**Zeitschrift:** Judaica : Beiträge zum Verstehen des Judentums

Herausgeber: Zürcher Institut für interreligiösen Dialog

**Band:** 73 (2017)

**Artikel:** West Slavic Canaanite glosses in medieval Hebrew manuscripts

Autor: Dittmann, Robert

**DOI:** https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-961034

#### Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Mehr erfahren

#### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. En savoir plus

#### Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. Find out more

**Download PDF:** 02.12.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, https://www.e-periodica.ch

# West Slavic Canaanite Glosses in Medieval Hebrew Manuscripts

By Robert Dittmann\*

#### Abstract

Gegenstand der Studie ist eine linguistische Auswertung slawischer Glossen in mittelalterlichen hebräischen Handschriften vom 10. bis 14. Jahrhundert.\(^1\) Im westslawischen sprachlichen Raum spielte Prag zu jener Zeit aus wirtschaftlichen Gründen eine besondere Rolle, und dies wird auch durch die linguistische Analyse der Glossen bestätigt. Die Sprache der westslawischen Glossen, besonders jener Autoren, die mit der Prager Gesellschaft verbunden waren, ist mit dem Prager Tschechisch dieser Zeit fast völlig identisch und bezeugt, dass die damalige alltägliche Sprache der jüdischen Kreise Tschechisch war. Die sprachliche Analyse zeigt auch die Wichtigkeit der Glossen für das Studium des Alttschechischen, besonders hinsichtlich seiner phonologischen Entwicklung. Die Graphematik der westslawischen Glossen, eigentlich das erste

Robert Dittmann, Ph. D., Ústav českého jazyka a teorie komunikace; Filozofická fakulta, Univerzita Karlova, nám. J. Palacha 2, CZ-116 38 Praha 1, Česká republika. - The study originated at Charles University in Prague thanks to the support of the project Progres 009: Historie – Klíč k pochopení globalizovaného světa. - Abbreviations: AB = ABRAHAM B. AZRIEL, Sefer Arugat ha-Bosem, Jerusalem 1939-1963; CDB = Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Regni Bohemiae, vol. IV–VI, Prague 1962-2006; Or Zarua' = ISAAC B. MOSE, Or Zarua', vol. I-II, Zhitomir 1862, vol. III–IV, Jerusalem 1887-1890; PFUL = CHRISTIAN TRAUGOTT PFUL (ed.), Łužiski serbski słownik, Budyšin 1866; Słownik staropolski = STANISŁAW URBAŃCZYK ET AL. (ed.), Słownik staropolski, 11 vols. Kraków 1953–2003; ŠMILAUER = VLADIMÍR ŠMILAUER, *Příručka slovanské toponomastiky*, Praha 1970; Sreznevskij = Izmail Ivanovič Sreznevskij, Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка по письменным памятникам, 3 vols. St. Peterburg 1890–1912 [Moskva <sup>2</sup>1958]. – The font *Kliment* was created by Kiril Ribarov, whom I owe thanks for permission to use it. The transcription of Hebrew and Arabic proper nouns respects editorial modifications.

<sup>1</sup> For transcription rules, see Ondřej Bláha / Robert Dittmann / Karel Komárek / Daniel Polakovič / Lenka Uličná, *Kenaanské glosy ve středověkých hebrejských rukopisech s vazbou na české země*, Praha 2015, p. 17. All glosses quoted are taken from there, pp. 402-728, unless signalled otherwise, manuscript and folio details are given here only when necessary. For an older summary see Franciszek Kupfer / Tadeusz Lewicki, *Źródła hebrajskie do dziejów Słowian i niektórych innych ludów środkowej i wschodniej Europy. Wyjątki z pism religijnych i prawniczych XI–XIII w.*, Wrocław / Warszawa 1956.

stabilisierte orthographische System des Tschechischen, verrät viel Interessantes auf diesem Gebiet, unter anderem im Vergleich mit französischen und deutschen Glossen. In einigen Fällen wurde die hebräische Schrift genauer für die Aufzeichnung des Tschechischen als die zeitgenössische lateinische Schrift. Im Artikel werden die wichtigsten Aspekte der westslawischen kenaanischen Glossen untersucht, zu denen nicht zuletzt auch das Problem der ältesten tschechischen Satzverbindung gehört.

#### 1. Introduction

In European diasporic communities of the High Middle Ages, Hebrew had a position similar to Latin in Christian Western Europe. It was a sacred, primarily written language with no native speakers, and served the highest communicative functions, in liturgy, scholarship and law, but for everyday communication the vernaculars of the surrounding majority population were used, including their dialectal features. For example, Jews in the French Talmudic centre of Troyes adopted the local Champenois dialect,<sup>2</sup> the writings of Italian Jews show regional features of Italian dialects<sup>3</sup> and Jews in Slavic speaking areas, of which Prague stands out in the first centuries of the second millenium, also adopted the local dialect. Similarly, to the penetration of vernacular glosses into medieval Latin writings we encounter glosses in local vernacular variants recorded in the Hebrew script and inserted in Jewish manuscripts. Such glosses, illuminating difficult passages and taking on a number of other functions,<sup>4</sup> offer a precious testimony since they belong to the early specimens of several European languages and in some areas, such as medieval France, the Hebrew-script vernaculars gradually expanded into

<sup>2</sup> KIRSTEN A. FUDEMAN, "The Old French Glosses in Joseph Kara's Isaiah Commentary," in: Revue des Études Juives 165 (2006), pp. 147-177, here p. 156.

<sup>3</sup> AARON D. RUBIN, "Judeo-Italian," in: LILY KAHN / AARON D. RUBIN (eds.), *Handbook of Jewish Languages*, Leiden / Boston 2016, pp. 297-364, here pp. 298-299.

MARC KIWITT, "Hébreu, Français, et « Judéo-Français » dans les commentaires bibliques des pašţanim," in: MARIE-SOPHIE MASSE / ANNE-PASCALE POUEY-MOUNOU (eds.), Langue de l'autre, langue de l'auteur. Affirmation d'une identité linguistique et littéraire aux XIIe et XVIe siècles, Genève 2012, pp. 137-154, here p. 149; ROBERT DITTMANN, "The Czech Language of Jews in Přemyslid Bohemia of the Eleventh to Fourteenth Century," in: International Journal of the Sociology of Language 238 (2016), pp. 15-35, here pp. 23-24; LENKA ULIČNÁ, Staročeské glosy ve středověkých rabínských spisech, Praha 2014 [unpublished Ph. D. dissertation], pp. 3-8; MENAHEM BANITT, Rashi. Interpreter of the Biblical Letter, Tel Aviv 1985, pp. 31-69; DRORI GANIEL, The Exegetical Method of Rabbi Yosef Kara with Regard to the Prophetic Books, Bangor 1993 [unpublished Ph. D. dissertation], pp. 109-111; HANNA LISS, Creating Fictional Worlds. Peshaţ-Exegesis and Narrativity in Rashbam's Commentary on the Torah, Leiden / Boston 2011, pp. 230-235.

mixed glossaries and even literary works of various genres recorded in Hebrew letters with a total of tens of thousands of words.<sup>5</sup>

Whereas Jewish writings documenting Old French stretch from mid-11th to 14th centuries,6 and Jewish recordings of Old Italian are evidenced between 1200 and 1700,7 West Slavic can be found in Jewish writings roughly from the 10th to 13th/14th centuries.8 Yet judging from the preserved manuscripts, the West Slavic glosses never went beyond the first phase of the vernacular penetration, i.e. individual glosses, phrases and at most sentences inserted into the Hebrew text. As to the number of glosses, the West Slavic material comprises around 400 items (most of them in works of authors flourishing in the first half of the 13th century),9 counting also recurrent occurrences and later copies, so that the size of the corpus is well comparable to early Yiddish glosses prior to 1300.10 The value of Czech glosses is to be more appreciated in light of the fact that from before the 1250s we have mostly scattered glosses (the number of bohemica in the 11th century totals 17)11 and one compound sentence in Czech, and the number of Czech words, excluding proper nouns, recorded in Latin lists from between 1241 and 1283 and compiled in the reliable edition Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris regni Bohemiae, 12 amounts to a total of about 170, including later copies. In

<sup>5</sup> Cf. MARC KIWITT, Les gloses françaises du glossaire biblique B.N. hébr. 301. Édition critique partielle et étude linguistique, Heidelberg 2013, p. 15.

<sup>6</sup> MARC KIWITT / STEPHEN DÖRR, Judeo-French, in: KAHN / RUBIN (eds.), Handbook of Jewish Languages (note 3), pp. 138-177, here p. 138.

<sup>7</sup> RUBIN, Judeo-Italian (note 3), p. 298.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Brad Sabin Hill, "Judeo-Slavic," in: Kahn / Rubin (eds.), Handbook of Jewish Languages (note 3), pp. 599-617, here p. 602.

<sup>9</sup> The total of several thousand glosses in the works of Isaac b. Mose and Abraham b. Azriel alone, adduced by HANNA ZAREMSKA, Żydzi w średniowiecznej Polsce. Gmina krakowska, Warszawa 2011, p. 38, is certainly overestimated.

<sup>10</sup> ERIKA TIMM, "The Early History of the Yiddish Language," in: CHRISTOPH CLUSE (ed.), The Jews of Europe in the Middle Ages (Tenth to Fifteenth Centuries). Proceedings of the International Symposium held at Speyer, 20–25 October 2002, Turnhout 2004, pp. 353-364, here p. 356.

<sup>11</sup> JANA PLESKALOVÁ, "K počátkům českého pravopisu," in: *Listy filologické* 122 (1999), pp. 167-175, here p. 168.

<sup>12</sup> SÁŠA DUŠKOVÁ / JINDŘICH ŠEBÁNEK (eds.), Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Regni Bohemiae. Tomi IV fasciculus primus (Inde ab a. 1241 usque ad a. 1253), Praha 1962; Ťomi IV fasciculus secundus (Inde ab a. 1241 usque ad a. 1253), Indices [...], Praha 1965; Tomi V fasciculus primus (Inde ab a. 1253 usque ad a. 1266), Praha 1974; Tomi V fasciculus secundus (Inde ab a. 1267 usque ad a. 1278), Praha 1981; ZBYNĚK SVITÁK / HELENA KRMÍČKOVÁ ET AL. (eds.), Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Regni

fact, the two masterpieces of Czech-Jewish literature of the first half of the 13th century, אור זרוע (Or Zarua') and ערוגת הבשם ('Arugat ha-Bosem), belong to the lengthiest works connected to the Czech soil of that time. Apart from geographical and ethno-historical mentions of mostly proper nouns in ספר יוסיפון (Sefer Josippon, mid-10th century), ספר מסעות (Sefer massa'ot), the "itinerary" of Benjamin of Tudela (12th century) and סיבוב העולם (Sibbuv ha-'olam), the "itinerary" of Petahiah of Regensburg (2nd half of the 12th century), by authors such as Isaac b. Dorbelo (around mid-12th century), Ephraim b. Jacob of Bonn (2nd half of the 12th century) and others, early Canaanite words bringing other than anthroponymical and toponymical material occur in the copies of works of Italian (Natan b. Jehiel [1035–1102]), French (especially Rashi [1040-1105], Joseph b. Shim'on Qara [c. 1050-c. 1125]), and German writers (Gershom b. Jehudah [c. 960-1028/1040]), Me'ir of Rothenburg [c. 1215–1293], ספר חסידים [Sefer Hasidim], Ḥayyim b. Isaac Or Zarua' [2nd half of the 13th century], anonymous compilations),13 and most of them appear in works of Slavic-speaking authors connected to Prague.<sup>14</sup> The oldest surviving manuscripts with such glosses date back to the 11th/12th centuries and most of the important manuscripts originated in the 13th/14th centuries, the latest copy of Or Zarua' goes back to the 17th century only. The manuscripts were usually written in Ashkenaz in Ashkenazi script, but some of them come from Italy and are written in Italian Hebrew script, whereas some old copies of Rashi or Natan b. Jehiel were written in Sephardi or Byzantine script and copied in those areas.<sup>15</sup>

Compared to Old French glosses in Hebrew script, the spectrum of literary genres containing West-Canaanite glosses is much poorer and limited to the fields where Hebrew dominated, i.e. liturgy, the Bible and religious law. Hints at a possible existence of a Czech translation of the Mahzor, the Targum or a glossary<sup>16</sup> are rather scanty und unreliable, and it is only later

Bohemiae. Tomi VI fasciculus primus (Inde ab a. 1278 usque ad a. 1283), Praha 2006. Hereafter cited as CDB (note 12), IV/1, IV/2, V/1, V/2, VI/1.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. MORITZ GÜDEMANN, Geschichte des Erziehungswesens und der Cultur der Juden in Deutschland während des XIV. und XV. Jahrhunderts, Wien 1888, p. 275.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Hill, "Judeo-Slavic" (note 8), p. 605; Kupfer / Lewicki, Źródła (note 1).

<sup>15</sup> BLÁHA ET AL., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), pp. 163-171. In the present study, I partially draw on the results achieved in that book.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Julius Wellesz, "Über R. Isaak b. Mose's 'Or Sarua'," in: Jahrbuch der Jüdisch-Literarischen Gesellschaft 4 (1906), pp. 75-124, here p. 94, Kupfer / Le-Wicki, Źródła (note 1), p. 191, Roman Jakobson / Morris Halle, "The Term Canaan in Medieval Hebrew," in: Roman Jakobson, Selected Writings, vol. VI: Early Slavic Paths and Crossroads, Part II: Medieval Slavic Studies, ed. Stephen

that we have reports about Avigdor Qara (before 1389–1439), a Prague rabbi, who composed songs and poems in the sacred language as well as in Czech (בלשון הקודש וגם בלשו' פיהם). <sup>17</sup>

## 2. The Prague Jewish community and Canaan

Prague, where the presence of Jews is first attested to by the Arabic writing Jewish diplomat and traveller, Ibrāhīm ibn Yaʻqūb of Tortosa (mid-10<sup>th</sup> century), who visited the town in the 960s, was the only really important Jewish community in the Přemyslid dukedom in its first centuries and the most significant one among Western Slavs in the medieval and early modern period. Already in the mid-10<sup>th</sup> century, the *Sefer Josippon* manifests a certain "Bohemia-centricity" of references to Slavs, <sup>18</sup> and the central position of Prague in Western Canaan has been recognized and repeatedly confirmed by modern historical scholarship. <sup>19</sup> In Hebrew writings, mentions of Prague have been appearing since the 11<sup>th</sup> century, <sup>20</sup> and Petahiah of Regensburg even identifies synecdochically Prague and Bohemia (פרגא ארץ בהם והיא הנקראת). <sup>21</sup> A synagogue and a school (yeshiva) probably had existed in Prague since the 11<sup>th</sup> century, the Latin

Rudy, Berlin / New York / Amsterdam 1985, pp. 858-886, herep. 885; Uličná, *Staročeské glosy* (note 4), pp. 147-148.

<sup>17</sup> Frankfurt a. M., Universitätsbibliothek, Ms hebr. oct. 94, fol. 213b.

<sup>18</sup> MIKHAILA. CHLENOV, "Knaanim – the Medieval Jewry of the Slavonic World," in: *Jews and Slavs* 24 (2014), pp. 13-51, here p. 17.

<sup>19</sup> HAJIM TYKOCINSKI, "Vorarbeiten zur 'Germania judaica'. II," in: Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums 53 (1909), pp. 344-359; cf. CHLE-NOV, "Knaanim" (note 18), p. 23; MAX WEINREICH, "Yiddish, Knaanic, Slavic: The Basic Relationships," in: MORRIS HALLE ET AL. (eds.), For Roman Jakobson. Essays on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday, 11 October 1956, The Hague 1956, pp. 622-632, here p. 624, speaks about the "orbit of Prague"; cf. ALEXANDER BEIDER, "Onomastic Analysis of the Origins of Jews in Central and Eastern Europe," in: Jews and Slavs 24 (2014), pp. 58-116, here p. 61.

<sup>20</sup> TYKOCINSKI, "Vorarbeiten" (note 19), p. 350.

<sup>21</sup> Bláha et al., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), p. 342.

<sup>22</sup> TYKOCINSKI, "Vorarbeiten" (note 19), p. 349; LENKA ULIČNÁ, "Hlavní proudy středověkého (pre)aškenázského myšlení a tzv. pražská komentátorská škola. Hledání identity v podmínkách izolace a integrace," in: JIŘINA ŠEDINOVÁ ET AL., Dialog myšlenkových proudů středověkého judaismu. Mezi integrací a izolací, Praha 2011, pp. 268-331, here p. 294; VLADIMÍR SADEK, "Medieval Jewish Scholars in Prague," in: Review of the Society for the History of Czechoslovak Jews 5 (1992–1993), pp. 135-149, here p. 138; the still preserved Old-New Synagogue comes probably from 1280, cf. MARTIN MUSÍLEK, "Úvodní studie," in: LENKA BLECHOVÁ

Chronica Boemorum by Kosmas of Prague (c. 1045–1125), an educated dean of the Prague chapter, mentions maiores natu Judeos ("Jewish elders") and reports about the Jews' extraordinary wealth, due to their involvement in coin minting,<sup>23</sup> confirmed also by names of Hebrew origin on early Přemyslid bracteates and later numismatic finds in Poland.<sup>24</sup> Evidence for the affluence of Prague Jews, compared to the poor conditions of their co-religionists in Russia, Poland and Hungary, is given also by Eliezer b. Isaac of Prague in the late 12th century, 25 and Isaac b. Dorbelo warns against laziness and lenient ruling among Polish traders of the time.<sup>26</sup> These reports go hand in hand with mentions of illustrious Prague sages, whose fame soon radiated beyond Canaan proper, so that Ephraim b. Isaac of Regensburg (d. 1175) speaks of them as הכמים מחכמים (the sages of sages), thus using a gradation phrase that is repeated by Isaac b. Mose (c. 1180-c.1250).<sup>27</sup> Since the 12th century, Jewish scholarship linked with Prague is represented by renowned wisemen such as Isaac Khazan, Jacob b. Isaac, Isaac b. Mordecai, Eliezer b. Isaac, Isaac b. Jacob ha-Laban, Abraham b. Azriel and Isaac b. Mose, and possibly Jekutiel b. Jehudah Zalman ha-Kohen. Starting with the first documented names, they provably often studied in Rhenish and French centres and to a large degree followed their exegetical methods and in the later stages of their careers maintained close ties especially to Regensburg. 28

ET AL. (eds.), Archiv český. Díl XLI. Prameny k dějinám Židů v Čechách a na Moravě ve středověku, Praha 2015, pp. vii-xxxv, here p. xxiii.

<sup>23</sup> TYKOCINSKI, "Vorarbeiten" (note 19), pp. 346, 355.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Luboš Polanský, "Jména mincmistrů na českých denárech přelomu 10. a 11. století," in: Eva Doležalová / Petr Meduna (eds.), Co můj kostel dnes má, nemůže kníže odníti. V ěnováno Petru Sommerovi k životnímu jubileu, Praha 2011, pp. 236-246, here p. 241.

<sup>25</sup> JAKOBSON / HALLE, "The Term Canaan," (note 16), p. 885.

<sup>26</sup> ISRAEL M. TA-SHMA, Creativity and Tradition. Studies in Medieval Rabbinic Scholarship, Literature and Thought, Cambridge / London 2006, p. 38.

