muslim dialect of Constantine than on the Jewish dialect of the city. This assumption is supported by the distinction between the masculine and feminine in the second person singular of the verb and in pronouns among Muslims, whereas in the Jewish dialect the two forms have merged. As noted above, the unification of these two persons is characteristic of the sedentary Maghrebi dialects; the preservation of this distinction in the Muslim dialect of Constantine reflects its greater exposure to nomadic influences.

A similar situation, where the Jewish and Muslim dialects are distinguished by the merger or non-merger of the second person singular forms, is also documented for the city of Bône, to the northeast of Constantine and for Sefrou in Morocco (see Sections [7.2.1.1], [7.2.1.2], and [8.1]).

This difference between the Jewish and Muslim dialects is unsurprising in light of the tendency to insularity among the Jewish communities, which are accordingly less exposed to nomadic influences. Blanc offered this explanation concerning the clear division between *gǝlǝt* and *qǝltu* dialects in Baghdad.[[198]](#footnote-201)

Since we cannot examine the Muslim dialect of Constantine, we will confine ourselves to summarizing the differences mentioned by the informants between their dialect and the Muslim dialect of their city. The most prominent difference is that mentioned above regarding the distinction between the masculine and feminine in the second person singular. The other differences relate to vocabulary:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Muslims | Jews |
| “Did” | *dār* | *fˁəl, ṣnaˁ, ˁməl* |
| “Was born” | *xləq* | *zdād* |
| “Generations” | *gṛūn* | *ǧyūl* |

From all the above we can conclude that CJA has a blend of features that are largely the product of its geographical location. Alongside classic features of the sedentary Maghrebi dialects, it also exhibits several features suggesting the absorption of nomadic influences. Constantine’s location between Tunisian- and Algerian-type dialects is evident in the presence in the dialect of various features typical of each of these dialect types. In some instances, the Algerian feature is dominant, displacing the Tunisian counterpart, while in others the reverse is the case. In particularly interesting cases, two forms of expression coexist in the dialect, graphically illustrating the city’s location at a dialectal crossroads.

Despite all the above, the Jewish dialect of Constantine also maintains some unique characteristics of its own. The various influences we have reviewed do not obscure its own underlying character, not least its conservatism.

**Chapter Twelve: Conclusion**

This book focuses on the Judeo-Arabic language of the *šarḥ* on the Psalms (*Zichron Ya’acov*), as reduced to writing by Rabbi Yosef Renassia of Constantine. This work is only a small element in the writings of this prolific figure who so dominated the spiritual and cultural life of the city’s Jewish community. His books also include translations and commentaries on books of the Bible and on the Mishnah; collections of religious laws, commandments, and *azharot*; dictionaries and grammars; and even historical studies. This impressive output is one of the chief manifestations of the ideology that guided Rabbi Yosef Renassia in all his activities, grounded chiefly in the desire to preserve the Jewish tradition and the Judeo-Arabic heritage and to struggle against their abandonment in favor of assimilation to French culture.

As an impressive educational figure, Rabbi Yosef Renassia saw the preparation of a broad range of user-friendly study aids as an important means for drawing the Jews of his community closer to their heritage. He attributed primary importance to ensuring that Jews would not only observe the commandments but would also be literate in the Jewish sources, from the scriptures themselves through the various commentaries, and on to the Mishnah, Talmud, Maimonides, Alfasi, and others.

The description of the Judeo-Arabic language reflected in the *šarḥ* on the Psalms (CJA) was based on a study of the reading of the text by rabbis from Constantine, combined with an examination of the printed Judeo-Arabic text.

The following is a brief summary of the chief features of this language as described in detail in this study:

The consonantal phonemic system of CJA as reflected in the *šarḥ* comprises 26 phonemes, 24 of which enjoy an independent and stable status; one (/ṛ/) is in the process of stabilization, while another (/ˀ/) is being displaced. This system has a largely conservative character, preserving several consonants that have disappeared from other Judeo-Arabic dialects. For example, CJA maintains a clear distinction between the phonemes /s/ and /š/ and between /ğ/ and /z/. The phoneme /h/ is also consistently preserved in this dialect. Similarly, the phoneme /q/ is almost always realized as [q], and /k/ is almost always realized as [k]: the voiced realization [g] is only found in a handful of loanwords. Even the glottal stop /ˀ/ has not disappeared completely and occurs in certain circumstances, as described in detail above.

A unique feature of the Jewish dialect of Constantine is the realization of the phoneme /ğ/ in two free variants [ğ] and [ž]. The free exchange of these two realizations illustrates Constantine’s location at a “dialectal crossroads.” Another feature of this language is the large number of realization of the phoneme /t/.

The consonantal phonemic system of CJA also reflects the familiar features of many sedentary Maghrebi dialects, such as the merger of the interdental fricatives \*ṯ, \*ḏ, and \*ᵭ̱ with their plosive counterparts. As in many other Maghrebi dialects, /\*r/ in this dialect is in the process of splitting into two separate phonemes: /r/ and /ṛ/. For the present we preferred to relate both phonemes to a single super-phoneme //r-ṛ//, since the split has not been completed.

The emphatic phoneme /ṛ/ has a force similar to that of the three classical emphatic phonemes /ṭ ḍ ṣ/, which imbue their emphatic character to their adjacent non-emphatic counterparts /t d s r/. These emphatic phonemes also have a clear influence on the phonemes /m b f w n z l/, which are realized as emphatic allophones, as well as on adjacent vowels. Emphasis spread within the word is equally evident in both directions.

Each of the semi-vowels /y/ and /w/ has two allophones in complementary distribution; one reflects a realization as a semi-vowel and the other as a vowel.

The vocal phonemic system of CJA comprises three stable long vowels: /ā/, /ū/, and /ī/; two long vocal phonemes with a secondary status – /ō/ and /ē/; and a short vocal phoneme /ǝ/. This short phoneme is the product of the neutralization of the three classical short vowels. This process of neutralization has not been completed, and the system of short vocalic phonemes can be described as one in transition between a binary system comprising /u/ and /ǝ/ and a system comprising a single phoneme /ǝ/ that is gradually securing its position in the dialect.

