

TE'UDA

VI

STUDIES IN HEBREW AND ARABIC

TEL AVIV UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
THE CHAIM ROSENBERG SCHOOL OF JEWISH STUDIES

Editorial Board of the Series

Joseph A. Ben-Shlomo

Nurit Govrin

Aron Dotan

Yair Hoffman

Abraham Tal

Mordechai A. Friedman

Daniel Carpi

TE'UDA

THE CHAIM ROSENBERG SCHOOL OF JEWISH STUDIES RESEARCH SERIES

VI

STUDIES IN HEBREW AND ARABIC

IN MEMORY OF DOV ERON

Edited by

ARON DOTAN

**TEL-AVIV UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY PUBLISHING PROJECTS 1988**

TE'UDA

THE CHAIM ROSENBERG SCHOOL OF JEWISH STUDIES RESEARCH SERIES

Volume 1 : Cairo Geniza Studies, 1980

Volume 2 : Studies in Bible, 1982

Volume 3 : Studies in Talmudic Literature, in Post-Biblical
Hebrew and in Biblical Exegesis, 1983

Volume 4 : Studies in Judaica, 1986

Volume 5 : Studies in Hebrew Literature, 1986

Volume 6 : Studies in Hebrew and Arabic, 1988

Forthcoming Volume:

Volume 7 : Studies in Judaica

CONTENTS

Editor's Preface	7
Dov Eron	9
Publications of Dov Eron	14
Menahem Zevi Kaddari	
Pronominal 'Copula' in Mishnaic Hebrew	15
Abraham Tal	
Observations on the Meaning of טעד	31
Chaim E. Cohen	
The Declension of פִּינ in Tannaitic Hebrew	37
Shimon Sharvit	
Two Phonological Phenomena in Mishnaic Hebrew	43
Daniel Boyarin	
Towards the Talmudic Lexicon IV	63
	* * *
Eliezer Rubinstein	
Deviating Syntax and Unexpected Translation	77
Haiim B. Rosén	
For a More Refined Understanding of the Syntactic Relations in Israeli Hebrew	85
Yitzhak Zadka	
The Hebrew Verb פִּרַץ and its Meanings	91
Maya Fruchtmán	
Modern Poetry as a Discourse Unit – A Linguistic Approach	109
	* * *

Aron Dotan		
	The Beginnings of Hebrew Lexicography – A Fragment of an Ancient Dictionary	115
Ilan Eldar		
	The Treatise on the Shewa and ‘Seder Ha-Simanim’ – Two Parts of a Whole	127
Dan Becker		
	‘Different from Arabic’ in Medieval Hebrew Linguistic Writings	139
	* *	
Joshua Blau		
	Changes in the Spelling System of Judeo–Arabic	159
Moshe Bar-Asher		
	‘Leshon Limmudim’ – A Short Biblical Commentary by Rabbi Raphael Birdugo	163
	* *	
Amos Goldreich		
	Possible Arabic Sources of the Distinction between ‘Duties of the Heart’ and ‘Duties of the Limbs’	179
Michael Schwarz		
	Maimonides’ ‘Guide of the Perplexed’ – the First Twelve Chapters in a New Hebrew Translation	209
English Summaries		

Pronominal 'Copula' in Mishnaic Hebrew

by

Menahem Zevi Kaddari

The starting point of previous research in the grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew (henceforth: MH) was characterized by critical comments on M.Z. Segal's 'Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew'. Current study has placed great stress on a description of the morpho-phonology of the language, based upon the best available manuscripts. However, in spite of the renewed interest in MH, little attention has been paid to its syntax. In this article, the author attempts an examination of the copula according to the discussion in Segal's "Grammar" (331-333).

Segal cites 26 examples of the pronominal copula *hu' hi' – hem hen*; these should be classified according to their sources (Mishna, Tosefta, Mekhlita, Sifre, and the Babylonian Talmud), moulded into meaningful syntactic units and emended wherever necessary. Collation with Ms. Kaufmann and other manuscripts eliminates some of Segal's examples (e.g. Yevamot 85b: *Zehu margila* → *Ze hu' margilah* = in this case, he is getting her accustomed').