<sup>27</sup> JULIUS WELLESZ, "Isaak b. Mose Or Sarua," in: *Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 48 (1904), pp. 129-144, here p. 137; JAKOBSON / HALLE, "The Term *Canaan*," (note 16), p. 885; BLÁHA ET AL., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), p. 338.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Tamás Visi, On the Peripheries of Ashkenaz. Medieval Jewish Philosophers in Normandy and in the Czech Lands from the Twelfth to the Fifteenth Century, Olomouc 2011 [habilitation thesis], pp. 124-130; Tamás Visi, Words of Power: Studies in Rabbinic Authority and Literature, Olomouc 2015, pp. 19-24; Bláha et al., Kenaanské glosy (note 1), pp. 77-88; Lenka Uličná, "Úvodní studie," (note 22), pp. 294-302; Lenka Uličná, Staročeské glosy (note 4), pp. 35-46. Robert Dittmann / Ondřej Bláha, "The Lexicological Contribution of Abraham

These relations might be supported by a gravestone of a certain *Milota* (מילוטא) in Worms from 1190.<sup>29</sup>

In the Middle Ages, Canaan may refer not only to the Biblical Canaan but metonymically, possibly since the close association of Slavs with slave trade and slavery, roughly to the Slavic-speaking area, and more narrowly to the Czech Lands<sup>30</sup> (and its ruling domain), to which most mentions of European Canaan in the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> centuries refer.<sup>31</sup> In the writings of Prague-connected authors, Canaan refers to the Czech kingdom as can be learned form Isaac b. Mose' phrase במלכותינו בארץ כנען (in our kingdom, in the land of Canaan), occurring four times.<sup>32</sup> In a parallel way, the language of Canaan may refer to the language of Biblical Canaan<sup>33</sup> or to Slavic languages, which were often considered as an undifferentiated whole, or from 10<sup>th</sup> to 13<sup>th</sup> centuries most typically to Czech. In the High Middle Ages and later, Christian Latin writings show a similar narrowing of the meaning of the

ben Azriel and Isaac ben Moses to Old Czech," in: ONDŘEJ BLÁHA ET AL. (eds.), Knaanic Language: Structure and Historical Background. Proceedings of a Conference Held in Prague on October 25–26, 2012, Prague 2013, pp. 66-91, here p. 84; ROMAN ZAORAL, "Wirtschaftsbeziehungen zwischen Bayern und Böhmen. Die Handelskontakte Prags mit Eger, Regensburg, Nürnberg und Venedig im 13. Jahrhundert," in: ROBERT LUFT / LUDWIG EIBER (eds.), Bayern und Böhmen. Kontakt, Konflikt, Kultur. Vorträge der Tagung des Hauses der Bayerischen Geschichte und des Collegium Carolinum in Zwiesel vom 2. bis 4. Mai 2005, München 2007, pp. 13-34, here pp. 22-29.

<sup>29</sup> BEIDER, "Onomastic Analysis" (note 19), p. 66. The name *Milota* is recorded also in a Latin list of Czech origin from 1194, see JANA PLESKALOVÁ, *Tvoření nejstarších českých osobních jmen*, Brno 1998, p. 136.

<sup>30</sup> JAKOBSON / HALLE, "The Term *Canaan*" (note 16), pp. 858-867; BLÁHA ET AL., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), 142-148, cf. CHLENOV, "Knaanim" (note 18), pp. 16-19. By Czech Lands I shall refer here only to Bohemia and Moravia, leaving aside other territories included in the Kingdom of Bohemia.

<sup>31</sup> CHLENOV, "Knaanim" (note 18), p. 17.

<sup>32</sup> Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Rosenthal 3, II, fol 21a, 21b, 67b, 151a; HAJIM TYKOCINSKI, "Lebenszeit und Heimat des Isaak Or Sarua," in: *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judetums* 55 (1911), pp. 478-500, here pp. 491-494.

<sup>33</sup> Judith Olszowy-Schlanger, "An Old Slavic Gloss in Rashi's Bible Commentary? שניר Revisited," in: Ondřej Bláha et al. (eds.), Knaanic Language (note 28), pp. 200-214. Such is also the reference to לשון כנען of R. Tam quoted by Avraham (Rami) Reiner, "Bible and Politics: A Correspondence Between Rabbenu Tam and the Authorities of Champagne," in: Elisheva Baumgarten et al. (eds.) Entangled Histories. Knowledge, Authority, and Jewish Culture in the Thirteenth Century, Philadelphia 2017, pp. 59-72, here p. 61.

phrase terra Sclavorum and lingua sclavonica.<sup>34</sup> So far all 10th to 13th centuries' in-text Slavic glosses introduced by the phrase in the language of Canaan (כנען בלשון) are identifiable with Early and Old Czech, provided scribal errors and historical development of Czech are taken into account.<sup>35</sup> Readings garbled by copyists or editors have often marred the appropriate interpretation, which manifests the necessity to study the authentic manuscripts. Now that the photodocumentation of nearly all known Czech-related Canaanite glosses (other than proper nouns) is available,<sup>36</sup> an obstacle obscuring interpretation even of the best scholars has been removed. At the same time, collection and interpretation of the Canaanite glosses are far from being completed. Since we possess no autographs, we must take into consideration that even later copies may have preserved a reading better than a chronologically preceding manuscript.

Such is the case of glosses recorded as קרוכי in both the early, 13th century Amsterdam manuscript and a late 16th/17th centuries Frankfurt copy of Or Zarua'. The reading kruchy 'pieces', which we put forward in our book, 37 for supposed Hebrew 'quince' may raise doubts and is not fully satisfactory. A more careful comparison with Isaac b. Mose's disciple Me'ir of Rothenburg and his glosses reveals that the latter preserved a more correct and even vocalized reading 'קרונ' kdúně 'quince' in a 14th century Parma manuscript, and that the Or Zarua' manuscripts not only lost vocalization but introduced common scribal errors by interchanging visually similar letters ¬ ¬ and ¬ ¬ 1. Moreover, the correct reading exemplifies an important variant, viz., a continuant of the reconstructed Common Slavic \*kbdun'a, which would sound kdúně in the nominative plural and had been attested in Old Czech and more widely West Slavic only in its reputedly ancient variant kdúle.38 At the same time, here and there new Canaanite glosses emerge such as three glosses in Sefer ha-pardes le-Raši³9 (לומל) כומל) ciad century in i.e. chmel or

<sup>34</sup> JAKOBSON / HALLE, "The Term Canaan" (note 16), pp. 860-867; BLÁHA ET AL., Kenaanské glosy (note 1), p. 146.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. DITTMANN, "The Czech Language" (note 4), pp. 19-23, JAKOBSON / HALLE, "The Term *Canaan*" (note 16), pp. 884, on a different view see especially ALEXANDER KULIK, "Jews and the Language of Eastern Slavs," in: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 104 (2014), pp. 105-144.

<sup>36</sup> Bláha et al., Kenaanské glosy (note 1), pp. 402-728.

<sup>37</sup> Bláha et al., Kenaanské glosy (note 1), pp. 443-445.

<sup>38</sup> JIŘÍ REJZEK, Český etymologický slovník, Praha 2015, pp. 299-300: entry kdoule.

<sup>39</sup> ספר הפרדס לרש"י: Sefer ha-pardes le-Raši. Sepher ha-pardes, an [sic] Liturgical and Ritual Work, Attributed to Rashi, Edited with Introduction and Critical Notes by Rabbi

chumel meaning 'beer, beverage made from hops' – this meaning is rarely attested in Old Czech;<sup>40</sup> furthermore ליטקא בלשון כנען, i.e. lýtko/lýtka 'calf/ calves'; and finally a passage where a Canaanite gloss accompanies an explanation in Hebrew and Old French: בלשון לעז רטא, ובלשון כנען צשקא ובלשון לעז רטא, cf. Old Czech čěška, Modern Czech čéška 'kneecap' (a word that in Slavic languages occurs in Czech only).<sup>41</sup> An unclear gloss שבחרא appears in a Cambridge manuscript of Jehudah he-Hasid's commentary on Genesis 1:3.<sup>42</sup>

The sages of the Prague community were obviously multilingual. Many must have grasped French and German during their study periods and by intensive contact, they mastered Hebrew and in everyday communication they most probably used the Prague vernacular Czech at least until the mid-13<sup>th</sup> century. German glosses are very scarce in the preserved writings of Abraham b. Azriel (1st half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century) and Isaac b. Mose and French glosses abound only in Isaac's work, 4d all keeping the orthographical norm of the French and German glossators, 45 so that their borrowing from

H. L. Ehrenreich. Budapest 684 [= 1924], pp. 65, 125, 165. These glosses have been identified by Dr. Lenka Uličná of the Jewish Museum in Prague, to whom I voice my sincere thanks.

<sup>40</sup> *Elektronický slovník staré češtiny*, see *Vokabulář webový* [on-line]. Version 0.8.0. [accessed 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2017]. Oddělení vývoje jazyka Ústavu pro jazyk český AV ČR, v. v. i. Available at <a href="http://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz">http://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz</a>, entry *chmel*.

<sup>41</sup> See Jiří Rejzek, Český etymologický slovník (note 38), entry čéška, p. 125.

<sup>42</sup> Joseph Dan, תורת הסוד תורת תורת אשכנז, 11 vols. Jerusalem 2008–2015, vols. V-VI: חוגיהם של בעלי הסוד באשכנז וחוג משפחת קלונימוס, vol. V: חוגיהם של בעלי הסוד באשכנז וחוג משפחת קלונימוס, p. 409, note 47 (I thank Tamás Visi for supplying the gloss and the reference).

<sup>43</sup> LENKA ULIČNÁ, "Towards the Everyday Life of Jews and Christians as Presented in the So-Called Kenaanic Glosses," in: EVA DOLEŽALOVÁ ET AL., Juden in der mittelalterlichen Stadt. Der städtische Raum im Mittelalter – Ort des Zusammenlebens und des Konflikts. Jews in the Medieval Town. Urban Space in the Middle Ages – A Place of Coexistence and Conflicts, Praha 2015, pp. 125-129, here pp. 126-129.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. AB IV, p. 293; for the *Or Zarua*", TYKOCINSKI, "Lebenszeit" (note 32), pp. 497-498, gives the number of 51 Canaanite, many French and 10 German glosses.

<sup>45</sup> ВLÁHA ЕТ AL., Kenaanské glosy (note 1), р. 240; ROMAN JAKOBSON, "Из разыс-каний над старочешскими глоссами в средневековых еврейских памятниках," in: ROMAN JAKOBSON, Selected Writings, vol. VI: Early Slavic Paths and Crossroads, pt. 2: Medieval Slavic Studies, ed. S. RUDY, Berlin / New York / Amsterdam, 1985, pp. 855-857, here pp. 856-857; ISAAK MARKON, "Die slavischen Glossen bei Isaak b. Mose Or Sarua," in: Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums 49 (1905), pp. 707-721, here p. 708.

foreign models has some probability and in some cases seems to be certain. The Prague Jews adopted a number of Czech geographical names, including exonyms, such as Praga, Dunaj, Vltava, Ostrigom, Botieč, and Vratislav.<sup>46</sup> In accordance with gradually Bohemicized German geographical names they partially used the final -k in cases such as אוֹר וֹירצבורק (עוֹר שׁנִידְלְּשׁתִים, בּוֹרְלְּשִׁתְּם, בּוֹרְבְּעִרְם, בּוֹרְלְּשִׁתְם, לֹיִר שׁנִיבְּוֹרְלְּשִׁתְם, לֹיִר שׁנִיבְּעִרְם, לֹיִר שׁנִיבְּעִרְם, לֹיִר שׁנִיבְּעִרְם, לֹיִר שׁנִיבְּעִרְם, לֹיִר שׁנִיבְּעִרְם, for Magdeburg, בוֹרְבְּעִרְם, for Nürnberg etc.<sup>47</sup> They were also able to produce linguistic puns based on paronymy with Czech words (Nemetum).<sup>48</sup> Furthermore, they used particularly feminine given names (but one of the sages, possibly identical with Abraham b. Azriel, bears the name הלדיק Chládek), and adopted a probably colloquial name of the Prague toponymy Mezigrada/Mezigradie ("between the castles"),<sup>49</sup> which originating at the latest from the early 13th century<sup>50</sup> parallels probably the expression inter utrasque urbes in Kosmas' Chronicle from the early 12th century.<sup>51</sup> Isaac b. Mose denotes Czech as the language spoken "by us, Jews": בלשונינו בלשׁו כנעׁי ("in our language, in the language of Canaan").<sup>52</sup>

The introductory formula בלשונינו ("in our language") is used already by Rashi and other rabbinical writings as a usual phrase to indicate "vernacular terms". <sup>53</sup> In addition to that, Isaac b. Mose quotes a saying consisting of Czech and Hebrew words used as a ritual formula during shopping of meat on Saturday. <sup>54</sup> The Czech vernacular is used also in a scrap of direct speech recorded by Isaac's teacher Abraham b. Azriel <sup>55</sup> and in Joseph Qara's commentary on Is 49:20 in a place quoting a direct speech. <sup>56</sup> The Slavic language

<sup>46</sup> BLÁHA ET AL., Kenaanské glosy (note 1), pp. 335-344.

<sup>47</sup> Wellesz, "Über R. Isaak" (note 16), pp. 97, 104, 105.

<sup>48</sup> JAKOBSON / HALLE, "The Term Canaan" (note 16), pp. 885-886.

<sup>49</sup> TYKOCINSKI, "Vorarbeiten" (note 19), pp. 347, 356.

<sup>50</sup> HANA VOLAVKOVÁ, *Zmizelá Praha 3. Židovské město pražské*, Praha / Litomyšl 2002, p. 14; BLÁHA ET AL., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), pp. 329-344.

<sup>51</sup> RUTH KESTENBERG-GLADSTEIN, "The Early Jewish Settlement in Central and Eastern Europe: Bohemia," in: CECIL ROTH (ed.), *The World History of the Jewish People, Ser. II. Medieval Period*, London 1966, pp. 309-312, here p. 311.

<sup>52</sup> Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Rosenthal 3, II, fol. 24a.

<sup>53</sup> MENAHEM BANITT, Rashi, Interpreter of the Biblical Letter, Tel Aviv 1985, p. 6.

<sup>54</sup> Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Rosenthal 3, II, fol. 209b. Such mixed formulas are perfectly acceptable in Jewish communities *pro foro interno*, cf. ROMAN JAKOBSON, "The Languages of the Diaspora as a Particular Linguistic Problem," in: ONDŘEJ BLÁHA ET AL., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), pp. 793-813, here p. 806.

<sup>55</sup> Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, ebr. 301, fol. 71a.

<sup>56</sup> BLÁHA ET AL., Kenaanské glosy (note 1), p. 314. The imperative pomkni s'a ("move") occurs in Cincinnati and Prague copies, and in a very distorted form possibly in a

consciousness of the Prague-connected authors employing Canaanite glosses, even though their works or their parts may have originated also outside of Prague,<sup>57</sup> is evident from their never confusing of voiced and voiceless consonants, in contrast to *Josippon*, the traveller Benjamin of Tudela, Me'ir of Rothenburg, Hayyim b. Isaac Or Zarua', Hebrew inscriptions on Polish coins or German-speaking Christians recording 13th-century Czech.<sup>58</sup>

## 3. West Slavic or Czech?

The above-mentioned authors employing glosses "in the language of Canaan" (בלשון בנעון) may be divided into two groups: firstly, authors who never resided in Prague such as Gershom b. Jehudah, Rashi, and Joseph Qara, but had Slavic students, and secondly, those probably born in Prague and spending part of their lives there (Abraham b. Azriel, Isaac b. Mose). The latter group's activity culminates in the first half of the 13th century; they authored the vast majority of known Canaanite glosses of which some are borrowed by later Ashkenazi authors and compilations as, e.g., Me'ir of Rothenburg, Hayyim b. Isaac Or Zarua', and the Nuremberg Mahzor. Of the former group the French exegete, "the greatest of medieval commentators of piyyut''59 and a proponent of the peshat-exegesis Joseph Qara excels with respect to Canaanite glosses with a dozen glossed passages and two dozen items of Canaanite vocabulary.

The Slavistic interpretation faces several serious obstacles:<sup>60</sup> early stages of Slavic languages were much closer to each other, but there is rarely literary evidence for them. Even less we know about dialectal differences and borderlines between them. Some glosses are not vocalized (and vowel differences are more helpful for Slavistic identification and

St. Petersburg copy at the same place, cf. Prague, National Library of the Czech Republic, XVIII F 6, fol. 336a; Cincinnati, Hebrew Union College, JCF 1, fol. 123a; St. Petersburg, Russian National Library, Evr. I 21, fol. 69a.

<sup>57</sup> VISI, Words of Power (note 28), p. 23.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. VÁCLAV FLAJŠHANS, Nejstarší památky jazyka i písemnictví českého, Praha 1903, vol. I: Prolegomena a texty, p. 66.

<sup>59</sup> ABRAHAM GROSSMAN, "Exegesis of the Piyyut in 11th Century France," in: GILBERT DAHAN ET AL. (eds.), Rashi et la culture juive en France du Nord au moyen âge, Paris / Louvain 1997, pp. 261-277, here p. 268.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Bláha et al., "On the Problem of Judeo-Czech and the Canaanite Glosses of the 11th to the 13th Centuries in Hebrew Manuscripts," in: *Jews and Slaws* 24 (2014), pp. 117-151, here pp. 120-122; Bláha et al., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), pp. 173-179.

interpretation than consonants). The orthography is sometimes imprecise and fails to distinguish between nuances, and the absence of autographs implies that scribal errors occur, disseminated especially by non-native Slavic scribes, and they are manifolded sometimes by editors of printed editions. Attempts have been propounded to explain some of the textual glosses in the language of Canaan with the help of Old Polish, Old Lusatian, Old Polabian or even Old Russian and/or southern Slavic languages, disrespecting to a large degree intra- and extralinguistic features and factors: As mentioned above, the Prague community was by far the most important of the West Slavic centres prior to 1300,61 distinguished by affluence and famous rabbinic authorities since the 12th century, and thus had the best conditions to cultivate the tradition and keep scholarly contacts with flourishing northern French and German centres. Indeed, we find glosses corresponding to the Early and Old Czech phonologically, morphologically, word-formationally and lexically. In the case of Isaac b. Mose, Lusatian has to be taken into account since the author spent some time in Meissen, and at that time there was a smoother dialect transition between Czech and Lusatian Sorbian, yet his phrase במלכותינו בארץ כנען "in our kingdom, in the land of Canaan" may refer to the Czech Přemyslid kingdom only.62 Since we have summarized our respective arguments elsewhere;63 it may suffice here to give the most problematic examples only.

For all of Joseph Qara's in-text glosses written in לשון כנען, the Czech interpretation is the easiest one, albeit hypothetically we cannot exclude the presence of some East Slavic glosses, for we know that also students from that area studied in French academies, and some forms are indiscriminately all-Slavic.<sup>64</sup> Yet whereas not a single one is distinctively East Slavic (which is in line with terms like דוסיא, רושיאה, כנען יוון, all referring to Rus'),<sup>65</sup> there are undoubtedly West Slavic glosses, unique parallels to Old Czech,

<sup>61</sup> Cf. VISI, On the peripheries (note 28), p. 121: "Up to the middle of the twelfth century Prague was probably the only city with a sizable Jewish population east of Regensburg and south of Merseburg."

<sup>62</sup> Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Rosenthal 3, II, fol 21a, 21b, 67b. KUP-FER / LEWICKI, Źródła (note 1), p. 206, mention 10 occurrences.

