Arabic Traces in the Hebrew Writing of Arab Authors in Israel

Arabic Traces in the Hebrew Writing of Arab Authors in Israel

By

Aadel Shakkour

Arabic Traces in the Hebrew Writing of Arab Authors in Israel

By Aadel Shakkour

This book first published 2021

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

A. Theoretical background

The subject of the present study is the influence of Arabic on the Hebrew of Arab writers in Israel. In my MA thesis (Shakkour 2009) I discussed the influence of Arabic on the Hebrew writings of Anton Shammas; however, so far no comprehensive study has been made of the traces of Arabic in the literary works of other Arab writers (Naim Araydi, Sayyid Qashu, Atallah Mansour, Gerries Tannous, Muhammad Ghanayim, Usama Abu Ghush and Salman Natour) originally composed in Hebrew or translated from Arabic into Hebrew by an Arab writer. Arabs writing literature in Hebrew is a relatively new phenomenon.[1] A number of researchers have described this phenomenon, in an attempt to explain the motives for its emergence, but have ignored the lexical and syntactic influence of Arabic on the works in question.[2]

The study below is based on the examination of the writings of numerous authors, from a variety of cultural and educational backgrounds. The research questions addressed here are the following:

Is the influence of Arabic equally great among most authors; what can we conclude from this?

Is there a connection between an author's education and the nature and strength of Arabic influences?

Do most authors adhere in equal measure to Arabic texts when they are translated into Hebrew, and how does the research affect the strength of the influences?

---

[1] See Shakkour 2013, pp. 1-17.
[2] Abu Bakr (2002) studied the influence of Arabic as a native language on the written Hebrew of 17-18-year-old Arab students taking the matriculation exams in the years 1996-2000, but made no mention of the influence of Arabic on the Hebrew writings of Arab authors. On the influence of Arabic on Modern Hebrew, see Marʿī (2012, pp. 10-17).

> Do Arab authors tend to preserve Arabic syntactic structures when writing in Hebrew or when translating their texts into Hebrew; what are the motivations for this?

Many prominent writers today compose literature in a language that is not their native tongue, that is, in the language of the "other". Some use the language of the other to express personal experiences or emotions, others use it on official occasions when speaking before a certain audience, and still others choose it freely and consciously because they feel comfortable and fluent in it. Discussing the other in literary research means focusing on the literature of minorities, minor literature, literature of groups that have historically been marginalized, and may also be motivated by a general liberal interest in strengthening the identity of cultural groups and in the promotion of cultural variation and multiculturalism. Focusing on the other shows to what extent culture itself is a variable ideological structure.[3] A good example of writing in the language of the other is that of the Algerian author Assia Jabbār, who consciously chose to write in French, the language of the colonizers in Algeria. She felt the need to express the brutality of French colonialism in the French language, and to use that language to document the Algerian people's rebellion and heroic struggle against the French enemy. As she explained, writing in the language of the other means making the other tangible and discernable.[4]

Margolin discussed syntactic traces of Arabic in the language of Anton Shammas' novel *Arabesques*.[5] She describes the many Arabic traces in this Hebrew novel as stylistic embellishments, that decorate the text like arabesques. They do not mar the quality of the novel's Hebrew, but create "a literary language that differs from all the languages of Hebrew literature so far".[6] Shammas was able to create such a language because of his intimate acquaintance with contemporary written Hebrew on one hand, and the linguistic culture of modern written Arabic on the other. His achievement thus reflects the diglossia in which he lives, as an Israeli Arab writer who is fluent in both Hebrew and Arabic.

---

[3] Buchweitz, Marʿī and Fragman 2010, p. 10.

[4] Jabbār 2003, pp. 19-27.

[5] Margolin 2003, pp. 53-60; Margolin 1996, pp. 296-348.

[6] Prof. Menahem Pery, editor of 'סראיא בת השד הרע', Shammas' Hebrew translation of Emile Habibi's سرايا بنت الغول (*Sarāyā the Ghoul's Daughter*), praises the translator for having produced a masterpiece which succeeds in conveying the qualities of Habibi's Arabic in a type of Hebrew which he created.

B. Bilingual literary activities of Arab writers in Israel

Any minority that lives adjacent to a dominant majority will be affected by the latter in many ways, in culture, customs and language. The evidence for this is readily available from a study of history, for example Spain during the period of Muslim rule. Spanish society was greatly influenced by Arabic and borrowed hundreds of Arabic words. The same was true of the Arab world during the Ottoman period, when numerous Turkish words entered Arabic (Dana 2000, p. 13). The same is true of the Arabs of Israel, a minority within a country with a Hebrew-speaking Jewish majority; this minority, too, is of course affected by this in numerous ways, especially in the linguistic domain, as a minority that speaks Hebrew fluently.

Among the Arabs of Israel Hebrew plays an important role in everyday life. Almost all Arabs have some command of Hebrew. Hebrew is taught in all Arab schools, and daily contact between Jews and Arabs have made this language a necessary element of life, and has enhanced its status within Arab society.

A good working knowledge of Hebrew among the Arabs of Israel gives them access to the dominant Jewish majority and to its social, economic and educational resources. Language is the main mechanism for interpersonal communication with the outside world, and a means for strengthening social frameworks and cultural awareness (Marʿī 2001, pp. 45-46). For this reason, Hebrew is an important tool in Israeli Arabs' everyday lives (Amara 2002, pp. 86-101).

Contact between Arabs and Hebrew speakers takes place in many different places: government offices, the workplace, restaurants, etc. Because of this contact, numerous Hebrew words and phrases have entered colloquial Arabic and are in common use among Arabs in Israel, for example *be-seder* ("ok"), ʿ*aruts* ("channel"), *mivtsa*ʿ ("sale"), *qanyon* ("shopping mall"), *matsil* ("lifeguard") and many more.[7] The use of Hebrew words and sentences by Israeli Arabs is not uniform, but takes place at different levels.[8] The extent of borrowing depends on gender, age, place of

---

[7] Dana (1983, pp. 47-49) and Amara (1999, pp. 81-103) speak of "linguistic merger" (الدَّمْجُ اللّغَوِي) in spoken Arabic, that is, the inclusion of Hebrew words and even complete sentences in one's speech, for example: شُفْتْ طبلات ال ليغه مِش لَلْ نوער لَلْ مבוגרים ("Did you see the league chart? Not the youth [league chart], the adult one").

[8] Amara (1986, p. 3) notes that Arabic also borrowed terms from English, as did many other languages, especially in the fields of science and technology. In this

residence, frequency of contact, etc. Thus Hebrew words are used by men more frequently than by women, since Arab men have closer contact with Jewish society than Arab women, especially in the workplace and in government offices. Young people are more adept in Hebrew than the elderly. The former's exposure to Hebrew is greater, because young people spend more of their leisure time in places of amusement in Jewish cities and because they are exposed to publications in Hebrew, especially newspapers, which help improve their Hebrew and cause them to use Hebrew words when conversing in Arabic (Amara 2002, p. 87).

