Introduction. In this article, we present and analyze a short glossary of animal names in the form of a bilingual word list, in which each Hebrew word is associated with a French lexical entry, also spelled in Hebrew characters. The glossary is found on fol. 108r of manuscript no. 2342 of the Biblioteca Palatina in Parma (cf. De Rossi 1803:541; Richler 2001:1542). The manuscript, written on parchment, contains a collection of works copied in an Ashkenazic semi-cursive script in the thirteenth century. The glossary, also written in an Ashkenazic semi-cursive script, was added by a later hand at an unknown date. It consists of a list of the names of twenty-four animals, nearly all of them birds, most of which occur in Leviticus 11:13–19 and Deuteronomy 14:12–18. The glossary is followed—still on the same folio—by another text in Hebrew, in which the author offers explanatory etymologies—explanatory in the sense of midrashic (homi-letical) interpretations—, of some Hebrew and French terms for most of the animal names; these are based on Rabbinic literature.

Our presentation of the manuscript is developed in five sections. Section one describes the Romance characteristics of the text. In section two we discuss relevant Biblical passages (Lev. 11:13–19, 29–30; Deut. 14:12–18) and their relation to the glossary. Section three contains our edition of the bilingual (Hebrew-French) glossary, with an analysis of the lexicon, followed, in section four, by the edition and translation of the homiletical commentary. A brief summary statement in section five concludes the article.

1. The Romance characteristics of the glossary. The Parma glossary contains a list of word pairs in which each Hebrew animal name is associated with a corresponding term in Romance, also written in Hebrew characters. For most of these correspondences, it can be shown that the language is, without any doubt, French. Since the date of the glossary is
unknown (the thirteenth century is the *terminus ante quem non*), the ques-
tion of whether the language of the glosses should be characterized as Old
or Middle French must be left open. The fact that Romance words appear
transcribed in Hebrew characters does not allow a distinction between
these two stages of the language (at least, not for the words contained in
the glossary); this point is discussed more fully in section three.1

That the Romance language represented in the glossary is French,
and not Latin or any other Romance language, may be concluded from
the following four points:

(1) A rather clear criterion that distinguishes French from other Ro-
mane languages is the loss of Latin intervocalic unvoiced plosives, where
the other Romance languages show either an earlier stage of Western Ro-
mane lenition or (for Eastern Romance languages) the conservation of
these sounds. For example, *PY'H* (no. 20),2 stands for some Romance form
derived from Latin *pica* ‘magpie’. It cannot be read as Italian *pica* (*DEI*
4:2899a), Spanish *pega* (*DCECH* 4:523b), or Occitan *piga* (*FEW* 8:423a),
whereas French *pie* (*T-L* 7:877; *FEW* 8:420b; Greimas 456b) is in fact quite
plausible.

(2) The Hebrew letter alef (transcribed by the symbol ’), originally
representing a glottal stop, can be associated with virtually any vowel in
Hebrew, but in Romance words, it usually represents either [a] or [e]. In
fact, the sequence alef-he, as found in *PY'H*, was commonly used in Hebrew
manuscripts of the Middle Ages to represent French final -e, pronounced
[a];3 see, for example, ’eYDəMiY'əH for *et demie* ‘and a half’, *MiY'əH* for *mie* (<
*mic* ) ‘crumb’, or *PaR'TiY'əH* for *partie* ‘part’ in *Fevres*, an Old French
medical treatise written in Hebrew letters (cf. Zwink 2006:251–252; Kiwitt
2001:21; the treatise is explained in more detail below).4 Thus *pie* is the
most plausible reading of the form *PY'H*.

(3) The use of final yod provides a further piece of evidence. The vo-
calic value of yod in Hebrew is either *e* or *i*, but it could also be used as an
alternative grapheme to represent final schwa in French, e.g., *MeR'TiYLeY*
for *mertille* ‘blueberry’ (also in *Fevres*; cf. Zwink 2006:251–252). Thus, the
form ’*YGLY* (no. 1) not only excludes Spanish *águila* (Herrera 1996, 1:56a),

1. Although we usually indicate only the Old French forms, in all cases, a Middle French
reading would also be possible.

2. We use the transcription adopted in Bos, Mensching et al. (in press), which is briefly
described in Zwink 2006. The symbol ’ represents the letter alef. In the system of trans-
literation adopted here, vowels (which, with only one exception, are absent from the
text under discussion) are represented by lower-case letters.

3. Note that this spelling potentially allows also a reading *şpia*, since the same letter se-
quence represents -a in Latin and other Romance languages; cf. Mensching 2004:98;

4. Kiwitt (2001:21) remarks furthermore that this sequence occurs mainly in feminine
nouns ending in -e.
Catalan *aguila* (*DECLC* 1:81a), Portuguese *aguia* (Morais Silva 1945 1:512b), and Italian *aquila* (*DEI* 1:262b), but also Occitan *aigla* (*FEW* 25–1:73a). In this case, French *aigle* ‘eagle’ (*T-L* 1:231; *FEW* 25–1:72a; Greimas 16a) is the only possible reading.

(4) The manuscript presents words that are found only in French and not in the other Romance languages, for example, ‘ŠQWPL’ (no. 4), interpreted as French *esco(u)fle* ‘kite’ (*T-L* 3:935; *FEW* 12:8a; Greimas 229b; *REW* 8003b), from Old Breton *škofla*, with no Romance derivations other than the French variants.

The fact that in this manuscript Hebrew characters have been used to represent non-Hebrew lexical items is not exceptional. Many medieval texts containing examples of Romance words in Hebrew transcription have been transmitted; the languages include Spanish, Catalan, Occitan, Italian, and French (cf. Sala 1998:372ff). Judeo-Spanish documents are extant in large numbers; French texts in Hebrew characters are less common. Famous examples are the poetic works published in the volume *Poèmes judéo-français du Moyen Age* (Blondheim 1927) and the thirteenth-century medical compilation *Fèvres*, mentioned above, which treats the causes and symptoms of fevers. In contrast to these two works, written entirely in French, we also know of Hebrew texts that contain isolated French words, among them, *Sefer Ko‘ah ha-‘Avanim* (*On the Virtue of Stones*), a twelfth-century Hebrew lapidarium composed by Berakhyah Ben Natronai ha-Nakdan, which describes the virtues of 72 stones, in which the names of the stones are given in Old French (Bos and Zwink, in press).

