



HANNA LISS / STEPHEN DÖRR

## Hebrew-French Bible Glossaries and the Question of Jewish-French Cultural Exchange in the High Middle Ages: A Reevaluation

CORPUS MASORETICUM WORKING PAPERS 2 (2022)<sup>o</sup>

HANNA LISS / STEPHEN DÖRR

# Hebrew-French Bible Glossaries and the Question of Jewish-French Cultural Exchange in the High Middle Ages:

## A Reevaluation

*Hanna Liss, Heidelberg Center for Jewish Studies / Stephen Dörr, Mainz Academy of Sciences and Humanities*

### Résumé

Dans le Nord de la France médiévale, l'ancien français (la *langue d'oïl*) était la langue vernaculaire, tant parlée qu'écrite, pour les populations chrétienne et juive. Avant l'expulsion des Juifs du Nord de la France en 1306, l'élite savante juive était culturellement intégrée à un tel point que les commentaires sur la Bible et le Talmud étaient enrichis de mots français tirés de divers genres littéraires. La particularité de ces traductions de mots bibliques et talmudiques en français, appelées *le'azim*, est qu'elles ont été écrites en lettres hébraïques. Elles ont été considérées comme si pertinentes qu'elles ont été rassemblées dans des glossaires spéciaux. Six glossaires (plus ou moins complets) et de nombreux glossaires fragmentaires, dont la plupart datent du 13<sup>e</sup> siècle, nous ont été transmis. Cet article aborde l'état des recherches des glossaires hébreu-français du côté des études romanes et juives et pose de nouvelles questions scientifiques.

### Summary

In medieval northern France, Old French (the *langue d'oïl*), both spoken and written, was the vernacular for the Christian and Jewish populations alike. Before the Jews were expelled from the region, the Jewish scholarly elite had been culturally integrated to such an extent that their commentaries on the Bible and Talmud were augmented with French words taken from various literary genres. These so-called *le'azim*, which were written in Hebrew letters, were considered so relevant that they were collected in special glossaries. Six full or partial Hebrew-French Bible glossaries and two alphabetically structured Hebrew-French *vocabularia* have been passed down to us. This article discusses the state of research of the Hebrew-French glossaries from the perspective of both Romance and Jewish studies and addresses groundbreaking questions that have yet been barely touched.

<sup>o</sup> Hanna Liss, Hochschule für Jüdische Studien Heidelberg/Universität Heidelberg, Landfriedstraße 12, 69117 Heidelberg, Email: [hanna.liss@hfjs.eu](mailto:hanna.liss@hfjs.eu); Stephen Dörr, *Lessico Etimologico Italiano* (LEI), Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur Mainz, E-Mail: [stephen.doerr@uni-mannheim.de](mailto:stephen.doerr@uni-mannheim.de)

# 1 Judeo-French Literacy

In medieval northern France, Old French (the *langue d'oïl*), both spoken and written, was the vernacular for the Christian and Jewish populations alike. Before the Jews were expelled from the region, the Jewish scholarly elite had been culturally integrated to such a degree that their commentaries on the Bible and Talmud were augmented with French words taken from a range of literary genres. Impressive testimony regarding this linguistic and cultural achievement can be found in the so-called *le'azim* (singular: *la'az* – glosses in the vernacular<sup>1</sup>), primarily in R. Shelomo Yitzḥaḳi's (Rashi; ca. 1040–1105) commentaries on the Bible, the Talmud, and liturgical poetry (*piyyuṭim*),<sup>2</sup> but also in the commentaries of his scholarly heirs such as R. Yosef Qara (d. 1125), Rashbam (d. c. 1158), and R. Eli'ezer of Beaugency (twelfth century), as well as in later halakhic Responsa literature. The unusual feature of these translations of biblical and talmudic words into French is that they were written in Hebrew letters and were considered so relevant that they were collected in special glossaries. Six full or partial Hebrew-French Bible glossaries<sup>3</sup> and two alphabetically structured Hebrew-French *vocabularia*<sup>4</sup> as well as various fragments from *incunabula* book bindings have come down to us.

The collections of these glosses in Hebrew-French (Bible) lexicons, the so-called *sifre pitronot*, date principally from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. In 2005, the Israeli scholar Menahem Banitt published the last volume – the *Introduction* – to his edition of the *Glossaire de Leipzig*, a Hebrew-French glossary, compiled at the end of the thirteenth century, probably in Tours-Orléans (and complemented with German glosses).<sup>5</sup> More than simply a detailed description of the Leipzig glossary, Banitt's introduction includes the essence of all the observations that he had assembled on the Hebrew-French glossaries over the course of his career. These glossaries present a sequential (yet not exhaustive) translation or interpretation of a biblical Hebrew lemma into Old French (usually struc-

1 On the term *la'az* referring to a foreign language, see the Talmud (b. Yoma. 70a; b. Sot. 49b; y. Sot. [21c]). Only Rashi's comments limited the use of the term to the Old French glosses.

2 There are some 3,500 *le'azim* in the commentary on the Talmud and about 1,300 in the recensions of the Bible commentary. On the *le'azim* in the *piyyuṭ* commentaries, see Elisabeth Hollender, *Clavis Commentariorum of Hebrew Liturgical Poetry in Manuscript* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2005); idem, *Piyyuṭ Commentary in Medieval Ashkenaz* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008); on the *le'azim* in Radaq's writings see Judith Kogel, "Le'azim in David Kimhi's *Sefer ha-shorashim*", in *The Late Medieval Hebrew Book in the Western Mediterranean. Hebrew Manuscripts and Incunabula in Context*, ed. Javier del Barco (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 182–200.

3 The most comprehensive glossaries are Basel, BPUB, A III 39 (GIBâle); Leipzig, UB, 1099 (GLeipzig); Paris, BNF, hébr. 301 (GIBNhébr301); Paris, BNF, hébr. 302 (GIBNhébr302); Parma, Palatina, Cod. 2780/de Rossi 637 (GIParmePalE); Parma, Palatina, Cod. 2924/de Rossi 60 (GIParmePalD). The glossaries and their various editions are cited here according to the sigla introduced in the *Dictionnaire étymologique de l'ancien français* [http://www.deaf-page.de/bibl\\_neu.php](http://www.deaf-page.de/bibl_neu.php) (accessed 03/2022).

4 Paris, BNF hebr. 1243 (<https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b105462003>); Oxford Bodleiana or. 135 (<https://digital.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/objects/5ff98145-16ff-4f1f-ac19-d9ce39145f76/>).

5 Menahem Banitt, ed., *Le Glossaire de Bâle*. 2 vols. (Jerusalem: Académie des sciences et des lettres d'Israël, 1972); idem, ed., *Le Glossaire de Leipzig*. 4 vols. (Jerusalem: Académie des sciences et des lettres d'Israël, 1995–2005).

tured according to the sequence of the biblical text<sup>6</sup>), accompanied by an internal biblical parallel as well as the corresponding equivalent in rabbinic Hebrew and/or an exegetical comment. As a consequence, very few scholars were and are able to read and work on these collections, and even fewer have engaged in editing (at least some of) them.<sup>7</sup> Thus, most of these glossaries have not yet been edited and analysed.

## 2 The History of Research on the *Le'azim*

In regard to the study of the glossaries, as early as in the nineteenth century, Romance and Jewish studies that focused on codicological and paleographical questions did not go hand in hand. The representatives of the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* (e.g., Wilhelm Bacher and Abraham Berliner) did not have expertise in Romance studies but took up the subject in order to deal with French-Jewish literature as part of the western European intellectual culture,<sup>8</sup> and to prove that Jewish studies were and are an integral part of the humanities' disciplines.<sup>9</sup> Moreover, the idea of a French linguistic culture of medieval Jewry in Ashkenaz and northern France could rebut the common idea that the Jews were "backward Orientals."<sup>10</sup> As the representatives of the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* were excluded from the German universities and thus pushed into rabbinical seminaries, interdisciplinary exchange became rather difficult. (Catholic) Christian Church History was not engaged

6 On the fragmentary glossary of birds' names (Lev. 11:13–19, 29–30; Deut. 14:12–18), see Gerrit Bos et al., "A Late Medieval Hebrew-French Glossary of Biblical Animal Names", *Romance Philology* 63 (2009): 71–94; Kirsten A. Fudeman, *Vernacular Voices. Language and Identity in Medieval French Jewish Communities* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010), 109–15. MSS Kroměříž, Arcubiskupská zámecka knihovna, 21.235/fr. 1. contains an alphabetically structured glossary on Proverbs.

7 Mayer Lambert and Louis Brandin, eds., *Glossaire hébreu-français du XIIIe siècle: Recueil de mots hébreux bibliques avec traduction française. Manuscrit de la Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds hébreu no 302* (Paris: E. Leroux, 1905); Harley J. Siskin, "A Partial Edition of a Fourteenth Century Biblical Glossary MS Parma 2780. Includes Partial Text of the Glossary (Genesis and Exodus), Translation into English, a Commentary, and a Word List" (PhD diss., Cornell University, 1981); Kirsten A. Fudeman, "Etymology, Gloss, and Pešat with Special Reference to the Hebrew French Glossary of Cod. Parm. 2342", *Materia Giudaica* 14 (2009): 387–406; Marc Kiwitt, ed., *Les gloses françaises du glossaire biblique B.N. hébr. 301. Édition critique partielle et étude linguistique* (Heidelberg: Winter, 2013; see Rafael Arnold, Review of *Les gloses françaises du glossaire biblique B.N. hébr. 301* by Marc Kiwitt and *Varietätenlinguistische Untersuchungen zum Judenfranzösischen* by Alexandra B. Edzard, *PaRDeS* 20 (2014): 155–58, 167–71; Franz Staller, *Kritische Edition und sprachhistorische Analyse der Innsbrucker Fragmente eines hebräisch-altfranzösischen Bibelglossars (ULB Tirol, Frg. B 9)* (Innsbruck: Studia Verlag, 2019); idem, "Die Innsbrucker Fragmente eines hebräisch-altfranzösischen Bibelglossars", in *700 Jahre jüdische Präsenz in Tirol. Geschichte der Fragmente, Fragmente der Geschichte*, ed. Ursula Schattner-Rieser and Josef M. Oesch (Innsbruck: Innsbruck university press, 2018), 149–68.

8 Cf. Wilhelm Bacher, review of *Glossaire hébreu-français du XIIIe siècle*, by Mayer Lambert and Louis Brandin, *Jewish Quarterly Review* 17 (1905): 800–807; Abraham Berliner, *Die altfranzösischen Ausdrücke im Pentateuch-Commentar Raschi's* (Krakau: Fischer, 1905).

9 On this topic, see Ottfried Fraise, *Ignác Goldziher's monotheistische Wissenschaft. Zur Historisierung des Islam* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014).

10 Cf. Achim Rohde, "Der innere Orient. Orientalismus, Antisemitismus und Geschlecht im Deutschland des 18. bis 20. Jahrhunderts", *Die Welt des Islams* 45 (2005): 370–411.

in this field of research because it was not related to the history of the Latin Bible, and (Protestant) critical Bible studies did not recognize its text-critical, exegetical, literary, theological, and cultural-scientific values and implications.

*Le'azim* are a unique source, not only for exegetical and cultural-historical research within Jewish studies, but also for morphological, phonological, and lexical studies on the *langue d'oïl*.<sup>11</sup> Some of the Jewish scholars in Romance studies have invested efforts in connection with the glossaries but much of the material has not yet been processed.<sup>12</sup> Arsène Darmesteter initiated important inquiries concerning the Rashi *le'azim*.<sup>13</sup> He was followed by Lambert and Brandin who engaged in seminal research on the Paris glossary BNF hébr. 302.<sup>14</sup> However, Lambert and Brandin as well as Darmesteter had only limited access to the Hebrew manuscript sources and thus had to base their research on outdated and/or eclectic print editions (Bibles and commentary literature).

Overall, scholars in Romance studies have been rather more interested in the form and script of the French *le'azim* than in their meaning in the context of Hebrew literature. However, Paris BNF hébr. 302, a glossary from eastern France (ca. 1240) with some 30,000 *le'azim*, must be considered out of date, owing to the way it was edited.<sup>15</sup> Many of the older editions 'invented' French forms that were very different from the known lemmas in Old French, although the word itself was entirely 'regular'. Furthermore, the lemmas in Darmesteter's Rashi edition<sup>16</sup> (RashiD<sup>1</sup>) that Levy excerpted in his *Trésor de la langue des Juifs français au Moyen Age*<sup>17</sup> (LevyTrés) have not been integrated completely into Levy-Trés and, thus, have not been accessible for subsequent studies in Romance lexicography. Last, but not least, since the emergence of the *French Etymological Dictionary* (Französisch Etymologisches Wörterbuch [FEW]), Romance philologists have dated the lemmas taken from Darmesteter (RashiD<sup>1</sup>) to the end of the eleventh century, based on Rashi's biographical data (ca. 1040–1105).<sup>18</sup> However, the fact that most of the manuscripts are

11 Rafael Arnold, "Judeo-Romance Varieties", in *Language Contact in the Mediterranean in the Middle Ages and in Early Modern Times (with Special Focus on Loanword Lexicography)*, ed. Francesco Crifò et al. (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2018), 321–57; Cyril Aslanov, *Le proven al des Juifs et l'hébreu en Provence, Le dictionnaire Šaršot ha-kesef de Joseph Caspi*. Paris: Peeters, 2001.

