# CHAPTER SIX THREE SHORTER TEXTS

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

The texts of this chapter are all significantly shorter than the two in the preceding chapters, comprising no more than a handful of folios in their respective manuscripts. Two of them, moreover, represent the only explicitly Jewish context for Portuguese written in Hebrew script. Both consist of excerpts contained in Hebrew *ma\_zorim*, vernacular instructions on the procedures for the Passover *seder*. The third text is a short (medical) prescription, contained on a single folio in a manuscript that includes several unrelated texts in different hands (see § 4 below).

Along with their religious context, the two Passover texts share a number of features that distinguish them from the other items in the corpus. First, they both consist of discontinuous text, in that the vernacular passages are interrupted by Hebrew-language blessings. They are also the only texts to make use of Hebrew lexical items, a feature no doubt attributable to their religious context (though not all of these are directly associated with the ritual).<sup>1</sup> In addition, they are the only texts in the corpus to make a systematic use of *niqqud* (diacritic vocalization). This feature is also due to the religious matrix in which they occur, since as is customary the Hebrew blessings and prayers are pointed. As in the other texts, however, three letters (X, 1,  $\gamma$ ) serve as full-fledged vowels,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Cambridge text also contains one Hebrew term, בהמה *behema* '(domestic) animal, livestock.' Although there is no religious context per se, the Portuguese text is surrounded by other Hebrew-language recipes and prescriptions.

such that the *niqqud* is generally redundant (though it does in some case distinguish /i/ from /e/ or /u/ from /o/). Some of the added diacritics serve no discernible function in the Portuguese spelling and do not even seem to draw on Hebrew convention, e.g. the *rafeh* on letters such as  $\neg r$  and  $\aleph \sqrt{in}$  the Brotherton text, or the alternation of both *dagesh* and *rafeh* on  $\neg d$  (which also appears with neither one) in the Bodleain text. As is often the case for medieval Hebrew manuscripts, the lettering and pointing were quite likely carried out by different individuals. Though the *naqdan* 'pointer' was in all likelihood a Portuguese speaker as well, he may not have been familiar enough with the Hebraicized orthography to deploy it "optimally." Given this likelihood, along with the categorically alphabetic nature of the writing, I have ignored the *niqqud* in my transliteration, and the Romanization follows the same principles as those used for the other texts (see chapter 3 § 3).

In addition to their similarities, there are several important differences between the two Passover texts. As opposed to the cursive script of the Bodleian text, and in fact in contrast to the rest of the corpus, the Brotherton manuscript is written in square Hebrew characters. Another important difference lies in the different representation of certain grammatically-salient final syllables. While the other texts show at least some alternation between vowel- and consonant-final forms in the spelling of these final syllables (e.g.  $1 \text{ an vs. } 1 \text{ an vs$ 

As noted above, the two Passover texts also contain more Hebrewlanguage elements than any of the other texts in the corpus, some of which do not have vernacular synonyms in either medieval Portuguese or modern English. For the Romanization of these items I have adapted the system described in chapter 3 by following the traditional practice of Semitic philology for the consonants (see chapter 2), regardless of whether the character representes a sound that exists in Portuguese. For the vowels, however, I have not rendered implicit vowels (those not represented by a *mater lectionis*) as superscripts, nor have I augmented the five Roman vowel letters to reflect the *niqqud* in the Hebrew-letter originals.<sup>2</sup>

Further characteristics of each of the texts are discussed in the individual sections below. Because of the overall brevity of these texts, and because none has appeared in edited form prior to my own preliminary editions (Strolovitch 2000b), I provide transcriptions of each text in modern Hebrew typeface. As in the previous two chapters, line numbers in the commentaries refer to the marginal numbering in the Romanization.

#### 2. Bodleian MS. Can. Or. 108

The first Passover text represents the first manuscript in the corpus to which I had first-hand access, and the only one published in Fudeman et al. (2000) whose edition was based on first-hand consultation. Metzger (1977) points out that when A. Neubauer catalogued this manuscript in 1886, he believed it to be a *ma\_zor* from Spain, with vernacular instructions written in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> In the English translation, however, I have followed a different standard to render Hebrewlanguage terms, preferring a "traditional" Romanization that more closely resembles the orthography-based transcriptions used by non-specialist English-language writers. Thus, for example,  $\forall s$  is rendered  $\langle sh \rangle$ ,  $\exists c$  and  $\supseteq f$  are both rendered  $\langle kh \rangle$ , and letters are doubled as per English spelling conventions. In addition, although the verbs in the Passover instructions alternate between imperative and future-tense forms, I have rendered them consistently as English imperatives.

Spanish. A major cause of his mistake was no doubt the frequency with which the scribe has used ]n on the inflection of 3rd-person plural verbs and certain determiners. This should not be taken as an indication that the scribe produced or perceived these words with a consonantal [n], since nasalization and loss of /n/ were well in progress by this time. It is most likely a conservative or simply archaizing spelling, not unlike the <m> of the modern language (though it could also be considered evidence for a Spanish influence on the scribe or in the transmission of the text). Indeed, as noted in § 1 and elsewhere, the use of ] in the spelling of word-final syllables is a characteristic alternant of the Judeo-Portuguese corpus as a whole. Nevertheless, apart from this feature the text has the least archaic appearance in the corpus, with few surprises from the point of view of the modern language.

In the sections below, ellipses indicate that a Hebrew blessing followed; these have been omitted in this edition.

#### 2.1. Transcription

[227r.] קוֹמוֹ שָׁאִירֶיז דֵי בֵּיתֿ הַכֶּנֶסֶתֿ דִירַז . . .

[227v.]

