

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: 06.03.2026

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 Altschechischen, 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 Q09: 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.), *Łużyski 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 21958]. – 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.

1 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 kenanischen 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,² the writings of Italian Jews show regional features of Italian dialects³ and Jews in Slavic speaking areas, of which Prague stands out in the first centuries of the second millennium, 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,⁴ 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

2 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.

3 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.

4 MARC KIWITT, “Hébreu, Français, et « Judéo-Français » dans les commentaires bibliques des pařanim,” 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 XIIIe 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. Peshat-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.⁵

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 *bohémica* 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

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

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

7 RUBIN, Judeo-Italian (note 3), p. 298.

8 Cf. BRAD SABIN HILL, "Judeo-Slavic," in: KAHN / RUBIN (eds.), *Handbook of Jewish Languages* (note 3), pp. 599-617, here p. 602.

9 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.

10 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.

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

12 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; *Tomi 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 (*Sibbu' 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 הסידים [*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.¹⁴ 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.¹⁵

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 glossary¹⁶ are rather scanty and 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.

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

14 Cf. HILL, “Judeo-Slavic” (note 8), p. 605; KUPFER / LEWICKI, *Žródla* (note 1).

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

16 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 / LEWICKI, *Žródla* (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).¹⁷

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 Ya‘qūb of Tortosa (mid-10th 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-10th century, the *Sefer Josippon* manifests a certain “Bohemia-centricity” of references to Slavs,¹⁸ and the central position of Prague in Western Canaan has been recognized and repeatedly confirmed by modern historical scholarship.¹⁹ In Hebrew writings, mentions of Prague have been appearing since the 11th century,²⁰ and Petahiah of Regensburg even identifies synecdochically Prague and Bohemia (ארץ בהם והיא הנקראת (פראג)).²¹ A synagogue and a school (yeshiva) probably had existed in Prague since the 11th century²² Referring to the end of the 11th century, the Latin

RUDY, Berlin / New York / Amsterdam 1985, pp. 858-886, here p. 885; ULIČNÁ, *Staročeské glosy* (note 4), pp. 147-148.

17 Frankfurt a. M., Universitätsbibliothek, Ms hebr. oct. 94, fol. 213b.

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

19 HAJIM TYKOCINSKI, “Vorarbeiten zur ‘Germania judaica’. II,” in: *Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 53 (1909), pp. 344-359; cf. CHLENOV, “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.

20 TYKOCINSKI, “Vorarbeiten” (note 19), p. 350.

21 BLÁHA ET AL., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), p. 342.

22 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,²³ confirmed also by names of Hebrew origin on early Přemyslid bracteates and later numismatic finds in Poland.²⁴ 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.²⁶ 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 *חכמים מחכמים* (*the sages of sages*), thus using a gradation phrase that is repeated by Isaac b. Mose (c. 1180–c.1250).²⁷ 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.

23 TYKOCINSKI, “Vorarbeiten” (note 19), pp. 346, 355.

24 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 odnítí. Věnováno Petru Sommerovi k životnímu jubileu*, Praha 2011, pp. 236–246, here p. 241.

25 JAKOBSON / HALLE, “The Term *Canaan*,” (note 16), p. 885.

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

27 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.

28 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* (מילוטה) in Worms from 1190.²⁹

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 Lands³⁰ (and its ruling domain), to which most mentions of European Canaan in the 11th and 12th centuries refer.³¹ In the writings of Prague-connected authors, Canaan refers to the Czech kingdom as can be learned from Isaac b. Mose' phrase במלכותינו בארץ כנען (*in our kingdom, in the land of Canaan*), occurring four times.³² In a parallel way, the *language of Canaan* may refer to the language of Biblical Canaan³³ or to Slavic languages, which were often considered as an undifferentiated whole, or from 10th to 13th 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.

29 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.

30 JAKOBSON / HALLE, “The Term *Canaan*” (note 16), pp. 858-867; BLÁHA ET AL., *Knaanské 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.

31 CHLENOV, “Knaanim” (note 18), p. 17.

32 Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Rosenthal 3, II, fol 21a, 21b, 67b, 151a; HAJIM TYKOCINSKI, “Lebenszeit und Heimat des Isaak Or Sarua,” in: *Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 55 (1911), pp. 478-500, here pp. 491-494.

33 JUDITH OLSZOWY-SCHLANGER, “An Old Slavic Gloss in Rashi’s Bible Commentary? שוׁיׁ 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*.³⁴ So far all 10th to 13th centuries' in-text Slavic glosses introduced by the phrase *in the language of Canaan* (בלשון כנען) are identifiable with Early and Old Czech, provided scribal errors and historical development of Czech are taken into account.³⁵ 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,³⁶ 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 פרישין '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 קדוני *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 ך – ך and ך – ך. Moreover, the correct reading exemplifies an important variant, viz., a continuant of the reconstructed Common Slavic **kydun'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-Raši*³⁹ (הגק[רא בלשון כנען] כומל), i.e. *chmel* or

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

35 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.

36 BLÁHA ET AL., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), pp. 402-728.

37 BLÁHA ET AL., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), pp. 443-445.

38 JIŘÍ REJZEK, *Český etymologický slovník*, Praha 2015, pp. 299-300: entry *kdoule*.

39 ספר הפרדס לרשי"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*

ch^umel meaning ‘beer, beverage made from hops’ – this meaning is rarely attested in Old Czech;⁴⁰ furthermore לִיטְקָא בְּלִשׁוֹן כְּנַעַן, i.e. *lytka/lytka* ‘calf/calves’; and finally a passage where a Canaanite gloss accompanies an explanation in Hebrew and Old French: בְּלִשׁוֹן לְעִז רְטָא, וּבְלִשׁוֹן כְּנַעַן צִשְׁקָא וּבְלִשׁוֹן עֵבְרִי כַף הִירֶךְ, cf. Old Czech *čěška*, Modern Czech *čěška* ‘kneecap’ (a word that in Slavic languages occurs in Czech only).⁴¹ An unclear gloss טבחרא introduced with בְּלִשׁוֹן כְּנַעַן appears in a Cambridge manuscript of Jehudah he-Hasid’s commentary on Genesis 1:3.⁴²

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-13th century.⁴³ German glosses are very scarce in the preserved writings of Abraham b. Azriel (1st half of the 13th century) and Isaac b. Mose and French glosses abound only in Isaac’s work,⁴⁴ all keeping the orthographical norm of the French and German glossators,⁴⁵ so that their borrowing from

H. L. Eehrenreich. 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.

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

41 See JIŘÍ REJZEK, *Český etymologický slovník* (note 38), entry *čěška*, p. 125.

42 JOSEPH DAN, תולדות תורת הסוד העברית, 11 vols. Jerusalem 2008–2015, vols. V-VI: חסידות אשכנז, vol. V: וחוג משפחת קלונימוס באשכנז וחוץ בעלי הסוד באשכנז, p. 409, note 47 (I thank Tamás Visi for supplying the gloss and the reference).

43 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.

44 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.

45 BLÁHA ET AL., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), p. 240; ROMAN JAKOBSON, “Из разысканий 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*.⁴⁶ In accordance with gradually Bohemized German geographical names they partially used the final *-k* in cases such as וירצבורק *Würzburg*, מ"דבורק for *Magdeburg*, נורבורק for *Nürnberg* etc.⁴⁷ They were also able to produce linguistic puns based on paronymy with Czech words (*Nemetum*).⁴⁸ Furthermore, they used particularly feminine given names (but one of the sages, possibly identical with Abraham b. Azriel, bears the name חלדיק *Chládek*), and adopted a probably colloquial name of the Prague toponymy *Mezihrada/Mezihradie* (“between the castles”),⁴⁹ which originating at the latest from the early 13th century⁵⁰ parallels probably the expression *inter utrasque urbes* in Kosmas’ Chronicle from the early 12th century.⁵¹ Isaac b. Mose denotes Czech as the language spoken “by us, Jews”: בלשונינו בלש' כנע' (“in our language, in the language of Canaan”).⁵²

The introductory formula בלשונינו (“in our language”) is used already by Rashi and other rabbinical writings as a usual phrase to indicate “vernacular terms”.⁵³ 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.⁵⁴ The Czech vernacular is used also in a scrap of direct speech recorded by Isaac’s teacher Abraham b. Azriel⁵⁵ and in Joseph Qara’s commentary on Is 49:20 in a place quoting a direct speech.⁵⁶ The Slavic language

46 BLÁHA ET AL., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), pp. 335-344.

47 WELLESZ, “Über R. Isaak” (note 16), pp. 97, 104, 105.

48 JAKOBSON / HALLE, “The Term *Canaan*” (note 16), pp. 885-886.

49 TYKOCINSKI, “Vorarbeiten” (note 19), pp. 347, 356.

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

51 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.