Geography and place of residence are also significant factors in the use of Hebrew by Israeli Arabs. The closer one's place of residence is to Jewish urban centers, the greater the influence of the Hebrew language. Thus the Arabs of the Triangle region and the Negev use Hebrew more extensively than the Arabs in Galilee, and in mixed cities and neighborhoods the everyday use of Hebrew is greater, since in such places the public institutions are shared by both Jews and Arabs. The daily contact between Jewish and Arab citizens has enhanced the status of Hebrew among Arabs (Amara and Marʿī 2002, p. 58).

Yet another factor that influences the use of Hebrew among Israel's Arabs is employment outside of one's place of residence. Employers in most workplaces are Hebrew-speaking Jews, as are managers, many of the employees, and the clients. The names of tools and machines used at work are Hebrew, as are their operating instructions. This state of affairs makes it necessary to learn Hebrew, which has come to play a dominant role in the lives of Arabs. We note here that Hebrew is not a difficult language for Arabs, who learn it quite quickly, since both Hebrew and Arabic are Semitic languages and share many lexical items.[9]

Although Hebrew is the second most important language for Israeli Arabs, both because it is necessary for contact with Jews in everyday life and because it serves as an agent of modernization, there still exist sociolinguistic restrictions on language convergence, as noted by Ben-Rafael (1994, p. 176):

> The double identity (Palestinian and Israel) is reflected in the linguistic repertoire of Palestinians in Israel. The tension between the two identities,

---

respect, the close relations between Israel and the United States are also a factor: some English words entered Arabic through Hebrew.

[9] Amara and Kabha 1996, pp. 60-62; Marʿī 2002/3, pp. 133-136; Cohen 1968, p. 670; Dana 2000, pp. 165-170.

Israeli and Palestinian, has limited the degree of approach to Hebrew, the language of the dominant Jewish culture. In other words, the Arabs have adopted the strategy of linguistic integration. On one hand, they attempt, through the acquisition of high-level Hebrew language skills, to connect to the broad social network shaped by the majority culture, and on the other hand they preserve their identity by keeping their mother tongue.

Snir (1990, pp. 248-253) provided an extensive description of how the culture of the majority in Israel attempted to obtain control of the Arab minority after the establishment of the State of Israel, an event which the Arabs viewed as *nakba* ("tragedy"). The Israeli establishment strove to implement a process of reeducation and re-acculturation, through which the Arabs of Israel would be detached from the Palestinian heritage and become integrated into the life of the state.[10] Arab nationalism of any kind was perceived as dangerous; the Israeli establishment and the Israeli public maintained the view, expressed well by the poet Maḥmoud Darwish before he left Israel, that every Arab was suspect and guilty. The Israeli establishment took harsh steps in order to achieve its aim. Thus, the Orientalist Michael Asaf, a major figure in the establishment's Arabic arm in the 1950s, and as such the managing editor of establishment journals such as the weekly *Ḥaqīqat al-amr*, the daily *Al-Yawm* and the journal *Ṣadā l-tarbiya* (Arabic-language organ of the Teachers' Union), called for more Hebrew lessons in Arab primary schools, at the expense of Arabic language lessons. For this reason, he was unpopular among Arabs (especially Communists) and was often described as a disseminator of hatred, incitement and misinformation concerning the Arab minority.

In contrast to Snir, who argued that the majority culture in Israel failed in its attempts to gain control over the state's Arab minority, Amir (1992, p. 41) is of the opinion that no such failure occurred, simply because the majority culture consciously and as a matter of principle refrained from any systematic and purposeful action. It wanted Arabs, if at all (in theory more than in fact), merely as adding a quaintly picturesque oriental flavor to the country, as law-abiding and hardworking subjects, and hoped they would be only passive players in party politics. It quite openly preferred Arabs who were "loyal to their people and their heritage", even when

---

[10] The main argument used by the policymakers who designed the Hebrew language curriculum was that Hebrew not only promotes the economic development of the Arab minority, but that is also helps it to integrate into the majority and to reduce existing gaps between the Arab and the Jewish communities in Israel (Spolsky and Shohamy 1999, p. 108).

fighting for their rights "in our enlightened regime", but not as full-fledged Israelis.

Snir (1997, pp. 141-153) also described in detail the phenomenon of Arab authors who write in Hebrew, and explained the background for this development. He argues that it is connected to the broader issue of the interrelations between the majority and the minority cultures and to the political power balance between them, which affects the literary scene as well. Bilingual Arab authors have their roots in the culture of the Arab minority in Israel, which exists within the culture of the country's Jewish majority. Usually, a minority culture adopts a position of opposition towards the culture of the majority; this is certainly the case here, where the majority culture, especially in the 1950s and the first half of the 1960s, attempted to gain control over the minority culture. Taha (2006, p. 1) discusses this at length:

> The rulers of Israel after the war of 1948 found themselves with an Arab minority that remained planted in the homeland. Some viewed this minority as a historical danger and made every effort to expel it. Others planned to Hebraize man and land, and indeed did succeed in Hebraizing the names of territories, springs, rivers, some village names and some names of cities. For example, *Wādī l-Ḥawārīth* was changed to *ʿEmeq Ḥefer*, the river *al-ʿŪjā* was changed to *Yarqon*, the city of *ʿAkkā* became *ʿAko*, *Yāfā* became *Yafo*, *Ṣafad* became *Tsfat* and *Bīsān* became *Bet Sheʾan*. But they did not succeed in changing the name of Arab lands and Arab people. At the beginning of Israeli rule over this Arab minority, the intention was to teach only Hebrew in Arab schools, in order to Hebraize the Arab minority. But this attempt failed, and so some Zionist intellectuals sought alternative plans to Hebraize this minority. On May 25 Eliahu Agasi, of the ruling MAPAI Party published an article in the newspaper *Davar* in which he called on Arab writers and poets in Israel to write in Hebrew, but his call was ignored. To the contrary, the Arabs of Israel rebelled against it, so Agasi changed his proposal and called on the Arabs to write Arabic using the Hebrew alphabet, in the same way that some medieval Jewish writers and poets wrote their works in Arabic using Hebrew letters. But this call, too, was rejected, and made the Arabs more determined to adhere to their own language. In fact, all these plans aimed at Hebraizing the minority created a huge response among Israel's Arabs and made their adherence to the Arabic language and to writing Arabic correctly a matter of national pride. Indeed, the preservation of Arabic from any kind of Hebraization is a matter of national importance, no less than the preservation of Arab land; to the contrary, preservation of the Arabic language is more important than preservation of Arab land.

