

# The Mizrahi Sociolect in Israel: Origins and Development

## ABSTRACT

This article examines the Hebrew of a bilingual female speaker, a native of Morocco, who recounts a folktale in Hebrew on the theme "charity rescues from death". Analyzed here are features from her native Judeo-Arabic, both overt and covert, that appear in the text. Clearly discernible influences of Judeo-Arabic on her Hebrew are found in the spheres of lexicon and semantics, syntax, and phonology. Seen as the first stage in the development of a distinct Israeli Hebrew sociolect, these features have parallels in the speech of native Israelis, the second-, third-, and fourth-generations of the immigration to Israel from Morocco who reside mainly in the Israeli periphery, and mark their spoken Hebrew as a separate Israeli Hebrew sociolect.

## INTRODUCTION

THE STATE OF ISRAEL'S SEVENTH DECADE IS AN APPROPRIATE JUNCTURE to reconsider the faces of Modern Israeli Hebrew. If Israel's early years were devoted to intense efforts to establish and disseminate a new language,<sup>1</sup> at present the Hebrew language has achieved independent status, Israeli society has crystallized, and the "melting pot" approach has given way to a multi-cultural one. My question is: to what extent has the "melting pot" vision been realized in contemporary Hebrew? More simply put, is modern Hebrew a single standardized language, or can one, in this seventh decade of Israeli statehood, isolate sociolects specific to different social groups in Israel?<sup>2</sup> As I have shown in previous studies, I claim that a sociolect has emerged in Israel, one that is characteristic of the speech of residents of the geographic and social periphery and which clearly shows the influence

of the Judeo-Arabic linguistic substrate of those speakers.<sup>3</sup> Note that the field study on which this conclusion was based focused on the language of second-, third-, and even fourth-generation North African immigrants to Israel, not the language of the first generation, which is examined here. Although the scope of this influence differs from individual to individual and from community to community, taken as a whole, its features create a clear-cut distinction between the language of the periphery and the language of the center.<sup>4</sup> Today, the language of the periphery draws on, or is perhaps even based on, the Judeo-Arabic formerly spoken by their parents and grandparents, still heard today among the immigrant generation.<sup>5</sup> This regional and social dialect has almost no written literature other than quotations or passages of dialogue in literature. Its main strength is as a spoken language.

Elsewhere I have dealt with the lexicographical, morphological, syntactic, semantic, and phraseological aspects that comprise this sociolect.<sup>6</sup> Here I explore the first stage in its formation. I examine the Hebrew of a first-generation immigrant woman from Morocco and point to aspects of the recognizable influence of Judeo-Arabic on her Hebrew (which is her second language). Her Hebrew contains features that can be found today in the Hebrew of native-born Israelis of Moroccan Jewish ancestry, who at present form the largest group among the immigrants from the Muslim world,<sup>7</sup> and who have had a decisive impact on the culture and language of Mizrahi Jews in Israel. My goal, then, is to note the influence and features of Judeo-Arabic that shaped the Israeli Hebrew of speakers from the social and geographical periphery.

#### “CHARITY RESCUES FROM DEATH”: ANALYZING THE HEBREW OF A MIZRAHI SPEAKER

In the context of Shlomo Izre'el's CoSIH (Corpus of Spoken Israeli Hebrew) project, a recording was made in 1999 of an Israeli woman there labeled “Fortuna”. At the time of her interview, Fortuna was sixty-three years old and earned her living as a cleaner. She had at that point lived in Israel for nearly forty years, having immigrated to Israel from Casablanca in 1961, at the age of twenty-five. Although Hebrew was now her primary spoken language, she could neither read or write Hebrew, nor Judeo-Arabic or French (CoSIH questionnaire), her previous spoken languages.<sup>8</sup> Fortuna related for her interviewer a sacred fable that circulated in North Africa about how almsgiving could forestall certain death, following oicotype F\*934.<sup>9</sup>

The story tells of a man who, sleeping overnight in a cemetery, overhears a conversation between two dead women in which one tells the other that the wife of the man sleeping there would be buried next to them the following day. After washing and hanging her husband's pants on the roof, when she went to take them down, she would be struck and killed by a stone falling from the roof. The man goes home and unsuccessfully attempts to deter his wife from washing his pants, and leaves the house so as not to witness the anticipated disaster. Meanwhile, the woman prepares supper for the family. At that juncture, two poor people arrive and request alms, and the woman gives them half of the meal she had prepared. After that, she goes to retrieve the clean pants from the roof. While pulling the pants toward her, a stone flies off the roof—and passes over her head without inflicting injury. The worried husband eventually returns home, and to his joy he encounters a great miracle: charity had saved his wife from death.

Jewish folktales with moral lessons are often grounded in talmudic or midrashic sources.<sup>10</sup> In this case the central motif of this story already appears in three talmudic legends (*b. Shabbat* 156b, *y. Shabbat* 6:10 [8d]), about how almsgiving averted death, in these cases from snakebite.<sup>11</sup> These legends carry a clear didactic lesson, promoting the giving of charity to the poor and noting the reward for those who uphold this important precept.

These ancient sources could well have led to the circulation of literary paraphrases among a variety of Jewish communities.<sup>12</sup> However, consultation of the University of Haifa's Dov Noy Israel Folktale Archives (IFA), reveals that all the tales dealing with the topic of "charity rescues from death" were recorded by storytellers from the Mizrahi communities, primarily from Morocco.<sup>13</sup> Regarding this specific legend, I found no parallels in the printed collections of stories and folktales of Moroccan Jews, but I did locate some eight parallels in the oral traditions of that community.<sup>14</sup> These versions display parallel motifs: (1) A person spending time in a cemetery<sup>15</sup> overhears a conversation between the dead;<sup>16</sup> (2) the wife of the person who overhears the conversation is destined to die;<sup>17</sup> (3) no explanation is provided for why the woman has been condemned to death;<sup>18</sup> (4) the washing of clothes is the indirect cause of death;<sup>19</sup> and (5) in some of the tales, the expected injury to the woman involves a roof—her falling from or a stone that flies off the roof—whereas in others there is danger of snakebite, as in the talmudic legends.

Fortuna unhesitatingly relates her tale in fluent Hebrew, but anyone listening to her story nevertheless apprehends that the story teller is bilingual, and the powerful influence of her Judeo-Arabic mother tongue and



native culture are clearly evident. This influence appears in two categories: one literary and the other linguistic. Although I intend to deal primarily with the linguistic aspect, I begin by noting a number of salient features of this tale's folkloristic and literary character.