12 Compare with Bacher 1905.

13 Arsène Darmesteter, "Les gloses françaises de Raschi dans la Bible", *Revue des études juives* 53 (1907), 161–93; 54 (1907), 1–34, 205–35; 55 (1908), 72–83; 56 (1908), 70–98; Arsène Darmesteter, ed., *Les gloses fr. de Raschi dans la Bible, accompagnées de notes par L. Brandin, et préc. d'une intr. par J. Weill* (Paris: Durlacher, 1909).

14 See above, note 7.

15 Lambert and Brandin refrained from editing the glosses in Hebrew letters, and from today's perspective the edition offers an inadequate and incomplete lexicological analysis; see Menahem Banitt, "L'étude des glossaires bibliques des Juifs de France au moyen age: Méthode et application", *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities* 2, no. 10 (1967): 188–210, 192; Kiwitt 2013, 28.

16 Siglum cited here according to the sigla introduced in the *Dictionnaire étymologique de l'ancien français* [http://www.deaf-page.de/bibl\\_neu.php](http://www.deaf-page.de/bibl_neu.php) (accessed 03/2022).

17 Raphael Levy, *Trésor de la langue des juifs français au Moyen Âge* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1964).

18 RashiD<sup>1</sup> 56,96 (Dan. 10:9) reads *asomiç* "étourdi [stunned/dizzy]." The verb *assomir*, which is poorly documented, was found for the first time in the *Dictionnaire du moyen français* as a lemma from 1356 (*terminus a quo*; see *French Etymological Dictionary* [Französisch Etymologisches Wörterbuch FEW] 12, 94b). The *la'az* from the Rashi tradition represents important evidence for the assumption that the word was

known to be from a much later period (the oldest Rashi manuscript was written in 1233) was not taken into account,<sup>19</sup> which made the dating of individual lemmas problematic.<sup>20</sup> Beginning in the 1960s, Banitt worked extensively on the Old French glosses.<sup>21</sup> He edited the Leipzig (GLEipzigBa) and Basel (GLBâleB) glossaries and initiated wide-ranging research on their epistemological, hermeneutical, and literary functions. Those glossaries offer the Hebrew text and the glosses almost diplomatically edited (albeit partially incomplete) and transliterated. However, from today's Romance studies' perspective, in particular in regard to the lexicography, the *langue d'oïl* has peculiarities in connection with the transcription that often lead to distortions; even the semantic analysis is not always error-free. Moreover, Banitt interpreted the *le'azim* almost exclusively against the background of (Hebrew) biblical and rabbinic law and lore as kind of a 'French Vulgate',<sup>22</sup> and it never occurred to him that there was an emerging corpus of (profane) vernacular literature that might have provided the inspiration behind a gloss. The fact that non-Jewish "vernacular voices" (Fudeman) from either a profane (epic, courtly, scientific) or a non-Jewish religious literary culture (sermons; *Bible de Paris*) found their way into the French Jewish lexicon was not an issue on his scholarly agenda. He considered that it was principally the great Bible commentator Rashi who introduced Old French *le'azim* into the exegetical discourse.<sup>23</sup> But this assumption has led in part to serious distortions in regard to the temporal classification of the Hebrew glosses. Rashi had not read courtly literature, but his grand-

---

already in use in the twelfth or thirteenth century. Thus, *le'azim* also play an important role in the dating of the manuscripts. In some cases, they are the only witnesses to an Old French Lemma.

19 On this problem, see Marc Kiwitt, "Un fragment inédit d'un glossaire biblique hebreu-français", in *Ki bien voldreit raisun entendre. Mélanges en l'honneur du 70e anniversaire de Frankwalt Möhren*, ed. Stephen Dörr and Thomas Städtler (Straßburg: Éditions de Linguistique et de Philologie, 2012c), 127–46, esp. 129, and Kay J. Petzold, *Masora und Exegese. Untersuchungen zur Masora und Bibeltextüberlieferung im Kommentar des R. Schlomo ben Yitzchak (Raschi)* (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter 2019), 1–53.

20 This can be seen in the case of the adjective *fanjos* "filled with mud", for which DEAFéI shows three proofs (<https://deaf-server.adw.uni-heidelberg.de/lemme/fanc#fanjos%20>; accessed 01/2022): RaschiD<sup>1</sup> 56,70; *Eneas* (Norman ca. 1160); AalmaR [a French-Latin glossary; H.L.] 3971 (second half of the fourteenth century). The question arises as to whether the *la'az* term can be traced back to Rashi and his contemporaries or whether it comes from twelfth-century French literature as the *Eneas* and was subsequently added to the commentary.

21 Banitt 1972; idem 1995–2005; see also Menahem Banitt, "Une langue fantôme: le judéo-français", *Revue de linguistique romane* 27 (1963): 245–94; idem 1972; idem, "Appendix I: The Glosses in MS. Valmadonna I", in *The Only Dated Medieval Hebrew Manuscript Written in England (1189 CE) and the Problem of Pre-Expulsion Anglo-Hebrew Manuscripts*, ed. Malachi Beit-Arié (London: Valmadonna Trust Library, 1985b), 29–31; idem, "Exegesis or Metaphrasis", in *Creative Biblical Exegesis. Christian and Jewish Hermeneutics through the Centuries*, ed. Benjamin Uffenheimer and Henning Graf Reventlow (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), 13–29; idem, "Une vue d'ensemble sur les glossaires bibliques juifs de France au Moyen Âge", in *Rashi et la culture juive en France du Nord au Moyen Âge*, ed. Gilbert Dahan et al. (Paris/Louvain: Peeters, 1997), 191–201.

22 Menahem Banitt, "Le renouvellement lexical de la version Vulgate des juifs de France au Moyen Âge dans le Glossaire de Leipzig", *Romania* 102 (1981): 433–55; see already Bacher 1905, 803.

23 See Menahem Banitt, *Rashi. Interpreter of the Biblical Letter* (Tel Aviv: Chaim Rosenberg School of Jewish Studies, 1985), esp. 6–10.

children's generation was familiar with that genre. Only the manuscripts<sup>24</sup> allow a more precise chronological, geocultural, and lexical classification after exhaustive processing of the glosses. On the other hand, Marc Kiwitt edited selected pages of the Paris glossary BNF hébr. 301,<sup>25</sup> but like his predecessors, he focused primarily on the linguistic quality of the glosses and neglected the Hebrew explanations and their rabbinic or any other literary frame.

Cyril Aslanov's most recent discussion of the interpretations of Einbinder and Fudeman<sup>26</sup> suggests that to this day there is a thoroughly ideologically motivated dissent as to whether the Jews spoke and wrote the vernacular of their French-speaking (Christian) environment or whether there was a distinct French sociolect.<sup>27</sup> Aslanov's observations contradict Banitt's results,<sup>28</sup> as the latter discerned a tendency to replace archaisms in the Leipzig glossary with lexemes that were current at the time. Further, some of the lexemes that Aslanov mentioned can also be found in other examples of Old French literature. In her analysis of Hebrew liturgical poetry (ChansHeid<sup>1</sup> and ChansHeid<sup>2</sup>),<sup>29</sup> Susan Einbinder notes that "use of the vernacular was more widespread among medieval French Jews than is customarily considered."<sup>30</sup> A similar conclusion was drawn by Kiwitt and Liss in their investigation of the *le'azim* in the Pentateuch commentary attributed to Rashbam.<sup>31</sup> Next to Fudeman's research, Liss' study was the first to pose the question as regards the interferences between Jewish and Christian vernacular cultures.<sup>32</sup>

---

24 The oldest extant Rashi manuscript (Munich, BSB, Cod. hebr. 5) was written in 1233 (in or near Würzburg).

25 Cf. Kiwitt 2013.

26 Cyril Aslanov, "The Lament on the Martyrs of Troyes as a Monument of Judeo-French on the Verge of the Expulsions", in *Jews and Christians in Thirteenth-Century France*, ed. Elisheva Baumgarten and Judah D. Galinsky (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 217–33; cf. Susan L. Einbinder, "Exegesis and Romance: Revisiting the Old French Translation of Kallir", in *Jews and Christians in Thirteenth-Century France*, ed. Elisheva Baumgarten and Judah D. Galinsky (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 235–47; Kirsten A. Fudeman, "Restoring a Vernacular Jewish Voice: The Old French Elegy of Troyes", *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 15 (2008): 190–221.

27 Cf. Aslanov 2015, 218.

28 Cf. Banitt 1995–2005, vol. 4, esp. 346–57.

29 See also Heinz Pflaum [Hiram Peri], "Deux hymnes judéo-français du Moyen Âge", *Romania* 59 (1933): 389–422, esp. 402–11.

30 Einbinder 2015, 245.

31 Cf. Hanna Liss, *Creating Fictional Worlds. Peshat-Exegesis and Narrativity in Rashbam's Commentary on the Torah* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2011), esp. 259–68; see already Marc Kiwitt and Stephen Dörr, "Judeo-French", in *Handbook of Jewish Languages*, ed. Lily Kahn and Aaron D. Rubin (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2016), 138–77; Marc Kiwitt, "The Problem of Judeo-French: Between Language and Cultural Dynamics", *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 226 (2014): 25–56.; idem, "Hébreu, français et 'judéo-français' dans les commentaires bibliques des paṣṭanim", in *Langue de l'autre, langue de l'auteur. Affirmation d'une identité linguistique et littéraire au XIIIe et XVIe siècles*, ed. Marie-Sophie Masse and Anne P. Pouey-Mounou (Paris: Droz, 2012a), 137–54; idem, "Le problème de la variance et l'édition des textes en ancien français rédigés en caractères hébreux", in *Le texte médiéval. De la variante à la recréation*, ed. Cécile Le Cornec-Rochelois et al. (Paris: PUPS, 2012b), 101–12.

32 Cf. Hanna Liss, "Peshat-Auslegung und Erzähltheorie am Beispiel Raschbams", in *Raschi und sein Erbe. Internationale Tagung der Hochschule für Jüdische Studien mit der Stadt Worms*, ed. Hanna Liss and Daniel Krochmalnik (Heidelberg: Winter, 2007), 101–24; idem, "The Commentary on the Song of Songs Attributed to R. Samuel ben Meir (Rashbam)." *Medieval Jewish Studies online* (2007): 1–27; idem, "Kommentieren

Following Banitt's research in Romance studies, several scholars, especially Gerrit Bos, Kirsten A. Fudeman, Marc Kiwitt, and Julia Zwink published a series of linguistic works on Hebrew-French texts and genres apart from the glossaries. Fudeman studied liturgical and profane Hebrew-French texts,<sup>33</sup> including some that were written exclusively in French (but in Hebrew script). Kiwitt<sup>34</sup> and Zwink<sup>35</sup> have proved that Jews used the Old French vernacular in the context of profane scientific (e.g., medical) subjects. Kiwitt<sup>36</sup> and particularly Bos and Zwink<sup>37</sup> have shown that Old French lapidaries (Anglo-Norman in the Marbode tradition) were the authoritative sources for the names of the precious stones in the Leipzig glossary as well as in the *Lapidarium of Berekhya Ben Natronai ha-Naqdan*.<sup>38</sup> Bos, Mensching et al. published comprehensive studies on lists of medical synonyms and medical-technical glosses (Hebrew-Arabic-Occitan).<sup>39</sup> Their results provide information

---

als Erzählen: Narrativität und Literarizität im Tora-Kommentar des Rashbam." *Frankfurter Judaistische Beiträge* 34/35 (2009): 91–122.

33 Kirsten A. Fudeman, "The Old French Glosses in Joseph Kara's Isaiah Commentary," *Revue des études juives* 165 (2006): 147–77; idem 2008; idem 2010.

34 Cf. Marc Kiwitt, *Der altfranzösische Fiebertraktat Fevres. Teiledition und sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung* (Würzburg: Königshausen und Neumann, 2001).

35 Cf. Julia Zwink, "Étude lexicographique du traité anonyme Fevres: Une compilation médicale en ancien français, écrite en caractères hébraïques", *Panace@* 7 (2006): 250–60; idem, "Ausbau der medizinischen Fachsprache im Französischen. Lateinische versus altfranzösische Termini in einem mittelalterlichen Fiebertraktat in hebräischer Graphie", in *Fachsprache(n) in der Romania. Entwicklung, Verwendung, Übersetzung. Kongressakten der gleichnamigen Sektion des XXXII. Romanistentags (Berlin 2011)*, ed. Laura Sergo, Ursula Wienen, and Vahram Atayan (Berlin: Frank & Timme, 2013), 183–207; idem, *Altfranzösisch in hebräischer Graphie. Teiledition und Analyse des Medizintraktats „Fevres“* (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2017).

36 Cf. Marc Kiwitt, "Les glossaires bibliques hébraïco-français et le transfert du savoir profane", in *Transfert des savoirs au Moyen Âge—Wissenstransfer im Mittelalter. Actes de l'Atelier franco-allemand, Heidelberg, 15–18 janvier 2008*, ed. Stephen Dörr and Raymund Wilhelm (Heidelberg: Winter, 2008), 65–80, esp. 71.

37 See Gerrit Bos and Julia Zwink, eds., *Berakhya Ben Natronai ha-Nakdan: Sefer Koah ha-Avanim (On the Virtue of the Stones). Hebrew Text and English Translation* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010).