52 Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Rosenthal 3, II, fol. 24a.

53 MENAHEM BANITT, *Rashi, Interpreter of the Biblical Letter*, Tel Aviv 1985, p. 6.

54 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.

55 Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, ebr. 301, fol. 71a.

56 BLÁHA ET AL., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), p. 314. The imperative *pomkeni 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,⁵⁷ 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.⁵⁸

3. *West Slavic or Czech?*

The above-mentioned authors employing glosses “in the language of Canaan” (בלשון כנען) 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 *pesbat*-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:⁶⁰ 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.

57 VISI, *Words of Power* (note 28), p. 23.

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

59 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.

60 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 Slavs* 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.⁶⁴ Yet whereas not a single one is distinctively East Slavic (which is in line with terms like *כנען יוון*, *רושיאה*, *רושייא*, *רוסיא*, all referring to Rus’),⁶⁵ there are undoubtedly West Slavic glosses, unique parallels to Old Czech,

61 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.”

62 Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Rosenthal 3, II, fol 21a, 21b, 67b. KUPFER / LEWICKI, *Źródła* (note 1), p. 206, mention 10 occurrences.

63 BLÁHA ET AL., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), pp. 121-124, 126-142, 173-181; DITTMANN, “The Czech Language” (note 4), pp. 19-23.

64 Cf. KULIK, “Jews and the Language” (note 35), p. 124.

65 Cf. ALEXANDER KULIK, “The Jews of *Slavia Graeca*: the Northern 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 France⁶⁶ with the glossed passages in Isaiah commentary originating from the 12th century.⁶⁷ 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 ק to render the Slavic /k/, which is a velar stop, see glosses פלינקא *plenka* ("a piece of cloth"), פומקניסא *pomkni s'a* ("move"), טוליקון *toliko* ("only"): it is in agreement with his Old French glosses, in which he consistently differentiates between ק, rendering the velar stop /k/, and כ rendering the labiovelar stop /k^w/.⁶⁸ In *Or Zarua'* and *'Arugat ha-Bosem*, we rarely encounter כ for the velar /k/, cf. כלדא *kláda* ("the stocks") and וַזְמִישְׁכְּנִיסָא *v zameškání s'a* ("in contemplation").

Furthermore, West Slavic features in Qara's glosses include the absence of positively marked *polnoglasie* (פלינקא *plenka*), the presence of contraction (אי נִי *iné*, סטטי for *státý*, אוגלי and אוגלי *uglé*), -dl- (מידלו *mýdlo*, בילדלו and בילידלו *bělidlo*), c for Common Slavic **ket* (פיצי or פייני *péci /s'a/* ["to occupy oneself with something undesirable"]), the absence of prothetic *j*- resulting from reconstructed coalescence *i-/ji-* in Bohemia of the 10th and 11th centuries (אי נִי *iné*) and *j*- absence in נמי *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 ז for Common Slavic **dj* (אודיזא, אודיזא, אודיזא *oděz'a* ["cloth for cradling a child"]); the spelling also allows for reading East Slavic љ). Another West Slavic trait is the presence of Germanisms (קובליא, קביליא *kabel'a, kobela* ["bag"], מושט, מושט *mošt* ["must"], it is also not excluded that

66 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 Nord 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.

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

68 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 *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 גליין for *glezen* (cf. Old Czech *hlezen*, *hležno* [“ankle”] vs. Old Russian *glezna*, SREZNEVSKIJ vol. I, p. 519), סטטי 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(ǔ)lb*, SREZNEVSKIJ vol. III, p. 1141) and the uncertain and possibly distorted reading ניכדא *nikda* (cf. Old Czech *nikda* [“never”] and Old Russian *ni kǔda* along with *ni kogda* and even *ni-kogda*, *nikǔkdy*, SREZNEVSKIJ vol. I, p. 1388; vol. II, p. 451). It seems that the semantic reasons also favour the Old Czech interpretation, e.g. פומקניסא, פומק ניסא *pomkni s’a* (“move [yourself]”) perfectly corresponds to Old Czech *pomknúti* (“move”), whereas Old Russian *potmǔknuti* 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*, *oděž’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 בילדלו [“bleach”], מידלו [“soap”] and 336a (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*, *bělídlo*), 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 *oděž’a* is preferable to *oděž’a*.

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”;⁷⁰ cf. glosses פוטץ for *pútec* in *Arugat ha-Bosem* and פוטץ

69 The spelling דוור 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.

70 Cf. LUBOR KRÁLIK, *Stručný etymologický slovník slovenčiny*, Bratislava 2015, *pút’*, p. 485.

pútec in *Or Zarua'*, cf. Old Czech *pútec*, nowadays no longer in use, in *Průruční slovník jazyka českého* from 1935–1957 and *Slovník spisovného jazyka českého* from 1960–1971 *poutec* is marked in this meaning as outdated and dialectal),⁷¹ 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 אשקורבדא *škerovada*, accompanying the French gloss אשקודרא (*eskudre* “container, vessel”), is in Old Czech preserved only in the meaning “quarrel, discord”, but the Old Church Slavonic parallel *CKOBPAΔA*, 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 פלצא *pleca* (“shoulder”; cf. Old Russian *pleče, plešče*, SREZNEVSKIJ vol. II, p. 964) bear clearly the strongest affinities to Old Czech⁷⁴ and the twice attested vocalization in טריבונא 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

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

72 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.

73 ZOE HAUPTOVÁ ET AL. (ed.), *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského / Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae*, 5 vols. Prague 1958–2016, vol. IV: S–Y, p. 89: entry *CKOBPAΔA*, 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 *škaravada/škerovada* 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.).

74 JAKOBSON / HALLE, “The Term *Canaan*” (note 16), p. 884, BLÁHA ET AL., *Kenanaanské glosy* (note 1), pp. 132–134, 585–586.

75 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.⁷⁷ 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 Slavonic⁷⁹ 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 century⁸⁰ 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

“Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Rekonstruktion des Urtschechischen,” in: *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 46 (2000), pp. 165–174, here p. 169.

76 I thank Dr. Lenka Uličná (Jewish Museum in Prague) for consultation.

77 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.

78 ZAREMSKA, *Żydzi w średniowiecznej Polsce. Gmina krakowska* (note 9), p. 66.

79 RADOSLAV VEČERKA, *Staroslověnská etapa českého písemnictví*, Praha 2010, p. 36.

80 Cf. KUPFER / LEWICKI, *Źródła* (note 1), pp. 37 and 152.

81 TAMÁS VISI, “Rabbinic Sources about Jews in Medieval Moravia,” 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. 103-123, here p. 106.

community.⁸² The superior position of Prague over Cracow already in the second half of the 10th century is persuasively reported by Ibrāhīm ibn Ya'qūb, relating that Prague is the greatest business centre in the region,⁸³ 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.”⁸⁴

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. Altbauer⁸⁵ drew attention to the glosses דלוק (dalok for dalek [“far”]) and דלוקו (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 דלוקו may have originated due to dittography in the same way as the gloss טריבונו 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

82 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 Węgrzech*, Poznań 2005, p. 33.

83 Cf. JÁN PAULINY, *Arabské správy o Slovanoch: 9.–12. storočie*, Bratislava 1999, p. 116; for the 13th century see CHLENOV, „Knaanim” (note 18), p. 22.

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

85 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.

86 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 פּוּץ *púc* ("hair parting"), close to Lusatian **pútc* (cf. Old Lusatian **kamenc* < *-*ccb* 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 פּוּטֶץ in the identically reading passage, cf. the Vatican copy (ולשון פיקוס לשון פתיחה כי מקום חילוק) (שערות כולו פתוח ונקרא בלשון כנען פּוּטֶץ ולשו' פיקוס הוא) (לשו' פתיחה כי מקום חילוק שערות כולו פתוח ונקרא בל' כנע' פּוּץ) and the Frankfurt copy (ולשו' פיקוס הוא) (לשו' פתיחה כי מקום חילוק שערות כולו פתוח ונקרא בל' כנע' פּוּץ). With the spelling פּוּטֶץ one can easily imagine an omission of the letter during the process of copying. Such a corrupted form (פּוּץ) appears also in Me'ir of Rothenburg's writings alongside another corrupted reading of the same word פּוּצֶץ (or פּוּצִין), whereas his teacher Isaac b. Mose, from whom he took over several Canaanite glosses, has in preserved copies uncorrupted readings (פּוּטִין, פּוּטִין) 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 (מֵיִשִּׁין; or possibly Czech, cf. Old Czech *Míšně*, *Míšeň* and the forms *Missn*, *Missnam* in Kosmas' Latin chronicle).⁹² The form לִפְסֶק *Lipske* (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.

