Introduction

Biblical personal names have been investigated from various semantic and interpretive approaches, many times involving Midrashic exegesis.¹ The linguistic study of biblical personal names has not reached a comprehensive appropriate description except for some sporadic comments.² Most grammar books and lexicons ignore these names. Medieval biblical lexicography disregarded them,³ and modern lexicons vary:

Kaddari discounts them while KBL includes them like any other nouns.⁴ Biblical concordances do list them, Mandelkern lists them in a special section, and Even-Shoshan lists them alphabetically.⁵ Modern lexicography does not include personal names unless the name carries a special meaning, e.g., Terah “euphemism for an old man or for someone behaving like one”.⁶

RaDaQ (R. David Qimḥi) includes personal names in his grammar book among regular nouns and classifies some of them as nouns derived from verbs (e.g., ראובן, שמעון, זבולון).⁷ Gesenius treats personal names as regular nouns,⁸ but he focuses especially on gentilic nouns.⁹ He also discusses some personal names as retaining old grammatical cases.¹⁰ Joüon and Muraoka claim that many personal names are formed as compound nouns (e.g., בְּלִיעֵל, גְּבַרְיָאֵל),¹¹ but they also treat personal names as regular nouns. They also discuss separately gentilic nouns with the -i suffix.¹²

Goshen Gottstein is the only one who discusses personal names and toponyms in his morphological analysis of biblical words. He includes personal names and toponyms among the continuous morphemes which are morphemes not derived by root and pattern combination. Most of them are not joinable, e.g., Moše, Levi, but some of them are because they accept derivational morphemes like the gentilic -i ending (the nisba), or the directional -a ending, e.g., haRe’uveni (<Re’uven), Doṭayna

---

⁵ See Solomon Mandelkern, Concordantiae hebraicae atque chaldaicae, Schocken, Jerusalem and Tel Aviv 1922; Abraham Even-Shoshan, A New Concordance of the Bible [in Hebrew], Kiryat Sefer, Jerusalem 1977.
⁶ See for instance Abraham Even-Shoshan, Even-Shoshan’s Dictionary [in Hebrew], Am Oved, Kineret Zmora Bitan, Dvir and Yediot Aharonot, Tel Aviv 2003, p. 2039.
⁹ See Gesenius, Hebrew Grammar; §86h (Note 8).
¹⁰ See Gesenius, Hebrew Grammar; §90 (Note 8).
¹² See Joüon and Muraoka, Grammar; §137c, §139d (Note 11).
Ephratt’s study tried to find grammatical principles in the assignment of toponyms by an Israeli Name Committee, but she did not consider the biblical names. This review will take too long if I list all the books and articles that examined biblical personal names, but as mentioned earlier, they all treat these names with interpretive and Midrashic approaches, not with linguistic ones.

Comparison of biblical names in the translations of various languages has been done before. The purpose of this study is to examine the representation of names—personal names and toponyms—and their gentilic derivatives in Bible translations into Spanish in the Middle Ages and in the Ladino translations of the Sephardic Diaspora after the expulsion from Spain. Because personal names and toponyms are a singular entity from a morphological point of view, and because gentilic nouns are derived systematically from them, I would like to compare these names in the translations to the extent there is a correlation between the way people and locations are named as well as consider the gentilic nouns derived from them. Moreover, such a comparison between the pre- and post-exilic translations can either support or oppose the assumption that the Ladino translations are based on the Spanish ones.


The Corpus

The medieval biblical Spanish translations examined in this study are Escorial E3, E4, E5/E7, and E19, and the Alba Bible. All these versions and others appear today online at http://corpus.byu.edu/bibliamedival/ and they include access to photocopies of the originals. Some of the versions were previously published in print copies. Not all the names were exemplified from E19 because some of the chapters were missing from it. The Ladino Bibles are the Pentateuch from Constantinople 1547, and the entire Bible from Constantinople and Thessaloniki from 1540 to 1572 (from here on C), and the Ferrara Bible from 1553 (F). The medieval and Ferrara Bibles are all written in Latin letters, whereas C is written in Hebrew square vocalized letters.


18 See Moshe Lazar (ed.), Ladino Pentateuch: Constantinople 1547, Labyrinthos, Culver City 1988. The version is online at the National Library in Jerusalem.