---

5. The use of yod for *a* in Latin or Romance languages is—to our knowledge—not documented and seems improbable.
6. Cf. Kramer and Kowallik 1994:xiv. As is generally known, and in contrast to other Romance languages, Judeo-Spanish has a special status, since it has been spoken outside Spain since the end of the sixteenth century by the Jews who were expelled from Spain and who settled in the region of the former Ottoman Empire. Judeo-Spanish is known in two variants: the vernacular so-called *djudezmo*, and the literary *ladino*, which is not really a language but rather a technique of translating (almost literally) the Bible. Both differ linguistically from the standard Spanish spoken in the Peninsula (cf. Sala 1998:375; for detailed discussion, cf. Sephiha 1974; Busse 1991).
7. For Occitan, see the famous Esther poem (Milner Silberstein 1973); for Catalan, the *Cants de noces* (Riera i Sans 1974). Occitan (and, to a lesser degree, Catalan) words, written in Hebrew characters in medico-botanical synonym lists, are analyzed in Bos, Mensching et al. (in press); Bos and Mensching 2001; Mensching and Savelsberg 2004; and Mensching 2004. For similar lists in Spanish and Catalan, see Bos and Mensching 2005.
8. This comprehensive anonymous treatise (almost 400 folios, recto and verso), parts of which have been published in various editions (Oesterreicher 1896; Katzenellenbogen 1933; Kiwitt 2001), continues to be the focus of several current projects (Zaun 2002; Zwink 2005; Zwink 2006).
9. This edition, as well as the projects discussed in the publications by Bos and Mensching mentioned in note 7, was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.
It is important to note here that the idea of a Jewish-French language, originally proposed by Blondenheim (1925), has since been rejected by most Romance philologists (cf. Banitt 1963 and Sala 1998:373).10 We agree with the general assessment that so-called Judeo-French is not a separate language, but is rather identical to the French dialects spoken (both by Christians and by Jews) in the regions where these texts were written.

In the glossary, the Hebrew transcription of the French lexical items follows, by and large, the graphical tradition of the Tosafists, Medieval Rabbis who wrote critical and explanatory glosses on the Talmud. This tradition dates back to the famous Bible and Talmud commentator Rabbi Solomon Ben Isaac, universally known as Rashi (1040–1105), who lived and worked in Troyes. In his commentary, Rashi added French glosses, i.e., translations of difficult Aramaic and Hebrew words into the La'az (i.e., 'vulgar language', pl. Le'azim).11 This convention of giving vernacular explanatory glosses in La'az12 in the cited graphical tradition is also followed in the Parma glossary. Details of the spellings of Old and Middle French terms in Hebrew characters may be found in Brandin’s edition of Gershom’s glosses (1901:62–75) and in studies of the medical compilation, Feuves (Kiwitt 2001:18–24; Zwink 2005; Zwink 2006: 251–253).

2. The passages on unclean animals in Leviticus and Deuteronomy. According to Yerkes (1923),13 Leviticus 11 and Deuteronomy 14 contain almost identical lists of animals, divided into clean animals, which may be eaten without incurring taboo, and unclean animals, which may not. With two exceptions, the names in the glossary belong to a third group identified by Yerkes, which contains twenty names of unclean flying creatures, mostly birds, but including as well the bat (Lev. 11:13–19; Deut. 14:12–18). The relevant Biblical passages are given in Hebrew below, followed by the version from the Vulgate:

---

10. In the FEW, variants taken from French glosses in Hebrew transcription (cf. above), are cited as “jud.-fr.” We take this to mean that the variants at issue are documented in French texts written in Hebrew letters.
11. The word La'az was already used in the Mishna (the first written form of the orally transmitted Torah, established between 70 and 200 CE, forming the basis of the Talmud) to designate a “barbarous” (i.e., non-Hebrew) language, and in particular, Greek. In the Middle Ages, Greek was the vernacular language of Jews living in Palestine. During this period, the term La'az also began to refer to Romance languages, which were adopted by the Jews of the diaspora. An early documentation of the extension of meaning to a Romance language is found in Rashi, who used the term La'az to designate the French dialect of the southern Champagne. For a detailed discussion of the history, denotation, and connotation of this term, see Aslanov 2001:108–114.
12. The glosses are edited in Darmesteter and Blondenheim 1929.
13. Yerkes (1923) attempts to reconstruct a list of animals that was the common basis of the two Bible passages, to identify the animals, and, to determine the criteria of uncleanness which made these animals taboo for eating.
Leviticus 11:13–19:


Deuteronomy 14:12–18:


In the Parma glossary, the animals are listed in the same order as in the Biblical passages. However, ‘oReB ‘raven’ (Lev. 11:15) is missing, and two names are added: *DYYH* ‘bird of prey’ (Deut. 14:13) and *NS* ‘falcon’
‘WRB ‘raven’ comes toward the end of the list (no. 21); it seems that it was unintentionally omitted and inserted later. After the raven, three more animals are added, namely, ‘QWWYS’, ‘TLP’, and ‘WŠTL’ (Lev. 11:29–30). The Table of Concordances contains our readings of the French lexical items, which we discuss in section three.14 The numbers in the first column indicate the order of the lexical items in the Parma glossary (the same order is used in section three); the symbol ‘ after the number refers to additional lexical items which occur only in the Biblical passage and not in the glossary.

The same animals appear in the list of unclean birds discussed in the Babylonian Talmud, tractate Hullin (Tosafot on tbHullin),16 chapter 3 (fols. 61a-65a), which interprets the Biblical expression “after its kind” (juxta genus suum in the Vulgate) in Leviticus 11 as referring to yet another four related species; thus it mentions explicitly twenty-four unclean birds: “There is a tradition that there are twenty-four species of unclean birds” (fol. 61b). The Hebrew names of the birds in these lists are uncertain; in many cases the species to which they refer is unclear. The glosses and the commentary literature reflect this uncertainty: at times the same term is given several different interpretations.

As reference works, we have selected the standard dictionary by Koehler-Baumgartner (1994–2000) for the modern scientific interpretation of these ancient names; the smaller lexicon by Gesenius (1987) for the Biblical terminology; and, from among the specialized literature on the animals of the Bible, the monograph by Feliks (1962). In several cases we refer as well to Lewysohn’s Zoologie des Talmuds (1858), which, though written in the nineteenth century, still offers a rich source of information, especially with regard to the Hebrew terms, their vernacular interpretations in the Rabbinic sources, and the traditions connected with them. For the French lexicon, we have systematically consulted the Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch (T-L, Tobler-Lommatzsch 1925–1976), the Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch (FEW, Wartburg 1928–2003), Greimas’ Dictionnaire d’ancien français (2004), and the Dictionnaire étymologique de l’ancien

14. Note that according to the Talmud, נים (DYH) and יר (YH) designate the same animal as תר (DYH). We may suppose that the latter was added here for this reason. Nevertheless, three different Romance bird names are given for the words at issue. For further discussion, see section three, nos. 4 to 6, and section four, no. 37. Furthermore, according to some Bible manuscripts, the second word added here, נים (NS), occurs almost immediately after תר (DYH), in Deut. 14:14, together with ברו (WRB), the word which was suppressed here. For the omission of this word in some (early) Greek translations, see Yerkes 1923:13–14.

15. The Latin correspondences reflect the order in which these appear in the Vulgate, and not necessarily the meaning of the Hebrew terms.

16. Hullin is one of the 63 tractates in which the Talmud is divided; Tosafot are medieval commentaries on the Talmud, more precisely additional explanations to the talmudic commentary of Rashi; “tb” stands for Talmud Bavli, i.e., the Babylonian Talmud.
The French terms were also compared to glosses in other editions of the French Bible in Hebrew transcription, especially Rashi (Darmesteter-Blondheim 1929), revised, with commentary, by Catane (1984) and Greenberg (1989).

