An Old Slavic Gloss in Rashi's Bible Commentary? שניר Revisited[1]

Judith Olszowy-Schlanger

The contribution of medieval Jewish sources to our knowledge of early Western-Slavic lexicology, and more particularly of early Czech is a well documented but still little studied fact. The commentary on liturgical poetry *Arugat ha-Bosem* by Abraham ben Azriel of Bohemia (written in the 1230s, and preserved in late-13th and 14th century manuscripts[2]) and the *Or Zaru'a* by Isaac ben Moses of Vienna (written in the 1240, and preserved in late-13th century manuscripts[3]) contain numerous vernacular glosses in a Slavic language, which are referred to in the text as לשון כנען, "the Language of Canaan". The use of Slavic words in these important texts related to the French and German rabbinic schools has been rightly interpreted as evidence of a high level of rabbinic learning among Bohemian Jews as well as of their fluent use of Czech and its application to exegesis.[4]

---

[1] I would like to thank the organisers of the conference on Canaanic Languages, and Dr. Robert Dittmann in particular, for inviting me to the conference and for all their kind help with the bibliography of this paper.

[2] Ephraim E. Urbach (ed.), *Sefer Arugat ha-Bosem* (Jerusalem, 1939–1963). For the date of the composition, see vol. 4, 112.

[3] For the description, history, textual transmission and palaeographical dating of the two preserved manuscripts of the Or Zaru'a, see Emile G. L. Schrijver, "Some Light on the Amsterdam and London Manuscripts of Isaac ben Moses of Vienna's Or Zaru'a," *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 75.3 (1992): 53–82.

[4] For the meaning of לשון כנען in medieval Hebrew texts and the overview of discussions of this term in scholarly literature since Leopold Zunz first mentioned the problem in 1822, see especially Roman Jakobson – Morris Halle, "The Term *Canaan* in Medieval Hebrew," in *Selected Writings VI.*

The presence of Old Czech in 13th century works of scholars active in Bohemia or in manuscripts copied in this region is easy to understand: it was a common practice of medieval Jewish scholars to explain textual difficulties of the classical Hebrew and Aramaic texts through the spoken vernacular. It is far less straightforward to explain the presence of Slavic glosses in the manuscripts of the works of earlier scholars, especially when these scholars lived in Northern France. The contacts of Central and Eastern European Jews with the Western communities are well attested by the end of the 12th and throughout the 13th century.[5] In the 11th century, however, such contacts or intellectual exchanges are not well documented. One cannot, of course, rule out the possibility that some Jewish individuals from Central/ Eastern Europe did attend French yeshivot, or at least passed through the economically dynamic region of Rhine valley or Champagne famous for its international trade and fairs, but such claims are based on circumstantial evidence.[6]

Early Slavic Paths and Crossroads. Part Two: Medieval Slavic Studies, ed. S. Rudy (Berlin – New-York – Amsterdam, 1985), 858–86.

[5] In addition to the aforementioned authors, there is evidence of the presence of the Jews from Russia in England. Latin registers mention a certain Isaac of Russia in 1180–1182, see Joseph Jacobs, *The Jews of Angevin England* (London, 1893). By the mid-13th century, a grammarian Isaac of Tchernichov is quoted by Moses ben Isaac ben ha-Nessiya of England, in his dictionary Sefer ha-Shoham. He is the source of a gloss "in the language of Tiras which is Russia (Rus)", see Benjamin Klar (ed.), *The Sefer ha-Shoham (the Onyx Book) by Moses ben Isaac Hanessiah*, vol. 1 (London – Jerusalem, 1947), 142. For the medieval Christians learning Russian alphabet with examples of words written in Hebrew characters, see J. Olszowy-Schlanger, *Les manuscrits hébreux dans l'Angleterre médiévale: etude historique et paléographique* (Paris – Louvain, 2003), 37, 271–77.

[6] See for example F. Kupfer – T. Lewicki, *Źródła hebrajskie do dziejów Słowian i niektórych innych ludów środkowej i wschodniej Europy. Wyjątki z pism religijnych i prawniczych XI–XIII w.* (Wrocław – Warszawa, 1956), 89, on Radanite merchants and their travels between Western Europe and the East as a possible channel of transmission.