The transcription in the Ferrara Bible uses the following conventions consistently: Het is represented by h and rarely by ch. Ayin and He are also represented by h; they are absent infrequently. Shin, Sin, Tsadi, and Samekh are represented by s, but Samekh is copied sometimes by c before the vowels i and e, and Tsadi rarely by z. Lene Bet is copied by b or v, and Vav by u or v. Tet and Tav are represented by t and Lene Tav sometimes by th. Kaf and Qof are copied by k, c (in front of a, o, u or a consonant) and sometimes qu, and Lene Kaf mostly by ch or h. Common to the writings of that time, there is no distinction between i-j-y and u-v. These representations are also typical of the medieval Bibles.
Because of the Latin script, one might assume that the personal names in the Ferrara Bible will be similar to the same names in the medieval Bibles, but this happens rarely, only in cases in which the medieval Bibles transcribe the Hebrew names. As we will see, most of the names are not transcribed in the medieval Bibles.

Two hundred and seventy-two examples were drawn in this study, most of them from the Pentateuch, especially from Genesis, but there are a few examples from other parts of the Bible (272 tokens belonging to 174 types). The list of verses from which the examples were taken appears in the Appendix. The number of types and tokens will be presented separately in each section, first personal names, followed by toponyms, and finally gentilic nouns. A discussion will conclude the article.

Findings

(1) Personal names:
People’s names are copied in their Hebrew pronunciation quite systematically in C and F, for instance:

Moses, מֹשֶׁה: Moseh
Parho, פַעֹה: Parho
Ribkah, רבכה: Ribkah
Terah, תֶּרֶח: Terah
Yehudi, יהודִּי: Yehudi

Of 125 tokens of personal names, which represent 95 types, there is a difference between C and F only in six names (5% tokens, 6% types). In all 125 tokens, C copies faithfully the biblical Hebrew name in the translations, whereas F demonstrates some change in the pronunciation in six names: מֶה is transcribed once as Hed and another time as Heth, apparently as some representation of Lene Tav. כedorlahomer is copied as Cedortlahomer, not with an initial k or qu, but rather with an initial c. Since this spelling occurs five times, it cannot be viewed as a typographical error, but rather represents

21 Tokens are the instances of a unit; type is the unit itself, a name in our case, e.g., the type תרח has 11 tokens in the Bible: nine in Genesis, one in Joshua, and one in Chronicles.
23 It occurs in Genesis 14:1, 4, 5, 9, 17.
[sedorla’omer] or [tsedorla’omer] (closely resembling E5/E7, see below). The names סְלֻחִים and פַּטִים are transcribed Caslohim and Patrosim with the vowel o instead of u. The name לֵו is copied as Loth, although th is typical in his transcription for the representation of Lene Tav, not Tet. Finally, the name שלח is transcribed Salah like the pausal form that occurs in the same verse (Gen. 10:24).

Unlike C and F, in the medieval translations there are no similar translations in 86 of the 125 tokens (69% of the tokens24). Here are a few examples:

אבימלך: abi malech; abimelec; abemeleque
אבּרִם: abran; abraham; abram
אסנת: aznad; aznat; asnath
ארכפשד: arapagsad; arpasat; arpad; arphachsad
בוט מְשֵא: fi de simj; fijo de symi; njeto de senhi; fio de simey
ophage: agar; hagar
אר: aran; aram; haran
ח: hed; quiuet; ed; etheu
יהודי: yahudi; yehudi; yehuedi, yendi; iudi25
הרלעמר: cador laomer; çardolaomer; chodorloomer
כסלחים: enjluym; cazloym
מצרים: mjzraym, los egipçianos (E3); egipto (E4×2); mjcrayn, mjzrraym (E5/E7); mesrayim, mesraym (Alba)
מותשל: mathusalam; matusalen; matuselah
פרעה: faraon; faron
רבקה: rebeca; rrabeca
רַעֲמָה: nagma, ragama; rregina; regma
תֶּה: tare; thare; tarch

24 The types were not calculated in this case because in many instances the same personal name is translated in different ways, sometimes when occurring twice within the same verse.
25 The name יהודי (Jer. 36:21) in E5/E7 is translated once yehuedi and once yendi. The yendi form appears also in Jer. 36:23 which means that it is not a typographical error (u-n misreading?). E3 copies the name יהוד always as yahudi, E4 copies the Hebrew pronunciation yehudi, and Alba shortens the name to iudi.
The name מִצְרָיִם is of special interest. As a personal name it is copied in C and F (Misraim). Some of the medieval Bibles copy this name as mjzraym and mjcraym in E5/E7. E3 has mjzraym in Gen. 10:13, but in Gen. 10:6 it is los egipçianos. Alba uses a close transcription of the name mesrayim and mesraym, but E4 translates it twice as a place name, egipto. I will further relate to this name later in the following sections.