שַׁי אָקוֹנְטֶיסֶיר פָּסָח  $|^2$  אַין שַבָּת דִירָאן . . . |<sup>3</sup> ייָרן אוֹ קִדּוּש טוּטוֹ שִׁי אָקוֹנְטֶיסֶיר פָּסָח  $|^4$  אַי אָקוֹנְטֶיסֶיר פָּסָח בְּמוֹצָאֵי שַבָּת דִירָן אוֹ אָדירָן אוֹ אָישְקריטוֹ  $|^4$  אַי שֶׁהָחַיִינוּ. אֵי שֵׁי  $|^5$  אָקוֹנְטֶיסֶיר פָּסָח בְּמוֹצָאֵי שַבָּת דִירָן אוֹ אוֹ קדוּש טוּטוֹ קדוש טוּטוֹ אָישְקריטוֹ . . . וי

[228r.] אִי בֵּיוֶיִרָאָן קָדָּאוּן שֶׁיאוֹ וָושוֹ ו<sup>2</sup> אֵי לַבּרָאן אַש ו<sup>3</sup> מָאאוֹש אֵי בֶינְזָיֶרָן . . . ו<sup>4</sup> אֵי טוֹמָאָרָא דּוֹ אַפִּייו אֵי מוֹלְיִירָא אֶינוֹ ו<sup>5</sup> וִינַגְרֵי אֶי בֶינְזֶירָא . . ו<sup>6</sup> אֵי קוֹמֵירָא אֵי דָרָא אָטוֹדּוֹש ו<sup>8</sup> זִי טוֹמָרָא טֶרָיש מָצוֹת אוּאָה שוֹבְרֶי אוֹטְרָא ו<sup>8</sup> אֵי פַרְטָא אַאוּאַה דֵילַאש פוֹר מֵייוֹ אֵי

[228v.]

וּי פּוֹרָא אָמֵיָיא אַנְטְרֵי אָש דּוּאָש שָאָאָש אֵי ו<sup>2</sup> אֵי אָאוֹטֶרָא מֵייָא דֵיפּוּנְדּוֹ דּוֹש מַנְטֶיאֶיש וֹ<sup>\*</sup> פֵירָא אָפִּיקוֹמִין אֵי אֶינְגָאאוֹ אוֹש וָושוֹש וֹ<sup>4</sup> דֵּי וִינְייוֹ אֵי קוֹמֵינְסָאָרן לוגו אֵי דִּירַאן . . .

[240r.]

י בֶּיוָא קַדָּאוּן שֶׁיאוֹ וָושוֹ ו<sup>2</sup> אֵי לָבַּארָן אָש מָאוֹש ו<sup>3</sup> אֵי בֶינְזֶירָן . . . אֵי טוֹמָרָא ו<sup>4</sup> אָש דּוּאָש מָצוֹת אֵי מֵייָא אֵי דִּירָא ו אֵי נוֹן

[240v.]

קּוֹמָא אָטָא קֵי דָּיגָא ... |<sup>2</sup> אַי פַּרְטָא דָא שָאָא דֵי סִימָא אֵי דָּא מֵייָא דֵי פֿוּנְדוֹ דֵּילָא אֵי דֵּיאֵי ו<sup>3</sup> אָטוֹדּוֹשׁ נוֹן מֵינוֹש דֵּי אוּאָה אָזֶייְטוֹנָא |<sup>4</sup> אֵי טוֹמָרָא דָא אַלְפָּסָאָ אַי מוֹלְייָרָא אַינוֹ |<sup>5</sup> תָרוֹסֶת אֵי דִיגָא ... |<sup>6</sup> אֵי טוֹמָרָא דָא אוייְטְרַא |<sup>7</sup> מָצַה שָאָאָה אֵי דָא אלְפָסָה אֵי מוֹלְייָרָא | אַינוֹ תָרוֹסֶת אֵי נוֹן דִיגָא בְרָכָּה אֵי קוֹמֶירָא טוֹמְרָא אָמֶייָרָא מָצָה גַי דָיגָא בַרָכָּה אַי טוֹמָרָא דָי טוֹמָרָא דָא אוייָטָרַא טוֹקֿרָא אַי דִיגָא בַרָכָּה אַי מוֹלָייָרָא אַטוּדוּש סָיאָרָן אַי דַיפוֹאַיש טוֹמָרָא אָמֶייָא מָצָה קַיפוֹש ו<sup>11</sup> דַּרָא אָטוּדוּש סָיאָרֶן אַי דֵיפוֹאַיש ווּיקן טוּדוּש טוֹמְרָא אָמֶייָא מָצָה קָיפוֹש ו<sup>12</sup> דַפֿוּנְדוֹ דּוֹש מָאנְטָיאַיש אֵי קוֹמָן טוּדוּש

[241r.]

ַלָּא קוֹאַנְטוֹ אוּאָה אָזֶייְטוֹנָא אֵי אֶינְגָ׳אאוֹ |<sup>2</sup> אוֹש וָושוֹש דֵיוִינְייוֹ אֵי דִּיגָאן רכת מזון ו<sup>3</sup> אֵי בֵיואָן קָדָא אוּן ו<sup>4</sup> ויאוֹ וָושוֹ אֵי טוֹרְנֵין אָאֵינְגַ׳יר אוש ו וַושוֹש אֵי דִיגָאן...

#### 2.2. Romanization

[227r.] komo s<sup>a</sup>iren de *bet hakeneset* dir<sup>a</sup>n...

**[227v.]** e si akonteçer  $pesa_{\iota}$  |<sup>2</sup> en *sabbat* diran . . . |<sup>3</sup> dir<sup>a</sup>n o *qiddu s* tuto eskrito / e *sehe<sub>\iota</sub>eyanu*. e si |<sup>4</sup> akonteçer  $pesa_{\iota}$  *bemoßa'e sabbat* dir<sup>a</sup>n / o *qiddu s* tuto eskrito . . . |<sup>5</sup> e logo dira ...