In response to efforts made by the culture of the majority to impose its cultural hegemony in the same way it imposed its political hegemony and to assimilate the culture of the minority within it, members of the minority engaged in intensive national cultural activity, the likes of which cannot be found in other Palestinian communities. This cultural confrontation is taking place against a backdrop of ambiguous interrelations: the Arab minority was the majority before the establishment of the State of Israel, and can still lay a claim to being the majority, if one takes the demographic balance in the entire Middle East into consideration. In contrast, the current Jewish majority is not only a minority in the Middle East, which is entirely Arab, but its collective consciousness is still suffused with the memory of existing as a minority throughout history, both in Palestine and in the Diaspora. Small wonder, then, that it still exhibits patterns of expression that typify minorities fighting for existence and hiding their power through these patterns.[11]

It only against the background of the dialectics of this complex political and cultural confrontation that it is possible to understand the complicated psychological and cultural world inhabited by the few authors who, unlike most members of the minority, certainly most of the intellectuals among them, did not restrict their use of Hebrew to practical communication purposes, but also wrote literature in that language. Snir notes that such linguistic-literary dualism is not unusual in societies in which a minority culture arises beside the culture of the majority, as a result of a system of political power relations. However, in Israel the high status of Arabic in the mostly Muslim minority's cultural and religious heritage has limited the production of works of literature in Hebrew to marginal groups, mainly Christians and Druze, for Arabic is not only the mother tongue, but also the language of religion, the Qurʾān, scholarship and heritage (Marʿī 2002/3, p. 130). The phenomenon of Hebrew writings by Arabs emerged in the Hebrew literary system only in the course of the 1980s, in the wake of the activities of the Druze Naim Araydi and the Christian Anton Shammas.

Shammas was born in the village of Fasūṭa in Galilee (1950). He achieved renown through his translations of Emile Habibi's works from Arabic into Hebrew, the articles he wrote for Israeli newspapers, and especially his first novel, *Arabesques* (1986), the most important Hebrew work of literature ever composed by an Arab. Not only was it not originally written in Arabic, it was also never translated into Arabic, although its author is

---

[11] See Grossman 1992, p. 199; Kayyal 2006, pp. 15-16.

one of the best Arabic-Hebrew translators (Margolin 1996, p. 18). The title *Arabesques* characterizes both the novel's content and its style. In content, it jumps around in space and time, with memory winding back and forth like a picturesque and twisted arabesque, while its style involves the use of numerous Arabic traces that serve as decoration. Naim Araydi was a Druze from the village of Maghār, where he lived with his family. He had a Ph.D. in Hebrew literature (his dissertation is about the poetry of Uri Zvi Greenberg). He was a well-known poet who received a number of prizes for his verses. Many of his poems, some in Arabic and others in Hebrew, have been translated into various languages and have appeared in poetry collections in Europe. *Fatal Christening* (*Ṭevila Qatlanit*) was his first novel (*Lexicon of Modern Hebrew Literature* 2005).

Snir (1990, p. 258) agrees with Hever (1989, pp. 193-196), that most locally-composed Arabic literature is still outside the Hebrew literary canon, although in the last two decades this literature has managed, albeit slowly, to break into the Hebrew canon and move from the rejected margins of the minority culture into the domain of the authoritative culture of the majority. This development is reflected in the growing number of translations into Hebrew, and its apex may be seen in attempts by Arab authors to write in Hebrew, the language of the majority.[12] Hever considers this a dramatic moment, in which the dialectic of power relations manifests itself through the cultural confrontation between the minority and the majority. In order to exhaust the possibilities of breaking through to the canonical center, the minority identifies weak spots in the majority culture and attacks then, thus forcing the majority's cultural mechanisms to grant it legitimacy, weight and significance.

Kochavi (1999, p. 267) notes that Shammas and Araydi, as well as others such as Ghanayim, constitute a cultural elite among Israel's Arabs. All

---

[12] We note that writers such as Anton Shammas, Muhammad Ghanayim and Salman Natour received their formal education in the Israeli school system and adhered closely to the Hebrew source text. As a result, their translations show clear influences of Hebrew and suffer from a lack of linguistic uniformity. This approach, which treats Hebrew as a dominant culture, deepened the isolation of this translation activity in the view of the Arab target audience, which refused to accept the hegemony of Hebrew. Small wonder, then, that two prominent representatives of this school of translation, Shammas and Ghanayim, ceased their translation work, apparently due to fierce criticism on the part of Arabs both in Israel and abroad, and the feelings of unease that accompanied their attempts to bridge the gap between two mutually alienated cultures (Kayyal 2005, p. 132; Shammas 1985, pp. 18-19).

three have also been active in frameworks belonging to the Hebrew majority culture. They belong to a prestigious and important class, whose views are respected and whose members are perceived in Hebrew culture as authoritative experts on Arab culture. She argues that were it not for the prominent status which Shammas and Araydi enjoyed in both cultures, it was doubtful whether Israeli institutions and publishers would have asked them to edit anthologies (Shammas is the editor of *Bishney Qolot* [*With Two Voices*]) or journals (Ghanayim edits the journal *Mifgash* [*Encounter*], financed by the Histadrut labor organization), or would have agreed to published anthologies of their own making (Araydi edited *Ḥayalim shel Mayim* [*Soldiers of Water*]).

Snir (1997, pp. 142-143) insists that it is not for lack of space that any discussion of Arab authors' writings in Hebrew focuses on Araydi and Shammas, but rather it is because they are the only Arab writers since the establishment of the State of Israel whose works carry any weight at all in Hebrew literature, in contrast to other writers, whose compositions proved to have been only fleeting episodes, for example Aṭallah Mansour, [13] author of the first Hebrew novel composed by an Arab (*Be-Or Ḥadash—In a New Light*, 1966). Other Arab writers in Hebrew who have received media attention in the new millennium include Sayyid Qashu, [14] who received the Prime Minister's Prize for Hebrew Writers after the publication of his ʿ*Aravim Roqdim* (*Dancing Arabs*) and *Vayehi Boqer* (*And It Was Morning*) (2010), which were translated into several language and garnered considerable praise. [15] The latest novel by an Arab author in

[13] Born in the village of Jīsh in Upper Galilee. He studied in Lebanon in the years 1946-1950. He returned clandestinely to Israel in 1950, and obtained Israeli citizenship only ten years later. After his return he lived for a year in the kibbutz of Shaʿar ha-ʿAmaqim, where he began to learn Hebrew. He worked as a youth counselor and later as a journalist for the weekly *Ha-ʿOlam Haze* (1954-1958). In the years 1958-1991 he was a reporter for the newspaper *Haʾaretz*. He wrote in Arabic, Hebrew and English.

[14] Born in Ṭīra. His father was a banker and his mother a teacher. He was the second of four children. At the age of fifteen he was accepted to the School of Science and Art in Jerusalem, a boarding school considered the best of its kind in Israel. After graduation he studied philosophy and sociology at the Hebrew University. After college he worked as a reporter for the newspaper *Kol ha-ʿIr*. Later he also wrote television reviews and a personal column. His captivating style and his refusal to become a kind of Uncle Tom expressing a synthetic type of "Israeliness" make him the target of nationalist criticism; however, this only served to enhance his prestige as a journalist.