The medieval translations show different linguistic traditions from the biblical names. Although some of the transcribed names are faithful to the Hebrew Bible (e.g., some of the translations of אברם, הגר, הרן, יהודי, אברם, חוה, רבקה, מרים, שרה), there is no consistency among the versions in retaining the Hebrew tradition. Some of the names have already appeared in the Latin translation of the Bible, e.g., נֹה נ — Noe, תָרָח — Thare, but not in the translation of מֵשֶׁה, which is Moses in Latin. A comparison of the similar names in the various translations shows that only 32 names (27%) have partial similarity to the Ladino translations C and F. Some of the names in translation retained the traditional pronunciation of the Hebrew names, though not consistently.

It should be noted that women’s names are scarce: אסנת, חוה, רבקה, מרים, שרה (×2), and שרי (a total of 8, 6% types or tokens). This result confirms another finding; only 7% of the biblical personal names are names of women.26

Three names from Gen. 25:3 were not included in the 125 names above: אשורוים, לְאֻמִּים and לְטוּשִׁים. The verse states: וְיָקְשָׁן יָלַד אֶת שְׁבָא וְאֶת דְּדן וּבְני דְדן היוּ אַשּׁוּם וּלְטוּשִׁים וּלְאֻמִּים “and Jokshan was the father of Sheba and Dedan; the descendants of Dedan were Ashurim/Ashurites, Letushim/Letushites and Leumin/Leummites”. Because of the -im (plural ending), it is unclear whether these are people’s names or gentilic nouns. The old biblical translators to Aramaic and the biblical interpreters wavered about the correct nomenclature.27 According to these translations, they are personal names because they are copied in the translations:


27 The Aramaic translators interpreted these names as nouns indicating features or attributes. Rashi interprets the first two as names of the rulers of nations, in opposition to Onkelos’ interpretation, and claims that the third refers to scattered tent owners. Ibn Ezra claims that they are personal names and opposes the view that they are gentilic nouns. RaDaQ also treats them as personal names and raises the question why they have the -im ending. RaDaQ adds that in the name מִצְרָיִם the ending -ayim is also a plural marker.
C: אשורים, לאומים, לטושים
F: Assurim, Leumim, Letusim
E3: asurym, leumjm, lemryn(!)
E4: asurin, leuim(!), letusin
E5/E7: asurim, leumjn, letusin
Alba: asurim, laumjm, latusym

Only E5/E7 copies the names in their Hebrew pronunciation, but replaces the final m by n. Alba transcribes the schwa as a, but the name resembles the Hebrew tradition.

(2) Toponyms:
Of 66 tokens of toponyms in this study, 46 are types. C and F generally copy these names in their Hebrew pronunciation, e.g.,

C: גיחון:גיחון; Chalna: Chalne
גילה: גילה; Hen Mispat
עין משפט: עין משפט
עדן: עדן; Heden
עמורה: עמורה; Hamora
רחובות: רחובות; Rechobot

Nevertheless, there is a greater variety in toponym translations in C and F than in personal names. F differs from C in sixteen tokens (24%) that belong to eight types (17%), nine of which are the name מצרים.

F is also inconsistent in the orthography of some names: אדמה is spelled Hadma in Gen. 10:19, but Adma in Gen. 14:2; נר is spelled Guerar in Gen. 20:2, but Gerar in Gen. 10:19; קנה is Chenaan in Gen. 11:31, but Kenahan in Gen. 47:15. These names are not many, yet they use the same pronunciation tradition.
The resemblance among the medieval translations is even smaller. Forty-six of the 66 toponyms are not translated in the same manner (70%), although sometimes they are similar to each other (overlooking spelling differences). Here again, there is no point in examining tokens, because the same toponym may vary in different verses of the same translation. Here are a few examples:

אַמָה: adma (E3×2, E4, Alba×2); adama (E4); adina (E5/E7×2)  
אור כשדים: vrcasdin (E3); hur de los caldeos (E4, E5/E7), ur caldeorum (Alba)  
אלֹני מַמְא: enzinas de manbre (E3); enzinar de manbre (E5/E7, E4); valles de manbre (Alba)  
אַשּוּר: asur (E3×4, E4×3, E5/E7×2, E19×2, Alba×1); assyria (E4), assyrios, siria, assur (Alba)28  
שׁוּ (ארץ: de los negros (E3); de judia (E4); de Ethiopia (Alba)  
כְו: erog; yereth; yeoreg; erech  
עֵן: parayso (E3), deleyte (E4), vergel (Alba)  
פרת: parad (E3); eufrates (E4, Alba)  
רְחֹבֹת: Rahobod (E3); reobot (E4); rrreouod (E5/E7); rrooboth (Alba)

Two phenomena are evident in these translations: (a) Even when the medieval translations resemble the Hebrew biblical names, these names are pronounced differently from the same names in the Ladino translations (compare, for instance, the names אַדָמה, פרת, and רְחֹבֹת); (b) many of the toponyms are identified with well-known place names known to the Spaniards either from the Latin translations or from other sources, or from interpretations given to these names, e.g., כוש — Aethiopiae, אור כשדים — Ur Chaldeorum, כנען — Chanaan, etc.

