Ni a wnawn, ac a wɹandawn:

William Morgan's Choices in His 1588 Welsh Translation of the Pentateuch — the Case of the Hebrew Verb *šmʿ* ('hear')

Júda Ronén

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Department of Linguistics

In 1588 William Morgan published his monumental Welsh translation of the Bible. This impressive work is quite atypical of the contemporary Bible translations, as the Old Testament was translated directly from the original Hebrew. This fact invites contrastive study of the Welsh and Hebrew texts, which may shed light on the Welsh text and language, the translation process, and (the translator's reading of) the original text.

In this paper I will attempt a close examination of the semantic field of HEAR-ING in the Welsh translation of the Pentateuch in comparison with the Hebrew text. A special attention will be given to the means by which Morgan translated the Hebrew verb *šmʿ* ('hear'), using the Welsh lexemes *clywed* and *gwɹando*. Apart from some neutralising environments, there seems to be a meaning-bearing lexical opposition between *clywed* and *gwɹando*: a meaningful choice the translator had to make every time he encountered this Hebrew verb. I hope the proposed description, which is based on formal-structural grounds and aims at understanding (Bible) translations through the lens of structural linguistic analysis, will contribute to our understanding of the 1588 Bible and its language.

Ac efe a gymmerth lyfr y cyfammod, ac ai darllenodd lle y clywe y bobl, a dywedafant ni a wnatwn, ac a wɹandawn y: hyn oll a lefarodd yɹ Arglwydd.

וַיִּקַּח סֵפֶר הַבְּרִית וַיִּקְרָא
בְּאָזְנֵי הָעָם וַיֹּאמְרוּ כֹּל
אֲשֶׁר־דִּבֶּר יְהוָה נַעֲשֶׂה
וְנִשְׁמָע׃

Left: Exodus 24:7, William Morgan's Bible, 1588
Right: Exodus 24:7, Leningrad Codex, 1008/9

Structure

1   Introduction

Hi,

✳ One of the most interesting, and most controversial, topics in Celtic studies is the relation between the **Celtic** language family and the **Afro-Asiatic** one. Now, interesting as it might be, I will not deal here with the question of whether there was a historical Afro-Asiatic substratum, or any connexion at all. What I will do is to deal with ✳ a special kind of 'substratum': a **textual substratum** — the translation of the Hebrew Bible into Welsh.

✳ In 1588 Dr William Morgan, Bishop of Llandaf and of Llanelwy, published the first translation of the whole Bible into Welsh. A crucial fact for us is that the Hebrew Bible in this monumental work was translated not intermediately from the classical translations but from the original Hebrew itself.

This fact invites contrastive study of the Welsh and Hebrew texts, which may shed light on the **Welsh text** and language, the **translation process**, and (the translator's **reading** of) the original text. In this paper I will attempt a close examination of one corner of this textual and linguistic complex: **the semantic field of HEARING.** ✳ This will be done

1

mainly by examining the means by which Morgan translated the Hebrew verb *šåmaʿ* ('hear'). This verb, which has 1159 occurrences in the Hebrew Bible, is translated mainly by **two** Welsh lexemes: *clywed* and *gwᴢando*. As we will see, apart from some neutralising environments, whenever the translator encountered *šåmaʿ* in the Hebrew text he had to **choose** whether to use **either** *clywed* **or** *gwᴢando*. This choice is a **meaning-bearing** choice, by which the translator was obliged to add new information which does not exist in the original text, thus **interpreting** it according to **his** understanding thereof. In my opinion, seeing the translator as **an interpreter** and the translation process as **an interpretation process**, which consists of many **decisions** the translator must do, has a great potential.

✶ **An allegory**. We all know Newton's experiments regarding the nature of light. Being able to compare a translated text with its origin enables us to do the very same thing: to **disperse** what seems to be an indivisible **one** into **diverse components**. *šåmaʿ* is our **white light**, the translation process is the **prism** and *clywed* and *gwᴢando* are the **spectral colours**.

This is quite a simple scenario: **one** being dispersed into **two**. There can be more complex, more complicated, scenarios, and simpler ones: **the case opposite to ours** [*trace the opposite direction of light*], when several elements in the original text are being **flattened** into one is, well, much less interesting.

✶ Now, as for the working procedure: when describing the relationship between *clywed* and *gwᴢando*, I will start with syntactic environments where they **are not in opposition**, that is, with **neutralising environments** in which only **one** of the two is selectable. Only **then**, after isolating the neutralising cases, I will attempt at uncovering the meaning-bearing difference between *clywed* and *gwᴢando*. Acting differently is bound to end up with a mixed bag of examples which one cannot make sense of. This working procedure, which is quite common sense, is unfortunately not as widely used as it should be. In the Jerusalem school of structural linguistics, where I come from, it is the standard procedure.

1.1   Corpus

✶ A word about the corpus and the editions I used.