[15] In *Dancing Arabs* Qashu describes his traumatic first encounter with Jewish society. It remained high on the bestseller list for eleven weeks, and was also well-

Hebrew is Sayyid Qashu's *Guf Sheni Yaḥid* (*Second Person Singular*, 2010).[16] In this connection we may also mention the authors Salman Natour, who wrote the Hebrew documentary book *Holkhim ʿal ha-Ruaʿ — Siḥot Be-Beit Shaʾan* (*Walking on the Wind—Conversations in Beit Sheʿan*, 1992),[17] Jeries Tannous' Hebrew novel *Be-Tsel ha-Shezaf – Tmunot me-Ḥayeh Shekhunati* (*Under the Shade of the Jujube Tree – Pictures of the Life of My Neighborhood*, 2007),[18] and Odeh Bisharat's Hebrew novel *Ḥutsot Zaytūniyya* (*The Streets of Zatunia*, 2009).[19]

---

received abroad. It was translated into Italian, German, French, Dutch and English. In *And It Was Morning* Qashu describes a young family's move from the city to their parents' village. The move to the village is described as a disaster, the end of all dreams and hopes. The narrator discovers this truth immediately upon his arrival in the village, which he describes in extremely depressing tones.

[16] I have not included the Hebrew version of Odeh Bisharat's novel *Ḥutsot Zaytūniyya* (*The Streets of Zatunia*, 2009), because the author translated it together with Prof. Moshe Ron. It was originally published in Arabic (ساحات زنوبيا - *Sāḥāt Zanūbia*, 2007).

[17] Born in Dāliyat al-Karmil, 1949. He studied philosophy at the Hebrew University and Haifa University. He is a writer, journalist, playwright and lecturer on philosophy and Arab culture, director of the Emile Toma Institute for Palestinian and Israeli Studies, and editor of the journal *Israeli Issues*, published in Ramallah. He has published twenty-five books: novels, short stories, literary criticism and books documenting the Palestinian memory. He translated David Grossman's *Ha-Zman ha-Tsahov* (*The Yellow Wind*) and Prof. Yeshaya Leibowitz's *Siḥot ʿal Madaʿ va-ʿArakhim* (*Conversations on Science and Ethics*) from Hebrew into Arabic.

[18] Born in Maghār, 1937, to peasant parents. From 1956 lives in Acre. A retired educator, he taught Hebrew language and literature in Arab high schools for forty-eight years. He is a graduate of Haifa University's departments of Hebrew Language and Literature and of Arabic Language and Literature. He composes prose and poetry in both languages. So far he has published three novels and two dictionaries in Arabic, as well as two dictionaries entitled *ʿImut Naʿim* (*Pleasant Confrontation*) about similarities and identical features between Hebrew and Arabic: Hebrew-Arabic and Arabic Hebrew. His *Under the Shade of the Jujube Tree* is written from the perspective of a boy from a peasant family, whose life proceeds mainly between one prank to another and the punishments he receives for them. Between stealing figs and trapping and freeing thrushes the extensive violence in the book—every page contains an act of violence, be it a kick from his brother or a thrashing by a priest or teacher—takes on almost a peaceable character.

[19] An Israeli Arab journalist and author, residing in the village of Yafīʿ. His family was displaced from the village of Maʿlūl. He served as the head of the National Committee of Arab High School Students and the Arab Students' Union at Haifa University. He was the Secretary General of Hadash—Democratic Front for Peace

The literary activities of Araydi and Shammas were affected by the fact that they belonged to two mutually estranged cultural systems: the Arabic system, within which they were born and took their first literary steps, and the Hebrew system, into which they were cast, at first against their will and later as a conscious esthetic preference. It is thus not to be wondered that they focused mainly on the dividing line between Hebrew and Arabic literature. Both are well-known translators. Their natural talent, their well-developed spiritual world, their expressive skills, fluent Hebrew, unique style and modernist techniques, enable them to write Hebrew fluently, occasionally even more fluently than in their Arabic mother tongue.[20]

Snir (1997, pp. 142-143) adds that in Araydi's and Shammas' natural Arab environment they are an oddity because of their conscious esthetic connection to Hebrew culture, while in Hebrew literature they are an oddity not only as recently arrived foreigners, but also, and mainly, because their activity within the system is made possible by the fact that they are treated as representatives of a minority. Hebrew literature is prepared to accept them almost only as authors who fill the slot which the Israeli cultural system (like the political system) designates for minorities. Thus, they find themselves working within a culture which, to put it mildly, does not consider the minority's culture as its main focus. Still, as writers operating at the margins of Arabic literature who strive to reach the canonical center of the majority's culture, their writings are aimed mainly at a Jewish audience and deal almost exclusively with questions of cultural identity. The penetration of such writers into the Israeli cultural system is never preplanned; it always involves solitary individuals with certain cultural preferences, whose common denominator can only be discovered after the fact. An examination of Araydi's and Shammas' activity in Israeli

---

and Equality (a political party) at the beginning of the 2000s and has a column in the newspapers *Ha'aretz* and *al-Ittiḥād*.

[20] Tannous, for example, has explicitly declared that his Hebrew writing skills are better than those in Arabic: "My linguistic wealth in Hebrew was greater than in Arabic. In Hebrew I succeeded in finding several synonyms for every word. I felt freer". Tannous' excellent Hebrew is not only the result of many years of experience with the language and his love for it, but is also based on ideology: "It is not only my love for writing with two pens, like your great people in the Middle Ages. I also want to contribute something". He explains: "To sweeten the pill. After all, to dispute there are many contributors, but to reconciliation there are not". When Tannous waves in greeting to his neighbor Ofra and she responds with a smile, it is easy to become addicted to the spirit of coexistence which he exudes: "Look what a life together we have here. Not just coexistence, but living together".

culture reveals that they present two distinct models of members of the Arab minority who are active within Israeli culture.

Amir (1992, p. 40) disagrees with Snir and others who have expressed reservations concerning the writings of Arabs as "Hebrew" authors and who view the works of Shammas, Araydi and their like as a passing and atypical phenomenon.[21] He does not understand why Snir, Oren and others were "excited" at Shammas' and Araydi's acceptance as legitimate authors in Hebrew literature. According to Snir, only a Jew can be a Hebrew author; according to Oren, Hebrew literature perforce possesses "a national, Jewish tone" and must convey a "vision", which in the nature of things must be Jewish and Zionist.[22] Amir (ibid., p. 39) discusses the situation as described by Yosef Oren,[23] concerning the danger of blurring the identity of Hebrew literature as a literature possessing a Jewish national character. According to Oren, until less than fifty years ago Hebrew literature did indeed possess such a national character. He views the activity of authors such as Shammas and Araydi as "problematic", because it presages an "unavoidable process" of mutual absorption of "authors of Jewish origin and authors from another national origin". This process, if allowed to continue, will cause Hebrew literature eventually to lose its Jewish national character. As evidence for his thesis, Oren mentions the fact that even today most "Israeli authors of Jewish origin" do not address the problem of the national culture's continuity; that writing which focuses on "actual Hebrew" values, ideas, topics and experiences is today perceived as merely "ethnic, old-fashioned and irrelevant literature". Amir (ibid., p. 40) views the Hebrew works of Arab authors as decisive evidence for the realization of the Canaanite vision; he adds that these works, rather than portending a melting pot of nationalities in Israel, mark its evolution towards a territorial, secular and democratic national society. He points out that every nation, every linguistic group, every national culture, every collective possessing any kind of linguistic-territorial uniqueness, whatever its religion or ethnicity, and usually also

---

[21] An opinion which is similar to that of Mahmoud Darwish (2004, pp. 2-3), who views it as a "fad". He believes it may signify an attempt at integration into Hebrew culture, perhaps as a rebellion against the Israelis in their own language.