Based on Segal's valid examples for the pronominal *hu'*, the following regularities in the language of the Mishna are evinced: 1. *Hu'* functions mainly as nominal predicator, being the postposited operator of the nominal predicate; 2. it may function as the predicate itself in a clause of identification; or 3. as the subject of a qualifying nominal clause. All these functions of *hu'* are present in the language of the Tannaitic Midrashim, while (in the sources cited by Segal) case 2 (the identifying predicate) is not attested to in the Hebrew of the Babylonian Talmud.

Since in cases 1 and 3 there are two possible word-orders, one has to rely on the prosodic feature of (sentence-) stress in order to avoid ambiguity.

Following are some examples for the three cases mentioned above, from the Mishna: 1. *Benot Yisra'el na'ot hem* (Nedarim 9:10) – 'Jewish women are nice', wherein *hen* is a nominal predicator; 2. *Šehape še'asar hu' hape šehitir* (Ketubot 2:2) – 'for the same mouth that pronounced the inhibition; has also pronounced the permission', wherein *hu'* is the identifying predicate; and 3. *'Arba'a šomrim hen* (Bava Meši'a 7:8) – 'they are four *šomrim*', *hen* being the anaphoric subject of the sentence, referring to the *bailees* in the Ex. XXII:6-14.

Observation on the Meaning of סעד

by

Abraham Tal

The verb סעד underwent a visible change in meaning in the course of time. From 'support' in Biblical Hebrew to 'join', 'accompany' in post-Biblical Hebrew. This is illustrated by such passages as Mishna Middot 1:3 and Para 3:6, where the procession that accompanies the red cow on its way from Jerusalem to its outskirts is mentioned: פרה וכל מסעדיה יוצאים להר המשחה, i.e. 'the (red) cow and its escort go to the Mount of Olives'. This double meaning of סעד is matched by Samaritan Aramaic which uses the same root along with צמות, in order to translate חבורה, 'company', 'assembly', in the Targum of the Pentateuch. This is in line with parallel roots, such as סיע from which a verb with the meaning 'support' derives, as well as a noun denoting 'company' (סיעה).

The Declension of אין in Tannaitic Hebrew

by

Chaim E. Cohen

The declension of the word 'אין' in Tannaitic Hebrew is unique. Some of the pronouns that are attached to the word are independent and others are suffixed. The whole declension is in complementary distribution. The independent pronouns are: the 2nd person pronouns (m., f., pl.), and the 1st person pl., i.e. 'אין אתה'; 'אין אתם'; 'אין אני'. The suffixed pronouns are the 3rd person pronouns – 'איןו' ('איןו'), 'איןה', 'איןן', and the 1st person sing., – 'איןי'. This declension differs in all its details from the BH declension in (BH: איןם, איןכם, איןנו, איןנה, איןנו, איןנו, איןך, איןך, איןי); but moreover, in this new declension there is an agreement between the form of the pronoun and its function (excluding 'איןי'). The independent pronouns are subjective while the suffixed are anaphoric pronouns.

This unique declension, it seems, is an original Hebrew phenomenon that did not originate from the Aramaic (in the Aramaic dialects of Eretz Israel we do not find a corresponding declension).

A particular examination is devoted in this essay to the form 'איןו' and to the question whether it is a result of contamination of 'אין+הוא' or perhaps it is identical to the form 'איןו'.

Two Phonological Phenomena in Mishnaic Hebrew

by

Shimon Sharvit

This article deals with two phonological phenomena:

1. The elision of the consonant ' preceded by šwa is attested in tannaic sources according to early manuscripts.

Examples: מוחר (<מאוחר); כילו (<כאילו); כיצד (<כאי צד); מורע (<מאורע).