3. Glossary, with commentary. The Parma glossary is reproduced here in its original wording in Hebrew characters (the numbering has been added). Our commentary follows the text. Citations of the standard works mentioned in the previous paragraph are given here in abbreviated form, eliminating the repetition of dates.

1. נֵרָשׁ אָנָלִיל (1) פֶּרֶס אָאוֹשֶׁטְיוֹרְי (2) עוֹנִית הָגְרוֹפֶּן (3) הָדָא (4) אַשְׁכּוֹפֶּלָא

אַשְׁכּוֹפֶּלָא

תָּאָרַי מָאוֹאנָה (5) דִּיחַ קוּרְפֶּנְטָה (6) נֵמַא אָסְפֶּנְקָר (7) תַּהַמְס בָּוהֹרַת (8) חָטֶף מַרְיֶשְׁתָּ (9) לֵוָו גוֹטִו (10) לְכַא אָרוֹנְלָא (11) רָהְס רֶשֲׁטָל (12) הָתָּסְפִּיתָ גַּטָּניָה (13) נִישַׁק זָאָסָא (14) תַּנְשָׁמַת קֹלוֹוְשְׁרִיָּ (15) קָאַט אָרוֹנְלָא (16) הָדָא (17) יָבָל (18) הָאַנְקָא (19) דּוֹקְסָס הָיוֹרְפֶּא (20) טֵסֶלְפֶּ פָּיָא (21) יָוֹר (22) הָאַנְקָא (23) תַּנְשָׁמַת שלָפָא (24) חוֹלָד אָאוֹשֶׁטְיוֹרְי.

1. נֵרָשׁ אָנָלִיל.

NŠR ‘YGLY

Hebrew NŠR: ‘eagle and vulture’ (Koehler-Baumgartner 731); Feliks 68: ‘griffon vulture’.

‘YGLY: OFr. aigle (var. egle) ‘eagle (genus Aquila)’ (T-L 1:231; FEW25-I:72a; Greimas 16a). For the identification of NŠR with ‘YGLY and the objection to it, cf. Tosafot on tbHullin 63a: “likewise are those mistaken who call NŠR ‘YGLY’; see also Greenberg 50 (ègle ‘eagle; aigle’) and footnote 132a, as well as Lewysohn 193.

2. פֶּרֶס אָאוֹשֶׁטְיוֹרְי

PRS ‘WŠTWYR

Hebrew PRS: ‘an unclean bird’, ‘type of vulture which breaks the bones of its prey, esp. lambs’ (Koehler-Baumgartner 969); Feliks 71: ‘bearded vulture’.

17. At the time of writing, only volumes G, H, I, and J were accessible.
'WŠTWYYR: OFr. (h)ostoir (vars. estoit, (h)u(i)toir) ‘hawk (Accipiter gentilis)’ (T-L 6:1393; FEW 24:72a; Greimas 431b). This Old French word was often confused with the name of the sparrow hawk, *esprevier* (cf. no. 7). See, for example, Darmesteter-Blondheim (758), where *WŠTWYYR* in tbHullin 42a is a gloss on *דַּמָּר* (HGS) ‘hawk’ (Lewysohn 191 and 164–165 ‘falcon’; Jastrow 1950:228), and is translated by the editors as ‘épervier’. In tbHullin 42a it appears as an explanation of Hebrew דַּמָּר (דרוהש וַיֹּאמֶר תִּשָּׁבוּ; see also Catane (2088): ostoir (as a synonym of *לֶבֶנֶון*, i.e., a large falcon or sparrow hawk; cf. no. 7). For a detailed discussion, see especially Lewysohn 191.

The Vulgate (see section two) has *gryphis* for *PRS*, following the tradition of the Greek translation (Yerkes 1923:10–11). In the Parma manuscript, OFr. *grifon* occurs in the next entry (no. 3); most probably, the two terms have been confused and *WŠTWYYR* is to be interpreted as a translation of ‘WZNYYH. Since one of its meanings is ‘osprey’, it may be that (h)ostoir represents (by confusion) OFr. *astoir* (see Livingston 1943:94, who reports a similar case of confusion in Middle English).

3. נַרְפָּאש

**WZNYYH**  **GRYPWN**

Hebrew ‘WZNYYH, ‘an unclean bird’, varying in its interpretation as ‘sea eagle, osprey, black vulture or the bearded vulture’ (Koehler-Baumgartner 810); Feliks 69: ‘black vulture’.  

**GRYPWN**: OFr. *grifon*, name of the fabulous *griffon* (half eagle, half lion; cf. DEAFG:1385; T-L 4:661; FEW 4:297b; Greimas 300a), which is also mentioned in Lev. 11:13 and Deut. 14:12, in the Septuagint and in the Vulgate. According to this tradition, however, the griffon corresponds to *PRS* (see no. 2).  

**GRYPWN** appears in Darmesteter-Blondheim (570) and Catane (2078). For the characteristics of this legendary animal, see also the commentator’s gloss at the end of the manuscript (section four). The term is present in Tosafot on tbHullin 42a: “to exclude [items made from] birds, like the claws of the **GRYPWN** from which items are made.”

4. יָדָה

**HD'H**  **'SQWPL**

Hebrew *D'H*: ‘red kite (Milvus milvus)’ (Koehler-Baumgartner 207); Feliks 67: ‘kite’. The form in the manuscript includes the Hebrew definite article (*H*).  

**'SQWPL**: OFr. *esco(u)fl e* (var. *escof(r)e*) ‘kite (genus Milvus)’ (T-L 3:935; FEW 12:8a; Greimas 229b); see also Greenberg (50): ‘*ז'Sqwp* [sic] (escofl e, escofre) ‘kite, écoufle, espèce de milan’, which is, however Rashi’s explanation of the Hebrew word in no. 2 (*PRS*). However, the identification with ‘kite’ is attested elsewhere (Yerkes 1923:12) and is also present in the Vulgate (see section two).
5. Ḥavam

Hebrew 'ḤYH: 'black kite (Milvus migrans)' (Koehler-Baumgartner 39); Feliks 67: 'buzzard'. Rashi, however, in his commentary on the Babylonian Talmud tractate Bava Mezi‘a (24b), explains 'ḤYH as 'WWLT. WR voltur 'vulture' (see no. 11), or Latin vultur (Georges 1983, 2:3564; Lewysohn 196). As observed by Gesenius (29a) and Yerkes (1923:13), Latin vul-tur is also used as the translation in the Vulgate. A general incertitude concerning the identification of the Hebrew term can thus be noted (see also section four, no. 37).

M’W’H most likely corresponds to OFr. mave / maue (cf. also möe) ‘(sea-)gull (genus Larus)' (T-L 5:108, 5:1321; FEW 16:495b; Greimas 373b). This interpretation does not correspond to any of the meanings that have been suggested for the Hebrew term. The only alternative explanation would be that we are faced with some derivation from Latin milvus, but the only known Romance variant that would correspond to the form M’W’H is the Old Occitan variant mivá (FEW 6-2:93b). It would be strange to find an Occitan variant in this text, which is clearly French in all other cases. In section four we discuss another reason why ‘sea-gull’ seems to be the correct solution.