88 BLÁHA ET AL., *Kanaanské glosy* (note 1), p. 403.

89 OZ IV, p. 55b. WELLESZ, "Über R. Isaak" (note 16), p. 104.

90 Cf. TYKOCINSKI, "Lebenszeit" (note 32), p. 483. On the Meissen community, see ANDREAS CHRISTL, "Die Meißner Judengemeinde im Mittelalter: Sachzeugen und Schriftquellen im Kontext," in: *Mitteilungen der DGAMN: Religiosität in Mittelalter und Neuzeit* 23 (2011), pp. 219-229, especially pp. 219-220.

91 TYKOCINSKI, "Lebenszeit" (note 32), p. 499.

92 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. Tykocinski⁹⁴ suggested emending it to *Labe*, and it might appear enticing to explain the end of the word by Lusatian (Upper Sorbian *Lobjo*, Lower Sorbian *Lobje*).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,⁹⁷ would have employed the river name of Lusatian dialects as the only Lusatianism⁹⁸ when writing his work three or four decades later. The hydronym לבו 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, כלדה *kláda* (“the stocks”), written without *waw*, probably confirms the Czech result of the liquid metathesis (cf. Lusatian *klóda*, *kloda* PFUL p. 253, ŠMILAUER p. 91; Old Polish *kloda*, see *Słownik staropolski* vol. III, p. 295). Lusatian might also be considered for explanation of the change *šč* > *št'* as in the gloss שטײט שטײט שטײט *štét* (“ripple”), which is well attested in Old Czech since the 14th century only, whereas in Lusatian the change *š'č'* > *št'*

93 Cf. PAUL WEXLER, *Explorations in Judeo-Slavic Linguistics*, Leiden 1987, p. 92.

94 TYKOCINSKI, “Lebenszeit” (note 32), p. 497.

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

96 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.

97 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 Saxonía referring to the end of the 13th century, cf. WEXLER, *Explorations* (note 93), p. 154; JAKOBSON / HALLE, “The Term *Canaan*” (note 16), p. 874.

98 Cf. KUPFER / LEWICKI, *Źródła* (note 1), p. 228.

99 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 *šćěć* ŠMILAUER 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 צָרִיף, צָרִיף *črěp* ("candlestick, clay vessel for a lamp"; cf. Upper Sorbian *črjóp/črjop*, 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 $s'ę > s'\ddot{a} > s'e > s'o$ by the mid-12th century), and Lower Sorbian (cf. $'\ddot{a} > \check{e}$ 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 $šć > š'$ in Central Slovak (13th to 16th centuries)¹⁰² and Old Czech (14th to 15th centuries)¹⁰³ allow us to see in the form *štět* 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 *štět* 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 10th-13th 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.,

100 SCHAARSCHMIDT, *A Historical Phonology* (note 86), p. 81.

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

102 EUGEN PAULINY, *Fonologický vývin slovenčiny*, Bratislava 1963, p. 178.

103 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; לִיטוּ לִיטוּ *léto* [“summer”] in Joseph Qara and *lato* in Polish, cf. *Słownik staropolski* vol. IV, p. 7; גְּלִיזוֹן for *glezen* in Qara and גְּלִיזְנוּ *glezno* in *Or Zarua'* would have to be *glozŋ* in Old Polish, cf. *Słownik staropolski* vol. II, p. 417; for קוֹבֵילָא *ko-bela* 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. כִּלְדָא *klada* in *Or Zarua'* above and *Vratislav* in the phrase יִצְחָק מוֹרְטִיסְלוֹי *Isaac of Vratislav* (recorded corruptedly מוֹרְטִיסְלוֹי) 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 וּלְאֲדִימִיר. In the slightly different version וּלְדִמִיר, 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., דְּרִזְנָא, דְּרִזְנָה *Dražna*, מְלָדָה *Mlada*, מְלָדוּשָׁה *Mladuša* on Jewish tombstones in Spandau (Berlin), *Dražna* appears also in Wrocław.¹⁰⁸ The presence of *b* in Isaac b. Hayyim's gloss הַהוֹבִיָצִי *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

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

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

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

107 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).

108 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 *kabel'a*, קובילא *kobel'a* in Qara's commentary would be in Old Polish *kobiel*, cf. *Słownik staropolski* vol. III, p. 306; Qara's אוּגְלִי *uglé* 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 *pomknąć* has a different meaning "swipe", cf. *Słownik staropolski* vol. VI, p. 370). Only the isolated spelling אִזְיִא 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': *gubicě*, Hayyim Or Zarua': *hubicě*, in Old Polish only *gabka*, cf. *Słownik 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 12th and 13th centuries.¹¹⁰ They were minted by Jews who probably came from Bohemia and East German regions.¹¹¹ 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."¹¹² As we explained in greater detail elsewhere,¹¹³ despite their limited reliability for linguistic

109 Cf. VISI, *On the Peripheries* (note 28), 122.

110 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.

111 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.

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

113 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.¹¹⁴

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".¹¹⁵ 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.¹¹⁶ 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 *pomkeni s'a*, if this emendation is correct (found in both Prague and Cincinnati copies, fol. 336a and 123a, respectively)¹¹⁷ 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 טוליקו בודי סטטי אנמיסא אי נִפְיָצִי (*toliko budi státý a neměj s'a iné péci* or *i na*

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

115 HILL, *Judeo-Slavic* (note 8), p. 603.

116 Cf. BLÁHA ET AL., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), for details.

117 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*, *bělídlo*, *debr*, *kobel'a/ kabel'a*.

péči; the last word could also be read גַּיְיִיִּי, 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 גוּנָא *gúňa* (“blanket”), 60b בְּלָאִין *blašēn* (“blissful”), 69a מוֹשֵׁט *mošt* (“must”), and possibly *pomkni s’a* (“move”, recorded distortedly as כוּדָא נִיכְדָא), 70a אוּגְלִי *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 undoubtedly 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.¹¹⁹ 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* (אִי נִי), nay in the intervocalic position typical for hiatuses (*s’a iné*), 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 Ѣ (= *i*) and ѣ (= *ji*) disappeared.¹²² The *Fragments* were almost certainly written in the Sázava Monastery and the monks therefore shared the Central Bohemian

118 ONDŘEJ BLÁHA, *Jazyky střední Evropy*, Olomouc 2015, p. 39.

119 Cf. BERTHOLD EINSTEIN, R. *Josef Kara und sein Commentar zu Kobelet. 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.

120 Cf. BLÁHA ET AL., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), pp. 181-189.

121 VLADIMÍR ŠAUR, *České náslovné j*, Opava 1994, pp. 83 and 92.

122 FRANTIŠEK VÁCLAV MAREŠ, “Hlaholice v Čechách a na Moravě,” in: FRANTIŠEK VÁCLAV MAREŠ, *Cyrlometodějská tradice a slavistika*, eds. Emílie Bláhová / Josef Vintř, 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 20th century.¹²³ The Old Czech verb *jmieti* received its *j*- since the same time as *iny*,¹²⁴ and again the Hebrew record reads *neměj* (and not *nejměj*). Considering the over-differentiation 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. Mose¹²⁵ 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 Ψ (voiceless post-alveolar fricative, see *mošř*) and \mathfrak{D} (voiceless prealveolar fricative, see *státj*, *s'a*), whereas the Old French glosses in Hebrew script only rarely employ \mathfrak{D} and they use Ψ for a voiceless alveolar fricative /s/.¹²⁶ Nonetheless a very old Slavic gloss *monista* in Qara's commentary on Isaiah also uses quite consistently word-internal \mathfrak{D} for the 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 מוֹנִיִּסְטָא),¹²⁷ which alone contains four Slavic glosses. The grapheme \mathfrak{D} occurs 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 אַסוֹאֲבִימוֹ *assovi mo(i)* and in an Old French sentence in Qara's commentary on Ez 11:11.¹²⁹ Another

123 JAN BALHAR ET AL., *Český jazykový atlas 5*, Praha 2005, pp. 358-361.

124 ŠAUR, *České náslovné j* (note 121), p. 92.

125 Cf. REINHART, "Möglichkeiten und Grenzen" (note 75), p. 170.

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

127 Our reading of the gloss differs from K. A. Fudeman, cf. the reproduction in BLÁHA ET AL., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), p. 706.

