

ONDŘEJ BLÁHA – ROBERT DITTMANN – LENKA ULIČNÁ (eds.)

KNAANIC LANGUAGE:

STRUCTURE AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Proceedings of a Conference Held in Prague on October 25–26, 2012

KATALOGIZACE V KNIZE – NÁRODNÍ KNIHOVNA ČR

Knaanic Language: Structure and Historical Background (2012 : Praha, Česko)

Knaanic Language: Structure and Historical Background : proceedings of a conference held in Prague on October 25–26, 2012 / Ondřej Bláha, Robert Dittmann, Lenka Uličná (eds.). – 1st ed. – Prague : Academia, 2013. –

(Judaica ; sv. 9)

ISBN 978-80-200-2295-0

80(=411.16)+908(100) * (=411.16) * 94“04/14“ * 81‘27/‘28 * 81‘282.8 * 81‘42
* 811.162.3‘0 * 091(=411.16) * 091“04/14“ * 091-028.12 * (437.3)

- Hebrew studies
- Jews – Czechia – 10th–13th centuries
- middle ages – Czechia
- language situation – Czechia – 10th–13th centuries
- languages in contact – Czechia
- code-switching (linguistics)
- old Czech language
- Hebrew manuscripts – Czechia – 13th century
- medieval manuscripts – Czechia – 13th century
- marginals – Czechia – 13th century
- proceedings of conferences
- hebraistika
- Židé – Česko – 10.–13. stol.
- středověk – Česko
- jazyková situace – Česko – 10.–13. stol.
- jazykový kontakt – Česko
- stírdání kódů (lingvistika)
- staročestina
- hebrejské rukopisy – Česko – 13. stol.
- středověké rukopisy – Česko – 13. stol.
- marginálie – Česko – 13. stol.
- sborníky konferencí

400 - Language [11]

80 - Filologie [11]

Reviewers:

Ass. Prof. Petr Chalupa, Th.D.

ThD. Petr Jan Vlnš

PhD. Petr Nejedlý

Cover photo © The National Library of the Czech Republic, a part of fol. 336r of the Cheb (Eger) Bible, XVIII.F.6. On this folio the Canaanite glosses *pomkni s'a* and *moš' appear*.

The publication is the result of research funded by the Czech Science Foundation as part of project No. P406/11/0861 *Kanaanské glosy ve středověkých hebrejských rukopisech s vazbou na české země* and conducted at the Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic.

Tato publikace byla vydána s finanční podporou grantu GA ČR č. P406/11/0861 *Kanaanské glosy ve středověkých hebrejských rukopisech s vazbou na české země*, řešeného na FF UK v Praze.

© Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Filozofická fakulta, 2013
ISBN 978-80-200-2295-0

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,¹ 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 epistolaris regni Bohemiae*.² 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).³ Naturally, these data were not be exploited by the Czech academic *Staročeský slovník* because the excerpts for

¹ This paper was researched and written with the support of the grant project of the Czech Science Foundation No. P406/11/0861 “Kenaanské glosy ve středověkých hebrejských rukopisech s vazbou na české země”.

² Dušan Šlosar – Radoslav Večerka – Jan Dvořák – Petr Malčik, *Spisovný jazyk v dějinách české společnosti* (Brno, 2009), 32; Dušan Šlosar – Jana Pleskalová, “Čeština stará raná,” in *Encyklopedický slovník češtiny*, eds. P. Karlík – M. Nekula – J. Pleskalová (Praha, 2002), 91.

³ The exact number is 86 (counting the phrase written *mezni wol* as a single lexical unit). In line with Zdeňka Hladká, “Jméno obecné (apelativum),” in *Encyklopedický slovník češtiny*, eds. P. Karlík – M. Nekula – J. Pleskalová (Praha, 2002), 204, we count only appellative nouns as appellatives.

this monumental work of science were made before publication of these new volumes.

Apart from this source and also leaving aside the special case of Jagić Glosses and Patera Glosses (which are a mixture of Ancient Czech and Church Slavonic with some items already belonging to Ancient Czech proper),⁴ Czech words recorded prior to the middle of the 13th century have been identified only in a few other sources such as the Cosmas chronicle (several words, 12th c.), some of the authentic glosses in the *Mater verborum* (about 55 original glosses up to the mid-13th c.),⁵ the foundation charter of the Leitmeritz chapter (a total of 13 words excluding proper nouns in a complex sentence consisting of two short clauses), the Olomouc glosses (GlosJer,⁶ about 10 words from the 1130s),⁷ cryptographic notes of Albertus Bohemus from the mid-13th century (probably between 1244 to 1256;⁸ about 50 words excluding proper nouns), an unclear note *strahotelnu tacii* (possibly *Strachotě lnú tací*) in the oldest preserved Břevnov monastery manuscript of the 11th c. and some other records.⁹ This gives a total of about 140 words other than proper nouns. Other records containing Czech words date back only to the second half of the 13th century: from the earlier years of the second half of the 13th c., we have only the *Cisiojan mnichovský* (CisMnich, 1258–1278) and

⁴ Cf. Josef Vintr, *Das Tschechische. Hauptzüge seiner Sprachstruktur in Gegenwart und Geschichte* (München, 2005), 148.

⁵ Cf. Šlosar – Večerka – Dvořák – Malčik, *Spisovný jazyk*, 32; Vintr, *Das Tschechische*, 149, gives the total 52.

⁶ The shortenings are taken 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.

⁷ Miroslav Flodr, “Glosy olomoucké,” *Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity C3* (1956): 38–53.

⁸ Thomas Frenz – Peter Herde (eds.), *Das Brief- und Memorialbuch des Albert Behaim* (München, 2000), 34–35.

⁹ Cf. Václav Flajšhans, *Nejstarší památky jazyka i písemnictví českého. Díl I. Prolegomena a texty* (Praha, 1903).

Píseň ostrovská (PísOstr, 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 *Homiliář opatovický*, Túl – *Túlec sv. Bonaventury*, GlosMV – some glosses in the *Mater verborum*, ModIKunh – *Modlitba Kunhutina* etc.). Some works of literature definitely existing at that time, like the songs *Hospodine, pomiluj ny* (less than 30 words) and *Svatý 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 *bohémica*,¹⁰ 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 challenged¹¹ and alternative opinions voiced,¹²

¹⁰ Jana Pleskalová, "K počátkům českého pravopisu," *Listy filologické* 122.3–4 (1999): 168.

¹¹ Lately cf. Alexander Kulik, "Jews from Rus' in Medieval England," *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 102.3 (2012): 399–400, in case of some glosses.