2. The interchange of א-י between two vowels as a glide is noted in several morphological classes:

1. Words ending with -ay: ודאים - רשיים - רשאים; בניים - בנאים - ודיים.
2. Nouns of ל"י stems: טלאים - צביים - צבאים; חצאים - חציים - טליים.
3. Haqtālā forms of ל"י stems: העלייה - העלאה; הודייה - הודאה; השקיה - השקאה.
4. Verbs of ל"י stems with pronominal suffixes: בנאו - בניין - בנאו - בניו.
5. The expanded feminine morpheme: מרחצאות - יות / אות; מרחצות - מרחציות; טבלאות - טבליות - טבלאות; מרחצות - מרחציות.
6. Gentilic names (and the like adjectives of ל"י stems): נכריים - נכריים.
7. Forms of participle qatul of ל"י stems: קרויה - נשויים - נשואים; קרויה - נשויים.

An examination of the Mishnaic Mss. leads to the conclusion that the palestinian branch prefers the usage of י while the babylonian branch prefers the usage of א.

Towards the Talmudic Lexicon IV

by

Daniel Boyarin

8. It is shown that the correct form for 'downtrodden' in rabbinic Hebrew is אמיליים and not אומללים. This is striking corroboration for the theory

advanced in particular by Shlomo Morag that Massoretic vocalization is based on reading traditions, since the only place that this vocalization can be found in the Bible is in Nehemiah, which logically should be in a late dialect close to rabbinic Hebrew in its morphology.

9. It is shown that in the *Mekilta, Pisha I*, the correct reading is קו and not קול. This is the same word which appears in Psalms 19:5, in parallelism with מליהם. Other possible occurrences of this form in intertestamental Hebrew are discussed.

10. Although the form מעלי שמשא properly means 'sunset' in Aramaic, there is one case in the Jerusalem Talmud where it must mean 'sunrise'. Some speculations on this development are offered.

11. The phrase בִּיאַת אֲרֵרִי in the Babylonian Talmud Berakot 2b is discussed, as to whether it means morning or evening. Some Geniza texts of the passage are discussed, and it is shown that this is an ancient controversy affecting the very readings of the passage.

Deviating Syntax and Unexpected Translation

by

Eliezer Rubinstein

The comparison of a text with its translation indicates that in spite of the syntactical and structural differences existing between the two languages, there is a basic syntactic similarity which enables the preservation of the syntactic valence of the original subject i.e., the number of nominals making up the subject frame is the same in both languages. This state of affairs reflects the fact that both sentences relate to an identical number of material objects.

Whenever a translation evinces a lack of equivalence between two parallel sentences, in the original text and its translation, it is suggested that this might be attributed to a different method of integration followed by the two languages: in one the argument is incorporated into the two languages: in one the argument is incorporated into the verb while in the other it is not. The translation may therefore, consist of a longer or shorter sentence than the original.

Close examination of translated texts shows that in many cases comparison between the original and the translated version is not a simple task. A particular translation is often the result of the translator's efforts to preserve

the syntactic valence of the original. This is most likely to happen in cases where the source language uses a deviant syntactic structure with more nominals than would be normally expected from the lexico-syntactic dictionary definition of the verb in question. The translator is faced with one of two possible solutions:

a) produce a literal translation and transfer the original syntactic deviance from the source to the translated version.

b) translate the verb of the original sentence, not by using the most expected equivalent in the target language, but by choosing a verb which has the same syntactic valence as the original sentence. This seems to be a justified choice since the deviant syntactic structure in the translated version is likely to result in a semantic shift allowing the verb to occur within a new syntactic frame.

In this paper, a number of translations of biblical verbs have been examined – specifically in cases where the above mentioned deviance occurs. This examination of a selected number of verbs is part of a more extensive work investigating the translation of sentences which might present the translator with similar syntactic difficulties.