[22] Amir points out that according to this approach, whoever is not of Jewish origin (especially if one is a native of this land, born and bred within the Arabic language and its culture) cannot of course belong. Even "loving stepsons", to use Snir's somewhat enthusiastic expression, are such that "their gift will not be well-received, nor their love".

[23] A prominent literary critic, who has for many years analyzed the works of contemporary Hebrew literature.

whatever its ideology, accepts the "other" to some degree. In a world of nations, certainly in the modern world, no nation is isolated, and no culture can for any length of time avoid the integration of "others" for reasons of religion, ethnicity, gender or ideology or to prevent them from operating within its cultural systems. Amir speaks of a far-reaching development in our generation, namely a process of renewal and changes in values following the absorption of people from "outside" who participate in the creative activities of cultures with a long history of distinct national and linguistic features. Clear examples of this process can be seen in the fertile contributions made by writers and intellectuals of Indian, Caribbean, Vietnamese, Polish, Russian, Romanian, Bulgarian, Hungarian, Greed, Spanish, Canadian, American, Australian, Arab, Israeli, Chinese, Japanese and African origin to the literature, art and music of countries such as Britain and France, not to speak of the United States, which appears to still possess a limitless capacity for absorption, melting and integration. The Muslim Arab culture, whose values and achievements, at least until the Ottoman period, have been highly praised, arose and flourished thanks to members of the cultures which it conquered, crushed and "digested" (speakers of Aramaic, Persian, Greek and Coptic; Zoroastrian Iranian, members of various eastern Christian denominations, Jews and Berber). Without all these nations, with their ancient heritages and cultural traditions, the sword-wielding camel riders who came out of the Arabian desert in the seventh century under the flag of Islam would have left no historical or cultural imprint. Amir presents another example, in question form, based on the history of the Jewish people:

> Does not its "canonical" historical memory provide hints as thick as the beam of an oil-press for mutual nourishment between it and its neighbors, for constant processes of assimilation and integration from which it was built and nourished (and in hindsight also suffered, it is true) from the dawn of its history? And the demographic abilities it demonstrated, on the eve of the destruction of its second temple and in its wake, for rebelling against the powerful Roman Empire and for confronting it time and again? Did this not come about to a crucial extent thanks to their semi-Hellenistic kings who imposed their rule and their Judaism on entire populations in territories such as Edom and "the Galilee of nations", territories which would later give rise to rebel leaders such as Yoḥana of Gush Ḥalav and Shimʿon Son of the Convert ("Bar Giora"), just as they apparently gave rise to Jesus the Galilean and his first disciples, founders of a new religion that spread over the entire world?

Shammas and Araydi were graduates of the establishment school system, which strove to educate Arab intellectuals to identify with the aims of a

state whose national character perforce makes them second-class citizens. Shammas (1986, p. 212) tells of the humiliation involved in adopting the occupier's symbols, such as the gigantic star of David which one of his teachers constructed of six wooden beams, on the orders of the school principal, who wished to impress the Jewish superintendent who had been invited to observe the students' achievements during their first year of public school. Snir (1992, p. 7) speaks of the various activities in which Shammas and Araydi engaged out of a sense of mission, derived from their profound belief in their ability to participate in shaping Israeli society. Already in the 1970s Shammas spoke of the new generation, which manages to break down walls, overcome the Hebrew language barrier, and attempts to reach other fields. This generation enjoyed both worlds: Its knowledge of Hebrew causes it to make its acquaintance with unfamiliar experiences, through Hebrew literature and foreign literature translated into Hebrew, while through its knowledge of Arabic it becomes acquainted with the latest achievements of modern Arabic literature. Qashu, too, speaks of a new generation that has overcome the language barrier and tries to reach new fields (2002, p. 1):

> It is difficult for an Arab to write in Hebrew. It is not so much a linguistic difficulty, as it is a difficulty to address the Israeli reading public at eye level. An author who writes in Hebrew takes into account the fact that he speaks to his audience at eye level. An author who writes in Hebrew takes into consideration the fact that he is addressing an Israeli audience, and that not always, in fact only quite rarely, will one find Arabs who are well-versed in Israeli culture and are fluent in the language that speaks to Israel, or to the reader of Hebrew. I hope very much that the Palestinian citizens of Israel will not be annihilated in the coming years; I have no doubt that then there will be many good writers. I believe that oppression leads to creativity, or at least gives rise to a need to create. The problem is that this is still a society which pushes its talented sons into the liberal professions; arts and literature do not yet carry weight in Arab society. This is the way of a minority that seeks professions that will help it survive. I believe that in the second or perhaps the third generation of Palestinian education inside Israel a creative generation will arise that will conquer the country's cultural stages. If we continue to live together, I am certain that we will play a role similar to that which the blacks fulfill in the United States. As for me, I still dream to be the Arab Cosby.

Araydi and Shammas, writers in the two languages, often feel like steppe wolves suffering the hell of a life lived in two cultures, two crisscrossing faiths (Hesse 1971, p. 26). Thus Shammas felt from the beginning that the path he had chosen embodies a significant statement about his Arab-Palestinian identity. As someone who, in his own words, chose unwillingly

to treat Hebrew as a foster native language, he senses that "this entire deed is a kind of cultural trespass, for which I may have to answer". Against the background of such an identity crisis and such a mental split, it is easy to understand their desire to serve as a bridge of some kind. While the sophisticated Shammas hides this desire, although it is hinted at, for example in *Arabesques*, in which he presents the village of his childhood, Araydi misses no opportunity to stress the fact that he is located at the junction of the two cultures. He does so, not only quite brutally in his collection *Ḥazarti el ha-Kfar* (*I Returned to the Village*, 1986),[24] but also through his activity as critic and researcher in both Arabic and Hebrew literature.

Somekh states that exceptionally difficult translation tasks should be given to Shammas (Somekh 1993, pp. 41-42):

> Shammas took a seemingly almost impossible translation task upon himself when translating Habibi's quite complex works, especially, according to Somekh, the translation of the difficult and complex novel *Sarāyā the Ghoul's Daughter*. After all, Emile Habibi's literary texts do not easily lend themselves to translation, for he does not use the standard modern literary language الفصحى (*al-fuṣḥā*) of our times in the usual way, but imposes a very personal style on it, to an extent that is not found among many Arab authors.

For Kochavi (1999, p. 260) the translation of all of Emile Habibi's novels by Anton Shammas following the popularity of the first of the translations, that of Habibi's novel *The Opsimist*, was a clear success. She wonders why no literary circles of translators from Arabic into Hebrew have been formed to this day; she explains this as due to the dispersed character of the field of Arabic-to-Hebrew translation.