The realizations of the short vocalic phoneme /ǝ/ are largely conditional on the consonantal surroundings. Variations in the long vowels in similar circumstances are also found but less often.

The system of vocal phonemes in CJA is characterized by the dominance of the qualitative distinction over the quantitative, although the latter cannot be ignored.

The reduced vowel has a strong present in the dialect and is often realized by the Constantine rabbis, although it does not have a distinguishing value.

The repertoire of diphthongs in the Jewish dialect of Constantine is relative extensive. In addition to the CA diphthongs *ay* and *aw*, the dialect also features diphthongs that were created at a later stage. In general, this dialect shows a clear tendency to preserve the diphthongs, and in this respect is resembles the Tunisian dialects more than those of Algeria. The diphthong is maintained when it follows a back or emphatic consonant, when it appears in word forming part of a construct chain, in verb conjugations, and elsewhere. However, we find the diphthong contractions aw > ō and ay > ē In certain words; the vowels resulting from these contractions may have a high realization.

The structure of the syllable in CJA is determined by two chief factors: the omission of the short vowel in an unstressed open syllable, which creates consonantal clusters; and, conversely, the splitting of consonantal clusters by an ancillary vowel, which in some instances may lengthen to form a full-fledged short vowel. The combination of these two factors is evident in the emergence of processes of *ressaut* and *sursaut* that have left their mark on the morphology of the dialect.

The orthography employed by Rabbi Yosef Renassia in *Zichron Ya’acov*, the *šarḥ* on the Psalms, largely reflects the system of consonants regarded by speakers as holding distinctive value. Thus, permanent consonant shifts are marked while sporadic variants are very rarely acknowledged. In contrast to the orthography of the consonants, the written rendition of the vowels is uneven. The orthography largely obscures the distinction between short and long vowels; Rabbi Yosef Renassia often uses a mater lectionis to denote the quality of a short vowel. The orthographic representation of the consonantal [w] and [y] is also inconsistent: sometimes ו and י are used, while in other instances doubled וו and יי are preferred. In general terms, Rabbi Yosef Renassia clearly adheres to several orthographic rules, but he is not excessively zealous in their application. His orthography may be characterized as a blend of conscious and subconscious factors: his own spoken language, with the phonological and morphological changes it reflects; his expansive knowledge of Arabic, and Judeo-Arabic in particular; the influence of the neighboring Tunisian orthography; and the proximity of various Arabic words to their Hebrew counterparts.

The conjugation of verbs shows several distinct features. The distinction between the masculine and feminine has been lost in the second-person singular, and the forms *ktǝbt* and *ktǝbti* are used interchangeably for both genders. Again, this reflects Constantine’s position at a dialectal crossroads. The first-person singular form has also merged with the shorter of the above-mentioned two forms for the second-person singular, *ktǝbt*. The merger of the masculine and feminine forms in the second-person singular is also seen in the future tense. By contrast, this distinction is maintained in the Muslim dialect of the city.

Another key feature of the dialect is the *–tīw* ending for the second-person plural in the past tense of all the verb forms and types; this form was created y way of analogy to *–ti*. The future tense forms follow the model *nkǝtbu*. Unsurprisingly, the masculine and feminine forms have also merged in the second- and third-person plural.

A number of additional features may be noted regarding the verb system. Remnants of the CA short vowel ُ *dammah* on the second root letter can be seen in the future tense of Form I verbs. Under the influence of the Hebrew source, the *šarḥ* maintains the distinction between the masculine and feminine forms of the plural active participle, a distinction that has been lost in the colloquial. The imperative forms in this dialect include an initial *ǝ* in the singular and plural, and presumably by way of analogy this vowel is also found in the imperatives of the verb form *tkǝttǝb*.

Lastly, differences can be seen between the system of verb forms in CJA and that in the spoken dialect of the Jews of Constantine. Due to the inherently conservative character of a *šarḥ* language, CJA maintains several verb forms that are no longer used in the modern spoken dialects. An example of this is the prevalent use of *n* verb forms (Form VII) in the šarḥ to convey the passive and repetitive sense; the presence of forms with a medial *t* (Form VIII); and participles from the causative Form IV. However, the penetration of certain though few verb forms from the vernacular into CJA can also be observed. We found some instances of the t/tt form for the passive, and several instances of the dialectal *smān* verb used to express a quality or change of state.

The pronominal system of CJA also reveals some distinct features. The singular proximal pronouns are the same as those used in the spoken language (*hāda*, *hādi*, *hād-*), but in the plural the archaic *hāwlay* is maintained (in contrast to the dialectal form *hādu*). The relative pronoun in CJA is *ǝldi*, whereas *ǝlli* is used in the vernacular. The second-person masculine singular pronoun in CJA is אנתא – *ǝnta*, withno instances of the feminine singular appeared in the corpus, whereas אנתי *ǝnti* is used in the spoken language for both the masculine and feminine of this person.

The Judeo-Arabic language reflected in the *šarḥ* also features several characteristic words. The most prominent of these is the negative particle ליש *layš*, which is the only particle used in this function in CJA. Several interrogative, causal, and conditional particles and a number of prepositions also show distinct features.

The Hebrew accusative particle את is consistently translated as אילא in CJA, a stark example of the subservience of the language of the *šarḥ* to the Hebrew source. Every Hebrew word in the verse is translated into an Arabic counterpart and the order of the Hebrew words is maintained strictly. As a result, this language carries distinct echoes of Hebrew syntax and phraseology.

The close affinity to the source language is also apparent in the use of the tenses in CJA, which mirrors that of the Hebrew text.