¹² E.g. P. Wexler in more of his works, for instance Paul Wexler, "Judeo-Slavic Linguistics: Aims, Accomplishments and Future Goals," in *Jews & Slavs* 1, eds. Wolf Moskovich – Shmuel Shvarzband – Anatolij Alekseev (Jerusalem

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-

– St. Petersburg: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities – Hebrew University of Jerusalem – Slavonic Bible Foundation – Russian Academy of Sciences, 1993): 202; Paul Wexler, *Explorations in Judeo-Slavic Linguistics* (Leiden, 1987), 85, 90–92.

¹³ Some of the earlier arguments lose validity in light of new findings. E.g. the gloss *led* (OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3, II, fol. 40b: לדי), given in the edition (OZ II, 1862, 30) incorrectly as לול, 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 unattested in Slavic languages (Wexler, *Explorations*, 92), is attested in Czech, cf. [Josef Jungmann,] *Slownik česko-německý Josefa Jungmanna* (Praha, 1835–1839), vol. II, 279, with an example from the 16th century. Prefixation *ob-* (in glosses *obznamenání 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 Uličná, "Hlavní proudy," 297 and 301.

¹⁵ Cf. Emile G. L. Schrijver, "Some Light on the Amsterdam and London Manuscripts of Isaac ben Moses of Vienna's *Or Zarua*," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 73.3 (1993): 56.

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.ub.uni-frankfurt.de>> (retrieved on 20th February 2013).

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.¹⁸ 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,¹⁹ 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.²⁰ They are able to cite correctly even untypical Czech

¹⁸ Cf. Roman Jakobson, "Řeč a písemnictví českých židů v době přemyslovské," in *Kulturní sborník ROK*, ed. L. Matějka (New York, 1957) 39; Schrijver, "Some Light," 56.

¹⁹ Cf. Ivan Hlaváček, "Rukopisy, jejich funkce a čtenáři v českém státě od nejstarších dob do husitství (Stručný nástin problematiky)," in *Knihy a knihovny v českém středověku (Studie k jejich dějinám do husitství)* (Praha, 2005), 23.

²⁰ Cf. Jakobson's lecture *The Languages of the Diaspora as a Particular Linguistic Problem*. See Roman Jakobson Papers, MC 72, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Institute Archives and Special Collections, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA, box 34, folder 44, p. 8. Here we would like to thank

grammatical forms like the future passive voice (*tobú budu objat*), the passive imperative (*budi dáno, budi dán*), double prefixation of a verb (*povymeten*) and of course various forms of a single paradigm (*b'lcha – b'lchy, dalek – daleko, budi dán – budi dáno, oslabil s'a /in Mahzor Nuremberg/ – oslab'u s'a* etc.) on the one hand and terminological vocabulary such as names of medical instruments for bleeding somebody (*róžky* or *baňky*), parts of the arm (*myška, pazucha, paža, loket*) or baking terminology (*škrovada, kuklíky*) on the other. As Jakobson and Halle²¹ noticed, in the Canaanite glosses recorded by the Slavs there is never any confusion between voiced and voiceless (or rather lax-tense)²² consonants.²³ 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. *tobroytra* (for *dobrojtro*), *poppomûz* (probably from *bóh pomozi*)²⁴ or *gîselitze* (for *kysělicě*).²⁵

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

²¹ Roman Jakobson – Morris Halle, "The Term *Canaan* in Medieval Hebrew," in *Selected Writings VI. Early Slavic Paths and Crossroads. Part Two. Medieval Slavic Studies*, ed. S. Rudy (Berlin – New York – Amsterdam, 1985), 884.

²² Vintr, *Das Tschechische*, 192–93.

²³ A special case is represented by the word *konvicě / konficě / koficě / kovicě*, cf. Lenka Uličná, "Altschechische Glossen in den hebräischen Schriften des Mittelalters," in *Aspekte der Sprachwissenschaft: Linguistik-Tage Jena. 18. Jahrestagung der Gesellschaft für Sprache und Sprachen e. V.*, ed. B. Bock (Hamburg, 2010), 460.

²⁴ Both in the work of a late 13th-century Austrian writer known under the name Siefried Helbling, cf. Helmut Glück, *Deutsch als Fremdsprache in Europa vom Mittelalter bis zur Barockzeit* (Berlin – New York, 2002) 73–74.

²⁵ Heinrich von Freiberg in the second half of the 13th century, cf. Matthias Lexer, *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch* (Leipzig, 1872–1878), in the entry *gîselitze*. Quoted according to the on-line version available at <<http://www.woerterbuchnetz.de>>. Retrieved on 20th February 2013.

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 century²⁶ and it is well known that Jewish scholarship flourished there, represented by such names as Isaac ben Jacob ha-Lavan. Isaac ben Moses mentions in his work a predecessor who may also have glossed Hebrew texts in Czech.²⁷ 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.²⁸ In the AB and OZ glosses,²⁹ the Old Czech phoneme /č/ is invariably transcribed by צ (see צָרִיף,³⁰

²⁶ Uličná, "Hlavní proudy," 294.

²⁷ Jakobson, "Řeč a písemnictví," 38.

²⁸ Cf. Pleskalová, "K počátkům," 171.

²⁹ The forms of the glosses, checked in manuscripts, are taken from our article (co-authored by K. Komárek, D. Polakovič and L. Uličná) On the Problem 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 the manuscript readings we quote deviate from editions (the differences concern among other things punctuation). If found also in the editions of the AB, OZ, and MN (= Mahzor Nuremberg), the reference is shortened just to the edition and fol. or page number of the editions: Ephraim E. Urbach (ed.), *Sefer Arugat ha-Bosem* (Jerusalem, 1939–1963); Isaac ben Moses, *Or Zarua I–II* (Žitomir, 1862), *Or Zarua III–IV* (Jerusalem, 1887–90); Bernhard Ziemlich, "Das Machsor Nürnberg," *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 11 (1886): 113–25, 12 (1886): 45–58, 13 (1886): 161–90. We would like to express our thanks to our colleague Daniel Polakovič of the Jewish Museum in Prague for collecting the manuscript readings.

³⁰ OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3, II, fol. 21b.

