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The Lexicological Contribution of Abraham ben Azriel and Isaac ben Moses to Old Czech
Robert Dittmann – Ondřej Bláha

The corpus of recorded *bohemica* other than proper nouns before 1250

Until relatively recently, the standard scholarly works on the development of Czech referred to a total of about 50 appellative nouns from the 11th to the 13th centuries (most of these from the 13th century) identified in sources in the edition known as the *Codex diplomaticus et epistolarii regni Bohemiae*. This number, passed on for generations, has now risen considerably with publication of new volumes of this series containing 13th century material. Volumes V–VII, published over the years 1974–2011, contain dozens, probably hundreds of appellative *bohemica*, e.g. the fifth volume alone contains almost ninety Old Czech appellatives in documents from the period 1253–1278 (i.e. not later copies). Naturally, these data were not be exploited by the Czech academic Staročeský slovník because the exceptions for

1. This paper was researched and written with the support of the grant project of the Czech Science Foundation No. P406/11/0861 “Kanaanske glosy ve slovedorckych hebrejskych rukopisech s vazbou na ceske zeme”, jazyk v dajnych ceskych spolecnost (Brno, 2009), 32; Dušan Šlosar – Jan Dvořák – Petr Malčík, *Spisovný Pleskalová*, “Čestina stará raná,” in *Encyklopedický slovník češtiny*, eds. P. Karlík – M. Nekula – J. Pleskalová (Praha, 2002), 91.

2. The exact number is 86 (counting the phrase written *mezní vol* as a single Encyklopedický slovník češtiny, eds. P. Karlík – M. Nekula – J. Pleskalová (Praha, 2002), 204, we count only appellative nouns as appellatives.


5. The shortening of from Kolektiv, Staročeský slovník (Praha, 1968–2008). We also respect the transcription rules of Old Czech as presented in the introductory volume issued in 1968 but unlike the Staročeský slovník we give no forms reconstructed for the year 1300.


KNAANIC LANGUAGE

The Lexicological Contribution of Abraham ben Azriel

the Czechness of Canaanite glosses in AB and OZ was not much disputed.13 Needless to say there are good reasons to attribute these glosses to the Old Czech of that time from the linguistic point of view such as the absence of nasal vowels reflexes and presence of loans from German and Latin.

The dates of origin of both OZ and AB are known. The OZ text was finished possibly in 1246 (although the author might not have considered it finished), and the AB was finished around 1234.14 Given the great length of these texts, they must have been something like life-long works.15 The oldest surviving medieval manuscripts of the OZ most probably date to the period 1260–1300,16 while the oldest manuscripts of the AB are from the 13th–14th century but cannot as yet be dated with more precision.17 In their earliest preserved copies the two works are therefore fully comparable with other pre-1300 manuscripts contain-

13 Some of the earlier arguments lose validity in light of new findings. E.g. the gloss led (OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliothek, MS Rosenthal 3, II, fol. 40b: ḫiyor), given in the edition (OZ II, 1862, 30) incorrectly as ḫiyor, was as a consequence of this mistake used as an instance of a non-Czech component (e.g. Wexler, Explorations, 91–92). Its meaning ‘hail’, considered untested in Slavic languages (Wexler, Explorations, 92), is attested in Czech, cf. [Josef Jungmann, Slovník česko-německý Josefa Jungmanna (Praha, 1835–1839), vol. II, 279, with an example from the 16th century. Prefixation ob- in glosses obznamenati s’a, obznamenati s’a) was quoted as a feature unparalleled in Slavic languages (Wexler, Explorations, 95), but in Old Czech the verb obznamenati is attested in the same meaning, see Staročeský slovník s.v.

14 Ulčna, “Hlavní proudy,” 297 and 301.


16 Schrijver, “Some Light,” 64 and 70.

17 See the catalogue of the National Library of Israel and the description of the Frankfurt manuscript at <http://sammlungen.un.uni-frankfurt.de> (retrieved on 20th February 2013).