128 BLÁHA ET AL., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), pp. 165-166, 621-624.

129 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 Ézéchiél," 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 *qansqe*), 154 (No. 102 *speclo*).

feature typical for Canaanite orthographic norm and partially different from typical Old French glosses is the **צ** for /c/ in *péci* (*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'/, /š/ and /c, č/, on the contrary the Old French glosses in Hebrew script use are less consistent, for instance /s/ may be usually denoted by both **צ** and **ש**.¹³² On the other hand, the in-word *aleph* in Ms Evr. I 21 *blažen* (בלאזין) 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 Wolf¹³³ noted at one occurrence of the phrase לשון כנען (with a gloss מונישטש *monistes*, in a commentary on Judges): "Qara gebraucht in seinem Commt. einigemal לשון כנען. Ich werde an einem andern Orte die Stellen zusammenstellen u. das nöthige hierüber angeben [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 vernacular¹³⁴ and among whose vernacular glosses we find Old French, Slavic, German, Occitan and Italian words,¹³⁵ 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.

131 FUEDEMAN, "The Old French Glosses" (note 2), p. 155; FUEDEMAN, "The Linguistic Significance" (note 68), p. 405.

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

133 AHARON WOLFF, "לקוטים מפרושי ר' יוסף 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.

134 FUEDEMAN, "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.

135 FUEDEMAN, "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.

136 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 1941.¹³⁷

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 *bohémica*, 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'/ – /š/, /c', č/ – /z, z'/, and /s, s'/ – /z, z'/, cf. spelling couples *soz* (1250, i.e. *šos*)¹³⁸ – *preseca* (1249, for *přesěka*),¹³⁹ *nozleb* (1249) – *nocleh* (1252) for *nocleh*,¹⁴⁰ and *zelezo* (1252) – *scheleso* (1253) for *železo*.¹⁴¹

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).

137 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 комментарий к Книгам Судей, связанный с именем Кара, содержит ряд 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 образчиками чеш. фраз.” A 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 soviétique* 2 (1961), pp. 228-241, here p. 237, EINSTEIN, R. *Josef Kara und sein Commentar* (note 119), p. 47.

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.

Moreover, neither Latin digraphs nor trigraphs are unambiguous, cf. the trigraph *sch* for both /s/ and /ʒ/ in *scheleso* (1253; for *šelezo*) and *schud* (1256, copy of the 15th century, for *šúd*),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 **ð**, and /š/, rendered by **ʷ**, between /c', č/, rendered by **ʒ**, and /z, ž'/, rendered by **ʔ**, between /s, s'/ and /z, ž'/. The Jewish authors born in the 12th 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 **וִדְלִי** *vidle*, whereas for Moravian dialects the *ja*-stem form *vidli* might be expected)¹⁴⁵ and possibly for lexis (**גְלוּוֹטִיצִי** *glavaticě* "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

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

143 CDB V/I, p. 31, line 40.

144 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.

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

146 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 ק over כ for /k/ and of ט over ת for /t/.¹⁴⁷ The greatest difference in consonants is the employment of graphemes in the Canaanite glosses that are not commonly used in Old French glosses such as ט and ת, the absence of commonly used in-word א, a different value of ש, partially צ and treating of some phonemes, e.g. both [tʃ] and [ʃ] may be rendered in French glosses by צ, whereas in Canaanite glosses they are represented by צ and ש, respectively. Other differences stem from different phonological systems, for example Canaanite glosses almost never contain כ /f/, non-final ה /h/, and they do not reflect any /dʒ/.¹⁴⁸ The first Yiddish gloss in the *Worms Mahzor* of 1272 uses both ש and ט, on top of that ת and כ, revealing thus several differences from both Canaanite and Old French norm.¹⁴⁹ The Old Yiddish writing system uses ש /s/ and in-word א like French and unlike Canaanite glosses, but differs from both the Canaanite and French norm in utilizing in-word ו.¹⁵⁰ The German glosses of the *Leipzig Glossary* employ כ and they use ש and צ 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 א, ש, and ט 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 א, the grapheme ש for /s/, double *waw* (וּ) and double *yod* (יּ).¹⁵³ In the same way German copyists adhered to Canaanite orthographical rules

349b (*blavatic* in Moravia means “female cannabis”, writes Blahoslav). Cf. also JAN BALHAR / PAVEL JANČÁK ET AL., *Český jazykový atlas 2*, Praha 1997, p. 77.

147 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.

148 Cf. KIWITT / DÖRR, “Judeo-French” (note 6), pp. 148-149.

149 Cf. LILY KAHN, “Yiddish,” in: KAHN / RUBIN (eds.), *Handbook of Jewish Languages* (note 3), pp. 641-747, here p. 655.

150 Cf. KAHN, “Yiddish” (note 149), p. 649.

151 MENAHEM BANITT, *Le Glossaire de Leipzig. Introduction*, Jérusalem 2005, p. 421.

152 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.

153 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 *Nürnberg 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 /ä/ and /a/; Qara's glosses reflect the absence of prothetic *j-* (יגדי *ine*), whereas later glosses from the first half of the 13th century always have *j-* prothesis (יגדיתו *jelito* ["bowel"] < Common Slavic **elito*; יגודי, יגוד"י and יגודי *jagody* ["berries"] < **agody*, the latter gloss appears also in Hayyim b. Isaac's writings as יגודי). The cluster *š'* is recorded in Isaac b. Mose's *Or Zarua'* (יגודי), whereas his teacher Abraham b. Azriel uses still *š'* (this may have been a mere orthographical phenomenon, see below). First attestations of ה *heth* for *b* < *g* appear only in the writings of Hayyim b. Isaac (2nd 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 *rj* 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,¹⁵⁴ 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/debet*), in Natan b. Jehiel and Rashi (מקו and מק, 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;¹⁵⁵ some glosses were repeated by Me'ir of Rothenburg and Hayyim Or Zarua'.¹⁵⁶ 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

154 Cf. BLÁHA ET AL., *Kanaanské 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 Ya'qub 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 *čtvrtb > צְטוּרְט čtvrť [“quarter”], Common Slavic *vblna > Old Czech vlna, cf. במוילנא *bamvilna* [“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 *čbr, *žbr groups there stabilized *-e-* (a clear tendency of stabilization occurs already in the first half of the 12th century),¹⁵⁸ whereas the syllabic *l* short and long (original or secondarily depalatalized) developed into *lu* and *lú*, 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 *l̥*),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. *Sopřče*), *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 *chstvirmie*, 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

157 MIROSLAV KOMÁREK, *Dějiny českého jazyka*, Brno 2012, p. 89.

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

159 ČORNEJOVÁ, “Ke grafice bohemik X.–XII. století” (note 158), p. 142.

160 FRANTIŠEK VÁCLAV MAREŠ, “Česká redakce církevní slovanštiny v světle Besěd Řehoře Velikého (Dvojeslova),” in: MAREŠ, *Cyrlometodějská tradice a slavistika* (note 122), pp. 368-402, here p. 373.

161 ČORNEJOVÁ, “Ke grafice bohemik X.–XII. století” (note 158), p. 140.

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

vowel *i*.¹⁶³ In some documents from the first half of the 14th 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*, *ll*) and consonantal *r*, *l*.¹⁶⁴

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 **blъcha* > 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: *kerve*, in the middle: *sedlský*, and at the end: *vedl*), of which the most important is the type *kerve*, pronounced as a one-syllable word in high-style Old Czech poetry until the end of the 14th century.¹⁶⁵ It seems that in common speech the type *kerve* (one-syllabic from **kerve*) and *vlna* (two-syllabic from **vьlna*) started to merge much earlier as can be learned from unsystematic spellings such as *kyrve*, *we kirvi*, *ze kirwe*, *pilnost* (< **pьln-*) and *zirno* (< **zьrno*), *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 word-final: see examples from the 13th century Amsterdam copy of *Or Zarua* 'במױלנא *bamvlna* ("cotton"), בִּלְחָא *blcha* ("flea"), בִּלְחֵי *blchy* ("of a flea"), צְטוּרְט *čtvrť* ("quarter"), פִּילְסְטָא *pilst* ("felt"), and from the Vatican copy of the *Arugat ha-Bosem* (late 13th century),¹⁶⁷ גְּרִיבּוֹסָא [possibly from גְּרִינּוֹסָא] *grinu*

163 Cf. FRANTIŠEK TRÁVNÍČEK, *Historická mluvnice československá. Úvod, hláskosloví a tvarosloví*, Praha 1935, p. 113.

164 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.