C. The difficulties of translation and the translator's task

Since the present study deals with works composed originally in Hebrew as well as texts translated from Arabic into Hebrew, a discussion of translation, the difficulties it poses and the translator's task is in order. Translation is a complex activity whose success requires great effort. It

---

[24] A poetic passage from the book (pp. 7-8): חָזַרְתִּי אֶל הַכְּפָר / בּוֹ יָדַעְתִּי לִבְכּוֹת בָּרִאשׁוֹנָה / חָזַרְתִּי אֶל הָהָר / בּוֹ הַנּוֹף הוּא הַטֶּבַע / וְאֵין מָקוֹם לִתְמוּנָה / חָזַרְתִּי אֶל בֵּיתִי הֶעָשׂוּי אֲבָנִים / אוֹתָן חָצְבוּ אֲבוֹתַי מִסְּלָעִים / חָזַרְתִּי אֶל עַצְמִי – / וְזוֹ הָיְתָה הַכַּוָּנָה ("I returned to the village / where I first learned to cry / I returned to the mountain / where the scenery is nature / and there is no place for a painting / I returned to my house of stone / which my fathers quarried from rocks / I returned to myself / and that was the intention").

demands considerable skill and talent in both source and target languages. The effort involved can be greater than that of writing the original composition. Translation is performed in the belief that meanings can be retained even when expressed in different words, including the words of another language. Translation has been said to be "a thankless job". People have coped with the obstacles involved in translating texts from one language to another since antiquity; past examples are translations of the Bible, and the transfer of Persian, Indian and other intellectual writings into Arabic.[25]

Students of language, literature and philosophy who discovered translation as a distinct discipline known today as "translation studies", first developed concepts and research methods for these studies based on their original fields of specialization, but gradually independent research methods for the study of translation have evolved. James Holmes, an American researcher at Amsterdam University, appears to have been the first to have given the discipline its name and called for treating it as an independent field of study at a conference held in Copenhagen in 1972.[26] Holmes' lecture at that conference marked an important point in time in the evolution of translation studies, since it was the first attempt to define it as a scientific discipline and to delineate its structures. However, its beginnings as a discipline that uses methodologies and theoretical frameworks based on other disciplines in order to study a broad range of issues related to translation, can be traced back to the 1970s. Today a variety of theoretical approaches to the study of translation exist: functional-communicative, linguistic, psycholinguistic-cognitive, and polysystem theory. The variety of schools and methodologies used for the study of translation is considered by some scholars as an advantage that has helped translation studies to develop into a scientific discipline.

Toury, who treats translation as a cultural phenomenon, puts the concept of "norms" at the center of his theoretical approach. The concept, which originated in work by Levy and Even-Zohar (Weissbrod 1989, p. 3), refers to inter-subjective factors, which are the main constraints operating on any behavioral, social and cultural activity (Kayyal 2006, p. 5). Norms are located between two end points of constraints: at one end there are objective rules, and at the other idiosyncratic, subjective rules.[27] The act of

---

[25] Blum-Kulka 1976, p. 12; Weissbrod 2007, p. 15.
[26] Kayyal 2000, p. 2; 2006, pp. 1-2; Toury 1995, p. 7; Weissbrod, ibid., p. 25; Gentzler 1993, p. 74.
[27] Toury 1972, pp. 223-224; 1974, p. 366; 1977, p. 6; 1995, pp. 54-55.

translation depends on norms at all its stages. The translator fulfills a social function, and usually knows what the preferred translation behavior is in a given socio-cultural situation (Toury 1995, p. 53). In principle a translator can choose either to obey these norms and be rewarded by society, for example by having the translated text published and receiving favorable reviews, or to ignore the norms, at the risk of negative reactions, for example refusal to publish the translated text, and negative reviews, or none at all (Toury 1995, p. 249; Kayyal 2006, p. 5). Norms[28] can change with changing social values; they can become rules or even laws, or they can lose their authority and become invalid. Norms that are in effect in a given translation sector may become organized into a normative system, with hierarchical relations among its components (Toury 1977, p. 11; Kayyal, ibid., p. 6).

Many scholars have discussed the translator's task. According to Blum Kulka (1976, p. 13) a translator into Hebrew should be required to fit the register of his translation with that of the source text, since Israeli Hebrew in its natural uses possesses clear register distinctions. Walter (1993) discussed the translator's task at length. He defines it (p. 44) as finding an appropriate tone in the target language, one that evokes an echo of the source text. This feature distinguishes translation from the art of composing a work of literature, for the latter never seeks a tone of language *per se*, in its totality, but always directly concerns itself with specific linguistic content contexts. In contrast to the original work, a translation does not view itself as existing within the forest of language itself, but rather remains outside. Without crossing its boundary, a translation calls on the source text to enter into the one unique place which returns in its own language the echoes of the text written in another language. Dudin (2009, pp. 7-8) also mentions the translator's task: "The translator's task is not to transfer the thoughts or the feelings of another mechanically, for literary translation is more important than such things; it is a creative act, and a translator is a creative writer like any other".

In the context of the present study the term "linguistic interference" is emphasized. This term refers[29] to the intervention and reflection of the

---

[28] For more on types of translation norms, see Toury 1980, pp. 53-57; 1995, pp. 51-56; Kayyal 2000, pp. 6-7; 2006, pp. 5-6.

[29] Amara (1999, p. 25), for example, speaks of extensive interference of Hebrew in the Arabic that is spoken in Israel. The source of this interference, in his opinion, lies in the fact that Hebrew is the dominant language in Israeli Arab society's modernization process, and fluency in Hebrew serves as a tool for reaching the same economic, educational and cultural levels as in Jewish society. But Amara

repertory, the rules and the norms of a given language, Arabic in our case, when intentionally realized in another language, Hebrew in our case (Kayyal 2005, p. 129). According to Toury (1980, pp. 71-78) interference is present in any translation, at least to some degree; in other words, it is impossible to translate from one language into another without interfering in the text. Toury (1995, pp. 274-279) proposes some ideas for a law of interference:

(1) For interference not to occur in a translation, special conditions and/or great efforts on the translator's part are necessary.

(2) Interference can take two forms: 1. Negative transfer, that is, deviations from the target system's rules and norms under the influence of the source language, and 2. Positive transfer, that is, choosing linguistic forms and structures that exist in the target language in any case, but in a way that is affected by the source language.

(3) Interference is influenced by the mental and cognitive processes that are involved in the act of translation, giving rise to what Toury called "discourse transfer", in which the source text imposes itself on the translator (Weissbrod 1989, p. 253).

(4) There is a clear connection between linguistic interference and the translator's treatment of the source text as a collection of units rather than as an integral entity.

(5) The more the translator takes the character of the source text into consideration when formulating his text, the greater the interference, unless the translator is extremely talented.

(6) Socio-cultural factors can affect the extent to which interference will be tolerated. Toleration tends to increase when the translation is made from a very prestigious or a majority culture/language, especially if the target culture/language is "weak" or that of a minority. But the extent of toleration is not necessarily identical at every textual and linguistic level of the target system.