I chose to used the original **1588** version by William Morgan over the more commonly used nowadays ✳ **1620** posthumous revision by others. The older version shows a clearer, purer, situation with regards to its relation to the original Hebrew: unlike the revision, it's a (more or less) uniform idiolect with no haphazard changes, and ✳ with no influence of King James' English Version, which was published in **1611**.

✳ I limited myself to the Pentateuch, the five books of Moses, due to practical reasons only, so I will have to examine about 300 examples instead of over one thousand, of which many are, of course, trivial and redundant.

Due to time limit, I will present here only **a small portion** of my findings and the relevant facts. There are many more cases which required choosing *clywed* over *gwɜando* or vice versa and in which Morgan's **careful and insightful reading** of the text is evident.

I also don't have time to tackle the **more difficult cases**, in which Morgan's choices are obscure. Nevertheless, I assure you these cases are very few in number. Some interesting **special cases** are unfortunately omitted as well. What's being presented here is a simplified view of the **general case**.

2 HEARING

2.1 Neutralising environments

✳ Now let's proceed to isolating **neutralising syntactic environments**, where only one of the two is selectable. **Three** evident environments are the following:

- ✳ 'šåmaʿ + PREPOSITION', which is translated by *gwɜando* + the Welsh preposition *ar* 'on'. [84 examples.]

- ✳ 'šåmaʿ + CONTENT', which is translated with *clywed*. [14 examples.]

- and ✳ 'šåmaʿ + OBJECT+PARTICIPLE', which is translated with *clywed* as well. [5 examples.]

2.1.1 *šåmaʿ* + PREPOSITION

⁂ *šåmaʿ* can be followed by three Hebrew prepositions [*use fingers*]: *bə-*, *ʾɛl* and *lə-*. The difference between these three after *šåmaʿ*, whatever it is, is **flattened** in the Welsh translation: they are all converted to a single Welsh preposition *ar* 'on'. The opposite direction generally holds true as well, meaning that '*gwɜando + ar*' translates '*šåmaʿ* + PREPOSITION' (other cases cases of *gwɜando* have **direct** objects).

As for the **complements** of the prepositions, the Welsh text **follows** the Hebrew one quite **literally**. For example, it translates the grammaticalised intermediating element *qōl* 'voice' by *llais*, with several semantically motivated exceptions (like *llef* 'cry', and *fwn* 'sound'). This is an example for how translated texts — especially sacred texts, which tend to be translated literally — have **different syntax** from native texts. I don't try to offer generalisations for 'the Welsh Syntax (or Lexicon)'; each kind of text, **each text**, has its **own system**.

A **common property** of the examples of this kind [*point at the highlighted text*] is that their semantics is of hearing as **obeying** or **accepting**. We will return to this later.

Let's have a look at **three examples**: for [*use fingers*] *bə-* (1), *ʾɛl-* (2) and *lə-* (3).

(The KJV text is, of course, given only as an aid)

Yna Mofes a attebodd, ac a ddywedodd, etto wele ni chɜedant i mi ac ni w̲ɜ̲a̲n̲d̲a̲w̲a̲n̲t̲ a̲r̲ fy llais: onid dywedant nid ymgdangofodd yɜ Arglwydd i ti.

way-yaʿan   mōšɛ   way-yōmɛr wə-hēn   lō-yaʾămīnū   l-ī wə-lō y̲i̲š̲m̲ə̲ʿ̲ū̲ b̲ə̲-̲q̲ō̲l̲ī̲ kī yōmrū lō-nirʾå ʾēlɛ̊kå YHWH

And Moses answered and said, But, behold, they will not believe me, nor h̲e̲a̲r̲k̲e̲n̲ unto my voice: for they will say, The LORD hath not appeared unto thee.

וַיַּעַן מֹשֶׁה וַיֹּאמֶר וְהֵן לֹא־יַאֲמִינוּ לִי וְלֹא יִ̲̲שְ̲̲מְ̲̲ע̲וּ̲ בְּקֹלִי כִּי יֹאמְרוּ לֹא־נִרְאָה אֵלֶיךָ יְהֹוָה:

→ Moses says the children of Israel will not believe him when he will tell them God will bring them forth out of Egypt and will not **follow**, **accept**, his orders (lit. in Heb. '*they will not hear*') [*point accordingly*].

And…

A Moſes a lefarodd felly wɪth feibion Iſrael: ond ni wɪandawſant ar Moſes, gan gyfyngdɪa yſɓɪyd, a chan y gaethiwed galed.

way-ḏabbēr mōšɛ kēn ʾɛl-bənē yiśrå̄ʾēl wə-lō šå̄mʿū ʾɛl-mōšɛ miq-qōṣɛr rūaḥ ū-mē-ʿăḇōḏå̄ qå̄šå̄

And Moses spake so unto the children of Israel: but they <u>hearkened</u> not unto Moses for anguish of spirit, and for cruel bondage.