Such contacts have been claimed notably on the basis of the presence of Slavic glosses in the works of early French scholars: four glosses in the commentary on the Babylonian Talmud tractate Ḥullin attributed to R. Gershom ben Judah of Mainz (or Metz) and found in MS Rome, Angelica Or. 1, four glosses in the Babylonian Talmud commentary of Rashi and one alleged gloss in his commentary on the Pentateuch, or several glosses (including one complete sentence) in the Bible commentaries of Rashi's pupil Joseph Qara have been already noticed by Leopold Zunz in 1822, studied in more detail by Abraham Harkavy in 1865, and have been discussed in subsequent scholarship. The presence of the glosses in the works of these medieval authors has been usually taken for granted and explained by possible presence of students from Slavic speaking lands in the yeshivot of Champagne and Rhine region. Until recently scholarship focused on the detailed philological and linguistic analysis of these glosses, their spelling and grammatical form as well as on their attribution to a specific Slavic language, with little attention to the essential question of the manuscripts in which the glosses are found, their date and origin.[7]

It is only recently that a group of researchers in Prague has undertaken a systematic analysis of the comprehensive corpus of the medieval Slavic glosses while taking into consideration as well the manuscript transmission of the texts. Indeed, a systematic checking of the glosses in the various extant manuscripts of the same text will hopefully clarify, at least in some cases, whether the glosses belong to the early layer of the text transmission and may go back to the author, or whether they are restricted to some manuscripts and might have been introduced

---

[7] Talking about glosses found in Rashi's commentaries, Roman Jakobson, who based his studies mostly on printed editions, did consider the possibility that some of the Slavic glosses in the works of French authors may be later additions of the scribes, but maintained that other glosses must have belonged to the original text of Rashi, see Roman Jakobson, "The City of Learning," *American Hebrew* (5th December 1941): 7.

in the process of the copy of these texts in Slavic speaking countries at a later stage. Indeed, the earliest dated manuscripts of the works of these French sages containing Slavic glosses date to the 13th century, and some other can be dated on palaeographical grounds to the late 12th century.[8]

While looking forward for the conclusive results of this systematic study of the glosses on the basis of extant manuscripts to assess with more precision the Slavic glosses found in the manuscripts of the works of early French authors, I propose in this paper to deal with one case: the alleged gloss in the commentary on Deuteronomy by R. Solomon ben Isaac (Rashi) of Troyes (c. 1040–1105): the explanation of the word שניר in Deut. 3:9: שניר הוא שם שלג בלשון אשכנז ובלשון כנען, "Senir is the name of 'snow' in the language of Ashkenaz and in the language of Canaan". This explanation of Deut. 3:9 is attested in this form in the most ancient dated manuscripts of Rashi's commentaries, such as the MS Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Cod. hebr. 5 (1233) and the MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Hebr. 154 (1298), and it cannot be claimed that the mention of the 'language of Canaan' here is a later addition. However, a closer look at the text and context of this commentary argues against the possibility of considering שניר as a gloss and לשון כנען as a reference to a Slavic language. After a short presentation of scholars' opinions about the word שניר as a Slavic gloss, I will try to place

---

this particular commentary in its context and try to show what Rashi might have meant by לשון כנען, "the language of Canaan".

שניר as a Slavic gloss in scholarly literature

The interest in the term לשון כנען used by Rashi, and in particular in the word שניר goes back to L. Zunz's biography of the French commentator, published in the inaugural issue of the *Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums*.[9] Not certain whether לשון כנען designates "a language in Asia or in Germany", Zunz compared nonetheless the word שניר with the Islandic *snioor*. Twenty years later in 1841, in his review of A. Asher's *The Itinerary of Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela*, Zunz compared שניר with the Polish *śnieg*. In 1865, Abraham Harkavy explained Rashi's glosses through Russian, with some references to Czech and Polish. In 1928, M. Altbauer considers that Rashi compares שניר with Czech (drawing upon information obtained from some of the numerous students of his yeshivah), and uses the discrepancy between final *resh* in Hebrew and *ch* in Czech to discuss the phonetical changes in the latter. In 1956, F. Kupfer and T. Lewicki go even further. They argue that Rashi's version was corrupted "by Rashi himself or his first copyists": he must have had in front of him two words, one in German (that Kupfer and Lewicki reconstruct as שניה) and one in Slavic (that they reconstruct as שניג). These glosses were mistakingly copied as שניר. Amidst the discussion of the possible origin of the 'gloss', Kupfer and Lewicki forget that שניר is after all a Hebrew term from the commented verse of Deuteronomy. Similar discussion of the possible Slavic variant for "snow" which would be reflected by שניר is to be found in the recent paper by A. Kulik, who however does not omit Hebrew, but simply states that Rashi's gloss on

---

[9] Leopold Zunz, "Salomon ben Isaac, genannt Raschi," *Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 1 (1822): 277–384.