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

166 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 kirvi* "známku přechodu pobočné slabiky v slabikotvornou likvidu" ("a sign of transition of the subsidiary syllable into a syllabic sonant").

167 Cf. ELISABETH HOLLENDER, "Vernacular Glosses in Piyyut Commentary: The

s'a (“I join”), even in late copies of the Jewish divorce documents *geṭs* we find the hydronyms ווילטווא ווילטווא *Viltava*,¹⁶⁸ וילטווא ווילטווא *Viltava*¹⁶⁹ or ווילטווא/ווילטווא *Vltava/Vultava* (Elbe).¹⁷⁰ An uncertain example is בִּילְקִי *volkudlaky* (“were-wolves”), 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).¹⁷¹ Later copies supply further examples, sometimes obviously distorted by previous copying, see the spelling בִּילְקִי attested twice in a 16th-17th-century Frankfurt *Or Zarua’* copy (for בִּילְחִי *blcha*), whereas another occurrence (בִּילְחִי *blchy*) is perfectly correct.¹⁷² Two more spellings במולִינֵא *bamvl̥na*, פִּלִּיסטֵא *p̥l̥st* of the same manuscript (and the above-mentioned distorted reading *gr̥nu s’a*) show a postposed semivowel, most probably a consequence of a scribal error which occurs also in צְטוּרִיט *čtvirt* appearing already in the important 13th-century Amsterdam copy. The word-final later layer of sonants is exemplified by דֵּבֵר *debr* (< **dbbr̥*) 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 פִּילֵט *p̥lt/p̥lt* (< Common Slavic **plbt̥* [“raft”]), recorded in both Amsterdam and Oxford copies of *Or Zarua’*, shows levelling according to other cases in the singular (genitive, dative, locative *p̥lti*, instrumental *p̥lt’ú*, all one-syllable) instead of the expected nominative form *p̥let*, attested commonly in Old Czech. In the nominative, however, *l* becomes syllabic, thus forming an initial stadium of a new syllabic *l̥* in the second position of the word evidenced in the first half of the 13th century (the appearance of the new syllabic *l̥* 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.

168 Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. hebr. 300, fol. 14a.

169 JICCHAK SATZ (ed.), *Seder ha-geṭ le-MaHaR"l Margalit*, Jerusalem 1983, p. 145.

170 ABRAHAM STEIN, *Die Geschichte der Juden in Böhmen*, Brünn 1904, p. 3.

171 St. Petersburg, Rossijskaja nacional’naja biblioteka, Evr. I 11, fol. 150a (marginal gloss).

172 Frankfurt a. M., Universitätsbibliothek, Ms. hebr. fol. 7, fol. 8b: בִּילְחִי (twice) and בִּילְחִי.

173 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 *chlup* may have developed from the nominative *chlp* (the expected nominative would be **chlep* < **chlep̥* [“hair”]; *Chlp* is attested as an Old Czech anthroponym and in Moravian dialects of the late 19th century as *chlp*)¹⁷⁴ which originated by analogy to declined forms such as *chlp̥a* (< **chlep̥a*). The same holds true for Old Czech *plt* (“complexion”), attested besides regular *plet* (< **plet̥*), *krt* (expected nominative **kret* < **kret̥*) or Modern Czech *hlt* (< **glt̥*; Old Czech *hlet*). Such analogical processes must have taken place only after the original syllabic short *l* gave *lu*, a change dated in Old Czech before the 13th century, cf. *Nabelem chlume* recorded in 1268 (= *Na bielém chlumě*, from **chl̥m̥ě* < **ch̥l̥m̥ě*).¹⁷⁵ Both *-l/-il-* are attested spelling forms for the old syllabic *l* in 12th century Latin-written Czech, cf. *Dilgonici* (*dlg-* < **d̥lg-*, CDB I, p. 120, recorded in 1131), *Na telmacoue* (*t̥lm-* < **t̥lm-*, CDB I, p. 120, from 1131).¹⁷⁶ In Roman-alphabet Old Czech, the forms *plt*, *plut* are uniquely attested,¹⁷⁷ in dialects the form *pl̥yt* (< **pl̥t*) was recorded as late as the end of the 19th century.¹⁷⁸

In the case of the glosses בִּלְחָא *bl̥cha*, בִּלְחֵי *bl̥chy*, the hard *l* (< Common Slavic **bl̥cha*) 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* < **bl̥ch̥*). Canaanite glosses seem to document again an early stage of such a process with semivowels accompanying the regular forms *bl̥cha*, *bl̥chy* (in some dialects of Czech, such semivowels became fully syllabic, e.g. *sl̥za* < *sl̥za* < *sl̥za* < *sl̥ʒa* < **sl̥ʒa* [“tear”]; in other dialects forms *sl̥za*, *sel̥za*, *slou̥za* are attested, in Old Czech *sh̥zy*, *sh̥zami*, *sil̥zy*, *sl̥zy*, all from **sl̥ʒ-*),¹⁷⁹ thus behaving like commonly attested forms of original syllabic /l/ and /l̥/, cf. other examples after the initial bilabial such as *Pilzen*, *Pelzen* (< **p̥l̥z-*, both recorded in

174 Cf. GEBAUER, *Slovník staročeský* (note 92), vol. I: A–J, p. 540: entry *chlup*.

175 CDB V/II, p. 118, line 35.

176 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.

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

178 GEBAUER, *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého* (note 73), vol. I: *Hláskosloví*, p. 291.

179 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 *vilke* (< **vblkeb*),¹⁸¹ in Latin script and פִּילְסְטָא *pilst* (< **pblstb*) in Canaanite glosses. In Czech written in Roman letters the forms *blucha* and *blichy* are also attested,¹⁸² supporting this interpretation. In these two cases, *p^hlt/pilt* and *b^hlcha, b^hlchy*, the later sonants behave the same as early, syllabic sonants in cases like *vlk* (< **vblkeb* [“wolf”]) and *vlna* (< **vblna* [“wool”]). We must be aware of the fact, however, that *vlk* and *vlna* there had the palatal syllabic *l'*, whereas in *p^hlt/pilt* and *b^hlcha, b^hlchy* 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~0* in one way (*blcha* > Modern Czech *blecha* according to the genitive plural *blech*) or the other (genitive plural *slez* > Modern Czech *sčz* according to cases with *sčz-*) and to unify syllabicity of the sonants (two-syllable *sčza* according to *sčz* < *slez*, two-syllable *b^hlcha* according to *b^hlch* < *blech*)¹⁸⁴ 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 conservative¹⁸⁵ 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 *ä, a'* in Early Czech. Probably by the mid-12th century, *ä* between two hard consonants coalesced with *a*, e.g. *mäso* >

180 ČORNEJOVÁ, “Ke grafice bohemik X.–XII. století” (note 158), p. 141.

181 Cf. HUJER, “Vývoj jazyka československého” (note 179), p. 27.

182 GEBAUER, *Slovník staročeský. Díl I [A–J]* (note 174), entry *blcha*, p. 65.

183 BOHUSLAV HAVRÁNEK, “K obecným vývojovým zákonitostem spisovných jazyků. Vývoj spisovného jazyka českého ve vztahu k vývoji národního společenství,” 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.

184 Cf. JAKOBSON, *Язык и орфография* (note 165), § 46, pp. 45-46.

185 Cf. KIWITT, “The Problem of Judeo-French” (note 147), p. 35.

maso (“meat”), under different conditions *'a*, *'á* coalesced with *'ä*, *'á*.” The Canaanite glosses seem to discern the two phonemes /*a*/ – /*ä*/ only in the writings of the earliest author Gershom b. Jehudah, the evidence is, however, very scarce: the orthography of the gloss טַיַג *täg* (“joint”) (< **tegb*) with a *yod* and *cere* reflects already denasalization and /*ä*/ close to /*e*/ in pronunciation. Another gloss of his פֶּלֶצָא *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 *ä* > *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 *ä* (< *e*, *'a*) and *a* (< *ä*, *a*) and render both phonemes identically as an *a*-sound, cf. examples with *ä* on one side such as קִנְיֻטְבֹּו *kn'äžstvo* “principality” (< **kɛnɛ-*, ‘*Arugat ha-Bosem* but possibly taken over from an older tradition),¹⁸⁶ מְנוֹזְסָא *množs'ä* “they multiply” (< **-ɛtɔ s'e*, ‘*Arugat ha-Bosem*), פּוֹחֹדְנָא *pochodňä* “torch” (< **-ɛnja*, *Nuremberg Mahzor*), and with *a* on the other side such as פֶּטָא *pata* “heel (of a boot)” (< **pɛta*) without a *yod* in Amsterdam and Oxford copy of *Or Zarua'* and בּוֹדוּ אוֹבֵיט *budu objat* (< **-jɛtɔ* [“I will be embraced”]) in ‘*Arugat ha-Bosem*.