וַיְדַבֵּ֥ר מֹשֶׁ֛ה כֵּ֖ן אֶל־בְּנֵ֣י יִשְׂרָאֵ֑ל וְלֹ֤א שָֽׁמְעוּ֙ אֶל־מֹשֶׁ֔ה מִקֹּ֣צֶר ר֔וּחַ וּמֵעֲבֹדָ֖ה קָשָֽׁה׃

→ They indeed do not **follow** him. Notice that we are not talking here about actual, sensory, hearing: they did perceive his voice, the acoustic waves, they just didn't follow.

Hefyd wɪth Adda y dywedodd, am <u>wɪando</u> o honot <u>ar</u> lais dy wɪaig, a bwytta o'ɪ pɪenn am yɪ hwn y goɪchymynnaſwn i ti gan ddywedyd, na fwytta o honaw: melldigedic [fydd] y ddaiar o'th achos di, a thɪwy lafur y bwyttei o honi holl ddyddiau dy enioes.

ū-l-ʾå̄ḏå̄m ʾå̄mar kī-šå̄maʿtå̄ lə-qōl ʾištɛḵå̄ wat-tōḵal min-hå̄-ʿēṣ ʾăšɛr ṣiwwītīḵå̄ lē-mōr lō tōḵal mimm-ɛnnū ʾărūrå̄ hå̄-ʾăḏå̄må̄ ba-ʿăḇūrɛḵå̄ bə-ʿiṣṣå̄ḇōn tōḵălɛnnå̄ kōl yəmē ḥayyɛḵå̄

And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast <u>hearkened</u> unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life;

וּלְאָדָ֣ם אָמַ֗ר כִּֽי־שָׁמַעְתָּ֮ לְק֣וֹל אִשְׁתֶּךָ֒ וַתֹּ֨אכַל֙ מִן־הָעֵ֔ץ אֲשֶׁ֤ר צִוִּיתִ֙יךָ֙ לֵאמֹ֔ר לֹ֥א תֹאכַ֖ל מִמֶּ֑נּוּ אֲרוּרָ֤ה הָֽאֲדָמָה֙ בַּֽעֲבוּרֶ֔ךָ בְּעִצָּבוֹן֙ תֹּֽאכֲלֶ֔נָּה כֹּ֖ל יְמֵ֥י חַיֶּֽיךָ׃

→ Adam not only sensorially heard Eve, but also **followed** her and ate of the tree.

2.1.2 *šå̄maʿ* + CONTENT

✴ ✴ **Two** Hebrew syntactical patterns are used for denoting **hearing of content** in the corpus: *šå̄maʿ* with a *kī* 'that' phrase, which introduces indirect speech, and *šå̄maʿ* with a form of *ʾå̄mar* 'say'. All these cases,

of hearing content, are translated by *clywed*, followed by a variety of Welsh structures.

In

		4
Dywedodd hefyd, wele <u>clywais</u> fod ŷd yn yɔ Aipht, ewch i <u>wared</u> yno, a phɔynnwch i ni oddi yno, fel y bôm fyw, ac na byddom feirw.	way-yōmɛr hinnē <u>šåmaʿtī</u> <u>kī</u> yɛš-šɛbɛr bə-miṣråyim rədū-šåmm-å wə-šibrū-l-ånū miš-šåm wə-niḥyɛ wə-lō nåmūt	Gen. 42:2

וַיֹּ֕אמֶר הִנֵּ֣ה שָׁמַ֔עְתִּי כִּ֥י יֶשׁ־שֶׁ֖בֶר בְּמִצְרָ֑יִם רְדוּ־שָׁ֙מָּה֙ וְשִׁבְרוּ־לָ֣נוּ מִשָּׁ֔ם וְנִחְיֶ֖ה וְלֹ֥א נָמֽוּת׃

And he said, Behold, I have <u>heard</u> that there is corn in Egypt: get you down thither, and buy for us from thence; that we may live, and not die.

→ there is a *kī* phrase.

And in

		5
A Pharao a ddywedodd wɔth Joſeph, bɔeuddwydiais freuddwyd, ac nid [oes] ai deonglo ef: ond myfi a <u>glywais</u> <u>ddywedyd</u> am danat ti, y gwɔandewi freuddwyd iw ddeonglu.	way-yōmɛr parʿō ʾɛl-yōsēp ḥålōm ḥålamtī ū-pōtēr ʾēn ʾōt-ō wa-ʾănī <u>šåmaʿtī</u> ʿålɛkå <u>lē-mōr</u> tišmaʿ ḥålōm li-ptōr ʾōt-ō	Gen. 41:15

וַיֹּ֤אמֶר פַּרְעֹה֙ אֶל־יוֹסֵ֔ף חֲל֣וֹם חָלַ֔מְתִּי וּפֹתֵ֖ר אֵ֣ין אֹת֑וֹ וַאֲנִ֗י שָׁמַ֤עְתִּי עָלֶ֙יךָ֙ לֵאמֹ֔ר תִּשְׁמַ֥ע חֲל֖וֹם לִפְתֹּ֥ר אֹתֽוֹ׃

And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, I have dreamed a dream, and *there is* none that can interpret it: and I have <u>heard</u> say of thee, *that* thou canst understand a dream to interpret it.