For a More Refined Understanding of the Syntactic Relations in Israeli Hebrew

by

Haiim B. Rosén

The sample sentence introduced by the title of this article, *Ma¹ hayta² kavanat³ a⁴ be⁵-'omr⁶ a⁷ še-ha-taḥbir ha-'ivri hu 'inyan pašut?* 'What¹ did she mean (= What¹ was² her⁴ intention³) when she said (= on⁵ her⁷ saying⁶) that Hebrew syntax was a simple matter?', demonstrates a particular feature of the Israeli Hebrew gerund (Biblical Hebrew construct infinitive), viz. *be-'omr-*, which, certain well-defined cases excepted, must not only be equireferential with the subject of the sentence in which it is located, but the grammaticality of its use in Isr. Heb. depends on a person-gender-number concord with that subject. Here, as with numerous other forms, which the present author has termed verboids, (e.g. *yeš l-* 'have', *bikolt-* 'be able', *peruš-* 'mean, signify' *šm-* 'be called' (GLECS, 10, 1965, 78ff., *Contemporary Hebrew* 107 etc.) the subject referred to is an adjunct to a substantival or,

in any case, non-verbal component of the sentence: *en bikolt-i* (1st pers. sing. suffix) *la'asot davar* 'I am unable (= it is not in my ability) to do anything' necessarily yields an interpretation of the infinitive as implying the 1st pers. sing. agent. On the other hand, *zot hayta kavanat-o* (3rd pers. sing. m. suffix) *be-'omr-a*, lit. 'this was his intention when she said', is at first glance, rather ungrammatical even nonsensical, or abtruse, or unacceptable (as some would have it). However, it is actually as ungrammatical as its correct English translation 'This is what he meant by her saying...'. (Current notions concerning the borderline between grammaticality and acceptability thus require careful reconsideration.) Consequently, in dealing with similar features, the concept of grammatical subject (which, along with that of agent and logical subject [topic, *thème*] and the obsolete psychological subject, probably introduced by Hermann Paul, giving rise to the linguistically unacceptable notion of subjecthood), should be revised; instead of describing it in terms of a specific nominal case, say the nominative, it should preferably be understood as that constituent of the sentence which is concord-motivating with respect to another primary part of the sentence structure.

The Hebrew Verb פָּרַץ and Its Meanings

by
Yitzhak Zadka

Several connotations of the verb פָּרַץ are evident in Modern Hebrew. All of these include one or more of the following components: unexpectancy, force and velocity.

I. פָּרַץ

פָּרַץ אֶת has two meanings, each deriving from the other:

- a) To cause partial destruction to a physical or abstract barrier in order to enter or exit.

1. הוּא פָּרַץ אֶת הַגֶּדֶר

- b) To exit or to enter (to break through) a physical or abstract barrier, by means of partial destruction.

The destruction may be merely implied, and not necessarily realized.

2. הוּא פָּרַץ אֶת הַמְכוֹנִית

II. פָּרַץ אֶת – to go in (break in)

פָּרַץ מִן – to go out (break out)

Here the meaning of motion is dominant. The meaning of destruction becomes irrelevant, although an abstract barrier, a prohibition is still explicit or implicit.

3. הדלת של המכוננית לא היתה נעולה והילדים פרצו לתוכה (broke in).

As a motion verb פרץ has a momentary character and consequently cannot join with duration adverbs.

4. האנייה פרצה אל החוף בשעה עשר * / משעה שמונה עד שעה עשר

It unites the meanings of entering and exiting:

הציפור פרצה את הכלוב ונמלטה

החתול פרץ את הכלוב וטרף את הציפור

In the following sentence it creates an ambiguity:

5. (in or out?) הוא פרץ את גבולות הארץ

III. פרץ – to begin happening

The syntactical frame: the subject, abstract noun (an event), optional adverbs, adverb of time and/or place.

6. המלחמה פרצה ביום הכיפורים

IV. פרץ ב- – to begin.

The syntactical frame: subject, animate noun, indirect complement, abstract noun of motion or voice.