As noted above, the name מצרים appeared as a personal name. In the medieval Bibles there were variations in the translations, either as a personal name, or as a toponym. As a personal name, some of the medieval versions showed some similarities to the Hebrew name, but as a toponym they opted for the name Egipto, as found in F as well, though some of them related to it as a gentilic name. Likewise the name כוש: as a personal name, it has been copied in the medieval Bibles — cus in all the Escorial

28 In some cases, some of the toponyms are not translated.
Bibles (and in F), *chus* in Alba. However, as a toponym, כוש is interpreted: *los negros* (the blacks), *judia* (Judea) or *Ethiopia* (like F). Whereas interpretive cases are rare in C and F, they are abundant in the medieval translations.

Only 13 toponyms show resemblance between C and F on the one hand, and the medieval translations on the other. This amount is lower than the one found among personal names.

(3) Gentilic nouns:
Gentilic nouns are derived from personal names, toponyms, or other social attributes, such as religion, and they function as adjectives or nouns. Most of the gentilic nouns in this study were derived from toponyms or from personal names by -i suffixation: לְאָבִי is derived from אב and מַצְרִי from מצרים. Sometimes there is no such ending but the nouns are nevertheless gentilic, as discussed below.

Seventy-six tokens of gentilic nouns represent 30 types, most of them from the Pentateuch, and a few from other books: ימיני in Esther 2:5, ירדר in Esther 2:5, 3:4, Zech. 8:23. As ירדר is also a personal name as referenced above, it is worth comparing it to its translation as a gentilic noun.

C differs from F in 39 tokens (51%) which are 10 types (33%). This percentage is higher than the ones found in place and personal names, but it is still low, because most of the words (two-thirds of the types) are translated in the same manner. Inconsistencies are revealed in the translations of the same names in different verses. The data are classified into three categories: (a) similarities between C and F; (b) variations in different verses; (c) total difference between C and F.

a. Similarities between Constantinople and Ferrara:
- לוש אמים; los Emim
- אֵיל אָרְמִי; el Arami (×2)
- גַּדוֹל גֶּרֶגֶּשָׁי; l Guirgasi
- יְהוֹדִי; Judio (×3)
- דֶּר בְּנִי הָיִם; de Binyamin

29 In fact more adjectives can be derived from other names, e.g., -תחתי-תחת ,ששי-שש ,רגלי-רגל. See Joüon and Muraoka, Grammar (Note 11), p. 242.
30 The dash before l indicates that the Spanish definite article was attached to other morphemes, such as al ‘to the; ACC.’, del ‘of the’.
b. Variations between C and F in different verses:

- El Emor (×5); -l Emori, el Emori (×2), el Emoreo (×2)
- El Hemor, el Hiueo (×2)
- El Hiti, el Hiteo (×2), el Heti
- El Yebusi (×2), el Yebuseo (×2)
- El Chenaani (×4), el Kenahaneo (×2)
- El Yebusi (×2), el Perezoeo (×2), -l Perezi

Anil Emori:

- Anl Hemori, el Emori (×2), el Emoreo (×2)
- Anl Heui, el Hiueo (×2)
- Anl Hiti, el Hiteo (×2), el Heti
- Anl Yebusi (×2), el Yebuseo (×2)
- Anl Chenaani (×4), el Kenahaneo (×2)
- Anl Perezoeo (×2), -l Perezi

In the first group, most of the gentilic nouns are copied in their Hebrew pronunciation, except for the noun ירודימי. In the second group, C tends to copy the Hebrew names which F either copies or changes into their Spanish equivalent ending in -eo.