D. Languages in contact, specifically Hebrew and Arabic

Since the present study is about the influence of Arabic on the Hebrew writings of Arab authors in Israel, an overview of contact linguistics is in

also points out that various factors have worked towards limiting the interference of Hebrew, including the Arab-Israeli conflict, which has intensified tensions between Jews and Arabs in Israel, the fact that most Jews and Arabs live in separate areas, and more.

order.[30] Human collectives make cultural contact in many forms. Language is the basic medium for communication between peoples and between individuals, and also serves as a tool for the transfer of cultural objects. While the forms of contact are quite varied, it is the same medium, language, that mediates between cultures. According to Amara (2005, p. 26), language is an important factor in socialization among children. It is not merely a tool of communication, but also constitutes an essential component in the socialization of the individual. Language not only transfers content, but is itself also content. When two nations come in contact, because geographical proximity, trade or conquest, their languages are affected mutually. In our case, Hebrew and Arabic are languages which historical events have brought into contact with each other at various times in history. When this happens, the two linguistic systems in question meet and a partial intermingling takes place, with the result that linguistic categories of one language affect the other (Basal 2004, p. 32). Wāfī (1971, p. 71) notes that every encounter between two languages or two dialects, whatever the cause or the intensity, will of necessity lead to mutual influence; in other words, no language can for long remain immune to the influence of a language with which it is in contact.

Weinreich, one of the greatest theorists of contact linguistics provides the following definition (1953, p. 7):"The practice of alternately using two languages will be called bilingualism". He argues (ibid., p. 14) that languages in contact experience transfer in the lexicon, phonology and syntax. Transfer usually occurs when a bilingual speaker uses words from the lending language in the borrowing language, or identifies a phoneme in the secondary system with another in the primary system (the mother tongue), to whose rules he adapts that phoneme.

Israeli Arabs provide a classical example of bilingualism, since they are speakers of Hebrew, in addition to their Arabic native tongue. Basal (2004, p. 32) applies to Arabic Ferguson's (1959, p. 336) distinction between a "high variety", classical Arabic in this case, and the colloquial[31] "low

---

[30] Pei (1970, p. 96) notes that linguists recently began to discuss the concept of "languages in contact". Structural analysis of languages shows that the structures of languages in geographical proximity become similar to each other, even when they have disparate origins; such languages develop shared parameters and features as a result of being used by speakers located in a single environment, not because one language quotes another.

[31] Freiha (1964, p. 258) rejects out of hand the claim that spoken Arabic is considered of low status, since it is the language of everyday speech, and so is of no lower status that literary Arabic.

variety", which is in everyday use and does not adhere to the normative rules of the classical language. In spoken Arabic the quantity of foreign elements is relatively larger than in literary Arabic, which attempts to preserve classical norms. In encounters between cultures language serves as the main medium, but the balance of power usually involves the linguistic dominance of one side, which seems to be associated with the cultural dominance of that side.

Higa (1979, p. 278) discussed the borrowing of lexical items as a sociolinguistic phenomenon which reflects a facet of cultural behavior. She noted that the process of lexical borrowing and its results reflect the main aspects and characteristics of both the lending and the borrowing culture, and formulated the following questions about inter-language borrowing as a methodological basis for studying this issue: What are the conditions for a word being borrowed? Who does the borrowing? Why are foreign words borrowed? How are they borrowed? How does the act of borrowing take place? What words are borrowed? To what extent are the borrowed words used in the borrowing language? Basal (Ibid., p. 33) argues that words are borrowed in order to fill a lexical gap in the borrowing language, or due to social motives, as when one is influenced by the dominant language and uses its words following cultural contact, commercial relations or conquest.

Borrowing can have two sources, oral and written. According to Gluska (1999, p. 110), borrowing from the spoken language happens in every case of contact between languages, and clearly has a sociolinguistic background. Society as a whole participates in the act of borrowing, although it begins with the activity of the individual (De Saussure 1964, p. 168), since eventually it is society that determines what is borrowed and what is not. Usually words that are borrowed from speech are technical terms that belong to specific domains of knowledge and industry (Jespersen 1962, p. 30). Gluska (Ibid., p. 168) disagrees with this claim, and argues that there is no reason to believe that speakers' needs concern only technical matters, and that culture, literature and the arts are also important for them.[32]

---

[32] Kaufman (1974, p. 166), who investigated the influence of Akkadian on Aramaic, found also lexical items in the domain of religion and general culture; Bloomfield (1976, p. 465), too, found words belonging to the fields of religion, ethics, hunting and sports. Apparently the only restriction on the type of borrowed word is the needs of the speakers. A form that is borrowed from speech is immediately transferred into the borrowing spoken language, and subsequently becomes naturalized in it and also comes to be used in written communication.

Literature, as a component of human culture, is an important medium for the transfer of concepts and terms, whether or not there is physical contact with the culture in question. It is an important channel of influence between languages, especially through the translation of works of literature from one language to another, and through cultural contacts between peoples and individuals (Basal, ibid., p. 34). Usually borrowing from literature enriches the lexicon of the borrowing language. Thus the encounter of Arabic with Greek and Aramaic literature took place through translated texts, among others. Greek and Aramaic literature were sources of borrowing for the Syrian translators, who knew Arabic in addition to Greek, the language of culture, and Syriac, their mother tongue. They translated treatises on science and philosophy from Greek and Syriac, or from Greek through the mediation of Syriac, and used a relatively large number of concepts and lexical items from the source language. In medieval scientific treatises in Arabic one also finds numerous borrowings of science terms (Basal, ibid., p. 34).[33] Similarly, medieval Arabized Hebrew, which was affected by Arabic from the fourth decade of the seventh century CE, following the Arab conquest of the huge territory between Persia in the east and North Africa and Spain in the west. The local populace adopted the rulers' language, and as time went on Arabic also became the language in which texts were composed on subjects that until then were never dealt with in Hebrew (Maman 1991, p. 106). Thus, for example, R. Saadia Gaon (882-942), who lived and was active in Egypt, Palestine and Babylonia, wrote his important linguistic treatises, *Kutub al-Lugha* (*Books of Language*) on grammar and *Egron*, a lexicon for poets, as well as his philosophy book *Kitāb al-Īmānāt wal-Iʿtiqādāt* (*Book of Beliefs and Opinions*) in Arabic. Yehuda Halevi (1075-1141), too, wrote his *Kitāb al-Ḥujja wal-Dalīl fī l-Dīn al-Dhalīl* (*A Defense of the Despised Faith*) in Arabic, and Maimonides also used Arabic for his *Dalālat al-Ḥāʾirīn* (*Guide for the Perplexed*). However, liturgical poetry, and later secular poetry as well, and *halacha* (religious jurisprudence) continued to be written in Hebrew, and occasionally also in Aramaic, but not in Arabic. From the eleventh century Hebrew also became a target language of translation, for the benefit of Jews of Europe and Asia Minor, who were unable to read the literature which their brethren produced in Judeo-Arabic (Maman 1991, p. 107). Thus, for example, the Karaite scholar Tuvya Ben Moshe came from the Byzantine Empire to Palestine. He was fluent in Arabic and during his years in Jerusalem studied philosophy and theology with Yūsuf al-Baṣīr (Ha-Roʾeh) at the Karaite seminary. While there he translated al-Baṣīr's and Yeshuʿa Ben Yehuda's

---

[33] See more in Bloomfield 1976, p. 444 and Bendavid 1967a, pp. 92-94.

writings from Arabic into Hebrew for Byzantine Jews, whose everyday language was Byzantine Greek and the works of important Karaite authors where thus inaccessible to them.