→ a form of *ʾåmar* occurs.

The way Morgan translated these complex syntactic complements is fascinating, but out of our scope here. The relevant fact is that hearing of **content** is translated using *clywed*.

2.1.3 *šåmaʿ* + OBJECT+PARTICIPLE

6

✳ The Hebrew structure of '*šåmaʿ* + OBJECT+PARTICIPLE' is our third neutralising environment. ✳ It is translated by its **closest structural (and semantic) equivalent**, '*clywed* + OBJECT+[*yn*+INFINITIVE]', with the Welsh '*yn*+INFINITIVE' paralleled to the Hebrew participle.

Here it is with the co-text of this beautiful linguistic parallelism (they all fit!).

A chlybu Moſes y bobl yn wylo trwy eu tylwythau, pob vn yn nrws ei babell: ac enynnodd dig yɔ Arglwydd yn fawɔ, a dɔwg oedd gan Moſes.

Then Moses <u>heard</u> the people weep throughout their families, every man in the door of his tent: and the anger of the LORD was kindled greatly; Moses also was displeased.

way-yišmaʿ   mōšɛ   ʾɛt-hå-ʿåm bōkɛ lə-mišpəḥōṯåw ʾīš lə-p̄ɛṯaḥ ʾåhålō way-yiḥar-ʾap̄ YHWH məʾōḏ ū-ḇ-ʿēnē mōšɛ råʿ

וַיִּשְׁמַ֨ע מֹשֶׁ֜ה אֶת־הָעָ֗ם בֹּכֶה֙ לְמִשְׁפְּחֹתָ֔יו אִ֖ישׁ לְפֶ֣תַח אָהֳל֑וֹ וַיִּֽחַר־אַ֤ף יְהוָה֙ מְאֹ֔ד וּבְעֵינֵ֥י מֹשֶׁ֖ה רָֽע׃

2.2   *clywed*:*gwɔando*

✳ Now, after we've sifted the cases where a true opposition exists from those in which only one of the two is selectable, we are getting to the core of the paper: the opposition between *clywed* and *gwɔando*.

✳ In the nutshell, the opposition is this [*point while speaking*]:

- *clywed* is 'hearing' in the simple, semantically unmarked, sense of **sensory perception of sound**.

- *gwɔando*, on the other hand, is 'hearing' in **any other sense**, involving actual sensory hearing or not. These include obeying, accepting, following, judging, interpreting, etc.

Keep this table in mind.

	sensory	additional meaning
clywed	+	−
gwɔando	±	+

> This is no surprise for any speaker of Welsh, but what I find intriguing is those many cases in which Morgan actually had to add **new information**, **new interpretation**, by choosing one over the other. I hope to show this in the next few minutes.

2.2.1   Lists of senses and abilities

> We will begin with the obvious and proceed to the more complex cases.

> ✳ Lists of senses are *par excellence* examples for the use of *šåma‘* in the pure **sensory** meaning, by definition. *šåma‘* in these examples is, as expected, translated by *clywed*. There are several such lists, of senses and abilities, in the Hebrew Bible.

Ac yno y gwafanaethwch dduwiau [o] waith dwylo dŷn, [ʃɛf] pɹɛn, a maen, y rhai ni welant, ac ni chlywant, ac ni fwyttânt, ac ni aroglant.

And there ye shall serve gods, the work of men's hands, wood and stone, which neither see, nor <u>hear</u>, nor eat, nor smell.

wa-‘åbaḏtɛm-šåm ʾɛlōhīm ma‘åśē yəḏē ʾåḏåm ʾēṣ wå-‘ɛbɛn ʾåšɛr lō-yirʾūn wə-lō yišmə‘ūn wə-lō yōklūn wə-lō yərīḥun

וַעֲבַדְתֶּם־שָׁם אֱלֹהִים מַעֲשֵׂה יְדֵי אָדָם עֵץ וָאֶבֶן אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִרְאוּן וְלֹא יִשְׁמְעוּן וְלֹא יֹאכְלוּן וְלֹא יְרִיחֻן:

7

[Deu. 4:28]

> [*point in terzas:*] they neither see, nor hear, nor eat, nor smell.

⁴ Eu delwau hwy [ydynt] o aur, ac arian, [ʃef] o waith dynnion. ⁵ Genau [ʃydd] iddynt, ac ni lefarant, llygaid [ʃydd] ganddynt, ac ni welant. ⁶ [Y maɛ] cluʃtiau iddynt, ac ni chlywant, ffroenau [ʃydd] ganddynt, ac ni aroglant. ⁷ Dwylo [ʃydd] iddynt, ac ni theimlant: traed [ʃy] iddynt, ac ni cherddant: ni leiʃiant [ychwaith] ai gwddf.