38 See Banitt 1995–2005, vol. 4, 414.

39 Cf. Guido Mensching, Maria S. Corradini, and Blanca Perrián, "Per la terminologia medico-botanica occitana nei testi ebraici: le liste di sinonimi di Shem Tov Ben Isaac di Tortosa", in *Atti del convegno internazionale, Pisa 7–8 novembre 2003: Giornate di studio di lessicografia romanza* (Pisa: ETS, 2004), 93–108; Gerrit Bos, *Novel Medical and General Hebrew Terminology*, 4 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011–2018); idem, "Arabic-Romance Medico-Botanical Glossaries in Hebrew Manuscripts from the Iberian Peninsula and Italy", *Aleph* 15 (2015): 9–61; Gerrit Bos and Guido Mensching, "A Medico-Botanical Glossary in Hebrew Characters of Italian Origin", *Iberia Judaica* 6 (2014):11–21; Guido Mensching, "Listes de synonymes hébraïques-occitanes du domaine médico-botanique au Moyen Âge", in *La voix occitane. Actes du VIIIe Congrès Internationale d'Études Occitanes*, vol. 1, ed. Guy Latry (Bordeaux: Presses Universitaires de Bordeaux, 2009), 509–26; Guido Mensching and Gerrit Bos, "Une liste de synonymes médico-botaniques en caractères hébraïques avec des éléments occitans et catalans", in *L'Occitanie invitée de l'Euregio, Liège 1981 – Aix-la-Chapelle 2008: Bilan et perspectives*. Vol. 1, ed. Angelica Rieger (Aachen: Shaker, 2011), 225–38; Guido Mensching and Dorothea Köhler, "Romanische Fachterminologie in mittelalterlichen medizinisch-botanischen Glossaren und Synonymenlisten in hebräischer Schrift", in *Fachsprache(n) in der Romania. Entwicklung, Verwendung, Übersetzung*, ed. Laura Sergo, Ursula Wienen, and Vahram Atayan (Berlin: Frank & Timme, 2013), 61–82; Guido Mensching and Julia Zwink, "L'ancien occitan en tant que langage scientifique de la médecine. Termes vernaculaires dans la traduction hébraïque du Zad al-musafir wa-qut al-hadir (XIIIe)", in *Los que fan viure e tresluir l'occitan. Actes du*



about the transfer of knowledge and the global culture of knowledge outside the Ashkenazi cultural sphere and beyond religious differentiations.

The *le'azim* in Hebrew Tosafist literature<sup>40</sup> have only been edited and worked on in a rudimentary way.<sup>41</sup> They also reflect Hebrew notation and are always marked as a translation (בלעזר “in French”), either in the Hebrew text or in a marginal note. Kiwitt and Liss edited and analyzed the *le'azim* in the Torah commentary attributed to Rashbam,<sup>42</sup> and Banitt edited the glosses in the Rashbam commentary on the Book of Job.<sup>43</sup> Determining the extent to which the surviving manuscripts and prints reveal autochthonous glosses by R. Yosef Qara, Rashbam, Rabbenu Tam, R. Eli'ezer of Beaugency, R. Yosef Bekhor Shor, *Yalqut Shim'oni*, R. Menaḥem of Joigny, R. Yitzḥaq from Evreux, Ḥizzequni, *Sefer ha-Gan*, *Da'at Zeqenim*, *Hadar Zeqenim*, *Minḥat Yehuda*, *Sefer ha-Orah*, *Sefer ha-Pardes*, *Maḥzor Vitry*, and the Responsa requires prospective research and will depend largely on a thorough geocultural classification of the manuscripts. An Anglo-Norman gloss is more likely to be attributed to Rashi's grandson Rashbam who lived in Rouen and Caen, than to Rashi himself, who worked in Troyes in the Champagne. Some glosses can easily be attributed to a specific geocultural area owing to their spelling and/or script.<sup>44</sup>

The nature of the glossaries has never been fully explained, and the question of the degree to which non-Jewish French literature and culture influenced the development of the northern French Jewish exegesis has not yet been explored in depth. One reason for the neglect of vernacular culture and literature is perhaps the notion that Bible commentaries do not seem to be comparable to contemporary literary genres. At first sight, there might be a deep disparity between the (biblical) stories that Rashbam ‘retells’ in his commentary

---

Xe congrès de l'AIEO, Béziers, 12–19 juin 2011, ed. Carmen Alén Garabato, Claire Torrelles, and Marie-Jeanne Verny (Limoges: Lambert-Lucas, 2014), 226–36.

40 See Ephraim E. Urbach, *The Tosaphists. Their History, Writings and Methods* (Heb.). 4th ed. (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1986); recent editions in Simcha Emanuel, ed., *Newly Discovered Geonic Responsa and Writings of Early Provençal Sages* (Heb.) (Jerusalem: Ofeq Institute, 1995); Simcha Emanuel, ed. *Responsa of Rabbi Meir of Rothenburg and His Colleagues* (Heb.), 2 vols. (Jerusalem: The World Union of Jewish Studies, 2012); Avraham Reiner and Pinchas Roth, eds., *Responsa of Rabbi Isaac ben Samuel of Dampierre. A Critical Edition* (Heb.) (Jerusalem: Mekize Nirdamim, 2020).

41 Berliner 1905; Darmesteter 1907/1908; Arsène Darmesteter and David S. Blondheim, eds., *Les gloses françaises dans les commentaires talmudiques de Raschi*, 2 vols. (Paris: Champion, 1929/1937); Gilbert Dahan, “L'exégèse de la Bible et l'usage du vernaculaire (XIIe-XIIIe siècles)”, *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 93 (2013): 181–201; Banitt 1985a and Mochè Catane, ed. *Recueil des gloses. Les gloses françaises dans les commentaires talmudique de Rachi d'après l'ouvrage d'Arsène Darmesteter et D. S. Blondheim* (Jerusalem: Gitler, 1988) focused almost exclusively on Rashi, and their editions are based mainly on the printed editions, which are not reliable. On the differences between Rashi manuscripts and the early printings, see Petzold 2019, esp. 26–53.

42 Liss 2011, 229–49.

43 Banitt's edition is found in Sara Japhet, ed. *The Commentary of Rabbi Samuel Ben Meir (Rashbam) on the Book of Job* (Heb.) (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2000), 277–92.

44 See below note 107.

and the mid-twelfth-century historiographical literature (such as Wace's<sup>45</sup> *Roman de Brut*<sup>46</sup> and *Roman de Rou*<sup>47</sup>) and/or with regard to the Champagne region, the *chansons de geste* and the literary oeuvre of Chrétien de Troyes (ca. 1140–1190). However, Liss has shown that Rashbam's Bible commentary reflects a considerable degree of French linguistic and cultural influence.<sup>48</sup> In many places, that commentary includes technical terms and suggests a knowledge of arts and crafts. For example, his interpretation of Gen. 49:24 adheres firmly to the archery imagery, using the terminology of the crossbow (*arbaleste*). His audiences might have felt that they were part of an archery lesson rather than a Bible class. We also find the *le'azim* used in this commentary (*arbalestre*; *forche*) in the (Anglo-Norman) *Voyage de saint Brendan*, the *Chanson de Roland*, the (Anglo-Norman) *Alexander*, the *Hue de Rotelande* (c. 1180), and Chrétien's *Cligés*.<sup>49</sup>

## 3 New Directions in the Study of the *Le'azim* in Romance and Jewish Studies

### 3.1 The Old French Glosses as a Source for Historical Lexicography

As early as 1989, Frankwalt Möhren (*Dictionnaire Étymologique de l'Ancien Français*) pointed to the importance of the Old French glosses in Hebrew script for historical lexicography.<sup>50</sup> Since then, important work by Banitt, Kiwitt, and, most recently, Staller has been published;<sup>51</sup> however, most of the glosses have not yet been edited, let alone lexically analyzed. The importance for Romance lexicology cannot be overestimated: For example, the Leipzig glossary comprises more than 22,100 glosses, some of which are found with different spellings. According to a lemmatization corresponding to the standard for Old French (according to the *Tobler-Lommatzsch Dictionary*),<sup>52</sup> these glosses can be assigned to 2005 Old French lemmas. However, the hitherto known thirty (partial) glossaries and

---

45 Wace c. 1110–after 1174; see Françoise H. M. Le Saux, *A Companion to Wace* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2005), esp. 11–80.

46 Written between 1150 and 1155; compare Eugene Mason, trans., *Arthurian Chronicles: Roman de Brut by Wace* (London: Dent, 1962), Introduction 3–13.

47 Written between 1160 and 1174.

48 See, e.g., Liss 2011; idem 2007b.

49 See Liss 2011, esp. 229–49, 257–68.

50 Frankwalt Möhren, "Points noirs dans la lexicographie des langues romanes: domaine historique", in *Actes du XVIIIe Congrès international de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes*, ed. Dieter Kremer, vol. 4 (Tübingen: Niemeyer 1989), 33–38, 34: "[pour] le seul domaine ancien français il reste tant à faire qu'il est vain de nommer des textes isolés à traiter; on peut seulement évoquer des champs de travail comme les glossaires hébreux ou les récits hagiographiques et bibliques."

51 Cf. Banitt 1985b; idem 1988; idem 1997; idem 1995–2002; see also note 7.

52 Adolf Tobler and Erhard Lommatzsch, eds., *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch. Elektronische Ausgabe redaktionell bearbeitet von Peter Blumenthal und Achim Stein* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2002).

single-sheet fragments from incunabula book bindings encompass some 110,000 *le'azim*, and we do not yet know to how many French lemmas these forms correspond. One example can illustrate the fact that there are wide-ranging lexical variants among the individual glossaries: The variant apparatus of Darmstadt Or. 56, a glossary fragment from the thirteenth century,<sup>53</sup> shows that in the six listed glossaries the first fifty glosses (on Haggai, Zephania, and Zechariah) appear in 107 different variants that can be traced back to 83 Old French lemmas. Further extrapolations give rise to the assumption that the *le'azim* correspond to a total of some 21,000 Old French lemmas. Given that the hitherto most extensive dictionary of Old French, the *Dictionnaire étymologique de l'ancien français* (DEAF<sup>54</sup>) includes more than 81,000 lemmas, the relevance of a comprehensive lexical analysis for the lexicographic history of Old French becomes obvious.

In order to determine the lexical, semantic, and cultural-historical import of the *le'azim*, the lemmas have to be compared with the material offered in the Romance and Latin language dictionaries. Romance analysis of the *le'azim* faces the following problems<sup>55</sup>:

1. Owing to the isolated position of the *le'azim*, which do not have a (French) literary context, any grammatical identification in connection with the gender of the word or the valence of a verb remains difficult.

2. Any semantic analysis might be hampered by various obstacles: Either the meaning of the Hebrew lemma is not entirely clear or the translation of the *la'az* refers to more than one semantic field. Very often, the *la'az* is not simply the translation of the Hebrew (biblical) lemma but serves to attach exegetical or grammatical information to allow the reader to enhance their knowledge of biblical Hebrew.

3. In regard to the semantic-lexical analysis, the following phenomena have already been described in preliminary research:

(a) *Le'azim* that display an archaic (proto-Romance) language level, for example, *bonijer* “*bien faire* = doing good”<sup>56</sup> (on \*BONIFICARE).

(b) Words from various Romance languages that entered the *la'az* tradition and were subsequently passed on, for example, *antremantir* “*trembler* = tremble.”<sup>57</sup>

53 Cf. Kiwitt 2012c, 132–33.

54 See [www.deaf-page.de](http://www.deaf-page.de) (accessed 03/2022).

55 See Kiwitt, 2012c, 104.

56 GIBâleB 1927, 6327, 6855 on \*BONIFICARE, FEW 1,433a: only in Jewish sources. Further Judeo-French forms of verbs in -icare are: *aïjer* “édifier/edify” (GIBâleB 2048, 3025, etc., “*aegier construire*” GIBNhébr301K 306–307 to AEDIFICARE “edify” FEW 24,205a); *frotejèr*, *frotijer* “*prospérer, être plantureux* = flourish” (GIBâleB 2352, 3503, 5434 on FRUCTIFICARE “bearing fruit” FEW 3,823a); *sêntijèr* “*santifier* = sanctify” (GIBâleB 8848 to SANTIFICARE “sanctify” FEW 11,14). Compare Kiwitt 2013, 314 on *avigier* v.tr. “*redonner de la vie, de la vigueur à qn*”: (from \*advivificare)“... Les formes parallèles relevées par Blondh dans des sources juives d'origine catalane, espagnole, portugaise et italienne suggèrent qu'il s'agit d'une tradition de glose antérieure au Moyen Âge français: il semble en effet probable que la glose constitue un calque morphologique datant de l'époque proto-romane, qui fut transmis par la suite dans l'enseignement biblique”; see also Kiwitt and Dörr 2016, 139.