Písečná ostrovní (Pisostr, towards the end of the 13th c., at the earliest from the 1270s; about 50 words), other documents dating to the very end of the 13th century (PsALTER, GlosOPAT – glosses in Homiliát opatovický, TUL – TULec s.v. Bonaventury, GlosMV – some glosses in the Mater verborum, MODKUHN – MODLIBA KUNHUTA etc.). Some works of literature definitely existing at that time, like the songs Hospodine, pomittuj ny (less than 30 words) and Svätý Václave, only survive in younger documents from the second half of the 14th century. The further we go back into the history, the more sparse is the evidence for Czech words, e.g., for the 11th century, Czech linguists know of only 17 instances of what is usually called bohemica, i.e. Czech words, especially proper nouns, in foreign, usually Latin, texts.

Or Zarua and Arugat ha-Bosem

Considering the total of Czech appellatives recorded before the mid-13th century, the value for Czech scholars of Canaanite glosses if attributed to Ancient and Old Czech is self-evident. In this paper, we shall focus on the lexicological contribution of just two works by authors flourishing in the 13th century, namely Abraham ben Azriel's Arugat ha-Bosem (hereafter, AB) and Isaac ben Moses Or Zarua (hereafter, OZ). Their relationship to the Czech Lands is beyond any doubt. Even though the previous optimism of R. Jakobson in attributing the whole corpus of Canaanite glosses in medieval Hebrew sources to Ancient and Old Czech has been challenged and alternative opinions voiced,12
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69
ing Old Czech words and they would appear not to have been far removed from the autographs.

It is most interesting that at virtually the very same time another monumental work originated in medieval Bohemia: the largest preserved medieval manuscript in the world, the famous Codex Gigas, conceived as an encyclopedia of the Christian medieval universe. The OZ, an extensive collection of legal and ritual rules, is something like an encyclopedia of the Central European Jewish life of the first half of the 13th century. Moreover, both works begin with a Hebrew alphabet: the Codex Gigas starts with it, while Isaac ben Moses devotes several paragraphs to the mystical meanings of the letters of the Hebrew alphabet. Both works are also extraordinarily important for diachronic Czech studies, because the Latin Codex Gigas contains several hundreds of Old Czech proper nouns and the OZ contains dozens of Old Czech appellatives. Considering that in the Bohemia of the first half of the 13th century there were only a few hundred literate people, these works are indeed medieval masterpieces.

Perfect knowledge of Czech and stable orthography

As the two Jewish authors, Abraham ben Azriel and Isaac ben Moses, show in their works, they had a perfect command of Old Czech. They are able to cite correctly even untypical Czech grammatical forms like the future passive voice (tobí budu objař), the passive imperative (budi dán, budi dáš), double prefixation of a verb (povymetem) and of course various forms of a single paradigm (blcha – blchy, dalek – daleko, budi dán – budi dánò, oslabí s’a in Mahzor Nuremberg – oslabí s’a etc.) on the one hand and terminological vocabulary such as names of medical instruments for bleeding somebody (rožky or báňky), parts of the arm (myška, pazucha, paža, loket) or baking terminology (škrovalda, kuklíky) on the other. As Jakobson and Halle noticed, in the Canaanite glosses recorded by the Slavs there is never any confusion between voiced and voiceless (or rather lax-tense) consonants. We too believe that this is a strong argument for the primacy of Slavonic and not German language consciousness in these authors. By comparison, Czech words in German-language sources from the 13th century show frequent confusion of prevocalic voiced-voiceless consonants, cf. tobrojtra (for dobrojtra), popomůž (probably from bôh pomoži) or giselitze (for kyselice).

Professor L. R. Waugh, the executive director of the Roman Jakobson Intellectual Trust.


Vintr, Das Tschechische, 192 93.