צָרִיף,³¹ [חבושתישצו < חבושתישצו],³² פרישצו).³³ In the *bohémica* of the first half of the 13th century recorded in the Latin script, the Czech /č/ was written (in appellatives and proper nouns together) in ten ways (*c*, *ch*, *s*, *sch*, *cz*, *tsch*, *ts*, *sc*, *z*, *tz*).³⁴ The only other function of the grapheme צ in the AB and OZ glosses was that of denoting the Czech *c'* (e.g. גלויטצי,³⁵ גוביצי,³⁶ פוטץ,³⁷ קונביצי,³⁸ גונגביצי,³⁹ פיוצי,⁴⁰ ויניץ,⁴¹ etc.).⁴² In the Latin script of the first half of the 13th century, the same sounds were recorded in as many as eight ways (*c*, *tz*, *z*, *ch*, *ts*, *cz*, *zz*, *thz*).⁴³ The phonemes /z, z'/ are virtually always recorded in the glosses by ז (e.g. גליזנו,⁴⁴ זנק,⁴⁵ זקובה,⁴⁶ זפונא,⁴⁷ זינקרי,⁴⁸ etc.)⁴⁹ while in the *bohémica* in the Latin script of the 13th century, both the graphemes *z* and *s* and several

³¹ OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3, II, fol. 209b.

³² AB: Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS ebr. 301, fol. 134a.

³³ AB: Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS ebr. 301, fol. 97a.

³⁴ Cf. Jana Pleskalová, "Vývoj pravopisu ve staré češtině z pohledu dějin jazykovědné bohémistiky," 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), 28.

³⁵ OZ: London, British Library, MS Or. 2860, fol. 55b.

³⁶ OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3, I, fol. 302b.

³⁷ AB: Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS ebr. 301, fol. 111a.

³⁸ OZ: London, British Library, MS Or. 2859, fol. 49b.

³⁹ OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3, II, fol. 177b.

⁴⁰ OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3, II, fol. 50b.

⁴¹ OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3, II, fol. 25a.

⁴² On the inventory of sibilant phonemes, see Vintr, *Das Tschechische*, 197.

⁴³ Pleskalová, "Vývoj pravopisu," 28.

⁴⁴ OZ: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Opp. 40, fol. 292a.

⁴⁵ Mahzor Nuremberg, fol. 74a (Zurich, Private collection of David Jeselsohn).

⁴⁶ Thus in the manuscript OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3, II, fol. 42b; in the edition OZ II, p. 31, mistakenly זקובה.

⁴⁷ OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3, II, fol. 53b.

⁴⁸ AB: Frankfurt a. M., Universitätsbibliothek, MS hebr. fol. 16, fol. 92b.

⁴⁹ The counterexample from AB (a form interpreted as containing the prefix *roz-* yet recorded with the letter ס) could perhaps be explained by regressive consonantal assimilation, well attested in 14th century Old Czech.

more (zz, sc, czs, zs, zh) are employed.⁵⁰ In the glosses the boundary between /s, s'/ on the one hand and /š/ on the other hand is maintained,⁵¹ 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 digraph system, and only at the cost of using a misleading pair of digraphs (zz – ss), soon to give way to an ambiguous simple grapheme s in the so-called later digraph system. The Canaanite glosses differentiate perfectly between the phonemes /s, s'/ and /z, z'/ by means of employing ʔ and ʔ, see the glosses gr²bí s'a, mast, ochstrju s'a, okostiti, oslabil s'a, oslab'u s'a; osv'áti s'a, pry'skanie, s'a, sedmým, skapala, syrovádka, spicě, suk, vesla (all containing ʔ)⁵² on the one hand and the glosses motovúz, pazucha, glezno, obznamenánie s'a, obznamenaj s'a, zákova, zameškánie s'a, zápona, znak, zvi-chri (all containing ʔ) 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, s'/ recorded by the grapheme z in lizti, Colinzkeho, ze kenihami, rozte, ztare, nazilne etc.,⁵³ in the CDB⁵⁴ edition we

⁵⁰ Pleskalová, "Vývoj pravopisu," 28.

⁵¹ Cf. Roman Jakobson, "Из разысканий над старочешскими глоссами в средневековых еврейских памятниках," in *Selected Writings VI. Early Slavic Paths and Crossroads. Part Two. Medieval Slavic Studies*, ed. S. Rudy (Berlin – New York – Amsterdam, 1985), 856.

⁵² There are two exceptions in the AB: the gloss אבסוקוסטא (AB: Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS ebr. 301, fol. 17b) and the gloss אבסוקוסטא (Frankfurt a. M., Universitätsbibliothek, MS hebr. fol. 16, fol. 53a), both with the assimilation before the consonant -k-. This perfectly fits the exceptional behaviour of the peripheral phoneme /k/ in Old Czech: this isolated phoneme (in consequence of the dismantled lax-tense correlation due to the change g > h) behaves exceptionally during the second Ancient Czech depalatalization, the Old Czech umlaut ā > ē and is the first one to be subjected to the assimilation of voicing (gdy etc.).

⁵³ Frenz – Herde, *Das Brief- und Memorialbuch*, 252, 513, and 547.

⁵⁴ CDB IV/1 = Jindřich Šebánek – Sáša Dušková (eds.), *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Regni Bohemiae. Tomi IV. fasciculus primus. Inde ab a. 1241 usque ad a. 1253* (Praha, 1962). CDB V/1 = Jindřich Šebánek – Sáša

read e.g. cyeztne⁵⁵ and ceztne⁵⁶ (both for čestně), ozada⁵⁷ and ozzada⁵⁸ (for osada) etc. Some phonemes merge in the graphics of the Canaanite glosses: /c', č/ are both recorded by ʔ and /š, ž/ could both be rendered as ʔ;⁵⁹ /z, z', ž/ were all written using the grapheme ʔ, and this ambiguity is shared with the Latin script applied on Czech words in the 13th century.⁶⁰

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. /ú/ in the gloss פוטע pútec),⁶¹ 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 ʔ (see e.g. škrovada) and phonological ambiguity of graphemes like ʔ, even though an (inconsistently used) rafe

Dušková (eds.), *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Regni Bohemiae. Tomi V. fasc. 1. Inde ab a. 1253 usque ad a. 1266* (Praha, 1974). CDB V/2 = Jindřich Šebánek – Sáša Dušková (eds.), *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Regni Bohemiae. Tomus V. Fasciculus 2. Inde ab a. 1267 usque ad a. 1278* (Praha 1981). Hereafter, quoted as CBD, page number and line number.

⁵⁵ CDB IV/1, page 71, line 10 (recorded 1241).

⁵⁶ CDB IV/1, 275, 30 (recorded 1249).

⁵⁷ CDB V/II, 279, 35 (recorded 1272).

⁵⁸ CDB V/II, 436, 15 (recorded 1275).

⁵⁹ 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 s used for /ž/ in examples like sydom for židóm in PisOstr and place-name records like Sthlich, Segrovicih, Siuohoschi, Sitinichich, 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.

⁶⁰ Cf. Pleskalová, "Vývoj pravopisu," 28–29.