57 FEW 13<sup>2</sup>, 238a; GLeipzigA. LevyTrés 21 displays this *la'az* in GIBNhébr302L, GLeipzigB, GIBNhébr301, GIBâleB, GIParmePalB, and GIParmePalE; Banitt 1995–2005, vol. 4, 253–54, interprets this form as an archaism. FEW shows that it is well represented in Occitan, especially in its modern dialects. We might, therefore, as-

(c) *Le'azim* that appear only in the glossaries and whose form is unclear, for example, *badia* m. “*serviteur* = servant.”<sup>58</sup>

(d) *Le'azim* mirroring technical terminology that were taken from vernacular texts or discourses such as the names of stones known from various *lapidariumuri*, medical terminology, and/or technical terms found in coeval texts on the processing of textiles.<sup>59</sup>

Owing to their specificity in regard to their script and corresponding Hebrew explanation, the *le'azim* will provide Romance historical lexicography with important and hitherto hidden references to linguistic-historical (etymological, semantic, phonetic) and cultural-historical (e.g., on cultural contact) developments. One concept that can serve to explain these peculiarities is discourse tradition, which was devised within German Romance studies by Koch and further developed by Oesterreicher and Wilhelm.<sup>60</sup> This discourse tradition explains how similar formulas, words, etc., have been created by ‘Diskursgemeinschaften’, in our case Jewish communities, in a supralinguistic context. In regard to the glosses, one could assume a kind of gloss inventory that was developed by borrowing elements from different languages (i.e., Middle Latin, Occitan, Old French, etc.) and spread over various geographical areas long before the first *le'azim* were put to parchment. It appears that the discourse tradition can explain archaic forms, Occitanisms, or syntactic influences of Hebrew in the Old French glosses better than anything suggested hitherto.

### 3.2 The Glossaries in View of Material Text Cultures

Research on the Hebrew-French glossaries should be reevaluated to address questions regarding the artifacts themselves, that is, how these glossaries were produced and for whom? How and in what contexts were they used? As the glossaries vary, particularly in regard to their *mise-en-page* and *mise-en-texte*, one has to assume that the glossaries and related reading and teaching practices are bound by a mutual connection that bears relevant information for their *Sitz im Leben* in medieval Jewish society between the twelfth and

---

sume that the Old French words that have been found only in Judeo-French glossaries were taken from Occitan; compare Banitt 1995–2005, vol. 4, 347 “*Substitution aux archaïsmes*”: “*antermantir par coreçer*” (1375).  
58 GLBâleB 8052; on \*BIDIL “servant” FEW 15,1,102b: “judfr.” The formation from the etymon remains unclear.  
59 Cf. in particular Kiwitt 2008; Bos and Zwink 2010; see also Judith Olszowy-Schlanger, “Binding Accounts: A Leger of a Jewish Pawn Broker from 14th Century Southern France (MS Krakow, BJ PRZYB/163/92)”, in *Books Within Books. New Discoveries in Old Book Bindings*, ed. Andreas Lehnardt and Judith Olszowy-Schlanger (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2014), 97–147, esp. 119–20.

60 See Peter Koch, “Diskurstraditionen: zu ihrem sprachtheoretischen Status und ihrer Dynamik,” in *Gattungen mittelalterlicher Schriftlichkeit*, ed. Barbara Frank et al. (Tübingen: Narr, 1997), 43–79; Wulf Oesterreicher, “Historizität – Sprachvariation, Sprachverschiedenheit, Sprachwandel”, in *Language Typology and Language Universals*, ed. Martin Haspelmath et al., vol. 2 (Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2001), 1554–95.; Raymund Wilhelm, “Diskurstraditionen und einzelsprachliche Traditionen,” in *Diskurse, Texte, Traditionen. Modelle und Fachkulturen in der Diskussion*, ed. Franz Lebsanft and Angela Schrott (Göttingen/Bonn: V&R unipress/Bonn University Press, 2015), 63–78.

the fourteenth centuries.<sup>61</sup> Various issues and questions have barely been touched upon or discussed in any detail:

*1. For whom were these glossaries written? What kind of reader might have made use of French words in Hebrew letters?*

Banitt pointed to the fact that some glossaries were created by professional writers on behalf of wealthy patrons.<sup>62</sup> The Basel glossary was made for a wealthy citizen of Rouen named Asher, but we do not have any information as to why Asher was interested in a French translation. Even the legitimate assumption that his French was far better than his Hebrew does not offer any kind of explanation.<sup>63</sup> The Paris glossary (GLBNhébr302; east/southeast of the *langue d'oïl* region; 1240) was written by a certain Yosef ben Shim'on (patron unknown)<sup>64</sup>.

According to Bacher, BNF hébr. 302 was the basis for a 'Jewish Vulgate', written for educational purposes as an "abbreviated interlinear translation of the Bible."<sup>65</sup> Some argue that the glossaries were prepared for those who were not able to read the Hebrew language (men, women, children alike),<sup>66</sup> but this seems unlikely given the fact that the glossaries address linguistically and rabbinically well-trained readers: They explain the *le'azim* either by referring to an Aramaic (GIParmePalD on Lev. 12:2; 13:42) or a mishnaic expression (GIParmePalD on Ps. 18[17]:5). Very often, an intertextual biblical lemma from the Prophets or Hagiographa is given; such vocabulary is not easily understandable for the less educated. In many instances, the glossaries also elucidate grammatical features (tempus, syntax, modality) of biblical Hebrew for those who are used to reading rabbinic texts (GIParmePalD on Lev. 12:4; GIParmePalD on Ps. 18[17]:30,38–39). The constant recourse to and use of these sources presupposes a high level of Jewish education, including training in linguistics and grammar. The fact that MS Oxford, Bodleian Library or. 135, a French manuscript (first half of the thirteenth century), includes not only two *le'azim* homonym lists, but also Ibn Parḥon's dictionary *Maḥberet ha-Arukh* shows that the glossaries were used not only in the context of religious education, but also for Hebrew grammatical and lexicological studies in the vernacular. However, unlike their Provençal and Spanish contemporaries who were educated in a Judeo-Arabic cultural and linguistic context and used Arabic as a meta-language (Hebrew-Arabic) for linguistic studies, northern French scholars sought to attach the study of grammar to the immediate study of the biblical text in a *lectio continua*.

---

61 The theoretical input for these questions in general can be traced back to the Collaborative Research Center 933 at the University of Heidelberg and the Heidelberg Center for Jewish Studies (<https://www.materiale-textkulturen.org/article.php?s=2>; accessed 03/2022).

62 Cf. Banitt 1997, 192.

63 See Banitt 1972, 29.

64 See Bacher 1905.

65 Bacher 1905, 803.

66 Cf. Kiwitt 2013, 161.

## 2. What is the relationship between the mise-en-texte of the glossaries and their function?

The variety of layouts matches a range of functions and the way they are dealt with. Some glossaries are carefully divided into several columns;<sup>67</sup> others display the text without commas or periods so they lack spatial clarity and thus point to a continuous reading rather than a search for a particular lemma.<sup>68</sup> Here and there, the glossaries have empty spaces, which suggests that the scribe left a gap in order to fill in certain information at a later point in time.<sup>69</sup>

## 3. Do we find traces of usage or any other meta-textual elements that might hint at an original Sitz im Leben of a certain glossary? Can we discern any attempts at codification of the translation and explanation?

Although there are several intersections among the glossaries, not all of them, such as Gl-ParmePalD, include selected comments from a recension of a Rashi commentary in the margins, which means that the first user compared the French explanations with Rashi's comments, and where Rashi had a similar explanation, he added it.<sup>70</sup> The glossaries as 'stores of knowledge' were obviously used in various ways, but only codicological, paleographical, and philological investigations will shed new light on these questions.

## 4. Which lemmas were translated and which were not?

It is not an easy task to determine the criteria that rendered the particular lemmata significant enough to be chosen for translation. Why (in our view) were common terms translated: פְּרוֹלִים *les pauvres* "(for) the poor" GlParmePalD in Ps. 9:10; שׁוּר *mur* "wall" GlParmePalD in Ps. 18:30? Were they used for teaching Hebrew or for understanding the biblical context? How relevant was Jewish translation activity in northern France for individual religious practice and teaching culture?<sup>71</sup>

## 5. Which coeval French texts served as the literary bases for the glossaries?

This is a crucial question, since in the long run it will allow deeper insights into the educational, social, cultural, and linguistic integration of Jewish intellectuals into the French environment. When it came to the translations of poetic sections in the Prophets and Hagiographa, at least, everyday vocabulary was no longer an adequate tool. We must assume that profane literature as well as religious texts such as the *Bible de Paris* must have been at hand. For instance, GlParmePalD on Ps. 9:17 translates the Hebrew term הִיגַיּוֹן "*higgayon*" as פְּרוֹלִים *parola* "word/speech."<sup>72</sup> Likewise, Ibn Ezra's commentary *ad loc.* alludes to this meaning, as he understood the term to be an expression for "stating out (loud)." At the

67 For example, Paris BNF hébr. 301, fol. 31v; go there for image: <https://gallica.bnf.fr/iiif/ark:/12148/btv1b105408901/f73/59,216,1657,1150/full/0/default.jpg>.

68 For example, Paris BNF hébr. 302, fol. 27v; go there for image: <https://gallica.bnf.fr/iiif/ark:/12148/btv1b10540891g/f59/225,1300,2256,2200/full/0/default.jpg>.

69 For example, Paris BNF hébr. 301, fol. 31v, line 13; go there for image: <https://gallica.bnf.fr/iiif/ark:/12148/btv1b105408901/f73/59,216,1657,1150/full/0/default.jpg>.

70 See e.g. MS Parma Palatina 2924, fol. 137v, 138r: [https://www.nli.org.il/en/discover/manuscripts/hebrew-manuscripts/viewerpage?vid=MANUSCRIPTS&docid=PNX\\_MANUSCRIPTS990001090380205171-1#\\$FL22485162](https://www.nli.org.il/en/discover/manuscripts/hebrew-manuscripts/viewerpage?vid=MANUSCRIPTS&docid=PNX_MANUSCRIPTS990001090380205171-1#$FL22485162).

71 On this question, see Hanna Liss, *Jüdische Bibelauslegung* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2020), esp. 73–98.

72 Modern translations often do not translate this term at all; see, for example, JPS *ad loc.*

same time, the Paris glossary GIBNhébr301 translates פנשייה as *pensee*, thereby referring to a philosophical terminology in the sense of “logic/meditation” as we find it, for example, in Avraham bar Ḥiyya’s *Hegyon ha-Nefesh*<sup>73</sup> or in Chrétien’s *Cligés* (CligesG; ca. 1176) where we find the word in the sense of “reflection/meditation.”<sup>74</sup> Thus, one has to examine the semantic fields of the *le’azim* in order to get a clearer idea as to which French texts might have inspired and influenced the Jewish scholars. It is more likely that the majority’s language and literature had an impact on the minority’s, rather than vice versa.

*6. In what way did the lemma-based translation shape the peshat-exegesis of the northern French exegetical school?*

Whereas rabbinic exegesis has always relied on polysemy and lexical ambiguity, both of which inform fixed elements in its exegetical hermeneutics, the editors of the glossaries seem to have given up this exegetical principle and delineated biblical exegesis in a new parameter: translating having led to *peshat*-exegesis.<sup>75</sup>

*7. The relationships among the glossaries have not yet attracted sufficient scholarly attention.*

Neither their similarities nor their deviations from one another have been subject to in-depth research. Some glossaries (e.g., GIBNhébr301) are unvocalized while others are partly or fully vocalized (e.g., GIParmePalb; GILeipzig). In some cases, vowels were only added to the biblical text and sometimes it were only the French translations in Hebrew letters that were meticulously vocalized. Very often, we find deviations in the explanatory notes of a French *la’az*. For instance, the translation of Ps. 18 [17] in GIParmePalb and GILeipzig shows that there is no immediate interdependency, as they quote different biblical phrases in various places and differ in regard to their explanations, to the number of translated lemmas, and to the quotations of the intertextual parallels.<sup>76</sup> Moreover, the *Sitz im Leben* of the glossaries and their relationship to one another cannot be determined without comparing the sequence of the biblical books within the glossary. With regard to the comparison of Ashkenazi manuscripts, the five *megillot* inform a decisive criterion.<sup>77</sup> There is no other group of texts that features such a variety in terms of their relative sequence and positions within a Bible codex. GIParmePale, GIBNhébr302, and GIParmePalb display the

73 Cf. PESCHAT – *Premodern Philosophic and Scientific Hebrew Terminology in Context. An Online Thesaurus* (<https://www.peshat.org>; accessed 3/2022).

74 See <https://deaf-server.adw.uni-heidelberg.de/lemme/penser#pensee>.

75 On this question, see, e.g., Fudeman 2009; Liss 2020, esp. 73–98; idem 2011, esp. 229–49; Elazar Touitou, *Exegesis in Perpetual Motion. Studies in the Pentateuchal Commentary of Rabbi Samuel Ben Meir* (Heb.). 2nd ed. (Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 2005); idem, “Peshat and Apologetics in the Rashbam’s Commentary on the Biblical Stories of Moses (Heb.)”, *Tarbiz* 56 (1982): 227–38; see also Eva De Visscher, *Reading the Rabbis. Christian Hebraism in the Works of Herbert of Bosham* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2014), esp. 67–78.

76 MS Parma Palatina 2924, fol. 139r–140r. Deviations in regard to the *le’azim* #13951, 13952, 13953, 13957, 13960, 13961, 13970, 13971 (counting according to Banitt 1995–2005, vol. 3).

77 See also Hanna Liss, “A Pentateuch to Read in? The Secrets of the Regensburg Pentateuch”, in *Jewish Manuscript Cultures. New Perspectives*, ed. Irina Wandrey (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2017), 89–128. (<https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/9783110546422/html>; accessed 3/2022), 100.