Hebrew שניר is ... שניר, and adds a discussion of how this 'gloss' fits Eastern versus Western Slavic dialects of the 11th century.[10] A different methodological approach is that of M. Banitt, who accepts that Rashi indicated the possibility of understanding the Hebrew שניר through its German or Slavic equivalent, just because he would have noticed a certain similarity of the sound. Banitt takes this example as evidence of international contacts and of Rashi's linguistic curiosity:

> "He [Rashi] then incorporated two more languages, scraps of which he picked up during his stay in Lotharingia: German (לשון אשכנז) and Czech (לשון כנען). Surely those Germanic and Czech glosses of R's [Rashi's] are in no way meant to serve as translation, since the purpose of the le'azim was the emendation of the French VV [Vulgate Version] for French speaking Jews. Neither may we accuse him of some vain ostentation. The only justification for their presence along the OF [Old French] glosses is the belief that like-sounding foreign vocables are a fundamental argument in the elucidation of the true meaning of a Biblical term".[11]

Of course, Banitt's argument based on paronomasia is methodologically far more acceptable than the philological analyses of the Hebrew Biblical word שניר as a close reflection of the pronunciation of an 11th century Slavic term.

In addition to these methodological shortcomings, I feel that the discussions on שניר did not take enough into consideration the context of the commentary itself. It is my belief that לשון כנען in this particular instance does not refer to any medieval language, and that all the above mentioned scholarly discussions are founded on a fortuitous and vague similarity of שניר [senir] with Slavic words for 'snow' (*snich, snieg*, etc.). Indeed, שניר is a Hebrew word and not the vernacular gloss, and has to be considered as such before any further discussions of its use. In

[10] Alexander Kulik, "Jews from Rus' in Medieval England," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 102.3 (2012): 400.

[11] Menahem Banitt, *Rashi, Interpreter of the Biblical Letter* ([Tel Aviv,] 1985).

the following paragraphs, I will first mention the structure of the comment on Deut. 3:9 stressing the conspicuous absence of the vernacular gloss itself, then I will discuss the meaning of Canaan in this particular commentary, and finally I will refer to a possible source of Rashi's interpretation of this Biblical verse.

The structure of the comment

The passage relevant to our topic is Rashi's interpretation of the word Senir in the verse of Deut. 3:9:

שניר הוא שם שלג בלשון אשכנז ובלשון כנען[12]

"Senir is the name of 'snow' in the language of Ashkenaz and in the language of Canaan".

We observe first of all that the structure of this comment is different from the usual way Rashi introduces foreign glosses, such as hundreds of French vernacular terms (le'azim) he used systematically to elucidate difficult Hebrew words, as well as some examples of Germanic words (e.g. I Kings 6:9; II Chronicles 16:10 or II Chronicles 31:6). The usual pattern consists of the Biblical lemma to be commented, its short explanation through another Hebrew term (sometimes with references to other sources), the vernacular gloss itself, always written in Hebrew characters, and finally (not always attested) the description of the vernacular gloss by בלעז, which normally designates French, or לשון אשכנז in the rare cases of Germanic glosses:

Biblical lemma – explanation in Hebrew – vernacular gloss – its description

---

[12] This is the reading of the MS Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Cod. hebr. 5, and the MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Hebr. 154, ad loc. Some later manuscripts (and printed editions) add a German la'az *Schnee*: שניר – הוא שלג בלשון אשכנז [שנעע] ובלשון כנען. In this paper, I follow the version of the early manuscripts.