5 **[228r.]** e beveran k<sup>a</sup>daun seu v<sup>a</sup>so  $|^2$  e  $|^a b^a$ ran as  $|^3$  maos e benz<sup>i</sup>er<sup>a</sup>n . . .  $|^4$  e  $|^5$  tomara do apyo e molyara eno  $|^6$  vin<sup>a</sup>gre e benzera . . .  $|^7$  e komera e d<sup>a</sup>ra atodos  $|^8$  e tom<sup>a</sup>ra t<sup>e</sup>res *maßot* ua sobre otra e p<sup>a</sup>rta aua delas por meio e

[228v.] e pora am<sup>e</sup>ya antre as duas saas  $|^2$  e aot<sup>e</sup>ra m<sup>e</sup>ya defundo dos

10 m<sup>a</sup>ntees  $|^3$  pera *afiqomin* e engao os  $v^a$ sos  $|^4$  de vinyo e komençar<sup>a</sup>n logo e diran . . .

**[240r.]** e beva k<sup>a</sup>daun seu  $v^a$ aso  $|^2$  e labar<sup>a</sup>n as m<sup>a</sup>os  $|^3$  e benzer<sup>a</sup>n . . . e tom<sup>a</sup>ra  $|^4$  as duas *maßot* e m<sup>e</sup>ya e dira . . . e non

**[240v.]** koma ata ke diga . . .  $|^2$  e p<sup>a</sup>rta da saa de çima e da m<sup>e</sup>ya de

- 15 fundo dela e dee  $|^3$  a.todos non menos de ua azeytona  $|^4$  e tom<sup>a</sup>ra da alf<sup>a</sup>ça e moly<sup>a</sup>ra  $|^5$  eno *aroset* e diga . . . e tom<sup>a</sup>ra da oytra  $|^6$  *maßa* saah e da alf<sup>a</sup>ç<sup>a</sup>h e moly<sup>a</sup>ra  $|^6$  eno *aroset* non diga *berafa* e komera  $|^7$  todo e diga . . . e  $|^8$  d<sup>a</sup>ra a.todos e çear<sup>a</sup>n e depoes  $|^9$  ke çearen tom<sup>a</sup>ra a a.m<sup>e</sup>ya *maβa* ke.pos  $|^{10}$  d<sup>e</sup>fundo dos mantees e kom<sup>a</sup>n todos
- 20 [241r.] dela koanto ua azeytona e en $\langle gao |^2$  os  $v^a$ sos de.vinyo e digan  $|^3$  birkat mazon

**[243v.]** e bevan k<sup>a</sup>da-un  $|^2$  seu  $v^a$ so e tornen a.en<ger os  $|^3 v^a$ sos e digan ...

### 2.3. Translation

[f. 227r.] Upon leaving synagogue say...

[f. 227v.] And if Passover falls on the Sabbath say... Say the whole written *kiddush* and *shehekheyanu*. And if Passover falls on the waning of the Sabbath say the whole written *kiddush*... and then say...

**[f. 228r.]** And everyone is to drink his glass and wash his hands and bless ... And take from the celery and dip [it] in vinegar and bless ... and eat [it] and give to everyone and take three *matzot* one on top of the other and divide one of them in half **[f. 228v.]** and put [one] half between the two unbroken ones and the other underneath the tablecloth for the *afikomen*, and fill the glasses with wine and begin right away and say ...

**[f. 240r.]** And everyone is to drink their glass and wash their hands and bless ... and take the two and a half *matzot* and say ... And don't **[f. 240v.]** eat until you say ... and divide the upper unbroken [*matza*] and the half below it and give everyone no less than an olive, and take [of] the lettuce and dip [it] in the *haroset* and say ... and take from the other unbroken *matza* and from the lettuce and dip [them] in the *haroset* and don't say a blessing and eat it all and say ... and give [some] to everyone, and dine, and after eating take the half which [you] put under the tablecloth and [let] everyone eat **[f. 241r.]** an olive-sized piece of it, and fill the glasses with wine and say Grace after Meals.

[f. 243v.] And everyone is to drink his glass and [again] fill the glasses and say...

### 2.4. Commentary

f. 227v.

# 2 <u>שֵׁי אָקוֹ</u>נְטֶיסֶיר

### si akonteçer

'if (it) falls (on)'. Future subjunctive of ModPg. *acontecer* < \*AD+CONTIGESCERE < CONTI(N)GERE 'reach'. Although  $\mathfrak{W}_{s}$  is the default choice for the spelling of sibilants, as in this word  $\mathfrak{D}$  s is used to spell those that do not derive strictly from Latin /s/ (compare אָאָירין sairen < salıre in line 1 and cearen < CENARE in line 18).

### אֵין שַבַּת

### en <sub>sabbat</sub>

'on Sabbath' (i.e. Friday night). As opposed to the vernacular preposition used with the Hebrew term here, the next locative expression of time in line 3, הַמוֹצָא' שֵׁבָּה בָמוֹצָא' שֵׁבָּה bemoßa'e sabbat 'Passover on the waning of Sabbath' (i.e. Saturday night), is fully in Hebrew, with the preposition -**1** be- 'in/on' instead of **en** moßa'e sabbat.

### 2-3 קדּוּש טוּטוֹ אֶישְקְריטוֹ אֵי שֶׁהֶחֵיָינוּ giddu s tuto eskrito e sehe eyanu

'the whole written *kiddush* and *shehekheyanu*'. Two Hebrew blessings, 'sanctification' (over wine) and 'that He has given us life'. Although the

two  $\mathfrak{V}$  † in *tuto* appear to be nearly identical to the immediately-preceding  $\mathfrak{W}$  (in handwritten cursive the two letters,  $\ddot{E}$  and  $\check{}$ , resemble one another more than in square script to begin with), it is problematic to find a sensible Hebrew or Romance interpretation for a word using the latter.

f. 228r.

# <u>בּיוֶירָאָן קַדָּאוּן 5</u>

### beveran kad<sup>a</sup>un

'each one drink'. ModPg. *beberam* < BIBERE HABENT. Intervocalic /b/ and /w/ merged early in Popular Latin, resulting in Pg. /v/; although  $\exists b$  is the usual spelling for Pg. /v/, forms of this verb are spelled with  $\exists w$ , while initial /v/ < classical Latin /w/ is spelled with  $\exists$  or  $\exists$ ]. Note the superfluous *niqqud* for /a/ under  $\aleph \sqrt{}$ , which is already preceded by a consonant with the same sub-linear diacritic, resulting in three distinct indications of the /a/ vowel. *kadaun* 'everyone' occurs with the same verb in the singular in line 12.