6.3 Umlaut *'ä* > *ě*, *'á* > *ie*

The Canaanite glosses systematically differentiate between the phonemes /*ä*/, /*á*/ and /*ě*/, /*ie*/ word-finally and thereby offer a unique testimony to their phonetic distinction as late as the first half of the 13th century, actually more accurately than the Latin script of the period, which renders the Czech phonemes /*ä*/, /*á*/ sometimes by *a* and sometimes by *e* (exceptionally by *ea* etc.). The phonemes /*ä*/, /*á*/ were very peripheral; in the 12th century they had a phonological value only before the phoneme /*k*/. 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 12th century, which is however uncertain,¹⁸⁷ the second half of the 12th century,¹⁸⁸ or the 13th century, in the Central Bohemian dialect possibly at its dawn.¹⁸⁹ Probably the

186 Cf. JAKOBSON, *Язык и орфография* (note 165), § 43, p. 35.

187 KOMÁREK, “Gebauerovo historické hláskosloví” (note 173), p. 744.

188 GEBAUER, *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého* (note 73), vol. I: *Hláskosloví* p. 117.

189 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 12th century.¹⁹⁰ 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 *bohémica*, i.e. Czech words in foreign language texts, in the Latin script of the 12th and 13th centuries, the phonemes /ä/, /ä'/ are rendered by *e*, e.g. *ceto* (čä<*s*>*to*, for *saepe*),¹⁹¹ *zetua* (žätva, for *messis*), *zuiczet* (*sviečät*, for *rutilat*), *metase* *ze* (*metáše s'ä*, for *iactabatur*), *vtisi* *ze* (*utiši s'ä*, for *moderatur*) or by *a*, see *bura* (*búr'ä*, for *procella*), *unosase* (*vnos'äše*, for *ingerebat*), *znasachu* (*snažáčhu*, for *moliebantur*), all these examples come from the *Jagić* and *Patera Glosses*¹⁹² 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'ä*), *poztideli ze* (*postyděli s'ä*), *rugatize* (*rúgati s'ä*), *podalizebise* (*podali s'ä byšä*) with *-e* in *s'ä* on the one hand and *rostekat sa* (*rostékät s'ä*), *usas sa* (*užas s'ä*), *uidalsabi* (*vydal s'ä by*), *criuenetisa* (*čřvėněti s'ä*) with *-a* in *s'ä* on the other well illustrate the interchangeability of the respective graphemes rendering the same phoneme. In the *Patera Glosses*, the *a* for /ä/, /ä'/ 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

190 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.

191 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.

192 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.

193 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.

194 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 'á' < 'á < **ɸja*) as in *uedena* (*veden'á*), *vzdvižena* (*vzdvižen'á*), *bita* (*bit'á*), *oteuznesena* (*ote vžnesen'á*), *naduta* (*nadut'á*) – supported by a Czech 12th century gloss *padena* (accusative plural *paden'á* glossing Latin accusative *ruinas*)¹⁹⁵ – and direct cases of the singular with *-e* (rendering *ie* from closed soft 'é < **ɸjē*)¹⁹⁶ as in *neuedene* (*nevědēn'ie*), *naste* (*nášt'ie*), even in the same lexeme: *pite* (accusative singular from **pitɸjē*) versus *pita* (genitive singular from **pitɸja*).¹⁹⁷ 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 ЦѢЛЕНИЕ, СКАЗАНИЕ instead of correctly etymological -ИѢ (< **ɸja*) and direct cases in singular such as ЛАКОМЪСТВИѢ instead of the expected -ИЄ (< **ɸjē*).¹⁹⁸

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 /ä/, /á/ on the one hand and /ě/, /ie/ on the other. Examples of word-final /ä/, /á/:¹⁹⁹ from *Or Zarua'* מקוביצה *makovicä* (with final ה according to usual Hebrew feminine ending), from *'Arugat ha-Bosem* and *Mahzor Nuremberg*: גריבוסא for *gr'nu s'ä* (?), פוחודנא *pochođnā*, אוסלבילסא *oslabil s'ä*, מנוזסא *množā s'ä*, possibly also מיששו (for מיטשו, readable as *miešā to*), אוזנמי נניסא and אוזנמיניסא *obznamenání s'ä* (locative cases), אוזנמיניסא and אוזנמיניסא *obznamenaj s'ä*, אוסלבילסא *oslabil s'ä*, אוסלבוסא *oslab'u s'ä* etc. Examples of the word-final /ě/, /ie/: from *Or Zarua'* גלוטיצי *glavaticě*, גוביצי *gubicě*, קונביצי *konvicě*, קופיצי *kupicě*, נוגביצי *nogavicě*, פיויצי *pijāvicě*, from *'Arugat ha-Bosem* סטיפיצי *stpicě*.

In the word-final position the Canaanite glosses render graphically the phonemes /ä/, /á/ systematically the same as their back unrounded open

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

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

197 In the *Jagić Glosses*, the evidence is too scarce, only *omražene* (*omražēn'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.

198 FRANTIŠEK VÁCLAV MAREŠ, "Domnělé doklady české přehlásky *a > e* v církevněslovanských textech (typ *čelenije* gen. sg.)," in: *Slavia* 28 (1959), pp. 132-140, here p. 139; cf. MAREŠ, "Česká redakce církevní slovanštiny" (note 160), p. 373.

199 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/, /á/, hence keeping in orthography the phonological correlation. Such a unification is attested word-internally in the Czech Church Slavonic *Besědy na evangelije* of the 11th century, preserved in Cyrillic script, which exceptionally reads МАСА (fol. 144αβ, line 5) for Latin *carnes*.²⁰⁰ 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 *māsa* < **męsa*. The Czech Glagolitic scribe had at his disposal the letters □, □ to denote *ä* (in the Cyrillic script Ѡ and ѡ).²⁰¹ The Glagolitic script, in Bohemia in continuous use until the end of the 11th century, could therefore differentiate between phonemes /a/ – /ä/ – /ě/ better than the Latin script of the period.

An interesting question arises whether the umlaut 'ä > ě, 'ā > 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 word-finally, 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 1957.²⁰² 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.²⁰³ 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 /ä/, /ā/ word-finally (19 occurrences vs. 16 *a*'s) than word-internally (9 times *a*, once *ie* in the gloss *otieti*, i.e. *ot'āti*; *e* is extremely rare with one occurrence only in *zdiršese*, i.e. *zdiržāše*, once *en* appears as a Palaeoslovenism in the gloss *censto*, i.e. *često*).

6.4 The change *g* > *γ* > *b*

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

200 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.

201 FRANTIŠEK VÁCLAV MAREŠ, “Pražské zlomky a jejich předloha v světle hláskoslovného rozboru,” in: MAREŠ, *Cyrlometodějská tradice a slavistika* (note 122), pp. 347-354, here p. 348.

202 MAREŠ, “Domnělé doklady české přehlásky” (note 198), p. 134.

203 JAKOBSON, *Язык и орфография* (note 165), § 44, p. 35-36.

with respect to its dating and systemic motivation.²⁰⁴ 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.²⁰⁵ 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),²⁰⁶ may have certainly both denoted $[\gamma]$: in the case of g as a traditionalism, in case of h as a signal of undergone spirantization.²⁰⁷ Words recorded with h , signalling probably fricative pronunciation, have prevailed in Old Czech since the mid-13th century.²⁰⁸ The Glagolitic script in the Emmaus Monastery, used to transcribe Old Czech at the turn of the 14th and 15th centuries, employed for Czech γ/h the grapheme \square , originally denoting g . Before voiced paired consonants the change $\gamma > h$ has not been completed in Czech until today.

Hebrew script has the possibility to differentiate between all three steps: g (\aleph), γ (λ) and h (η). However, the glossators and punctuators never used \aleph in our material.²⁰⁹ The almost general use of λ and more persuasively of \aleph may contribute to reconstruction of the chronology of the change. One early gloss deserves special attention: Rashi's שניר (for *snieg* “snow”), in which ש may allegedly only have originated due to the pronunciation of $[\gamma]$.²¹⁰ It seems, however, that this gloss is not Slavic at all.²¹¹ Even if we admit its

204 VÍT BOČEK, “Znovu ke změně $g > \gamma > h$ v slovanských jazycích,” in: KATARINA BALLEKOVÁ ET AL. (eds.), *Jazykovedné štúdie XXXII. Prirodzený vývin jazyka a jazykové kontakty*, Bratislava 2015, pp. 211-219, here p. 211.