⁴ Their idols *are* silver and gold, the work of men's hands. ⁵ They have mouths, but they speak not: eyes have they, but they see not: ⁶ They have ears, but they <u>hear</u> not: noses have they, but they smell not: ⁷ They have hands, but they handle not: feet have they, but they walk not: neither speak they through their throat.

⁴ ʾăṣabbēhɛm kɛsɛp̄ wə-zåhåb̲ maʿăśē yəd̲ē ʾåd̲åm ⁵ pɛ-l-åhɛm wə-lō yəd̲abbērū ʿēnayim l-åhɛm wə-lō yir'ū ⁶ ʾåznayim l-åhɛm wə-lō yišmåʿū ʾap̄ l-åhɛm wə-lō yərīḥūn ⁷ yəd̲ēhɛm wə-lō yəmīšūn raḡlēhɛm wə-lō yəhallēk̲ū lō-yɛhḡū bi-ḡrōnåm

⁴ עֲצַבֵּיהֶם כֶּסֶף וְזָהָב מַעֲשֵׂה יְדֵי אָדָם:
⁵ פֶּה־לָהֶם וְלֹא יְדַבֵּרוּ עֵינַיִם לָהֶם וְלֹא יִרְאוּ:
⁶ אָזְנַיִם לָהֶם וְלֹא יִשְׁמָעוּ אַף לָהֶם וְלֹא יְרִיחוּן:
⁷ יְדֵיהֶם | וְלֹא יְמִישׁוּן רַגְלֵיהֶם וְלֹא יְהַלֵּכוּ לֹא־יֶהְגּוּ בִּגְרוֹנָם:

▌ This is a beautiful example for mental and other abilities.

2.2.2 Judgement

▌ ✶ *šåmaʿ* in the sense of **judging**, of deciding one way or the other, or of asking God for judgement, is translated by *gwɜando*. Ex. 9 is such an example, out of five.

A'r amʃer hwnnw y goɜchymynnais i'ch barnwŷɜ chwi gan ddywedyd: gwɜandewch [ddadleuon] rhwng eich bɜodyɜ, a bernwch gyfiawnder rhwng gŵɜ ai frawd, ac ai eʃtron hefyd.

And I charged your judges at that time, saying, <u>Hear</u> the causes between your brethren, and judge righteously between *every* man and his brother, and the stranger *that is* with him.

wå-ʾăṣawwɛ ʾɛt̲-šōp̄ṭēk̲ɛm b-å-ʿēt̲ ha-hi lē-mōr šåmōaʿ bēn-ʾăḥēk̲ɛm ū-šp̄aṭtɛm ṣɛd̲ɛq bēn-ʾīš ū-b̲ēn-ʾåḥīw ū-b̲ēn gērō

וָאֲצַוֶּה אֶת־שֹׁפְטֵיכֶם בָּעֵת הַהִוא לֵאמֹר שָׁמֹעַ
בֵּין־אֲחֵיכֶם וּשְׁפַטְתֶּם צֶדֶק בֵּין־אִישׁ וּבֵין־אָחִיו
וּבֵין גֵּרוֹ:

2.2.3 Vows

> ✳ Chapter 30 of the book of Numbers deals with making women's **vows** void. We will not enter the religious legal details here, but the relevant fact is that whether her father or husband actually **hears** the vow being pronounced is crucial to the validity of making it void. *clywed* is being used. There are 9 examples in that chapter.

Ond os ei gŵr gan ddiddymmu ai diddymma hwynt y dydd y clywo, ni ſaif dim a ddaeth allan oi gwefuſau, oi haddunedau, ac o rwymedigaeth ei henaid, ei gŵr ai diddymmodd hwynt, ar Arglwydd a fadde iddi.

But if her husband hath utterly made them void on the day he <u>heard</u> *them*; *then* whatsoever proceeded out of her lips concerning her vows, or concerning the bond of her soul, shall not stand: her husband hath made them void; and the Lord shall forgive her.

wə-ʾim-håp̄ēr yåp̄ēr ʾōṯ-åm ʾīšåh bə-yōm <u>šåmʿō</u> kål-mōṣå śəp̄åṯɛhå li-ndårɛhå ū-l-ʾissar nap̄šåh lō yåqūm ʾīšåh hăp̄ēråm wa-yhwh yislaḥ-l-åh

וְאִם־הָפֵר֩ יָפֵ֨ר אֹתָ֥ם ׀ אִישָׁהּ֮ בְּי֣וֹם <u>שָׁמְעוֹ֒</u> כָּל־מוֹצָ֨א שְׂפָתֶ֧יהָ לִנְדָרֶ֛יהָ וּלְאִסַּ֥ר נַפְשָׁ֖הּ לֹ֣א יָק֑וּם אִישָׁ֥הּ הֲפֵרָ֖ם וַיהֹוָ֥ה יִֽסְלַֽח־לָֽהּ׃

10
[Num. 30:13*]

2.2.4 Interpretation of dreams

> ✳ Hearing others' dreams in the sense of interpreting them is translated by *gwrando*. As you can see in ex. 11:

A Pharao a ddywedodd wrth Joſeph, breuddwydiais freuddwyd, ac nid [oes] ai deonglo ef: ond myfi a glywais ddwedyd am danat ti, y <u>gwrandewi</u> freuddwyd iw ddeonglu.