<sup>63</sup> BLÁHA ET AL., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), pp. 121-124, 126-142, 173-181; DITT-MANN, "The Czech Language" (note 4), pp. 19-23.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Kulik, "Jews and the Language" (note 35), p. 124.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. ALEXANDER KULIK, "The Jews of *Slavia Graeca*: the Nothern Frontier of Byzantine Jewry?" in: ROBERT BONFIL ET AL. (eds.), *Jews in Byzantium. Dialects of Minority and Majority Cultures*, Leiden / Boston 2012, pp. 297-314, here pp. 298, 312.

and Germanisms. Even the longest piece of early Canaanite text, a compound sentence, fits very well Early Czech. At least some in-text glosses had most probably been included already in the protographs, for instance the glosses in Qara's commentary on Isaiah can be found already in the best and oldest copy, i.e. New York, JTS, Ms. Lutzki 778, probably written in France<sup>66</sup> with the glossed passages in Isaiah commentary originating from the 12th century.<sup>67</sup> These glosses are included also in other early manuscripts such as Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Cod. Hebr. 5/2 (from 1233), Paris, BNF, Hébreu 163 (1253), and New York, JTS, Lutzki 777 (1268). This hypothesis is further supported by the consistent use in Qara's Slavic glosses of the grapheme  $\overline{p}$  to render the Slavic /k/, which is a velar stop, see glosses פלינקא פלינקא plenka ("a piece of cloth"), פומקניסא pomkni s'a ("move"), טוליקו toliko ("only"): it is in agreement with his Old French glosses, in which he consistently differentiates between 7, rendering the velar stop /k/, and rendering the labiovelar stop /kw/.68 In Or Zarua' and 'Arugat ha-Bosem, we rarely encounter כלדא for the velar /k/, cf. כלדא kláda ("the stocks") and יוַמִישְׁכַנִיסָא v zameškání s'a ("in contemplation").

Furthermore, West Slavic features in Qara's glosses include the absence of positively marked polnoglasie (פלינקא פלינקא), the presence of contraction בילידלו (סְטָטִי for státý, אוגלי and אוגלי and בילידלו mýdlo, -dl- (יני mýdlo, -dl- פָייני or מְיִילוֹ and בילידלו and בילידלו péci /s'a/ ["to occupy oneself with something undesirable"]), the absence of prothetic j- resulting from reconstructed coalscence i-/ji- in Bohemia of the 10th and 11th centuries (אַ ine) and j- absence in נְמִי neměj (on the contrary měti in East Slavic is somewhat rare and late, since the 15th century, cf. SREZNEVSKIJ vol. II, p. 252) and the probable z for Common Slavic \*dj (אוֹדִיזַא, אוֹדִיזַא, אוֹדִיזַא, אוֹדִיזַא, אוֹדִיזַא, אוֹדִיזַא, אוֹדִיזַא, אוֹדִיזַא, אוֹבִילָא, קבילא, קבילא, קבילא, קבילא, קבילא, אוֹניִלא, kobela ["bag"], מושט מושט, מושט אונ is also not excluded that

<sup>66</sup> SARA JAPHET, "The Commentary of Rabbi Samuel ben Meir (Rashbam) on the Book of Job," in: GILBERT DAHAN ET AL. (eds.), Rashi et la culture juive en France du Norde au moyen âge, Paris / Louvain 1997, pp. 163-176, here p. 166; cf. AVRAHAM GROSSMAN, "The School of Literal Jewish Exegesis in Northern France," in: MAGNE SÆBØ (ed.), Hebrew Bible. Old Testament: the History of Its Interpretation, vol. I/2: The Middle Ages, Göttingen 2000, pp. 321-371, here p. 350.

<sup>67</sup> FUDEMAN, "The Old French Glosses" (note 2), p. 151; JAPHET, "The Commentary of Rabbi Samuel ben Meir" (note 66), pp. 165-166.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. KIRSTEN A. FUDEMAN, "The Linguistic Significance of the Le'azim in Joseph Kara's Job Commentary," in: *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 93 (2003), pp. 397-414, here p. 405.

the basis of the gloss פלכטיצא פלכטיצא plachtica ["mantle"] is a loan from German). It seems that morphology and word formation also support the West Slavic and Czech character of Qara's glosses, for instance גְלִיזַן for glezen (cf. Old Czech hlezen, hlezno ["ankle"] vs. Old Russian glezna, SREZNEVSKIJ vol. I, p. 519), סְטְטֵי for státý (cf. Old Lusatian staty ["steadfast"] in the exactly corresponding meaning, PFUL, p. 676), אוגלי and אוגלי uglé (cf. Old Czech uhlé ["coal"] and Old Russian ug(z)/z, SREZNEVSKIJ vol. III, p. 1141) and the uncertain and possibly distorted reading ניכדא nikda (cf. Old Czech nikda ["never"] and Old Russian ni koda along with ni kogda and even nikogda, nikokdy, SREZNEVSKIJ vol. I, p. 1388; vol. II, p. 451). It seems that the semantic reasons also favour the Old Czech interpretation, e.g. פומקניסא, פומקניסא, פומקניסא pomkni s'a ("move [yourself]") perfectly corresponds to Old Czech pomknúti ("move"), whereas Old Russian pombknuti means "subordinate, humiliate, catch" (SREZNEVSKIJ vol. II, p. 1167). Last but not least, the closeness of some glosses in Qara's commentary on Isaiah facilitates the presupposition of their Czechness, if uglé (Is 54:16) and mošt (Is 49:20) are Czech, then דבר debr ["valley"] (Is 40:4) and léto ["summer"] (Is 28:4) are likely to be attributed to Czech as well, and this concerns even closer plachtica/plenka, oděz'a (Is 3:22) and מוניסטא, מוניסטא, מוניסטא, מוניסטא monistes/monista ["necklaces"] (Is 3:18). If glosses in Qara's commentary in Prague (National Library, XVIII F 6) on fol. 334b (בילידלו) ["bleach"], מידלו (פומקניסא, מושט) are clearly West Slavic, it is reasonable to suppose that the reading of the all-Slavic gloss in the same manuscript on fol. 335b דבר will be Czech debr:69 If Qara's commentary uses two semantically close West Slavic equivalents in a commentary on Jr 2:22 (mýdlo, bělidlo), it may be presumed that the two Canaanite synonyms in Is 3:22, one of them West Slavic, will both be Czech and the reading oděz'a is preferable to oděža.

Unsurprisingly the continuants of Canaanite glosses have, in very rare cases, survived only in West Slavic languages other than Czech, for instance Lusatian Sorbian has preserved staty, Polabian and other languages kept the continuant to monisto "necklace", Slovak dialects know kupica "cup" (a continuation of the gloss קופיצי in the Or Zarua'), Standard Slovak pútec ("hair parting";<sup>70</sup> cf. glosses קופיץ for pútec in 'Arugat ha-Bosem and קופיץ

The spelling TIIT at the same place in the Cincinnati manuscript reveals probably the German orthographical habits, cf. HENRI BOURGEOIS, Petite Grammaire Judéo-Allemande à l'usage des personnes qui désirent s'initier à la langue des Juifs de Russie, Galicie et Roumanie, Paris 1913, p. 6.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Ľubor Králik, *Stručný etymologický slovník slovenčiny*, Bratislava 2015, *púť*, p. 485.

pútec in Or Zarua', cf. Old Czech pútec, nowadays no longer in use, in Příruční slovník jazyka českého from 1935–1957 and Slovník spisovného jazyka českého from 1960–1971 poutec is marked in this meaning as outdated and dialectal),<sup>71</sup> and the outdated Slovak odedza is the closest parallel to the gloss oděz'a.72 Sometimes, the older stages of Slavic languages preserved better the meaning closer to the Canaanite gloss: the Or Zarua' vocable אשקרובדא škrovada, accompanying the French gloss אשקרובדא (eskudre "container, vessel"), is in Old Czech preserved only in the meaning "quarrel, discord", but the Old Church Slavonic parallel CKORPADA, occurring in the canonical Codex Suprasliensis, has the corresponding meaning "roasting pan, grate".73 In support of the Czech interpretation it should be noted that even some of the earliest glosses in Gershom b. Jehudah's writings (died 1028/1040) such as טיג täg ("joint") and פָּלָצֵא pleca ("shoulder"; cf. Old Russian pleče, plešče, SREZNEVSKIJ vol. II, p. 964) bear clearly the strongest affinities to Old Czech<sup>74</sup> and the twice attested vocalization in יסְרֵיבוֹנוֹ for triebeno ("ritually cleansed") excludes the presence of the polnoglasie.

In the latter case, the Czech reading *triebeno* supposes a dittography or a common scribal error of interchanging *yod* and *waw* (attested well also elsewhere in the glosses) and later added vocalization, 75 which indeed is the case

<sup>71</sup> See the on-line versions available at URL: <a href="https://bara.ujc.cas.cz/psjc/">https://bara.ujc.cas.cz/psjc/</a> and <a href="http://ssjc.ujc.cas.cz/">http://ssjc.ujc.cas.cz/</a>, accessed on 7 February 2017; also, VÁCLAV VÁŽNÝ, Historická mluvnice česká II. Tvarosloví. 1. část. Skloňování, Praha 1970, p. 75.

<sup>72</sup> KRÁLIK, *Stručný etymologický slovník slovenčiny* (note 70), see the entry *odedza*, p. 397; cf. ROMAN JAKOBSON, "Řeč a písemnictví českých židů v době přemyslovské," in: LADISLAV MATĚJKA (ed.), *Kulturní sborník ROK*, New York 1957, pp. 35-46, here p. 39.

<sup>73</sup> ZOE HAUPTOVÁ ET AL. (ed.), Slovník jazyka staroslověnského / Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae, 5 vols. Prague 1958–2016, vol. IV: S–Y, p. 89: entry cκοβραμα, cf. Franz Miklosich, Vergleichende Grammatik der slavischen Sprachen, 4 vols. reprint Cambridge 2015, vol. I: Lautlehre, p. 74; Jan Gebauer, Historická mluvnice jazyka českého, 4 vols. Praha 1894–1929, ²1958–1963, vol. I: Hláskosloví, p. 483. The Old Czech forms škravada/škrovada explain according to our opinion the Czech dialectal form škarvanit, poškarvanit se "to get angry", škarvadit se "argue, quarrel" unclear to Václav Machek, Etymologický slovník jazyka českého, Praha 1997, the entry škarvanit (p. 611), and possibly more persuasively also the dialectal škavražný "eloquent" (ibid.).

<sup>74</sup> Jakobson / Halle, "The Term *Canaan*" (note 16), p. 884, Bláha et al., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), pp. 132-134, 585-586.

<sup>75</sup> Presupposed already by JAKOBSON / HALLE, "The Term *Canaan*" (note 16), p. 884. The reading *triebono* corresponds to Old Polish, cf. JOHANNES REINHART,

in the manuscript (Rome, Biblioteca Angelica, Or 1, fol. 284a). 76 The similarity of yod and waw is well observable especially in the first occurrence of the gloss. The existence of these scribal errors is surely plausible and hardly surprising if we take into account the long process of copying (the relevant manuscript dates back to the 12th/13th centuries only, whereas Gershom lived between 960-1028/1040). The Early Polish affiliation of this gloss, the only serious Polish candidate among early West Slavic Canaanite textual appellative glosses, admittedly cannot be fully excluded. From among the Polish centres of that time, especially Cracow must be taken into consideration, which may have had certain affinities to the Rhenish communities, influenced by Gershom b. Jehudah, since around the turn of the 10th and 11th centuries.<sup>77</sup> Yet the town was under Bohemian control of the Přemyslid dukes until the end of the 10th century, 78 the function of a local standard language was at that time fulfilled probably by Czech Church Slavonic<sup>79</sup> and we have no reports about illustrious scholars living there for almost two following centuries. Cracow of that time may be considered rather a business station of itinerant Jewish merchants with some permanent Jewish settlement. References to Poland by Jehudah ha-Kohen of the 11th century and Isaac b. Dorbelo of the 12th century<sup>80</sup> are in this line, in the latter case it has been noted that the report "does not necessarily indicate settled Jewish life there".81 It is noteworthy that the reports of Eliezer b. Isaac and Isaac b. Dorbelo (12th century, see below) speak against presupposition of any developed scholarship and neither of the 12th century travellers, Petahiah of Regensburg nor Benjamin of Tudela, transmits any mention of Cracow or its

<sup>&</sup>quot;Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Rekonstruktion des Urtschechischen," in: Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch 46 (2000), pp. 165–174, here p. 169.

<sup>76</sup> I thank Dr. Lenka Uličná (Jewish Museum in Prague) for consultation.

<sup>77</sup> Cf. ISRAEL M. TA-SHMA, Creativity and Tradition (note 26), pp. 37-38; IRVING A. AGUS, Urban Civilization in Pre-Crusade Europe. A Study of Organized Town-Life in Northwestern Europe during the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries Based on the Responsa Literature. Volume One, Leiden 1968, pp. 96-97; ZAREMSKA, Żydzi w średniowiecznej Polsce. Gmina krakowska (note 9), p. 96.

<sup>78</sup> ZAREMSKA, Żydzi w średniowiecznej Polsce. Gmina krakowska (note 9), p. 66.

<sup>79</sup> RADOSLAV VEČERKA, Staroslověnská etapa českého písemnictví, Praha 2010, p. 36.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. Kupfer / Lewicki, Źródła (note 1), pp. 37 and 152.

<sup>81</sup> TAMÁS VISI, "Rabbinic Sources about Jews in Medieval Moravia," in: EVA DO-LEŽALOVÁ ET AL., Juden in der mittelalterlichen Stadt. Der städtische Raum im Mittelalter – Ort des Zusammenlebens und des Konflikts. Jews in the Medieval Town. Urban Space in the Middle Ages – A Place of Coexistence and Conflicts, Praha 2015, pp. 103-123, here p. 106.

community.<sup>82</sup> The superior position of Prague over Cracow already in the second half of the 10<sup>th</sup> century is persuasively reported by Ibrāhīm ibn Ya'qūb, relating that Prague is the greatest business centre in the region, <sup>83</sup> and recognized by modern scholarship: "It seems that during the tenth century Bohemia and Kievan Russia were more advanced on the road to economic development and feudalisation than Poland."<sup>84</sup>

Some scholars express persisting doubts even with respect to Abraham b. Azriel's and Isaac b. Mose' glosses, connecting them both to Lusatian Sorbian. In the case of Abraham b. Azriel, M. Altbauer<sup>85</sup> drew attention to the glosses דְלֹוֹק (dalok for dalek ["far"]) and דָלוֹקוֹ (daloko for daleko ["far"]) as Lusatianisms. As a matter of fact, we have no hints or reports of Abraham's relation to Lusatian-speaking areas, but we know he was educated in Prague, was a teacher there of Isaac b. Mose and had relations to Regensburg with strong ties to Prague. The form לוֹקוֹ may have originated due to dittography in the same way as the gloss טְרֵיבוֹנוֹ of Gershom b. Jehudah did in our interpretation. It might appear tempting to consider both these vocalized cases as connected to Lusatian, but the labialization of e > o after palatalized consonants in Lusatian Sorbian did not probably yet start at the beginning of the 11th century, which excludes identity of these two cases as the same phonological process.86 Dittography and analogy seems to us a much more probable explanation, enhanced by the easy interchangeability of yod and waw, exemplified also by Canaanite glosses: the ליד led ("hail") of an early Amsterdam manuscript is copied in a late Frankfurt copy לוד, sedmým ("seventh") is recorded as סודמים in the Vatican copy of 'Arugat ha-Bosem, chvoštišče ("broom") is recorded as חבושתישצו, loket ("elbow") as לוקוט, dnem ("day") as דנוס etc. Altbauer (p. 34) concludes that apart from dalok and

<sup>82</sup> EUGENIUSZ DUDA, Krakowskie judaica, Warszawa 1991, pp. 3 and 7; BERNARD D. WEINRYB, The Jews of Poland. A Social and Economic History of the Jewish Community in Poland from 1100–1800, Philadelphia 1973, pp. 22-23; MARIAN FUKS, Żydzi w Polsce. Dawniej i dziś, Poznań 2000, p. 10; HANA ZAREMSKA, Żydzi w średniowiecznej Europie Środkowej: w Czechach, Polsce i na Wegrzech, Poznań 2005, p. 33.

<sup>83</sup> Cf. Ján Pauliny, *Arabské správy o Slovanoch: 9.–12. storočie*, Bratislava 1999, p. 116; for the 13<sup>th</sup> century see Chlenov, "Knaanim" (note 18), p. 22.

<sup>84</sup> FRANCIS W. CARTER, Trade and Urban Development in Poland. An Economic Geography of Cracow, from Its Origins to 1795, Cambridge 1994, p. 55.

<sup>85</sup> MOSHE ALTBAUER, "Achievements and Tasks in the Field of Jewish-Slavic Language Contact Studies," in: MOSZE ALTBAUER, Wzajemne wpływy polsko-żydowskie w dziedzinie językowej, Kraków 2002 [1972], pp. 29-42, here p. 33.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. GÜNTHER SCHAARSCHMIDT, A Historical Phonology of the Upper and Lower Sorbian Languages, Heidelberg 1997, p. 86.

daloko, there occur further Lusatianisms in Abraham's glosses, but he does not give any details. He might have been thinking about the gloss pútec, recorded in the Frankfurt manuscript as אָל פֿוץ púc ("hair parting"), close to Lusatian \*pútc (cf. Old Lusatian \*kamenc < \*-bcb etc.) with the loss of the penultimate yer before 1200.87 Nevertheless, the Vatican copy of 'Arugat ha-Bosem has a less corrupted and vocalized reading פוטץ in the identically reading passage, cf. the Vatican copy ( מקום חילוק פתיחה כי מקום חילוק eading passage, cf. the Vatican copy ולשו' פיקוס הוא ) and the Frankfurt copy (שערות כולו פתוח ונקרא בלשון כנען פוּטַץ לשו' פתיחה כי מקום חילוק שערות כולו פתוח ונקרא בל' כנע' פוץ). With the spelling סחפ כמח easily imagine an omission of the letter during the process of copying. Such a corrupted form (פוץ) appears also in Me'ir of Rothenburg's writings alongside another corrupted reading of the same word פוצץ (or פוצין), whereas his teacher Isaac b. Mose, from whom he took over several Canaanite glosses, has in preserved copies uncorrupted readings (פוטיץ, פוטיץ) in a total of four occurrences, copied perfectly even in a late Frankfurt manuscript of Or Zarua'.

Isaac b. Mose (c. 1180–c. 1250), born to a family of scholars probably in Bohemia, 88 stayed as a boy in Meissen in Saxony, as he himself once reports, 89 probably in the 1180s, 90 and therefore it is likely to assume that some Lusatianisms may have found their way into his works, even though he spent most of his childhood and youth in Bohemia. 91 The weak ties to the town of Meissen are reflected by the fact that he calls the town by its German and not Sorbian name (מֵיישׁין; or possibly Czech, cf. Old Czech Mišně, Mišeň and the forms Missn, Missnam in Kosmas' Latin chronicle). 92 The form אוליפסק Lipsk (cf. modern Czech Lipsko) for Leipzig is probably an archaic loanword from Lusatian dialects to Czech. More complicated is the

87 Cf. Schaarschmidt, A Historical Phonology (note 86), p. 64.

<sup>88</sup> BLÁHA ET AL., Kenaanské glosy (note 1), p. 403.

<sup>89</sup> OZ IV, p. 55b. Wellesz, "Über R. Isaak" (note 16), p. 104.

<sup>90</sup> Cf. Tykocinski, "Lebenszeit" (note 32), p. 483. On the Meissen community, see Andreas Christi, "Die Meißner Judengemeinde im Mittelalter: Sachzeugen und Schriftquellen im Kontext," in: *Mittellungen der DGAMN: Religiosität in Mittelalter und Neuzeit* 23 (2011), pp. 219-229, especially pp. 219-220.

<sup>91</sup> TYKOCINSKI, "Lebenszeit" (note 32), p. 499.