7. הוא פרץ בככי; בצחוק; בקללה; ... בדהרה; בריצה

Modern Poetry as a Discourse Unit – A Linguistic Approach

by

Maya Fruchtman

In this paper the authoress attempts the 'presentation of a structural-syntactic model of non-communicative', poetry, based on an analysis of a poem by a contemporarily Hebrew poet: *A Modern Ballad* by David Avidan.

The writer's assumption is that non-communicative poetry may be created by certain grammatical devices which are all within the normative limits of language. One such device is the creation of absurd meaning by the consecutive arrangement of very short sentences, without the utilization of any conjunctions whatsoever (or almost limited usage of them). As a result, cohesion is eventually realized via syntactic means. Such poems abound in seemingly unrelated propositions whose existence can only be justified by structural linguistic analysis.

The Beginnings of Hebrew Lexicography – A Fragment of an Ancient Dictionary

by

Aron Dotan

This paper is devoted to the study of a fragment from a heretofore unpublished ancient dictionary located in the Cairo Geniza (Cambridge T-S Ar. 5.30). Written in Arabic, it consists of some 36 entries from the letter *mem* (from מלה to מעד). An overwhelming majority of these are biblical, and only four of them derive from the Mishna. Each entry includes biblical, rarely Aramaic (Targum Onqelos), quotations as well as their Arabic translation.

It is evinced that the author's center of activity was close to the area of influence by the writings of Rav Se'adya Gaon, viz, he flourished in the east. The dictionary exhibits a striking resemblance to Rav Se'adya's *'Egbron* and to another early dictionary, a fragment of which was recently published by the present author (*Lěšonenu*, 45 (1981), p. 163-212). Although the author of the new fragment is clearly independent and brings quite a number of original interpretations, he accepts many of Se'adya's comments, copies whole entries from his *'Egbron* and mentions the Gaon's *Tafsir* mostly in order to approve his explanations, and rarely to disagree with him. He shows practically no influence from the teachings of others, and the few traceable hints of such influence are limited to Se'adya's younger contemporaries – Judah ben Quraysh and David ben Abraham. All this leads to the conclusion that the author of this dictionary flourished around the middle of the tenth century C.E.

However, an analysis of the author's grammatico-lexicographic approach indicates a sharp departure from the Se'adyanic system. His concept of the 'root' is entirely different, and completely original. While Se'adya lists nouns of even four or more letters, no lemma in our dictionary has more than three. In order to arrive at trilateral basic forms, the author did not hesitate to dissect forms in such an arbitrary manner that a prefixed *mem* fell within the base form. Some of the resultant roots, all of them impossible, include: מלך, מלף, מלץ, מנד, מנר, מסל, מסף.

These manipulations do not merely represent a strenuous effort designed to achieve lexicographic uniformity. This dictionary actually represents the beginnings of the novel concepts of the triliterality of the Hebrew root. It is logical to assume that the author caught a faint echo of Judah Ḥayyuj's triliteral theory, but lacked the necessary knowledge to determine the three

radical letters, in each case of weak roots. He is still a member of the generation of Menahem ben Saruq and David ben Abraham, who regarded only those letters persisting in all the conjugations and derivations of a word – not necessarily three but even two letters – as its basic root.

It may thus be concluded that the dictionary adopts a half-way position between the latter two and Ḥayyuj, fitting perfectly the date suggested for the author, on the basis of his exegesis, which may now be possibly further limited to the second half of the tenth century. It is thus evident that this dictionary represents an important milestone in the history of the development of Hebrew lexicography and of the concept of the Hebrew root.

The Treatise on the Sheva and 'Seder-Ha-Simanim' – Two Parts of a Whole

by

Ilan Eldar

This paper will attempt to prove that two medieval grammatical texts (written in Judaeo-Arabic) that were published at different times and were considered in the study of linguistic literature to be two separate texts are, in reality, two parts of a single treatise. The texts are called 'Ma'mar Hasheva' (K. Levi, ed., Stuttgart 1936) and 'Seder Hasimanim' (N. Aloni, ed., *HUCA*, vol. 35).