6. Ḥayyad

DYYH QWRMRNT

Hebrew DYYH: ‘bird of prey’ (Koehler-Baumgartner 220); Feliks 67: ‘kite’ (= D’H). According to Yerkes (1923:12), this word is an error of transmission, appearing only in Deut. 14:13 as a corrupted variant of D’H (see no. 4 and also section four).

QWRMRNT: OFr. cormorant (vars. cormare(n)g / cormarenc / copre marant, and FEW Jud.-Fr. cormorenl) ‘cormorant, sea raven (Carbo cormoranus)’ (T-L 2:869; FEW 2-2:1239b; Greimas 132a).

7. Ḥayyad

NS eŠPReWeR

Hebrew NS: ‘falcon (Falco peregrinus)’ (Koehler-Baumgartner 714); Feliks 65: ‘sparrow hawk’. eŠPReWeR: OFr. esperv(i)er / esprevier ‘sparrow hawk (Accipiter nisus)’ (T-L 3:1254; FEW 17:171b; Greimas 243a). The vowelling suggests the reading *esprevier. Also Darmesteter-Blondheim (411) ’aŠPaRWyyR and Greenberg (51) ’YŠPRWWYR, as a synonym for ŠH (see no. 10). FEW offers the transcribed form esparvier from Darmesteter-Blondheim (loc. cit.), with the annotation “Jud.-Fr.”

For the identification of NS with esperv(i)er and ostoir, cf. Rashi (Berliner 1905:231; Chavel 1982:347): ’YSPRWWYR [WŠTWYR], and on tbḤullin 63a: “NS is ’YSPRWWYR”. However, according to the Tosafot, this identifica-
tion is incorrect, but they do not provide a corrected interpretation; see also Lewysohn 190.

8. בֶּת הַדּוֹנִהֲו אָרֵי דָּרוֹשָׁרָכְאָו
   BָT HָY'NָH 'WָP Dָ'WָŠTָRָWָS'
Hebrew BָT HָY'NָH or Y'NָH: ‘ostrich (Struthio camelus)’ (Koehler-Baumgartner 421); Feliks 76: ‘dark desert eagle-owl’.
   WָP Dָ'WָŠTָRָWָS’: possibly OFr. o(e)f / uef d'oustru(s)ce (vars. ostric(h)e / ostrisse and, according to FEW, Jud.-Fr. osterriche) ‘egg of the ostrich (Struthio camelus)’ (T-L 6:1397; FEW 12:309b; Greimas 311b for ostruce, etc.; cf. T-L 11:5; FEW 7:474a; Greimas 420a for forms o(e)f, etc.), but it might well be that WָP is a misspelling of ‘WָP, i.e., ‘bird’, in Hebrew. Perhaps a copyist wrongly interpreted the entry as o(e)f / uef and inserted the preposition de to make sense of the form.

9. תַּחַת בָּוּרָא
   TָHָMָS BWWRT
Hebrew TָHָMָS: ‘unclean bird, but the species cannot be precisely identified’ (Koehler-Baumgartner 1717); Feliks 64: ‘kestrel’. The Talmud does not discuss the word (Yerkes 1923:15).
   BWWRT: possibly a Romance derivation from Lat. bubo ‘eagle owl’. FEW (1:581a) gives the Old Walloon bube along with the reduplicated forms in Mod. Fr. bobout (Grenoble), boubote (Besançon), and perhaps even more interesting, because they match the form in the manuscript, the variants bobert (Lorraine) and bubert (Luxembourgeois; FEW 1:581b). Since bubo is present in the Vulgate (Lev. 11:17), and since there seems to exist a tradition according to which a kind of owl is mentioned at this place (noctua in the Vulgate, see section two; cf. Yerkes 1923:15), it is quite possible that a variant along the lines of the cited dialect forms is intended here.

10. תֶּשֶׁח מָרִי שׁ
   HָSֶP MWWYŠWN
Hebrew HָSֶP: ‘forbidden bird, traditionally gull or seagull’ (Koehler-Baumgartner 1463); Feliks 86: ‘gull’. According to Yerkes (1923:16), another frequent interpretation is ‘cuckoo’.
   MWWYŠWN: probably OFr. mois(s)on (vars. moisseron / moisnel) ‘sparrow (Passeridae)’ (T-L 6:157; FEW 6-2:259b; Greimas 392a). This bird is suggested by the Hebrew spelling of the French term, although there is no tradition of mentioning the sparrow in the list of unclean birds.

11. חָבָט בָּשׁי
   HָKָWS BWTWR
Hebrew HָKָWS: ‘small owl, an unclean bird living in ruins’ (Koehler-Baumgartner 466); Feliks 74: ‘little owl’. See also no. 13.
BWTWR: possibly OFr. vo(l)t/or / voltur ‘vulture’ (T-L 10:870; FEW 14:647b; Greimas 627a). Also Darmesteter-Blondheim (1066) רִשְׁפָר for voltur. The vulture is traditionally present in the list of unclean birds, although normally mentioned fourth or fifth (see the Table of Concordances, and entry no. 2; cf. also Yerkes 1923:11–13). The French term seems to be misplaced here.

12. נוח מירון

ŠLK HYRWN

Hebrew ŠLK: unclean bird of uncertain identity, possibly ‘heron’ (Koehler-Baumgartner 1530); Feliks 81: ‘fish owl’.

HYRWN: OFr. he(i)ron / ha(i)ron ‘heron (Ardeidae)’ (DEAFH:68; T-L 4:837; FEW 16:118a; Greimas 305b). Cf. also Greenberg (52, no. 134) H’YYRWN, as a synonym for ’NPH (see no. 18). For this identification, see also Rashi (Berliner 1905:231; Chavel 1982:347) H’NPH, “it seems to me that this is [the bird] which is called HYRWN”; see also Lewysohn (200).

13. נשים זאסה

YNŠWP ŠWT’

Hebrew YNŠWP: ‘unclean bird of uncertain identity’ (Koehler-Baumgartner 417); Feliks 78: ‘long-eared owl’. See Yerkes (1923:19–20) for the interpretation ‘ibis’, which is also found in the Vulgate.

ŠWT’: OFr. süete (vars. cüete, chöete, chauete) ‘owl’ (T-L 2:408; Greimas 105b). See also Greenberg (51) ŠuWeYT’, for OFr. ch(o)uete ‘screech-owl, chouette, effraie’, and no. 132; see also Darmesteter-Blondheim (294) ŠWYT’. For the identification, see Rashi (Berliner 1905:231; Chavel 1982:347) KWS WYNŠWP (these are ŠWYTš that cry in the night).20

14. תנשמת ילאשלורריך

TNŠMT Q’LWWŠWRYS

Hebrew TNŠMT: possibly some kind of owl, more specifically ‘night-owl’ (Koehler-Baumgartner 1765); Feliks 73: ‘barn screech owl’. The form TNŠMT reoccurs in Lev. 11:30, where it does not, however, refer to a bird, but is interpreted as either ‘chameleon’ (Gesenius 885b) or ‘mole’; the Talmud prefers the latter interpretation (Yerkes 1923:20). The second meaning of the word occurs in our list under no. 23.