*le'azim* on the *megillot* after the Pentateuch,<sup>78</sup> whereas in GIBNhébr301 and GILeipzig, they are integrated into the Hagiographa.<sup>79</sup>

*8. An exhaustive taxonomy of the glosses has not yet been undertaken.*<sup>80</sup>

The glosses have to be investigated in terms of their lexicological, grammatical, syntactical, and etymological, as well as their metrical, stylistic, exegetical, and theological/philosophical quality. This will, at a second stage, lead to a more precise picture of their use and function within the Jewish educational system. It is in this context that one has to address the question of the relationship between the Hebrew-French glossaries and the Latin-Hebrew glossaries/Hebrew-Latin bilingual Bibles and commentaries. To date, scholars have not yet come to a clear consensus in regard to the degree of knowledge of Latin among the Jews and of Hebrew among the Christian scholars.<sup>81</sup>

*9. A thorough translation study on the glossaries is still needed.*

The glossaries do not reveal easy answers with regard to the central translational question of the relationship between the “source and target language.” What has been observed so far is that they were not written merely to produce an interlinear Bible translation for an audience no longer able to read the Hebrew text. Rather, the rabbinic explanation of the biblical text suggests that the Jews in France during the eleventh and twelfth centuries were well-trained in rabbinic Hebrew but not well-versed in biblical Hebrew.<sup>82</sup> Nonetheless, the (Hebrew) Bible played an important role in the fraught and complicated contemporary Jewish-Christian relations, and the Jews must have felt the need to reclaim their monopoly as interpreters of the Bible. To substantiate that claim, the Jewish Bible masters determined to guarantee a thorough knowledge of biblical Hebrew among their contemporaries.

*10. The western European Ashkenazi Bibles and Masorah tradition documented in the glossaries has never been subject to scholarly research.*

The glossaries were written in different *langue d'oïl* regions (Champagne, Lorraine, Normandy, Franche-Comté, England). Preliminary investigations have already revealed many deviations from the Tiberian Bible recensions,<sup>83</sup> in particular, in the glossaries that are

78 GIParmePale: Qohelet, Esther, Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations; GIBNhébr302: Qohelet, Esther, Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations (same sequence as GIParmePale!); GIParmePalb: Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Qohelet, Esther [labeled as “*megilla*”].

79 GIBNhébr301: Psalms, Proverbs, Song of Songs, Ruth, Job, Daniel, Lamentations, Qohelet, Esther; GILeipzig: Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Daniel, Ezra/Nehemia, I/II Chronicles, Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Qohelet, Esther (the *megillot* are presented in the same sequence as in GIParmePalb; the Book of Esther labeled as “*Megillat Esther*”).

80 On the taxonomy of Latin glosses see Susan Boynton, “Glossed Hymns in Eleventh-Century Continental Hymnaries” (PhD diss., Brandeis University, 1997); see also Hollender 2008, 19–20.

81 Liss 2011, esp. 5–34; Gilbert Dahan, *Les juifs en France médiévale. Dix études* (Paris: Cerf Patrimoines, 2017), 90.

82 Compare also Rashbam’s Torah commentary that often presents a gloss to specify a verbal phrase in terms of its ground form and derived stems as well its tenses and modes (on this topic, see Liss 2011, esp. 230–235).

83 For example, Firkovich, Evr. I B 19a or Aleppo Codex; see, in particular, Hanna Liss and Kay J. Petzold, “Die Erforschung der westeuropäischen Bibeltexttradition als Aufgabe der Jüdischen Studien”, in *Judaistik im Wandel. Ein halbes Jahrhundert Forschung und Lehre über das Judentum in Deutschland*, ed. Andreas Lehnardt (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2017), 189–210.



fully vocalized and written with diacritical signs, such as a *rafe* attached to the so-called ‘BeGaDKefaT’ consonants,<sup>84</sup> as is the case in GIParmePalD and GILeipzig.<sup>85</sup> This issue has never been considered: earlier research was simply based on some kind of *textus receptus* as we find in the most common printed Bible editions such as Bomberg,<sup>2</sup> Letteris, Koren, BHS, and Keter.<sup>86</sup> However, random editions dealing with psalms in GIParmePalD have already disclosed that the glossaries display various deviations in the consonantal text as well as in the vocalization of the biblical text: Ps. 9:1 reads עלמות as one word, which is typical of the Ashkenazi Bible text tradition.<sup>87</sup> Ps. 18:34 (the glossary labels it as Ps. 17) displays the verbal form מְשִׁיחָה as *hif’el*, whereas the Tiberian Bibles read the verb in the *pi’el* (מְשִׁיחָה). Moreover, we have already found countless differences between synthetically and asyndetically connected parts of sentences (as real variants), for example, for Ps. 7:7, the GIParmePalD reads הַנְּשִׂא, whereas Firkovich, Evr. I B 19a (BHS) offers the reading הַנְּשִׂא (without *waw* and vocalized with *qamats*). For Hos. 8:4, the two Parma and the Leipzig glossaries (GIParmePalD, GIParmePale, GILeipzigB) not only discuss the reading of the verb הַשִּׁיר, adopting the Rashi commentary ad loc., but also integrate a Masoretic note on the replacement of *samekh* for *sin*.<sup>88</sup> Clearly, then, only a thorough exploration of the biblical lemmas will shed new light on the distribution of various Bible text recensions in medieval Ashkenaz and France.

In conclusion, it must be said that for the last 150 years, research on the range of texts and literary genres in northern France (Hebrew Bibles, Bible, Talmud and *piyyut* commentaries, Hebrew-French *le’azim*, Tosafists’ texts on religious law and *minhag*, Judeo-French texts in Latin script) have always been studied independently of one another. As a result, text cultures and domains of knowledge have been and still are torn apart, their networks dissolved. The biblical texts of the glossaries came from Ashkenazi Bible editions, which formed the hypotexts to any Bible and Talmud explanation, as the basis for *halakha* and *minhag*. It is time to explore the linguistic, paleographical-codicological, and content-related peculiarities of the glossaries in an interdisciplinary research network from Jewish studies and Romance languages.

### 3.3 The *Le’azim* in Biblical Commentaries

The glossaries as well as isolated *le’azim* in medieval Jewish Bible commentaries bear invaluable information in regard to Old French lexicography, the libraries of French Jewish scholars in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the biblical text and Masora recensions, and, last,

84 א, ב, ג, ד, כ, פ, ת. The dot (= *dagesh*) inside a consonant indicates that it is doubled. The BeGaDKefaT consonants are then spoken as plosives, spirantized without *rafe* (*bet/vet; pe/fe*).

85 GILeipzig does not reflect vocalization throughout.

86 See, in particular, Petzold 2019, 54–93.

87 Cf. Petzold 2019, esp. 197–216.

88 See GIParmePalD, fol. 121r: לא אוֹסִיֶרְט שֵׁן מִתְחַלֶּפֶת בְּסִמְךָ לְ הַסִּירוֹ “*prinçoièrent [ils ont installé des princes]*, they have installed princes, which means they have made rulers but not from my doctrine, *oterent [ils ont ôté]* they took away. (The letter) *sin* can be replaced by (the letter) *samekh* (and should be read as) an expression for הַסִּירוֹ.”

but not least, even the geographical area where a Hebrew manuscript was written. However, various instances have been found in which the glossaries evidence readings different from those of the commentators. Banitt assumed that the commentators made use of the Vulgate versions, that is, the (oral?) translation in Old French (לעז העם).<sup>89</sup> He considered that the glossaries (not necessarily those extant today but their predecessors) included lexemes from the Vulgate versions, which were, in turn, emendated and enlarged on by the commentators, whose comments were integrated into the extant recensions of the *sifre pitronot*.

We are still left with the question of the relationship between the Vulgate versions and the glossaries. Until today, there has been only very limited research in connection with the French vernacular Bible editions, in particular on the so-called *Bible de Paris*, written in the middle of the thirteenth century.<sup>90</sup> The fact that during that century not only Latin, but also French (glossed) Bibles were produced must have been a serious challenge for the Jewish intellectuals who realized that even their well-educated contemporaries were not well-versed in biblical Hebrew. It is not by chance that Rashbam on Gen.1:29 explained and

---

89 Banitt 1985a, esp. 3–30. It is not by chance that we find a similar approach on the Christian side, such as in the *Dictionnaire Hébreu-Latin-Français de la Bible hébraïque de l'Abbaye de Ramsey*, which was copied in order to emend the corrupt Latin text of the Vulgate according to the Hebrew version (see also esp. Judith Olszowy-Schlanger, ed., *Dictionnaire hébreu-latin-français de la Bible hébraïque de l'Abbaye de Ramsey (XIII. s.)* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008); idem, *Les manuscrits hébreux dans l'Angleterre médiévale. Étude historique et paléographique* (Paris: Peeters, 2003); idem, "The Knowledge and Practice of Hebrew Grammar among Christian Scholars in Pre-Expulsion England: The Evidence of 'Bilingual' Hebrew-Latin Manuscripts", in *Hebrew Scholarship and the Medieval World*, ed. Nicholas R. M. de Lange (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 107–28.

90 In regard to its content as well as to the sequence of the biblical books, the *Bible de Paris* mirrors the Vulgate (see also Bonifatius Fischer, "Zur Überlieferung altlateinischer Bibeltexte im Mittelalter", *Nederlands archief voor kerkgeschiedenis* 56 [1975]: 19–34). To date, thirty-nine manuscripts (full and partial editions) are known (including those fragments that were integrated into the *Bible Historiale Complétée*). Of the Old Testament, only the Book of Genesis has ever been edited (Michel Quereuil, *La Bible française du XIIIe siècle. Edition critique de la Genèse* (Geneva: Droz, 1988)) as have parts of the New Testament (Guy de Poerck, *Notions de grammaire historique du français et exercices philologiques*, 2 vols. (Gent: Story, 1962) and Clive R. Sneddon, "A Critical Edition of the Four Gospels in the Thirteenth-Century Old French Translations of the Bible" (PhD diss., Oxford University, 1978)). Whereas Samuel Berger (*La Bible française au Moyen Âge. Étude sur les plus anciennes versions de la Bible écrites en prose de la langue d'oïl* [Paris: Imprimerie nationale], 1884) assumed that the *Bible de Paris* was written by a group of scholars led by the Paris University, others such as Paul Meyer ("Compte-Rendu de Berger 1884", *Romania* 17 [1888]: 121–41) and Charles Robson ("Vernacular Scriptures in France", in *The West from the Fathers to the Reformation, vol. 2 of The Cambridge History of the Bible*, ed. Geoffrey Lampe [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969], 436–52, 528–32) concluded that the *Bible de Paris* consisted of various sections that were combined in the middle of the thirteenth century. Recently, Clive R. Sneddon, "Rewriting the Old French Bible: The New Testament and Evolving Reader Expectations in the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries", in *Interpreting the History of French. A Festschrift for Peter Rickard on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday*, ed. Rodney Sampson and Wendy Ayres-Bennet (Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi, 2002), 35–59, esp. 36 suggested that the *Bible de Paris* was commissioned by Blanche of Castile; on Blanche's relation with Jewish scholars, see, e.g., Judith Kogel and Patricia Stirnemann, "A Portrait of Abraham Ibn Ezra (Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal MS 1186)", in *Illuminating the Middle Ages: Tributes to Prof. John Lowden from His Students, Friends and Colleagues*, ed. Laura Cleaver et al. (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2020), 157–63. Claudio Lagomarsini in Siena is planning a new project on twelfth- and thirteenth-century Latin and French Bibles, which could well lead to new results.

translated the Hebrew phrase הנה נתתי לכם (“Behold, I give you...”) as הנה נתתי לכם. נותן (‘‘I give it [to] you at this moment, *doins* in Old French’’), thereby referring not to the meaning of the root נתן ‘‘to give’’, but to its tense and mood, explaining the perfect form as the present tense.<sup>91</sup>

Yet another interesting example is the *la‘az* tradition for Cant. 6:4: ‘‘You are beautiful, my beloved, as Tirtzah, Comely as Jerusalem, Awesome as bannered hosts [אֵימָה בְּנִדְגָלוֹת].’’<sup>92</sup>

The glossaries translate as follows:

1. Leipzig UB. 1099, 216r:<sup>93</sup> יהגה אימה כמו לבך יראה קרִימורוֹזָא q̄rēmōrōzā [cremorose] ‘‘frightening, as (in) *Your heart shall murmur in awe.*’’ (Isa. 33:18)
2. BNF hébr. 302, 33v:<sup>94</sup> דוֹטֵיָה דוֹטֵיָה dōṭē‘ah [dotee] ‘‘redoutable/fearsome’’ [part. perf.].
3. BNF hébr. 301, 95v:<sup>95</sup> וְאִמְתוּ אֵל תֵּב q̄rmwyyrwyzz [cremoiroise] ‘‘frightening, as (in) *And not let His terror frighten me.*’’ (Job 9:34)
4. Parma, Palatina 2780, 43r: אֵימָה וִירָאָה קרִימורוֹזָא q̄rēmūrōzā [cremorose] ‘‘frightning, an expression for awe and fear’’.
5. Parma, Palatina 2924, 36v: קרִימורוֹזָא כִּי יִרְאֶה אֵימָה לְ יִרְאָה q̄rōmārōzā [cremorose] ‘‘frightning, as [the bibl. word] ‘awe / terror’,<sup>96</sup> an expression for fear.’’