### לַבַּרָאַן

### la*b* aran

'they will wash'. ModPg. *lavaram* < LAVARE (HABENT). Since other occurrences of this verb omit the *dagesh* that the scribe has placed in the  $\square$ , its use here must be an error, or else a hypercorrection (the word would have sounded identical to one with an original intervocalic /b/). It is conceivable, though highly unconventional, that the scribe has used the *dagesh* simply to signal very generally the modified reading of the consonant.

6

# אַפּייו

# apyo

'celery'. While the Brotherton text calls for *alfaça* 'lettuce' (see § 3.3), the present one calls for celery (as in Castilian versions of the Passover rubrics), both of which serve to translate Hebrew *Creo karpas* 'greens'. Regarding *vinagre* (ultimately < VINUM ACRE 'sharp/sour wine'), there is disagreement as to whether the Portuguese form is borrowed from Catalan (Nascentes 1932) or Castilian (Da Cunha 1982).

## קַרְטָא אָאוּאָה 7

### p<sup>a</sup>rta auah

'divide the one'. Subjunctive of *partir* 'divide'. As in the Brotherton text (line 2), *aua* 'the one' is written as a single word.

f. 228v.

9 פּוֹרַא

## pora

'will put'. ModPg. *pora* < PONERE (HABET). Williams (1962) claims that *-n*-assimilated to the /r/ in this verb, which would lead us to expect a long medial consonant. Yet despite the scribe's fondness for explicitly spelling VV sequences elsewhere, no doubled consonant is spelled here, as is conventional in this writing system.

# דיפוּנִדּוֹ

# defundo

'under' < DE FUNDU (written as separate words in line 12), replaced in the modern language by *debaixo* (de) < DE BASSU along with the latinism *sob* < SUB (cf. note line 10 in § 3.4).

### f. 240r.

# נון מֵינוֹש דֵּי אוּאָה אָזֶייְטוֹנָא 15

# non menos de ua azeitona

'no less than an olive'. Although the normal call for an "olive-sized" portion also occurs in line 20 קוֹאַנְטוֹ אוּאָה אָזֶייָטוֹנָא *koanto ua azeytona*, the commentator seems to have altered the content of this ritualized phrase.

# קוֹמֵירָא 17

# komera

'(will) eat'. ModPg. *comera* < \*CUM+EDERE (HABET). Although the  $\neg r$  is difficult to make out, the transliteration in Salomon (1980) as *comea* forces us to consider *-a* to be an enclitic object, presumably referring to *a otra maßa saa* (which would also entail that *todo* agree as a feminine). The reading of the individual letters is difficult, but it seems necessary to posit the  $\neg r$  and thus a future tense similar to those used elsewhere in the text.

#### קיפוש 19

#### ke.pos

'that (he) placed'. As opposed to the multi-vowel spelling in the Brotherton text (see note line 10), only a single vowel is spelled in this form (ModPg.  $p\hat{os}$ ).

#### 3. BROTHERTON ROTH MS. 71

The second Passover text stands apart from the other items in the Judeo-Portuguese corpus in several respects. In the first place, it consists only of a trio of individual folios that have become separated from their original manuscript, which has perhaps been lost along with the intervening folios (which may, of course, have contained further vernacular passages). It is also the only Hebrew-letter Portuguese text written in the square script rather than the cursive *Rashi* script typical of most Iberian and later Sephardic writing (and printing). In addition, it is probably the oldest manuscript in the corpus, having been dated by its previous owner Cecil Roth to the late thirteenth century (Salomon 1980).

The age and wear of the manuscript makes several elements of the *niqqud* difficult to determine: the placement of the dot over  $\mathfrak{V}$  that differentiate historical Hebrew / $\mathfrak{O}$ s/ from / $\mathfrak{s}$ s/; the placement of the dot above or to the left of 1 to differentiate /o/ and /u/; the single subscribed *iriq* that represents /i/ may in some cases be one of the two dots of a *βere* or the three of a *segol* (both of which represent /e/). Other *niqqud* that is "absent" in my transcription

may, in fact, simply be imperceptible to the naked eye.<sup>3</sup> In addition, it is often difficult to distinguish the *T*-shaped *qama* $\beta$  from the simpler *pata*<sub>c</sub>, though as symbols for /a/ they do not serve to represent distinct Portuguese vowels. Overall, however, the occurrence of overt vowel letters is more consistent than in the Bodleian text.

In the transcription of this Passover text the Hebrew blessings are included as in the original (given here in bold). The formulaic part that is common to each one is abbreviated by the scribe as three- and four-letter acronyms using the initials of each word. Although this is a recurrent practice in Hebrew through the ages,<sup>4</sup> the initials are usually "revocalized" to create a phonotacticallyacceptable Hebrew word (akin to English acronyms that contain no vowel-letters being read as letter-names). In all four instances here, however, the *naqdan* has preserved the diacritics of the initial letters as they occur in their full-word contexts, since these forms would no doubt be read as the full words they stood for. In the English translation the Hebrew passages are given in italics and written out in full.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Indeed, there was no *niqqud* included in the transcription in my first edition of this text (Strolovitch 2000ab because I had worked from a photocopy of the article by Salomon (1980) in which the diacritics were simply not apparent. Consulting the manuscript in Leeds first-hand revealed most of the *niqud*, but, as noted, several diacritics still required some inference.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> The informal names for both Maimonides (בי משה בן מיימון *Rabbi Moshe ben Maimon*, aka *Rambam*) and the Israeli Defense Forces (צבא ההגנה לישראל *Tsva haHagana leYisrael*, aka *Tsahal*), for example, are composed this way.

[f.5r.]