<sup>92</sup> JAN GEBAUER, *Slovník staročeský*, 2 vols. Praha 1903–1906, reprint 1970, vol. II: *K*–*N*, p. 372: entry *Míšně*, *Míšeň*; cf. HAJIM TYKOCINSKI, "Meissen," in: ISMAR ELBOGEN ET AL. (eds.), *Germania Judaica*, vol. I: *Von den ältesten Zeiten bis 1238*, Tübingen 1963, pp. 225-226, here p. 225.

form לבו Labo in Or Zarua' for the river Elbe,93 flowing through Meissen. Tykocinski<sup>94</sup> suggested emending it to *Labe*, and it might appear enticing to explain the end of the word by Lusatian (Upper Sorbian Łobjo, Lower Sorbian Łobje).95 However, the first syllable contradicts its alleged affiliation to Lusatian: the -o- in Lusatian forms is very old, stemming from Common Slavic metathesis of liquids, 96 and therefore we would expect a waw (the vocalization, however, reads -a-). It seems that the unexpected form, if it is not a scribal error, might be explained by the instability of the hydronym in Old Czech: Laba, Labe (the latter is attested already in the 12th century), Labě, formerly feminine, then neuter, for which the ending -o in the nominative singular has been the most typical. It seems unlikely that Isaac b. Mose, who in Meissen probably lived among German-speaking Jews,<sup>97</sup> would have employed the river name of Lusatian dialects as the only Lusatianism98 when writing his work three or four decades later. The hydronym appears in the second part of Or Zarua', which originated probably from the years between 1224–1235.99 Isaac b. Mose might have used a variant name from Prague Czech, where he was in the meantime educated, and where he was possibly also active as a school director. Another gloss of his, כלדא kláda ("the stocks"), written without waw, probably confirms the Czech result of the liquid metathesis (cf. Lusatian kłóda, kłoda PFUL p. 253, SMILAUER p. 91; Old Polish kłoda, see Słownik staropolski vol. III, p. 295). Lusatian might also be considered for explanation of the change x = x' as in the gloss אָטִיש, שְׁטֵישׁ, שְׁטֵישׁ אָשָׁנִישׁ אָשָׁנִישׁ אַנּלּל ("ripple"), which is well attested in Old Czech since the 14th century only, whereas in Lusatian the change  $\xi'\xi' > \xi't'$ 

<sup>93</sup> Cf. PAUL WEXLER, Explorations in Judeo-Slavic Linguistics, Leiden 1987, p. 92.

<sup>94</sup> TYKOCINSKI, "Lebenszeit" (note 32), p. 497.

<sup>95</sup> Cf. PAUL WEXLER, Two-Tiered Relexification in Yiddish. Jews, Sorbs, Khazars, and the Kiev-Polessian Dialect, Berlin / New York, 2002, p. 163.

<sup>96</sup> Cf. Schaarschmidt, *Historical Phonology* (note 86), p. 45; George Y. Shevelov, *A Prehistory of Slavic. The Historical Phonology of Common Slavic*, New York 1965, p. 396.

<sup>97</sup> TYKOCINSKI, Lebenszeit (note 32), pp. 490-491. The oldest Czech-written chronicle of the so-called Dalimil (from the beginning of the 14th century) speaks about Germans from Meissen attacking Czechs, see ROMAN JAKOBSON, Moudrost starých Čechů. Komentovaná edice s navazující exilovou polemikou, Praha / Červený Kostelec 2015, p. 183. At least some Jews in Saxony spoke Lusatian, as confirmed by a remark of Johannes de Saxonia referring to the end of the 13th century, cf. WEXLER, Explorations (note 93), p. 154; JAKOBSON / HALLE, "The Term Canaan" (note 16), p. 874.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. Kupfer / Lewicki, Źródła (note 1), p. 228.

<sup>99</sup> TYKOCINSKI, "Lebenszeit" (note 32), p. 487.

took place probably in the 12th century (in Slovak being completed possibly by the mid-13th century). 100 Yet the absence of assibilation (cf. Old Lusatian šćėć SMILAUER P. 177), which existed in Lusatian already since the beginning of the 12th century and is attested in the Latin script as early as 1202, and the absence of further Lusatianisms force us to look for another explanation (see below). The absence of possible Lusatianisms is evidenced by the absence in Isaac's glosses of labialization e > o, completed in Lusatian Sorbian by the middle of the 12th century, in צְרֵיף, צְרֵיף ("candlestick, clay vessel for a lamp"; cf. Upper Sorbian ¿rjóp/ ¿rjop, Lower Sorbian crjop); the systematic absence of prothetic v- in Canaanite glosses versus its presupposed presence in Lusatian since well before the 11th century; the opposite development of  $\ddot{a} > e$  at the end of word in both Upper Sorbian (cf. accusative of the reflexive pronoun  $s'e > s'\ddot{a} > s'e > s'o$  by the mid-12<sup>th</sup> century), and Lower Sorbian (cf.  $\ddot{a} > e$  with further development) – on the contrary, the Canaanite glosses of Abraham b. Azriel and Isaac b. Mose treat the  $\ddot{a}$  at the end of a word systematically the same way as  $a.^{101}$ 

Similarly, the very long duration and gradual realization of the dissimilation šč > šť in Central Slovak (13th to 16th centuries)<sup>102</sup> and Old Czech (14th to 15th centuries)<sup>103</sup> allow us to see in the form šťť an early development in Central Bohemian Prague Czech, if not a scribal habit influenced by Latin orthography (see below). This interpretation is supported by the fact that by Canaan Isaac b. Mose always refers to Bohemia; therefore, the language of Canaan (לשון כנען) should refer to Old Czech, too. The gloss šťť appears in Or Zarua I, p. 77, very close to the gloss konopie ("hemp"; Or Zarua I, p. 75; Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Rosenthal 3, I, fol. 93b), which corresponds the Old Czech but not the Old Lusatian forms (konopej, konopje PFUL p. 271).

The Polish interpretation of West Slavic 10<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> century Canaanite glosses, which Kupfer and Lewicki (1956) sometimes suggested, can be easily excluded on the following purely linguistic grounds and arguments: there are no traces of assibilation (a feature mentioned with respect to the alleged Lusatianisms already above, cf. *budi*, *budu*, *deget*, *mošt*, *oděz'a* etc.); the absence of nasal vowels; the presence of lexical Germanisms; the contracted forms such as *mém* instead of *mojim*; the absence of Polish dispalatalizations (cf.,

<sup>100</sup> SCHAARSCHMIDT, A Historical Phonology (note 86), p. 81.

<sup>101</sup> On development of Old Lusatian, see SCHAARSCHMIDT, A Historical Phonology (note 86), pp. 53-54, 86, 98.

<sup>102</sup> EUGEN PAULINY, Fonologický vývin slovenčiny, Bratislava 1963, p. 178.

<sup>103</sup> MIROSLAV KOMÁREK, Historická mluvnice česká I. Hláskosloví, Praha 1969, p. 140.

e.g., glosses like pěna/piena ["foam"] in Joseph Qara and Or Zarua' in Old Polish would have to sound piana, cf. Słownik staropolski vol. VI, p. 77; ליטוֹ, ליטו ("summer") in Joseph Qara and lato in Polish, cf. Słownik staropolski vol. IV, p. 7; גליזן for glezen in Qara and גליזנו glezno in Or Zarua' would have to be glogn in Old Polish, cf. Słownik staropolski vol. II, p. 417; for קובילא kobela see below). 104 In Canaanite glosses, Czech results of the liquid metathesis are reflected: in Polish the groups tolt, tort became trot, tlot, but in Czech trat, tlat and the same is true for Canaanite glosses, cf. כלדא klada in Or Zarua' above and Vratislav in the phrase יצחק מורטיסלוי Isaac of Vratislav (recorded corruptedly מורטיסליו) in 'Arugat ha-Bosem, 105 whereas Polish reads Wrocław; the same metathesis result occurs in a report, related to the year 1171, about a Russian Jew named R. Benjamin of Volodymyr / Vladimir/ in Cologne, which can be found in several manuscripts that read Vladimir, 106 a place name that in Hayyim b. Isaac's responses on Or Zarua' appears in the clear reading ולאדימיר. In the slightly different version ולדמיר, the same place name is mentioned also in another halachic collection. 107 Similar forms echoing the trat/tlat reflex and illustrating the same metathesis result are, e.g., דרזנא, דרזנה Dražna, מלדושה Mlada, מלדושה Mladuša on Jewish tombstones in Spandau (Berlin), Dražna appears also in Wrocław. 108 The presence of b in Isaac b. Hayyim's gloss הַהּוֹבֵיצֵי ha-hubicě ("mushrooms"; with slightly distorted punctuation) likewise excludes Polish background. Arguments against the Polish affiliation also can be deduced from a lot of other minor deviations, either

<sup>104</sup> In case of קוֹיטֵנִי *květný* the Polish reads *kwiat*, but in Old Polish the adjective *kwietny* is attested, cf. *Słownik staropolski* vol. III, p. 478.

<sup>105</sup> Vatican, Vat. ebr. 301, fol. 31a. The edition AB I, p. 191, reads יצחק מורטיסלוי. HAJIM TYKOCINSKI, "Wratzlau," in: ISMAR ELBOGEN ET AL. (eds.), Germania Judaica, vol. I: Von den ältesten Zeiten bis 1238, Tübingen 1963, p. 474, gives ורטיסיליו, a form identical with ABRAHAM BERLINER, Gesammelte Schriften, vol. I: Italien, Frankfurt a. M. 1913 [reprint Hildesheim 1981], I, p. 39.

<sup>106</sup> MICHAEL TOCH, The Economic History of European Jews. Late Antiquity and Early Middle Ages, Leiden / Boston 2013, p. 172.

<sup>107</sup> On both readings see Alexander Kulik, "The Earliest Evidence of the Jewish Presence in Eastern Rus'," in: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* XXVII (1–4) 2004–2005, pp. 13-24, here pp. 18-19. The Volodymyr Jewish community was connected to "the cultural realm of Ashkenazic Jewry" (p. 21).

<sup>108</sup> Cf. MARKUS BRANN, "Geschichte der Juden in Schlesien. I. Von den ältesten Zeiten bis 1335 – Anhang II. Die hebräischen Grabschriften schlesischer Juden aus dem 13. und 14. Jahrhundert," in: Jahresbericht des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars Fraenckel'scher Stiftung, 1896, pp. vi-xiii, here p. ix; BEIDER, "Onomastic Analysis" (note 19), p. 60; ALEXANDER BEIDER, Handbook of Ashkenazic Given Names. Their Origins, Structure, Pronunciation, and Migrations, Bergenfield 2001, pp. 491-492, 548.

in their form (e.g. קבילא קובילא kabel'a, קוֹבִילֹא kobel'a in Qara's commentary would be in Old Polish kobiel, cf. Słownik staropolski vol. III, p. 306; Qara's עולף would have sounded wagl in Old Polish, cf. Słownik staropolski vol. X, p. 95), or in their meaning (e.g. Qara's pomkni s'a corresponds semantically to Old Czech pomknúti, whereas Old Polish pomknáć has a different meaning "swipe", cf. Słownik staropolski vol. VI, p. 370). Only the isolated spelling אוֹנִיוֹא of Qara's gloss oděz'a could be regarded as a case of assibilation (cf. New York, Jewish Theological Seminary, Lutzki 778, fol. 42b). The remaining manuscripts, however, clearly corroborate the reading oděz'a. As a matter of fact, in Old Polish assibilation emerged in the 12th century only. Therefore, it is very unlikely to have its echo already in the writings of Joseph Qara, who died in the 1120s.

Words undocumented in Old Polish, but recorded in Old Czech and West Slavic Canaanite glosses include, e.g., plachtica, péci s'a and gubica (cf. Or Zarua': gubicĕ, Hayyim Or Zarua': hubicĕ, in Old Polish only gabka, cf. Stownik staropolski vol. II, p. 387). As such, this argument, however, is not a very strong one due to our limited knowledge of Old Polish dialectal vocabulary of that time. An additional, extralinguistic argument against the Polish affiliation could provide the late date of origin of sizable Jewish communities and their poor material conditions. 109

However, we have reliable (material) testimonies to recording of Polish in Hebrew script, namely Polish bracteates struck in the time from the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> centuries. They were minted by Jews who probably came from Bohemia and East German regions. According to B. S. Hill, "further linguistic analysis [of the coins] may help to ascertain the spoken language of the earliest communities of Polish Jews." As we explained in greater detail elsewhere, despite their limited reliability for linguistic

<sup>109</sup> Cf. VISI, On the Peripheries (note 28), 122.

<sup>110</sup> Cf. JAKOBSON, "Řeč a písemnictví" (note 72), p. 45; WEXLER, *Explorations* (note 93), p. 96, MARIAN GUMOWSKI, *Hebräische Münzen im mittelalterlichen Polen*, Graz 1975; WITOLD GARBACZEWSKI, "Monety z napisami hebrajskimi w średniowiecznej Europie," in: *Biuletyn Numizmatyczny* 333 (No. 1) 2004, pp. 41-58.

<sup>111</sup> At these locations, the Jews were certainly active in minting the coin, as historical reports and/or archeological finds document. Cf. BLÁHA ET AL., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), p. 331-332; LUBOŠ POLANSKÝ, "Jména mincmistrů" (note 24), pp. 239, 241.

<sup>112</sup> HILL, "Judeo-Slavic" (note 8), p. 599 (with further bibliography).

<sup>113</sup> ROBERT DITTMANN, "K významu raných česko-židovských kontaktů pro diachronní bohemistiku," in: *Listy filologické* 135 (2012), pp. 259-285, here p. 266; BLÁHA ET AL., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), p. 331.

conclusions, the coin inscriptions represent an orthography norm that mixes *Canaanite* and *Ashkenazi* features and, thus, seems to confirm the hypothesis of their inhomogeneous origin. Further evidence to the Czech component in the language of Polish Jews is given by proper nouns as well as words of Czech origin in Yiddish, especially in ritual terms.<sup>114</sup>

#### 4. Importance of Canaanite glosses for Czech diachronic studies

According to B. S. Hill's recent summary, the value of Canaanite glosses "both linguistically and historically cannot be overestimated". The oldest attestations of words, meanings, words otherwise attested only in other Slavic languages, early evidence of multilingual lexical parallels (tautonymical rows), the earliest recorded Czech direct speech, a candidate for the oldest Czech complex sentence, first use of Czech for illustrating grammatical rules, possibly the earliest evidence of phonetic studies on the Czech soil, a unique sociolinguistic testimony of the Prague dialect of the intellectual elites of a religious minority and linguistic behaviour in the case of proper nouns in the Jewish community – all this, and much more, is comprised in this material. To mention here but one of these contributions only in more detail:

It is not excluded that the Canaanite glosses contain one of the oldest Czech compound sentences, preserved in the St. Petersburg manuscript Evr. I 21 with Joseph Qara's haftarot commentaries. The manuscript itself is of a more recent date, probably the 14th century, and contains some glosses known from other manuscripts of Qara's haftarot commentaries, such as uglé (in the manuscript Prague, National Library, XVIII F 6, fol. 310a), mošt (in the manuscript Cincinnati, JCF 1, fol. 124b, dated 1294) and the imperative phrase pomkni s'a, if this emendation is correct (found in both Prague and Cincinnati copies, fol. 336a and 123a, respectively)<sup>117</sup> as well as other glosses. Among them, a special, unique place has the only compound sentence in Western Canaanite glosses, that comments on Joshua 1:18 and reads מוֹלִיקוֹ בוּדִי סְטֵטֵי צֵּוְמִיטֵא צִי נֵיכֵיצִי (toliko budi státý a neměj s'a iné péci or i na

<sup>114</sup> Cf. BLÁHA ET AL., Kenaanské glosy (note 1), pp. 209-211, 334 with further literature.

<sup>115</sup> HILL, Judeo-Slavic (note 8), p. 603.

<sup>116</sup> Cf. Bláha et al., Kenaanské glosy (note 1), for details.

<sup>117</sup> Thus, the unclarity of this gloss (cf. Kulik, Jews and the Language [note 35], p. 134; Bláha et al., *Kenaanské glosy* [note 1], pp. 623-624) is with some probability cleared away. Some other glosses occur in the Prague and Cincinnati manuscripts only: *mýdlo*, *bělidlo*, *debr*, *kobel'a*/ *kabel'a*.

péči; the last word could also be read נְיפִיינִי, but this is a more corrupt reading). The sentence appears on fol. 75a, the manuscript contains five more glosses, four of them vocalized, namely on fol. 55b גוֹנָא gúňa ("blanket"), 60b גוֹנָא blažen ("blissful"), 69a מוֹשְׁטִ mošt ("must"), and possibly pomkni s'a ("move", recorded distortedly as מוֹשְׁטִ בּיכֹּלא uglé ("coal"), all may be perfectly ascribed to Early Czech, the three most neighbouring glosses are definitely Czech, showing clear West Slavic features (mošt being a loanword from German Most, uglé displaying contraction and absence of nasals or prothesis and pomkni s'a perfectly corresponding semantically to the Old Czech pomknúti, in contrast to Old Polish, Old Russian and the absence of the word in Lusatian).

The compound sentence itself, to our knowledge found in this manuscript only, is of special interest, because the earliest known undoubtly compound sentence otherwise recorded in Czech dates back to the dawn of the 13th century, still predating the oldest Polish sentence by more than half a century. 118 The Hebrew compound sentence is certainly older than the manuscript and fully respects the exegetical tendency often employed by Qara to explain units larger than just a single word, focusing on interpretation of text in its context.<sup>119</sup> The sentence is partially distorted (word boundaries, some punctuation marks) and displays very archaic features. 120 Among them, the absence of prothetic j- in the ill-divided word iné (אָי נֵיי), nay in the intervocalic position typical for hiatuses (s'a inė), is especially remarkable: the Early Czech prothetic j- has been emerging probably since the end of the 10th and early 11th centuries. 121 However, in the 11th century we have still good evidence about coalescence of the former i- and ji-, as proven by the Glagolitic Prague Fragments where the difference between the letters  $\mathfrak{T}$  (= i) and  $\Psi$  (= ji) disappeared. 122 The Fragments were almost certainly written in the Sázava Monastery and the monks therefore shared the Central Bohemian

<sup>118</sup> ONDŘEJ BLÁHA, Jazyky střední Evropy, Olomouc 2015, p. 39.

<sup>119</sup> Cf. Berthold Einstein, R. Josef Kara und sein Commentar zu Kohelet. Aus dem Ms. 104 der Bibliothek des Jüdisch-theologischen Seminars zu Breslau, Berlin 1886, pp. 40, 47; Vladimír Sadek / Jan Heřman, "České glosy v rukopise Chebské bible," in: Minulostí Západočeského kraje, Plzeň 1962, pp. 7-15, here p. 12; Ganiel, The Exegetical Method (note 4), pp. 111 and 185.

<sup>120</sup> Cf. Bláha et al., Kenaanské glosy (note 1), pp. 181-189.

<sup>121</sup> Vladimír Šaur, *České náslovné j*, Opava 1994, pp. 83 and 92.

<sup>122</sup> František Václav Mareš, "Hlaholice v Čechách a na Moravě," in: František Václav Mareš, *Cyrilometodějská tradice a slavistika*, eds. Emílie Bláhová / Josef Vintr, Praha 2000, pp. 61-118, here p. 104.

dialect with the Prague Jewish community. As a matter of fact, the lack of *j*-prothesis in this word (*jiny*) was documented in Central Bohemia and other regions by the Czech dialectological atlas as late as in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The Old Czech verb *jmieti* received its *j*-since the same time as *iny*, and again the Hebrew record reads *neměj* (and not *nejměj*). Considering the overdifferentiation of consonants in Joseph Qara's glosses (in the case of French labiovelar and velar *k*) and some vowels in the works of Abraham b. Azriel and Isaac b. Mose 125 in comparison to contemporary Latin script as well as the consistent presence of *j*-prothesis in later glosses, we may safely presume that the manuscript reflects the genuine pronunciation.

The orthography of Slavic glosses in the St. Petersburg manuscript Ms Evr. I 21 shows a Canaanite feature in distinguishing w (voiceless postalveolar fricative, see mošť) and voiceless prealveolar fricative, see státý, s'a), whereas the Old French glosses in Hebrew script only rarely employ vand they use w for a voiceless alveolar fricative /s/. Nonetheless a very old Slavic gloss monista in Qara's commentary on Isaiah also uses quite consistently word-internal voiceless alveolar fricative. Evidence to this word is given in no less than seven manuscripts, including the best copy of Qara's commentary on Isaiah known as Lutzki 778, the relevant part dating back to the 12th century France (it reads the vocalized gloss word), 127 which alone contains four Slavic glosses. The grapheme voccurs also in the Slavic glosses commenting on Is 49:20 in two other manuscripts with Qara's commentary (with the third having a distorted reading at the same place) 128 and it appears also in a French gloss on Is 38:14 and it appears also in a French gloss on Is 38:14 Another

<sup>123</sup> JAN BALHAR ET AL., Český jazykový atlas 5, Praha 2005, pp. 358-361.