Most of the glossaries translate the term אֵימָה as *cremorose* ‘‘frightening’’ (with reference to Isa. 33:18 and Job 9:34), but GlBNhébr302 gives it as *dotee* ‘‘redoutable.’’ So far, the adjective *cremorose* has only been found in the glossaries,<sup>97</sup> although in regard to the formation of the word, the term seems to be quite common. The noun *cremor* (not just *cremeur*) is found, for example, in the *Roman de Thebes* (ThebesC; ca. 1160) and in Bernard de Clairvaux’s sermons on the Song of Songs.<sup>98</sup>

We now take a brief look at the explanations given in the Bible commentaries. Rashi (ca. 1040–1105) on Cant. 6:10 interpreted the Hebrew אֵימָה בְּנִדְגָלוֹת in the sense of a heavenly army, legions of angels who allow the project of restoration to be continued and completed, and explained this as follows:

*You are beautiful, my beloved, as Tirtzah.* And the Holy One, Blessed Is He, praises her for this [saying], ‘‘You are beautiful, My beloved’’, when you are desirable to Me. So it is expounded in Sifrei ... *Awesome as bannered hosts.* Legions of angels.<sup>99</sup> I will cast your awe upon them so that they should not wage war and stop you from the work, as it is stated in Ezra (cf. Ezra 5:5).<sup>100</sup>

91 No entry in GlLeipzigBa; see Liss 2011, esp. 230–31.

92 JPS comments on the translation of the phrase אֵימָה בְּנִדְגָלוֹת with ‘‘Meaning of Heb. uncertain.’’

93 Edited in Banitt 1995–2005, vol. 3, #20737.

94 See also Lambert and Brandin 1905 (without Hebrew transliteration).

95 Edited in Kiwitt 2013, 287, nos. 885, 886.

96 Cf. Gen. 15:12; Deut. 32:25; Isa. 33:18; Job 39:20; Job 41:6 (a biblical reference is indicated by the Hebrew [בְּמִן] כְּמִן).

97 The adjective *cremos* is found in Tobler and Lommatzsch 2002, 1026, as well as in GlLeipzigBa 13075 (on Hab. 1:7).

98 Paul Verdeyen and Raffaele Fassetta, eds., *Bernard de Clairvaux. Sermons sur le Cantique*, vol. 1 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf 1996); see also Stewart Gregory, ed., *La traduction en prose française du 12<sup>e</sup> siècle des ‘sermones in cantica’ de saint Bernard* (Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi, 1994).

99 Cf. BamR 2:5; Tan 2 Bamidbar 7:71.

100 Rashi *ad loc.* יפה את רעיתי כרתצה. והקדוש ברוך הוא מקלסה על זאת יפה את רעיתי כשאת רצויה לי כך הוא. נדרש בספרי ... אימה כנדגלות חיילי מלאכים אימתך אטיל עליהם שלא להלחם ולהשביתכם מן המלאכה כמו שנאמר

Subject to further manuscript investigations, he did not add a *la'az* in this place; his understanding of this phrase was based on rabbinic sources, and he saw no need for further clarification.

In the Hebrew commentary on the Song of Songs in MS Hamburg Cod. hebr. 32, attributed to Rashbam or Pseudo-Rashbam,<sup>101</sup> the expression *אֵימָה בְּנִדְגָלוֹת* is commented on several times (possibly a sign of a multiple revisions of the text). In this context, the commentary offers two Old French translations:

*As Tirtza*: (Tirtza) is an important and beautiful city build by King Solomon. *Awe-some as bannered hosts*: אֵשְׁפָאוֹטְבֵּלָא *áspə'ōṭabla'*/*aspeontable* [*espoentable*] קוֹמֵ קוֹבֵּי *qōm qōnpayəṭī'as* [*come conpaignies*] in (Old) French.<sup>102</sup>

The term *espoentable* has been documented in the Canterbury Psalter<sup>103</sup> (first half of the twelfth century) in Ps. 64:5,<sup>104</sup> but is also well attested to in the *Fables* of Marie de France<sup>105</sup> and in the *Lancelot ou Le chevalier de la charrete* by Chrétien de Troyes<sup>106</sup> who lived in Troyes in the Champagne region. In regard to the script and spelling of *áspə'ōṭabla'*/*aspeontable* (= *espoentable*), we can state that the fact that our commentator glossed the Hebrew אֵימָה “terrible/fearful” with *aspeontable*, that is, with an ‘a’ at the beginning, does not mean that he wrote poor French. Rather, the spelling with ‘a’ is documented in Jean Priorat, *Li abrejance de l'ordre de chevalerie* (JPrioratR) and in one of the prose versions of *La Vision de Tondale* (VisTondpF), both dating to the second half of the thirteenth century in the Franche-Comté region. From here, we can assume that the French-speaking, -reading, and -writing Jewish intellectuals were up to date in regard to French literature and used the script from the vernacular texts with which they were familiar. Moreover, the

---

אימה שיש אימה ממנה לכל רואיה, כמו איום ונורא כנדגלות כמחנות בעלות) בעזרא (הדגלים) interpreted *בְּנִדְגָלוֹת* as deriving from the root דגל.

101 On the question of the attribution of this commentary to Rashbam, see Sara Japhet, *The Commentary of Rabbi Samuel ben Meir (Rashbam) on the Song of Songs* (Heb.) (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 2008), esp. 9–51; Liss 2007b, esp. 1–8 (open access: <http://www.medieval-jewish-studies.org/journal.html>; accessed 03/2022); Barry D. Walfish, “An Annotated Bibliography of Medieval Jewish Commentaries on the Song of Songs”, in *The Bible in the Light of Its Interpreters: Sarah Kamin Memorial Volume*, ed. Sara Japhet (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1994), 518–71, esp. 540–42. Many observations lead us to think that some of the commentaries attributed to Rashbam, in particular, the Torah commentary, were composed rather by one of his successors (*mi-devei* Rashbam) than by Rashbam himself (see recently Hanna Liss, “Scepticism, Critique, and the Art of Writing: Preliminary Considerations on the Question of Textual Authority in Medieval Peshat Exegesis”, in *Yearbook of the Maimonides Centre for Advanced Studies*, ed. Bill Rebigier (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter 2018), 15–45, esp. 15–26 (open access: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110577686-003>; accessed 03/2022)).

102 בתרצה. עיר חשובה ויפה שבנה שלמה המלך. ואימה כנדגלות אֵשְׁפָאוֹטְבֵּלָא קוֹמֵ קוֹבֵּי *qōm qōnpayəṭī'as* Hamburg State and University Library Carl von Ossietzky, Cod. hebr. 32, fol. 83r–83v (go there for image: <https://iip.corpusmasoreticum.de/iiif/Sub.Hamburg.Cod.Hebr.32/Fol.%20083v.tif/2006,647,1408,582/full/0/default.jpg>; Moritz Steinschneider, *Catalog der hebräischen Handschriften in der Stadtbibliothek zu Hamburg und der sich anschliessenden in anderen Sprachen* (Hamburg: Meissner, 1878), 8–9 (<https://t1p.de/ngfe>).

103 PsCambrM/Psautier de Cambridge/Canterbury Psalter (MS Paris BNF Lat. 8846): <https://t1p.de/fh34w>, Canterbury ca. 1200.

104 *O espoentable, en justise, oi nus [...]* (note that in BHS the counting is Ps. 65:6: תַּעֲנֵנוּ (נוראות בְּצִדְקַת תַּעֲנֵנוּ)). PsCambrM translates the Hebrew *nora'ot* “awesome deeds” as *espoentable*.

105 Marie de France, *Adaptation d'une compilation anglaise de fables d'Ésope* (MarieFabW; ca. 1180).

106 According to the DEAF-Siglum LancPrK.

glosses reveal the geographical environment in which the manuscript was written and thus can help clarify their geocultural backgrounds.<sup>107</sup>

In the (Pseudo-)Rashbam commentary, the term *aspeontable* which can refer to the city of Tirtza and/or to the beloved who is like Tirtza, as in Cant. 6:4, “You are beautiful, my beloved, as Tirtzah, awesome as bannered hosts”, is commented on several times. Furthermore, the French gloss on the expression *ואיזמה כנדגלות* (added later?) concludes the *peshat* explanations of the verse and is not explicitly assigned to either the first or the second half of the verse’s line. There is, however, a similar though more explicit explanation on this verse in an anonymous thirteenth-century Hebrew commentary on the Song of Songs, which clearly says that the beloved is not only beautiful, but also ready to frighten anyone who tries to get too close to her:

*Fearsome as an army with banners.* She instills fear in people. Lest you might say that because she is so beautiful everyone has his hands on her, therefore he said that she instills fear in people and they are afraid to touch her as they are afraid to stretch out a hand in the towns which are surrounded by its armies with their banners in their hands.<sup>108</sup>

It is remarkable that this explanation comes very close to the translation in the so-called *Bible de Paris ad loc.*, which also has the adjective *espoantable* in this context:

My beloved, you are beautiful and sweet, and you are beautiful as Jerusalem and terrifying as a cohort of armed men, ready to fight.<sup>109</sup>

The *Bible de Paris* adheres to the literal sense: the beloved is not only beautiful but also terrifying because she wants to fight (defend herself?).<sup>110</sup> In this, the translation in the *Bible de Paris* represents a kind of missing link between the two above-mentioned Hebrew commentaries, both of which clearly show that their authors had long since entered the realms of coeval French literature.

The expression *כנדגלות* (“as bannered hosts”) is translated consistently in both our Hebrew commentaries and in the glossaries with the French expression *come compaignies/come*

107 Irina Wandrey, ed., *Ausstellungskatalog Tora – Talmud – Siddur* (Hamburg: Universität Hamburg, SFB 950, 2014), 60 (open access: [https://www.manuscript-cultures.uni-hamburg.de/MC/manuscript\\_cultures\\_no\\_6.pdf](https://www.manuscript-cultures.uni-hamburg.de/MC/manuscript_cultures_no_6.pdf); accessed 3/2022) locates the manuscript (based on Malachi Beit-Arié’s research) in the “Ashkenazi region”, sometime after 1300, which can now be located and dated more precisely to the Champagne, Lorraine, or Franche-Comté not earlier than 1250.

108 איזמה כנדגלות. אימתה מוטלת על הבריות. שלא תאמר מאחר שהיא יפה כל כך ידי הכל ממשמשות בה. לכן אמי' 108 שאימתה מוטלת על הבריות ונפחדים לגעת בה כמו שיראים להושיט יד בעירות שחילותיה מקיפין אותה ודגליהם בידיהם, in Sara Japhet and Barry D. Walfish, eds., *The Way of Lovers: The Oxford Anonymous Commentary on the Song of Songs (Bodleian Library, MS Opp. 625). An Edition of the Hebrew Text, with English Translation and Introduction* (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 210.

109 Bern Burgerbibliothek 28, fol. 24v: Cant. 6 [first sentence missing] (2) Mes amis est descenduz en son cortill au fruit des aromaz que il soit iluec peuz es cortils et cueille les liz. (3) Je sui a mon ami et il a mi quar il est peuz entre les lis. (4) M'amie, tu es bele et soeve et es bele come Jherusalem et espoantable come eschiele de genz armez por combatre.

110 *Espoantable* is an adjective singular and, thus, can only refer to the beloved.

*compagnons*.<sup>111</sup> *Compaignie* (“society/group”) is very well documented in twelfth- and thirteenth-century literature, in particular in non-military contexts where it denotes “comradeship/society.” The meaning of “escort/security” can be found in the *Raoul de Cambrai* (RCambrM, end of the twelfth century),<sup>112</sup> Gaimar’s *Estoire des Engleis, chronique d’Angleterre* (GaimarB; 1139), and in the Anglo-Norman *Voyage de Saint Brendan* (BrendanPr<sup>1</sup>W; second half of the twelfth century).

Unlike the glossaries, the (Pseudo-)Rashbam commentary in MS Hamburg Cod. hebr. 32 does not refer to any biblical parallel, but simply presents the French translation as if to indicate that the target audience was familiar with the literary context of the *le’azim*. In particular, the *la’az* expression “*come compaignies*” conveys a rejection of any allegorical reading of the poems in the Song of Songs. In this case, both the commentary and the Hebrew-French glossaries suggest that the Jewish intellectuals picked up motifs and issues from the vernacular literature and applied them to the biblical works. Thus the Old French *le’azim* point to a thorough knowledge – both oral and written – of the nascent Old French literary tradition, which engendered the attempt to develop a literary-aesthetic understanding of the Hebrew Bible.

## 4 Conclusion and Outlook

The translation activity of the Jews in the Middle Ages has been associated primarily with their participation in the scientific discourse in the Muslim lands and translations from Arabic into Hebrew.<sup>113</sup> For Steinschneider, the Jewish translations from Arabic into Hebrew not only show the level of their education, but also suggest their homelessness in exile.<sup>114</sup> However, in regard to the *le’azim* in general and the Hebrew-French glossaries in particular, this interpretation does not match the social-historical situation of the Jews in medieval France, as that population spoke Old French as their mother tongue, and the glossaries reflect translations from Hebrew phrases into Old French. However, the respective target audiences of the glossaries and the interpreters enriching their commentaries with

111 MS Hamburg Cod. hebr. 32: קוֹם קוֹמֵי קוֹמֵי קוֹמֵי *qōm qōnpayyāṭī’ās* (see also the edition in Japhet, *Rabbi Samuel ben Meir (Rashbam) on the Song of Songs*, 204). There is a slightly different transliteration in Kiwitt 2013, 459). The spelling of *qōnpayyāṭī’ās* remains difficult; for an image see above note 102. Leipzig UB 1099: קוֹמֵי קוֹמֵי קוֹמֵי קוֹמֵי *qōmḡōnpānē’ōh* (see also GLeipzigBa #20738); GIParmePalD, fol. 36v: קוֹמֵי קוֹמֵי קוֹמֵי קוֹמֵי *qōmā’ qōnpānuś* “*come compagnons*”; GIBNhébr301, fol. 95v: קוֹמֵי קוֹמֵי קוֹמֵי קוֹמֵי *qwn qwnp’ny’ś* “*con* (Kiwitt reads “*come*” für *qwm*) *compagnies*.”