Three nouns are distinct in C and F, טבריה, כושית, and ישראלי. Regarding כושית, C uses the word כושית once, but in its second occurrence he interprets it as ניגרה ‘black’, whereas F uses the gentilic noun Ethiopissa in both cases (The verse says "וַתְּבֵּר מִיָם וְאַהֲרֹן בְּמֹשֶׁה עַל־אֹדֹות הָאִשָּׁה הַֻשִׁית אֲשֶׁר לָקָח ִי־אִשָּׁה כֻשִׁית לָקָח" "And Miriam and Aaron spoke against Moses because of the Cushite woman whom he had married; for he had married a Cushite woman"). Regarding ישראלי and טבריה, C consistently interprets them as Jewish – ירדייו, whereas F adjusts the names to the Spanish equivalent of ישראלי – Ysraelita and טבריה – Hebreo.

The variations are much greater among medieval translations. In fact, only four tokens (5%) of gentilic nouns show resemblance among the translations. Three of the tokens are the translation of ירודימי as judio (like C and F), and one token is the translation of העברי – el ebreo only in Gen. 14:13, but not in any other place. All
other tokens are diverse. The examples below show the same gentilic nouns presented above in the Ladino translations, with three additional examples.\footnote{The data is presented in the following order: E3, E4, E5/E7, E19 (if there are examples), and Alba. The examples from each version are separated by a semi-colon followed by two slashes. To avoid complications the exact citations of verses are not listed.}

אֵימִים: los emjn; los gayanes; los emonjm; los emim (Alba resembles C and F)
הָֽהֲרָמי: el aramj; de aram; el aramj; el aranj [de mesopotania]
גָּרְגֶּשׁ: guijrjasí; guirgaseos; el gergasi; -l gargasy
יוֹרְדוּ: Judio (×3) (all versions)
דָּפָאִים: de biñamjm; benjaminista; benjamjnj; de benjamin
דְּרָפָאִים: los gigantes; los gigantes; los rrefaym; los raphaim
הַּמְּרָאִים: emori, -l emory (×4), el emory; / los emorros (×2), amorreos, emoreos, los emoreos (×2), el emoreo; -l emori, el emori (×3), el emorreo, los emorreos; / el hemory; / los emoreos, -l emori (×2), el emory, el emori (×2)
הַרי: -l hiuj (×3); los yne, yneos, los vneos; / el eu (×2), el ebi; / el yuj; / el hiuj, el hjuj (×3)
"בַּה"י: el hity (×4); / yteos, los yteos (×2), el yteo; / el ety (×2), -l eti, el yteo; / el hity (×2); / hiti, el hity, los oteos, el hiteño
דְּפֶסֶוֹ: -l yebüçi, yaybüçi, el abuçi (×2); / los gebuceos (×3), gebuzeos; / -l eboçi, el eboçi (×3); / el eboçi (×2); / los jebuseos, -l gebusi, el yebüçi, el jebuci
יִשְרַאֵלִים: de ysrrael, ysrraelj, la yzraela; / de ysrrael, ysrraelita, la ysrraelita; / ysrraelid (×2), la ysrraelid; / de Israel (×2), aquella judia
לִבָּגִים: cuxia; / etipensa; / cusid (×2); / estrañja; / cusyth [ethiopiana], cusyth
הַקֵּנִינו: -l cananj (×2), de canaan (×2), el cananj (×2); / los cananeos (×4), de los cananeos; -l cananj (×2), de canaan (×2), canaan, el cananj; / el cananeo (×2); / los cananeos (×2), del chanaani (×2), el cananeo (×2)
יהוֹרֵדרִים: el parezi (×3); / perizeos (×2), los perizeos; / el perezi (×2), -l seresi; / el faryseo (×2); / el parisj (×2), los pharisoseos
יהוֹשֵׁעִים, הָֽעֵבְרִים, הָֽעֵבְרִים, עֵבְרִים: el ebreo (×2), la ebreo, los ebreos (×2), hebreo, judio, ebreo (×3); / el ebreo (×2), la ebreo, los ebreos (×2), ebreo (×5); / judio, el ebreo, judia, los ebreos (×2), ebreo (×5); / el judio, la judia, los judios (×2), judio (×5); / judio (×6), el ebreo, judia, los judios (×2), los ebreos
קָנִינִי: -l qujn; quineos; -l qujn; los çineceos

31 The data is presented in the following order: E3, E4, E5/E7, E19 (if there are examples), and Alba. The examples from each version are separated by a semi-colon followed by two slashes. To avoid complications the exact citations of verses are not listed.
In addition to the many variants within the medieval Bibles, there is diversity within the same translation in different places. This diversity is atypical in the Ladino translations.\(^{32}\) In many cases, the translation uses the plural form instead of the singular (e.g., האומר, החוי, החתי here, and among the toponyms or אור כדברים at the end of section (1)). Many gentilic nouns end in Spanish -eo to indicate the person, both in F and in the medieval translations (e.g., see the translations of החוי, החתי, העברי, המצרי). But the most striking phenomenon is the remoteness of the medieval translations from the biblical Hebrew nouns. This phenomenon is in contrast to F. In F, we find the use of the Spanish formation with the -eo suffix; however, the basic gentilic noun remains close to the Hebrew word (cf. for instance the translations of ירמוי, יהוד, יבוסי, הפריזי).