There is yet another noteworthy aspect in the OZ and AB glosses, namely their slightly archaic character and stable orthography. Both have been discussed in earlier scholarly literature and we would like to make just a few remarks here. The Prague yeshiva was probably founded in the 11th century25 and it is well known that Jewish scholarship flourished there, represented by such names as Isaac ben Jacob ha-Išažan. Isaac ben Moses mentions in his work a predecessor who may also have glossed Hebrew texts in Czech.26 In view of the striking earlier tradition of the sages of Bohemia, it is not surprising that the orthography of Czech words in Hebrew displays much greater stability than that of the Czech words in other sources. Two examples will be given.

a) The phoneme-grapheme correspondence may be illustrated using sibilants, which generally pose the greatest problem in early Czech orthography.27 In the AB and OZ glosses,28 the Old Czech phoneme /č/ is invariably transcribed by uvre (see .Requires,29

32 Jakobson, “Reč a písmoníctví,” 38.
34 The forms of the glosses, checked in manuscripts, are taken from our article of Judeo-Czech and the Canaanite Glosses of the 11th to the 13th Centuries in Hebrew Manuscripts, to appear in vol. 24 of Jews & Slavs. Sometimes in the manuscript readings we quote deviates from editions (the differences concern and MN (= Mahzar Nuremberg), the reference is shortened just to the edition: Aragot ha-Bosem (Jerusalem, 1939–1963); Isaac ben Moses, Or Zarua 1–II Das Machson Nürnberg,” Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums 11 express our thanks to our colleague Daniel Polakovic of the Jewish Museum in Prague for collecting the manuscripts.
35 AB: Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS ebr. 301, fol. 134a.
36 AB: Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS ebr. 301, fol. 97a.
38 OZ: London, British Library, MS Or. 2860, fol. 55b.
39 OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3, I, fol. 302b.
40 OZ: London, British Library, MS Or. 2859, fol. 49b.
41 OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3, II, fol. 177b.
42 OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3, II, fol. 50a.
43 OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3, II, fol. 25a.
44 OZ: London, British Library, MS Or. 2860, fol. 111a.
45 Mahzar Nuremberg, fol. 74a (Zurich, Private collection of David Jeselsohn).
46 In the manuscript OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3, II, fol. 42b; in the edition OZ II, p. 31, mistakenly ינשא.
47 OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3, II, fol. 53b.
49 The counterexample from AB (a form interpreted as containing the prefix veg- yet recorded with the letter ) could perhaps be explained by regressive consonantal assimilation, well attested in 14th century Old Czech.
more (zz, sc, czs, zs, zh) are employed. In the glosses theboundary between /s/ and /š/ on the one hand and /š/ on the other hand is maintained, a principle which was to be applied in appellatives in the Latin script in the Czech Lands only at the beginning of the 14th century in the complicated older digram system, and only at the cost of using a misleading pair of digraphs (zz – zs), soon to give way to an ambiguous simple grapheme s in the so-called later digram system. The Canaanite glosses differentiate perfectly between the phonemes /s/, /š/ and /z/, /ž/ by means of employing  따른 and  따른, see the glosses gríbi s’a, mast, ockstru s’o, okositi, oslabí s’o, oslabí s’o, osváti s’a, przyskanie, s’o, sedmíny, skapała, syrovádka, stpic, suk, vesla (all containing  따른 on the one hand and the glosses motováč, pazucha, glezno, obznámenië s’a, obznamnaj s’a, zákova, zameškanie s’a, zápona, znak, zvechri (all containing  따른) on the other. On the contrary, in the 13th century bohemica in the Latin script, the graphemes are often interchanged, e.g. in Albertus Bohemus’ notebook we read the phonemes /s/, /š/ recorded by the grapheme z in lizti, Colinkeho, ze kenihmi, roze, zare, nazline etc. in the CDB edition we

read e.g. czezne and czezne (both for cěstné), ozada and ozada (for osada) etc. Some phonemes merge in the graphics of the Canaanite glosses: /še/, /š/ are both recorded by ‘a and /š/, /ž/ could both be rendered as ‘a, /ž/ were all written using the grapheme ‘a, and this ambiguity is shared with the Latin script applied on Czech words in the 13th century.

Comparing the Latin and Hebrew orthography, we should also note the ability of the Hebrew script to signal the end-position of some consonants in the script. Some punctuated glosses may indicate vowel length by one grapheme or a punctuation mark (cf. /š/ in the gloss ṭ ש in the gloss ṭ ש in the gloss pütce), a principle adopted in the Czech Latin script more frequently only in the 15th century. On the other hand the frequent absence of vocalization increases the ambiguity of the Czech words in the Hebrew script and the grapheme-phoneme correspondence is also violated by the prothetic š (see e.g. škrovada) and phonological ambiguity of graphemes like z, even though an (inconsistently used) rafe


CDB IV/1, page 71, line 10 (recorded 1241).