If we accept that Deut. 3:9 is indeed commented by Rashi through a reference to a vernacular language, the structure of the commentary is irregular for Rashi:

Biblical lemma (שניר) – explanation in Hebrew (שלג) – the description of the vernacular gloss, even a double description (בלשון אשכנז ובלשון כנען)
Senir – "snow" – in the language of Canaan

One notices immediately that the vernacular, the explanatory gloss itself, is absent. Indeed, the commentary does not contain here a gloss at all, but simply says that the Biblical word Senir is not strictly speaking a Hebrew word, but a word "in the language of Ashkenaz and in the language of Canaan". The mention of the 'language of Ashkenaz' is difficult in this context, and will be left aside for the time being. However, the mention of 'the language of Canaan' can be easily understood in the context of Rashi's commentary, without any necessity to seek a foreign gloss.

The meaning of לשון כנען in Rashi's commentary on Deuteronomy 3:9

Let us begin with the Biblical verse itself. Deut. 3:9 reads as follows: צידונים יקראו לחרמון שריון והאמורי יקראו לו שניר, which can be translated as "The Sidonites call Hermon Sirion, while the Amorite(s) call it Senir". This verse as a whole has attracted Rashi's attention. He explained that the Mount Hermon was of such an importance for four different kingdoms that they each called it by a different name in its own language. Consequently four different names of Mount Hermon are attested in the Bible: שריון and חרמון, שניר are mentioned in this verse of Deut. 3:9, and one more, שיאון, in Deut. 4:48. Rashi wrote:

צידנים יקראו לחרמון וגו' – ובמקום אחר הוא אומר (דברים ד, מח) ועד הר שיאון הוא חרמון, הרי לו ארבעה שמות למה הוצרכו ליכתב, להגיד שבח ארץ ישראל, שהיו ארבעה מלכיות מתפארות בכך, זו אומרת על שמי יקרא, וזו אומרת על שמי יקרא:

> "The Sidonites call Hermon, etc. – but in another place it says (Deut. 4:48): 'And until the mount Si'on that is Hermon'. Behold, it [Hermon] has four names. Why had they to be written? To express the glory of Israel, since four kingdoms were seeking honour in it, this one saying 'it is called after me' and the other one 'it is called after me'".

Rashi then adds the specific explanation of the word שניר, describing it as the word for "snow" in the 'language of Canaan'. As we saw, the expression 'language of Canaan' was taken by the scholars as referring to a medieval geographical and linguistic area. However, the context of the Biblical account and the various rabbinic sources that Rashi might have known and used suggest that לשון כנען for this particular verse was not employed by Rashi in a contemporary geographical sense, but as a reference to ancient Biblical times. Indeed, לשון כנען is used by Rashi elsewhere as a reference to a language spoken by the Israelites' ancient neighbours and enemies in the Bible. For example, in his commentary on Num. 21:1, the term designates the language adopted by Amalek (with whom is identified 'the Canaanite King of Arad' of the verse):

יושב הנגב – זה עמלק, שנאמר (במדבר יג, כט) עמלק יושב בארץ הנגב. ושנה את לשונו לדבר בלשון כנען, כדי שיהיו ישראל מתפללים להקבה לתת כנענים בידם והם אינם כנענים, ראו ישראל לבושיהם כלבושי עמלקים ולשונם לשון כנען, אמרו נתפלל סתם, שנאמר אם נתון תתן את העם הזה בידי:

> "And he dwells in the Negev – this is Amalek, as it is said (Num. 13:29): 'Amalek dwells in the land of Negev'. And he changed his language to speak the *language of Canaan*, because the Israel were praying to the Holy Blessed Be He to deliver the Canaanites into their hands, while they (Amalekites) were not Canaanites. The Israel saw that their clothes were like the clothes of the Amalekites, but their language was the *language of Canaan*; they said: Let us pray in the same way, as it is said 'If you truly deliver this people in my hands ...' (Num. 21:2)".

208

Indeed, to come back to Deut. 3:9, the term לשון כנען, "the language of Canaan" as the origin of the word Senir in Rashi's commentary corresponds and explains the והאמורי יקראו לו שניר, "and the Amorite(s) call it Senir" of the Biblical verse. Rashi's לשון כנען in this verse is not contemporary Slavic but the language used by the ancient Amorites who, according to the Biblical genealogy in Gen. 10:15–16 are descendants of Canaan (himself one of the sons of Ham according to Gen. 10:6). The "language of Canaan" does not seem to describe a medieval gloss (which, as we saw, is absent anyway) but refers to a dialect of a Biblical tribe.