Q’LWWŠWRYS: OFr. chalve suriz / chauve soriz ‘bat’ (T-L 2:336; FEW 12:111b). The transcribed Q’ represents the Hebrew letter qof with a diaritic, reflecting its palatal pronunciation. Cf. also Greenberg (51) for OFr. calve soriz ‘bat, chauve-souris’, and Darmesteter-Blondheim (183) Q’LBR ŠWRYS.

18. The FEW (16:304a) has only choe.
19. For KWS see no. 11.
20. The authors are responsible for the English translations of the citations from Rashi.
The identification of \textit{TNŠMT} with the ‘bat’ is found in Rashi (Berliner 1905:231; Chavel 1982:347): \textit{QLB}’ \textit{ŠWRYS} “and it is similar to a mouse that flies in the night, and the \textit{TNŠMT} mentioned amongst the swarming things (Lev. 11:30) is similar to it, but does not have eyes, and is called \textit{TLP}.” This second part of Rashi’s commentary refers to the other meaning of \textit{TNŠMT}, \textit{TLP}, which is OFr. \textit{talpe} ‘bat’. In other glosses \textit{talpe} has the meaning ‘chaude-souris’; see Greenberg (53) and Darmesteter-Blondheim (979), which is also cited in \textit{FEW}.\textsuperscript{21} Note that the Hebrew word ‘\textit{TLP}’ (no. 20) traditionally carries two meanings: (1) ‘bat’ (for references and discussion, see no. 20), and (2) ‘mole’ (Lewysohn 102ff).\textsuperscript{22} We thus suppose that our author was influenced by this double meaning, which he transferred to the vernacular term, or possibly that Hebrew ‘\textit{TLP}’ and French \textit{talpe}, by their close resemblance, caused the confusion.

15. \textit{אלה} \textit{'Q'T} \textit{RWNDL’}

Hebrew \textit{Q’T}: ‘an unclean species of bird’ (Koehler-Baumgartner 1959f); Feliks 74: ‘little owl (Athene noctua saharae)’. See Yerkes (1923:20–21) for the uncertainty and confusion of the Greek translations. \textit{'RWNDL’}: OFr. \textit{arondele(e) / arondelle} ‘(little) swallow; fledgling of the swallow ( Hirundinidae)’ (T-L 1.5:43; \textit{FEW} 4:434a; Greimas 39b); also Darmesteter-Blondheim (68) \textit{'RWNDYL’} for OFr. \textit{arondele} ‘hirondelle’. The swallow is not usually included in the list of unclean birds.

16. \textit{רות} \textit{RWŠYNWL}

Hebrew \textit{RH. M}: ‘vulture, possibly the Egyptian vulture, \textit{Vultur percnopterus}’ (Koehler-Baumgartner 1217); Feliks 70: ‘Egyptian vulture’. \textit{RWŠYNWL}: OFr. \textit{ross(e)ignol} (vars. \textit{rossignel / roisignour}) ‘nightingale (Luscinia megarhynchos)’ (T-L 8:1492; \textit{FEW} 5:471a; Greimas 534a), although it does not correspond to any bird within the tradition of unclean animals. Cf. also Greenberg (51) \textit{RWŠYN [YW]L} [\textit{YYL}]: transcribed as \textit{rosiniol, ros(s) iniel} (as a synonym of \textit{YNŠWP}, i.e., ‘unclean bird of uncertain identity; perhaps long-eared owl’; cf. no. 13).

17. \textit{חטירא} \textit{'HHYSYDH SGWYN’}

Hebrew \textit{HSYDH}: traditionally interpreted as ‘stork’ or ‘heron’ (Koehler-Baumgartner 337); Feliks 83: ‘stork’.

\textsuperscript{21} \textit{TalPe’}, interpreted as \textit{talpe}, appears also in Brandin 1901:66, no. 9.
\textsuperscript{22} The Hebrew term features also in the \textit{Sefer ha-Shimmush} (Bos, Mensching et al. in press), s.v. \textit{‘ayin} 17.
§GWYNY': OFr. ce(g)oïne (vars. cigogne / soigne) ‘stork (Ciconiidae)’ (T-L 2:429; FEW2-1:665b; Greimas 88a). Cf. also Greenberg (52) §YGWNYY’ and §YGWYNN’H.  

For the identification, see Rashi (Berliner 1905:231; Chavel 1982:347): “This is a white bird of prey, §YGWNY’.”

18.  

H’NPH  HWHWN  

Hebrew ‘NPH: unclean bird, possibly ‘clover’ or ‘cormorant’ (Koehler-Baumgartner 72); Feliks 84: ‘heron, bittern’. According to Yerkes (1923:22), the addition “after its kind” indicates that it is a generic term in Hebrew and that, according to the Talmud, the term designates the common heron.  

HWHWN: should be emended to HYRWN OFr. he(i)ron / ha(i)ron ‘heron’. For references and discussion, see no. 12.

19.  

DWKYPT  HYRWP’  

Hebrew DWKYPT: ‘hoopoe (Upupa epops)’ (Koehler-Baumgartner 216); Feliks 90: idem.  

HYRWP’: OFr. упуе / хуп(п)е ‘hoopoe (Upupa epops)’ (T-L 4:1221, 1229; FEW 14:57b). The form appears only in French texts in Hebrew transcription; see HYRWP’, HRWP’ in Greenberg (52), which he transcribes as herup(p)e. For the identification of the two terms, see Rashi (Berliner 1905:231; Chavel 1982:347): “the DWKYPT is HRWP’ in the vernacular”; see also Lewysohn (267).

20.  

‘TLP  PY’H  

Hebrew ‘TLP: ‘bat’ (Koehler-Baumgartner 814); Feliks 47: idem.  

PY’H: must surely be OFr. pie ‘magpie (Pica caudata)’ (T-L 7:877; FEW 8:420b; Greimas 2005:456b), even though the definition given is completely different from the Hebrew term (about which, according to Yerkes 1923:23, there is no question), and the magpie is not usually included among the unclean birds.  

Rashi, on tbBekhorot (7b), 24 explains “TLP is QLBH ŠWR$, similar to a mouse and it has wings”; cf. no. 14).

21.  

QRWBWL  

Hebrew ‘WRB: ‘raven’ (Koehler-Baumgartner 879); Feliks 88: ‘raven, crow’.  

23. Gershom de Metz has §YQWNY’, transcribed by the editor as zikoñe (Brandin 1901:68, no. 14β).  
24. Bekhorot is one of the 63 talmudic tractates.  
25. The superscript resh (ף) is an addition in the manuscript.
QRWBWL: corresponds (with metathesis) to OFr. corbel (vars. corbat / corp) ‘raven (Corvidae)’ (T-L 2:847, 846, 892; FEW 2:1:1238b; Greimas 131a). The waw in the last syllable seems to be an error for yod.