CDB IV/1, 275, 30 (recorded 1249).

CDB IV/1, 279, 33 (recorded 1272).

CDB IV/1, 436, 15 (recorded 1275).

Also in the Czech records of the 13th century in the Latin script, it is not uncommon for the grapheme used to record the phoneme /š/ to be employed to record /ž/ as well, cf. the grapheme z used for /ž/ in examples like sydom for židom in PioOstr and place-name records like Slibich, Segrovich, Sůchochi, Sítichich, cf. Michaela Čornejová, “Specifika grafiky nejstarších českých toponymických bohemik,” in Dějiny českého pravopisu (do r. 1902). Sborník příspěvků z mezinárodní konference Dějiny českého pravopisu (do r. 1902) 23–25, září 2010. Brno, Česká republika, eds. M. Čornejová – L. Rychnovská – J. Zemanová (Brno, 2010), 58.


AB: Vatican, Bibliotheca Apostolica, MS ebr. 301, fol. 111a.
eliminates this threat in some glosses, cf. differentiation between Old Czech bilabials b and v in e.g. ot výbora.\textsuperscript{62}

b) Relative orthographical stability can also be illustrated by the invariant mode of recording particular Czech words. Thus e.g. the Old Czech word loket is attested in the preserved copies of OZ and AB fourteen times with minimal variation: 

\(\text{loká\v{s}}\)

once with punctuation (\(\text{loká\v{s}}\)), a scribal's interchange of the mater lectionis (\(\text{loká\v{s}}\)), thrice in the regular form of the t-stem declension, twice punctuated 'loká\v{s}' and once without punctuation (\(\text{loká\v{s}}\)).\textsuperscript{63} The punctuated form additionally illustrates the contribution that the glosses can make to knowledge of Old Czech morphology: in the Latin script the expected consonantal declension form of the nominative plural lokte is not attested in the older stages, and had therefore been considered a later coinage.\textsuperscript{64} There are several words excerpted from the CDB that appear there more than once, but the variation is much greater and in fact only rarely do we find two identical ways of recording the same word. For instance the word noceleh is attested in the CDB in the period 1249–1271 seven times, in five different forms: noceleh (CDB IV/I, page 275, line 20, recorded 1249), noceleh (CDB IV/I, p. 418, l. 40, 1252), nochlegh (CDB IV/I, p. 135, l. 35, 1256), noceleh (CDB V/I, p. 309, l. 30, 1259), nochlegh (CDB VI, p. 461, l. 30, 1262), noceleh (CDB V/I, p. 552, l. 1, 1263), nochlegh (CDB V/I, p. 271, l. 1, 1271). Similarly the word svoda/swoda is attested thirteen times in the CDR between the years 1248 and 1271 in nine different forms (s\(\text{zuoda}\), \(\text{swoda}\), \(\text{swodh}\), \(\text{zwod}\), \(\text{swod}\), \(\text{swode}\), su\(\text{wode}\)).\textsuperscript{65} In the Latin script of the time, the variability of rendering of Czech proper nouns is even greater. This is not to say that there is no orthographic variation of Old Czech words in the Hebrew script at all, e.g. the word pitec is recorded in four slightly different forms: \(\text{pit\v{c}}\), (corrupted) \(\text{pit\v{c}}\), (corrupted) \(\text{pit\v{c}}\), (corrupted) \(\text{pit\v{c}}\).