And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, I have dreamed a dream, and *there is* none that can interpret it: and I have heard say of thee, *that* thou canst <u>understand</u> [lit. in Heb. *hear*] a dream to interpret it.

way-yōmɛr parʿō ʾɛl-yōsēp̄ ḥălōm ḥålamtī ū-p̄ōṯēr ʾēn ʾōṯ-ō wa-ʾănī šåmaʿtī ʿålɛḵå lē-mōr <u>tišmaʿ</u> ḥălōm li-p̄tōr ʾōṯ-ō

וַיֹּ֤אמֶר פַּרְעֹה֙ אֶל־יוֹסֵ֔ף חֲל֣וֹם חָלַ֔מְתִּי וּפֹתֵ֖ר אֵ֣ין אֹת֑וֹ וַאֲנִ֗י שָׁמַ֤עְתִּי עָלֶ֙יךָ֙ לֵאמֹ֔ר <u>תִּשְׁמַ֥ע</u> חֲל֖וֹם לִפְתֹּ֥ר אֹתֽוֹ׃

11
[Gen. 41:15]

12

⎡ Gen. ⎤
⎣ 37:6 ⎦

O blegit dywedafe wᴈthynt, gwᴈandewch atolwg y bᴈeuddwyd hwn, yᴈ hwn a frenddwydiais.

And he said unto them, <u>Hear</u>, I pray you, this dream which I have dreamed:

way-yōmɛr ʾălēhɛm <u>šimʿū</u>-nå ha-ḥălōm haz-zɛ ʾăšɛr ḥålåmtī

וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵיהֶם שִׁמְעוּ־נָא הַחֲלוֹם הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר
חָלָמְתִּי:

13

⎡ Judges ⎤
⎣ 7:15 ⎦

Pan glybu Gedeon adᴈoddiad y bᴈeuddwyd ai ddirnad, yna efe a addolodd: ac a ddychwelodd i werffyll Ifrael, ac a ddywedodd, cyfodwch, canys rhoddodd yᴈ Arglwydd werffyll y Madianiaid yn eich llaw chwi.

And it was *so*, when Gideon <u>heard</u> the telling of the dream, and the inter-pretation thereof, that he worshipped, and returned into the host of Israel, and said, Arise; for the LORD hath de-livered into your hand the host of Mid-ian.

way-hī <u>ki-šmōaʿ</u> giḏʿōn ʾɛt-mispar ha-ḥălōm wə-ʾɛt-šiḇrō way-yištåḥū way-yåšåḇ ʾɛl-maḥănē yiśråʾēl way-yōmɛr qūmū kī-nåṯan ʏʜᴡʜ bə-yɛḏkɛm ʾɛt-maḥănē miḏyån

וַיְהִי כִשְׁמֹעַ גִּדְעוֹן אֶת־מִסְפַּר הַחֲלוֹם
וְאֶת־שִׁבְרוֹ וַיִּשְׁתָּחוּ וַיָּשָׁב אֶל־מַחֲנֵה יִשְׂרָאֵל
וַיֹּאמֶר קוּמוּ כִּי־נָתַן יְהֹוָה בְּיֶדְכֶם אֶת־מַחֲנֵה
מִדְיָן:

2.2.5 *Ni a wnawn, ac a wᴈandawn*

precedes *nišmå'* ('we will hear', *gwɜandawn*) is a token for the people of Israel's willingness to accept the Torah: they say they will **do**, even before **hearing** what to do.

Now, I do not know whether Morgan was familiar with the Jewish Biblical hermeneutics, I guess not, but anyway his interpretation of this verse is different. He does not use *clywed* here, but *gwɜando*. This means he considers *na'ăśε* and *nišmå'* as parallel, that is, being two members of a Biblical paralellism, as two ways for saying basically the same thing: we will obey.

(The Vulgate, by the way, translates '*faciemus et erimus oboedientes*' and the English translations follow.)

Ac efe a gymmerth lyfr y cyfammod, ac ai darllenodd lle y clywe y bobl, a dywedaſant ni a wnawn, ac a <u>wɜandawn</u> yɜ hyn oll a lefarodd yɜ Arglwydd.