Fortuna relates to her interviewer a sacred tale that circulated orally in North Africa, recounted by both men and women.<sup>20</sup> In so doing, she transfers the folktale she heard in her parents' home into a fresh vessel, contemporary Hebrew, which, despite its new linguistic guise, preserves the traditional narrative framework. Fortuna opens with a short introduction inviting the listener to pay attention: "I will tell you something."<sup>21</sup> She also anchors the story in authoritative sources: "This thing's from the Torah!"<sup>22</sup> as if to say: I am telling you a story with a significant ethical message, and I am not making it up but merely repeating what was recounted by important people.<sup>23</sup> Only then does she turn to the story itself, beginning with the traditional opening: "There [once] was a man . . ."<sup>24</sup> Charmingly and tastefully recounted, the dialogues and many dramatic elements in the story receive prominence.<sup>25</sup> The storyteller concludes with the moral that emerges from the story.

Thinking that the story has ended, Fortuna's interlocutor says, "Nice story," adding, "Lovely. It's a lovely story." She then asks, "Is it a widely-known story?" and tries to direct the conversation to a discussion of the story's sources. However, Fortuna does not capitulate and continues to adhere to the legend's narrative framework: she speaks in praise of charity to her interlocutor, devoting a good deal of attention and verbiage to the moral (about 100 words):<sup>26</sup> "They always say charity cancels evil decrees," and addresses her interlocutor directly: "Whenever you give alms it's good. Even if you have three shekels, give one shekel of that. Don't say: he doesn't deserve it, let him go and work. No. What difference does it make to you? Give some charity." When her listener responds defensively and apologetically, "There are a lot now who come asking," she continues with a variety of direct appeals, trying to convince her not to harden her heart but to give alms to all who ask: "Don't ever say 'No, I won't give to him. He needs to work.' No! Give to him. What difference does it make to you? It's charity from you," until finally the recorder gives in and says, "Umm . . . my brother always gives." Fortuna's approach is very widespread in North Africa both orally and in writing.<sup>27</sup> A speaker tells a story or legend and concludes with general ethical advice connected to the moral of the legend. The speaker may address the listeners directly and adjure them to change their ways in light of the story. Sometimes the stories are long and the lessons brief; sometimes the story is merely a rhetorical device and the main

point is the speaker's didactic message.<sup>28</sup> In this as well, Fortuna evidently reproduces the culture of her parental home.

Fortuna's native tongue and culture are apparent not only in literary features of her story, but mainly in its linguistic aspects. Even though she has been living in Israel and speaking Hebrew for about forty years, Judeo-Arabic is easily discerned in her speech. This folktale affords an opportunity to track Judeo-Arabic features in the Hebrew spoken by Israelis of North African, especially Moroccan, origin.<sup>29</sup> Even though this Hebrew story is based on an original Judeo-Arabic version, it would be incorrect to view Fortuna's tale as an exact translation of a Judeo-Arabic morality tale. Neither fixed nor precise, the wording of the original tale is rather variable and flexible, which makes it possible for various storytellers to recount it their way. This formed the basis for the assumption that the language of the story reflects Fortuna's own Hebrew in everyday speech as well.<sup>30</sup> Thus, I direct my attention to an examination of the interlingual Judeo-Arabic-Hebrew contact and its influence on the Hebrew spoken by Fortuna in recounting this tale.

## LINGUISTIC FEATURES

Although the influence of Judeo-Arabic on the storyteller's language is evident in every sphere of language,<sup>31</sup> the discussion is restricted to a limited number of linguistic features from the lexical-semantic, syntactic, and phonological spheres.

### LEXICON AND SEMANTICS

An initial examination of the storyteller's language might convey a somewhat deceptive impression. She appears to speak fluent Hebrew, but a closer look at her vocabulary discloses several Hebrew words that are none other than Arabic words in Hebrew guise.

### WORDS

עֲקָשָׁנִים. One example is her use of the word עֲקָשָׁנִים [*aqšanim*, usually meaning "stubborn ones"]. Toward the end of the story, she says: "He was not מְהַעֲקָשָׁנִים [*me-ha-aqšanim*, presumably: 'one of those stubborn types']; he went to the cemetery at night. He went back to the cemetery." Clearly, from the context, the storyteller is signaling that the character was not indolent, but went back to the cemetery in order to hear the dead women talking and learn why his wife was saved.



The use of the term אָשָׁן (*aqšan*) to denote indolent is surprising, because the semantic connections between אָשָׁן and אֲשָׁלָן (*aslan*), the term for “lazy person”, are not transparent and it is difficult to assume that this reflects an internal Hebrew semantic shift. We could, of course, dismiss this as an “error” or “slip of the tongue” on the speaker’s part, but reference to the lexicon of her native Judeo-Arabic reveals a simple solution: *akšān*/*agžān* in that language means “lazy”.<sup>32</sup> Here the speaker has taken the Arabic form and embedded it in her Hebrew, even adding Hebrew affixes for the definite article and plural number marking. She did not take into account that, in Hebrew, the term *aqšan* denotes an uncompromising person, not an indolent one as in Arabic.

מִסְכֵּן. Another Hebrew-Arabic word common in the informant’s speech, and of many Israelis in the periphery, is מִסְכֵּן (*misken*, commonly pronounced “*māskēn*”). In contemporary Hebrew, מִסְכֵּן denotes an unfortunate person, someone in need of assistance and compassion.<sup>33</sup> In North African Judeo-Arabic, however, the term does not necessarily carry a negative connotation, conveying instead sympathy toward the person to whom it is applied. The entry in Colin’s dictionary of Moroccan Arabic for *misken* (p. 1836) is: “malheureux; pauvre diable,” alongside “individu inoffensif, humble, modeste; individu qui mène une vie paisible . . . d’un caractère doux et tranquille.” The expression meaning “a *misken* person” he even translates both as “pauvre diable” and as “d’un caractère tranquille, modeste et réservé”.<sup>34</sup> Indeed, in the language of the Israeli periphery, we hear such sentences as “[That] *miskenah* [feminine singular form of *misken*] made all the food for her engagement party,” or “Let her go around ahead of you in line, the *miskenah*; she’s in a hurry to get to work.” The whole intent in using the expression “*māskēn*” is to express identification with, sympathy for, and even appreciation of the person to whom the word is applied.

Fortuna too uses the term “*māskēnah*” in these senses. For example: “So, the *māskēnah*, she wanted to take down the pants. It flew—the stone—over her head, behind her.” In addition to the Arabic sense discernible in her use of the term, Fortuna’s pronunciation too, *māskina*, resembles that of the Arabic cognate, further strengthening our claim that the word she uses is Arabic dressed up as Hebrew.