An examination of the Judeo-Arabic language reflected in the šarḥ cannot be divorced from the broader dialectal picture in Constantine and its surroundings. Despite its relatively ancient and conservative character, CJA also includes vernacular features adopted through interaction with the neighboring dialects. The location of Constantine in a province with many transitional dialects is also apparent in the language of the Jews of the city. Thus, we found certain features that are characteristic of the Tunisian dialects alongside others familiar from the Algerian dialects. Particularly interesting situations emerge when our dialect “prevaricates” between two alternative forms or pronunciations, such as the alternative realizations of the phoneme /ğ/ or the second-person singular past forms *ktǝbt* / *ktǝbti*.

Lastly, the Judeo-Arabic dialect of Constantine has been seen to comprise three principal registers: CJA, the language of the *šarḥ* to the Psalms); the everyday vernacular; and an intermediate register used both in the later *šarḥ* texts and in the numerous didactic and exegetic works written and published by Rabbi Yosef Renassia.

The language of the *šarḥ* is positioned significantly above the other registers, showing the inherent conservatism of a translation tradition intended to replicate a sacred text. As a result, CJA has archaic features displaced from the vernacular, while also showing evidence of penetration by vernacular forms, testifying to a process of rapprochement between the language of the *šarḥ* and the local dialect.

This rapprochement is vastly greater in the intermediate register, which includes a very large proportion of dialectal elements. This intermediate register is evident in the later šarḥ works, although in some characteristics this register maintains what we might call *sarḥ*-like features. These features include subservience to Hebrew syntax and phraseology, the paucity of Hebrew words embedded in the Judeo-Arabic text, and a few archaisms.

By contrast, Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s exegetic and didactic works display a fluent language whose Arabic syntax and collocations are speckled with Hebrew words; this is a language that reflects the author’s personal style. At the same time, the numerous vernacular features found in the later *šarḥ* texts and their evident local flavor are common both to these texts and to the exegetic and didactic works.

This outline explains why we chose to include these two types of works – the later *šarḥ* texts and exegetical and didactic literature – within a single intermediate register, since their Judeo-Arabic language is similar. The distinctions between these two genres, due to their inherent characters, do not impair the validity of this classification.

The intermediate register, which essentially serves as a local literary language, occupies the position implied by its name. It has many similarities to the spoken language, while remaining distinct from it, but does not reach the rarefied levels of the language in the *šarḥ* on the Psalms. The intermediate register oscillates between these two poles in terms of the balance of vernacular and literary elements.

This study has examined the *Zichron Ya’acov šarḥ* to the Psalms from a linguistic viewpoint, describing and discussing its characteristics. The character of the translation itself also deserves study in order to illuminate the origins of the translation tradition(s) reflected in this text. Such a study would also allow us to positiong this text within the broader picture of the translation traditions that flourished among the Jewish communities of the Maghreb.