22. אָמַרָה מַרְיָם

Hebrew ‘NQ’ [read ‘NQH’]: unclean animal, possibly ‘gecko’ (Koehler-Baumgartner 73); Feliks 97: idem.

Q’WWYS’: possibly an onomatopoeic term to indicate the croaking of the frog, indicated by coac / coax (n.) and coasser (v.) in French (documented for Middle and Modern French, respectively; cf. FEW 2:2:1:1599a). A less probable alternative is that the term represents a word related to Modern French meaning ‘little green frog’ (ALF map 668, grenouille) körás (point 230) and rèn körás26 (points 148 and 128). The variants are documented for the département Marne (Champagne). These hypotheses presuppose, however, that the spelling with initial Q’ is an error (see no. 14).

Rashi (Berliner 1905:232; Chavel 1982:348) explains ‘NQH as HRYSWN; cf. also Greenberg (53) HeRiYSWoN, which is transcribed as hérizan (‘hedgehog’).

23. מַלְפָּה תְנוּנָה

Hebrew TNŠMT: possibly some kind of owl, more specifically, ‘night-owl’ (Koehler-Baumgartner 1765); Feliks 73: ‘barn screech-owl’. According to Yerkes (1923:20), TNŠMT is mentioned among the unclean animals (Lev. 11:30). It is translated into Greek as ἄσπαλαξ ‘mole’ (see also the Vulgate translation talpa in the Table of Concordances, and entry no. 14).

TLP’: OFr. talpe (var. taupe), generally ‘mole’ (Talpa L.) (cf. T-L 10:142; FEW 13:1:61b; Greimas 577a); for the identification, see no. 14.

24. אָרָשֶׁם

Hebrew HWLD: ‘mole (Spalax Ehrenbergi)’ (Koehler-Baumgartner 316); [not in Feliks].


For the identification, see Rashi (Berliner 1905:232; Chavel 1982:348): MWŠTYLH: HHLD (i.e., “mostele is the HLD”); also the Vulgate, which translates the term as musteile (see section two).

4. Notes on the commentary. Following the list of animal names, the manuscript contains a short explanatory text (also on fol. 108r). This

26. The etymology of (rén) körás could not be determined.
passage may be understood as a kind of midrashic interpretation, i.e., a rabbinical commentary, in particular of the homiletical or aggadic type, which was concerned with illustrating or explaining mostly non-legal texts in an edifying manner, making use of multiple sources. At the beginning of the text, the author states that he wants to “give the reasons.” As becomes evident from the text, these are mostly reasons for the animal names, with the exception of the first item. Here the author quotes Genesis 44:12, “beginning with the oldest,” where ‘oldest’ (דוע) means, literally, ‘largest’, but also ‘mightiest’ or ‘strongest’.

Thus, the passage in the Parma glossary most likely means that the eagle is mentioned first because it is the mightiest animal, following the tradition of beginning with the oldest or mightiest. Most of the commentaries, however, give a (mostly pseudo-) etymological explanation. For example, entry no. 7 states that the hawk or falcon is called נס (NS) because it throws off its feathers (N$WT, from NSH ‘feather’). As an additional explanation, the author, referring to Numbers 21:8, derives the word from סנ (NS) ‘signal, flag, standard’ (maybe thinking of an Egyptian Horus standard or other kinds of symbols involving birds), though it is spelled with an entirely different sibilant, and has an entirely different etymology. Another midrashic explanation concerns the term דה (red) kite’ (no. 4). In this case, the interpretation is based on a variant reading of the term, namely, רֵח, appearing in Deut. 14:13, but considered a spelling error (Gesenius 736a; Yerkes 1923:12). Since $R$ is related to the root meaning ‘to see’, tbHullin 63b states that the bird at issue is so called because it can see very keenly.

Our commentary is appended to the edition and English translation of this brief explanatory text. We do not offer an exhaustive study here, but concentrate on points of the text that we feel are most relevant to the field of Romance philology.

27. When looking for the silver cup that Joseph had hidden in Benjamin’s sack, “he [i.e., the steward] searched, beginning with the oldest and ending with the youngest; and the goblet turned up in Benjamin’s bag” (Tanakh 1985).
28. Only sometimes is the etymology correct, for example, in no. 17, in the case of סדה (HSYDH), literally, ‘the pious one’ (cf. the Latin name of the stork, avis pia, as already observed in Gesenius 1987:247b), and in no. 9, the explanation of תמש, where the explanation (‘because the mother behaves maliciously . . .’) seems to be based on the fact that “[e]tymologically, the Hebrew term would indicate a bird characterized by cruelty” (Yerkes 1923:15).
29. “Then the LORD said to Moses, Make a seraph figure and mount it on a standard סנ (NS). And if anyone who is bitten looks at it, he shall recover.”
30. Also cf. Yerkes (1923:13): “The Talmud, after a long discussion, comes to the conclusion that had (D$H), har (R$H), hyd (DYH), and hya (YH) are four different names for one and the same bird. The meaning of the name, however, is explained only from the second word: he is said to have such a keen vision that he can see a carcass in Palestine.”
The author comments on only seventeen of the twenty-four lexical entries listed in the glossary (section three); nos. 8, 10, 14, 21, 22, 23, and 24 are not mentioned.

And now I will give the reasons [for their names]:

1. *NŠR* *AYGL’* because it is the king of the birds\(^{33}\) as it is written (cf. Genesis 44:12); “beginning with the oldest” [lit., ‘largest’].

---

\(^{31}\) Ms., emendation by the authors: נרש

\(^{32}\) This word, illegible in the text, is best read as indicated.

\(^{33}\) Cf. *tb*Hagigah 13b: “the king of the birds is the eagle” (*Sonsano Babylonian Talmud*). The Hagigah is a talmudic tractate.
2. **PRS**  WŠT WYYR because it hails from the country of Persia [**PRS**] which is called 'WŠTRYQ'.

3. ‘**WZNYYH**  GRYPWN because it has the power of a land-animal but also of a bird.

4. **HD'H**  'SQWP' because it can see [**R'H**] very keenly.

5. **HYYH**  M'W'H because it lives in the coastlands [**YY**] [cf. Isaiah 11:11].

6. **DYYH**  QWRMRNT because she says to everyone: this is mine [**DYLY**], because she is jealous of all her companions. 34

7. **NS**  'ŠPRWWR because it throws off its feathers [**NS.H**] [when it is] in a cage which is called M'W'H and also because it is mounted on a standard [**NS**] (cf. Numbers 21:8).

9. **TÎMS**  BWWRT because the mother behaves maliciously towards her companions [**HBRWT**]; the Romance term is proof of this because MWZRT betrays her friends.

11. **KWS**  BWT WR after ‘to cut [. . .]’, 35 this is always a bad sign and when they are caught, it is sign of costliness.

12. **ŠLK**  HYRWN because it catches [**ŠLH**] fish out of the sea. 36

13. **YNŠWP**  ŠWT', and she cries [ŠW'T'] in the night. 37

15. **Q'T**  'RWNDL' because she is disgusted by her companions and despises them.