And he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people: and they said, All that the LORD hath said will we do, and be <u>obedient</u> [lit. in Heb. *we will hear*].

way-yiqqaḥ   sēp̄εr   hab-bərīt̠
way-yiqrå   bə-ʾåznē   hå-'åm
way-yōmrū   kōl   ʾăšεr-dibbεr
YHWH na'ăśε <u>wə-nišmå'</u>

וַיִּקַּח֙ סֵ֣פֶר הַבְּרִ֔ית וַיִּקְרָ֖א בְּאָזְנֵ֣י הָעָ֑ם וַיֹּ֣אמְר֔וּ
כֹּ֛ל אֲשֶׁר־דִּבֶּ֥ר יְהֹוָ֖ה <u>נַעֲשֶׂ֥ה וְנִשְׁמָֽע</u>:

14

[Ex. 24:7]

This kind of matching **hearing** with **doing** (and **keeping**) in the way of parallelism is quite common in the Pentateuch: there are over 20 examples of this kind, matching *gwɜando* with *gwneuthur* ('to do') and with, commonly, with *cadw* ('to keep').

✳ One such example, which exemplifies the opposition between *clywed* and *gwɜando* very clearly, and with which we will finish, is 15:

Neſſa di a chlyw 'r hyn oll a ddywed y2 Arglwydd ein Duw, a llefara di w2thym ni y2 hyn oll a lefaro 'r Arglwydd ein Duw w2thit ti: ac nyni a w2andawn, ac a wnawn [hynny.]

Go thou near, and <u>hear</u> all that the Lord our God shall say: and speak thou unto us all that the Lord our God shall speak unto thee; and we will <u>hear</u> *it*, and do *it*.

qəraḇ ʾattå <u>ū-šămå‘</u> ʾēṯ kål-ʾăšɛr yōmar YHWH ʾĕlōhēnū wə-ʾat təḏabbēr ʾēlēnū ʾēṯ kål-ʾăšɛr yəḏabbēr YHWH ʾĕlōhēnū ʾēlɛḵå <u>wə-šåma‘nū</u> wə-‘åśīnū

קְרַב אַתָּה֩ וּֽשֲׁמָ֨ע אֵ֜ת כָּל־אֲשֶׁ֤ר יֹאמַר֙ יְהוָ֣ה אֱלֹהֵ֔ינוּ וְאַ֣תְּ ׀ תְּדַבֵּ֣ר אֵלֵ֗ינוּ אֵת֩ כָּל־אֲשֶׁ֨ר יְדַבֵּ֜ר יְהוָ֧ה אֱלֹהֵ֛ינוּ אֵלֶ֖יךְ וְשָׁמַ֥עְנוּ וְעָשִֽׂינוּ׃

→ In this example there are two occurrences of *šåma‘* which are translated **differentially** into Welsh: the first one with *clywed* and the second one with *gw2ando*. The context of this verse is that the people are afraid of God's voice at Mount Sinai, and ask Moses to hear God's words and transmit them to them. Moses will **hear** [*point at chlyw and ū-šămå‘*], will receive, God's words and **speak** [*point at llefara and təḏabbēr*] them unto the people. This already means they will hear Moses' voice sensorially; in saying 'we will hear' [*point at w2andawn and wə-šåma‘nū*] they do **not** mean they will sensorially hear Moses, but that they will **accept** God's commandments, in other words: 'we will do' [*point at wnawn and wə-‘åśīnū*].

There are many more interesting examples and many more relevant facts and findings, but, well, **time is short**.

3   Further research

In the handout you can see, in a random order, several points I think worthy of **further research**. I'd be happy to **discuss** them with you and hear your comments and ideas, in the question session in a minute, or afterwards.

A. Expanding the scope to the rest of the senses. Especially interesting is *rå'å* ('see'), due to several reasons:

- Like *šåma‘* ('to hear'), it is a very common verb: *šåma‘* has 1159 occurrences in the Hebrew Bible, and *rå'å* has 1299. This allows us to draw definite conclusions, see how it was translated in

diverse syntactical, semantic and textual environment environments, and carefully examine the subtleties in the translator's interpretation of the text.

- Here as well it seems there are two main lexemes in use: *gweled* and *edrych*.
- The functional opposition between *gweled* and *edrych* has to be uncovered, but if *gweled*:*edrych* is parallel to *clywed*:*gwᴢando*, what we'll have is a whole that is more than the sum of its parts: a common underlying semantic distinction of 'sensory' (*clywed*, *gweled*) versus 'more than sensory'/'metaphoric'. Note that it is *gweled*, not *edrych*, that is being used in lists of senses (§2.2.1).

We cannot know *a priori* what is considered a sense in the semantic-cognitive classification of the ancient Hebrews (or the Welsh of the 16th–17th century). Lists of senses can be used as our key.

B. Comparing, typologically, the situation here with that of other translations of the Bible: other Welsh translations (the 1620 edition and the new translation of 1988/2004), other Celtic translations and translations into other, unrelated, languages. It seems to me especially enriching not only to draw general conclusions about the systemic differences and similarities, but also to examine closely particular verses and see the ways different translators in different languages, periods and cultures choose to interpret the text.