As for the meaning "snow" given by Rashi as a Hebrew equivalent, it is not based on Slavic, but simply derives from the Aramaic Targum of this verse: Senir is indeed translated in Aramaic as טור תלגא, "the mountain of snow". Rashi simply follows the Aramaic Targum תלגא when he interprets the Biblical word 'Senir' as שלג, "snow". He explains that 'Senir' means snow and is the name of the Mount Hermon in the language of the *Biblical* Canaanites, because the Bible (and the Targum) states that this is the idiom of the Amorites, who are descendants of Canaan. There is no necessity or reason to understand לשון כנען, "the language of Canaan", here as a reference to any contemporary Slavic language.

Rashi's sources for the interpretation of שניר

As we see, the scenario of Rashi's students coming to his yeshiva from remote Czech Lands and informing him that the Biblical word שניר sounds something like their native word for "snow", as appealing as it may look, is unnecessary to grasp Rashi's understanding of שניר. Moreover, Rashi is not the only one who interpreted שניר as the name of the Mount Hermon in the language of the *Biblical Canaanites*. An analogous interpretation, in a wording reminiscent of that of Rashi's, appears as well in

a medieval compilatory midrash edited by S. Buber in 1894 under the title of *Midrash Aggadah*:

צידונים יקראו לחרמון שריון. וכי מה היה צורך למשה לכתוב זה הפסוק, ולמה עשה כן, להודיע שבחה של ארץ ישראל, שכל המלכיות היו רוצים להיות להם חלק בארץ, שהרי חרמון היה הר, והיו ארבע מלכיות מושלות בו, וכל אחת ואחת שמה לו שם בפני עצמו, ואלו הן חרמון שריון שניר שיאון, ולמה נקרא שמו שניר, שהוא הר השלג, כי לעולם ימצא בו השלג, ובלשון כנען אומר לשלג שנר[13]:

"The Sidonites call Hermon Sirion. Why did Moses need to write this verse, and why he did it? To express the glory of the Land of Israel, because all the kingdoms wanted to have a share in the Land. Indeed, Hermon was a mountain and four kingdoms governed it, and each of them gave it a different name. These are: Hermon, Sirion, Senir, Si'on. And why is its name called Senir? Because it is a mountain of snow, because there is always snow on it, and in the language of Canaan snow is called שנר".

Indeed, the allusion to the fact that Senir is one of the names given to Hermon by Israel's Biblical enemies is a locus communis is Rabbinic literature, to begin with the Babylonian Talmud (BT Hullin 60b, see as well Sifrei Num. par. 161, Sifrei Deuter. Parasha 'Eqev, 37). These texts do not however give the explicit meaning of 'Senir' as "snow": its source is the Aramaic Targum. The earliest sources putting together the two interpretations: 'Senir' as a 'foreign' name for Hermon and its meaning "snow" in the "language of Canaan" is found in *Midrash Aggadah* (which, at least in its printed version, quotes the 'Canaanite' word as such, שנר) and Rashi's commentary to Deut. 3:9 (where the word is not quoted). It is possible that there is a connection between the *Midrash Aggadah* and Rashi's commentary. When S. Buber edited the *Midrash Aggadah* from the only then known manuscript of Oriental origin, he has noticed many similarities of this midrash to the Rashi's quotations from the lost works

---

[13] Salomon Buber, *Midrash Aggadah* (Wien, 1894), vol. II, parasha Devarim, ch. 3.

of Moses ha-Darshan (11th century, Narbonne).[14] He therefore attributed the *Midrash Aggadah* to this Provençal sage.[15] This attribution of *Midrash Aggadah* to Moses ha-Darshan or his school is generally accepted today.[16] Although Rashi does not say it explicitly in the commentary to Deut. 3:9, it is possible that his interpretation is influenced by this text and tradition.