עֹזֵב. The verb עֹזֵב (*‘azav*, “left”) in the sense of “left behind” occurs several times in our story. The first time, the woman wants to wash her husband’s pants, and when he refuses she replies: “I have to touch it. I won’t leave it (יֵעֹזֵב אוֹתוֹ)”. The second occurrence is when she invites the poor man to eat, and the storyteller says: “She gave him half a [loaf of] bread. She left half for herself (בְּשִׁבְלָהּ הֵצִי צֶנֶזְבָּה).” An examination of the meaning

of the verb עזב (*ʿazav*) reveals that in the first sentence the meaning is to leave behind, to let go of something, and this indeed fits the context: the woman refuses to let go of the pants, which she holds onto insistently. This sense of עזב is familiar from all strata of Hebrew (Ben-Yehuda, pp. 4403–6; Even-Shoshan, p. 1361). The meaning of the verb in the second instance, however, is surprising, since the sense of letting go of something is inappropriate there. Why should she let go of the bread? The syntax, too, provides no support for that meaning, since the proposition בְּעִשְׂבִּיל (*bišvil*, “for [the benefit of]”) is incongruent with the act of letting go.

Arabic is clearly at work here too. The verb *ʿazav* is employed here in the sense of “left behind”. The woman gave the poor man half a loaf of bread and “left” the other half for herself. This is a classic calque: in North African Arabic the verb *xella* denotes both senses of “leave”, to let go and to leave behind.<sup>35</sup> The use of the verb עזב by Fortuna borrows an additional meaning from the Arabic usage with which she is familiar. This calque, it should be noted, is not unique to Fortuna’s speech. It occurs not infrequently in the language of the Israeli periphery in writing and in speech.<sup>36</sup>

Analysis of Fortuna’s language also shows the presence of Hebrew words whose meaning diverges from their accepted sense in contemporary Hebrew.

תּוֹרָה. The Hebrew word תּוֹרָה (“Torah”) was imported into North African Judeo-Arabic where the meaning of the term *al-Torah* (with the definite article) was broadened beyond its narrow sense as denoting the Five Books of Moses, to apply to all areas of Judaism.<sup>37</sup> All Jewish sources—law and lore and even Hebrew—can be called “Torah”. Thus, for example, an informant from Tunisia told me (in Judeo-Arabic): “On Hoshana Rabbah, we sing Torah *piyyutim*,”<sup>38</sup> by which she meant “liturgical poems sung in Hebrew”.

Telling our story, Fortuna begins: “This is from the Torah, what I want to tell you.” Even though it is clear to her that this folktale was not given at Sinai and not inscribed in the Five Books of Moses, she uses the Hebrew term “Torah” in its customary meaning in her native Jewish dialect.

נְדָבָה. The Hebrew noun נְדָבָה (*n<sup>e</sup>dava*) also made its way into Judeo-Arabic and other Jewish languages, serving, for the most part, as a synonym for another Hebrew term, צְדָקָה (*s<sup>e</sup>daka*, translated above as “charity” or “alms”). The use of נְדָבָה to denote alms is not found in classical sources, and seems to have been an innovation in Jewish languages other than Hebrew.<sup>39</sup> Even though that late meaning of the term is noted in contemporary Hebrew dictionaries (Ben-Yehudah, Cnaani, Even-Shoshan, as well as *Rav-Milim* and *Milon ha-hoveh*), in practice it does not appear widely



in spoken Hebrew as a separate term. The frequent term currently used for that phenomenon is צדקה. The term נדבה appears almost only in forms of the collocation נדבות קבוצ (gibbus n'edavot "collecting alms").<sup>40</sup> The example listed in the *Rav-Milim* dictionary (p. 1179) for the usage of נדבה is, in fact, "The drunk sat on the street corner and collected handouts (נדבות וקיצ)." Even a Google search reveals that נדבה has very limited distribution (mostly in citations from classical sources, in the collocation נדבות קבוצ in various forms, and as a surname), whereas צדקה has a wider range of appearances.

In Israel's periphery, however, this word is more common, paralleling the use of צדקה. See, for example, what Yonatan, a young man in his thirties, says: "I don't want to live off the *nedavot* of others."<sup>41</sup> Our storyteller, too, uses the term נדבה in the sense of "money given to the poor". It is interesting to note, though, the choice she exercises here: in recounting the legend, she places the expression "requests a נדבה in the beggar's mouth, perhaps viewing this term as more authentic in the context of a story from the "Torah" rooted in her parental culture. Interestingly, in spelling out the moral of the story for her listener, Fortuna makes exclusive use of the term צדקה (five times), evidently thinking that the latter term would be more familiar to her interlocutor and more appropriate for general Israeli discourse.

#### PHRASES AND EXPRESSIONS

היל אשת (éšet hayil). This expression appears twice in Fortuna's story. In both instances, it provides a positive description of the woman who was to have been brought to burial. The first occurs in the preliminary conversation of the two dead women in the cemetery: "She said to her, 'What a woman! An אשת היל! Really something!'" The other is in the dead women's second dialogue: "היל האשת" [the éšet hayil], the woman who is supposed to come live with her." Note that in the first instance, אשת היל describes the woman who was to arrive at the cemetery, whereas in the second instance the phrase has been nominalized by the addition of the definite article.

This expression was not coined by Fortuna. Its source is the book of Proverbs (ch. 31), a paean to the industrious, God-fearing woman. Recited or sung by Jews on Friday night, before the festive Sabbath dinner, it became the custom to recite it at women's funerals as well. Examination of the expression's meaning shows that Jewish languages are divided, each highlighting a different aspect of the poem in Proverbs. In Yiddish, the term denotes a clever, quick, industrious, efficient woman, one even involved in trade.<sup>42</sup> In the various Judeo-Arabic-speaking communities it referred specifically to the woman's spiritual level: God-fearing, righteous,



and possessed of fine qualities, taking on in addition the sense of a woman who had died.<sup>43</sup> In the Jewish communities of Bayonne in southern France as well, the term was employed to denote a woman who was deceased.<sup>44</sup> This use of the phrase probably emerged from the custom of beginning a woman's funeral by reciting that chapter of Proverbs, and may be a euphemism designed to distance the speaker from death and the dead.

From Jewish languages, this expression made its way directly into modern Hebrew.<sup>45</sup> It seems, however, that here too, as in many other instances, it was the meaning of the term in Yiddish that was accepted in Israeli Hebrew. This is well documented in the dictionaries of modern Hebrew. In the Ben-Yehuda dictionary (p. 409), which generally relies on classical sources, no additional modern sense acquired from Jewish languages is mentioned, but Even-Shoshan (p. 129), *Rav-Milim*, and even Rosenthal's *Dictionary of Hebrew Idioms and Phrases* (p. 79) refer to the sense of diligence, alacrity, efficiency, and energy, as in Yiddish usage, but do not mention the spiritual praise of the woman that appears in the passage in Proverbs and characterizes the use of the phrase in Jewish languages of the Middle East and North Africa.