יּי בִּיבִירָאוֹ ד |<sup>2</sup> אָאו שׁיאו בַּאשׁו אי לָאבָּרַאַאוּ שוּאשׁ |<sup>3</sup> אָאוש אָי דִּירָאאו בָּאַי אֱמֶה אֲקִבְּו |<sup>4</sup> עַל נְטִילַת יָדַיִם״ אי פּילְייַאָרָא אַשׁ |<sup>5</sup> דּוּאַש מַצוֹת אי מֵייָא אי דְירָא דֿואַש ד |<sup>6</sup> בָּרָכֿוֹת אַנְטֵיש קֵי קוֹמָא׳ אָאוּאָהֿ בָּאַיָי |<sup>7</sup> אֱמֶה אי מֵייָא אי דְירָא דֿואַש ד |<sup>6</sup> בְּרָכֿוֹת אַנְטֵיש קֵי קוֹמָא׳ אָאוּאָהֿ בָּאַיָי |<sup>7</sup> אֱמֶה זַמּוֹצִיא לֶחֶם מִן הָאָרֶץ״ |<sup>8</sup> אֵי אַ שֵׁיגֿוּנְדָא אַי אֱמֶה אֲקְבְן עַל |<sup>9</sup> אָכַילַתֿ זַמּוֹצִיא לֶחֶם מִן הָאָרֶץ״ |<sup>8</sup> אֵי אַ שֵׁיגֿוּנְדָא אַי אָנְאָקבן עַל |<sup>9</sup> אָכָילַתֿ זַמּוֹצִיא לֶחֶם מִן הָאָרֶץ״ |<sup>8</sup> אֵי אַ שֵׁיגֿוּנְדָא אַי מֶמִיסָאָדִי אָי קוֹמֵירָא טוֹדו |<sup>11</sup> אֵין מַצָּה״ אֵי פַ׳רְטֵירָא דָה מַצָּהֿ ווּזי אָי וֹי אֵי דָארָא אַטוֹדוּשׁ״י, אי מּקיטָאָדִי אָי קוֹמירָא אי מוֹלְייָאָרָא אַינְוֹ וֹי אַי דָארָא אַי מוֹדוּשָׁין אי פֿירָיָאַרָא אָי וֹי וֹי אַי דָארָא אַטוֹדוּשׁ״י, אי מּיטָאָדי אָרָא אָזינויזין אי מוּליין אָרָא אָי וֹרוֹסֵת אי ו<sup>11</sup> בִינזירָא יָי מָאַקָבן עַל אָכָּילַתֿ ווּ<sup>14</sup> אָאָינוּןיעָאַרָא אַי וֹרוֹסֵת אי וּין געין אי פֿילאַאָרָא אַינון (חרוסת] אַלְפַאסַא אָי אונטַאֿרא אינון (חרוסת]

[f.5v.]

אַי קוֹמַירָא אָי דִּירָא זֶכֶּר לַמִּקְדָשׁ פְּהַלֵּל ״ אֵי |<sup>2</sup> דָּארָּא אָטוֹדּוֹשׁ׳ אֵי דֵּישָׁפּוֹאישׁ קִי קוֹמֵיר |<sup>3</sup> שואַה סְעוּדַה טוֹמָאֿרָא אַה מַצָה אָה מֵייָא |<sup>4</sup> קֵי פּוֹאוֹשׁ דֵי שון אוש מַאַנְטֵיאֵישׁ פֵּירָא |<sup>5</sup> אַפָּקומִין אֵי קוֹמֵירָאֿאו טוֹדוֹשׁ דֵּי אֵילָא |<sup>6</sup> קוֹנְטִיאָה דֵי אוּאָה אֲזֵייְטוֹנָא לא פַּחוֹת וְלֹא |<sup>7</sup> יוֹתֵר״ אֵי אֵינְגֿירָאאו אוש בא וָואשוש דֵי ן יִנִייוֹ אֵי דְירָאו בָּרָכָּת מַזוֹך״

[f.7v.]

הַגֶפֶֿן״ [ו] אֵי בֵּיבֵּירָאאׂו קָדָּאאוּ שֵׁיאוֹ |² בָּאשוֹ׳ אֵי אָנְ[ג]רָאאׂו אוש וָואשׁוֹש דֵּי וֹּ וִינְייוֹ אֵי דִּירָאאוֹ שְׁפֿוֹדֶ ...

#### 3.2. Romanization

**[f. 5r.]** e <be<br/> <berao  $|^2$  ka<dau seo <baso e la<br/><baso e la<br/>sharau suas  $|^3$  maos e dirao  $b\sqrt{y}$ <br/> $\sqrt{mh}\sqrt{qbw} |^4$  fial ne†ilat yadaim. e pilyara as  $|^5$  duas maßot e m<sup>e</sup>ya e dira<br/>duas  $|^6$  berafot antes ke koma auah  $b\sqrt{y}\sqrt{mh}$  hamoßi $\sqrt{le_e}$ em min ha $\sqrt{are\beta}$ .<br/> $|^7$  e a segunda  $b\sqrt{y}\sqrt{mh}\sqrt{qbw}$  fial  $|^8\sqrt{filat}$  maßa. e partira d<sup>a</sup>h maßa |<sup>9</sup>

5 a.saah e a.mitade e komera todo  $|^{10}$  en uo e dara a todos e pilyara  $|^{11}$ d<sup>a</sup>.alfaça e molyara eno *aroset* e  $|^{12}$  benzira  $b\sqrt{y}\sqrt{mh}\sqrt{qby}$ ial  $\sqrt{filat}$   $|^{13}$ *maror*. e dara a.todos e pilaara  $|^{14}$  da *ma\beta a*.oytra a.enteyra e  $|^{15}$  da alfaça e untara eno *aroset*. [**f. 5v.**] e komera e dira *zefer lamiqda*, *s kehilel* e  $|^2$  dara a.todos e despoes ke komer  $|^3$  suah *sefiuda* tomara ah *maßa* a m<sup>e</sup>ya  $|^4$  ke poos de son os mantees pera  $|^5$  *afiqomin* e komerao todos de ela  $|^6$  kontiah de uah azeitona *lo pa*, *ot v<sup>e</sup>lo*  $|^7$  *yoter* e en<girao os ba vasos de  $|^8$  vinyo e dir<sup>a</sup>o *birkat mazon*.