1. Exceptions to this are extremely rare, particularly given the extensive distribution of this particle. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Blau 1980a, p. 143, §206a; Blau 1981, pp. 87, 132 (Appendix I); Blau 1966-67, II, p. 305, §204. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Blau, ibid., ibid., fn. 20. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. For example: שלא אחד בלבד עמד עלינו לכלותינו is translated: אלדי ליס ואחד בס ואקף עלינא לייפ'נינא (*Zeved Tov*, p. 11) [Renassia, Y. 1968, p. 11]. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. For similar and alternative explanations for the absence of the *š*, see: Cohen 1975, p. 268 (when the verb is followed by a direct, indefinite complement or when a words such as *əlla*, *ḥatta,* or *ˁomr* follows); Cohen 1912, p. 376, and see also: Heath and Bar-Asher 1982, p. 73. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Conversely, some dialects feature combinations of “ma + the various third person pronouns + ši;” for example, the dialect of Takrouna: Marçais and Guîga, 1958–61, VII, p. 3762. Cf. the form מהוסי: Shitrit 1989, p. 71, fn. 123. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The negation of the verb with ma … š is also found in many other dialects, such as: the Jewish dialects of Algiers and Tunis, the Muslim dialect of Tlemcen, Moroccan dialects, and so forth: Cohen 1912, p. 376; Cohen 1975, p. 268; Marçais 1902, pp. 188-189; Brunot 1950a, p. 137. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Including one rabbi who always translates directly from the Hebrew source, and another who did so in those sections where I asked him to do so. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. However, the word לא is translated in these Haggadot as *lam*: לם in Baghdad and לאם in Algiers. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Blanc 1964b, p. 27; Cohen 1912, p. 378. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Doron 1980, pp. 138, 142-145. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. For examples of this use, see: Bar-Asher 1985a, pp. 234-235. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. The particle מה is also translated in this manner when it has rhetorical force. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. The interrogative הֲ is also translated as אש in the Algiers Haggadah: .. הנסה אלהים..., אש ג'ררב אללה (Dt 4:34). [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Cf. Cohen 1975, p. 347; Blanc 1964a, p. 136. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Blau 1966-67, I, pp. 139-141, §3. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Blau 1980a, p. 65, §52. איש is common, while אש is rarer. See also: ibid., §§ 367, 373. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Blau 1980s, p. 10, 140, §204. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Blau 1981, pp. 108-109; 1966-67, I, pp. 49 C, II, p. 303 B. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Blau 1958, p. 88 and fn. 25 there; Blau 1980s, p. 65, fn. 55, and see also his reservation: Blau 1981, p. 62, fn. 1. See also: Doron 1980, pp. 137, 140. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. It also appears in the Algiers Haggadah as a translation of מה; cf.: Cohen 1912, p. 347. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Willms 1972, p. 49 b; Heath and Bar-Asher 1982, p. 61. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. Doron 1980, p. 137. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Blanc 1985, p. 304. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Blanc 1964a, pp. 136-137. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Jastrow 1978, pp. 115-117. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. In addition to the words detailed here, see also the phrase *kīfaš* in Section 10.2.2. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. עלאש, with its various shades of pronunciation, can be found for example in the Jewish dialects of Algiers, Tunis, and Tafilalat. In the Jewish dialect of Baghdad, ˁala(ˀ)ēš is used in the sense of “about what?”: Cohen 1912, p. 347; Cohen 1975, p. 237; Blanc 1964a, p. 137; Heath and Bar-Asher 1982, p. 61. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s trilingual dictionary (p. 365) gives: من – mène as the equivalent of the Hebrew מי. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. The phrase *ḥtta lǟi̯ən* is also used in the Jewish dialect of Algiers in the sense of the Hebrew עד לאן. See: Cohen 1912, p. 372. The colloquial Jewish dialect of Tunis uses *lǟ́yən* in the sense of לאן, אנה. See: Cohen 1975, p. 242. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. This particle is documented in the sense of איך in Rabbi Renassia’s trilingual dictionary (p. 89): איך – كيفاش *kifache*. This word is used with the same meaning in the Jewish dialect of Tunis: Cohen 1975, p. 237. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. One of the informants often pronounces this word as [an]. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. This particle is used in the sense of the Hebrew משום ש in the Jewish dialect of Algiers: Cohen 1912, p. 270. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. The word *lāyən* exists in their *šarḥ*, but only very rarely, as I learned from Bar-Asher. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. Doron 1980, p. 323. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. Thus, I found in the Baghdad Passover Haggadah (Livorno, 1865) [הגדת בגדאד 1865] and in other Haggadot from Baghdad. See also: Blanc 1964b, p. 28. Blanc states that in various Judeo-Arabic texts from Baghdad, the particles *ab*, *leˀan*, and ḥēθ are used instead of אד'. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. Blau 1980a, p. 220, §342, p. 225, fn. 26. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. Blau 1980a, p. 225, §346, fn. 26; Blau 1961, p. 105, §165; Doron 1980, p. 323; Blau 1966-67, III, p. 519, §406. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. The word سبة and the phrase فِي سبة are documented in Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s dictionary (p. 68). This word is also used in the commentary *Zichron Tov*, for example: ומן האד אסבה כאיין מנהג מא ירכבו למצבה מן ג;יר ורא 12 שהאר (commentary on Psalm 31, p. 101). See also: Beaussier 1958, p. 455; Cohen 1912, p. 268. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. The Algiers Haggadah [הטל 1975] adopts a similar translation: למען – לסבת (e.g., p. 18), פ'י סבת (e.g., p. 9), על שום ש – עלא סבת די (p. 36). [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. See Section [7.12.2], p. 254, and fn. 2 there. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. See Section [8.2] for a discussion of the enclitic pronouns. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. In many cases the rabbis presented the noun in an indefinite form, although we would expect it to be accompanied by the definite article. This may be due to the dynamics of responding to a questionnaire. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. The particle מתאע is used in the *Zeved Tov* Passover Haggadah (e.g., p. 16b). [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. The rabbi who translates directly from the Hebrew source uses this particle relatively frequently. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. This example illustrates both forms in a single verse. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. I learned of this from Bar-Asher. See also: Marçais 1936, p. 1053; cf. Brockelmann 1961, II, p. 243. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. In the Mesopotamian dialect region, in all the *gǝlǝt* and *qǝltu* dialects, including those of Anatolia, Khuzistan, and Iraq, the word *māl* is used to express possession; this also has its origins in a word meaning property or anything owned by a person. Blanc 1964a, pp. 7, 156. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. Blau 1980a, p. 159, §227D. The oldest examples of this use can be found in Judeo-Arabic texts from the eleventh century: in the responsa of the Rif and in Yitzhak Ben Giat’s *Kitab al-Zahd*. Blau ibid. and fn. 21, p. 321. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. In medieval texts it is already possible to find declined forms such as בתאעה for the feminine singular and בתוע for the masculine plural, as well as forms with enclitic pronouns, such as בתאעתהו. See: Blau 1981, p. 82. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. This is true, for example, of the Jewish dialect of Tunis, where *tāˁ* is used alongside *ntāˁ*. Cohen 1975, p. 252. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. When I asked one of the rabbis, who used the particle *tāˁ* inside construct chains, whether he was familiar with the use of *tāˁ*, he replied that this was a mistake and the correct form is *ntāˁ*. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. It is possible that the conditioning we observed in those instances when these particles have penetrated the reading of the *šarḥ* may also apply in the colloquial, but this requires more extensive examination. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. In a single instance, one of the rabbis translated: *l-fˁāyɪl d-əl bən-adəm* (לִפְעֻלּ֣וֹת אָ֭דָם, Ps 17:4). [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
55. Ostoya-Delmas 1938, p. 80. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
56. Marçais 1936, p. 1053. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
57. Millon 1937, p. 348; Cohen 1912, pp. 324, 364. [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
58. Marçais 1902, p. 20. [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
59. Marçais 1908, p. 175. [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
60. Cohen 1975, p. 252. [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
61. Talmoudi 1980, p. 158. [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
62. In Morocco, too, *mtāˁ* is used alongside *di* and *dyāl*; the situation in the various dialects differs. See, for example: Willms 1972, pp. 38-40; Brunot 1950a, pp. 247, 264; Harrell 1962, p. 202, fn. 11. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
63. See Section [6.4] regarding the orthography of the particle פ'י when it is attached to the following word. [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
64. See Section [10.7] for details. [↑](#footnote-ref-64)
65. See Section [10.10] regarding this word. [↑](#footnote-ref-65)
66. Particularly by the informant who translates directly from the Hebrew source. [↑](#footnote-ref-66)
67. This shortened form is found in many Maghrebi dialects, including Moroccan dialects and the Jewish dialect of Tunis: Brunot 1950a, p. 65; Cohen 1975, pp. 249-250. [↑](#footnote-ref-67)
68. For example: מן לברכה אלי יבארךּ בן אדם על למאכלה אלי יאכל (commentary on Ps 63, p. 64). [↑](#footnote-ref-68)
69. See also Section [10.7]. [↑](#footnote-ref-70)
70. The Sousse *šarḥ* uses מעא together with the first-person singular enclitic pronoun: מעי, and the third-person masculine singular enclitic pronoun: מעהו. See Doron 1980, p. 156. [↑](#footnote-ref-71)
71. In the Jewish dialect of Tunis this word is pronounced *ḥatta*, while the Jews of Algiers pronounce *ḥtta*: Cohen 1975, p. 244; Cohen 1912, p. 365. [↑](#footnote-ref-72)