As noted, in presenting the conversations in the cemetery Fortuna uses this expression twice, and her praise for the woman who is to be brought there is focused neither on her alacrity nor her tremendous energy but on her fine moral qualities, which will come to the fore as the story unfolds. In the first conversation, this is emphasized in the second woman's response to the "news" that this "ēšet ḥayil, really something" is to become her neighbor the next day: "If only! I'm waiting." Clearly, this deceased woman is not likely to be enthusiastic about an industrious, efficient living woman becoming her neighbor, since there is no point to industriousness or efficiency in the world of the dead. There is, however, reason to be enthused about a woman possessing fine qualities and virtues, which will be assets for her in the "world of truth" that awaits after death. Furthermore, the meaning of "a deceased woman" borne by the phrase אִשָּׁה תְּהִי, known (as we have mentioned) from Judeo-Arabic, is very appropriate in this context: in both of its appearances, the expression is used by dead women buried in a cemetery, telling about a newly deceased woman about to arrive. Thus, in this instance as well, Fortuna uses a well-known, common Hebrew expression, but in a sense consistent with her native Jewish language.

עלִי/עליכ תבטל לגזרה. (təbəl 'lih/'lik lə-gzira).<sup>46</sup> The central axis of our story is the cancellation of the death sentence by virtue of performance of the commandment to donate to charity. The phrase for the cancellation of

a decree, גְּזֵרָה בְּטוּל (bittul gezero), appears seven times in the story in various forms, and the influence of the Judeo-Arabic substrate on the storyteller's language is discernible for almost all of them.

At the beginning of the episode and the encounter with the poor man, the storyteller already has recourse to Arabic and uses a complete Judeo-Arabic expression that was in common use in her language: לגזרה תבטיל עלי (tabṭal 'li la-gzira). Only after using the Arabic expression four times in a row does she switch to Hebrew translations of the expression. The use of the original Arabic expression seems to manifest the storyteller's sense that she can express with precision the notion that is the essence of the story—the cancellation of an evil decree—only in the Judeo-Arabic in which she had been raised. It may also be that she felt that by citing the Arabic expression she was continuing the tradition learned in her mother's home and passing it on to her young listener. Replacing or translating the phrase might have detracted from her sense of identification with its value-laden message in a manner that would harm her status as a cultural agent. Indeed, the inclusion of expressions from Jewish languages is attested among informants recounting various folktales.<sup>47</sup>

As mentioned above, of the seven appearances of this expression, four are in Judeo-Arabic. In two of its appearances in Hebrew, traces of the underlying Arabic are evident. One instance, נבטלה הגזרה עליה (nivtela ha-gezero 'aleha), is a word-for-word loan translation of the Arabic expression, including the preposition 'al. The storyteller has even transformed the Arabic reflexive form into a Hebrew reflexive form, the *nif'al* pattern, and the morphological and syntactic result is not at all normative.

In the second appearance, את הצדקה מבטל את הגזרות (et ha-ṣ'edaqa m'vatṭel et ha-gezerot), the speaker appears at first to have moved into proper Hebrew, but is in fact still encumbered by Judeo-Arabic in mistakenly translating the Arabic definite article *al* as an object marker. She also fails to match the gender of the verb and the subject. Here too, the result is syntactically improper.

The influence of Arabic is evident in paraphrases of the Arabic expression as well. Four times, the storyteller uses the present passive form מְבִטֵּלָת (‘cancelled’). In three instances, she pronounces the letter ב (bet) as a stop rather than a fricative: *m'butṭelet*, as in Arabic and not in Hebrew.<sup>48</sup> However, in the expression's final appearance, when Fortuna translates the Arabic into Hebrew for the benefit of her listener, who does not understand Arabic, she is careful to use a fricative: “May the decree be cancelled (*m'vutṭal*) for you.”<sup>49</sup>



## SYNTAX

This section examines three syntactic issues that emerge from Fortuna's usage, but they are not unique to bilingual speakers such as Fortuna. Frequently found among Israeli Hebrew speakers from the periphery who are native speakers of Judeo-Arabic, this once again uncovers the lasting influence of Judeo-Arabic on contemporary Hebrew.

*Prepositions.* Prepositions are a sphere that clearly reflects the influence of one language on another among bilingual speakers. And indeed, in both the Hebrew spoken in the periphery<sup>50</sup> and Fortuna's story, we can discern prepositional use that diverges from normative use in contemporary Hebrew.

בַּשֻּׁלְחָן. Thus, we find in Fortuna's language a sentence such as "He found his wife at the table, with the children, eating, drinking," where "at the table" is expressed by בַּשֻּׁלְחָן (lit. "in the table"). Obviously, her intent is not that the woman was inside the table with her children, but rather at the table, sitting beside it. Additionally, the absence of the direct object marker אֵת (the sentence begins: ". . . מָצָא אִשְׁתּוֹ")—"He found his wife" with the object of the verb, "his wife", unmarked grates on the Israeli ear. We would have expected Fortuna to say לִיד הַשֻּׁלְחָן (using the usual preposition for "at" in the sense of "located next to [the table]") as the beginning of the sentence. A comparison with Arabic shows this to be a standard, normative construction there: *lqa mǝrt-o fǝ-l-mida*.

*Direct object marker.* Fortuna's use of the direct object marker, too, is not always in accord with accepted norms. In Arabic there is no object marker equivalent to the Hebrew אֵת (*et*), which marks a definite direct object, and the Arabic speaker marks a direct object with the definite particle. Given that difference, the interlingual contact between Hebrew and Arabic would be likely to cause bilingual speakers to perceive the definite article as indicating both definiteness and a direct object. In fact, we find Fortuna employing the Hebrew definite article as a direct object marker, as when she says תפול לה אֵת הָאֶבֶן עַל הָרֶאשׁ ("the stone will fall on her head")—tagging the subject, הָאֶבֶן, ("the stone") with the marker for a definite direct object. The same is true of her statement: אֵת הַצְדָקָה מַבְטֵל אֵת הַגְּזֵרוֹת ("charity cancels evil decrees"), again tagging the subject with the indicator of a direct object.