⁶¹ AB: Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS ebr. 301, fol. 111a.

eliminates this threat in some glosses, cf. differentiation between Old Czech bilabials *b* and *v* in e.g. אוֹטְבִּיבּוֹרָא *ot výbora*.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: לוקט, לוקט, once with punctuation (לוקט), a scribal's interchange of the *mater lectionis* (לוקט), thrice in the regular form of the *t*-stem declension, twice punctuated לוקטי and once without punctuation (לוקטי).⁶³ The punctuated form לוקטי 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.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 *nocleh* is attested in the CDB in the period 1249–1271 seven times, in five different forms: *nozleh* (CDB IV/I, page 275, line 20, recorded 1249), *nocleh* (CDB IV/I, p. 418, l. 40, 1252), *nochlegh* (CDB V/I, p. 135, l. 35, 1256), *nozleh* (CDB V/I, p. 309, l. 30, 1259), *nochleh* (CDB V/I, p. 461, l. 30, 1262), *noczleh* (CDB V/I, p. 552, l. 1, 1263), *nochleh* (CDB V/II, p. 271, l. 1, 1271). Similarly the word *svod/svoda* is attested thirteen times in the CDB between the years 1248 and 1271 in nine different forms (*szuoda*,

⁶² AB: Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS ebr. 301, fol. 86a.

⁶³ Cf. AB: Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS ebr. 301, fol. 55b; Frankfurt a. M., Universitätsbibliothek, MS hebr. fol. 16, fol. 26a; OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3, I, fol. 202b–203a, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Opp. 40, fol. 241a–241b.

⁶⁴ Václav Vážný, *Historická mluvnice česká II. Tvarosloví. 1. část. Skloňování* (Praha, 1970), 91. The regular *u*-stem genitive singular *polu* is an example of the well-preserved archaic features of the Canaanite glosses.

suoda, swode, swohd, zwod, zvod, swod, swode, zuuod).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 *pútec* is recorded in four slightly different forms: פּוּטֵץ, פּוּטֵץ, פּוּטֵץ, (corrupted) פּוּץ.⁶⁶

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 גּוּבִיצִי, 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 *lopata* לופטא (in the Frankfurt manuscript in a punctuated form לופטא).⁶⁷ A further indication of careful attention to orthography in the Hebrew writings is the difference between אציל with an *aleph* and with an *ayin* which is explained by vernacular couples in *la'az* (קושרא, איישלש) and אציל באלף הוא איישלש פדוחא ואציל (translation: arm /אציל/ with an *aleph* is אציל באלף הוא איישלש פדוחא ואציל):⁶⁸ *loket* and *pazucha*:⁶⁸ אציל באלף הוא איישלש פדוחא ואציל (translation: arm /אציל/ with an *aleph* is אציל באלף הוא איישלש פדוחא ואציל), *loket* and *pazucha*, and arm with an *ayin* is קושרא, *loket*).

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

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

⁶⁷ AB: Frankfurt a. M., Universitätsbibliothek, MS hebr. fol. 16, fol. 48b.

⁶⁸ Cf. OZ I, p. 156. The form פדוחא is corrected according to the manuscripts which have the expected form *pazucha* (פזוחא): OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3, I, fol. 202b–203a; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Opp. 40, fol. 241a–241b.

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 *čtvrt* (פולו קב'רטי) *polu kvarty* and חצי צ'טורט *half of čtvrt*.⁶⁹

b) Partial synonymy: *לָנָא lana* (in Mahzor Nuremberg)⁷⁰ and [הבושתישצו] *metla*⁷² and *zápona*;⁷¹ *פומיטלו pometlo*;⁷⁴ *סוק suk*⁷⁵ and *כלדא 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 (עתר), using the Old Czech words *וידלא vidla* (in the manuscript with a vocalization וידלא)⁷⁷ and *lopatá* 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 dicitur; kopci vel hranice*)⁷⁹ and very rarely between Old Czech and German (*a iure, quod berne seu losunge Teuthonice dicitur*).⁸⁰

⁶⁹ 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 OZ: London, British Library, 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 AB: Frankfurt a. M., Universitätsbibliothek, MS hebr. fol. 16, fol. 109a.

⁷⁶ OZ: London, British Library, MS Or. 2860, fol. 39a.

⁷⁷ AB: Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS ebr. 301, fol. 73a.

⁷⁸ AB II, p. 151.

⁷⁹ CDB IV/1, 280, 25, recorded 1249; CDB IV/1, 279, 25, recorded 1249.

⁸⁰ CDB IV/1, 420, 10, recorded 1252. Note the general cover term *ius (a iure)*, specified only by the vernacular lexical items which thus rank among cohyponyms.

Of course, Hebrew-Canaanite cross-language synonymy is attested in many instances in the OZ and AB, but so too is Ashkenaz-Canaanite synonymy (ובלשון אשכנז ובלשון) *Stock* and Czech *kláda*),⁸¹ Old French-Canaanite synonymy (כנען קרטיני ויניץ) *צפל* and Old Czech *květný věnec*),⁸² and even Hebrew-Ashkenaz-Old Czech synonymy (וולוס – רפסודות) *p'lt* (פילט)⁸³ and Hebrew-Old French-Canaanite synonymy (צמר גפן – קותון – OCz *bamv'lna*; furthermore *ברד* – איישילש – OCz *led* ליד⁸⁵ and also *פזוחא pazucha*).⁸⁶ 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*.⁸⁷ 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 (гречьскъзмь · ѡззѣкъзмь · параклитъ · роумьскъзмь же · ѡдзвокатоушь · ѡли · конше[-]латорь · словеньскъзмь же · ѡззѣкъзмь · призвагель · ли · ѡѣтѣшитель).⁸⁸

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.

⁸⁵ OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3, II, fol. 40v. Cf. Uličná, "Hlavní proudy," 309.

⁸⁶ OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3, I, fol. 202b–203a; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Opp. 40, fol. 241a–241b.

⁸⁷ Bohumil Ryba, "Středolatinický slovník 'Lucianus' a jeho české úpravy." *Věstník Královské české společnosti nauk, třída filos.-hist.-filol.* 3 (1944): 3.