16. **RHM**  RWSYNYL because she was created to [. . .] and to console [**NJHM**] and have mercy [**RHM**] on the creatures. 38

17. **HHŠSYDH**  SGWYN because it shows kindness [**HHŠSYDWT**, pl. of **HHŠSYDH**] to its companions. 39

18. **H'NP’** [. . .] [read: **HYRWN**] she is called irascible because all birds hate her. 40

19. **DWKYPT**  **HYRWP’** because its crest is tied together [lit., doubled, **KPWP**]. 41

20. ‘**TLP** is a bird that flies with its wings [**KNPYH**].

As far as the French material is concerned, this explanatory text includes the same words as the list presented in section three, with only a few exceptions:

34. Cf. tbHullin 63a: “the ‘NFH is an irascible [kind of] DYYH. Why is she called ‘NFH? Because she quarrels with her companions.”

35. Hebrew **HTK** is a synonym for **BTR** in the sense of ‘cutting’, and thus seems to explain the term BWTWR.

36. Literal quote from tbHullin 63a; cf. Rashi on Lev. 11:17.


38. Cf. tbHullin 63b: “Why is it called RaHaM? Because when the RaHaM comes, mercy [RaHaMm] comes to the world” (Soncino Babylonian Talmud).

39. Literal quote from tbHullin 63a.

40. Cf. the tradition quoted under no. 6 regarding the DYYH; ‘NP means ‘to be angry’ in Hebrew.

41. Cf. Rashi on Lev. 11:19 (Berliner 1905:231; Chavel 1982:347): “DWKYPT is TRNGWL HBR and its crest is doubled . . . Why is it called DWKYPT? Because its crown appears double” (see also tbHullin 63a).
No. 7. In place of 'eŠPReWeR, the commentary uses the unvocalized variant 'ŠPRWWR, where the sequence -WW is most probably an error.

No. 9. In addition to BWWRT, the commentary mentions MWZRT (MWWRT?). This form, beginning with M-, is supposedly corrupt, but it may possibly have been the result of a confusion with OFr. mal(l)art (var. maslart) ‘mallard, wild duck’ (cf. T-L 5:972, 1228; FEW 6-1:426a; Greimas 360b, 372a).

No. 18. The commentary gives only the disordered fragment /\WWN of HWHWN, which, as we have already noted in section three, is probably a corrupt form of HYRWN. Both passages show that the scribe seems not to have understood the Old French term.

No. 20. The commentary is lacking the Romance term corresponding to the Hebrew animal name, PY'H, identified as pie ‘magpie (Pica caudata)’. This entry also illustrates an interesting philological point. It might seem coincidental that the last sequence of letters in the commentary (BKNPYH) ‘with its wings’ (B-KNP-Y-H, literally, ‘with-wing-plural-her’) contains the substring PYH, but it seems quite possible that the line originally read something like: TLP PY'H is a bird that is so called because it flies with its wings (KNPYH). This seems a probable solution, given that the author/commentator generally tries to give etymologies for the Hebrew animal names, and on some occasions, he gives similar kinds of explanations for the Romance terms by reducing them to similarities to the sound or spelling of Hebrew words and phrases. This is the case in no. 13, where $W'T$ (for sütet ‘owl’) is explained by the Hebrew $W'QT$ ‘she cries’. Similarly, it seems that no. 9, BWWRT (for bobert, probably a derivation from Latin buvō ‘eagle owl’), is explained by the Hebrew HBRWT, i.e., ‘the companions’ (towards whom this bird behaves maliciously). The only case in which a Romance etymology is given for a Romance term is no. 2, where the author tries to explain ostoir by relating it to 'WSTRYQ', designating an unidentified country (*austrique or the like, probably related to OFr. austre ‘south (wind)’; cf. FEW 25-2:1065a; T-L 1:685); the author establishes a parallel to the explanation of the Hebrew סר (PRS) with the origin of the bird in Persia.

In general, the contribution of this text to the elucidation of the Romance words in the list is rather scant. Only in no. 5 does the commentary offer a clue to the Hebrew word at issue: YYH has been translated by M'W'H (mawe) sea-gull’, the reason being that in the text, the ‘YYH is considered to be an animal that lives in the coastlands.

Finally, one new French word comes forth in the rather cryptic passage in no. 7, where it is stated that the falcon or hawk throws off its feathers in a cage, which is called M'W'H. The passage seems to be corrupt at first sight, since we have just confirmed that M'W'H is best read mawe, i.e., ‘sea-gull’. The solution, however, lies in falconry, where moulting birds are put into a special cage, called mew in English. The English word (Middle
English *meue* derives from OFr. *müe* ‘cage for moulting’ (T-L 5:398; FEW 6-2:286b). The (modern) variants *mowe* and *mauwe* (Walloon dialect spoken in the region of Liège, see FEW, loc. cit.) perfectly match *M’W’H*.

5. Some conclusions. The Hebrew-French glossary of animal names in manuscript no. 2342 of the Biblioteca Palatina in Parma represents an interesting document of Jewish culture in medieval France. Although it does not offer new insights into the problematic Hebrew animal terminology of the Bible, which remains unclear in many places, the glossary, as well as the commentary that follows it, is intriguing from a philological viewpoint, as it reveals some interesting lexicological aspects of Medieval French.

On the whole, the Romance linguistic material cannot be clearly assigned to a specific French dialect. At first glance, one might attribute this to the fact that the date of the manuscript is relatively late (as stated in the introduction, the thirteenth century is the terminus ante quem non), when French documents of all regions began to approximate the dialect of the Ile-de-France (cf. Pope 1952:33). However, these tendencies towards linguistic uniformity apply to the Christian scriptae traditions using the Latin alphabet and can hardly be applied to the “parallel” Romance scriptae based on the Hebrew alphabet. The reason lies rather in the fact that the Hebrew transcription of French does not allow us to draw definite conclusions concerning pronunciation, especially the pronunciation of vowels. The glossary is not vocalized (the single exception being no. 7, אָספְרִירוֹ (ešPReWeR) ‘sparrow hawk’, suggesting a variant *esprever*, which cannot, however, be assigned to a specific dialect). Nonetheless the Parma manuscript contains two items, first documented in our text, that indicate a probable origin in an eastern French territory. The first is *BWWRT* ‘eagle owl’ (no. 9), which has been tentatively identified as *bobert* (var. *bubert*). The FEW documents these variants for the (modern) Lorraine and Luxembourgeois dialects. The second is *M’W’H* ‘cage for moulting’ (no. 5), which may correspond to (modern) Walloon *mauwe*.