*Compound tenses.* The use of compound tenses (a form of the verb היה [to be] followed by a participle) is discussed at length in the scholarly literature on the Hebrew language. It has been characterized as the usage of schoolchildren from underprivileged backgrounds,<sup>51</sup> and of uneducated



speakers.<sup>52</sup> I suggest rather that this evidences the influence of Arabic-Hebrew interlingual contact.<sup>53</sup> In Fortuna's story I found the use of an extended compound tense in the woman's words to her husband: "כְּמַעַט" "הָיִיתִי הוֹלֵכֶת לָמוּת" ("I was almost going to die"), a statement in which speakers of standard modern Hebrew would employ the past tense of the verb, saying instead "כְּמַעַט הֵלַכְתִּי לָמוּת" or something similar. It would not occur to them to use the compound past tense, which in contemporary usage generally indicates habitual or repeated action, or a negated condition, or other such specific conditions.<sup>54</sup>

It should be noted that later on in the story, when the woman goes on to tell her husband about the incident, she uses a similar phrase: "I pulled the pants [toward me], and almost—if a stone had landed on my head, I would have been gone (הוֹלֵכֶת הָיִיתִי)" or ". . . I would have been a goner" (i.e., dead). Here the compound tense represents a negated condition, a usage in keeping with the norm in contemporary Hebrew.<sup>55</sup>

*Lack of agreement in number.* Interlingual contact frequently brings about changes in perception of a noun's gender. An example in our story is the noun מְכַנְסִים ("pants"). In Judeo-Arabic, the concept is expressed by a noun whose form is singular, *sarwal*, as well as a plural form, *sarawal*,<sup>56</sup> whereas the Hebrew is a dual noun form.<sup>57</sup> Our speaker perpetuates the practice of her substrate language, consistently relating to מְכַנְסִים as a singular and not a dual/plural form. All the references to the pants appear with singular pronouns: תְּכַבֵּס אוֹתוֹ ("launder it"); תְּתַלֶּה אוֹתוֹ ("hang it up"); עָלֵיו תְּשִׂים ("put . . . on it"); לְכַבֵּס אוֹתוֹ ("to launder it"); בּוֹ תִּנְגְּעֵי לֹא ("don't touch it"); הִיבַת לְנַגֵּעַ בּוֹ ("have to touch it"); אוֹתוֹ יֵעֹזֵב לֹא ("won't let it go"); אוֹתוֹ תּוֹצִיא ("take it out"); אוֹתוֹ הִכְנִיסָה ("put it in"); כְּבֻסָּה אוֹתוֹ ("laundered it"); תְּלַתֶּה אוֹתוֹ ("hung it up"); שָׂמָה עָלָיו ("put . . . on it"); תְּלִיתִי אוֹתוֹ ("I hung it up"); עָלָיו וְשָׂמָתִי ("and I put . . . on it").

#### PHONOLOGY

It is widely recognized that the influence of the phonological substrate in the speech of bilingual individuals is quite noticeable. This statement is further validated by a phonological analysis of Fortuna's language.

#### CONSONANTS

ר [r]. Only a trilled, alveolar *r* sound appears in Fortuna's speech. I did not find even a single appearance of the common Israeli uvular *r*.

*Pharyngeals:* ה, ע [ʕ, h]. Fortuna consistently preserves the pharyngeal ע. This raises questions about the origin of Hebrew-Arabic parallel words, such as the preposition על (*al*). Fortuna pronounces that word

with a pharyngeal  $\var�$  and no vowel, as in Arabic, so that, for example, in the sequence  $\text{עַל הַגַּג אוֹתוֹ תִּתְּלֶה}$  (“hang it on the roof”), where in standard Hebrew the last two words would be pronounced *‘al [h]a-gag*, Fortuna says *‘l-a-gag*. It is difficult to determine whether we are witnessing a Hebrew word with an elided vowel or an Arabic word with the same sense as its Hebrew cognate, used in a Hebrew sentence.

A different picture emerges regarding the realization of the fricative  $\text{ח}$ . Fortuna regularly tends to pronounce this consonant as a velar fricative as in the standard Israeli pronunciation. Here and there, though, one can hear a pharyngeal  $\text{ח}$ ; I found that realization of  $\text{ח}$  in Fortuna’s pronunciation of the words  $\text{כֹּחַ}$  (“*koah*”) and “ $\text{בְּכֹחַ}$ ” (“*b<sup>e</sup>koah*”) and the verbs  $\text{חִלְקָה}$  (“*hilkā*”) and  $\text{מְחַכֶּה}$  (“*m<sup>e</sup>haka*”).

*Emphatics:*  $\text{ט}$ ,  $\text{ק}$ ,  $\text{צ}$  [ $\text{ʃ}$ ,  $\text{q}$ ,  $\text{ʧ}$ ]. Fortuna does not preserve the Judeo-Arabic pronunciation of the emphatic consonants, and does not distinguish between  $\text{ת}$  and  $\text{ט}$ . (The emphatic nature of the latter is different in Arabic, transcribed by linguists as  $\text{ʧ}$ .) She also makes no distinction between  $\text{כ}$  and  $\text{ק}$ . (The emphatic nature of the latter is again different in Arabic, transcribed by linguists as  $\text{q}$ .) The Arabic realization of the consonant  $\text{צ}$ , too, is not preserved in Fortuna’s Hebrew, and she pronounces it as an affricate: *ts*. Thus, for example:  $\text{רוֹצָה}$  (“*rotsa*”),  $\text{יָצְאָה}$  (“*yats’a*”),  $\text{צְרִיכָה}$  (“*tsrixa*”),  $\text{הִצְלִיחָה}$  (“*hitslixā*”),  $\text{צָרִיךְ}$  (“*tsarix*”), and others. But in the word  $\text{צִדְקָה}$ , a key term in our story, the storyteller preserves the original unaffricated pronunciation (although without emphasis), *s* (and not *ts*), always realized as an alveolar fricative, unvoiced (*s*) or voiced (*z*), so that the words are pronounced either *sdaka* or *zdaka*.<sup>58</sup>

$\text{ב}$ ,  $\text{v}$  [ $\text{b}$ ,  $\text{v}$ ]. Arabic has no fricative version of its *b* consonant—neither a bilabial *b* fricative (as in Spanish) nor a labio-dental [*v*] (as in modern Hebrew). Thus, Arabic speakers have trouble pronouncing the Hebrew allophones *f* and *v*. Fortuna has no trouble pronouncing fricative [*v*], but here and there we find an irregular instance of her substituting its counterpart stop,  $\text{ב}$  (*b*) instead. We encountered this in her pronunciation of  $\text{בִּשְׁבִּיל}$  as “*bishbil*” and of  $\text{יִבְרַח}$  as “*yibrax*.” This realization is particularly prominent in the passive participle  $\text{מְבֻטָּלָה}$ , which is always pronounced with a *b* (“*m<sup>e</sup>butelet*”).<sup>59</sup> I noted the significance of the preservation of the Judeo-Arabic realization above.