⁸⁸ Václav Konzal – František Čajka (eds.), *Čtyřicet homilií Řehoře Velikého na*

- c) Cohyponymy (פזוחא,⁸⁹ לוקט⁹⁰ – *pazucha, loket* in relation to the Hebrew hyperonym אציל *arm*), probably also רושקי או בנקי (róžky or baňky).⁹¹
- d) Antonymy: פּרדסא אַנו זסא (*prěd s'a, ano za s'a*).⁹²
- e) Meronymy: פזוחא, לוקט and מישקא (*pazucha, loket, myška*)⁹³ in relation to *paža* (extant in a graphically corrupted instrumental case *pažú* recorded פשו).⁹⁴
- f) Polysemy: *pometlo* as 1. a broom,⁹⁵ 2. an instrument for clearing the ashes from a fireplace.⁹⁶ Metaphorically transposed meanings: the word *pata* (פטא)⁹⁷ used to denote a part of a boot,⁹⁸ probably the word *myška* (מישקא)⁹⁹ used to denote an arm muscle,¹⁰⁰ כלדא *kláda*¹⁰¹ as an instrument for torture.
- g) Relations within a lexical field like *p'lt – kotví – vesla* are at the boundary of paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations.

evangelia v českocírkevněslovanském překladu. Díl druhý (Praha, 2006), 846, fol. 197ba–197bβ, cf. František Václav Mareš, “Česká redakce církevní slovanštiny v světle Besěd Řehoře Velikého (Dvojeslova),” in *Cyrilometodějská tradice a slavistika*, eds. E. Bláhová – J. Vintr (Praha, 2000), 395. The font Kliment, created by K. Ribarov, is used with permission in this quotation.

⁸⁹ OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3, I, fol. 202b–203a; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Opp. 40, fol. 241a–241b.

⁹⁰ AB: Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS ebr. 301, fol. 55b.

⁹¹ OZ IV, p. 41.

⁹² AB III, p. 129.

⁹³ OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3, I, fol. 202b–203a; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Opp. 40, fol. 241a–241b; AB: Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS ebr. 301, fol. 55b.

⁹⁴ AB: Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS ebr. 301, fol. 175a.

⁹⁵ OZ II, p. 234.

⁹⁶ AB III, p. 280.

⁹⁷ OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3, I, fol. 121b.

⁹⁸ Cf. OZ I, p. 185.

⁹⁹ OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3, I, fol. 203a.

¹⁰⁰ Václav Machek, *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého* (Praha, 1997), 385–86.

¹⁰¹ OZ: London, British Library, MS Or. 2860, fol. 39a.

- h) Relations within a single paradigm like doublets, e.g. the word *konvicě / konficě / koficě / kovicě* written as קונפיצי, קונביצי, קוביצי, קופיצי.¹⁰²

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

- a) Collocability: e.g. קוֹיטְנִי וַיִּנִּיץ *květný věnec*,¹⁰³ פּוֹיִיבְפֶשׁוּ *pojěv pažú*,¹⁰⁴ דְנוּם סוּדְמִים [דְנִים סִדְמִים] *dnem sedmým*.¹⁰⁵
- b) Valency of verbs: אוֹסְבִיטְסָא *tobú budu objat*,¹⁰⁶ אוֹסְבִיטְסָא *osv'átí s'a tobú*,¹⁰⁷ מִישְׁטוּ [מישטו] *miešá to*,¹⁰⁸ אֶשְׁנֶפְנִי *ež nepění*.¹⁰⁹
- c) Government of prepositions: פּוֹמִים אוֹבְזְנְמִינְסָא *po mém obznamenání s'a*,¹¹⁰ אוֹטְבִיבּוֹרָא *ot výbora*,¹¹¹ פּרֶדְסָא אַנו זסָא *prěd s'a, ano za s'a*,¹¹² פּרֶדְנִי *prěd ně*,¹¹³ וַזְמִישְׁכְּנִיָּא *v zameškání s'a*.¹¹⁴

In word formation processes and distribution of parts of speech we find evidence for processes such as diminution (*lopata – lopatka*) and derivation (*pěna – nepění, melta – pometlo – povymeten, objat – pojěv, temná – potemněla, obznamenaj s'a – obznamenání s'a, prýšćú – prýskanie* 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

¹⁰² OZ: London, British Library, MS Or. 2859, fol. 49b.

¹⁰³ OZ: Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3, II, fol. 25a.

¹⁰⁴ AB III, p. 527.

¹⁰⁵ AB II, p. 207. AB: Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS ebr. 301, fol. 80b.

¹⁰⁶ AB I, p. 113.

¹⁰⁷ AB III, p. 86.

¹⁰⁸ AB: Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS ebr. 301, fol. 175a.

¹⁰⁹ OZ: London, British Library, MS Or. 2859, fol. 160b.

¹¹⁰ Frankfurt a. M., Universitätsbibliothek, MS hebr. fol. 16, fol. 47a.

¹¹¹ AB: Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS ebr. 301, fol. 86a.

¹¹² AB III, p. 129.

¹¹³ Frankfurt a. M., Universitätsbibliothek, MS hebr. fol. 16, fol. 22a.

¹¹⁴ Frankfurt a. M., Universitätsbibliothek, MS hebr. fol. 16, fol. 22a.

-ica (*nogavica, glavatica, gubica, konvica, makovica, pijavica*) and the verbal nouns *-nie/-tie* (*obznamenanie s'a, pryškanie, zameškánie 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 1300.¹¹⁵ In the glosses there is attested a variety of word formation prefixes (*o-*: *okol, omdlený, ožeg, oslabiti s'a, osv'átiti s'a* etc.; *ob-*: *objáti, obznamenati s'a; po-*: *pometlo, pojěv, potemněti, povymeten* etc.; *roz-*: *rozkýchala s'a; s-*: *skapala; vý-*: *výbora, z-*: *zvichri; za-*: *zameškánie s'a, zá-: zákova, zápona*) and suffixes (e.g. *-ec*: *pútec* etc., *-ek*: *dalek, róžek, -ica*: *gubica*, etc., *-ie*: *zameškánie s'a* etc., *-išče*: *chvoštišče, -iti*: *pěnití* etc., *-ka*: *baňka, lopatka* etc., *-la*: *metla, -mo*: *běльмо, -ňa*: *pochodňa, -no*: *glezno, -ný*: *květný* (or *květní*), *temná, -stvo*: *knažstvo, -ucha*: *pazucha*). Among word formation processes, further degrees of derivation and compound suffixes are also documented, see e.g. *-at-ica* (*glavaticě*), *-ov-ica* (*makovica*), *-en-ec* (*ogněncách*), and also double prefixation (*po-vy-meten*). The word formation process of intensification of verbs by *roz-* and *s'a* (cf. the corrupted gloss *רוקקו חלקסא*)¹¹⁶ is more commonly attested in Old Czech only in the 14th century.¹¹⁷

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 *bohemica* 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,*

¹¹⁵ Markéta Malá, *Nejstarší doklady slovo tvorných typů českých substantiv* (Brno, 2002; unpublished M.A. thesis), 41 and 57.

¹¹⁶ Frankfurt a. M., Universitätsbibliothek, MS hebr. fol. 16, fol. 53a.