It might well be objected that in the OZ and AB we have only two authors and that some renderings would have been faithfully copied within each single work, while in the above examples from the CDB there are many more authors and texts involved. On the other hand, in view of the length of the OZ and AB, in some cases the scribe would probably not have been able to remember all previous occurrences. Such is the case with e.g. the plural form \(\text{lopete\v{c}}\), appearing in three OZ manuscripts (Amsterdam, London, Cincinnati) in identical form in a total of five instances. Another Old Czech word with an identical orthography (in both OZ and AB) is lopota (\(\text{lopete\v{c}}\)) in the Frankfurt manuscript in a punctuated form (\(\text{lopete\v{c}}\)).\textsuperscript{66} A further indication of careful attention to orthography in the Hebrew writings is the difference between the Hebrew \(\text{aleph}\) and with an \(\text{ayin} which\) is explained by vernacular couples in la\'az (\(\text{k\v{r}t\v{r}a\v{s}, \text{k\v{r}t\v{r}a\v{s}}\)) and \(\text{pazucha}\) (\(\text{lopete\v{c}}\)).\textsuperscript{68} Similar, the Hebrew \(\text{ayin}\) is explained by a pair of Old Czech \(\text{k\v{r}t\v{r}a\v{s}},\text{lopete\v{c}}\).\textsuperscript{68}

---

\textsuperscript{62} AB: Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS ebr. 301, fol. 86a.

\textsuperscript{63} Cf. AB: Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS ebr. 301, fol. 55b; Frankfurt a. M., Universitätsbibliothek, MS hebr. fol. 16, fol. 26a; OZ: Amsterdam, University Library, MS Opp. 40, fol. 241a–241b.

\textsuperscript{64} Václav Váňka, \textit{Historická slovnice česká II. Tvaroslaví. I. část. Skloňování} (Praga, 1970), 91. The regular u-stem genitive singular polu is an example of the well-preserved archaic features of the Caananic glosses.

\textsuperscript{65} Our thanks go to our colleague K. Komárek for providing us with the excerpts.

\textsuperscript{66} AB: Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS ebr. 301, fol. 111a; Frankfurt a. M., Universitätsbibliothek, MS hebr. fol. 16, fol. 77a; OZ: Amsterdam, Universitätsbibliothek, MS Rosenthal 3, II, fol. 45a and 55a.

\textsuperscript{68} AB: Frankfurt a. M., Universitätsbibliothek, MS hebr. fol. 16, fol. 48b.

\textsuperscript{68} Cf. OZ I, p. 156. The form \(\text{pazucha}\) is corrected according to the manuscripts which have the expected form pazucha (\(\text{k\v{r}t\v{r}a\v{s}}\)). OZ: Amsterdam, Universitätsbibliothek, MS Rosenthal 3, I, fol. 202b–203a; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Opp. 40, fol. 241a–241b.
The lexicological contribution of Or Zarua and Arugat ha-Bosem

The lexicological contribution of the OZ and AB to the study of Old Czech may be viewed from several perspectives. Here we shall emphasize just some of them:

In regard to paradigmatic relations the glosses provide evidence for the following relations:

a) Full synonymy: one quarter expressed by kvarty and ětvrt (ıkları, half of ětvrt). 69

b) Partial synonymy: lana (in Mahzor Nuremberg)70 and zapona, 71 metla, 72 and hvoštičec, 73 and pomelo; 74 suk 75 and kláda 76 (as a torture instrument, both explained as a kind of beam in Hebrew). A distinction between Old Czech partial synonyms is also employed to explain the Hebrew word for picks (רַה), using the Old Czech words vidla (in the manuscript with a vocalization vidla)77 and lopata in AB. 78

It must be added that explicit synonyms also appear in the Latin manuscripts of the time between Old Czech lexical items (que vulgo bernie vel pomocz diciture, kopci vel hranice)79 and very rarely between Old Czech and German (a iure, quod berne seu losunge Teuthonice diciture). 80

80 OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3, II, fol. 209b.
70 Mahzor Nuremberg, fol. 68b (Zurich, Private collection of David Jeselsohn).
71 OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3, II, fol. 53b.
72 AB: Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS Or. 2860, fol. 68b.
73 AB: Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS ebr. 301, fol. 134a.
74 AB: Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS ebr. 301, fol. 137a.
75 OZ: London, British Library, MS Or. 2860, fol. 39a.
76 AB II, p. 151.
77 CDB IV, 280, 25, recorded 1249; CDB IV, 279, 25, recorded 1249.
78 CDB IV, 420, 10, recorded 1252. Note the general cover term ius (a iure), colyponyms.