*Gemination.* Gemination—the doubling of a consonant, a feature that occurs in certain phonetic situations in classical Hebrew (marked by a *dages*) but is rarely heard in standard Israeli Hebrew today—is practiced in Judeo-Arabic both in Arabic words,<sup>60</sup> and in the traditional chanting of the Bible and the Mishnah.<sup>61</sup> Even so, Fortuna’s Hebrew is devoid of



gemination except for two instances: וּנְבֹטְלָהּ עָלֶיהָ הַגְזֵרָה (“... *haggezera* . . .”) and נּוֹפְלֵת לִי אָבֵן עַל הַרְאֵשׁ (“... *harroš* . . .”). In both instances, the speaker geminates the consonant that follows a definite article, as practiced in both the Hebrew component and the Arabic of her native Judeo-Arabic. The influence of Arabic is so pronounced that in the second example, (הַרְאֵשׁ), the gemination occurs in a consonant (ר) that is not geminated in standard Hebrew grammar.<sup>62</sup>

#### VOWELS

[*e*, *i*]. These two vowels are not fully distinguished in Fortuna’s speech. She sometimes voices an *i* instead of an *e* (רִיחַ—“*riyah*”; אֵלִיךְ—“*ilix*”; אֶבְרַח—“*ibrax*”; מִבְּקֵשׁ—“*mivakes*”), and sometimes she voices a central vowel, making it difficult to determine just which vowel we are hearing. It should be noted, however, that the speaker does attempt to distinguish between these vowels, and the influence of Arabic here, while present, is not especially strong.

[*o*, *u*]. The distinction between these vowels is present in many instances. On occasion, I found a word with *u* realized as *o*. Thus, מְבֹטְלֵת is pronounced “*mboṭelet*.”

#### STRESS

In telling her story, Fortuna adheres to the standard patterns of stress in contemporary Hebrew: the ultimate syllable is stressed, except in certain categories of words in which we find penultimate stress. The first example of penultimate stress, מְשֻׁהוּ מְשֻׁהוּ “*mašu, mašu*”, is pronounced exactly as in contemporary spoken Hebrew today, but two other examples are rooted in Moroccan Judeo-Arabic. In the phrase הַיֵּל אֶשֶׁת, normally (in both classical and modern Hebrew) pronounced with stress on both penults (*éšet ḥayil*), has ultimate stress in Fortuna’s Hebrew: *éšet-ḥayil*. The noun גְּזֵרָה (*gzera*), which in classical and modern standard Hebrew has ultimate stress (*gzera*), has penultimate stress in the Judeo-Arabic expression לַגְזֵרָה תִּבְטַל עָלַיִךְ: *gzera*. The fact that these two exceptions occur in central motifs of the story—the praiseworthy action and the cancellation of the edict of death—should not be overlooked. It is only natural that the speaker should attempt to preserve the spirit of the original folktale.

To summarize my findings, we can characterize Fortuna’s spoken Hebrew as unhesitant and fluent. To recall, she does not read or write Hebrew. Her language contains Hebrew words and expressions from a middle and higher register, including terms from educated speech, such as עֵלְמִין בַּיִת (cemetery), גְּזֵרָה, נְדָבָה, and אֶשֶׁת. Fortuna’s Hebrew also



reveals, however, the contact between her two languages: Judeo-Arabic and contemporary spoken Hebrew. The influence of that contact is quite evident in her phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics, and in her discourse strategies—not analyzed here—as well. We need to distinguish among those areas, however. Although the influence of Judeo-Arabic phonology is primarily characteristic of the first bilingual generation and its indicators become fewer (although still present) among the second and third generations of Israelis of Moroccan origin, in other areas of language we have found phenomena similar to those in Fortuna's Hebrew in the language of young Israelis from the periphery. We have seen, for example, that the verb עזב used in the sense of "left behind" is common in the periphery, and the usage of such nouns as נִדְרָה and מְסִינָה in the senses borrowed from Judeo-Arabic. Even whole expressions from Judeo-Arabic, such as לגזרה עליכ תבטל and characteristic uses of prepositions and the compound tense, are shared by Fortuna's Hebrew and that of the present-day Israeli periphery. These findings indicate clearly the strength of Judeo-Arabic influence in the formation of a socio-geographic sociolect of contemporary Hebrew, which reflects a natural process of contact between the Hebrew and Judeo-Arabic languages.

It should also be noted that for historical reasons, that contact did not impact the early phase of the modern revival of the Hebrew language.<sup>63</sup> It is discernible only from the mid-twentieth century, with the mass immigration of Jews from North Africa and the Middle East. This may be why that sociolect remained on the margins of Israeli society and did not extend beyond the bounds of the Mizrahi sector.

## NOTES

I thank the readers of this article for *Israel Studies* for their insightful, pertinent comments.

1. Raphael Nir, *The Instruction of Hebrew as Mother-Tongue at High Schools* (Tel-Aviv, 1974); Shlomo Haramati, "On the History of the Teaching of the Hebrew Language in Israel," *Language and Hebrew* 8 (1991): 55–64; Ben-Zion Fischler, "On the History of the Teaching of the Hebrew Language in Israel," *Language and Hebrew* 6 (1990): 35–9; Eliakim Weinberg, *Adult Education in the Early State of Israel* (Jerusalem, 1992); Shlomo Kodesh, *Introduction to the Guiding Principles of Inculcating Hebrew* (Jerusalem, 2000). See also Yael Reshef, "Hebrew Speech Taking Root during the British Mandate Period: On Efforts to Establish the Status

of Hebrew under the British Mandate,” in *The Speech Machine as Language Teacher: Hebrew Spoken Here*, ed. Shlomo Izre’el (Tel-Aviv, 2012), 143–62 [all in Hebrew].

2. I refer here not to the sociolect of the first-generation immigrants from Germany or Iraq, for example, but to a marked dialect used by Israeli-born speakers of Hebrew (the second-third-fourth generations from aliyah).

3. See Yehudit Henshke, “On the Oriental Sociolect in Israel: A Socio-lexical Consideration of Hebrew of Israelis of North African Origin,” *Journal of Jewish Languages* 1.2 (2013): 207–27. For a definition and discussion of sociolect (social dialect), see Suzanne Romaine, *Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, 2nd ed. (Oxford and New York, 2000); Janet Holmes, *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, 4th ed. (London and New York, 2013).

4. This sociolect forms the basis for various dramatic and entertaining television series such as *Ammamiyot* and *Zagury Empire*.