The first part of this treatise is the text of 'Ma'mar Hasheva' which is mentioned in the body of the treatise as 'אלקול פי שרוט אלשווא' (the article which discusses the rules of the sheva); the second part is the text 'Seder Hasimanim' which is called in the treatise 'אלקול פי אלז' מלוך' (the article which is concerned with the seven vowels).

Evidence is presented from the content, structure, style, and terminology of the treatise, which clearly shows the organic interdependence between these two texts, and which also indicates that both were written by the same author. Although the author's name is not known, there is no doubt that this treatise is an early Judaeo-Arabic work (probably dating from the second half of the 10th century), and was composed in one of the countries of the Middle East (probably in Israel).

'Different From Arabic' in Medieval Hebrew Linguistic Writings

by

Dan Becker

It is interesting to note that a comparatively large number of medieval Hebrew linguists and exegetes, living in countries under Arab rule, dealt with comparisons between Hebrew and Arabic.

Works containing such comparisons may be listed under two separate divisions:

- a) Treatises which engage in systematic comparisons between the two languages, e.g. the *Risāla* (Epistle) of Judah Ibn Kuraysh, and *Kitāb Al-muwāzana bayna Al-luga Al-'ibraniyya wa Al-'Arabiyya* (The Book of Comparison between the Hebrew and Arabic Languages) authored by Isaac Ben Barun.
- b) Various treatises relating to the Bible, such as dictionaries and commentaries, which contain occasional references to the Arabic. Examples of such treatises include the dictionaries of the Bible authored by David ben Abraham, *Kitāb Jāmi' Al-Alfāz* (The book of Word Compilation): Jonah Ibn Janāḥ, *Kitāb Al-'usūl* (The Book of Roots), and the exegetical works of Judah Ibn Bal'am: *Kitāb Al-tarjih* (Book of Decision) and *Nukat Al-Miqra* (Niceties of Scripture). This division may be further expanded by including the critical treatises of Dunash ben Labrat against Rav Sa'adya Gaon and Menahem ben Saruq.

Most understandably, the authors of the above works mainly focused on the similarity between the two languages, although it should be stressed that whenever they incidentally came across instances of dissimilarity, these were also noted. In most instances, such comments were evoked by the process of translation.

In the present article, 95 examples of dissimilarities between the two languages are presented. These have been accumulated from the writings of eleven authors, grammarians, dictionarians, exegetes, and translators as well. The examples have been divided into four classes: phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics.

This list, which is by no means exhaustive, is designed to present a survey of this interesting phenomenon, which, to the best of the author's knowledge, has not been hitherto treated as a distinct phenomenon.

Changes in the Spelling System of Judeo-Arabic

by

Joshua Blau

Medieval Judeo-Arabic texts written in Hebrew characters are, in the main, spelt according to a system based both on Hebrew orthography (as in marking $\dot{\text{c}}$, $\dot{\text{g}}$ by $\dot{\text{z}}$, $\dot{\text{l}}$, and the use of double $\dot{\text{y}}$ / $\dot{\text{w}}$ to mark consonantal, especially double, y/w), and Classical Arabic spelling (ض , ظ being represented by $\dot{\text{z}}$, $\dot{\text{t}}$; marking long vowels only by *matres lectionis*, with the comparatively frequent exception of short u ; and spelling the definite article in the morphophonemic method of Classical Arabic). Yet letters written on papyri (not later than the ninth century), analysed by S.A. Hopkins and the present author, reflect no influence whatsoever of Arabic spelling (ظ ض are marked by z ; the use of vowel letters is rather erratic; and the definite article is spelled phonetically). This early vulgar Judeo-Arabic spelling also occurs in magical texts (as in T-S K1 fol. 153, to be published by M.A. Friedman and the present writer and T-S Ar. 50 fol. 117, for which has been edited by S. Shaked for publication in the *A. Scheiber Memorial Volume*, and even in a literary text (dealing with halakhic problems connected with the calendar, contained in the above-mentioned T-S K1 fol. 153). On the other hand, the usual (classical) Judeo-Arabic spelling is further attested to by early marriage contracts (vid. M.A. Friedman, *Jewish Marriage in Palestine, A Cairo Geniza Study*, Volume II, Tel Aviv - New York 1981).