¹¹⁷ Šlosar in Arnošt Lamprecht – Dušan Šlosar – Jaroslav Bauer, *Historická mluvnice češtiny* (Praha, 1986), 333.

quod datur [...] pro eo, quod vulgo dicitur chistotne),¹¹⁸ or the meaning is specified actually by the vernacular expression alone (1256: *ad ecclesiam venditio redeat simul cum eo, quod vulgo dicitur mezni wol*;¹¹⁹ 1271: *ab eo, quod vulgo dicitur nochleh seu narez et preseka*).¹²⁰ 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 *p'lt* explained in Hebrew and also by two vernacular equivalents.¹²¹

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. *pazucha* 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): *ogně nec* (AB, MN), *loket* (OZ, AB), *lopata* (AB, OZ), *oslabiti s'a* (AB, MN), *pometlo* (AB, OZ), *pútec* (AB, OZ), *rataj* (AB, MN and also in an anonymous commentary on Mahzor, Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Cod. hebr. 346, fol. 82b), *skapati* (AB, MN), *veslo* (AB, MN). Sometimes we find forms that were already archaic in the 14th century Old Czech, e.g. the conjunction form *ež*.¹²² Special mention must be made of borrowings from Latin (*kvarta*), derivation from words borrowed from Latin (*kuklik* – a possible cognate of *kukla*, which is a borrowing from Middle Latin *cuculla*)¹²³ or at least the appearance of a lexical

¹¹⁸ CDB V/I, 155, 15, recorded 1256.

¹¹⁹ CDB V/I, 155, 20, recorded 1256.

¹²⁰ CDB V/II, 271, 1, recorded 1271.

¹²¹ See OZ I, p. 27.

¹²² Cf. Jaroslav Bauer, *Vývoj českého souvětí* (Praha, 1960), 138.

¹²³ Cf. Machek, *Etymologický slovník*, 306. The other possibility is a loan from German.

unit in Latin-Czech dictionaries (*zákova*)¹²⁴ as well as borrowings from German (e.g. *bamv'lna* – in the OZ probably the oldest known record of this word in Czech in which the form *bavil-na* also existed,¹²⁵ *konvica*, *lana*, *merk* /in Mahzor Nuremberg/, *stpicě*, *štolcě/štulcě*, *kotva* reflected in the derived word *kotviti*), some of these borrowings being calques (*bamv'lna*, *kotva*). Nor should we forget that there are also German glosses like קומפויש and אשחוק in the Or Zarua.¹²⁶ The appearance of such Germanisms is hardly surprising given the close relations of the Prague sages to the Bavarian regions, especially Regensburg,¹²⁷ which paralleled Christian relations.¹²⁸ The language of the originally Slavic-speaking areas in Bavaria (after the end of the Common Slavic unity) was Czech because the migration

¹²⁴ See the entry *zakov*, *zákova* in *Elektronický slovník staré češtiny* (hereafter, ESSČ). Version 0.8.0. Oddělení vývoje jazyka Ústavu pro jazyk český AV ČR, v.v.i. Available at <<http://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz>>. Retrieved on 20th February 2013.

¹²⁵ See ESSČ s.v. *bavlna*.

¹²⁶ OZ IV, p. 38 a 53.

¹²⁷ See for instance, Isaac ben Jacob ha-Lavan's brother Petachiach of Regensburg, Lavan's own move to Regensburg, Isaac ben Mordecai of Bohemia who presided over the rabbinical court in Regensburg, the characteristic relationship of Abraham ben Azriel to the Regensburg pietists and studies as well as Isaac ben Moses's brief period of residence there. Cf. Uličná, "Hlavní proudy," 294–300. One of the OZ manuscripts was kept in Regensburg, as Israel Isserlein relates, cf. Schrijver (1993, p. 55). An important business route from Kiev via Prague led to Regensburg, which was "the oldest and most significant Jewish community in southern Germany", see Silvia Codreanu-Windauer, "Regensburg: The Archeology of the Medieval Jewish Quarter," in *The Jews of Europe in the Middle Ages (Tenth to Fifteenth Centuries)*. *Proceedings of the International Symposium held at Speyer, 20–25 October 2002*, ed. C. Cluse (Turnhout, 2004), 391.

¹²⁸ Cf. for example the baptism of fourteen Czech dukes in Regensburg dated 845, the regular ancient loanword *Řezno* (from *Castra Regina*) with the second Common Slavic palatalization of velars, or the religious terminology (e.g. *vezdejší*, *peklo*) taken from the Bavarian missionaries preceding the Cyrillo-Methodian mission. The Regensburg bishop Baturich and his collaborators were famous for knowledge of Slavic dialects, cf. Jaroslav Kadlec, *Přehled českých církevních dějin* (Praha, 1991), 10; František Dvorník, *Zrod střední a východní Evropy: mezi Byzanci a Římem* (Praha, 1999), 37.

currents into Bavaria came from the Czech Lands, probably in the 8th century – a view supported by the evidence of dozens of reconstructed place names.¹²⁹ The knowledge of specialized terminology in lexical fields like medicine (*myška*, *růžky*, *baňky*, *glezno*, *běльмо*, *gnój*, *mast*, *pazucha* etc.) or sailing terminology (*kotví*, *p'lt*, *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 dána* 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:¹³⁰

| | Nouns | Adj | Pron | Num | Verbs | Adv | Prep | Conj | Part | Tokens |
|--------------|-------|------|------|-----|-------|-----|------|------|------|--------|
| AB | 29 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 73 |
| | 17,7% | 1,8% | 4,3% | 0 | 14% | 0 | 5,5% | 0,6% | 0,6% | 44,5% |
| OZ | 76 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 79 |
| | 46,3% | 0,6% | 0 | 0 | 0,6% | 0 | 0 | 0,6% | 0 | 48,2% |
| MN | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| | 4,3% | 1,2% | 0 | 0 | 1,8% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7,3% |
| Total | 112 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 164 |
| | 68,2% | 3,7% | 4,3% | 0 | 16,5% | 0 | 5,5% | 1,2% | 0,6% | 100% |

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,¹³¹ is as follows:

| | Canaanite glosses AB/OZ/MN | Dalimil's Chronicle |
|-----------|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| underived | 43,9% | 75,6% |
| derived | 55,5% | 23,9% |
| composed | 0,6% | 0,5% |

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 13th 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,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,

¹³¹ For data on Dalimil's Chronicle see Ondřej Bláha, *Principy vývoje češtiny* (Praha, forthcoming). The analyzed chapters totalled 3.000 tokens taken from Jiří Daňhelka et al. (eds.) *Staročeská kronika tak řečeného Dalimila: vydání textu a veškerého textového materiálu* (Praha, 1988), 98, 105–06, 118–19, 129, 139, 149–50, 161–62, 178–79, 200–01, 210, 218–19, 237–38, 247, 251–52, 260–61, 269, 272, 278, 286–87, 299–300, 308, 316–17 (extracts from chapters 1–26). Both tables were prepared by O. Bláha.