72. See Section [10.6] for examples of its use as a conjunction. [↑](#footnote-ref-73)
73. See Section [10.2]. [↑](#footnote-ref-74)
74. This word is occasionally pronounced without the vowel in the first syllable: *qddām*. [↑](#footnote-ref-75)
75. Bar-Asher 1985b, p. 44, fn. 12. [↑](#footnote-ref-76)
76. In the translation of the Torah by the western Issachar Ben-Susan, the phrases פ'י קבאלת and בין ידין are used to translate את פני, under the influence of Sa’adia Ben Gaon. Doron 1980, pp. 315-317. [↑](#footnote-ref-77)
77. See Section [10.10], I. [↑](#footnote-ref-78)
78. The pronunciation *ˁawād* is also documented for the Jewish dialect of Algiers. See: Cohen 1912, p. 366. [↑](#footnote-ref-79)
79. For example, see: Hava 1970, p. 503. [↑](#footnote-ref-80)
80. Beaussier 1958, p. 684. [↑](#footnote-ref-81)
81. See Sections [10.2] and [10.4]. [↑](#footnote-ref-82)
82. In the *šarḥ* of the Jews of Tafilalat, רבתמא is used to translate פן. Ben-Asher 1988a, p. 9. [↑](#footnote-ref-83)
83. *qbǝl* in the sense of “before” is found in many dialects, such as that of Jijli: Marçais 1956, p. 522. קבל as a translation for the Hebrew טרם is also found in the šarḥ of Sousse; see: Doron 1980, pp. 159-160. [↑](#footnote-ref-84)
84. In the *šarh* to Ecclesiastes, the Passover Haggadah *Zeved Tov*, and Rabbi Renassia’s translation of the Mishnah (*Nishmat Kol Chai*), the Hebrew word את is not translated. [↑](#footnote-ref-85)
85. The object appears in the definite in the translation here, though not in the original. [↑](#footnote-ref-86)
86. In translating the verse וַיִּֽירְא֥וּ הָעָ֖ם אֶת־יְהוָ֑ה (Ex 14:13), the translators of the Algiers and Baghdad Haggadot and the *Or Ne’erav* all used the preposition מן, as required by the Arabic verb, rather than אילא to translate את. Cf. various translations of the form ירא את- in the *šarḥ* of Sousse: Doron 1980, pp. 310-311. [↑](#footnote-ref-87)
87. Doron 1980, p. 313, §7.1.4. [↑](#footnote-ref-88)
88. Although there are some exceptional instances in which את is not translated. We should add that in the instructions for holding the Seder included in the Algiers Haggadah, which are written in Arabic and not based on a written Hebrew source, there is no use of אילא before a direct object. For example: כל וואחד יחבס כאסו פ'יידו.. (Algiers Haggadah, p. 1, קדש) [הטל 1975, עמ' א, "קדש"]. [↑](#footnote-ref-89)
89. Blanc 1964b, p. 28; 1964a, pp. 121, 197, n. 133. [↑](#footnote-ref-90)
90. Doron 1978, pp. 14-15; 1980, pp. 299-300. [↑](#footnote-ref-91)
91. Regarding *Or Ne’erav*, it should be noted that the verses from the Torah that appear in the Passover Haggadah were examined; these did not include any instance of an independent את standing alone (without a pronoun) before a definite direct object that was translated as אלא. The same is true of additional verses I examined. However, אלא appeared occasionally with a pronoun; for example: וְאוֹתָ֖נוּ הוֹצִ֣יא מִשָּׁ֑ם לְמַ֨עַן֙ הָבִ֣יא אֹתָ֔נוּ לָ֤תֶת לָ֨נוּ֙ אֶת־הָאָ֔רֶץ (Ps 6:23) – ואלינא כ'ררג' מן תמא לסבת ידכ'ולנא ליעטי אלינא אלארץ'. The Hebrew אותנו and לנו are both translated as אלינא (sic. – not אילנא), while את before the word ארץ is not translated. [↑](#footnote-ref-92)
92. For example, in the *šarḥ* of the Jews of Tafilalat, see fn. 4 above. See also the references quoted in Doron 1978, p. 14, fn. 33. [↑](#footnote-ref-93)
93. Bar-Asher 1988a, p. 5, fn. 26. [↑](#footnote-ref-94)
94. See Doron 1978, p. 15. [↑](#footnote-ref-95)
95. See Section [10.5]. In the *šarḥ* to the Psalms, אל was translated as אילא, but in the spoken language *li* serves in this function. [↑](#footnote-ref-96)
96. For example, in the Algiers Haggadah [Hatal 1975, p. 23]: אלא הקדוש ברוך הוא בכבודו ובעצמו – אלא למקדש מבארךּ הווא בווקרו ובקוותו (p. 23), and in the Baghdad Haggadah [Baghdad Haggadah 1865, p. 19b]: אל מקדס תבארך הו בואג'בו ובעצ'מוותו (p. 19b). [↑](#footnote-ref-97)
97. Doron 1978, p. 13. [↑](#footnote-ref-98)
98. See, for example: Blau 1980a, p. 8, §1. [↑](#footnote-ref-99)
99. Blau 1980s, p. 179, §269a, p. 178, §266d, p. 177, §265c; see also p. 172, §254e. [↑](#footnote-ref-100)
100. Blanc 1964b, p.28, n. 30; 1964a, pp. 128-130, §5.41. [↑](#footnote-ref-101)
101. Blau 1980a. pp. 118-120, §164. [↑](#footnote-ref-102)
102. Blau explains the use of אלי in several instances in place of a direct object as the result of confusion this explanation does not provide an overall solution for the emergence of this phenomenon, though it may be pertinent for the specific instances he quotes: Blau 1980a, p. 177, §265c. [↑](#footnote-ref-103)
103. Tzabar 1982, p. 130. [↑](#footnote-ref-104)
104. The Hebrew interrogative particle איך is also translated in the *šarḥ* as כיף (Ps 11:2); see section [10.2.2]D above. [↑](#footnote-ref-105)
105. The particle בחאל appears in Ps 58:8, 58:9, 61:7, and elsewhere. The particle כיף appears in Ps 58:8, 58:10, and elsewhere. [↑](#footnote-ref-106)
106. *bḥāl* is used in the Jewish dialect of Algiers alongside the particles *ki*, *kif*, and *mtǝl*; see: Cohen 1912, p. 366. It is also found in various Moroccan dialects: Burnot 1950a, p. 244. This particle is rare in the Tlemcen dialect, where other words are usually preferred: Marçais 1902, p. 165. [↑](#footnote-ref-107)
107. The interrogative “how” in this dialect is expressed by *tif* (\*k > t): Heath and Bar Asher 1982, pp. 34-36, 61. [↑](#footnote-ref-108)
108. For example, in the Passover Haggadah of the Jews of Tafilalat, the demonstrative word שנאמר is translated פ'חאל מא קאל לפסוק. Bar Asher 1988a, p. 7. Similarly, we found that, in the Algiers Haggadah, כיףis usually used to translate the comparative particle, although here, too, בחאל is usually preferred as the translation of שנאמר.