Linguists are divided on the question of how open languages are to foreign influences. Some identify such influences in every aspect of language, including grammar, while others believe that grammatical influences are minor and that languages are basically impenetrable in this respect (Basal, ibid., p. 35). Weinreich (1953, pp. 29-30) mentions two opposing approaches, which illustrate the debate among linguists. He is of the opinion that the grammatical system in contact is immune to the influence of another language, but he also presents a counter-example, showing that even the feminine ending is not immune to such influence.

It should be noted that the morpho-phonemic system is rigid, and any change in it is clearly visible. Higa (1979, p. 289, Table 4) studied borrowings between English and Japanese and found that English verbs borrowed into Japanese constitute a mere 2 percent of borrowings, compared to ninety-one percent for nouns. According to Gluska (1999, p. 224), the basic assumption is that any linguistic change begins with the speech of an individual, and is gradually disseminate throughout the language. Until the 1970s most researchers rejected the possibility of changes in the morpho-phonemic system under the influence of language contact. However, this system is part of the structure of language, and cannot but be affected by contact with foreign languages (Basal, ibid., p. 36). In recent decades the study of this subject has advanced; thus, for example, we read the following with respect to classifying language components according to their vulnerability to change under contact (Karttunen 1977, p. 183):

> In general, in language contact situation, it appears to be true that vocabulary replacement is persuasive and immediate. Phonology, the most obvious area of systematic linguistic change, seems to be affected next, and syntax remains most resistant to change.

Weinreich (1953, p. 26) notes that it is only natural that the differences between languages in the number and qualities of their phonemes, whatever the language family to which they belong, will cause borrowed words to undergo adaptations of various kinds when used in the borrowing language, and that this will make it difficult to always identify a borrowed form. However, usually phonemes in languages that belong to the same family will be related in a lawful way, making identifications almost certain. Arab grammarians from the earliest times discussed phonematic

relations that can make it possible to identify words as being of foreign origin. In a state of diglossia, it is only natural that the phonemics of one language affect those of the other. The primary changes are phonetic, and these in a sense also bring about morphological change.

Basal (ibid., p. 37) quotes Blau's article on the Hebrew elements in Judeo-Arabic (1958, p. 186):

> In the field of morphology, words borrowed from Hebrew, because of the great similarity in grammatical categories between Hebrew and Arabic, may appear in an Arabic category that corresponds to the category in Hebrew. This makes it difficult to identify the borrowed element.

It behooves us to consider the encounter between Hebrew and Arabic in the present study. Both languages, as is well-known, belong to the Semitic family of languages, and the history of encounters between them goes back a long time. They also share many features because of their genetic relationship. Yet they also differ in all linguistic categories: in the number of sounds and the way they are produced, in sentence structure, in derivation and in the lexicon (Basal, ibid., p. 40). Hebrew belongs to the North-West Semitic branch. It is the language of most of the Jewish Bible and is also called "Jewish" (*Yehudit*; Nehemiah 13:14) and the "language of Canaan" (*sefat Kenaʿan*; Isaiah 19:18). During the Mishnaic period it was called "language of the Bible" (*leshon miqra*) and "the holy tongue" (*leshon ha-qodesh*), in distinction to "language of the sages" (*leshon ḥakhamim*). The name "Hebrew" (*ʿivrit*) first appears in Mishnaic literature. In descriptions of the history of the Hebrew language Biblical Hebrew is clearly distinguished from the succeeding stages: Mishnaic Hebrew, Medieval Hebrew and Modern Hebrew.

Until the second century CE Hebrew was spoken in Palestine, in addition to Aramaic. The Jews who returned from Babylonia and who spoke Babylonian Aramaic were fluent in both languages and easily moved from one to the other. Subsequently Aramaic became the more prestigious language, because it was used for official, diplomatic and commercial purposes (Gluska 1999, pp. 16-18). These uses also caused it to function as a culture-bearing and culture-transferring language. Aramaic-speaking foreigners were more numerous than any ethnic group in Palestine in general, and even in Judea; because it was more prestigious, it became the dominant language, a fact that is reflected in both epigraphic texts and written literature.

Hebrew survived among groups and in places where Aramaic did not penetrate deeply (Basal, ibid., p. 40). Hebrew was spoken in Palestine for about one-thousand-five-hundred years, from the days of Joshua until the Bar-Kochva Rebellion. Hebrew was never a dead language; although it was not spoken much, but it continued to function as the language of creative writing, both in poetry and in prose, and in fact its lexicon grew and it underwent changes in syntax (Zuckerman 2008, pp. 19-21). The decrease in the use of Hebrew as the sole spoken language, until its complete disappearance as a spoken everyday language towards the end of the second century CE, was a gradual process. Even in the generation of R. Yehuda Hanasi there are still echoes of Hebrew's struggle to survive, in the form of sayings of the rabbinic sages in praise of learning Hebrew.

Arabic belongs to the South-West branch of the Semitic languages. It is spoken mainly in the Arabian Peninsula, the Fertile Crescent and North Africa. Very little is known of ancient Arabic, although there exist quite a few inscriptions from before the fifth century CE. The Jewish rabbinic sages mention some nouns which "*be-ʿArabyia qorin*" ("in Arabia are called") so-and-so. The main sources for the study of pre-Islamic Arabic are Jāhilī poetry, maxims and stories about the battles among the Arab tribes in those times. Arabic appears at two distinct levels of development: ancient Arabic, a very archaic language, of the Akkadian type, and neo-Arabic. Using ancient Arabic poetry and the Qurʾān as their inspiration, Arab philologists of the eighth and ninth centuries CE created the learned system of Classical Arabic, which became the framework language of medieval Islamic civilization (Basal, ibid., p. 46). Neo-Arabic, which is of a type that is akin to the younger Semitic languages, especially Aramaic, is embodied mainly in contemporary Arabic dialects. This is a language type that existed in antiquity. Scholars are in two minds on when neo-Arabic emerged and when ancient Arabic stopped serving as a spoken language and became the cultural language of poetry, scholarship and public administration. According to one opinion, the neo-Arabic type was in common use in pre-Islamic times in cities such as Mecca and among the Arab tribes. One of its distinctive features was a lack of vowel endings. According to the other view (held by Theodor Nöldeke and Joshua Blau) neo-Arabic emerged after the spread of Islam and the founding of the Caliphate (Fischer & Jastrow 2001, p. 11). Under the influence of the Mozarabs and the contact of Arabic speakers with the populace in Aramaic-, Greek-, Coptic- and Berber-speaking regions, ancient Arabic lost its standing as a spoken language and was replaced by a new type, neo-Arabic. However, Arab philologists view this type as a perversion of Arabic, caused by its use by non-Arabs outside of Arabia.