<sup>124</sup> ŠAUR, České náslovné j (note 121), p. 92.

<sup>125</sup> Cf. REINHART, "Möglichkeiten und Grenzen" (note 75), p. 170.

<sup>126</sup> Cf. KIWITT / DÖRR, "Judeo-French" (note 6), p. 149.

<sup>127</sup> Our reading of the gloss differs from K. A. Fudeman, cf. the reproduction in Bláha et al., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), p. 706.

<sup>128</sup> Bláha et al., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), pp. 165-166, 621-624.

<sup>129</sup> FUDEMAN, "The Old French Glosses" (note 2), p. 172 (unattested in Lutzki 778); CYRIL ASLANOV, "Le français de rabbi Joseph Kara et de rabbi Éliézer de Beaugency d'après leurs commentaires sur Ézéchiel," in: Revue des Études Juives 159, 2000, pp. 425-446, here p. 427; cf. also Moshe B. Ahrend, Rabbi Joseph Kara's Commentary on Job Based on Manuscripts and First Printings, Edited, with Introduction, Variants, References, Explanatory Notes and Appendices, Jerusalem 1988, pp. 150 (No. 29, ques; No. 32 gansge), 154 (No. 102 speclo).

feature typical for Canaanite orthographic norm and partially different from typical Old French glosses is the  $\mathfrak{T}$  for /c/ in  $p\acute{e}ci$  (s'a), in Old French glosses it denotes /c/ or /s/,  $^{130}$  but in Qara, including the Lutzki 778, it serves accordingly to denote only /c/.  $^{131}$  In fact, the Canaanite glosses of Slavic authors painstakingly discern between three kinds of phonemes: /s, s'/, /s/ and /c,  $\acute{e}c/$ , on the contrary the Old French glosses in Hebrew script use are less consistent, for instance /s/ may be usually denoted by both  $\mathfrak{T}$  and  $\mathfrak{W}$ . On the other hand, the in-word aleph in Ms Evr. I 21  $bla\check{z}en$  (בְּלָאנִין) is very untypical for Canaanite norm, yet frequent in Old French and German glosses.

A critical edition of Qara's commentaries to the haftarot still does not exist and thus the conclusions so far may be only provisional. For instance, while editing the Ms Kirchheim from Breslau with Qara's commentaries on Joshua and Judges, Aharon Wolf<sup>133</sup> noted at one occurrence of the phrase Joshua and Judges, Aharon Wolf<sup>133</sup> noted at one occurrence of the phrase (with a gloss wife an enemantary on Judges): "Qara gebraucht in seinem Commt. einigemal לשון כנען. Ich werde an einem andern Orte die Stellen zusammenstellen u. das nöthige hierüber ange ben [sic]." But to our knowledge, he did not realize this plan. Taking into account the exegetical method of Joseph Qara, who unlike other glossators, inserted phrases and even sentences in the vernacular and among whose vernacular glosses we find Old French, Slavic, German, Occitan and Italian words, and the presence of Canaanite glosses even in the most representative and oldest manuscripts, believed to transmit genuine Qara's commentary, 136 it

130 Cf. KIWITT / DÖRR, "Judeo-French" (note 6), p. 149.

<sup>131</sup> FUDEMAN, "The Old French Glosses" (note 2), p. 155; FUDEMAN, "The Linguistic Significance" (note 68), p. 405.

<sup>132</sup> Cf. KIWITT / DÖRR, "Judeo-French" (note 6), p. 149.

<sup>133</sup> Aharon Wolff, "בירכהיים קרא מכתב־יד קירכהיים (Excerpts of the commentaries of R. Joseph Qara and his pupils in the ms. Kirchheim]," in: השחר 4 (1871), pp. 55-63, here p. 61.

<sup>134</sup> Fudeman, "The Linguistic Significance" (note 68), p. 400. On the complex problem of inserting vernacular glosses in Qara cf. Sara Japhet, "The Nature and Distribution of Medieval Compilatory Commentaries in the Light of Rabbi Joseph Kara's Commentary on the Book of Job," in: MICHAEL FISHBANE (ed.), *The Midrashic Imagination. Jewish Exegesis, Thought, and History*, Albany 1993, pp. 98-130, here pp. 113-114.

<sup>135</sup> FUDEMAN, "The Old French Glosses" (note 2), p. 149. On the use by Qara of vernacular glosses and phrases in the commentary on the Former and Latter Prophets, see GANIEL, *The Exegetical Method* (note 4), pp. 184-185.

<sup>136</sup> MAURO PERANI, "Yosef Ben Šim' on Kara's Lost Commentary on the Psalms.

seems unavoidable that at least some Slavic glosses were inserted into his commentary already in France, as foreseen – without the possibility of checking the glosses in actual manuscripts – already by Roman Jakobson in 1941.<sup>137</sup>

5. Orthography and comparison of West Slavic, Old French, and German glosses The West Slavic Canaanite glosses represent the first relatively stable orthographical system applied to Czech words. The Glagolitic script designed for rendering all peculiarities of the Slavic sound system was at this time, as far as we know, not used for the Czech language proper, even though Bohemian language traits were penetrating into Czech Church Slavonic. The Latin script used for bohemica, i.e. Czech words in foreign texts, displays up to 1300 a rather unsystematic rendering of Czech phonemes. Let us give only one example, namely disregarding the difference in Latin script of Czech /s, s'/-/s', /c', /c',

The Imola Fragment from the 'Italian Genizah'," in MAURO PERANI (ed.), The Words of a Wise Mouth Are Gracious – Divre Pi Chacham Chen. Festschrift für Günter Stemberger on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday, Berlin 2005, pp. 395-428, here pp. 403-404. Of Kara's Isaiah commentaries, we know only one showing the absence of the glosses: Israel, National Library, Ms. Heb. 8°721 (according to Daniel Polakovič, Jewish Museum in Prague, whom I herewith thank).

138 CDB IV/I, p. 402, line 20.

139 CDB IV/I, p. 275, line 30.

140 CDB IV/I, p. 275, line 20; CDB IV/I, p. 418, line 40.

141 CDB IV/I, p. 334, line 25; CDB IV/I, p. 418, line 40; CDB V/I, p. 31, line 40.

<sup>137</sup> In a Russian formulation — the manuscript is preserved in Roman Jakobson Papers, MIT Archives and Special Collections, MC72, box 13, folder 55 (my thanks are due to Prof. Linda R. Waugh, Executive Director of Roman Jakobson Intellectual Trust, for permission to publish this material), which was the source for his English study (1941): "характерно, что и коментарий к Книгам Судей, связанный с именем Кага, содержитряд чеш. глосс как в Бресл., так и в ленингр. списке, при чем специфич. черти фр. глосс Кара, перевод целых фраз, находит себе параллель и в этих чеш. глоссах, и эти переводы отд. библ. стихов, повидимому являются древнейшими образ чиками чеш. фраз." А contrary view was voiced among others by TADEUSZ LEWICKI, "Les sources hébraïques consacrées a l'histoire de l'Europe centrale et orientale et particulièrement a celle des pays Slaves de la fin du IXe au milieu du XIIIe siècle," in: Cahiers du monde russe et sovétique 2 (1961), pp. 228-241, here p. 237, EINSTEIN, R. Josef Kara und sein Commentar (note 119), p. 47.

Moreover, neither Latin digraphs nor trigraphs are unambiguous, cf. the trigraph sch for both /s/ and /z/ in scheleso (1253; for  $z \in \mathbb{Z}_{20}$ ) and schud (1256, copy of the 15th century, for súd),142 and even a quadruple combination occurs such as in maetsch for meč. 143 None of this exists in the Canaanite glosses of authors connected directly to the Slavic-speaking milieu of Prague, since there is a sharp differentiation between /s, s'/, rendered by  $\overline{o}$ , and  $/\check{s}/$ , rendered by  $\underline{v}$ , between /c',  $\check{c}/$ , rendered by  $\underline{v}$ , and /z, z'/, rendered by T, between /s, s'/ and /z, z'/. The Jewish authors born in the 12<sup>th</sup> century, and in the case of Qara's glosses possibly even earlier, thus strikingly cracked the greatest problem for medieval writing systems generally when recording the Czech phonological system, namely the sibilants and affricates. At the same time, the Canaanite glosses are in full agreement with dialectological unity of the emerging Czech standard language in Latin script, which displays typically features of the Prague Central Bohemian dialect and only seldom shows traces of dialectal differentiation. The central position of Prague and its surroundings throughout the whole Middle Ages is perceivable not only thanks to Bohemisms penetrating Glagolitic-written Czech Church Slavonic but also in spreading the authoritative norm for medieval Latin, German, Yiddish and Czech abroad. 144 Unlike the Hebrew glosses of Old French, Old Italian or medieval Christian Latin-written Polish, the Canaanite glosses show no clear dialectal differentiation as far as we may judge from their limited corpus and our limited knowledge of contemporary Czech. The Bohemian provenience of the Canaanite glosses is evidenced also in morphology (the probable dative singular sounds ויְרָלֵי vidle, whereas for Moravian dialects the ja-stem form vidli might be expected)145 and possibly for lexis (גלווטיצי "cabbage" has probably also the meaning 'young plant' in Old Czech for which the oldest detailed metalinguistic dialectological source for Czech, Jan Blahoslav's grammar, finished in 1571, evidences Bohemian and not Moravian affiliation). 146

<sup>142</sup> CDB V/I, p. 31, line 40; CDB V/I, p. 143, line 20.

<sup>143</sup> CDB V/I, p. 31, line 40.

<sup>144</sup> Cf. BOHUSLAV HAVRÁNEK, Vývoj českého spisovného jazyka, Praha 1980, p. 32; WERNER BESCH, Die deutsche Sprache in den böhmischen Ländern, in: HANS ROTHE (ed.), Deutsche in den böhmischen Ländern, Köln 1992, pp. 83-10, here p. 101; ALEXANDER BEIDER, A Dictionary of Ashkenazic Given Names. Their Origins, Structure, Pronunciation, and Migrations, Bergenfield 2001, p. 213.

<sup>145</sup> Cf. GEBAUER, *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého* (note 73), vol. III: *Tvarosloví*, pt. I: *Skloňování*, Praha 1896, p. 190.

<sup>146</sup> MIREK ČEJKA ET AL. (eds.), *Gramatika česká Jana Blahoslava*, Brno 1991, fol. 349a-

The Canaanite orthographic norm, as best represented by Or Zarua', 'Arugat ha-Bosem and Nuremberg Mahzor, shares several basic tendencies with Judeo-French, Judeo-Spanish, Judeo-Italian, Judeo-Portuguese and Judeo-Greek such as the preference of  $\overline{\rho}$  over  $\overline{\rho}$  for /k/ and of  $\overline{\upsilon}$  over  $\overline{\rho}$  for /t/.147The greatest difference in consonants is the employment of graphemes in the Canaanite glosses that are not commonly used in Old French glosses such as D and T, the absence of commonly used in-word X, a different value of v, partially z and treating of some phonemes, e.g. both [t] and [] may be rendered in French glosses by \overline{\bar{p}}, whereas in Canaanite glosses they are represented by z and w, respectively. Other differences stem from different phonological systems, for example Canaanite glosses almost never contain 5/f/, non-final 7/h/, and they do not reflect any 1/43/1.148 The first Yiddish gloss in the Worms Mahzor of 1272 uses both w and o, on top of that n and 5, revealing thus several differences from both Canaanite and Old French norm. 149 The Old Yiddish writing system uses v /s/ and in-word v like French and unlike Canaanite glosses, but differs from both the Canaanite and French norm in utilizing in-word y. 150 The German glosses of the Leipzig Glossary employ 2 and they use w and s for s.151 In defiance of their relative stability, the French, Canaanite and German norms are obviously partially independent. In later Prague's Judendeutsch, the graphemes T, W, and o are used indiscriminately. 152

In the process of copying, the Canaanite authors kept the orthographical habits of their French and German co-religionists and used in-word  $\kappa$ , the grapheme  $\psi$  for /s/, double waw (11) and double yod (v). In the same way German copyists adhered to Canaanite orthographical rules

<sup>349</sup>b (*hlavatice* in Moravia means "female cannabis", writes Blahoslav). Cf. also JAN BALHAR / PAVEL JANČÁK ET AL., Český jazykový atlas 2, Praha 1997, p. 77.

<sup>147</sup> MARC KIWITT, "The Problem of Judeo-French between Language Dynamics and Cultural Dynamics," in: *International Journal of the Sociology of Language. Jewish Language Contact* 226 (2014), pp. 25-56, here pp. 35-36; BLÁHA ET AL., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), pp. 248-249.

<sup>148</sup> Cf. KIWITT / DÖRR, "Judeo-French" (note 6), pp. 148-149.

<sup>149</sup> Cf. LILY KAHN, "Yiddish," in: KAHN / RUBIN (eds.), Handbook of Jewish Languages (note 3), pp. 641-747, here p. 655.

<sup>150</sup> Cf. Kahn, "Yiddish" (note 149), p. 649.

<sup>151</sup> MENAHEM BANITT, Le Glossaire de Leipzig. Introduction, Jérusalem 2005, p. 421.

<sup>152</sup> LEOPOLD SCHNITZLER, Prager Judendeutsch. Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung des älteren Prager Judendeutsch in lautlicher und insbesondere in lexikalischer Beziehung, Gräfelfing bei München 1966, p. 24.

<sup>153</sup> Bláha et al., Kenaanské glosy (note 1), p. 240.

when transcribing their models, for instance when Me'ir of Rothenburg took over some glosses from his teacher Isaac b. Mose, but they adopted the German spelling way when recording a Czech noun themselves as in the *Nürnberger Memorbuch*.

## 6. Some linguistic features

Since the Canaanite glosses stretch from the 11th to 13th/14th centuries, it is natural that they reflect the gradual development of Czech. For instance, the oldest glosses of Gershom b. Jehudah seem to differentiate between  $/\ddot{a}/$  and /a/; Qara's glosses reflect the absence of prothetic j- (יִּ inė̂), whereas later glosses from the first half of the 13th century always have jprothesis (ייליטוֹ jelito ["bowel"] < Common Slavic \*elito; ייליטוֹ and יגודי and יגודי jagody ["berries"] < \*agody, the latter gloss appears also in Hayyim b. Isaac's writings as יגוֹדִי). The cluster št' is recorded in Isaac b. Mose's Or Zarua' (שָׁטֶיט), whereas his teacher Abraham b. Azriel uses still  $\check{x}\check{c}$  (this may have been a mere orthographical phenomenon, see below). First attestations of  $\pi$  heth for h < g appear only in the writings of Hayyim b. Isaac (2<sup>nd</sup> half of the 13th century), while his father Isaac b. Mose employs constantly the grapheme ג gimel, and the unclear reading אוכסטריוסא, probably for אוכסטריוסא ochstrju s'a ("I will get sharpened") in Mahzor Nuremberg, completed in 1331, possibly uses the cluster  $\eta$  to denote r, whereas none of the earlier glosses contains any sign of assibilated pronunciation of /r'.

Migration of Canaanite glosses from one author to another is not exceptional, similar or identical glosses appear for example in Gershom b. Jehudah and Sefer ha-pardes le-Raši (chmel, see above), in Rashi and Eliezer b. Natan (deget/dehet), in Natan b. Jehiel and Rashi (מקן and מקן, cf. mák ["poppy"]), in Qara and Isaac b. Mose (glezen/glezno), in Sefer Hasidim and Isaac b. Mose, in Abraham b. Azriel and Isaac b. Mose; some glosses were repeated by Me'ir of Rothenburg and Hayyim Or Zarua'. Other glosses were taken over as internationally understandable loanwords, such as mošt, appearing in Qara and Isaac b. Mose, or monisto in Qara's commentary on Judges (8:26) and Isaiah (3:18). In the following paragraphs, I shall look

<sup>154</sup> Cf. BLÁHA ET AL., Kenaanské glosy (note 1), pp. 423, 450-451, 584, 589, 625, 604.
155 Cf. JIŘINA ŠEDINOVÁ, "Life and Language in Bohemia as reflected in the Works of the Prague Jewish School in the 12th and 13th Centuries," in: PETR CHARVÁT / JIŘÍ PROSECKÝ (eds.), Ibrahim ibn Yaqub at-Turtushi. Christianity, Islam and Judaism Meet in East-Central Europe, c. 800–1300 A.D. Proceedings of the International Colloquy 25–29 April 1994, Praha 1996, pp. 207-216, here p. 215.
156 DITTMANN, "The Czech Language" (note 4), p. 19.

more closely at the most important contributions of the Canaanite glosses to Old Czech phonology (6.1-6.8) and afterwards briefly mention other language levels, too (6.9).

### 6.1 Svarabhactic vowel accompanying sonants r, l

One of the peculiar orthographical traits of the Old Czech glosses is their systematic treatment of the semivowel accompanying the older layer of sonants (e.g. Common Slavic \*četvъrtъ > אָטְוִירָט čtvrt ["quarter"], Common Slavic \*volna > Old Czech vlna, cf. במוילנא bamv'lna ["cotton"]). These vowels were inherited in Early and Old Czech from Common Slavic and are usually attested also in Latin-written Czech words from the 11th to 14th centuries. 157 The vowel is placed before or after the syllabic consonant and its quality varies (i, e, y, u), most often being the preceding -i- before r, in the former \*čъr, \*žъr groups there stabilized -e- (a clear tendency of stabilization occurs already in the first half of the 12th century), 158 whereas the syllabic \( \ell \) short and long (original or secondarily depalatalized) developed into tu and tú, respectively. Standard Czech adopted these solutions, some non-central dialects showing other developmental paths. In the case of pre-13th century place names, the dominant reflex is ri and the i prevails also with syllabic l' (later syllabic 1), 159 which survived only after bilabials. The oldest attestations of the syllabic r without accompanying vowel come from the Czech Church Slavonic Besědy na evangelije, 160 which originated almost certainly in the Sázava Monastery probably in the second half of the 11th century. More can be found in 12th century toponymical records such as Zoprche (i.e. Soprče), Brnen (Brnen, today Brno), Trnouaz (Trnovas) etc. 161 and 13th century appellative examples (chtwrtne, i.e. čtvrtně ["quarter"] recorded in 1249 and 1258, along with chstvirnie, i.e. čtvirtně ["quarter"], from 1262).162 The first Latin-alphabet system for recording Old Czech, appearing at the dawn of the 14th century, relatively very systematically contains y as an accompanying vowel to syllabic sonants, which may indicate its difference from the

<sup>157</sup> MIROSLAV KOMÁREK, *Dějiny českého jazyka*, Brno 2012, p. 89.

<sup>158</sup> MICHAELA ČORNEJOVÁ, "Ke grafice bohemik X.–XII. století," in: *Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity* A53 (2005), pp. 137-145, here p. 144.

<sup>159</sup> ČORNEJOVÁ, "Ke grafice bohemik X.-XII. století" (note 158), p. 142.

<sup>160</sup> FRANTIŠEK VÁCLAV MAREŠ, "Česká redakce církevní slovanštiny v světle Besěd Řehoře Velikého (Dvojeslova)," in: MAREŠ, *Cyrilometodějská tradice a slavistika* (note 122), pp. 368-402, here p. 373.

<sup>161</sup> ČORNEJOVÁ, "Ke grafice bohemik X.-XII. století" (note 158), p. 140.