As shown above, the translation of the words ישראלי andעברי clearly distinguish C from F: C translates it ג'ודייו ‘Jewish’, while F translates the Spanish equivalent Ysraelita and Hebreo, respectively. In the medieval Bibles, the two traditions—ebreo (mostly without h) and judío—exist side by side in all the translations, except E4 that opts for ebreo, but the translation of (ישראלי) shows many variations. The translation of כושית is also varied both in the Ladino (as shown above) and the medieval Spanish translations, and it is partly based on Midrashic exegesis. Most of the medieval translations do not repeat the word in the translation. E19 explains כושית as estrañja ‘strange’, E3 copies it as cuxia (pronounced [kušia]), Alba and E5/E7 adopt the Hebrew word with some variation, although in its first occurrence Alba interprets it in parentheses as Ethiopian [etiopensa], and Ferrara’s Ethiopissa (which slightly resembles E4’s etiopensa).

The translation of מצרי represented as המצרי, המצרית, למורו, מצרי, מצרי, מצרי, and מציריה deserves special discussion. Here is its distribution:

**C:**
- אלוש, (×4)
- מצרי, את אוגיסיאנה, (איל) אוגיסיאנה, (איל) אוגיסיאנה (×3)
- לור, מצרי, מצרי

**F:**
- l Egypciano, la Egypçiana, Egyptianos (×2), a los egypçianos, Egypto (×3), Egypciano (×3)

\(^{32}\) The example of כושית is exceptional in C.

\(^{33}\) In some versions there is no representation for all of the word’s occurrences.
E3: el egipčiano (∗2), la egipčiana, alos egipčianos, egipčiano (∗2), los egibčianos, los egipčianos (∗4), egibčiano
E4: el egipčiano, -l egepčiano, el egepčiana(!), alos egepčianos, egepčiano (∗2), egipto (∗2), los egepčianos (∗2), egipčiano
E5/E7: el egipčiano (∗2), la egipčiana, alos egipčianos, egipčiano (∗2), los egipčianos (∗2), egipto, los de egipco, egibčiano
E19: el egbtano (∗2), a los egibtanos, egbtano (∗3), los egibtanos (∗2), los egebčianos
Alba: -l egipčiano, el egipčiano, la egipčiana, para los egipčianos, egipčiano (∗3), los tegipčianos (∗5)

C uses the Hebrew base מצרי eight times; four other times the Spanish equivalents egipcbiano or egepcbiano are used. As indicated above, as a personal name and as a toponym has always been copied as מצרי in C. F uses the Spanish equivalents consistently, as is done in the toponyms (contrary to the representation of personal names).

All the medieval translations use the Spanish name inconsistently. Next to egipčiano one finds mostly egbtano in E19. The use of b instead of p occurs rarely in the other versions as well, cf. egipčiano—egibčianos. Moreover, there is also variation in the vowel, egepčiano in E4, and egebčianos in E19.

As noted in the Hebrew list of occurrences, I included the name מצרי among them, and not only variations of מצרי. Syntactic agreement is the reason for this choice, because sometimes refers to the people, and not to the name of the country.

Here are the instances:

Gen. 45:2: “He wept loudly; the Egyptians heard it and Pharaoh’s household heard about it”.
Gen. 47:15: “When the money from the lands of Egypt and Canaan was used up, all the Egyptians came to Joseph and said, ‘Give us food! Why should we die before your very eyes because our money has run out?’”
Gen. 47:20:

34 The spelling with bet instead of pe in such circumstances is quite common in that era. See Ora (Rodrique) Schwarzwald, “Orthography and Pronunciation in Two Ladino Prayer Books for Women” (in Hebrew), Massorot 15 (2010), pp. 198-199.
“So Joseph bought all the land of Egypt for Pharaoh. Each of the Egyptians sold his field, for the famine was severe. So the land became Pharaoh’s”.

Gen. 50:3: שִׁבְעִים מִצְיִם אֹתוֹ וַיִּבְכּוּ וַיִּמְלְאוּ לוֹ אַבָּעִים יוֹם יֵן יִמְלְאוּ יְמֵי הַחֲנטִים יוֹם “They took forty days, for that is the full time needed for embalming. The Egyptians mourned for him seventy days”.