To sum up, the understanding of Rashi's interpretation of 'Senir' as "snow" in "the language of Canaan" as a reference to a Slavic language, generally accepted in modern scholarship, seems to be difficult to maintain in the face of the study of its context. This reference, which would be the only reference to Slavic in Rashi's Bible commentaries, cannot be considered as Slavic on several grounds. First, the structure of the interpretation is different from the way Rashi introduces vernacular glosses: here the Biblical lemma would have to be considered to be simultaneously its own gloss. Second, Rashi's other references to כנען suggest that he refers also in the comment to Deut. 3:9 to the Biblical tribe and the historical past, rather than to his Central European contemporaries. Third, the interpretation of Senir as the name of Hermon in the language of the ancient Canaanites corresponds to the sense Rashi gave to the verse. The

---

[14] Indeed, Rashi quoted Moses ha-Darshan explicitly. Moses ha-Darshan was notably described by Rashi as the source for one of his Arabic glosses (the others were borrowed from Menaḥem Saruq and Dunash ibn Labrāṭ), see Paul Fenton, "L'arabe dans Rachi et Rachi en arabe," in *Héritages de Rachi, Edition de l'éclat*, ed. R. Sirat (Paris, 2006), 265. It has been suggested that Rashi was acquainted with the work Yesod of Moses ha-Darshan through the intermediary of Menaḥem ben Ḥelbo, see Abraham Epstein, *Moses Ha-Darschan aus Narbonne* (Vienna, 1891); Simon Eppenstein, "Recherches sur les comparaisons de l'hébreu avec l'arabe chez les exégètes du nord de la France," *Revue des Études Juives* 47 (1903): 47–56; Banitt, *Rashi, Interpreter*, 145.

[15] See Buber, *Midrash Aggadah*, p. VI.

[16] See Günter Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (Edinburgh, 2006), 310, 355.

interpretation of Senir as a name given to Hermon by a Biblical tribe is found in several early sources, including the Babylonian Talmud and Sifrei. The meaning of the name 'Senir' itself as "snow" derives from the Aramaic Targum of the verse. It must be noted that later commentators understood Rashi and his sources exactly in this way. Nahmanides wrote in his own commentary to Deut. 3:9:

צידנים יקראו לחרמון שרין – במקום אחר הוא אומר עד הר שיאון הוא חרמון, הרי לו ארבע שמות, להגיד שבח ארץ ישראל שהיו ארבע מלכיות מתפארות בכך, זה אומר על שמי יקרא וזה אומר על שמי יקרא, לשון רש"י מדברי אגדה (ספרי עקב לז). ויתכן שיהיה השבח הזה כך, אבל עיקר הכתוב לומר כי צידונים בני בכור כנען יקראו לחרמון שרין בהיותו בידם מלפנים, והאמורי היושב בה עכשיו אשר מהם ילכדו אותו ישראל יקראו לו שניר, והוא שלג בלשון כנען כמו שרש"י מעיד עליו, וכן תרגם אונקלוס:

"The Siddonites call Hermon Sirion, etc. And in another place the verse says (Deut. 4:48): 'Until the Mount Si'on which is Hermon, because it [Hermon] has four names, to express the praise of the Land of Israel, because four kingdoms were taking pride in it, one saying 'it was called after me', and the other saying 'it was called after me': so far Rashi, from the words of the Aggadah.[17] It is possible that this praise was like this, but the meaning of the verse is that the Sidonites, the sons of the Eldest of Canaan, called Hermon Sirion when it was in their possession in the past, while the Amorite who occupies it now and from whom the Israelites captured it, called it Senir, which means 'snow' in the language of Canaan, as Rashi tells about it, and so does Targum Onkelos (…)"

Last but not least, an interpretation of Deut. 3:9 in similar terms as that of Rashi's is found in the *Midrash Aggadah* which is attributed to Moses ha-Darshan or his school. If this attribution is correct, this text may have been a source for Rashi's interpretation of the verse. These considerations argue that the accepted interpretation of שניר as a Slavic gloss in Rashi's commentary on Deut. 3:9 is difficult to uphold.

---

[17] Interpreted as Sifrei, 'Eqev, 37.

MANUSCRIPTS

St. Petersburg, Russian National Library, Evr I 21.

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Cod. hebr. 5. Available at <http://daten. digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0003/bsb00036327/images/index.html> and at <http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0003/bsb00036330/images/index. html>. Retrieved on 20th February 2013.