     In Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s translation of the Mishnah, we find: קבלה אלי האד לענין תוקאל למשה רבינו פ'י הר סיני (Nazir, end of Chapter 7). Cf.: Bar-Asher 1988a, p. 7. In Renassia’s Passover Haggadah *Zeved Tov*, by contrast, כמו שנאמר is translated כיף אלדי קאל לפסוק. [↑](#footnote-ref-109)
109. This informant also sometimes used *ki* and *kif* to translate כי in the temporal sense: כִּ֣י אֶמּֽוֹט (Ps 13:5; in the printed šarḥ: אין נמיל (נטיח)), כִּֽי־אֶרְאֶ֣ה (Ps 8:4) – *ki nənḍaṛ*. See also Appendix I: The Phonemic Transcription, Section 2.12, and cf. section 4.2.4. [↑](#footnote-ref-110)
110. The use of both *ki*  and *kīf* is documented in the Philippeville district, in the Jewish dialects of Algiers and Tunis, in Jijli and Tlemcen, and elsewhere: Cohen 1912, pp. 366, 371; Cohen 1975, p. 251; Marçais 1902, pp. 163-165; Ostoya-Delmas 1938, p. 81; Marçais 1956, pp. 523-524. Regarding the various explanations mentioned concerning the form of the particle *ki*, see: Cohen 1975, p. 251; Ostoya-Delmas 1938, p. 81. [↑](#footnote-ref-111)
111. *mǝtl* [CHECK, mtəl?] serves as a comparative particle in the Jewish dialect of Tunis in literary uses, though *kīf* is more common in speech: Cohen 1975, p. 253. [↑](#footnote-ref-112)
112. I learned of this from Bar-Asher. [↑](#footnote-ref-113)
113. In the Baghdad Haggadah, לו כאן serves in this function, without the introductory vocative יא. [↑](#footnote-ref-114)
114. Cohen 1912, pp. 370, 487. [↑](#footnote-ref-115)
115. Marçais 1902, p. 193. [↑](#footnote-ref-116)
116. Here, too, it is often accompanied by an initial *ya*: Marçais and Guîga 1958-61, VII, p. 3697–3704. [↑](#footnote-ref-117)
117. Cohen 1975, p. 261. [↑](#footnote-ref-118)
118. There is no certain example of لو كان for Christian Arabic: Blau 1966-67, III, p. 595, §487.1. [↑](#footnote-ref-119)
119. Blau 1980a, p. 254, §401; Brafmann 1942, p. 173; and see also: Blau 1981, pp. 86-87, fn. 4. [↑](#footnote-ref-120)
120. This assumption is corroborated by the fact that אן, אדא, and לו may be omitted, so that כאן stands alone as a conditional particle. This is found not only in medieval texts, but also in modern dialects. In the Jewish dialects of Algiers and Tunis, for example, *kān* is used on its own to express the conditional sense. See: Blau 1980a, p. 251, fn. 10; Cohen, M. 1912, p. 370; Cohen, D. 1975, p. 261. Wilentschik suggests that this כאן may have emerged through an admixture of كَانَ and كَأَنَّ; see: Wilentschik 1929, p. 278, fn. 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-121)
121. In Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s trilingual dictionary (p. 36), ياسر – *iassère* is documented with the meaning מאד (and also with the meaning הרבה – p. 448). *bəzzǟf* and *yā́sər* are also used in the Jewish dialect of Algiers, though the latter is rare; conversely, among the Jews of Tunis *yā́sər* is the more usual word. See: Cohen 1975, p. 238; Cohen 1912, p. 375. [↑](#footnote-ref-122)
122. Cf. the particle *šu̯īi̭ä* in the sense of “a little” in the Jewish dialect of Algiers: Cohen 1912, p. 375. [↑](#footnote-ref-123)
123. In Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s trilingual dictionary (p. 336), قليل is given as the equivalent of the Hebrew מעט. [↑](#footnote-ref-124)
124. In Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s trilingual dictionary (p. 14), كساعة – *kessaâ* is given as the equivalent of the Hebrew אז. [↑](#footnote-ref-125)
125. Cf. Cohen 1912, pp. 373-374; Fischer 1959, pp. 143-145. [↑](#footnote-ref-126)
126. In the *šarḥ*, דלוקת is used to translate both עתה and נא. The translate of נא with the meaning “now” has a firm place in tradition, documented from Second Temple times to the present day; I also found the word translated in this manner in the Haggadot of Algiers and Baghdad, which I compared on this matter. On this matter, see: Blau 1980b, pp. 187-191. See section [6.5] for a discussion of the orthography of this word. [↑](#footnote-ref-127)
127. Cohen 1912, pp. 373, 478. [↑](#footnote-ref-128)
128. For example ,in the Jewish dialect of Tunis: Cohen 1975, p. 243. [↑](#footnote-ref-129)
129. Maimonides 1954, 1, 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-130)
130. Blau 1980a, p. 122, §172. [↑](#footnote-ref-131)
131. This word (*žmīˁ*) is also used in the Jewish dialect of Tunis in the sense of “together.” Cohen, D. 1975, p. 237. [↑](#footnote-ref-132)
132. *Bilshon Limudim*: *Biqulsi*, Bar-Asher 1988b, p. 5, para. 12. [↑](#footnote-ref-133)
133. Doron 1980, pp. 331-335. [↑](#footnote-ref-134)
134. Cohen, D. 1975, p. 238. [↑](#footnote-ref-135)
135. By contrast, in Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s translation of the Mishnah we found translated phrases that are subservient to the Hebrew source, such as דאם כן – אלי אידא האכדא (Pesahim 1:2). [↑](#footnote-ref-136)
136. Additional examples of this close affinity were noted in the previous sub-sections. [↑](#footnote-ref-137)
137. In the *šarḥ* of the Jews of Tafilalat, too, the verb *tkəl* is used to translate the Hebrew root ב.ט.ח, and the accompanying preposition may be influenced by the counterpart in the Hebrew source. For example: בָּ֣טַח בָּ֭הּ (Ps 31:11) was translated: תכל פ'יהא. In their spoken language, the Jews of Tafilalat would use the phrase *tkəl ˁla* to convey this meaning. I learned of this from Bar-Asher. [↑](#footnote-ref-138)
138. See Section [10.7]. [↑](#footnote-ref-139)
139. Bar-Asher 1988a, p. 8. For Zafrani’s contribution to the study of the šarḥ traditions, see in particular Zafrani 1980. [↑](#footnote-ref-140)
140. In a seminar paper I wrote entitled “A Comparison between the Translations of the Algiers Haggadah and the Baghdad Haggadah,” submitted to G. Goldenberg in 1985. [↑](#footnote-ref-141)
141. Blanc 1964b, pp. 18-20. [↑](#footnote-ref-142)
142. I compared the language of his translation of the Mishnah and the language of his commentary in *Nishmat Kol Chai* in a seminar paper I wrote entitled: “Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s *Nishmat Kol Chai*,” submitted to Y. Shetrit in 1986. [↑](#footnote-ref-143)
143. Rabbi Yosef Renassia wrote many of these commentaries by himself, while mentioning earlier scholars on whose work he based his remarks. For example, in his commentary on the Psalms, *Zichron Ya’akov*, he drew on the exegesis of Rabbi Chaim Yosef David Azulai; his commentary on the Song of Songs drew on Rabbi Ovadia Ben Jacob Sforno, and so forth. [↑](#footnote-ref-144)
144. It is interesting to note that Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s translation of Rashi’s commentary on the Pentateuch contains fewer vernacular influences than his translation of Rashi’s commentary on the Psalms (in *Zichron Ya’acov*). [↑](#footnote-ref-145)
145. This work includes numerous translations of verses, presented in a higher register of Judeo-Arabic than the surrounding commentary. [↑](#footnote-ref-147)
146. Chetrit 1980 [?], p. 25. [↑](#footnote-ref-148)
147. Cantineau 1938; Ostoya-Delmas 1938; Mangion 1937 etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-149)