<sup>162</sup> See CDB IV/I, p. 284, line 15; CDB V/I, p. 252, l. 10; CDB V/I, p. 459, l. 10.

vowel i.<sup>163</sup> In some documents from the first half of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, e.g., in the archaic Hanuš's fragments of the *Dalimil Chronicle*, the svarabhactic vowel is used quite systematically. Likewise, the *Legend about St. Procopius* has a clear tendency to differentiate between older sonants (typically recorded by doubled letters: rr, l) and consonantal r, l.<sup>164</sup>

A newer layer of sonants r, l appeared after the loss of weak yers in the second half of the 10th century. These sonants were not fully syllabic but formed another peak of sonority in the syllable, e.g. Common Slavic \* blacha > Old Czech blcha (a one-syllable word), later blecha ("flea"). There were four types of positions in which the newer sonants could appear (at the beginning: *lháti*, in the second position between consonants: *krve*, in the middle: sedlský, and at the end: vedl), of which the most important is the type krve, pronounced as a one-syllable word in high-style Old Czech poetry until the end of the 14th century<sup>165</sup> It seems that in common speech the type knve (one-syllabic from \*krvve) and vlna (two-syllabic from \*vvlna) started to merge much earlier as can be learned from unsystematic spellings such as kyrwe, we kirwi, ze kirwe, pilnost (< \*psln-) and zirno (< \*zsrno), wilna from the Wittenberg Psalter and Glossed Psalter, respectively. 166 This situation is partially reflected also in Canaanite glosses connected to Prague Czech of the first half of the 13th century. In the glosses the older as well as the newer sonants r, l are always recorded with an accompanying vowel unless wordfinal: see examples from the 13th century Amsterdam copy of Or Zarua' במוילנא bamvilna ("cotton"), בילְחָא belcha ("flea"), בילְחִי belchy ("of a flea"), צְּטְוַיְרְט *čtvirt* ("quarter"), פילסטא pilst ("felt"), and from the Vatican copy of the 'Arugat ha-Bosem (late 13th century), בריבוֹסָא [possibly from גְרִיבוֹסָא grinu] גָרִיבוֹסָא

<sup>163</sup> Cf. František Trávníček, *Historická mluvnice československá*. Úvod, hláskosloví a tvarosloví, Praha 1935, p. 113.

<sup>164</sup> Zuzana Kůrečková, *Jazykový rozbor Života svaté Kateřiny a Legendy o sv. Prokopu*, Brno 2008 [unpublished B.A. thesis], p. 31; Pavel Kosek, *Historická mluvnice češtiny – překlenovací seminář*, Brno 2014, p. 65.

<sup>165</sup> ROMAN JAKOBSON, Язык и орфография ханаанских глосс и имен в др.-евр. письменности, § 46, р. 44 [a part of an unpublished monograph, see the edition in BLÁHA ET AL., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), pp. 729-785, here p. 760].

<sup>166</sup> GEBAUER, Historická mluvnice jazyka českého (note 73), vol. I: Hláskosloví pp. 292-293; MIROSLAV KOMÁREK, Poznámky a doplňky, in: GEBAUER, Historická mluvnice jazyka českého (note 73), vol. I: Hláskosloví, pp. 705-722, here p. 716, rightly sees in the spellings we kirwi "známku přechodu pobočné slabiky v slabikotvornou likvidu" ("a sign of transition of the subsidiary syllable into a syllabic sonant").

<sup>167</sup> Cf. ELISABETH HOLLENDER, "Vernacular Glosses in Piyyut Commentary: The

s'a ("I join"), even in late copies of the Jewish divorce documents gets we find the hydronyms ווילטווא  $V^iltava,^{168}$  וילטווא  $V^iltava^{169}$  or וולטווא/וולטוא Vltava/ V"ltava (Elbe). An uncertain example is בֿולְקָרָלְקי volkudlaky ("werewolves"), most probably an Eastern Slavic gloss, in a copy from before 1271 of Rashi's commentary (St. Petersburg, Rossijskaja nacional'naja biblioteka, Evr. I 11, fol. 150a).<sup>171</sup> Later copies supply further examples, sometimes obviously distorted by previous copying, see the spelling בילחא attested twice in a 16th-17th-century Frankfurt Or Zarua' copy (for בֵּילְחָא belcha), whereas another occurrence בִילְהִי) is perfectly correct. Two more spellings במולינא bamvlna, פליסטא plst of the same manuscript (and the above-mentioned distorted reading grinu s'a) show a postposed semivowel, most probably a consequence of a scribal error which occurs also in צָטְנִירִיט appearing already in the important 13th-century Amsterdam copy. The wordfinal later layer of sonants is exemplified by דבר debr (< \*dъbrъ) in Joseph Qara's commentary in the Eger Bible (14th century?), a gloss appearing already in a Cincinnati manuscript of 1294.

Two readings are of special interest as they may document the process of analogical levelling in the paradigm and merger of older and younger layer of sonants. The gloss פילט pelt/pilt (< Common Slavic \*ploto ["raft"]), recorded in both Amsterdam and Oxford copies of Or Zarua', shows levelling according to other cases in the singular (genitive, dative, locative plti, instrumental plt'ú, all one-syllable) instead of the expected nominative form plet, attested commonly in Old Czech. In the nominative, however, l becomes syllabic, thus forming an initial stadium of a new syllabic l in the second position of the word evidenced in the first half of the 13th century (the appearance of the new syllabic l is usually dated to the 14th century). 173

Case of Lashon Kenaan," in: ONDŘEJ BLÁHA ET AL. (eds.), Knaanic Language: Structure and Historical Background. Proceedings of a Conference Held in Prague on October 25–26, 2012, Prague 2013, pp. 129-155, here p. 137.

<sup>168</sup> Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. hebr. 300, fol. 14a.

<sup>169</sup> JICCHAK SATZ (ed.), Seder ha-geṭ le-MaHaR''I Margalit, Jerusalem 1983, p. 145.

<sup>170</sup> ABRAHAM STEIN, Die Geschichte der Juden in Böhmen, Brünn 1904, p. 3.

<sup>171</sup> St. Petersburg, Rossijskaja nacional'naja biblioteka, Evr. I 11, fol. 150a (marginal gloss).

<sup>172</sup> Frankfurt a. M., Universitätsbibliothek, Ms. hebr. fol. 7, fol. 8b: בֵילְהָא (twice) and בֵילְהִי

<sup>173</sup> MIROSLAV KOMÁREK, "Gebauerovo historické hláskosloví ve světle dalšího bádání," in: GEBAUER, *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého* (note 73), vol. I: *Hláskosloví*, pp. 723-765, here p. 742.

This development is supported by Old Czech examples in Latin script: E.g., Old Czech chłup may have developed from the nominative chłp (the expected nominative would be \*chłep < \*chłep = ["hair"]; Chlp is attested as an Old Czech anthroponym and in Moravian dialects of the late 19th century as chtp)174 which originated by analogy to declined forms such as chtpa (< \*chlspa). The same holds true for Old Czech plt ("complexion"), attested besides regular plet (< \*plots), krt (expected nominative \*kret < \*krots) or Modern Czech hlt (< \*ghts; Old Czech hlet). Such analogical processes must have taken place only after the original syllabic short t gave tu, a change dated in Old Czech before the 13th century, cf. Nabelem chlume recorded in 1268 (= Na bielém chlumě, from \*chłmě < \*chъłmě). 175 Both -el-/-il- are attested spelling forms for the old syllabic t in 12th century Latin-written Czech, cf. Dilgonici (dlg- < \*dulg-, CDB I, p. 120, recorded in 1131), Na telmacoue (tim- < \*tolm-, CDB I, p. 120, from 1131).176 In Roman-alphabet Old Czech, the forms plt, plut are uniquely attested, 177 in dialects the form  $p\ell yt'$  (< \* $p\ell t'$ ) was recorded as late as the end of the 19th century. 178

In the case of the glosses בֵּילְהֵי שׁ lcha, בִילְהַי b'lchy, the hard t (< Common Slavic \*blocha) is again in the second position in the word under which circumstances there is always a full syllable in Modern Standard Czech (in this case blecha according to the regular genitive plural blech < \*blochb). Canaanite glosses seem to document again an early stage of such a process with semivowels accompanying the regular forms blocha, blochy (in some dialects of Czech, such semivowels became fully syllabic, e.g. sluza < slza < slz

\_

<sup>174</sup> Cf. Gebauer, *Slovník staročeský* (note 92), vol. I: A–J, p. 540: entry *chlup*. 175 CDB V/II, p. 118, line 35.

<sup>176</sup> Cf. ČORNEJOVÁ, "Ke grafice bohemik X.–XII. století" (note 158), p. 141; MARTA ŠTEFKOVÁ, *Vývoj hláskosloví u místních jmen z edice Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris regni Bohemiae*, Brno 2008 [unpublished B.A. thesis], p. 41.

<sup>177</sup> *Staročeský slovník*, Praha 1968–2008, entry *plet*<sup>1</sup> (quoted an on-line version available at <a href="http://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz/hledani.aspx">http://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz/hledani.aspx</a>, retrieved on 26 Nov. 2017).

<sup>178</sup> Gebauer, Historická mluvnice jazyka českého (note 73), vol. I: Hláskosloví, p. 291.

<sup>179</sup> Arnošt Lamprecht, Hláskosloví, in: Arnošt Lamprecht et al., *Historická mluvnice češtiny*, Praha 1986, pp. 25-128, here p. 78; Oldřich Hujer, Vývoj jazyka československého, in: Československá vlastivěda. Díl III. Jazyk, Praha 1934, pp. 1-83, here pp. 26-27.

1186), 180 vilk (< \*vьlkъ), 181 in Latin script and פילסטא pilst (< \*pьlstъ) in Canaanite glosses. In Czech written in Roman letters the forms blucha and blicha are also attested, 182 supporting this interpretation. In these two cases, pelt/pilt and belcha, belchy, the later sonants behave the same as early, syllabic sonants in cases like vlk (< \*vьlkъ ["wolf"]) and vlna (< \*vьlna ["wool"]). We must be aware of the fact, however, that vlk and vlna there had the palatal syllabic l', whereas in pelt/pilt and belcha, belchy the hard syllabic l is new, because the original short syllabic l had undergone the change into lu.

As the Old Czech material shows, there were dialectal differences in the analogical levelling, the accompanying svarabhactic vowels are actually said to be one of the very few dialectal differences of Old Czech recorded in the Latin script at the dawn of the 14th century. 183 The tendency to avoid the existence of allomorphs and thus to eliminate the alternation  $e\sim 0$  in one way (blcha > Modern Czech blecha according to the genitive plural blech) or the other (genitive plural slez > Modern Czech slz according to cases with s/z-) and to unify syllabicity of the sonants (two-syllable s/za according to s/z < slez, two-syllable blcha according to blch < blech)<sup>184</sup> seems to be in operation in the Canaanite glosses recording Prague Czech already in the first half of the 13th century, however scarce the evidence is. It well fits into the picture of spellings recorded in the Latin script and of the relative chronology of reconstructed Czech phonological development. At the same time, we must bear in mind the fact that the Jewish communities linguistically are generally more conservative<sup>185</sup> and therefore we cannot extrapolate the state of affairs found in the Canaanite glosses to the Old Czech of the Christian majority directly. The more surprising are the early attestations of the syllabic levelling.

# 6.2 Differentiation between 'ä (< \*e) and 'a

The reflex of Common Slavic e is  $\ddot{a}$ ,  $\ddot{a}$  in Early Czech. Probably by the mid-12<sup>th</sup> century,  $\ddot{a}$  between two hard consonants coalesced with a, e.g.  $m\ddot{a}so >$ 

<sup>180</sup> ČORNEJOVÁ, "Ke grafice bohemik X.-XII. století" (note 158), p. 141.

<sup>181</sup> Cf. HUJER, "Vývoj jazyka československého" (note 179), p. 27.

<sup>182</sup> GEBAUER, Slovník staročeský. Díl I [A-J] (note 174), entry blcha, p. 65.

<sup>183</sup> BOHUSLAV HAVRÁNEK, "K obecným vývojovým zákonitostem spisovných jazyků. Vývoj spisovného jazyka českého ve vztahu k vývoji národního spole-čenství," in: BOHUSLAV HAVRÁNEK, *Studie o spisovném jazyce*, Praha 1963, pp. 90-100, here p. 93. On the levelling cf. GEBAUER, *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého* (note 73), vol. I: *Hláskosloví*, p. 297.

<sup>184</sup> Cf. JAKOBSON, Язык и орфография (note 165), § 46, pp. 45-46.

<sup>185</sup> Cf. KIWITT, "The Problem of Judeo-French" (note 147), p. 35.

maso ("meat"), under different conditions 'a, 'á coalesced with 'ä, 'a. The Canaanite glosses seem to discern the two phonemes  $|a| - |\ddot{a}|$  only in the writings of the earliest author Gershom b. Jehudah, the evidence is, however, very scarce: the orthography of the gloss טֵיג täg ("joint") (< \*tegъ) with a yod and cere reflects already denasalization and  $|\ddot{a}|$  close to |e| in pronunciation. Another gloss of his פָּלְצֵא pleca shows a different treatment of the original a rendered by patah and aleph. In the Latin script of the Patera Glosses of the first half of the 12th century with probably more chronological layers, some glosses may show orthographical coalescence  $\ddot{a} > a$  in some positions in agreement with reconstructed phonological development, but the orthography is ambiguous. The glosses of later Jewish authors do not generally differentiate between  $\ddot{a}$  (<  $\varrho$ , 'a) and a (<  $\ddot{a}$ , a) and render both phonemes identically as an a-sound, cf. examples with ä on one side such as קנוֹסְטָבֿוֹ kn'äžstvo "principality" (< \*kunę-, 'Arugat ha-Bosem but possibly taken over from an older tradition), אונוֹנְסָא mnoǯa"s'ä "they multiply" (< \*-ett s'e, 'Arugat ha-Bosem), פוחוֹדְנֵא pochodňä "torch" (< \*-ьnja; Nuremberg Mahzor), and with a on the other side such as מטא pata "heel (of a boot)" (< \*peta) without a yod in Amsterdam and Oxford copy of Or Zarua' and בודו אוביט budu objat (< \*-jets ["I will be embraced"]) in 'Arugat ha-Bosem.

### 6.3 Umlaut ' $\ddot{a} > \check{e}$ , ' $\ddot{a} > ie$

The Canaanite glosses systematically differentiate between the phonemes  $/\ddot{a}/$ ,  $/\ddot{a}/$  and  $/\ddot{e}/$ , /ie/ word-finally and thereby offer a unique testimony to their phonetic distinction as late as the first half of the  $13^{th}$  century, actually more accurately than the Latin script of the period, which renders the Czech phonemes  $/\ddot{a}/$ ,  $/\ddot{a}/$  sometimes by a and sometimes by e (exceptionally by ea etc.). The phonemes  $/\ddot{a}/$ ,  $/\ddot{a}/$  were very peripheral; in the  $12^{th}$  century they had a phonological value only before the phoneme  $/\rlap/e/$ . As in the case of the beginnings of syllabic analogical levelling mentioned above, the Canaanite glosses may help us to date the end of this vowel change more exactly than the previous research which admitted that the Latin script does not allow for a more precise dating than possibly the  $12^{th}$  century, which is however uncertain, 187 the second half of the  $12^{th}$  century, 188 or the  $13^{th}$  century, in the Central Bohemian dialect possibly at its dawn. 189 Probably the

<sup>186</sup> Cf. JAKOBSON, Язык и орфография (note 165), § 43, р. 35.

<sup>187</sup> Komárek, "Gebauerovo historické hláskosloví" (note 173), p. 744.

<sup>188</sup> Gebauer, Historická mluvnice jazyka českého (note 73), vol. I: Hláskosloví p. 117.

<sup>189</sup> Cf. Komárek, "Gebauerovo historické hláskosloví" (note 173), p. 744; Lamprecht, Hláskosloví (note 179), p. 65.

most precise dating is that it was finished before the last third of the 12<sup>th</sup> century. <sup>190</sup> Again we have to be aware of the fact that the glosses mediate the linguistic situation in the Jewish religious minority, which usually conserves linguistically archaic features in comparison with the surrounding Christian majority, and thus we may not generalize them too straightforwardly. Be that as it may, in the case of syllabic levelling we have noticed some progressive features in the glosses.

In the bohemica, i.e. Czech words in foreign language texts, in the Latin script of the 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> centuries, the phonemes  $/\ddot{a}/$ ,  $/\ddot{a}/$  are rendered by e, e.g. ceto (čä<s>to, for saepe), 191 zetua (žätva, for messis), zuiczet (sviecat, for rutilat), metase ze (metáše s'ä, for iactabatur), vtisi ze (utiší s'ä, for moderatur) or by a, see bura (búr'ä, for procella), unosase (vnos'ase, for ingerebat), znasachu (snažachu, for moliebantur), all these examples come from the Jagić and Patera Glosses<sup>192</sup> of the first half of the 12th century, which are a mixture of Czech and Czech Church Slavonic. The readings of the Patera Glosses such as negodil se (negodil s'à), poztideli ze (postyděli s'à), rugatize (rúgati s'à), podalizebise (podali s'ä byšä) with -e in s'ä on the one hand and rostekat sa (rostěkát s'ä), usas sa (užas s'ā), uidalsabi (vydal s'ā by), criuenetisa (črivěněti s'ā) with -a in s'ā on the other well illustrate the interchangeability of the respective graphemes rendering the same phoneme. In the Patera Glosses, the a for  $|\ddot{a}|$ ,  $|\ddot{a}|$  prevails over e in this function in the ratio 2,5 : 2 (of a total of almost 50 occurrences), 193 but we have to consider the mixed Czech and Czech Church Slavonic character of these glosses and the fact that the Patera Glosses probably consist of more layers, not examined in detail yet. 194

<sup>190</sup> František Bergmann, "K chronologii některých staročeských zjevů mluvnických z bohemik Friedrichova CB I, II," in: *Listy filologické* 48 (1921), pp. 223-239, here p. 223; KOMÁREK, *Dějiny českého jazyka* (note 157), p. 90.

<sup>191</sup> JOSEF VINTR, "Die tschechisch-kirchenslavischen Glossen des 12. Jahrhunderts in der Bibel Sign. 1190 der Nationalbibliothek in Wien (sog. Jagić-Glossen)," in: Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch 32 (1986), pp. 77-113, here p. 100. It is not excluded that the lexeme is Church Slavonic but it could be perfectly explained also as Czech.

<sup>192</sup> Cf. Josef Vintr, "Glosa ke grafice Jagićových a Paterových glos," in: MICHAELA ČORNEJOVÁ ET AL. (eds.), *Dějiny českého pravopisu (do r. 1902). Sborník příspěvků z mezinárodní konference Dějiny českého pravopisu (do r. 1902) 23.–25. září 2010*, Brno 2010, pp. 43-52, here pp. 44-45, 48.

<sup>193</sup> On the ratio cf. also GEBAUER, *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého* (note 73), vol. I: *Hláskosloví*, p. 117. I exclude forms of direct cases such as *pite* for *pit'é > pit'ie*, see below.

<sup>194</sup> VINTR, "Glosa ke grafice" (note 192), p. 47.