205 BOČEK, “Znovu ke změně” (note 204), p. 216.

206 ŠTEFKOVÁ, *Vývoj hláskosloví* (note 176), p. 39.

207 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.

208 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.

209 The *dagesh* appears in Canaanite glosses only exceptionally: דוב *dub* “oak” (St. Petersburg, Rossijskaja nacional'naja biblioteka, sign. Evr. I 11, fol. 83b, 144a – marginal glosses); צרף *črěp* “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.

210 MOSHE ALTBAUER, “Une glose slave de Raschi: *s'nir*,” in: *Revue des Études Slaves* 8 (1928), pp. 245-246, here p. 246.

211 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's²¹² suggestion. In line with R. Krajčovič's²¹³ explanation of morphological causes of the spirantization $g > \gamma$, it may have started in Czech only after the change $d\zeta' > \zeta'$, evidenced already in the *Kiev Folia* (9th/10th centuries) and in the first leaf of the *Prague Glagolitic Fragments* (the middle or the second half of the 11th century),²¹⁴ hence it is perfectly possible to reconstruct it for the end of the 11th century (Rashi died in 1105). In Canaanite glosses before the mid-13th 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 γ even in the Hebrew script, namely the inconsistently used *rafeb* above *gimel*, which is commonly used in Hebrew to denote fricative pronunciation. In Canaanite glosses, there are three attestations: קרוג *kerug*²¹⁵ "circle, compasses" (St. Petersburg, Rossijskaja nacional'naja biblioteka, Evr. I 11, fol. 155a, a marginal gloss, ms. from before 1271), יגודי *jagody* "berries", גליזל for *glezno*²¹⁶ "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 *š* 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

212 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 שניר.

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

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

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

216 Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Rosenthal 3, I, fol. 67b and 241b.

217 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 *Würzburg* (along with בורג-), מ"דבורק for *Magdeburg*, מינצבורק for *Münzenberg*, נורבורק for *Nürnberg*, ריגנשבורק for *Regensburg* (along with בורג- and variants in readings),²¹⁸ cf. Old Czech *Markéta* from *Margareta* etc.

Later Canaanite glosses include also the graphemes *be* (and *bet*) for Czech *b*, first in glosses of Isaac b. Mose' son Ḥayyim Or Zarua', flourishing in the 2nd half or towards the end of the 13th century, who shortened his father's compendium and took over some glosses. The spellings הַהוֹבִיִצִי, הַחֹבִיִצִי *ba-hubicě*, *ba-chubicě* "mushrooms" show, among other things, adaptation of the Slavic word into Hebrew by adding the Hebrew article. An *b* is present also in a late edition of Rashi's commentary: דוהיט for *debet* "tar".²¹⁹ An indirect testimony to the existence of *b* is possibly supplied by the reading אוגנציה *ogněncích* "emitters of flames" instead of the expected ה in *Mahzor Nuremberg* (finished 1331): it is more likely explicable by a possible affiliation of the scribe to the *bne bes* with whom *ch* and *b* coalesced, which is probably the case with Hayyim b. Isaac too, and such a coalescence appears also in German glosses of the *Leipzig Glossary*.²²⁰ Other testimonies to the existence of the Czech *b* include Rabbinical sources of the 15th century which denote the Hussites by a pun as בני הושים,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 *šč* of whatever origin dissimilated in Bohemian Old Czech into *šl'*. The first safe attestations of this change appeared only since the 14th century.²²³ In the 14th century, *šč* still prevails, receding only in the

218 WELLESZ, "Über R. Isaak" (note 16), pp. 97, 104, 105, 108.

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

220 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.

221 Eleazar b. Jaakov (Frankfurt a. M., Universitätsbibliothek, Ms hebr. oct. 94, fol. 213b): הוש *Huš*, הושן *hūs[ī]n* Hussites.

222 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.

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

following century.²²⁴ There are some uncertain pre-1300 proper noun spellings: *Tugast* (variants: *Tugost*, *Tugust*, *Tugocz*; instead of the expected *Tugosc* for *Tugošć*) in copies of Kosmas' *Chronicle* (Kosmas died in 1125),²²⁵ *Chegost* (CDB I, p. 300, line 21, recorded in 1190),²²⁶ *Gradist* (for *-išče*, CDB II, p. 205, line 10, recorded in 1221)²²⁷ 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*.²²⁸ 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*.²³⁰ 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'* > *Šč'*.²³² Applying this mechanism, it is hypothetically possible to imagine a backward move from *šč* to *st*. The above-mentioned confusion of graphemes *c* and *t* would have been impossible in Glagolitic script (certainly the *Prague Glagolitic Fragments* and probably the *Besědy na evangelije*, both from the 11th century, had *šč*)²³³ and neither was it plausible in Hebrew orthography. Yet more probable for the Latin script *st* rendering *šč* seems to be a simpler explanation adduced by S. Rospond: it was a German orthographical habit to treat *šč* 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 14th century there is an abrupt emergence of preserved Old Czech versed texts.

224 KOMÁREK, *Historická mluvnice* (note 103), p. 140.

225 See the on-line version available at <http://digit.nkp.cz/projekty/VZ-2004_2010/2007/Prilohy/StructuredText/Kosmas_pozn.xml>, retrieved on 26th November 2016.

226 Cf. BERGMANN, "K chronologii" (note 190), p. 238.

227 Cf. JAKOBSON, *Язык и орфография* (note 165), § 48, p. 59.

228 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.

229 ANTONÍN PROFOUS, "Místní jména Domažlice a Taus," in: *Listy filologické* 67 (1940), pp. 312-319, here p. 316.

230 VLADIMÍR ŠMILAUER, "Výklady slov," in: *Naše řeč* 25 (1941), pp. 11-17, here p. 12.

231 Cf. JAKOBSON, *Язык и орфография* (note 165), § 49, p. 63.

232 HUJER, "Vývoj jazyka československého" (note 179), p. 36.

233 MAREŠ, "Česká redakce církevní slovanštiny" (note 160), p. 374.

234 STANISLAW ROSPOND, *Dawność mazurzenia w świetle grafiki staropolskiej*, Wrocław

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

In the Canaanite glosses of Abraham b. Azriel, whose work was finished around 1234 or in the 1240s,²³⁷ we find only *šĕ*, see *חבושתישצו* *chvoštišče* “broom” (obviously a common scribal error from *חבושתישצי*)²³⁸ and *פרישצו* *prjščú* “they snort” of the same Vatican manuscript. The more surprising is that Abraham b. Azriel’s pupil in the Prague yeshiva, Isaac b. Mose, uses *št’* (< *šĕ*) in the gloss *štět*, preserved unequivocally in three copies of his work *Or Zarua’*: Amsterdam (*שטײט*), New York (*שטײט* or rather *שטײט*) and Oxford (*שטײט*). Moreover, Jakobson quotes a corrupted gloss transcribed by I. Kahan as *Ziruscht*, which Jakobson reads *צירושט* and identifies with a place name *טרישט* *Trěšt’*.²³⁹ There are no more records of *šĕ/št’* but it would seem that whereas Abraham b. Azriel uses only *šĕ*, his pupil Isaac b. Mose *št’*. We cannot exclude that the change *šĕ* > *št’* 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 *ždž* (> *žd*), 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 *חבושתישצו* *chvoštišče* is *chvostišče* and the cluster *št* (*שת*) could have resulted from assimilation of articulatory place *st’* > *št’*.²⁴¹ The same kind of assimilation (*sk* > *šĕ*) appeared in Isaac b. Mose’s gloss with prothetic *aleph*

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

235 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, *Raschi, 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.

236 BLÁHA ET AL., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), p. 213.

237 VISI, *On the Peripheries* (note 28), pp. 133-134.

238 Cf. GEBAUER, *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého* (note 73), vo. I: *Hláskosloví*, p. 482.

239 Cf. JAKOBSON, *Язык и орфография* (note 165), § 49, p. 61.

240 KOMÁREK, *Historická mluvnice* (note 103), p. 40.

241 Cf. GEBAUER, *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého. Díl I. Hláskosloví* (note 73), p. 482, who presupposes the change *st’* > *šĕ* > *št’* (the last step as a distant dissimilation).