148. See Section [1.4]. [↑](#footnote-ref-150)
149. The main comparison here will be between the language of the *šarḥ* and the spoken language as reflected in the questionnaire. Almost no comments were added regarding Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s other books, since these were not read out by the rabbis. [↑](#footnote-ref-151)
150. According to Cantineau, the settled dialects in the Constantine Province pronounce /q/ as [q, k, ˀ] but not [g] (1938, p. 853). [↑](#footnote-ref-152)
151. Ostoya-Delmas 1938, pp. 67-68. [↑](#footnote-ref-153)
152. Bar-Asher 1988a, p. 11. See also the distinction between the /k/ pronunciation of [k] in the *šarḥ* and the k > t shift in the spoken language. [↑](#footnote-ref-154)
153. Cf. the differences noted by H. Blanc between the spoken language of the Jews of Baghdad and their literary language. See: Blanc 1964b, pp. 20-22. [↑](#footnote-ref-155)
154. Thus, for example, in the commentary *Zichron Ya’acov* (p. 91, וג'אוובו); in *Sefer Ha-Azharot* (vol. I, p. 129, תג'אובהו), and in Rabbi Yosef Renassia’s trilingual dictionary (p. 382): *djaouèbe*. [↑](#footnote-ref-156)
155. Blanc 1964b, p. 24. [↑](#footnote-ref-157)
156. See Section [3.6]. [↑](#footnote-ref-158)
157. D. Cohen notes that among the Jews of Tunis, remnants of the *n* form are confined solely to the literary language (1975, p. 123). [↑](#footnote-ref-159)
158. Conversely, object sentences are conveyed without any syndetic conjunction; for example: נקדרו נעטיו (נשמת כל חי, Pesahim 1:4 - commentary). [↑](#footnote-ref-160)
159. We found it presented just once, in parentheses, outside the corpus (PS 58:8): כְּמ֣וֹ יִתְמֹלָֽלוּ – (באש) (כיף) ישיחו. [↑](#footnote-ref-161)
160. For example: לא נמנעו מלהדליק את השמן שנפסל... – מא תמנעוש מן לישעל אזית אלי תפ'ססל... (Pesahim 1:6 – translation). In the šarḥ to Ecclesiastes, we found in the same verse the use of “ל + third person masculine singular of the future tense” and the use of “באש + the future tense” (e.g., Ecc 1:13). [↑](#footnote-ref-162)
161. For example: נבדדלוהו (להמירו, *Shir Ben David*, p. 27), תבארכהו (*Sefer Ha-Azharot*, I, p. 129). [↑](#footnote-ref-163)
162. For example: ילזמלו (*Zichron Ya’acov*, p. 50), עלא אש אלי עמלולהם (Rashi Deuteronomy, p. 58b). [↑](#footnote-ref-164)
163. The form האולאי is found in these registers only in a translation of a biblical verse in *Sefer Ha-Azharot*; see section [8.3]. [↑](#footnote-ref-165)
164. Cohen 1975, p. 221. [↑](#footnote-ref-166)
165. We found the particle in the Algiers and Baghdad Haggadot, and it is also documented in the *šarḥ* of the western Issachar Ben-Susan, the *šarḥ* of the Jews of Tafilalat, and literary writings in the Jewish dialect of Baghdad: see Section [10.1]. [↑](#footnote-ref-167)
166. See Section [10.7]. [↑](#footnote-ref-168)
167. When they translated certain psalms independently, the informants added Hebrew words that do not appear in the printed text. [↑](#footnote-ref-169)
168. Regarding the addition of the definite article to Hebrew words embedded in a Judeo-Arabic text, see section [9.2] above. [↑](#footnote-ref-170)
169. In this verse, the Hebrew word נשך was “translated” by another Hebrew word, רבית. However, the text of the *šarḥ* also presents two alternative translations: בלפ'איידא, בלגדים. In the *šarḥ* of the Jews of Tafilalat, תרבית and מרבית were translated by the Hebrew term רבית, which is common in the Talmudic literature. See: Bar-Asher 1985a, p. 231. Rabbi Raphael Birdugo adopted a similar approach in his work *Leshon Limudim*. See: Bar-Asher 1988c, p. 4, §5.10. [↑](#footnote-ref-171)
170. The rabbis read this word according to its Hebrew pronunciation and not as in Arabic. [↑](#footnote-ref-172)
171. Bar-Asher 1985a, pp. 236, 243-250. [↑](#footnote-ref-173)
172. Bar-Asher, ibid., pp. 242-243. [↑](#footnote-ref-174)
173. See previous note. [↑](#footnote-ref-175)
174. In my above-mentioned seminar paper on the work *Nishmat Kol Chai*. [↑](#footnote-ref-176)
175. See Bar-Asher’s distinction between four groups of speakers (1978, pp. 166–167). [↑](#footnote-ref-177)
176. Bar-Asher, ibid., p. 167; Chetrit 1989, pp. 33–34, 36. [↑](#footnote-ref-178)
177. We also find a large degree of cooption of the gender of Hebrew adjectives, even when the Arabic noun is of the opposite gender. For example, in Ps 19:10: יִרְאַ֤ת יְהוָ֨ה ׀ טְהוֹרָה֮ עוֹמֶ֪דֶת לָ֫עַ֥ד is translated as כ'וף אללאה טאהרה ואקפ'א לדואם. See also Section [7.2.1.4]. [↑](#footnote-ref-179)
178. Doron 1980, p. 34. [↑](#footnote-ref-180)
179. See Section [1.2]. [↑](#footnote-ref-182)
180. Bar-Asher 1988a, p. 8. [↑](#footnote-ref-183)
181. One of the rabbis mentioned that in his commentary in *Zichron Ya’acov*, Rabbi Yosef Renassia includes references to topical events in the life of the community and various stories. These elements presumably also reflected an effort to encourage the members of his community to engage in study of the *šarḥ* on the Psalms. [↑](#footnote-ref-184)
182. Chapter 11; this aspect also deserves broader study. [↑](#footnote-ref-185)
183. Bar-Asher 1988b, p. 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-186)
184. Although this process is also found in certain Mashriqi dialects; see Section [5.3.4]. [↑](#footnote-ref-187)
185. This comment refers in particular to the pronunciation of /ˀ/, but also to the pronunciation of /q/: the number of instances in the *šarḥ* in which /q/ is pronounced [g] is even smaller than in the spoken dialect. [↑](#footnote-ref-188)
186. See Section [7.2.1.1] regarding alternative conjugation forms for the second-person singular in the past tense. [↑](#footnote-ref-189)
187. See the map of the region in Appendix II. Cantineau 1938, pp. 851–852; Ostoya-Delmas 1938, pp. 63–65. [↑](#footnote-ref-190)
188. Naturally, some of these phenomena are also documented for other regions, such as the western Maghreb, but these are not relevant in the context of our current discussion. [↑](#footnote-ref-191)
189. In the Jewish dialect of Tunis, \*š and \*s are usually realized as [š], or as [ṣ] before an emphatic consonant; the variant [s] appears only before a non-emphatic *r*. See Section [2.2.4]. [↑](#footnote-ref-192)
190. Regarding the preservation of this pattern in CJA, see Section [2.2.11]. [↑](#footnote-ref-193)
191. In the Cherchell dialect, however, the vowel is realized. See: Grand-Henry 1972, p. 45. [↑](#footnote-ref-194)
192. Cohen 1912, p. 111. [↑](#footnote-ref-195)
193. See p. 106, fn. 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-196)
194. Cantineau repeatedly emphasizes the extent of the influence of these dialects on the dialects in the Constantine Province. For example, see: Cantineau 1938, pp. 855-856, 858. [↑](#footnote-ref-197)
195. Mangion 1937, p. 376. According to D. Cohen, the nomadic dialects have a conservative character. See: Cohen 1970a, p. 116, f.n. 53 Cohen 1970a, p. 116, fn. 53. [↑](#footnote-ref-198)
196. Cantineau 1940, p. 225; Ostoya-Delmas 1938, pp. 63-65. [↑](#footnote-ref-199)
197. Retsö 1983, p. 98. [↑](#footnote-ref-200)
198. Blanc 1964a, pp. 170-171. [↑](#footnote-ref-201)