Ex. 14:13: וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל הָעָם אַל תִּיאוּ הִתְיַצְּבוּ וּאֶת יְשׁוּעַת ה' אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשֶׂה لָכֶם עוֹד עַד עוֹלָם לִאֹתָם הַיּוֹם לֹא תֹסִיפוּ מִצְיִם הַיּוֹם אֲשֶׁר רְאִיתֶם אֶת הַמִּצְרִים הָיוֹם אֲשֶׁר לֶאָרָם זוֹרִיר נְפָלִים יְמֵי “Moses said to the people, ‘Do not fear! Stand firm and see the salvation of the Lord that he will provide for you today; for the Egyptians that you see today you will never, ever see again’”.

In four of the 76 gentilic nouns there is similarity between the Ladino and the medieval translations: in the translation of עברי (Alba excluded),35 and יהודים, in the two occurrences of האמרי and המצרי shown above, and in the translation of האר臊ים (E4 excluded),36 which transliterate the name. As in the case of personal names, feminine gentilic nouns are rare: 6 tokens (8%)

Discussion

The data presented above prove that there is a hierarchy in the Ladino translations of the names examined in this study. Personal names are the ones copied in the translation in the highest rate followed by toponyms. Gentilic nouns are at the lowest end of the scale where there are some variations among the translations. Medieval translations show more variations in all the types of names.

Personal names are very arbitrary. Toponyms are related to certain locations which are identified and interpreted in some ways in Spanish, therefore the variation increases in them. Gentilic nouns are morphologically different from personal names and toponyms. The Hebrew derivation with the suffix -i enables the equivalent formations in Spanish with the -eo suffix in Ladino, hence many of the gentilic nouns

35 The word עבר in Num. 24:24 is interpreted as a gentilic noun. In his translation only Alba uses a gentilic noun: los ebreos, contrary to all the others that copy it: ever, eber, euer in medieval translations, עבר in C and Heber in F.
36 E4 translates it as arbadeos.
were derived in this way, and the basic name remained untouched as the translations of מצרי or כנעני 만צר or 만צר prove. The variations are greater where there is no basic name from which the gentilic noun can be derived, as in מַעֲרָיו or מַעֲרָיו (there is no *פרז or *אמור).

Ferrara and Constantinople are distinct in the translations of ישראלי, עברי and כושית. The term is interpreted in C in its second occurrence in the verse as ‘black’ (ניריה), although in its first occurrence the Hebrew name is used in the translation. F uses the interpretation of Ethiopian like two of the medieval translations, although the others copy an approximate version of the Hebrew name or interpret כושית as ‘strange’. ישראלי and עברי are consistently interpreted in C as גיודיאו ~ גיודייו ‘Jewish’, while F adopts ישראלי as Ysraelita from Israel and עברי as Hebreo from Heber. As mentioned above, the medieval translations also show variation in these nouns. The perception of ישראלי and עברי as ‘Jewish’ was apparently common among the Jews, but not among the Christians and the ex-Conversos to which F belongs, hence the difference among them. In the translation of יהוד as a gentilic noun, there is no difference between the translations, and they all render this term as ‘Jewish’.

Ferrara and Constantinople have similar translations in 208 examples of the 272 tokens examined in this study (76%; 150 of 174 types – 86%), which is quite a high percentage. In contrast, the medieval translations show a clear resemblance among each other in 42 cases (15% of the 272 tokens), and a partial resemblance in 21 other cases (8%). This total of 23% similarities is very low.

Ferrara shows more resemblance to the medieval Spanish Bible than Constantinople. A comparison of F to E3, E4 and Alba, shows the following resemblance (of the 272 tokens sampled in this study):

F = E3: 106 tokens (38%)
F = E4: 84 tokens (31%)
F = Alba: 73 tokens (27%)

F clearly differs from E3, with more than 60% of the tokens. Namely, the difference is greater than the resemblance, and this difference increases in the other translations.38 The comparison has not been made to C because the data showed more remoteness than both because of the orthography and because of the other differences presented

37 Based on some traditional interpretations, e.g., RaDaQ.
38 E5/E7 was not included in the statistics, but it would have shown results similar to E4; E19 has not been calculated because many verses were lacking in the comparison.
above. These findings lead us to the following question: Is it possible that the pre-exilic medieval Spanish Bibles were the source for the post-exilic Ladino translations?