אשקרוּבדא *škerovada* “lid for baking; roasting pan?” in a London manuscript of *Or Zarua*, stemming from Common Slavic **skovorda* (in Old Czech *skrovada/škerovada*).²⁴²

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 14th century. Data, totalling 36 token occurrences, stretch from Rashi (*okřín* “vessel” attested in six old manuscripts in forms אוקרין, אוקרין, אוקרין, אוקורין, אונקרין, אוקרין)²⁴³ and his follower Joseph Qara of the 12th century (the in-text gloss *oděz’a* attested in six manuscripts, in forms אודיזא, אודיזא, אודיזא) to *Mabzor Nuremberg*, finished in 1331 but comprising earlier tradition. The lack of prothetic *v-* is typical for both non-proprial lexemes and proper nouns (אוסטריגום *Ostrigom*).²⁴⁴ This picture may be supported by adducing data from Latin script, in which none of the place names such as *Odrenovici*, *Ogrozim*²⁴⁵ and other *bohémica* from 1253–1283 collected in the Latin *Codex diplomaticus* have the *v*-prothesis, cf. the word *osada* “settlement” (1249 and 1272 *ozada*, 1275 *ozzada*, *ozzade*), *osadni* (1269 *ossadni*) and *osep* “corn paid as a tax” (1249 and 1259 *ozzep*, also 1263 in a dubious document).²⁴⁶

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 אוקוסטא *vs kost* “to the bone” (< *vz kost?*) and רוּסְקוּ סַלְסָא *roskysala s’a*²⁴⁷ “it spread” (< *roz-*) 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

242 GEBAUER, *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého. Díl I. Hláskosloví* (note 73), p. 483.

243 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.

244 Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Rosenthal 3, I, fol. 128b.

245 ŠTEFKOVÁ, *Vývoj hláskosloví* (note 176), pp. 45-46.

246 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.

247 Frankfurt a. M., Universitätsbibliothek, Ms. hebr. fol. 16, fol. 53a; cf. רותקוּחְלָא 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 קדוני *kdúně* (< nom. sg. **kɛdun'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”, פּרֶד *prěd* “to the front of”, טברוג *tvarog* “cottage cheese”. The readings such as טברוג *tvarog*, קויטני for *květný* “floral”, קברטי for *kvarty* “quarter” confirm the expected lack of progressive assimilation of /v/. There are three unexpected readings: סרוּבדקא *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 פירבטקא *syrovátka*) 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 *vil-lam dictam Zabradka* opposed to *Hec autem sunt ville [...] V Zabratky* recorded in the same year.²⁴⁹ The reading אוגננציה *ogněncích* instead of the expected ח in *Mahzor Nuremberg* is explicable by *bne hes* for whom *ch* and *b* coalesced. The twice recorded spelling קונפיצי *konfice* in the *Or Zarua'*, with an unexpected *f* instead of קוניצי, originated most probably by scribal mixing of the correct forms קוניצי *konvice* and קוביצי *kupice*, attested in the same manuscript several times in neighbourhood of the corrupted readings. In the loanword ליפסק *Lipske* “Leipzig” in the *Or Zarua'*, the assimilation has been carried out, if the etymology from **Liběskъ* is correct.²⁵⁰

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, 'ú > i, í (אוסלבוסא *oslab'u s'a* “I will grow weak”, אוכסכיריוסא for *ochstrju s'a* “I will get sharpened”, פרישצו *prýšću* “they snort”), *aj* > *ej* (אובזנמיניסא *obznamenaj s'a* “acquaint yourself with it”), *čr'/čř* > *tr'/tř* > *str'* (צריף and צריף *čřep* “candlestick, clay vessel for a lamp” – in this case the Canaanite glosses may help illuminate the chronology of the change, in

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

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

250 WALTER WENZEL, *Die slawische Frühgeschichte Sachsens im Licht der Namen*, Hamburg 2017, p. 171. One of the older etymologies was **Lipěskъ*.

the older layers of the 14th century Old Czech *tř* already prevails).²⁵¹ On the other hand, we already have *t*-epenthesis in words *stryda* (the change *stř* < *sř* 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 *Srěmešná*/, 1131 *Zrebrniceb* /for *Sriebr-*/ in Latin script)²⁵³ in an unidentified Oxford manuscript in a corrupted gloss סטרגדא (*stryda* for *střěda*),²⁵⁴ furthermore סטפיצי (*stpicě*, evidencing the Old Czech *s-* unequivocally), אוכסטריוסא (for אוכסטרוסא, possibly *ochstrju s'a* “I will get sharpened”) and uncertain צאשטלאן (possibly corrupted *Částlav*).²⁵⁵ The *t*-epenthesis between consonants may have been old in some cases, cf. the place name spelling *Stpicki* (denoting *Špičky*, CDB I, p. 218, line 31), recorded already in 1169. F. Bergmann considers it early evidence of the dissimilation *šč* > *št*, but the *-t* is a mere epenthetic consonant so that the group *št* did not originate from *šč* and nor is there a *t'*.²⁵⁶

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*‘, *Mabzor Nuremberg*, and *‘Arugat ha-Bosem*, the nouns exceed 75 per cent.²⁵⁷ 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

251 TRÁVNÍČEK, *Historická mluvnice* (note 163), p. 174.

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

253 CDB I, p. 266, line 28, CDB I, p. 122, l. 3.

254 JAKOBSON / HALLE, “The Term *Canaan*” (note 16), p. 863.

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

256 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, *Kronologii* (note 190), p. 238.

257 BLÁHA ET AL., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), p. 281.

including the verbal ones.²⁵⁸ 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,²⁵⁹ 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.²⁶⁰ 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 zľuhonibus [...] nichil dabis* (with Latin declension of the adapted Czech *a*-stem noun *sluha* > Latin nominative *slubo*),²⁶¹ 1262 *de manso videlicet duas mensuras, que vulgariter strichones dicuntur* (from Czech *strych/štrych* > *strycho/štrycho*).²⁶² 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 *ež* 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 Latin-written documents. For example, the gloss *pometlo* is accompanied by the following exposition: חופיא אשקובא שמכבדין בה את הבית ובלשון כנען פומיטלו ועושיין יחוד אשקובא (i.e. Hebrew אשקובא is explained by the Czech vocable *pometlo* /פומיטלו/ "broom" and in detail the technique from what material and how it is made are added).²⁶³ In these glosses we also find one of the earliest examples of tautonymy, i.e. cross-linguistic 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 *Besědy na evangelije*, which originated in the 11th century, yet are

258 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.

259 Cf. WEINREICH, "Yiddish, Knaanic, Slavic" (note 19), p. 625; MAX WEINREICH, *History of the Yiddish Language*, New Haven / London 2008, p. 84.

260 BLÁHA ET AL., *Kenaanské glosy* (note 1), pp. 285-286.

261 CDB V/I, p. 555, line 10.

262 CDB V/I, p. 477, line 5.

263 Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Rosenthal 3, II, fol. 187b.

preserved in much later Russian Cyrillic copies, we meet a Greek-Latin-Slavic tautonymy.²⁶⁴ However, an *Or Zarua*' 13th century manuscript adduces a quadruple tautonymy: עצים הקושרים זה אצל זה הרבה יחד ובלשון המקרא קורא אותו רפסודות ובל' לעז ריד ובל' אשכנז וולוס ובלשו' כנ' פילט. In this passage, the Hebrew word רפסודות is explained by glosses in Old French (ריד *red*), Ashkenazic (וולוס *vlōz*) and Canaanite (פילט *p^hli*) languages,²⁶⁵ of which the first two are already present in Rashi.²⁶⁶ Isaac b. Mose reveals that he thought 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,²⁶⁷ a phenomenon paralleled by Czech vocables inserted into Latin Christian writings.²⁶⁸

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,²⁶⁹ 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

264 DITTMANN / BLÁHA, “The Lexicological Contribution” (note 28), p. 79; VÁCLAV 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.

265 Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Rosenthal 3, I, fol. 29b.

266 Cf. MOCHÈ CATANE, *אוצר לעזי רש"י*, 2 vols. Jerusalem 1996, vol. II: המילים הצרפתיות שבפירושי רש"י על התלמוד, p. 18.

267 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.

269 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.

1300,²⁷⁰ 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 variability²⁷¹ 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;²⁷² 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.²⁷³

270 Cf. BLÁHA, *Jazyky střední Evropy* (note 118), p. 15.

271 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).

272 WEINREICH, *History* (note 259), p. 81. PAVEL TROST, “Medieval Judeo-Czech,” in: *Judaica Bohemica* 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 ke sedm-desátým narozeninám*, Praha 2012, pp 212-226, here p. 221.

273 Cf. BLÁHA, *Jazyky střední Evropy* (note 118), p. 125.