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Hebr. 154. Available at <http://gallica. bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b9064912h/f5.image.r=H%C3%A9breu.langEN> and at <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b9064913x.r=H%C3%A9breu. langEN>. Retrieved on 20th February 2013.

REFERENCES

BANITT, M. (1985). *Rashi, Interpreter of the Biblical Letter.* [Tel Aviv]: Chaim Rosenberg School of Jewish Studies, Tel Aviv University.

BLÁHA, O. – DITTMANN, R. – KOMÁREK, K. – POLAKOVIČ, D. – ULIČNÁ, L. (forthcoming) . "On the Problem of Judeo-Czech and the Canaanite Glosses of the 11th to the 13th Centuries in Hebrew Manuscripts." *Jews and Slavs* 24.

BUBER, S. (1894). *Midrash Aggadah.* Wien: A. Fanto.

DITTMANN, R. (2012). "K významu raných česko-židovských jazykových kontaktů v oblasti českých zemí pro diachronní bohemistiku." *Listy filologické* 135.3–4 (2012): 259–85.

EPSTEIN, A. (1891). *Moses Ha-Darschan aus Narbonne.* Wien: Druck von A. Alakalay.

EPPENSTEIN, S. (1903). "Recherches sur les comparaisons de l'hébreu avec l'arabe chez les exégètes du nord de la France." *Revue des Études Juives* 47, 47–56.

FENTON, P. (2006). "L'arabe dans Rachi et Rachi en arabe." In: SIRAT, R. (ed.) *Héritages de Rachi.* Paris: Edition de l'éclat, 261–70.

JACOBS, J. (1893). *The Jews of Angevin England.* London: D. Nutt.

JAKOBSON R. – HALLE, M. (1985). "The Term *Canaan* in Medieval Hebrew." In: JAKOBSON, R. *Selected Writings VI. Early Slavic Paths and Crossroads. Part Two. Medieval Slavic Studies.* Ed. S. Rudy. Berlin – New York – Amsterdam: Mouton, 858–86.

JAKOBSON, R. (1941). "The City of Learning." *American Hebrew,* 5th December 1941, 6–7, 13 and 16–17.

KLAR, B. (ed.) (1947). *The Sefer ha-Shoham (the Onyx Book) by Moses ben Isaac Hanessiah.* Vol. 1. London: The Jewish Historical Society of England; Jerusalem: Meḳitse nirdamim be-siyu'a Mosad ha-Rav Ḳuḳ yeha-Ḥevrah ha-Yehudit le-hisṭoryah be-Angliyah.

KULIK, A. (2012). "Jews from Rus' in Medieval England." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 102.3, 371–403.

KUPFER, F. – LEWICKI, T. (1956). *Źródła hebrajskie do dziejów Słowian i niektórych innych ludów środkowej i wschodniej Europy. Wyjątki z pism religijnych i prawniczych XI–XIII w.* Wrocław – Warszawa: Zakład imienia Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo Polskiej akademii nauk.

OLSZOWY-SCHLANGER, J. (2003). *Les manuscrits hébreux dans l'Angleterre médiévale: étude historique et paléographique.* Paris – Louvain: Peeters.

SCHRIJVER, E. G. L. (1992). "Some Light on the Amsterdam and London Manuscripts of Isaac ben Moses of Vienna's Or Zaru'a." *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 75.3, 53–82.

STEMBERGER, G. (2006). *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash.* Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

URBACH, E. E. (1939–1963). *Sefer Arugat ha-Bosem.* Jerusalem: Mekitse Nirdamim.

ZUNZ, L. (1822). "Salomon ben Isaac, genannt Raschi." *Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 1, 277–384.

RÉSUMÉ

Une ancienne glose slave dans le commentaire biblique de Rachi? שניר revisité

Les gloses slaves en caractères hébraïques insérés dans les manuscrits médiévaux sont une sources inestimable pour la lexicologie des langues slaves. Dans certains cas, ces gloses sont les plus anciens témoins écrits de certaines langues. Parmi ces gloses, les chercheurs ont souvent mentionné le mot שניר et son interprétation par Rashi dans son commentaire à Deutéronome 3:9. Le présent article réexamine ce commentaire, en questionnant la présence d'une glose slave.

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

KNAANIC LANGUAGE:
STRUCTURE AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

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