¹³² Cf. Isaak Kahan, "Or Sarua als Geschichtsquelle," *Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für die Geschichte der Juden in ČSR* 9 (1938): 43–100.

and lexical fields such as medical vocabulary. When compared with the *bohémica* 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'a*).¹³³ They generally have an archaic form (e.g. *čřěp* before the change to *strěp*, no 'ä > ě word finally, no *g / γ > h*, the forms *ež*, *lokte* 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.

MANUSCRIPTS

Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Rosenthal 3. Available at <<http://dpc.uba.uva.nl/cgi/i/image/image-idx?view=entry;subview=detail;c=ubinvimg;cc=ubinvimg;entryid=x-HS-ROS-3-1>> and at <<http://dpc.uba.uva.nl/cgi/i/image/image-idx?view=entry;subview=detail;c=ubinvimg;cc=ubinvimg;entryid=x-HS-ROS-3-2>>. Retrieved on 20th February 2013.

Frankfurt a. M., Universitätsbibliothek, MS hebr. fol. 16. Available at <<http://sammlungen.ub.uni-frankfurt.de/mshebr/urn:nbn:de:hebis:30:2-11517>>. Retrieved on 20th February 2013.

London, British Library, MS Or. 2859, MS Or. 2860.

Mahzor Nuremberg: Zurich, Private collection of David Jeselsohn. Available at <http://jnul.huji.ac.il/dl/mss-pr/mahzor-nuremberg/open_eng.html>. Retrieved on 20th February 2013.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Opp. 40.

Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS ebr. 301.

¹³³ Cf. Jan Gebauer, *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého. Díl I. Hláskosloví* (Praha, 1963), 462.

REFERENCES

- BAUER, J. (1960). *Vývoj českého souvětí*. Praha: NČSAV.
- BLÁHA, O. (forthcoming). *Principy vývoje češtiny*. Praha: H&H Vyšehradská.
- BLÁHA, O. – DITTMANN, R. – KOMÁREK, K. – POLAKOVIČ, D. – ULIČNÁ, L. (forthcoming). "On the Problem of Judeo-Czech and the Canaanite Glosses of the 11th to the 13th Centuries in Hebrew Manuscripts." *Jews and Slavs* 24.
- CDB IV/1 = ŠEBÁNEK, J. – DUŠKOVÁ, Š. (eds.) (1962). *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Regni Bohemiae. Tomi IV. fasciculus primus. Inde ab a. 1241 usque ad a. 1253*. Praha: NČSAV.
- CDB V/1 = ŠEBÁNEK, J. – DUŠKOVÁ, Š. (eds.) (1974). *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Regni Bohemiae. Tomi V. fasc. 1. Inde ab a. 1253 usque ad a. 1266*. Praha: Academia.
- CDB V/2 = ŠEBÁNEK, J. – DUŠKOVÁ, Š. (eds.) (1981). *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Regni Bohemiae. Tomus V. Fasciculus 2. Inde ab a. 1267 usque ad a. 1278*. Praha: Academia.
- CODREANU-WINDAUER, S. (2004). "Regensburg: The Archeology of the Medieval Jewish Quarter." In: CLUSE, C. (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: Brepols, 391–403.
- ČORNEJOVÁ, M. (2010). "Specifika grafiky nejstarších českých toponymických bohemik." In: ČORNEJOVÁ, M. – RYCHNOVSKÁ, L. – ZEMANO-VÁ, J. (eds.) *Dějiny českého pravopisu (do r. 1902). Sborník příspěvků z mezinárodní konference Dějiny českého pravopisu (do r. 1902) 23.–25. září 2010, Brno, Česká republika*. Brno: Host – Masarykova univerzita, 53–74.
- DAŇHELKA, J. et al. (eds.) (1988). *Staročeská kronika tak řečeného Dalimila: vydání textu a veškerého textového materiálu*. Praha: Academia.
- DOSTÁL, A. (1967). *Historická mluvnice česká II. Tvarosloví. 2. část. Časování*. Praha: SPN.
- DVORNÍK, F. (1999). *Zrod střední a východní Evropy: mezi Byzancí a Římem*. Praha: Prostor.
- ESSČ = *Elektronický slovník staré češtiny* [on-line]. Version 0.8.0. Oddělení vývoje jazyka Ústavu pro jazyk český AV ČR, v. v. i. Available at <<http://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz>>. Retrieved on 20th February 2013.
- FLAJŠHANS, V. (1903). *Nejstarší památky jazyka i písemnictví českého. Díl I. Prolegomena a texty*. Praha: F. Bačkovský.
- FLODR, M. (1956). "Glosy olomoucké." *Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity* C3, 38–53.
- FRENZ, T. – HERDE, P. (eds.) (2000). *Das Brief- und Memorialbuch des Albert Behaim*. München: Monumenta Germaniae Historica.
- GEBAUER, J. (1963). *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého. Díl I. Hlásokloví*. Praha: NČSAV.
- GLÜCK, H. (2002). *Deutsch als Fremdsprache in Europa vom Mittelalter bis zur Barockzeit*. Berlin – New York: de Gruyter.
- HLADKÁ, Z. (2002). "Jméno obecné (apelativum)." In: KARLÍK, P. – NEKULA, M. – PLESKALOVÁ, J. (eds.) *Encyklopedický slovník češtiny*. Praha: NLN, 204.
- HLAVÁČEK, I. (2005). "Rukopisy, jejich funkce a čtenáři v českém státě od nejstarších dob do husitství (Stručný nástin problematiky)." In: *Knihy a knihovny v českém středověku (Studie k jejich dějinám do husitství)*. Praha: Karolinum, 19–35.
- ISAAC BEN MOSES (1862). *Or Zarua I–II*. Žitomir: Spira.
- ISAAC BEN MOSES (1887–1890). *Or Zarua III–IV*. Jerusalem: Chajim Hirschensohn.
- JAKOBSON, R. – HALLE, M. (1985). "The Term Canaan in Medieval Hebrew." In: JAKOBSON, R. *Selected Writings VI. Early Slavic Paths and Crossroads. Part Two. Medieval Slavic Studies*. Ed. S. Rudy. Berlin – New York – Amsterdam: Mouton, 858–86.
- JAKOBSON, R. (1957). "Řeč a písemnictví českých židů v době přemyslovské." In: MATĚJKA, L. (ed.) *Kulturní sborník ROK*. New York: Moravian Library, 35–46.
- JAKOBSON, R. (1985). "Из разысканий над старочешскими глоссами в средневековых еврейских памятниках." In: JAKOBSON, R. *Selected Writings VI. Early Slavic Paths and Crossroads. Part Two. Medieval Slavic Studies*. Ed. S. Rudy. Berlin – New York – Amsterdam: Mouton, 855–57.
- [JUNGMANN, J.] (1835–1839). *Slowník česko-německý Josefa Jungmanna*. Praha: Knížecí arcibiskupská knihtiskárna.
- KADLEC, J. (1991). *Přehled českých církevních dějin*. Praha: Zvon.
- KAHAN, I. (1938). "Or Sarua als Geschichtsquelle." *Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für die Geschichte der Juden in ČSR* 9, 43–100.
- KOLEKTIV (1968–2008). *Staročeský slovník*. Praha: Academia.
- KONZAL, V. – ČAJKA, F. (eds.) (2006). *Čtyřicet homilií Řehoře Velikého na evangelia v českocírkevněslovanském překladu. Díl druhý*. Praha: Euroslavica.
- KULIK, A. (2012). "Jews from Rus' in Medieval England." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 102.3, 371–403.
- LAMPRECHT, A. – ŠLOSAR, D. – BAUER, J. (1986). *Historická mluvnice češtiny*. Praha: SPN.
- LEXER, M. (1872–1878). *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch*. Leipzig: S. Hirzel. Cited according to the on-line version available at <<http://www.woerterbuchnetz.de>>. Retrieved on 20th February 2013.
- MACHEK, V. (1997). *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*. Praha: NLN.
- MALÁ, M. (2002). *Nejstarší doklady slovtvorných typů českých substantiv*. Brno: MU (unpublished M.A. thesis).
- MAREŠ, F. V. (2000). "Česká redakce církevní slovanštiny v světle Besěd Řehoře Velikého (Dvojeslova)." In: MAREŠ, F. V. *Cyrlometodějská tradice a slavistika*. Eds. E. Bláhová – J. Vintr. Praha: Torst, 368–402.
- PLESKALOVÁ, J. (1999). "K počátkům českého pravopisu." *Listy filologické* 122.3–4, 167–75.
- PLESKALOVÁ, J. (2010). "Vývoj pravopisu ve staré češtině z pohledu dějin jazykovědné bohemistiky." In: ČORNEJOVÁ, M. – RYCHNOVSKÁ, L. – ZEMANO-VÁ, J. (eds.) *Dějiny českého pravopisu (do r. 1902). Sborník*