At the same time it is interesting that the *Patera Glosses* strictly differentiate the genitive singular and direct cases of the plural with -a (rendering 'a' < 'a < \*bja) as in uedena (veden'a), vzduizena (vzdvižen'a), bita (bit'a), oteuznesena (ote vznesen'a), naduta (nadut'a) — supported by a Czech 12th century gloss padena (accusative plural paden'a' glossing Latin accusative ruinas)<sup>195</sup> — and direct cases of the singular with -e (rendering ie from closed soft 'é < \*bje)<sup>196</sup> as in neuedene (nevěděn'ie), naste (nášťie), even in the same lexeme: pite (accusative singular from \*pitbje) versus pita (genitive singular from \*pitbja).<sup>197</sup> The scribes of the 11th century Czech Church Slavonic Prague Glagolitic Fragments and Besědy na evangelijě failed to keep such differences consistently as proven by occasional genitives singular transcribed in the Cyrillic script Цѣлєниє, Сказаниє instead of correctly etymological -нѣ (< \*bja) and direct cases in singular such as лакомьствиѣ instead of the expected -нє (< \*bje).<sup>198</sup>

The data from  $Or\ Zarua'$  and 'Arugat ha-Bosem, representing Prague Central Bohemian Czech of the first half of the 13th century, still precisely discern the word-final  $/\ddot{a}/$ ,  $/\ddot{a}/$  on the one hand and  $/\ddot{e}/$ , /ie/ on the other. Examples of word-final  $/\ddot{a}/$ ,  $/\ddot{a}/$ :199 from  $Or\ Zarua'$  מקוביצה  $makovic\ddot{a}$  (with final  $\ddot{a}$  according to usual Hebrew feminine ending), from 'Arugat ha-Bosem and Mahzor Nuremberg: גְרִיבוֹסֵא for grinu s'ä (?), מְרִישׁא mriežä, אַסְלְּבוֹסָא pochodňä, אָסְלְבּילָסא אוֹכְזְנַמִינַנִיסָא  $množa's'\ddot{a}$ , possibly also שִׁישׁטּו (for מָישׁטּו oslabil s'ä, אוֹכְזְנַמִינַנִיסָא obznamenání s'ä (locative cases), אוֹכְלְבִילַסא and אוֹבְזְנַמִינַנִיסא mnoza' אוֹכְלַבּילָסא אוֹכְלַבּיֹסָא mnoza' אוֹכְלַבּילָסא אוֹכְלַבּיֹסָא mnoza' אוֹכְלַבּיֹסָא mnoza' ma' אוֹכְלַבּיִנַיִּי mnoza' ma' moza' ma' moza' ma' moza' moza

In the word-final position the Canaanite glosses render graphically the phonemes  $/\ddot{a}/$ ,  $/\ddot{a}/$  systematically the same as their back unrounded open

<sup>195</sup> MIROSLAV FLODR, Glosy olomoucké, in: Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity, řada historická C 5 (1956), pp. 38-53, here p. 50.

<sup>196</sup> Some authors give the transcription 'a' for these direct cases, I use the transcription applied in LAMPRECHT, "Hláskosloví" (note 179), p. 42.

<sup>197</sup> In the *Jagić Glosses*, the evidence is too scarce, only *omrazene* (*omrazen'ie*), cf. VINTR, "Die tschechisch-kirchenslavischen Glossen" (note 191), p. 97, but fits the rule; Vintr does not exclude that the word is a South Slavism.

<sup>198</sup> František Václav Mareš, "Domnělé doklady české přehlásky *a* > *e* v církevněslovanských textech (typ *cělenije* gen. sg.)," in: *Slavia* 28 (1959), pp. 132-140, here p. 139; cf. Mareš, "Česká redakce církevní slovanštiny" (note 160), p. 373.

<sup>199</sup> In the following examples, I use a more precise transcription in the case of the phonemes in question than the *Staročeský slovník* (note 177).

counterparts /a/, /a/, hence keeping in orthography the phonological correlation. Such a unification is attested word-internally in the Czech Church Slavonic Besĕdy na evangelije of the 11th century, preserved in Cyrillic script, which exceptionally reads MACA (fol. 144 $\alpha\beta$ , line 5) for Latin carnes. <sup>200</sup> This accusative plural, possibly rendering the phonetical form masa as a result of the first Early Czech depalatalization dated to the second half of the 11th and the beginning of the 12th century, comes from mäsa < \*mesa. The Czech Glagolitic scribe had at his disposal the letters  $\Box$ ,  $\Box$  to denote  $\ddot{a}$  (in the Cyrillic script  $\Box$  and  $\Box$  better than the Latin script of the period.

An interesting question arises whether the umlaut  $\ddot{a} > \ell$ ,  $\ddot{a} > ie$  inside the word took place earlier than at the end. This opinion is based among other facts on the larger extent of the umlaut word-internally than wordfinally, resulting probably from higher assimilation of the vowel between consonants, and on the evidence of the Canaanite glosses, submitted by R. Jakobson in his Prague lecture in 1957.<sup>202</sup> There are much fewer instances of word-internal substitutions of the Common Slavic e in the Canaanite glosses, so that the testimony is far from indisputable, which had been recognized by Jakobson himself.<sup>203</sup> The Jagić and Patera Glosses of the 1st half of the 12th century, both preceding the usual dating of the umlaut, do not seem to support the above-mentioned hypothesis; on the contrary, the somewhat younger Patera Glosses with fewer Palaeoslovenisms have more e's representing  $/\ddot{a}/$ ,  $/\ddot{a}/$  word-finally (19 occurrences vs. 16 a's) than word-internally (9 times a, once ie in the gloss otieti, i.e. ot'ati; e is extremely rare with one occurrence only in zdirsese, i.e. zdiržaše, once en appears as a Palaeoslovenism in the gloss censto, i.e. često).

# 6.4 The change $g > \gamma > h$

The explanation of spirantization of the Common Slavic g, which took place in several Slavic tongues in all Slavic branches, is not entirely clear

<sup>200</sup> MAREŠ, "Česká redakce církevní slovanštiny" (note 160), p. 372; VÁCLAV KONZAL / FRANTIŠEK ČAJKA (eds.), Čtyřicet homilií Řehoře Velikého na evangelia v českocírkevněslovanském překladu, 2 vols. (Práce Slovanského ústavu AV ČR; NS vol. 20), Praha 2005, pt. I, p. 628.

<sup>201</sup> František Václav Mareš, "Pražské zlomky a jejich předloha v světle hlás-koslovného rozboru," in: Mareš, *Cyrilometodějská tradice a slavistika* (note 122), pp. 347-354, here p. 348.

<sup>202</sup> MAREŠ, "Domnělé doklady české přehlásky" (note 198), p. 134.

<sup>203</sup> JAKOBSON, Язык и орфография (note 165), § 44, р. 35-36.

with respect to its dating and systemic motivation. Nowadays most researchers place the change  $g > \gamma$  in the period after the breakup of Common Slavic unity, but the most recent research does not exclude that it was realized in Common Slavic as suggested previously by Trubetzkoy or Jakobson. The orthography does not shed light on the progress of the change: the Latin grapheme g as well as h, attested in Czech first in 1131 (not 1169 as is usually claimed), and have certainly both denoted  $[\gamma]$ : in the case of g as a traditionalism, in case of g as a signal of undergone spirantization. Words recorded with g, signalling probably fricative pronunciation, have prevailed in Old Czech since the mid-13th century. The Glagolitic script in the Emmaus Monastery, used to transcribe Old Czech at the turn of the 14th and 15th centuries, employed for Czech g/g the grapheme g0, originally denoting g0. Before voiced paired consonants the change g0 has not been completed in Czech until today.

Hebrew script has the possibility to differentiate between all three steps:  $g(\lambda)$ ,  $\gamma(\lambda)$  and  $h(\lambda)$ . However, the glossators and puctuators never used  $\lambda$  in our material. The almost general use of  $\lambda$  and more persuasively of  $\lambda$  may contribute to reconstruction of the chronology of the change. One early gloss deserves special attention: Rashi's with the gloss deserves special attention: Rashi's with the pronunciation of  $[\gamma]$ . It seems, however, that this gloss is not Slavic at all. Even if we admit its

<sup>204</sup> Vít Boček, "Znovu ke změně  $g > \gamma > h$  v slovanských jazycích," in: Kata-RÍNA BALLEKOVÁ ET AL. (eds.), *Jazykovedné štúdie XXXII. Prirodzený vývin jazyka a jazykové kontakty*, Bratislava 2015, pp. 211-219, here p. 211.

<sup>205</sup> Boček, "Znovu ke změně" (note 204), p. 216.

<sup>206</sup> ŠTEFKOVÁ, *Vývoj hláskosloví* (note 176), p. 39.

<sup>207</sup> Cf. LAMPRECHT, "Hláskosloví" (note 179), p. 83; ROMAN JAKOBSON [in his review of: Trávníček: *Příspěvky k nauce o českém přízvuku*. Brno 1924], in: *Slavia* 4 (1925–1926), pp. 805-816, here pp. 812-814.

<sup>208</sup> JOSEF VINTR, Das Tschechische. Hauptzüge seiner Sprachstruktur in Gegenwart und Geschichte, München 2005, p. 196; GEBAUER, Historická mluvnice jazyka českého (note 73), vol. I: Hláskosloví, p. 482.

<sup>209</sup> The dagesh appears in Canaanite glosses only exceptionally: דּוּבָּ dub "oak" (St. Petersburg, Rossijskaja nacional 'naja biblioteka, sign. Evr. I 11, fol. 83b, 144a – marginal glosses); אָרִיף "candlestick, clay vessel for a lamp" (Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Rosenthal 3, II, fol. 21b). This may have been caused by possible unclarity of its function in foreign words.

<sup>210</sup> MOSHE ALTBAUER, "Une glose slave de Raschi: s'nir," in: Revue des Études Slaves 8 (1928), pp. 245-246, here p. 246.

<sup>211</sup> OLSZOWY-SCHLANGER, "An Old Slavic Gloss" (note 33), p. 209.

Slavic character, its Czech origin is in our opinion not excluded, contrary to A. Kulik's<sup>212</sup> suggestion. In line with R. Krajčovič's<sup>213</sup> explanation of morphonological causes of the spirantization  $g > \gamma$ , it may have started in Czech only after the change  $d\chi' > \chi'$ , evidenced already in the *Kiev Folia* (9<sup>th</sup>/10<sup>th</sup> centuries) and in the first leaf of the *Prague Glagolitic Fragments* (the middle or the second half of the 11<sup>th</sup> century),<sup>214</sup> hence it is perfectly possible to reconstruct it for the end of the 11<sup>th</sup> century (Rashi died in 1105). In Canaanite glosses before the mid-13<sup>th</sup> century the grapheme *gimel* solely appears without distinguishing the position in the word (in pre-consonantal position the change is reconstructed as slowlier).

There is a possible positive evidence of the fricative  $\gamma$  even in the Hebrew script, namely the inconsistently used rafeh above gimel, which is commonly used in Hebrew to denote fricative pronunciation. In Canaanite glosses, there are three attestations: קרוג krug²15 "circle, compasses" (St. Petersburg, Rossijskaja nacional naja biblioteka, Evr. I 11, fol. 155a, a marginal gloss, ms. from before 1271), קרוג jagody "berries", לְלִיוָט for glezno²16 "ankle" (both in the Amsterdam copy of Or Zarua', possibly from the 13th century). This hypothesis is supported by an unambiguous fact that rafe above the letter bet in Canaanite glosses always signals the fricative [v] and that the grapheme  $\check{\lambda}$  in Old French glosses signals a changed pronunciation, namely the affricate /dʒ/ or fricative /ʒ/.²17 Possible indirect evidence that there was no /g/ for some time in Old Czech, at least word-finally, is supplied by

<sup>212</sup> Alexander Kulik, "Jews from Rus' in Medieval England," in: Jewish Quarterly Review 102 (2012), pp. 371-403, here pp. 128-129, cf. Bláha et al., Kenaanské glosy (note 1), pp. 135-136; Dittmann, "The Czech Language" (note 4), p. 22. Mochè Catane, "Le monde intellectuel de Rashi," in: Gilbert Dahan (ed.), Les Juifs au regard de l'histoire. Mélanges en l'honneur de Bernhard Blumenkranz, Paris 1985, pp. 63-85, here p. 78, supplies also Russian in explanation of Rashi's wire

<sup>213</sup> RUDOLF KRAJČOVIČ, "Zmena  $g > \gamma$  (> h) západoslovanskej skupine," in: *Slavia* 26 (1957), pp. 341-357, here pp. 349-353.

<sup>214</sup> VEČERKA, *Staroslověnská etapa* (note 79), p. 64; FRANTIŠEK VÁCLAV MAREŠ, "Církevněslovanské písemnictví v Čechách," in: MAREŠ, *Cyrilometodějská tradice a slavistika* (note 122), pp. 256-327, here p. 274. The z' < dz' < dj appears also in Canaanite glosses in the writings of Joseph Qara (died around 1125), namely in the gloss oděz'a (<\*-dj-).

<sup>215</sup> St. Petersburg, Rossijskaja nacional'naja biblioteka, Evr. I 11, fol. 155a (marginal gloss).

<sup>216</sup> Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Rosenthal 3, I, fol. 67b and 241b.

<sup>217</sup> KIWITT, "The Problem of Judeo-French" (note 147), p. 34; KIWITT / DÖRR, "Judeo-French" (note 6), p. 149.

place names adapted with a /k/ in the  $Or\ Zarua'$ , even though it is not clear if it may reflect the variants in German: וירצבורק for today's  $W\ddot{u}rzburg$  (along with מינצבורק, בורג, for  $M\ddot{u}nzenberg$ , נורבורק for  $N\ddot{u}rnberg$ , בורג for Regensburg (along with בורג, and variants in readings), 218 cf. Old Czech  $Mark\acute{e}ta$  from Margareta etc.

Later Canaanite glosses include also the graphemes he (and het) for Czech b, first in glosses of Isaac b. Mose' son Hayyim Or Zarua', flourishing in the 2<sup>nd</sup> half or towards the end of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, who shortened his father's compendium and took over some glosses. The spellings הַהוֹבִיצֵי הַהוֹבִיצֵי hahubicě, ha-chubicě "mushrooms" show, among other things, adaptation of the Slavic word into Hebrew by adding the Hebrew article. An h is present also in a late edition of Rashi's commentary: דוהיט for dehet "tar".<sup>219</sup> An indirect testimony to the existence of h is possibly supplied by the reading אוגננציה ogněncích "emitors of flames" instead of the expected n in Mahzor Nuremberg (finished 1331): it is more likely explicable by a possible affiliation of the scribe to the bne hes with whom ch and h coalesced, which is probably the case with Hayyim b. Isaac too, and such a coalescence appears also in German glosses of the Leipzig Glossary.<sup>220</sup> Other testimonies to the existence of the Czech h include Rabbinical sources of the 15th century which denote the Hussites by a pun as בני חושים, 221 and in I. Isserlein's (d. 1460) responsa containing also the place name Hradiš (הרעדיש).222

### 6.5 The consonantal cluster šč

The consonantal group & of whatever origin dissimilated in Bohemian Old Czech into &. The first safe attestations of this change appeared only since the 14th century. 223 In the 14th century, & still prevails, receding only in the

<sup>218</sup> Wellesz, "Über R. Isaak" (note 16), pp. 97, 104, 105, 108.

<sup>219</sup> ABRAHAM BERLINER, Raši 'al ha-Tora, 'im be'ur Zechor le-Avraham, kolel he'arot we-tiķunim, me'et Avraham Berliner, Berlin 1866, p. 368; JAKOBSON / HALLE, "The Term Canaan" (note 16), p. 884.

<sup>220</sup> BANITT, Le Glossaire de Leipzig. Introduction (note 151), p. 421; cf. MANFRED GERNOT HEIDE, "Die h-Graphen im älteren Jiddisch," in: HERMANN-JOSEF MÜLLER / WALTER RÖLL (eds.), Fragen des älteren Jiddisch. Kolloquium in Trier 1976. Vorträge. Trierer Beiträge. Sonderheft 2, Trier 1977, pp. 4-15, here p. 6.

<sup>222</sup> ISAAK MARKON, "Einige slavische Wörter in den Responsen des R. Israel Isserlin," in: *HaKedem* 2 (1908), No. 1-2, pp. 58-59, here p. 59.

<sup>223</sup> GEBAUER, *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého* (note 73), vol. I: *Hláskosloví*, p. 521; TRÁVNÍČEK, *Historická mluvnice* (note 163), p. 146. First continuous documents

following century.<sup>224</sup> There are some uncertain pre-1300 proper noun spellings: Tugast (variants: Tugost, Tugust, Tugocz; instead of the expected Tugosc for Tugošč) in copies of Kosmas' Chronicle (Kosmas died in 1125),<sup>225</sup> Chegost (CDB I, p. 300, line 21, recorded in 1190),<sup>226</sup> Gradist (for -išče, CDB II, p. 205, line 10, recorded in 1221)<sup>227</sup> and two uncertain readings in the Patera Glosses of the first half of the 12th century, which in two cases contain the graphematic group st.<sup>228</sup> Uncertainty results from the considerable similarity of the letters c and t in the Latin script, so that explanations relied on their confusion such as in case of Tugost, 229 yet parallels, existing in Polish, such as Cegost, Siegost, have led some scholars to assume an existence of a personal name Tugost.<sup>230</sup> Moreover there are parallels in Ancient Polish such as Turkouiste (for the expected -isce denoting -išče) in the Latin Bull of Gniezno from 1136.231 New light on these spellings may be thrown by the development of Latin Stephanus > Old Czech  $St' > S't' - S'c' - S\check{c} : 2^{32}$ applying this mechanism, it is hypothetically possible to imagine a backward move from  $\check{x}$  to st. The above-mentioned confusion of graphemes cand t would have been impossible in Glagolitic script (certainly the Prague Glagolitic Fragments and probably the Besédy na evangelije, both from the 11th century, had  $\tilde{x}^*$ )<sup>233</sup> and neither was it plausible in Hebrew orthography. Yet more probable for the Latin script st rendering št seems to be a simpler explanation adduced by S. Rospond: it was a German orthographical habit to treat K by st. 234 Could possibly the Latin script influence the orthographical habits

in Old Czech are attested from the 1270s onwards, since the beginning of the 14<sup>th</sup> century there is an abrupt emergence of preserved Old Czech versed texts.

<sup>224</sup> Komárek, Historická mluvnice (note 103), p. 140.

<sup>225</sup> See the on-line version available at <a href="http://digit.nkp.cz/projekty/VZ-2004\_2010/2007/Prilohy/StructuredText/Kosmas\_pozn.xml">http://digit.nkp.cz/projekty/VZ-2004\_2010/2007/Prilohy/StructuredText/Kosmas\_pozn.xml</a>, retrieved on 26th November 2016.

<sup>226</sup> Cf. Bergmann, "K chronologii" (note 190), p. 238.

<sup>227</sup> Cf. JAKOBSON, Язык и орфография (note 165), § 48, р. 59.

<sup>228</sup> JOS SCHAEKEN, "Die tschechisch-kirchenslavischen Patera-Glossen (St. Gregor-Glossen, Prager Glossen)," in: *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 35 (1989), pp. 159-191, here pp. 180, 185.

<sup>229</sup> Antonín Profous, "Místní jména Domažlice a Taus," in: Listy filologické 67 (1940), pp. 312-319, here p. 316.

<sup>230</sup> Vladimír Šmilauer, "Výklady slov," in: *Naše řeč* 25 (1941), pp. 11-17, here p. 12.

<sup>231</sup> Cf. JAKOBSON, Язык и орфография (note 165), § 49, р. 63.

<sup>232</sup> HUJER, "Vývoj jazyka československého" (note 179), p. 36.

<sup>233</sup> MAREŠ, "Česká redakce církevní slovanštiny" (note 160), p. 374.