5. Evidently, the harsh public opposition to use of spoken Jewish languages that characterized the renewal of Hebrew under the Mandate and in the early decades of the State did not affect the immigrants from Islamic lands who arrived in the 1950s and 1960s. See Reshef, “Hebrew Speech”.

6. On the lexicographical aspects of this sociolect, see Henshke, “On the Oriental Sociolect”. For its semantic aspects see Henshke, “Peripheral Hebrew: Between Error and Loan,” *Language Studies* 14–15 (2013): 175–86 [Hebrew]. On its phraseology, see Henshke, “The Contribution of the Hebrew Component in Judeo-Languages to the Revival of Spoken Hebrew,” *Revue des Études Juives* 172 (2013): 169–87.

7. Eliezer Ben-Rafael, *Language, Identity and Social Division: The Case of Israel* (Oxford, 1994), 95.

8. She spoke both languages with her parents, but mainly Arabic. With her brothers, she spoke mostly French. See the questionnaire.

9. Oicotypes, stories specific to a particular ethnic community, are categorized in folkloristic studies. For a transcript of the tale, see Izre’el on the CoSIH website: [http://humanities.tau.ac.il/~cosih/CoSIH\\_files/F\\_folkstory\\_1/F\\_folkstory\\_1.pdf](http://humanities.tau.ac.il/~cosih/CoSIH_files/F_folkstory_1/F_folkstory_1.pdf); and Shlomo Izre’el, “The Corpus of Spoken Israeli Hebrew (CoSIH): Textual Examples,” *Lešonenu* 64 (2002): 308–12 [Hebrew]. On types of tales, see Heda Jason, “Types of Jewish-Oriental Oral Tales,” *Fabula* 7 (2009): 190.

10. See Aliza Shenhar, *Folktales of Jewish Communities* (Tel-Aviv, 1982), 46–80 [Hebrew].

11. It goes without saying that Fortuna did not study Talmud and was not directly exposed to its content. Rather, she recounts a folktale current in her community, whose source was in *talmidei hakhamim* (sages) who transmitted these talmudic stories to their communities. See Shenhar, *Folktales*, 13–23.

12. The wide distribution of legends with a similar motif among various Jewish communities shows that all shared a common source.

13. Shenhar, *Folktales*, 66. It should be noted that Shenhar counted tales under the general theme of “charity saves from death”. A more focused search that I



undertook in the IFA for tales matching specific components of Fortuna's story reduced the number. (See the following note.) For an attempt to explain the concentration of these stories among Mizrahi communities, see Shenhar, *Folktales*, 56–7.

14. I found thirteen tales in the IFA: eight from Morocco, two from Yemen, and one each from Turkey, Greece, and Egypt. A similar motif appears in another story from Greece as well. See Ora Schwarzwald, “The Words in the Judeo-Spanish Press from Greece,” in *Proceedings of the Tenth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (1989), *Division D, Volume I: The Hebrew Language: Jewish Languages* (Jerusalem, 1990), 211–12 [Hebrew]. My thanks to Dr. Idit Pintel-Ginsburg, director of the IFA, for her assistance in locating parallels to our tale. For published collections of Moroccan Jewish folktales, see Dov Noy, *Jewish Folktales from Morocco* (Jerusalem, 1964); Zalman Beharav, *Sixty Folktales, Collected from Narrators in Ashkelon* (Haifa, 1964); *One Generation to Another: Seventy-one Folktales Collected in Israel* (Tel-Aviv, 1968); Jacob Avitsuk, *The Tree that Absorbed Tears* (Haifa, 1965); Issachar Ben-Ami, *The Flower that Resuscitates the Dead: Moroccan Jewish Folktales* (Jerusalem, 2000); Asher Knafo, *A Cantor at the Mikveh: 52 Rhymed Fun-Stories* (Tel-Aviv, 2010) [all in Hebrew]. A Yemenite version of the story did appear in print, in Rachel Seri, *The Holy Amulet* (Haifa, 1967–68), 24–46 [Hebrew]. The eight Moroccan parallels, all stored at the IFA, are: Mor-Yosef, Sa'uda [Ben-Ami, Y.], 1089; Peretz, Yihya [Peretz, Yihya], 5784; Vazana, Aliza [Harburger, Shlomit], 6767; Vazana, Aliza [Harburger, Shlomit], 6768; Mizrahi, Hanna [Cohen, Ziona], 7586; Ankar, Makhlouf [Ivri, Rina], 11100; Dadon, Liza [Raveh, Talya], 11865; Cohen, Dani [Ettinger, Ayelet], 14818.

15. In one tale (5784), the man receives notification in a dream.

16. The motif of conversations among the dead in a cemetery appears in classical rabbinic literature as well. See *b. Ber.* 18b; Schechter, ed., *Avot de-Rabbi Nathan A*, chap. 3 (New York and Jerusalem, 1997), 16–17. I am indebted to a reader for this comment.

17. In two tales (6768, 11865) the one fated to die is another woman. On the place of the woman in these tales, see Shenhar, *Folktales*, 61.

18. With the exception of one tale (7586), in which the reason is not having given alms.

19. In two legends (1089, 6767) the clothes-washing theme does not appear.

20. The notes made by the interviewers recording the stories show that these stories were told by both women and men. See n.16 above.

21. To simplify the quotations, I avoid a precise transcription of the hesitations and the elided syllables and add normal punctuation. For the complete transcript, see Izre'el on the CoSIH site; and Izre'el, “CoSIH: Textual Examples,” 308–12.

22. Not as in Izre'el's transcript, the CoSIH website, and Izre'el, “CoSIH: Textual Examples,” 308.

23. On the anchoring of the Jewish oicotype in biblical verses and traditional sources, see Shenhar, *Folktales*, 63–4.



24. Examples of this appear in many folktales from Morocco. See Aliza Shenhar and Haya Bar-Itzhak, *Folktales from Bet Shean* (Haifa, 1981), 25, 31, 41, and passim [Hebrew].

25. On the place of dialogue in folktales, see Tamar Alexander and Dov Noy, "Characteristics of the Folktale," in *Forever After . . . : On the Art of the Folk Narrator* (Givatayim, 1993), 44–5 [Hebrew]. On the storyteller's presentation, see p. 23 in Galit Hasan-Rokem, "'To See the Voices': A Functional, Semiotic and Hermeneutic Approach to Folk-Narrating," *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Folklore* 10 (1987–8): 21–30 [Hebrew]; Tamar Alexander-Frizer, *The Heart is a Mirror: The Sephardic Folktale* (Detroit, 2008), 469–519.

26. On the moral in folktales, see Shenhar, *Folktales*, 46, 64.

27. See Shenhar, *Folktales*, 21–2.

28. Henshke, "Twentieth Century Hebrew Journalism in Tunisian Judeo-Arabic Translation," *Massorot* 13–14 (2006): 91 [Hebrew].