112 *Raoul de Cambrai* (ed. Paul Meyer, *Raoul de Cambrai. Chanson de geste* (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1882) belongs to the *chansons de geste*, which criticized fiefdom and feudal legislation.

113 See Moritz Steinschneider, *Die hebraeischen Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters und die Juden als Dolmetscher. Ein Beitrag zur Literaturgeschichte des Mittelalters, meist nach handschriftlichen Quellen* (Berlin: Kommissionsverlag des Bibliographischen Bureaus, 1893); see also Otfried Fraise, *Moses Ibn Tibbons Kommentar zum Hohelied und sein poetologisch-philosophisches Programm. Synoptische Edition, Übersetzung und Analyse* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2004).

114 “Was hat die Juden vorzugsweise zum Volke der Sprachen gemacht? Eine Nation ohne Land, aber mit einer heiligen Schrift ... wird allmähig zur Übersetzung gedrängt ...” (Steinschneider 1893, XV).

*le'azim* might have been different: Rashbam/(Pseudo-)Rashbam, for instance, proposed a two-pronged approach to the study of Torah, each path requiring its own exegetical methodology. He presented Rashi's commentary as the gateway to religious instruction, that is, the study of the Torah as a "sacred text." He noted that the "erudite reader" like himself, who was fascinated by the new literary (trans)-formation of courtly literature, contended that the literary quality of the Bible as the *matière des Hebreux* was at least as good as that of the *matière de Bretagne*.<sup>115</sup> Rashbam's interest in the Bible was directed toward its narrative quality more than toward its theological import.

In contrast, in composing their comprehensive volumes, the glossators might have been motivated by the apparent need to guarantee a proper (Jewish!) understanding of the Hebrew Bible for a Jewish population whose vernacular was Old French. These French-speaking Jews might have turned to a French Vulgate rather than to the Hebrew text. In that, the Bible glossaries stood at the center of a Jewish identity discourse, as was the case later in the nineteenth century when German Jewish intellectuals likewise insisted on a German-Jewish translation of the Bible.<sup>116</sup>

In any case, the glossaries as well as the *Bible de Paris* and other French vernacular Bible translations are exceptional witnesses to a simultaneously developing (Jewish and Christian) French (Bible) reading culture in western Europe between the twelfth and fourteenth centuries, a relationship that has never been subject to scholarly investigation. They are basic texts for research into the links between Jewish intellectual history and the non-Jewish environment, and their treatment will juxtapose the historical depiction of painful antagonism in Christian-Jewish relationships with an image of a culturally fruitful interdependence between French vernacular literature and an erudite Jewish society, which has so far been hardly recognized and barely appreciated.

---

115 Cf. esp. Liss 2007b; idem 2011 esp. 186–93.

116 See e.g. Abigail Gillman, *A History of German Jewish Bible Translation* (Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press, 2018).

## 5 Bibliography

- Arnold, Rafael. 2014. Review of *Les gloses françaises du glossaire biblique B.N. hébr. 301* by Marc Kiwitt and *Varietätenlinguistische Untersuchungen zum Judenfranzösischen* by Alexandra B. Edzard. *PaRDeS* 20 (2014): 155–58, 167–71.
- . 2018. “Judeo-Romance Varieties”, in *Language Contact in the Mediterranean in the Middle Ages and in Early Modern Times (with Special Focus on Loanword Lexicography)*, ed. Francesco Crifò et al. (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2018), 321–57.
- Aslanov, Cyril. 2001. *Le provençal des juifs et l’hébreu en Provence, Le dictionnaire Šaršot ha-kesef de Joseph Caspi*. Paris: Peeters, 2001.
- . 2015. “The Lament on the Martyrs of Troyes as a Monument of Judeo-French on the Verge of the Expulsions”, in *Jews and Christians in Thirteenth-Century France*, ed. Elisheva Baumgarten and Judah D. Galinsky (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 217–33.
- Bacher, Wilhelm. 1905. Review of *Glossaire hébreu-français du XIIIe siècle*, by Mayer Lambert and Louis Brandin. *Jewish Quarterly Review* 17 (1905): 800–807.
- Banitt, Menahem. 1963. “Une langue fantôme: le judéo-français.” *Revue de linguistique romane* 27 (1963): 245–94.
- . 1967. “L’étude des glossaires bibliques des juifs de France au Moyen Âge: Méthode et application.” *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities* 2, no. 10 (1967): 188–210, 192.
- , ed. 1972. *Le Glossaire de Bâle*. 2 vols. Jerusalem: Académie des sciences et des lettres d’Israël, 1972.
- . 1981. “Le renouvellement lexical de la Version Vulgate des juifs de France au Moyen Âge dans le Glossaire de Leipzig.” *Romania* 102 (1981): 433–55.
- . 1985a. *Rashi. Interpreter of the Biblical Letter*. Tel Aviv: Chaim Rosenberg School of Jewish Studies, 1985.
- . 1985b. “Appendix I: The Glosses in MS. Valmadonna I”, in *The Only Dated Medieval Hebrew Manuscript Written in England (1189 CE) and the Problem of Pre-Expulsion Anglo-Hebrew Manuscripts*, ed. Malachi Beit-Arié (London: Valmadonna Trust Library, 1985), 29–31.
- . 1988. “Exegesis or Metaphrasis”, in *Creative Biblical Exegesis. Christian and Jewish Hermeneutics Through the Centuries*, ed. Benjamin Uffenheimer and Henning Graf Reventlow (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), 13–29.
- . 1997. “Une vue d’ensemble sur les glossaires bibliques juifs de France au Moyen Âge”, in *Rashi et la culture juive en France du Nord au moyen âge*, ed. Gilbert Dahan et al. (Paris/Louvain: Peeters, 1997), 191–201.
- , 1995–2005. ed. *Le Glossaire de Leipzig*. 4 vols. Jerusalem: Académie des sciences et des lettres d’Israël, 1995–2005.
- Berger, Samuel. 1884. *La Bible française au Moyen Âge. Étude sur les plus anciennes versions de la Bible écrites en prose de la langue d’oïl*. Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1884.



- Berliner, Abraham. 1905. *Die altfranzösischen Ausdrücke im Pentateuch-Commentar Raschi's*. Krakau: Fischer, 1905.
- Bos, Gerrit. 2015. "Arabic-Romance Medico-Botanical Glossaries in Hebrew Manuscripts from the Iberian Peninsula and Italy." *Aleph* 15 (2015): 9–61.
- . 2011–2018. *Novel Medical and General Hebrew Terminology*. 4 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011–2018.
- Bos, Gerrit, and Guido Mensching. 2014. "A Medico-Botanical Glossary in Hebrew Characters of Italian Origin." *Iberia Judaica* 6 (2014): 11–21.
- Bos, Gerrit, and Julia Zwink, eds. 2010. *Berakhayah Ben Natronai ha-Nakdan: Sefer Koah ha-Avanim (On the Virtue of the Stones)*. Hebrew Text and English Translation. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010.
- Bos, Gerrit et al. 2009. "A Late Medieval Hebrew-French Glossary of Biblical Animal Names." *Romance Philology* 63 (2009): 71–94.
- Boynton, Susan. 1997. "Glossed Hymns in Eleventh-Century Continental Hymnaries". PhD diss., Brandeis University, 1997.
- Catane, Mochè, ed. 1988. *Recueil des gloses. Les gloses françaises dans les commentaires talmudique de Rachi d'après l'ouvrage d'Arsène Darmesteter et D. S. Blondheim*. Jerusalem: Gitler, 1988.
- . 2013. "L'exégèse de la Bible et l'usage du vernaculaire (XIIe-XIIIe siècles)." *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 93 (2013): 181–201.
- . 2017. *Les juifs en France médiévale. Dix études*. Paris: Cerf Patrimoines, 2017.
- Darmesteter, Arsène, ed. 1909. *Les gloses fr. de Raschi dans la Bible, accompagnées de notes par L. Brandin, et préc. d'une intr. par J. Weill*. Paris: Durlacher, 1909.
- . 1907/1908. "Les gloses françaises de Raschi dans la Bible." *Revue des études juives* 53 (1907), 161–93; 54 (1907), 1–34, 205–35; 55 (1908), 72–83; 56 (1908), 70–98.
- Darmesteter, Arsène, and David S. Blondheim, 1929/1937. eds. *Les gloses françaises dans les commentaires talmudiques de Raschi*. 2 vols. (Paris: Champion, 1929/1937)
- De Visscher, Eva. 2014. *Reading the Rabbis. Christian Hebraism in the Works of Herbert of Bosham*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2014.
- Del Barco, Javier. 2015. *The Late Medieval Hebrew Book in the Western Mediterranean. Hebrew Manuscripts and Incunabula in Context*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2015.
- Einbinder, Susan L. 2015. "Exegesis and Romance: Revisiting the Old French Translation of Kallir", in *Jews and Christians in Thirteenth-Century France*, ed. Elisheva Baumgarten and Judah D. Galinsky (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 235–47.
- Emanuel, Simcha, ed. 1995. *Newly Discovered Geonic Responsa and Writings of Early Provençal Sages* (Heb.). Jerusalem: Ofeq Institute, 1995.
- , ed. 2012. *Responsa of Rabbi Meir of Rothenburg and His Colleagues* (Heb.). 2 vols. Jerusalem: The World Union of Jewish Studies, 2012.
- Fischer, Bonifatius. 1975. "Zur Überlieferung altlateinischer Bibeltexte im Mittelalter." *Nederlands archief voor kerkgeschiedenis* 56 (1975): 19–34.
- Fraisse, Ottfried. 2014. *Ignác Goldzihers monotheistische Wissenschaft. Zur Historisierung des Islam*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014.

- , ed. 2004. *Moses Ibn Tibbons Kommentar zum Hohelied und sein poetologisch-philosophisches Programm. Synoptische Edition, Übersetzung und Analyse*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2004.
- Fudeman, Kirsten A. 2006. “The Old French Glosses in Joseph Kara’s Isaiah Commentary.” *Revue des études juives* 165 (2006): 147–77.
- . 2008. “Restoring a Vernacular Jewish Voice: The Old French Elegy of Troyes.” *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 15 (2008): 190–221.
- . 2009. “Etymology, Gloss, and Pešat with Special Reference to the Hebrew French Glossary of Cod. Parm. 2342.” *Materia Giudaica* 14 (2009): 387–406.
- . 2010. *Vernacular Voices. Language and Identity in Medieval French Jewish Communities*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.
- Gillman, Abigail. 2018. *A History of German Jewish Bible Translation* (Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press: 2018).
- Gregory, Stewart, ed. 1994. *La traduction en prose française du 12<sup>e</sup> siècle des “sermones in cantica” de saint Bernard*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi, 1994.
- Hollender, Elisabeth. 2005. *Clavis Commentariorum of Hebrew Liturgical Poetry in Manuscript*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2005.
- . 2008. *Piyyut Commentary in Medieval Ashkenaz*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008.
- Japhet, Sara, ed. 2000. *The Commentary of Rabbi Samuel Ben Meir (Rashbam) on the Book of Job* (Heb.). Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2000.
- , ed. 2008. *The Commentary of Rabbi Samuel ben Meir (Rashbam) on the Song of Songs* (Heb.). Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 2008.
- Japhet, Sara, and Barry D. Walfish, eds. 2017. *The Way of Lovers: The Oxford Anonymous Commentary on the Song of Songs (Bodleian Library, MS Opp. 625). An Edition of the Hebrew Text, with English Translation and Introduction*. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Kiwitt, Marc, ed. 2001. *Der altfranzösische Fiebertraktat Fevres. Teiledition und sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung*. Würzburg: Königshausen und Neumann, 2001.
- . 2008. “Les glossaires bibliques hébraïco-français et le transfert du savoir profane”, in *Transfert des savoirs au Moyen Âge—Wissenstransfer im Mittelalter. Actes de l’Atelier franco-allemand, Heidelberg, 15–18 janvier 2008*, ed. Stephen Dörr and Raymund Wilhelm (Heidelberg: Winter, 2008), 65–80.
- . 2012a. “Hébreu, français et ‘judéo-français’ dans les commentaires bibliques des paštanim”, in *Langue de l’autre, langue de l’auteur. Affirmation d’une identité linguistique et littéraire au XIII<sup>e</sup> et XVI<sup>e</sup> siècles*, ed. Marie-Sophie Masse and Anne P. Pouey-Mounou (Paris: Droz, 2012), 137–54.
- . 2012b. “Le problème de la variance et l’édition des textes en ancien français rédigés en caractères hébreux”, in *Le texte médiéval. De la variante à la recréation*, ed. Cécile Le Cornec-Rochelois et al. (Paris: PUPS, 2012), 101–12.
- . 2012c. “Un fragment inédit d’un glossaire biblique hébreu-français.” In *Ki bien voldreit raisun entendre. Mélanges en l’honneur du 70<sup>e</sup> anniversaire de Frankwalt Möhren*, ed. Stephen Dörr and Thomas Städtler (Straßburg: Éditions de Linguistique et de Philologie, 2012c), 127–46.