It stands to reason that, in early times, uneducated writers applied the vulgar spelling, and educated scribes the standard one, whereas later on, the standard spelling prevailed, presumably through the influence of Rav Sa'adya Gaon's translation of the Bible. In exceptional cases only, did scribes, completely ignorant of Arabic orthography (even through the medium of the classical Judeo-Arabic spelling), independently return to a spelling resembling the early vulgar one. This is the case with the letter contained in T-S Ar. 18(1) fol. 113, which S.A. Hopkins and the present author hope to publish in the near future. The writer of this letter seems to have been most aware of his unconventional spelling; he vocalized it completely in order to make it intelligible.

The rift between Islamic culture and Jewish speakers of Arabic, especially from the 16th century onwards (vid. G. Vajda, *EP²*, s.v. *Judaeo-Arabic*, 303), was responsible for the appearance of a different type of Judeo-Arabic literature. This was a much more vernacular tongue, often spelled in a manner resembling early vulgar Judeo-Arabic, although by no means influenced by it.

'Leshon Limmudim' – a Short Biblical Commentary by Rabbi Raphael Birdugo

by

Moshe Bar-Asher

In Morocco, as in other Jewish communities of the 'Oriental Diaspora', study of the bible was aided by an oral translation of the Bible (*sharḥ* pronounced *sərh* in the local dialect). This *sharḥ* was taught in the traditional schools (the *heder*, known as *šla* in Morocco).

In small communities, teachers were less familiar with the *sharḥ*, particularly, with the rare Hebrew words that it contained. Rabbi Raphael Birdugo (Meknes 1747-1821), one of the outstanding Rabbis of Moroccan Jewry in modern times, wrote a short commentary to aid *melammedim* in teaching the *sharḥ*. In a work entitled '*Leshon Limmudim*' (according to the testimony of Rabbi Yoseph Ben-Naim in his well-known book *Malkhe Rabbanan*), Birdugo translated part of each chapter of the Bible, usually only words, sometimes, however, expressions and complete verses.

There are many differences between the oral *sharḥ* and *Leshon Limmudim*, two of them are cited in the present paper:

a) the oral translation includes the Pentateuch, the Haftara portions, Job, Proverbs, Daniel, and three of the five Megillot (*Ruth, Esther, Lamentations*; a few communities also had a *sharḥ* to *Canticles*. In southern Morocco, some communities also possessed a translation of *Isaiah*. '*Leshon Limmudim*' on the other hand, contains all of the Bible except *Canticles, Ecclesiastes Ezra-Nehemiah* and *Chronicles*.

b) the *sharḥ* is a literary translation; *Leshon Limmudim*, however, is less literary.

Possible Arabic Sources for the Distinction Between 'Duties of the Heart' and 'Duties of the Limbs'

by

Amos Goldreich

The distinction between *Fara'id al-Qulūb* (Ḥovot ha-Levavot; Duties of the Heart) and *Fara'id al-Jawarih* (Ḥovot ha'evarim; Duties of the Limbs) is pivotal in R. Baḥya Ibn Paquda's *Magnum Opus*. In this article, an attempt

is made to uncover possible Arabic sources from which these terms, as well as the notion of two distinct sets of religious obligations, could have been derived. Some recently published works of the ninth century Sufi theologian Aal-Harith b. Asad Al-Muḥāsibī have been examined for this purpose. It is evinced that theological works of Muḥāsibī were well-known in Andalus during the eleventh century.