29. Because of this community's size and prominence, in the periphery in particular, I chose a Moroccan storyteller in order to identify elements of Judeo-Arabic embedded in the language of the descendants of olim from Morocco. I did not examine the language of storytellers from other communities.

30. The storyteller consciously retains the traditional framework of a legend and this is also reflected in her language. On the other hand, hidden linguistic phenomena, of which she is unaware, in the semantic, syntactic, and phonological fields, may reflect her everyday speech.

31. We could argue that the storyteller deliberately chooses to combine Judeo-Arabic and modern Hebrew. But comparison of the Judeo-Arabic elements embedded in her Hebrew to those found in the language of Israelis from the periphery indicates, in my opinion, that this combination of languages is largely unconscious.

32. See Marcus Hanouna, *A Dictionary of Jewish Moroccan (Hebrew Version)* (Kiryat Motzkin, 2008), 250 [Hebrew].

33. See Reuben Alcalay, *The Complete Hebrew-English Dictionary* (Tel-Aviv, 1996), 1936.

34. Colin, *Le dictionnaire Colin d'arabe dialectal marocain* (Rabat, 1993–94).

35. *Ibid.*, 2.471; Marcus Hanouna, *Artichoke Marriage, Plums Divorce: The Wisdom of Moroccan-Jews Proverbs* (Jerusalem, 2008), 140 [Hebrew].

36. Henshke, "Peripheral Hebrew," 178–9.

37. Henshke, *Hebrew Elements in Daily Speech: A Grammatical Study and Lexicon of the Hebrew Component of Tunisian Judeo-Arabic* (Jerusalem, 2007), 115, 121 [Hebrew].

38. *Ibid.*, 398.

39. Henshke, "The Contribution of the Hebrew Component," 169–87.

40. See Ruvik Rosenthal, *Dictionary of Hebrew Idioms and Phrases* (Jerusalem, 2009), 585 [Hebrew].

41. Asaf Gibor, "The Spring is so Short Here," *Makor Rishon* (Dyokan section), 10 August 2012 [Hebrew].

42. See Alexander Harkavy, *English-Yiddish Dictionary* (New York, 1898), 76.
43. See Abraham Ben Jacob, *Hebrew and Aramaic in the Language of the Jews of Iraq* (Jerusalem, 1985), 15 [Hebrew]; Moshe Bar-Asher, *Traditions Linguistiques des Juifs d'Afrique du Nord*, 2nd ed. (Jerusalem–Ashkelon, 1999), 296 [Hebrew]; Henshke, *Hebrew Elements in Daily Speech*, 114, 186.
44. See Moshe Bar-Asher, *Les traditions de l'hébreu des communautés juives du sud-ouest de France* (Jerusalem, 2006), 1.126–7 [Hebrew].
45. On the contribution of Jewish languages to the revival of Hebrew, see Henshke, “Hebrew Component”.
46. In the first three appearances of the expression, the pronoun suffix is in the third person masculine singular (*'lih*, “on him”), contrary to what appears in Izre'el's transcript. Only in the third appearance is the pronoun suffix in the second person feminine singular (*'lik*, “on her”).
47. See Alexander-Frizer, *The Heart Is a Mirror*, 14–16; Shenhar and Bar-Itzhak, *Folktales from Bet Shean*, 176–7. This phenomenon of the use of common Judeo-Arabic expressions is widespread in the spoken Hebrew of Israelis from the periphery, even among second-, third-, and fourth-generation speakers. I do not refer only to such expressions as *mši mduwra 'lik* (“I'd give my life for you”), which I heard from a 3-year-old girl in Yeruham, but to more complex expressions such as: *ža ibbuš-u - ṣma-h* (“he came to kiss him—and blinded him”); *wqt ən-n'ila hārbo bə-s-sofār* (“at Ne'ila time they ran off with the *shofar*”), and others. See also Henshke, “Peripheral Hebrew”. The interlingual and intercultural contact between Judeo-Arabic and Hebrew is undoubtedly what brought about, both in the periphery and in Fortuna's speech, the interpolation of these expressions into modern Hebrew.
48. In one instance, the recording is insufficiently clear, but it seems to me that she is voicing a stop (*b*) rather than a fricative (*v*).
49. Izre'el's transcription should be corrected here: CoSIH site and Izre'el, “Emergence of Spoken Israeli Hebrew,” 310.
50. Henshke, “Peripheral Hebrew,” 184–5.
51. See Abraham Stahl, *Language and Thought of Culturally Deprived Children in Israel* (Tel-Aviv, 1977), 124 [Hebrew]; p. 125 in Yudith Cais, “Language Problems of Disadvantaged Children,” *Studies in Education* 4 (1974) [Hebrew]; pp. 136–7 in Lawrence Davis, “Is the Language of Disadvantaged Children Really Disadvantaged?” *Studies in Education* 14 (1977) [Hebrew].
52. Ruth Aronson Berman, *Modern Hebrew Structure* (Tel-Aviv, 1978), 164.
53. Henshke, “Peripheral Hebrew,” 182–4.
54. See Haiim Rosén, *Contemporary Hebrew* (Tel-Aviv, 1977), 184–97; Aronson Berman, *Modern Hebrew Structure*, 164–5.
55. Rosén, *Contemporary Hebrew*, 184–97; Aronson Berman, *Modern Hebrew Structure*, 164–5.
56. Colin, *Dictionnaire*, 4.804.
57. Even-Shoshan, *Ha-milon be-ḥadash* [*The New Dictionary*], 972.



58. On the voiced realization of this consonant, see Henshke, *Hebrew Elements in Daily Speech*, 351.

59. In one instance there is a slight stutter, and the realization as *b* is not sufficiently clear.

60. Bar-Asher, *Traditions Linguistiques*, 281.

61. See Aharon Maman, "The Reading Tradition of the Jews of Tetouan: Phonology of Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew," *Massorot* 1 (1984): 80–1; Natalie Akun, "The Reading Tradition of the Jews of Tetouan: Phonology of Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew" (Ph.D. diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2010), 110–40 [both in Hebrew].

62. On the gemination of  $\aleph$  in Hebrew words in North African Judeo-Arabic, see Bar-Asher, *Traditions Linguistiques*, 325–424; Henshke, *Hebrew Elements in Daily Speech*, 49.

63. On the place of Yiddish and its culture in the revival of Hebrew, see, among others, Benjamin Harshav, *Language in Time of Revolution* (Berkeley, 1993).

Copyright of Israel Studies is the property of Indiana University Press and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.