The study of the romanized Bibles and their affinity to the Ladino Bibles has been investigated by several researchers.\(^{39}\) The assumption was that these medieval translations from Escorial and Alba laid the foundation for the Ladino translations published in the sixteenth century. The arguments raised were as follows: (a) these Bibles were translated by Jews or with the help of Jews; (b) the translation was based on the Hebrew Bible rather than the Vulgate or other Christian versions; (c) the order of the books and the division of the Parashot follow the Hebrew Bible; (d) many instances show that the translations are based on Aramaic and Jewish interpretations found in the Bible. There were also arguments that although Christians initiated these Bible translations, Jews also might have used them.\(^{40}\)

---


Contrary to this assumption, a claim is made that the Jewish Bible translations are based on an oral tradition that started in the Middle Ages, and they were only produced in writing after the expulsion from Spain, in the two major Iberian Diasporas of the Jews: the expelled Jews in the Ottoman Empire, and the ex-Converso communities in Italy and Holland. In spite of the geographical distance and the different orthography, the two Ladino translations closely resemble each other in their translation methods, and they are extremely different from the translation methods used in medieval Spain.

The use of personal names also distinguishes the Ladino translations from the medieval Spanish ones. The resemblance between C and F is much higher than between the medieval Spanish ones, as shown above. This resemblance cannot be accidental, and certainly cannot be attributed to any of the medieval translations. Therefore, the claim that the Ladino Bibles are based on the medieval Spanish translations cannot be supported. The resemblance of C and F is justifiable only by assuming a long-lasting tradition of oral transmission of the Bible; this resemblance lasted until the onset of print production in the sixteenth century and afterwards. If the Ladino translations were based on the medieval written tradition extant among Christians, we would have found much more variety in the translation of the words, in personal names, toponyms, and gentilic nouns, because when copying such a long text, the translator would be influenced by the texts in front of him, and he would be unable to change them in a


consistent fashion. The fact that most proper names, toponyms and gentilic nouns retained their Hebrew pronunciation and that they show more consistency than in the translations made before the expulsion, proves that it was a reliable oral tradition. The translator of Ferrara was an ex-Converso. His translations demonstrate that although he used the Latin alphabet, only sparingly did he follow the Christian usage.

Finally, the copying of the Hebrew names in the translation is one of the clearest signs of the Jewish nature of the text. In Midrash Tehilim\(^43\) the text states:

> "אמר ר' אלעזר הקפר בזכות ארבעה דברים (מנגאלו ישראלו ממצרים), שלא שניה את שמם, ולא שינו את לשונם, ולא גילה את מתחורי שילהם, ולא הודו פרוצים בפורית. והשבה,McCłe לא שניה את שמו, (לארובון) [שלו] מפותחת והארובני (בمدכב קר ג), (לאשיםון) [שלו] מפותחת השמשוני (שמש שם במדכב כ"ר), כי נחתים ראובן ושמעון, ודי, כי נחתן ראובן ושמעון, ודי, ראובן ושמעון."

R. Elazar Ha-Qapar says: For four reasons [Israel were redeemed from Egypt]: they did not change their names, they did not change their language, they did not reveal their secrets, and they did not engage in sexually immoral behavior. And the most important [reason] is that they did not change their names, (from Reuuben) [one finds these are] the Reuheni families, (from Šimcon) [one finds these are] the Šimconi families, because they went [into Egypt] as Reuhen and Šimcon and got out as Reuhen and Šimcon.

Although there is a change in language in the translations, the principle of retaining the Hebrew name was kept intact for personal names, toponyms, and gentilic nouns, even when there is morphological adjustment to Spanish, the original Hebrew name is preserved as the stem, and that’s what makes the texts Jewish, unlike the medieval Spanish translations.

\(^{43}\) Midrash Tehil, Buber’s edition, chapter 114, *The Responsa Project* 18+, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan (2010).
Appendix: The verses from which the names were taken

Gen. 2:10, 13-14; 4:2, 12, 18; 9:18; 5:4, 9, 16, 21; 10:2, 4, 6-7, 9-19, 24; 11:31; 13:10; 14:2, 5-7, 13; 15:19-21; 20:1-2; 215:3, 9-10, 18, 20, 26; 39:2, 14; 10:1, 15; 41:12, 34, 45; 43:32; 45:2; 47:15, 20; 21:2
Ex. 2:11, 12; 3:8, 17; 14:13; 21:2
Lev. 24:10
Num. 12:1; 24:24
Deut. 15:12
Jer. 36:21, 23
Zech. 8:23
Esther 2:5; 3:4