**[f. 7v.]** ... hagefene  $\langle be \langle berao k^a dau seo |^2 \langle baso e in \langle girao os vasos de |^3$ 

15 vinyo e dirao *spof*...

### **3.3. Translation**

[**f.5r.**] And everyone is to drink his glass and wash his hands and say: *blessed* are you, my lord, our god king of the universe, who has sanctified us with his commandments and commanded us on the washing of the hands. And take [the] two and a half *matzot* and say two blessings before eating: the one *blessed are you*, my lord, our god king of the universe, who draws forth bread from the earth, and the second blessed are you, my lord, our god king of the universe, who has sanctified us with his commandments and commanded us on the eating of matza. And divide the unbroken *matza* and the half and eat it all at once and give to everyone and take [some] of the lettuce and dip [it] in the *haroset* and bless: *blessed are you*, my lord, our god king of the universe, who has sanctified us with his commandments and commanded us on the eating of bitter herb. And give to everyone and take from the other whole *matza* and from the lettuce and dip [them] in the *haroset* **[f. 5v.]** and eat [them] and say in remembrance of the blessing of Hillel. And give [some] to everyone and after eating the meal take the half-*matza* that you put under the tablecloth for the *afikomen* and everyone is to eat an olive-sized piece of it, no less no more. And fill the glasses with wine and say Grace after Meals.

[f. 7v.] And everyone is to drink his glass and fill the glass with wine and say *shpokh*...

### 3.4 Commentary

f.5r.

2 פּילְייַא**ר**ָא

### pilyara

'take'. ModPg. *pilhar* < \*PILIARE < PILARE 'pillage, plunder', though Ferreira (1999) claims that it a borrowing of It. *pigliar*e. As in the modern meaning of the Portuguese verb, it is used here to mean simply 'take'. The form that occurs in line 7, פֿילאַאָרָא pilaara, is either a scribal error or else a hypercorrection to avoid what the scribe felt was a Castilian-like palatal (the word is unrelated to ModPg. *pilar* < 'crush', a dublet ultimately based on the same Latin etymon).

# ז דוּאַש בִּרַכֿוֹת 3

### duas berafot

'two blessings'. A Hebrew term with the feminine morphology preserved on both the Hebrew word itself and the agreeing Portuguese numerical adjective. This maintenance is also seen on the adjectives and determiners modifying סעודה sefuda ''meal' (line 10) and the various occurrences of  $ma\beta a$  (and its plural מצה maßot) in both Passover texts.

### אַנְטֵיש קֵי קוֹמַא' אַאוּאָה

### antes ke koma a.uah

'before you eat, the first...'. The lack of modern-style punctuation in the Hebrew-letter text obscures the fact that *auah* refers to the first of the two blessings (which is followed by אָיָגוּנְרָא i e a segunda 'and the second' in the next line), rather than 'before you eat the one' (with verb in subjunctive).

# 4 זָה מַצָּה אָשָׁאאָה 4

### dªh maߪh a.saah

'from the unbroken *matza*'. ModPg.  $s\tilde{a} < \text{SANA}$  'whole, sound'. This adjective alternates in the text with *ente(i)ra*. The word order is reminiscent of the normal Hebrew syntax for a definite noun + adjective, e.g. Heb. המצה השלמה *hamaßa ha\_slema*, lit. 'the-matza the-whole' (also in line 10,

אָה מַצָּה אָה מַיָּא *ah maβa ah m<sup>e</sup>ya*, lit. 'the-matza the-half'). This pattern does not, however, occur in the Bodleian text..

### 5 מיטאדי

### mitade

'middle'. ModPg. *metade* 'half' < MEDIETATE (cf. Fr. *moitié*). Nascentes (1932) describes this form as "remade" from *\*meitade, meetade*.

# **6 דְּאַלְפֿאסַא**

### dª.alfaça

'from the lettuce'. ModPg. *alface* < Ar. *al-\_ass* (though the final  $\aleph$ , along with the *niqqud* that precedes it, indicates that the final vowel here is /a/). Da Cunha (1982) incorrectly lists *al-\_a\beta a* as the etymon (Heb. הסה *i.s:h* correlates with the former). The word also occurs in the Bodleian manuscript, in one instance (line 17) with a vowel-less pseudo-etymological spelling  $\sqrt{psh}$ .

# דא מַצָה אָאוייִטְרָא אָאינֵטֵייְרָא ז

### da maßa a.oytra a.enteira

'from the other intact *matza*', lit. from-the *matza* the-other the-intact'. Again reminiscent of Hebrew phraseology (cf. note line 4).

### 8 אונטַאֿרא

### untara

'(will) dip'. ModPg. *untar* 'rub, grease' < \*UN(C)TARE, an iterative verb based on UNCTUS, the past participle of UNGERE 'smear, anoint'. In his preliminary edition of the Bodleian text Salomon (1980) provides a long footnote to account for his reading of this word as *auntara* as a uniquely Jewish term from \*IN+TINGERE (adjusted to the first conjugation), akin to *entindran* in the Spanish *haggada* published in Strolovitch (2000a) (note that *molyar* 'moisten' < \*MOLIARE, from MOLLIS 'soft', is also used here). Yet this interpretation poses several problems. The development of an initial diphthong from INT- is not expected, and it is unlikely that 'N alone spells a diphthong (cf. 1%N for *-ão* third plural verb endings). Moreover, there is no trace of the -NG- cluster.

# 10 פּוֹאוֹשׁ

### poos

'placed'. Although the long- (or "double-") vowel spelling -1%1- may suggest the regularly lost -n- of the Latin infectum stem, this is in fact the perfectum POSUIT > \*pouse > pôs, though in this intermediate stage the *niqqud* specifies that both vowels are /o/.