Scholars (Prof. Mansoor, following the late Prof. Yahuda) have suggested that the title of *Hovot ha-Levavot* (*Al-Hidāya 'ila Fara'id al-Qulūb*) may possibly reflect the influence of the title of the work *Dawā Da' al-Qulūb* (Therapy for the Heart's Disease) attributed to Muḥāsibī. However, in all likelihood, Al-Muḥāsibī's *Masā'il fi A'māl al-Qulūb wa'l-Jawāriḥ* (Questions Concerning the Actions of the Heart and the Limbs (Cairo, 1969) is a much more definite possibility. This title actually indicates the basic underlying distinction of *Hovot ha-Levavot*.

A statement of Muḥāsibī in the later work to the effect that the actions of the heart may be divided into countless sub-divisions (*furū'*) is of special interest. A similar assertion is noted in *Hovot ha-Levavot*; R. Bahya says that the duties of the limbs are limited in number, 'about 613', while the duties of the heart branch out into an infinite number of *furū'*. This is a highly interesting paragraph which has some bearing on the crucial question: did R. Bahya regard the duties of the heart as part of the 613 commandments, or as an autonomous system paralleling the *Taryag mizvot*?

As far as the use of the word *fard* or *faridah* in connection with the heart and the limbs, it should be noted that in Muḥāsibī's *Risālat al-Mustarshidin* (Aleppo 1964) *farḍ al-qalb* (duty of the heart) as well as the duties of certain other members, are discussed. The entire discussion bears considerable resemblance to R. Bahya's exposition of the desired restraint of man's limbs (*Hovot* 9:5), which cannot be easily dismissed as accidental. An additional significant parallel between *Risālat al-Mustarshidin* and *Hovot ha-Levavot* is presented in appendix C.

The plural form *farā'id* is also employed by Muḥāsibī in order to denote duties imposed upon the heart and the limbs, in his *Kitāb al-Waṣāyā* (Cairo 1965).

From all the above, it can be concluded that the subject of the Arabic sources of *Hovot ha-Levavot*, a subject of precise study by eminent scholars of the past, is still far from being exhausted.

Appendix A deals with 'duties of the heart' mentioned in lists of the 613 commandments known to R. Bahya. Appendix B discusses Ibn Sinā's theory of the infinite details of the spiritual, in contrast with the limitedness of the

corporal. However, it is quite unlikely that R. Baḥya was influenced by Ibn Sinai. Appendix C deals with the identical distinction of R. Baḥya and Muḥāsibī between fear of God's punishment, and reactions to the doctrines of R. Baḥya and Muḥāsibī in their respective communities. Appendix E examines the question: to what extent was the voluminous Sufi work, *Qūt al-Qulūb*, known in Andalus during the epoch of R. Baḥya? Appendix G records some examples of Arabic expressions indicating actions of the heart and actions of the limbs antedating Muḥāsibī, which do not always have the same theological meaning given to them by the ninth century Sufi sage.

Maimonides' 'Guide of the Perplexed' The First Twelve Chapters in a New Hebrew Translation

by

Michael Schwarz

This article represents the second installment of an attempt to retranslate Maimonides' *Guide* from the original Arabic text into Modern Hebrew. (The first installment, which is a translation of Maimonides' introduction to his work, is scheduled for publication in a Jubilee Volume dedicated to Professor S. Pines.)

The present selection encompasses Part I, chapters 1-12 of the work. Most of these chapters center around the interpretation of various biblical terms, word, and concepts. Following is a list of terms and subjects dealt with in these chapters:

Chapter 1: 'Image' and 'likeness'

Chapter 2: Man's knowledge before the fall and after

Chapter 3: 'Figure' and 'Shape'

Chapter 4: 'To see'; 'to look'; 'to have a vision'

Chapter 5: What was Moses allowed to 'see' of God?

Chapter 6: 'Man' and 'woman'; 'sister'; 'brother'

Chapter 7: 'To bear children'

Chapter 8: 'Place'

Chapter 9: 'Throne'

Chapter 10: 'To descend' and 'to ascend'

Chapter 11: 'Sitting'

Chapter 12: 'Rising'

(Chapters 13ff. are to appear elsewhere. A translation of the whole work is in preparation.)