- , 2013. ed. *Les gloses françaises du glossaire biblique B.N. hébr. 301. Édition critique partielle et étude linguistique*. Heidelberg: Winter, 2013.
- . 2014. “The Problem of Judeo-French: Between Language and Cultural Dynamics.” *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 226 (2014): 25–56.
- Kiwitt, Marc, and Stephen Dörr. 2016. “Judeo-French”, in *Handbook of Jewish Languages*, ed. Lily Kahn and Aaron D. Rubin (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2016), 138–77.
- Koch, Peter. 1997. “Diskurstraditionen: zu ihrem sprachtheoretischen Status und ihrer Dynamik,” in *Gattungen mittelalterlicher Schriftlichkeit*, ed. Barbara Frank et al. (Tübingen: Narr, 1997), 43–79.
- Kogel, Judith. 2015. “*Le’azim* in David Kimhi’s *Sefer ha-shorashim*”, in *The Late Medieval Hebrew Book in the Western Mediterranean. Hebrew Manuscripts and Incunabula in Context*, ed. Javier del Barco (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 182–200.
- Kogel, Judith, and Patricia Stirnemann. 2020. “A Portrait of Abraham Ibn Ezra (Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal MS 1186)”, in *Illuminating the Middle Ages: Tributes to Prof. John Lowden from His Students, Friends and Colleagues*, ed. Laura Cleaver et al. (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2020), 157–63.
- Lambert, Mayer, and Louis Brandin, eds. 1905. *Glossaire hébreu-français du XIIIe siècle: Recueil de mots hébreux bibliques avec traduction française. Manuscrit de la Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds hébreu no 302*. Paris: E. Leroux, 1905.
- Le Saux, Françoise H. M. 2005. *A Companion to Wace*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2005.
- Levy, Raphael. 1964. *Trésor de la langue des juifs français au Moyen Âge*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1964.
- Liss, Hanna. 2007a. “Peshat-Auslegung und Erzähltheorie am Beispiel Raschbams”, in *Raschi und sein Erbe. Internationale Tagung der Hochschule für Jüdische Studien mit der Stadt Worms*, ed. Hanna Liss and Daniel Krochmalnik (Heidelberg: Winter, 2007a), 101–24.
- . 2007b. “The Commentary on the Song of Songs Attributed to R. Samuel ben Meïr (Rashbam).” *Medieval Jewish Studies online* (2007b): 1–27 (online: <http://www.medieval-jewish-studies.org/journal.html>; accessed 03/2022).
- . 2009. “Kommentieren als Erzählen: Narrativität und Literarizität im Torakommentar des Rashbam.” *Frankfurter Judaistische Beiträge* 34/35 (2009): 91–122.
- . 2011. *Creating Fictional Worlds. Peshat-Exegesis and Narrativity in Rashbam’s Commentary on the Torah*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2011.
- . 2017. “A Pentateuch to Read in? The Secrets of the Regensburg Pentateuch”, in *Jewish Manuscript Cultures. New Perspectives*, ed. Irina Wandrey (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2017), 89–128 (online: <https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/9783110546422/html>; accessed 3/2022).
- . 2018. “Scepticism, Critique, and the Art of Writing: Preliminary Considerations on the Question of Textual Authority in Medieval Peshat Exegesis”, in *Yearbook of the Maimonides Centre for Advanced Studies*, ed. Bill Rebigier (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter 2018), 15–26 (online: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110577686-003>; accessed 03/2022).
- . 2020. *Jüdische Bibelauslegung*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.

- Liss, Hanna, and Kay J. Petzold. 2017. "Die Erforschung der westeuropäischen Bibeltexttradition als Aufgabe der Jüdischen Studien", in *Judaistik im Wandel. Ein halbes Jahrhundert Forschung und Lehre über das Judentum in Deutschland*, ed. Andreas Lehnardt (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2017), 189–210.
- Mason, Eugene, trans. 1962. *Arthurian Chronicles: Roman de Brut by Wace*. London: Dent, 1962.
- Mensching, Guido. 2009. "Listes de synonymes hébraïques-occitans du domaine médico-botanique au Moyen Âge", in *La voix occitane. Actes du VIIIe Congrès Internationale d'Études Occitanes*, ed. Guy Latry. Vol. 1 (Bordeaux: Presses Universitaires de Bordeaux, 2009), 509–26.
- Mensching, Guido, and Gerrit Bos. 2011. "Une liste de synonymes médico-botaniques en caractères hébraïques avec des éléments occitans et catalans", in *L'Occitanie invitée de l'Euregio. Liège 1981–Aix-la-Chapelle 2008: Bilan et perspectives*, ed. Angelica Rieger. Vol. 1 (Aachen: Shaker, 2011), 225–38.
- Mensching, Guido, Maria S. Corradini, and Blanca Perriñán. 2004. "Per la terminologia medico-botanica occitana nei testi ebraici: le liste di sinonimi di Shem Tov Ben Isaac di Tortosa", in *Atti del convegno internazionale, Pisa 7–8 novembre 2003: Giornate di studio di lessicografia romanza* (Pisa: ETS, 2004), 93–108.
- Mensching, Guido, and Dorothea Köhler. 2013. "Romanische Fachterminologie in mittelalterlichen medizinisch-botanischen Glossaren und Synonymenlisten in hebräischer Schrift", in *Fachsprache(n) in der Romania. Entwicklung, Verwendung, Übersetzung*, ed. Laura Sergo, Ursula Wienen, and Vahram Atayan (Berlin: Frank & Timme, 2013), 61–82.
- Mensching, Guido, and Julia Zwink. 2014. "L'ancien occitan en tant que langage scientifique de la médecine. Termes vernaculaires dans la traduction hébraïque du *Zad al-musafir wa-qut al-hadir* (XIIIe)", in *Los que fan viure e tresluir l'occitan. Actes du Xe congrès de l'AIEO, Béziers, 12–19 juin 2011*, ed. Carmen Alén Garabato, Claire Torreilles, and Marie-Jeanne Verny (Limoges: Lambert-Lucas, 2014), 226–36.
- Meyer, Paul. 1882. *Raoul de Cambrai. Chanson de geste*. Paris: Firmin Didot, 1882.
- . 1888. "Compte-Rendu de Berger 1884." *Romania* 17 (1888): 121–41.
- Möhren, Frankwalt. 1989. "Points noirs dans la lexicographie des langues romanes: domaine historique", in *Actes du XVIIIe Congrès international de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes*, ed. Dieter Kremer. Vol. 4 (Tübingen: Niemeyer 1989), 33–38.
- Oesterreicher, Wulf. 2001. "Historizität—Sprachvariation, Sprachverschiedenheit, Sprachwandel", in *Language Typology and Language Universals*, ed. Martin Haspelmath et al. Vol. 2 (Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2001), 1554–95.
- Olszowy-Schlanger, Judith. 2001. "The Knowledge and Practice of Hebrew Grammar Among Christian Scholars in Pre-Expulsion England: The Evidence of 'Bilingual' Hebrew-Latin Manuscripts", in *Hebrew Scholarship and the Medieval World*, ed. Nicholas R. M. de Lange (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 107–28.
- . 2003. *Les manuscrits hébreux dans l'Angleterre médiévale. Étude historique et paléographique*. Paris: Peeters, 2003.

- , ed. 2008. *Dictionnaire hébreu-latin-français de la Bible hébraïque de l'Abbaye de Ramsey (XIII. s.)*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2008.
- . 2014. "Binding Accounts: A Leger of a Jewish Pawn Broker from 14th Century Southern France (MS Krakow, BJ PRZYB/163/92)", in *Books Within Books. New Discoveries in Old Book Bindings*, ed. Andreas Lehnardt and Judith Olszowy-Schlanger (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2014), 97–147.
- Petzold, Kay J. 2019. *Masora und Exegese. Untersuchungen zur Masora und Bibeltext-überlieferung im Kommentar des R. Schlomo ben Yitzchaq (Raschi)*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter 2019.
- Pflaum [Peri], Heinz [Hiram]. 1933. "Deux hymnes judéo-français du Moyen Âge." *Romania* 59 (1933): 389–422.
- Poerck, Guy de. 1962. *Notions de grammaire historique du français et exercices philologiques*. 2 vols. Gent: Story, 1962.
- Queyreuil, Michel. 1988. *La Bible française du XIIIe siècle. Edition critique de la Genèse*. Geneva: Droz, 1988.
- Reiner, Avraham, and Pinchas Roth, eds. 2020. *Responsa of Rabbi Isaac ben Samuel of Dampierre. A Critical Edition* (Heb.). Jerusalem: Mekize Nirdamim, 2020.
- Robson, Charles. 1969. "Vernacular Scriptures in France", in *The West from the Fathers to the Reformation. Vol. 2 of The Cambridge History of the Bible*, ed. Geoffrey Lampe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 436–52, 528–32.
- Rohde, Achim. 2005. "Der Innere Orient. Orientalismus, Antisemitismus und Geschlecht im Deutschland des 18. bis 20. Jahrhunderts." *Die Welt des Islams* 45 (2005): 370–411.
- Siskin, Harley J. 1981. "A Partial Edition of a Fourteenth Century Biblical Glossary MS Parma 2780. Includes Partial Text of the Glossary (Genesis and Exodus), Translation into English, a Commentary, and a Word List." PhD diss., Cornell University, 1981.
- Sneddon, Clive R. 1978. "A Critical Edition of the Four Gospels in the Thirteenth-Century Old French Translations of the Bible." PhD diss., Oxford University, 1978.
- . 2002. "Rewriting the Old French Bible: The New Testament and Evolving Reader Expectations in the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries", in *Interpreting the History of French. A Festschrift for Peter Rickard on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday*, ed. Rodney Sampson and Wendy Ayres-Bennett (Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi, 2002), 35–59.
- Staller, Franz. 2018. "Die Innsbrucker Fragmente eines hebräisch-altfranzösischen Bibelglossars", in *700 Jahre jüdische Präsenz in Tirol. Geschichte der Fragmente, Fragmente der Geschichte*, ed. Ursula Schattner-Rieser and Josef M. Oesch (Innsbruck: innsbruck university press, 2018), 149–68.
- . 2019. *Kritische Edition und sprachhistorische Analyse der Innsbrucker Fragmente eines hebräisch-altfranzösischen Bibelglossars (ULB Tirol, Frg. B 9)*. Innsbruck: Studia Verlag, 2019.

- Steinschneider, Moritz. 1878. *Catalog der hebräischen Handschriften in der Stadtbibliothek zu Hamburg und der sich anschliessenden in anderen Sprachen*. Hamburg: Meissner, 1878.
- . 1893. *Die hebraeischen Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters und die Juden als Dolmetscher. Ein Beitrag zur Literaturgeschichte des Mittelalters, meist nach handschriftlichen Quellen*. Berlin: Kommissionsverlag des Bibliographischen Bureaus, 1893.
- Tobler, Adolf, and Erhard Lommatzsch, eds. 2002. *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch. Elektronische Ausgabe redaktionell bearbeitet von Peter Blumenthal und Achim Stein*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2002.
- Touitou, Elazar. 1982. “Peshat̄ and Apologetics in the Rashbam’s Commentary on the Biblical Stories of Moses (Heb.)” *Tarbiz* 56 (1982): 227–38.
- . 2005. *Exegesis in Perpetual Motion. Studies in the Pentateuchal Commentary of Rabbi Samuel Ben Meir* (Heb.). 2nd ed. Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 2005.
- Urbach, Ephraim E. 1986. *The Tosaphists. Their History, Writings and Methods* (Heb.). 4th ed. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1986.
- Verdeyen, Paul and Raffaele Fassetta, eds. 1996. *Sermons 1–15. Bernard de Clairvaux. Sermons sur le Cantique*. Vol. 1 of *Sermons 1–15* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf 1996).
- Walfish, Barry D. 1994. “An Annotated Bibliography of Medieval Jewish Commentaries on the Song of Songs”, in *The Bible in the Light of Its Interpreters: Sarah Kamin Memorial Volume*, ed. Sara Japhet (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1994), 518–571.
- Wandrey, Irina ed. 2014. *Ausstellungskatalog Tora–Talmud–Siddur*. Hamburg: Universität Hamburg, SFB 950, 2014 (online: [https://www.manuscript-cultures.uni-hamburg.de/MC/manuscript\\_cultures\\_no\\_6.pdf](https://www.manuscript-cultures.uni-hamburg.de/MC/manuscript_cultures_no_6.pdf); accessed 03/2022).
- Wilhelm, Raymund, 2015. “Diskurstraditionen und einzelsprachliche Traditionen,” in *Diskurse, Texte, Traditionen. Modelle und Fachkulturen in der Diskussion*, ed. Franz Lebsanft and Angela Schrott (Göttingen/Bonn: V&R unipress/Bonn University Press, 2015), 63–78.
- Zwink, Julia. 2006. “Étude lexicographique du traité anonyme Fevres: Une compilation médicale en ancien français, écrite en caractères hébraïques.” *Panace@7* (2006): 250–60.
- . 2011. “Ausbau der medizinischen Fachsprache im Französischen. Lateinische versus altfranzösische Termini in einem mittelalterlichen Fiebertraktat in hebräischer Graphie”, in *Fachsprache(n) in der Romania. Entwicklung, Verwendung, Übersetzung. Kongressakten der gleichnamigen Sektion des XXXII. Romanistentags (Berlin 2011)*, ed. Laura Sergo, Ursula Wienen, and Vahram Atayan (Berlin: Frank & Timme, 2013), 183–207.
- . 2017. *Altfranzösisch in hebräischer Graphie. Teiledition und Analyse des Medizintraktats “Fevres”*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2017.