Of course, Hebrew-Canaanite cross-language synonymy is attested in many instances in the OZ and AB, but so too is Ashkenaz-Canaanite synonymy (יִשְׂרָאֵל, i.e. later German Stock and Czech kláda). 81 Old French-Canaanite synonymy (יִשְׂרָאֵל, i.e. Old French and Old Czech květný věnců). 82 and even Hebrew-Ashkenaz-Old Czech synonymy (יוֹר הַגִּニュース, OCZ p’tit and Hebrew-Old French-Canaanite synonymy בָּמַיִית, מֶרְכָּך and OCZ bamyha) 83 onwards, and Hebrew-Ashkenaz-Old Czech synonymy אֶשְׂרֵי - בֶּרֶכֶך, and also Old Hebrew-Old Czech pazzucha 84.

As far as we know, three-language synonymy (namely Latin-German-Czech) in the Latin script in the Czech Lands is more often attested only as late as the turn of the 14th and 15th centuries, in a dictionary called Lucianus. 85 Three-language synonymy may well have occurred earlier, in the Church Slavonic tradition in the Czech Lands, most probably in the Glagolitic script: there is evidence for Greek-Latin-Slavonic synonymy in the translation of Forty Gospel Homilies of St. Gregory the Great, originating in Bohemia in the 11th century but preserved only in later Russian copies in the Cyrillic script (греческýмъ, Ązyikaмъ, параклēтa, ρωμαϊκζ, ǣdereκατάμυν, ἢλι, κόμπα[-]λατα, словенскζмъ, Ązyikaмъ, призгатель, ли, бýтвeнитель). 86

81 OZ IV, p. 38.
82 OZ II, p. 18. The punctuation and reading of the Canaanite gloss is corrected according to the manuscript OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3, II, fol. 25a.
83 OZ I, p. 27.
84 OZ II, p. 18.
88 Václav Konzal – František Čajka (eds.), Čtyřicet homilii Řehoře Velikého na
c) Cohyponymy (רָצוּךְ, וַלְקֶטֶן) – pazucha, loket in relation to the Hebrew hyperonym arm, probably also for פָּזַעַת אָרִֽמֹּ֥שׁ (růžky or baňky).  

d) Antonymy: אָדָם אָדָם (pręd s’a, anoz s’a).  

e) Meronymy: אֲחַלַּמְתָּה אֲחַלַּמְתָּה (pazucha, loket, myška) in relation to paža (extant in a graphically corrupted instrumental case pažů recorded רָצוּךְ).  

f) Polysemy: pometto as 1. a broom, 2. an instrument for clearing the ashes from a fireplace. Metaphorically transposed meanings: the word pata (پطس) used to denote a part of a boot, probably the word myška (เมียส) used to denote an arm muscle, kláda as an instrument for torture.  

g) Relations within a lexical field like pilt – kotvi – vesla are at the boundary of paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations.

h) Relations within a single paradigm like doublets, e.g. the word konvič / konfíc / kofic / kovic written as کوینیه, کوینیه, گلیه, وینیه.  

Within the syntagmatic relations, the glosses inter alia provide evidence for:

a) Collocability: e.g. poříčkova květlný věnec, pojev pažů, dnem sedmým.  

b) Valency of verbs: tobou budu objat, měsíť to, měsíť to, ež nepěně.  

c) Government of prepositions: po mém obznamenání s’a, ano za s’a, před ře, v zameškání s’a.  