### די שון

### de son

'under'. The normal development of sub 'under' > *so* does not survive in Modern Portuguese as an independent word. A form with *-n* occurs in the Spanish *haggada* as well (cf. Strolovitch 2000a), and Salomon cites Menéndez-Pidal's explanation that it is the result of a phonetic analogy with *non*, *nin*, etc. Its status here as an unbound morpheme may be illusory, since it is likely dependent upon the preceding *de* as in ModPg. *debaixo* or *defundo*, the latter written both separately and as one word in the Bodleian text (cf. note line 9 in § 2.4).

# 11 קוֹנְטִיאָהֿ דֵי אוּאָהֿ אֲזֵייְטוֹנָא kontiah de ua azeitona

'the amount of an olive'. The odd vocalism in קונטיאה *kontiah* < \*QUANTIA 'amount' is no doubt due to the scribe having forgotten an  $\aleph$  between 1and 1. Native oliva has been supplanted in most cases by the loanword used here, based on Ar. *az-zaitüna*.

# 12 לא פֿחות ולא יוֹתֵר

### lo pa\_ot v<sup>e</sup>lo yoter

Heb. 'not less and not more'. An adverbial phrase entirely unadapted from its Hebrew-language form. It is the only Hebrew-language item in the Passover texts with no inherently ritual or religious connotation to the words themselves, and one of only two such cases that I have encountered in the Judeo-Portuguese corpus (cf. note line 6 in § 4.3).

f.5v.

### אוש בא וואשוש

### os ba vasos

'the cups'. The spelling for the various occurrences of this word (from \*vasu, a regularized form of vas, pl. vasa) alternates between initial  $\beth$  and (1)1. In this particular instance, however, the writer appears to have stopped to correct his spelling without emending what he felt to be an error.

## 13 בְּרַכַּת מַזוֹן

### birkat mazon

Heb. 'Grace after Meals', literally 'blessing of alimentation'.

f.7.v.

# 14 אִנִ[ג]רָאאי

ing<sup>e</sup>rao

'fill'. ModPg. *encher* < IMPLERE. The same term is used in Iberian *ma\_zorim* with instructions in Castilian, though in Portuguese this verb did not first shift to the fourth conjugation (cf. ModSp. *henchir*).

### 4. Cambridge ms. Add.639.5 (f. 20r.)

The shortest text in the corpus, which is edited and published here for the first time, consists of a half-page prescription<sup>5</sup> in a 27-folio manuscript that contains notes on diseases and remedies, and which is bound together with six other manuscripts in a volume held at the Cambridge University Library (England). Like the Portuguese prescription, these other manuscripts deal with a variety of non-Judaic issues, chiefly pharmacology and astrology. They also contain passages in a variety of languages written in Hebrew script: the first manuscript, for instance, contains a pharmacological glossary in Judeo-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> The content of the text seems to offer two possibile readings: it describes either a method for dealing with a horse-induced wound, or else a technique for skinning rabbit. The options for each of these interpretations are discussed in the commentaries (§ 4.4).

Spanish and Judeo-Arabic, while the fourth contains prescriptions in Judeo-Arabic along with "miscellaneous scribblings" in Judeo-Greek, Judeo-Spanish, and Judeo-Italian (Reif 1997).

In his catalog of Hebrew manuscripts held at Cambridge, Reif identifies the language of the second manuscript in this volume (ms. Add.639.2), which consists of six folios of gnomic verse, as Judeo-Spanish and Judeo-Portuguese. This text has been studied by Gutwirth (1992), who described it as written in Judeo-Spanish and Judeo-Portuguese; after my own brief examination of that text, I would more accurately characterize it as Judeo-Spanish with significant Portuguese influence. Thus it is understandable that Reif (1997) would not recognize the Portuguese character of the short prescription in the fifth manuscript (ms. Add.639.5), identifying instead it as Judeo-Spanish. Unlike Neubauer's mistaken characterization of the Bodleian Passover text (see § 2.1), however, there is no obvious feature that might have induced this misidentification. Indeed, unlike the ambiguities in the gnomic verse of ms. Add.639.2, the orthographic features of the text of ms. Add.639.5 presented here point unambiguously to its language as Portuguese.

The text of this short prescription is written in a hand distinct from some of the Hebrew-language paragraphs that immediately surround it, though all are written in the cursive *Rashi* script. Unlike the Passover texts, there is no diacritic vocalization, and the only *niqqud* used is a *rafeh* to indicate the fricative reading of several instances of  $\mathfrak{D} p$  and  $\lambda g$  (as in *O libro de ma<gika* it is normally reduced to a dot above the letter). The transcription and Romanization below maintain the line division of the original.

#### 4.1. Transcription

די קוואלו / [זירי] קי פֿולי דאדו און קוייסי אאון גוליאו אין סיאל דו באסו נון אין או באסו מישמו שי נון פוקו מאיש אריבה אי מאנדואו או פֿישיקו פואיר ליי |<sup>5</sup> א שינטדו מויטו אלי אין אקיל לוגאר / אי מאנדו דיגולאר אואה בהמה קרניירו אי טומו פידסוש די אקילה פילי קינטי אי פוגֿי די ריבה אי טיראר און פידאסו אי מיטיר אוטרו פֿין קי נון אביאה מאיש פילי / אי טאנבין או שאנגרו לוגו / דו |<sup>10</sup> בראסו

#### 4.2. Romanization

de k<sup>a</sup>valo

[zere] ke fole dado un koyçe aun gulio en çeal do baço non en o baço mesmo si non poko mais arib<sup>a</sup>h e mandou o fisiko poer ly<sup>e</sup>

a sent<sup>a</sup> do muito ale en akel lugar / e mando degolar uah *behema* k<sup>a</sup>rneiro e tomo ped<sup>a</sup>ços de akela pele kente e pu<ge de rib<sup>a</sup>h e tirar un pedaço e meter otro fin ke non abiah mais pele / e tanben o sangro logo / do

10 braço

#### 4.3. Translation

On horse.