A term that is worth a closer look is the Romance word *HYRWP*’ (no. 19) ‘hoopoe’. This form is not attested in current dictionaries of Old French, where we have only *upupe* or *hup(p)e* (see the references at no. 19). The perfectly matching variant *herup(p)e* is only documented in the glosses of Rashi. Since the idea of a special Judeo-French language has proven to be untenable, this form might correspond rather to a Jewish-French scripta tradition, an aspect which, as far as we know, has yet to be studied thor-
oughly. It seems more probable, however, that this spelling was copied from Rashi or from a source based on Rashi’s glosses, and in fact we have seen (section three) that most of the meanings assigned to the Hebrew animal names, and often their Romance equivalents as well, may be traced back to Rashi himself or to the Tosafot, and are frequently found in the compilations of glosses edited by Darmesteter and Blondheim (1929) and Greenberg (1989). It seems that the author tries to offer an original solution only when the Talmud and related Jewish traditions or texts did not provide any interpretation, or at least not a uniform one. In such cases, he only rarely resorted to the Vulgate tradition, a procedure that is recognizable in no. 9, where he interprets THMS as ‘owl’. In most other cases, the Hebrew-French synonymies can be shown to be based on the author’s own pseudo-etymological explanations (see section four). We see this clearly in ‘YH—mave (no. 4), DYYH—cormorant (no. 6), KWS—votor (no. 11), and ‘TLP—pie (no. 20). We may suspect that this is also the case for RHM (no. 16), interpreted as rossignol instead of the standard gloss vulture. The nightingale has always been a highly symbolic bird, strongly connected to love and related concepts in Antiquity and in the Medieval Christian tradition (cf. Pfeffer 1985). Thus, the etymology that the author gives for RHM (‘because she was created to [. . .] and to console [NHM] and have mercy’) might have led the commentator to assume that this bird must be the nightingale. The reasoning behind other synonymies, among them, ŠHP—moison (no. 10) and Q’T—arondele (no. 15), remain obscure. In summary, the text contains quite a number of puzzles, only a few of which we hope to have unravelled in the present article.
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## Table of Concordances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry No.</th>
<th>Leviticus 11: (verse)</th>
<th>Deuteronomy 14: (verse)</th>
<th>Leviticus Vulgate</th>
<th>Deuteronomy Vulgate</th>
<th>Hebrew word in the glossary</th>
<th>French gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(13) נֵשָׁר</td>
<td>(12) נֵשָׁר</td>
<td>aquila</td>
<td>aquila</td>
<td>נשרא</td>
<td>aigle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(13) פֵּרֶס</td>
<td>(12) פֵּרֶס</td>
<td>griffis</td>
<td>griffis</td>
<td>פרס</td>
<td>ostoir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(13) חֲלֵית</td>
<td>(12) חֲלֵית</td>
<td>haliaeetus</td>
<td>haliaeetus</td>
<td>חֲלֵית</td>
<td>grifon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3'</td>
<td>(13) אַיָּלָה</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ixios</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(14) הָיוֹא</td>
<td>(13) הָיוֹא</td>
<td>milvus</td>
<td>vultur</td>
<td>דָּוָא</td>
<td>escofe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(14) הָיוֹא</td>
<td>(13) הָיוֹא</td>
<td>vultur</td>
<td>milvus</td>
<td>אֹיָא</td>
<td>mave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5'</td>
<td>(15) עֶרֶב</td>
<td>(14) עֶרֶב</td>
<td>corvinum</td>
<td>corvinum</td>
<td>see no. 21</td>
<td>see no. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>[רֶדָּא, see no. 5]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>[vultur]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>יָדָא</td>
<td>cormorant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>[ינָפָה, see no. 10']</td>
<td>[ינָפָה, see no. 10']</td>
<td>[accipiter]</td>
<td>[accipiter]</td>
<td>יָנָפָה</td>
<td>esprevier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(16) בֶּהוֹת</td>
<td>(15) בֶּהוֹת</td>
<td>struthio</td>
<td>struthio</td>
<td>בֶּהוֹת</td>
<td>of d’ostruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(16) נֵס</td>
<td>(15) נֵס</td>
<td>nocta</td>
<td>nocta</td>
<td>נֵס</td>
<td>bobert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(16) שֵׁה</td>
<td>(15) שֵׁה</td>
<td>larus</td>
<td>larus</td>
<td>שֵׁה</td>
<td>moison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10'</td>
<td>(16) נֵת</td>
<td>(15) נֵת</td>
<td>accipiter</td>
<td>accipiter</td>
<td>see no. 7</td>
<td>see no. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(17) תֹּט</td>
<td>(16) תֹּט</td>
<td>bubo</td>
<td>herodio</td>
<td>בּוֹבּ</td>
<td>votor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>(17) שַׁלֹּשָּׁה</td>
<td>(17) שַׁלֹּשָּׁה</td>
<td>mergulus</td>
<td>cygnus</td>
<td>שַׁלֹּשָּׁה</td>
<td>heron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>(17) נֵשָּׁה</td>
<td>(16) נֵשָּׁה</td>
<td>ibis</td>
<td>ibis</td>
<td>נֵשָּׁה</td>
<td>siete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>(18) נַנְנָה</td>
<td>(16) נַנְנָה</td>
<td>cygnus</td>
<td>mergulus</td>
<td>נַנְנָה</td>
<td>calve soris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>(18) נַנְנָה</td>
<td>(17) נַנְנָה</td>
<td>onocrotalus</td>
<td>porphyrio</td>
<td>נַנְנָה</td>
<td>arondele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>(18) מָרָה</td>
<td>(17) מָרָה</td>
<td>porphyrio</td>
<td>nycticorax</td>
<td>מָרָה</td>
<td>rossignel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>(19) מָשָּׁס</td>
<td>(18) מָשָּׁס</td>
<td>herodio</td>
<td>onocrotalus</td>
<td>מָשָּׁס</td>
<td>cegoine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>(19) נָנָה</td>
<td>(18) נָנָה</td>
<td>charadrios</td>
<td>charadrios</td>
<td>נָנָה</td>
<td>heron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>(19) נָנָה</td>
<td>(18) נָנָה</td>
<td>upupa</td>
<td>upupa</td>
<td>נָנָה</td>
<td>herope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>(19) נַנְנָה</td>
<td>(18) נַנְנָה</td>
<td>vespertilio</td>
<td>vespertilio</td>
<td>נַנְנָה</td>
<td>pie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>see no. 5'</td>
<td>see no. 5'</td>
<td>see no. 5'</td>
<td>see no. 5'</td>
<td>see no. 5'</td>
<td>corbel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21'</td>
<td>(29) עֲבָר</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>mus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21&quot;</td>
<td>(29) עֲבָר</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>crocodilus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>(30) שָׂפָה</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>mygale</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>אַנְקָפָה</td>
<td>cox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22'</td>
<td>(30) שָׂפָה</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>charmeleon</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22&quot;</td>
<td>(30) שָׂפָה</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>stellio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>(30) שָׂפָה</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>lacerta</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>(30) תָּנְשָׁה</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>talpa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>תָּנְשָׁה</td>
<td>talpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>(29) לֹז</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>mustela</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>לֹז</td>
<td>mostele</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This term occurs in Deuteronomy 14:13.
* This term occurs in Leviticus 11:16 and Deuteronomy 14:15.
* The first animal mentioned in Leviticus 11:29 appears as the final item in the Parma glossary.
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DEI  Battisti and Alessio 1968
FEW  Wartburg 1928–2003
REW  Meyer-Lübke 1935
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