In word formation processes and distribution of parts of speech we find evidence for processes such as diminution (lopata – lopatka) and derivation (pěna – nepěný, metla – pometlo – povyytemen, objat – pojév, temná – potemněla, obznamenali s’a – obznamenání s’a, prýščů – prýškanie etc.). As regards word formation productivity reflected in the frequency of units, here we shall make just observation in all awareness of the limitations imposed by the scarcity of material: the popularity of the suffix...
-ica (nagavica, glavatica, gubica, konvica, makovica, pijavica) and the verbal nouns -nie/tie (obznamenané s’a, prýškané, zameškané s’a) correspond well with the dominance of these types in their respective word formation categories in the Czech records in Latin script prior to 1300. In the glosses there is attested a variety of word formation prefixes (o-: okol, omdlený, ožeg, oslabiti s’a, osv’áti ti s’a etc.; ob-: objálti, obznamenatí s’a; po-: pometlo, pojęvé, potomněti, povymetaní etc.; roz-: rozkýchala s’a; s-: skapala; vý-: výbora, z-: zvichrli; za-: zameškání s’a, zá-: zákova, zápona) and suffixes (e.g. -ec: piutec etc., -ek: dalek, růžek, -ica: gubica etc., -ie: zameškání s’a etc., -išče: choviště, -iti: pěniti etc., -ka: báňka, lopatka etc., -la: metla, -mo: bělo, -ňa: pochodňa, -no: glezn, -ný: květný (or květni), temná, -stvo: knažstvo, -ucha: pazeč). Among word formation processes, further degrees of derivation and compound suffixes are also documented, see e.g. -ar-ica (glavaticé), -ov-ica (makovicé), -en-ec (ogněnécí), and also double prefixation (po-vy-meten). The word formation process of intensification of verbs by roz- and s’a (cf. the corrupted gloss capitalized) is more commonly attested in Old Czech only in the 14th century.

Elaborate semantic definitions aimed at precisely pinning down the meaning are also to be found among the Canaanite glosses of AB and OZ. When we compare these definitions with the bohemia in the CDB, the main difference is in the explicit Hebrew description of the meaning in some of the Canaanite glosses. Where Old Czech words are introduced into the Latin script of the time, their meaning is often indicated merely as equivalence to the Latin term, or as narrower than the Latin term (e.g. ius – čistotné in the following example from 1256: Ius, quod datur [...] pro eo, quod vulgo dicitur chistotne), or the meaning is specified actually by the vernacular expression alone (1256: ad ecclesiam venditio reedet simul cum eo, quod vulgo dicitur mezn wol; 1271: ab eo, quod vulgo dicitur nochleu se narez et preseka). In other records like those of Albertus Bohemus (Albertus Beheim) or the Leitmeritz complex sentence there is of course no such explanation at all. In the Canaanite glosses of OZ and AB, it is sometimes the case that the Hebrew word is defined in Hebrew and then further explained by a vernacular gloss, see e.g. the description of pít explained in Hebrew and also by two vernacular equivalents.

That the Canaanite glosses in the OZ and AB are sometimes the earliest attestations of Old Czech words or their meanings underlines their importance for Czech scholars. Some of the words concerned are very rarely attested in Old Czech (e.g. pazeč or kruchy), and nine Old Czech lexemes are unattested anywhere but in the Canaanite glosses, e.g. okostiti, zvichriti. Nine lexemes occur both in OZ and AB (or Mahzor Nuremberg): ogněnec (AB, MN), loket (OZ, AB), lopata (AB, OZ), oslabiti s’a (AB, MN), pometlo (AB, OZ), piutec (AB, OZ), rataj (AB, MN) and also in an anonymous commentary on Mahzor, Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Cod. hebr. 346, fol. 82b), skapati (AB, MN), veseł (AB, MN). Sometimes we find forms that were already archaic in the 14th century Old Czech, e.g. the conjunction form ež. Special mention must be made of borrowings from Latin (kvarta), derivation from words borrowed from Latin (kuklík – a possible cognate of kukla, which is a borrowing from Middle Latin cunculla) or at least the appearance of a lexical

---

118 CDB VI, 155, 15, recorded 1256.
119 CDB VI, 155, 20, recorded 1256.
120 CDB V/II, 271, 1, recorded 1271.
121 See OZ I, p. 27.
123 Cf. Machek, Etymologicky slovnik, 306. The other possibility is a loan from German.
unit in Latin-Czech dictionaries (zákova) as well as borrowings from German (e.g. bavílna – in the OZ probably the oldest known record of this word in Czech in which the form bavílna also existed, konvica, lana, merk /in Mahzor Nuremberg, stícé, stolec/stulce, kotva reflected in the derived word kotvítí), some of these borrowings being calques (bavílna, kotva).