<sup>234</sup> Stanisław Rospond, Dawność mazurzenia w świetle grafiki staropolskiej, Wrocław

of Canaanite glosses, as we know from Old French glosses?<sup>235</sup> We know of Latinisms in both proper and appellative nouns in Judeo-Czech writings of the period.<sup>236</sup>

In the Canaanite glosses of Abraham b. Azriel, whose work was finished around 1234 or in the 1240s,<sup>237</sup> we find only šč, see הבושתישצו chvoštišče "broom" (obviously a common scribal error from פרישצו)<sup>238</sup> and פרישצו prýščú "they snort" of the same Vatican manuscript. The more suprising is that Abraham b. Azriel's pupil in the Prague yeshiva, Isaac b. Mose, uses H' (< šč) in the gloss štět, preserved unequivocally in three copies of his work Or Zarua': Amsterdam (שָׁטֵישׁ), New York (שָׁטֵיִ"ט or rather שֶׁטֵיִ"ט and Oxford (שָּטֵיט). Moreover, Jakobson quotes a corrupted gloss transcribed by I. Kahan as Ziruscht, which Jakobson reads צירושט and identifies with a place name טרישט Trěšť. There are no more records of  $s\tilde{c}/s\tilde{t}$  but it would seem that whereas Abraham b. Azriel uses only K, his pupil Isaac b. Mose K. We cannot exclude that the change 5% > 5% began in Prague Czech already in the first half of the 13th century. It would have been supported by a dissimilation of its voiced counterpart in the consonantal group  $\xi d\xi$  (>  $\xi d$ ), which in the 14th century was already an archaism. 240 The dynamism of assimilation and dissimilation processes is attested by Canaanite glosses elsewhere: the etymon of הבושתישצו chvoštišče is chvostišče and the cluster št (שת) could have resulted from assimilation of articulatory place  $st' > st'.^{241}$  The same kind of assimilation (sk > šk) appeared in Isaac b. Mose's gloss with prothetic aleph

<sup>1957,</sup> p. 69. I am grateful to Dr. Izabela Winiarska-Górska from Warsaw University for her kind help.

<sup>235</sup> MENAHEM BANITT, Le Glossaire de Bâle. Introduction, Jérusalem 1972, pp. 58-59; BANITT, Le Glossaire de Leipzig. Introduction (note 151), pp. 207-209; on the knowledge of the Vulgate cf. BANITT, Rashi, Interpreter of the Biblical Letter (note 53), p. 7; HANNA LISS, "Peshat-Auslegung und Erzähltheorie am Beispiel Raschbams," in: DANIEL KROCHMALNIK ET AL. (eds.), Raschi und sein Erbe. Internationale Tagung der Hochschule für Jüdische Studien mit der Stadt Worms, Heidelberg 2007, pp. 101-124, here pp. 106-108.

<sup>236</sup> BLÁHA ET AL., Kenaanské glosy (note 1), p. 213.

<sup>237</sup> VISI, On the Peripheries (note 28), pp. 133-134.

<sup>238</sup> Cf. Gebauer, *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého* (note 73), vo. I: *Hláskosloví*, p. 482.

<sup>239</sup> Cf. JAKOBSON, Язык и орфография (note 165), § 49, р. 61.

<sup>240</sup> Komárek, Historická mluvnice (note 103), p. 40.

<sup>241</sup> Cf. GEBAUER, Historická mluvnice jazyka českého. Díl I. Hláskosloví (note 73), p. 482, who presupposes the change sť > šť > šť > šť (the last step as a distant dissimilation).

אשקרובדא škrovada "lid for baking; roasting pan?" in a London manuscript of Or Zarua', stemming from Common Slavic \*skovorda (in Old Czech skrovada).<sup>242</sup>

## 6.6 Absence of prothetic bilabial v-

Canaanite glosses confirm unequivocally the data of previous scholarship that the *v*-prothesis before *o*- does not emerge in Old Czech before the 14<sup>th</sup> century. Data, totalling 36 token occurrences, stretch from Rashi (*okřín* "vessel" attested in six old manuscripts in forms אוקרין, אוקרין, אוקרין, אוקרין, אוקרין, אוקרין, אוקרין, אוקרין, אונקרין, אונקרין, אונקרין, אונקרין, אונקרין, אונקרין, אונקרין, אונקרין, אוניזא, אוֹנִיזא, אַנִיזי, אַנִיזי, אוֹנִיזא, אַנִיזי, אַנִיין, אַנִיין, אַנִיין, אַנִיין, אָנִייִין, אַנִייִין, א

#### 6.7 Consonantal assimilation

With respect to the fact that West Canaanite glosses of Slavic authors generally never confuse s and z, it is possible that in the unclear glosses of the first half of the 13th century אוסקוסטא vs kost "to the bone" (< vz kost?) and vs riskysala  $s'a^{247}$  "it spread" (< mz-) we have early evidence for regressive consonantal assimilation, otherwise safely attested in Old Czech since the beginning of the 14th century. It is important that both cases concern

<sup>242</sup> GEBAUER, Historická mluvnice jazyka českého. Díl I. Hláskosloví (note 73), p. 483.

<sup>243</sup> Arsène Darmesteter / David S. Blondheim, Les gloses françaises dans les commentaires talmudiques de Raschi (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Sciences Historiques et Philologiques, vol. 254), Paris 1929, vol. I: Texte des gloses, p. 103; Kulik, "Jews and the Language" (note 35), p. 130; cf. Moše Landau, מרפא לשון, Odesa 1864, p. 251: אקדון.

<sup>244</sup> Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Rosenthal 3, I, fol. 128b.

<sup>245</sup> ŠTEFKOVÁ, Vývoj hláskosloví (note 176), pp. 45-46.

<sup>246</sup> CDB IV/I, p. 275, line 30; CDB V/II, p. 279, l. 35; CDB V/II, p. 436, l. 15; CDB V/II, p. 436, l. 20; CDB V/II, p. 195, l. 1; CDB IV/I, p. 275, l. 20; CDB V/I, p. 309, l. 30; CDB V/I, p. 552, l. 1.

<sup>247</sup> Frankfurt a. M., Universitätsbibliothek, Ms. hebr. fol. 16, fol. 53a; cf. רותקוחלא in Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, ebr. 301, fol. 82b.

the consonant k which is in Latin script first subjected to the assimilation (cf. gdy < kdy etc.). On the other hand, the glosses show a lack of assimilation of the group kd, see קרוני kdúně (< nom. sg. \*kъdun'a) in Me'ir of Rothenburg (died 1293), taken over from Or Zarua'. 248 In the word-final position, the glosses confirm lack of assimilation as expected, e.g. ליד led "hail", אושג ožeg "poker", דיס prěd "to the front of", טברוג tvarog "cottage cheese". The readings such as קברטי tvarog, קניטני for květný "floral", קברטי for kvarty "quarter" confirm the expected lack of progressive assimilation of /v/. There are three unexpected readings: סָרוֹבַּדְקָא syrovádka "whey" (Isaac b. Mose, instead of the expected end of the word -tka, which is attested in his pupil, Me'ir of Rothenburg's writings, with a scribal error in the initial as פִּירֹבַטָּקא symvátka) is probably a mere result of analogy with words ending in -dka. Such interchanges -dka/-tka are recorded also in Latin script, e.g. 1281 villam dictam Zahradka opposed to Hec autem sunt ville [...] V Zahratky recorded in the same year. <sup>249</sup> The reading אוגננציה ogněncích instead of the expected ח in Mahzor Nuremberg is explicable by bne hes for whom ch and h coalesced. The twice recorded spelling קונפיצי konfice in the Or Zarua', with an unexpected finstead of קונביצי, originated most probably by scribal mixing of the correct forms קונביצי konvice and קוביצי kupice, attested in the same manuscript several times in neighbourhood of the corrupted readings. In the loanword ליפסק Lipsk "Leipzig" in the Or Zarua', the assimilation has been carried out, if the etymology from \*Libbsks is correct.<sup>250</sup>

# 6.8 Some other phonological and phonetic Old Czech changes

Most Canaanite glosses appear in the writings of Abraham b. Azriel and Isaac b. Mose and in Mahzor Nuremberg, a compilation from between the mid-13th century and 1331. As expected, the glosses do not contain later changes such as 'u, 'u > i, i (אוֹסָלְבוֹים oslab'u s'a "I will grow weak", for ochstrju s'a "I will get sharpened", אוֹכָסכיריוסא pryśśźu "they snort"), aj > ej (אוֹכְּחָבִינִיְּסָא אוֹבְּוָנְמִינִיְסָא obznamenaj s'a "acquaint yourself with it"), čr'/čř > tr'/tř > stř (אַרִיך and אָרֵיך "candlestick, clay vessel for a lamp" – in this case the Canaanite glosses may help illuminate the chronology of the change, in

<sup>248</sup> Unclear is the reading בניקו: ניכדא (for *vniknu: nikda* "I cannot enter anytime" or rather more distorted *pomkni s'a* "move"?) in Qara's St. Petersburg manuscript.

<sup>249</sup> CDB VI/I, p. 211, line 25; CDB VI/I, p. 235, l. 25. On limited value of these renderings cf. KRAJČOVIČ, Zmena  $g > \gamma$  (> h) západoslovanskej skupine (note 213), p. 347. It is not excluded that the assimilation before k took place there.

<sup>250</sup> WALTER WENZEL, Die slawische Frühgeschichte Sachsens im Licht der Namen, Hamburg 2017, p. 171. One of the older etymologies was \*Lipiski.

the older layers of the 14th century Old Czech tr already prevails). 251 On the other hand, we already have t-epenthesis in words stryda (the change str < sr took place before the 14th century, 252 records until the end of the 12th century have sr, cf. spellings recorded in 1180/82 Sremesna /for Sremesna/, 1131 Zrebrniceh /for Sriebr-/ in Latin script) 253 in an unidentified Oxford manuscript in a corrupted gloss אוכסטר (stryda for streda), 254 furthermore אוכסטריוסא (stryda for streda), 254 furthermore אוכסטריוסא (stryice), evidencing the Old Czech s- unequivocally), stryice (stryice) and uncertain אוכסטריוסא (stryice) (stryice) and uncertain אוכסטריוסא (stryice) (stryice) stryice) stryice (stryice) stryice) stryice (stryice) stryice) and uncertain stryice (stryice) (stryice) stryice) stryice0 (stryice) stryice1 (stryice2) stryice3 (stryice3) stryice4 (stryice3) stryice4 (stryice3) stryice5) stryice6 (stryice3) stryice6 (stryice3) stryice6 (stryice3) stryice6 (stryice6) stryice7) stryice8 (stryice8) stryice9 stry

## 6.9 Higher language levels

The Canaanite glosses give testimony not only to phonological, but also morphological, word-formational, lexicological, syntactical, and textological development. Morphologically, more than two thirds of the glosses with ties to the Czech lands, counting also occurrences in the copies, are nouns, typically in the nominative singular, and in the group of *Or Zarua*', *Mahzor Nuremberg*, and '*Arugat ha-Bosem*, the nouns exceed 75 per cent.<sup>257</sup> In the *Or Zarua*' alone, nouns predominate with over 95 per cent. Only in the '*Arugat ha-Bosem*, the coverage of verbs is more balanced, and the author often uses Czech vocables to illustrate grammatical forms of Hebrew

<sup>251</sup> TRÁVNÍČEK, Historická mluvnice (note 163), p. 174.

<sup>252</sup> TRÁVNÍČEK, *Historická mluvnice* (note 163), p. 163; cf. KOMÁREK, *Historická mluvnice* (note 103), p. 145.

<sup>253</sup> CDB I, p. 266, line 28, CDB I, p. 122, l. 3.

<sup>254</sup> JAKOBSON / HALLE, "The Term Canaan" (note 16), p. 863.

<sup>255</sup> See Nürnberger Memorbuch (photocopies at the Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts, Jewish National and University Library, Jerusalem, 2828 5), fol. 104b (I thank Daniel Polakovič, Jewish Museum in Prague, for checking the manuscript reading). Cf. SIEGMUND SALFELD, Das Martyrologium des Nürnberger Memorbuches, Berlin 1898, p. 68.

<sup>256</sup> Cf. LADISLAV HOSÁK / RUDOLF ŠRÁMEK, Místní jména na Moravě a ve Slezsku II. M–Ž. Dodatky, doplňky, přehledy, Praha 1980, entry Špičky, p. 553; cf. BERGMANN, K chronologii (note 190), p. 238.

<sup>257</sup> BLÁHA ET AL., Kenaanské glosy (note 1), p. 281.

including the verbal ones.<sup>258</sup> Non-Slavic endings or beginnings of the word (the Hebrew article), one of M. Weinreich's arguments for separation of the language which the glosses represent from the co-territorial Slavic,<sup>259</sup> are actually extremely scarce; the former appear only in the oldest group of authors flourishing in the 11th and 12th centuries, the latter with late authors of the 13th and 14th centuries and similarly rare are calque translations.<sup>260</sup> Nor are such morphological adaptations infrequent in medieval Christian Latin, as can be learned, e.g., from the following records from the mid-13th century legal lists: 1263 dabis annis singulis mensuram unam tritici [...]; de allodio tuo, de zluhonibus [...] nichil dabis (with Latin declension of the adapted Czech a-stem noun sluha > Latin nominative sluho),261 1262 de manso videlicet duas mensuras, que vulgariter strichones dicuntur (from Czech strych/štrych > strycho/štrycho).<sup>262</sup> As expected, the Old Czech Hebrew glosses comprise older forms which soon became outdated in the course of the 14th century such as the imperative budi, the conjunction ex or the pronominal instrumental tobú. Morphology, word-formation, lexicology and syntax (however scarcely the latter is documented) of the Canaanite glosses all fit very well into the reconstructed system of Early and Old Czech. Due to Isaac b. Mose's concentration on every-day objects and their glossing in Czech, there occur more elaborate semantic definitions than in the contemporaneous Latinwritten documents. For example, the gloss pometlo is accompanied by the following exposition: חופיא אשקובא שמכבדין בה את הבית ובלשון כנען פומיטלו ועושין is אשקובא (i.e. Hebrew) אותה מעלין של לולב התלושין מן השדרה ואוגדין מהן הרבה יחד explained by the Czech vocable pometlo /פומיטלו "broom" and in detail the technique from what material and how it is made are added).<sup>263</sup> In these glosses we also find one of the earliest examples of tautonymy, i.e. crosslinguistic equivalence, with as many as four languages, the combination of which is unrivalled in Czech Christian writings of the time. It is probable that three-language parallels had been supplied on the Czech soil before: already in Besĕdy na evangelije, which originated in the 11th century, yet are

<sup>258</sup> Cf. ROMAN JAKOBSON, "The City of Learning," in: *American Hebrew* 150 (05.12.1941), pp. 6-17, here p. 7; ŠEDINOVÁ, "Life and Language" (note 155), p. 215.

<sup>259</sup> Cf. Weinreich, "Yiddish, Knaanic, Slavic" (note 19), p. 625; Max Weinreich, *History of the Yiddish Language*, New Haven / London 2008, p. 84.

<sup>260</sup> Bláha et al., Kenaanské glosy (note 1), pp. 285-286.

<sup>261</sup> CDB V/I, p. 555, line 10.

 $<sup>262 \</sup>text{ CDB V/I}$ , p. 477, line 5.

<sup>263</sup> Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Rosenthal 3, II, fol. 187b.

preserved in much later Russian Cyrillic copies, we meet a Greek-Latin-Slavic tautonymy. However, an Or Zarna' 13th century manuscript adduces a quadruple tautonymy: עצים הקושרים זה אצל זה הרבה יחד ובלשון המקרא. In this passage, the Hebrew word קורא אותו רפסודות ובל' לעז ריד ובל' אשכנז וולוס ובלשו' כנ' פילט. In this passage, the Hebrew word היד is explained by glosses in Old French (דיד red), Ashkenazic (סילס) and Canaanite (סילס) וולוס) languages, he languages, he languages, and canaanite (סילס) של חולוס) and Canaanite (סילס) של חולוס) וולוס מר are already present in Rashi. he he hought in Czech because in the flowing Hebrew text he inserts in several cases morphological forms of Czech vocables required by a Czech translation of the passages, such as a genitive of the incongruent attribute, an objective dative or a genitive after negation and he sometimes omits the otherwise usual phrase בלשון כנען בען בען בען בעון כנען בעון בעון כנען Latin Christian writings. he will be a canada and he constituted into Latin Christian writings.

#### 7. Conclusions

The growth of economy, power and territory of the Přemyslid dukedom and kingdom in Central Europe co-prepared conditions for expansion of medieval Czech, dominating the emerging standard Slavic languages of the area, surpassing them in the medieval development at least by a century, <sup>269</sup> and spreading to Silesia, Vienna, Lusatia and elsewhere. A similar growth and expansion, despite deceleration by occasional worsening of living conditions, was enjoyed by the Prague Jewish community, the most important West Slavic Jewish centre in the Middle Ages at least until

<sup>264</sup> DITTMANN / BLÁHA, "The Lexicological Contribution" (note 28), p. 79; VÁC-LAV KONZAL / FRANTIŠEK ČAJKA (eds.), Čtyřicet homilií Řehoře Velikého na evangelia v českocírkevněslovanském překladu. Díl druhý, Praha 2006, p. 846, fol. 197bα-197bβ, cf. MAREŠ, "Česká redakce církevní slovanštiny" (note 160), p. 395.

<sup>265</sup> Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Rosenthal 3, I, fol. 29b.

<sup>266</sup> Cf. Mochè Catane, אוצר לעזי רש"י, 2 vols. Jerusalem 1996, vol.  $\Pi$ : המילים המילים על התלמוד על התלמוד אוצר הע"י על התלמוד אוצר הע"י על התלמוד המילים. p. 18.

<sup>267</sup> BLÁHA ET AL., Kenaanské glosy (note 1), p. 311; ULIČNÁ, Staročeské glosy (note 4), p. 8. 268 Cf. BLÁHA ET AL., Kenaanské glosy (note 1), p. 323, and the Czech neuter adjective zabile (= zabilé, actually for množství zabilé) glossing insana multitudo in the Patera Glosses, see JOS SCHAEKEN, "Die tschechisch-kirchenslavischen Patera-Glossen (St. Gregor-Glossen, Prager Glossen)," in: Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch 35 (1989), pp. 159-191, here p. 172.

<sup>269</sup> OLAF JANSEN [= ROMAN JAKOBSON], "Český vliv na středověkou literaturu polskou," in: *Co daly naše země Evropě a lidstvu. Od slovanských věrozvěstů k národnímu obrození*, Praha 1998, pp. 93-101, here p. 93; BLÁHA, *Jazyky střední Evropy* (note 118), p. 58.

1300,<sup>270</sup> as evidenced by its economic success, improvement of their position especially during the reign of Přemysl Otakar II (1253–1278) and profound scholarship. Nowhere else in the Czech lands do we know of such a concentrated contemporaneous series of scholars with international reputation as from the Prague Jewish community of the second half of the 12th and the first half of the 13th centuries and no other group of Bohemia-related scholars of the period succeeded in having Czech vocables recorded or copied by scholars in France and Germany. The relatively scanty documentation of the literary output and its genre variability<sup>271</sup> of the then Prague community may have been caused by the Prague pogrom of 1389, yet despite its devastating effect, the surviving Jewish works with Czech glosses count among the richest sources of pre-1250 appellative bohemica and works with a wide international acclaim linked to Bohemia of the former half of the 13th century. The Prague community seems to have been gradually Germanized and Yiddish became "victorious" by the mid-15th century;<sup>272</sup> however, its authoritative role did not diminish in the Central-European Jewish context and it helped to transmit the early phases of Yiddish including Czech proper nouns and specialized vocabulary eastwards.<sup>273</sup>

<sup>270</sup> Cf. BLÁHA, Jazyky střední Evropy (note 118), p. 15.

<sup>271</sup> Cf. VISI, Words of Power (note 28), p. 24, on various genres cultivated by Prague-related authors (only in some works we meet the Canaanite glosses).

<sup>272</sup> WEINREICH, *History* (note 259), p. 81. PAVEL TROST, "Medieval Judeo-Czech," in: *Judaica Bohemiae* 4 (1968), p. 138, relates that unlike in lists of the 14th century, in a list of names dated to the end of the 15th century the ratio of German and Czech names is already equalled. Still, some authors claim that Czech remained the main language of Prague Jews until at least 1526, cf. Lena Arava-Novotná, "Jewish Society in Prague in Time of Rabbi Löw, Known as Maharal (1525–1609)," in: Jiří Blažek et al. (eds.), *Šalom. Pocta Bedřichu Noskovi k sedm-desátým narozeninám*, Praha 2012, pp 212-226, here p. 221.

<sup>273</sup> Cf. Bláha, Jazyky střední Evropy (note 118), p. 125.