příspěvků z mezinárodní konference *Dějiny českého pravopisu (do r. 1902)* 23.–25. září 2010, Brno, Česká republika. Brno: Host – Masarykova univerzita, 17–29.

- RYBA, B. (1944). "Středolatinický slovník 'Lucianus' a jeho české úpravy." *Věstník Královské české společnosti nauk, třída filos.-hist.-filol.* 3, 1–97.
- SCHRIJVER, E. G. L. (1993). "Some Light on the Amsterdam and London Manuscripts of Isaac ben Moses of Vienna's *Or Zarua*." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 73.3, 53–82.
- SCHWARZ, E. (1960). *Sprache und Siedlung in Nordostbayern*. Nürnberg: H. Carl.
- ŠLOSAR, D. – PLESKALOVÁ, J. (2002). "Čeština stará raná." In: KARLÍK, P. – NEKULA, M. – PLESKALOVÁ, J. (eds.) *Encyklopedický slovník češtiny*. Praha: NLN, 91–94.
- ŠLOSAR, D. – VEČERKA, R. – DVOŘÁK, J. – MALČÍK, P. (2009). *Spisovný jazyk v dějinách české společnosti*. Brno: Host.
- ULIČNÁ, L. (2010). "Altschechische Glossen in den hebräischen Schriften des Mittelalters." In: BOCK, B. (ed.) *Aspekte der Sprachwissenschaft: Linguistik-Tage Jena. 18. Jahrestagung der Gesellschaft für Sprache und Sprachen e. V.* Hamburg: Dr. Kovač, 453–62.
- ULIČNÁ, L. (2011). "Hlavní proudy středověkého (pre)áškenázského myšlení a tzv. pražská komentátorská škola. Hledání identity v podmínkách izolace a integrace." In: ŠEDINOVÁ, J. et al. (eds.) *Dialog myšlenkových proudů středověkého judaismu. Mezi integrací a izolací*. Praha: Academia, 268–331.
- URBACH, E. E. (ed.) (1939–1963). *Sefer Arugat ha-Bosem*. Jerusalem: Mekitse Nirdamim.
- VÁŽNÝ, V. (1970). *Historická mluvnice česká II. Tvarosloví. I. část. Skloňování*. Praha: SPN.
- VINTR, J. (2005). *Das Tschechische. Hauptzüge seiner Sprachstruktur in Gegenwart und Geschichte*. München: Otto Sagner.
- WEXLER, P. (1987). *Explorations in Judeo-Slavic Linguistics*. Leiden: Brill.
- WEXLER, P. (1993). "Judeo-Slavic Linguistics: Aims, Accomplishments and Future Goals." In MOSKOVICH, W. – SHVARZBAND, S. – ALEKSEEV, A. (eds.) *Jews & Slavs 1*. Jerusalem – St. Petersburg: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities – Hebrew University of Jerusalem – Slavonic Bible Foundation – Russian Academy of Sciences, 201–17.
- ZIEMLICH, B. (1886). "Das Machsor Nürnberg." *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 11, 113–25.
- ZIEMLICH, B. (1886). "Das Machsor Nürnberg." *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 12, 45–58.
- ZIEMLICH, B. (1886). "Das Machsor Nürnberg." *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 13, 161–90.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Lexikologischer Beitrag von Abraham ben Asriel und Isaak ben Moses zum Altschechischen

Der Artikel untersucht den lexikologischen Beitrag der altschechischen Glossen bei Abraham ben Asriel und Isaak ben Moses für die Erforschung des Altschechischen, und zwar im Vergleich mit den altschechischen Glossen der Zeit, die in der Lateinschrift geschrieben wurden. Ihre Bedeutung liegt in dem frühesten Beleg einiger Wörter, der Wortformen und Bedeutungen in den reich belegten paradigmatischen und syntagmatischen Beziehungen, verschiedensprachigen Äquivalenten (d. h. Anführung der Synonyme aus den verschiedenen Sprachen), wortbildenden Prozessen und Wörtern eines lexikalischen Feldes. Aufmerksamkeit ist auch der Graphik der kanaanischen Glossen im Vergleich mit der Lateinschrift gewidmet.