Nor should we forget that there are also German glosses likeadera and asari in the Or Zarua. The appearance of such Germanisms is hardly surprising given the close relations of the Prague sages to the Bavarian regions, especially Regensburg, which paralleled Christian relations. The language of the originally Slavic-speaking areas in Bavaria (after the end of the Common Slavic unity) was Czech because the migration

---


125 See ESSČ s.v. bavílna.

126 See IV, p. 38 a 53.


128 For example the baptism of fourteen Czech dukes in Regensburg dated second Common Slavic palatalization of velars, or the religious terminologu by (e.g. vezijji, peko) taken from the Bavarian missionaries preceding the barbarians famous for knowledge of Slavic dialects, cf. Jaroslav Kadlec, Přehled českých čírveních dějin (Prague, 1991), 10; František Dvorník, Zrod střední a východní Evropy: mezi Byzanci a Římem (Prague, 1999), 37.

---

The Lexicological Contribution of Abraham ben Azriel

Currents into Bavaria came from the Czech Lands, probably in the 8<sup>th</sup> century – a view supported by the evidence of dozens of reconstructed place names. The knowledge of specialized terminology in lexical fields like medicine (myska, růžky, baňky, glezno, bělko, gnój, mast, pazucha etc.) or sailing terminology (kotvi, pštiv, vesla) displayed in the OZ and AB is further evidence of the authors’ mastery of Old Czech.

Last but not least, it seems to us that yet another aspect of the Canaanite glosses deserves attention. This is the enrichment of the vocabulary by the testing of grammatical boundaries of Czech in the development of equivalents for Hebrew grammatical forms. Examples include povymeten, v zameškání s’ a, budi dán or po mém obznamenání s’ a, which most probably were not frequently used grammatical forms of Old Czech.

Statistically, nouns predominate as the bearers of the static meanings in the distribution of parts of speech in the OZ and AB glosses. In the AB the ratio is more balanced as a result of the author’s grammatical ambitions, as is shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nouns</th>
<th>Adj</th>
<th>Pron</th>
<th>Num</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Adv</th>
<th>Prep</th>
<th>Conj</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZ</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

129 Ernst Schwarz, Sprache und Siedlung in Nordostbayern (Nürnberg, 1960), 176 and 378.

130 Adj stands for Adjectives, Pron for Pronouns, Num for Numerals, Adv for Adverbs, Prep for Prepositions, Conj for Conjunctions, Part for Particles. The parts of speech classification draws from the Czech grammatical tradition. The table counts all tokens followed in our study in Jews and Slavs 24.
The ratio of derived to underived/compound words, compared to the so-called Chronicle of Dalimil,\textsuperscript{131} is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Canaanite glosses</th>
<th>Dalimil's Chronicle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AB/OZ/MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underived</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>derived</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>composed</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relatively low percentage of derived words in the Chronicle of Dalimil and high percentage in the glosses reflects the fact that the glosses are not continuous text and often use derived words to express various shades of meaning.

Conclusions

Isaac ben Moses and Abraham ben Azriel were among the finest intellectuals connected to Bohemia of the first half of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century. In their monumental works, Or Zarua and Arugat ha-Bosem, they left us multifaceted unique evidence of Jewish scholarship of the time, whether in relation to history,\textsuperscript{132} religious practices or the Czech language. Their Old Czech glosses reveal deep knowledge of Czech reflected at the lexical level of language in both paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations, the semantics, cross-language relations, word formation processes, and lexical fields such as medical vocabulary. When compared with the bohemica in the Latin script, the Canaanite glosses in the OZ and AB show some parallels (e.g. in the ambiguity of some graphemes, the presence of German equivalents in the neighbourhood of some glosses, the almost entire absence of digraphs, the presence of Latinisms and German loanwords etc.) but also some differences. Their main lexicological value for the research of Old Czech lies in their early attestation of words and meanings, sometimes providing the first instance and also in their documentation of systematic relations between lexical units and of some possibly dialectal forms (ochstrju s'á).\textsuperscript{133} They generally have an archaic form (e.g. čřēp before the change to strēp, no 'ā > ě word finally, no g / γ > h, the forms ež, lote etc.). There are still numerous tasks ahead for scholarly research on the OZ and AB vernacular glosses from many perspectives, including comparison of Ashkenaz and Canaanite glosses, and complex comparison with Old Czech glosses in the Latin script or with other Canaanite glosses of earlier centuries.
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