C. Expanding the procedural working method used here to other kinds of linguistic entities: not only verbs, or even lexemic elements, but grammemic elements as well. Of special interest is, to me, the second person pronouns in languages which have, like Welsh, a *tu*:*vu* (*ti*:*chi*(:*chdi*)) distinction. By examining the translator's choices in translating from a language which has no such distinction (Biblical Hebrew, Modern English, …) into a language which does have, we can map the social hierarchies between the characters in the narrative: who is talking to whom with *tu*/*ti* in what situations, and who with *vu*/*chi*.[1]

D. In *Beibl i Gymru*[2], Morgan Prys writes:

---

[1] Such a distinction, I believe, will not be seen in machine translation in any foreseeable future, as it involves a deep understanding of human social structures.

[2] MORGAN, Prys, *Beibl i Gymru*, (Gwasg Cambria / Pwyllgor Dathlu Pedwarcanmlwyddiant Cyfieithu'r Beibl, 1988).
URL: http://www.llgc.org.uk/big/index_c.htm

Y mae copi o Feibl Hebraeg yn perthyn i William Morgan wedi goroesi. Bu ym meddiant Arglwyddes Llanofer ac y mae heddiw yn un o drysorau Llyfrgell Genedlaethol Cymru yn Aberystwyth. Gellir gweld ar ymylon y ddalen nodiadau manwl William Morgan ar ystyron geiriau Hebraeg.

The copy of the Hebrew Bible belonging to William Morgan has survived to this day, preserved first by Lady Llanover, and now kept as one of the treasures of the National Library of Wales at Aberystwyth. In the margins of the pages may be seen detailed notes on the meanings of abstruse Hebrew words.

A single photograph from this copy is reproduced there, as Figure 19.

Being able to read these notes can be a peerless aid to a fuller understanding of the 1588 translation: being able to glance at a record of the translation process itself. As far as I know, no facsimile edition of the copy has been made. Is there any detailed record as for the content of the notes? Is there any chance to read them? If I will continue my research of the 1588 Bible, I will contact the National Library of Wales.

E. Comparing the system emerging from Morgan's Bible with other kinds of Welsh. Is the same holds true in (native) Modern Welsh (literary or colloquial)? What about the contemporary Welsh (c. 1588)? What about older stages of Welsh?

F. Morgan translated the Hebrew Bible from the Hebrew text. That's certain. But it is also evident that he did use existing translations in addition: the classical translations (the Greek Septuagint and the Latin Vulgate) and maybe some English translations. To what extant did they affect the translation in question? When did Morgan made use of them, and for what purposes?

G. Expanding the scope to the whole Hebrew Bible. Just as in the Pentateuch, many of the occurrences of *šåmaʿ* in the rest of the Hebrew Bible are quite trivial with regards to the opposition *clywed*:*gwɜando*. Nevertheless, I am sure there are many which are interesting, i.e. which required careful reading of the text in order to choose one over the other, which required interpreting the text according the translator understanding thereof.

Of special interest seems to me the cases in which *clywed* is used as an inclusive verb of perception (cf. Italian *sentire*), use (*b*) in the GPC:

Canfod neu dderbyn argraffiadau drwy'r synhwyrau (ag eithrio'r golwg); teimlo; arogleuo (cf. Gwydd. C. *atcluinti a boludh*, *RC* xvi. 54); blasu; *to feel*; *smell*; *taste*.	Perceive or receive impressions through the senses (except vision); to feel; to smell (cf. Mid. Irish *atcluinti a boludh*, *RC* xvi. 54); to taste: [...]

The GPC gives one example from the Bible, Ps. 58:9 (here I give the whole verse), in which *clywed* does not translate *šăma*ʿ but another Hebrew verb:

Cythɔyblied ef megis [mewn] llid, fel [peth] amrwd cynn i'ch crochanau glywed gwɔês y mieri.	bə-ṭɛrɛm yåḇīnū sīrōṯēḵɛm ʾåṯåḏ kəmō-ḥay kəmō-ḥårōn yiśʿårɛnnū

Before your pots can <u>feel</u> the thorns, he shall take them away as with a whirlwind, both living, and in *his* wrath.	בְּטֶרֶם יָבִינוּ סִּירֹתֵיכֶם אָטָד כְּמוֹ־חַי כְּמוֹ־חָרוֹן יִשְׂעָרֶנּוּ׃

4   Conclusion

✳ **What are the ends of the linguist's work?** This question had been answered diversly by many researchers from different schools. My answer, which I owe to my 'shoulders of giants' in Jerusalem and elsewhere, is this: to offer a more complete, deeper, wider, more exact, subtler and more sensitive understanding of **texts** by the means of linking **formal signifiers** with **functional signifieds** and describing the linguistic system that emerges from the text.

✳ Twenty minutes is not enough time for presenting such a description adequately. Nevertheless, I hope that I **did** manage to do two things: to present a formal way to extract such subtleties by comparing texts,

and to exemplify some of Morgan's fine and insightful readings of the Hebrew Bible in his magnificent work.

Thank you very much!