Be it that one was given a heel in the knee above  $|^2$  the spleen, not in the spleen itself but rather a little  $|^3$  higher up. And I get the medic to  $|^5$  sit him down very far away in that place. And I get  $|^6$  the throat of a horned animal slit, and I take pieces  $|^7$  of that hot skin and I put [them] over [it] and remove  $|^8$  one piece and place another until there is no  $|^9$  more skin, and I also bleed it over  $|^{10}$  the coals.

#### 4.4. Commentary

#### קוואלו 1

### k<sup>a</sup>valo

'horse'. ModPg. *cavalo* < CABALLU, spelled "unetymologically" with double-'I) to represent Pg. /v/ < Lat. /b/ (cf. chapter 3 § 2.3.2). Reading this as a form of ModPg. *coelho* < CUNICULU is, on orthographic grounds alone, more problematic. It would have to be construed as the only Judeo-Portuguese use of double-II to represent /w/, or else as a diphthong or a VC syllable whose second element is a semivowel (cf. chapter 3 § 3.2.4). In addition, the scribe has not used any (')' to indicate palatalization of the /l/, a spelling that is, however, found a few words on in the clitic pronoun of 'D *fo-le* 'that it be (to it)', as well as a number of cases in *O libro de komo se fazen as kores* and *O libro de ma<gika*.

#### **זירי** 2

#### zere

'be (it)'. This first word of the paragraph itself poses a difficult reading. As a form of the verb *ser*, the initial  $r_z$  would not be expected. It is possible, if unlikely, that the first letter is in fact  $\overrightarrow{P} q$  (if written small, a cursive  $\widetilde{}$  can more closely resemble cursive  $\hat{E}_z$ ), in which case this may be a form of ModPg. *querer* 'want' (perhaps used in the sense of Fr. *falloir*). In addition, the second consonant could well be  $\neg d$  rather than  $\neg r$  (see note line 4).

#### קוייסי

#### koyçe

'heel' or 'paw'. ModPg. *coice <* calx, calcis 'heel', a variant of the more common *calcanhar <* \*calcaneare

### אאון גוליאו

#### aun gulio

'to the knee/foreknuckle'. ModPg. *joelho* < OPg. *geolho* < \*GENUCULU < GENICULUM, a diminutive of GENU, -US 'knee'. This interpretation depends upon reading the middle letter as 7 l rather than  $\Im \beta$ , which more closely resemble each other in this script (cursive  $\ddot{I}$  and  $\hat{}$ ). It is possible that the

scribe has left out a l between the two  $\aleph$  in the first word and that it is in fact אואון *oun* 'or a'.

# אין סיאל

en çeal 'above' (or some other prepositional expression).

### 3 באסו

### baço

'spleen' or 'hindquarters'. Though this term clearly resembles ModPg. baço 'spleen' < Gk. h<br/>epátion (Houaiss 2001), it could be a figurative use of the word derived from BASSU (ModPg. baixo 'low'; cf. Yid. אהחת tux¥s 'behind (n.)', whose Hebrew source is the preposition 'beneath').

### 4 מאנדואו

### mandou

'I send'. A causative -like use of the verb (ModPg. *mandar* 'send, order'). Note the simpler spelling of the desinence מאנדו *mando* in line 5. That this and the other verbs in the prescription are not third-person preterite forms is supported by the more obviously first-person pu < ge in line 7 (see below).

### פואיר ליי א שינטדו

### poer ly<sup>e</sup> a sent<sup>a</sup>do

'sit him down'. Cursive,, *d* and *r* are extremely similar in most Sephardic manuscripts, and although the final consonant in the last word here more closely resembles *-*, it is difficult to find a plausible interpretation for the word as שינטרו *sentro*.

### 5 אלי

### ale

'far away', lit. 'beyond'. Houaiss (2001) cites the competing etymologies for ModPg.  $al\acute{e}m <$  (AD) ILLINC (Da Cunha 1982), or < ECCE HINC (Machado 1967), although given the <I> the former seems more likely.

## 6 דיגולאר

### degolar

ModPg. *degolar* 'behead' < DECOLLARE (Houaiss 2001), probably used here in the sense of 'slit (the throat)'.

### אואה בהמה קרניירו

### uah behema karneiro

'a (domestic) animal, (a) ram'. The first term is a generic Hebrew word for 'animal' (Eng. *behemoth* derives from the Greek transcription of its plural form). However if the second term (ModPg. *carneiro* 'ram') is an adjective modifying the first word (as in 'a horned animal'), it would be expected to agree with the feminine gender of the Hebrew noun (which the article, for its part, does). Hence the vernacular term is more likely an elaboration on the Hebrew word.

### פידסוש

### pedªços

'pieces'. Easily misread as לירסוש *perços* ('piercings', perhaps based on Fr. *percer*), this is more likely akin to ModPg. *pedaço* < \* PITACIU < PITTACIUM, a form of which occurs more clearly in line 8.

### פוגי 7

### pu<ge

'I placed'. ModPg. *puxe* 'pull' < PULSAVI, apparently used here with a slight modification in meaning.

### די ריבה

### de ribªh

'above'. An alternative to אריבה  $arib^ah$  in line 4, in the case composed with the preposition *de*.

### פֿין קי 8

### fin ke

'until'. Akin to ModIt. *finchè*, this conjunction does not appear to survive in exactly this form and sense in the modern language (cf. ModPg. *a fim de* 'in order that').

### 9 או שאנגרו

### o sangro

'(I) bleed it'. ModPg. *sangrar* < \**sanglar* < \**sanguilar*, a dissimilated form of sanguinare (Houaiss 2001).

# 10 לוגו דו בראסו

### logo do braço

'over the coals'. ModPg. *logo* 'soon, then' is apparently used here with a spatial reference. The second term ooccurs in Modern Portuguese as the feminine collective *brasa*. Like the English word *braise* 'cook in liquid', is most likely borrowed from Fr. *braise* '(hot) charcoal'. The TLF suggests it is a Germanic loanword of obscure origin, attested as early as tenth-century Latin *brasa carbones* (with feminine gender, as opposed to the form here).