Jonathan M. Weiser is the author of *Frumspeak*. He teaches and writes about language.

TRANSLATION AS INTERPRETATION: RASHI'S USE OF FRENCH IN HIS COMMENTARY TO THE TORAH

Rashi incorporated close to three hundred French words into his Torah commentary. Studies of Rashi's French have faced two principal challenges. First, the dearth of authoritative manuscripts has necessitated a great deal of attention to the task of reconstructing the precise French words Rashi intended. Second, that Rashi employs French translation only infrequently, poses the question of what particular purposes French words were intended to serve.

Optimally, translation strives optimally for complete semantic equivalence. A good translator attempts to represent all definitional, euphonic, etymological, and connotative information from the source language into the target language. Such equivalence is recognized generally to be an unattainable goal. A translator who selects certain elements over others to retain in translation does so with a purpose. It is in that selective process that a translation becomes an interpretation. Rashi is counted among the most important interpreters of the Torah. His interpretive skills undoubtedly guided his use of translations. After all, if all translation is interpretation, Rashi, chiefly an interpreter, should have been well suited to serve as a translator.

Rashi's translations are integral, not external, to his interpretive commentaries. Nonetheless, studies of Rashi's glosses have until now concentrated on reconstructing the words themselves and have failed to introduce them back into the commentaries to which they are elemental. Even in their brief attention to Rashi's specific use of particular glosses, they neglect to establish the general guidelines both by which Rashi elected to translate at all and by which he selected, with great precision, French words to relay certain aspects of the semantic loads of Hebrew words.

New studies might undertake the task of incorporating Rashi's glosses back into his commentaries. They should address the glosses as

interpretive elements within a larger interpretive environment. They could do so with attention to the etymological, grammatical, and connotative affinity between source and target languages. Most importantly, they should do so within the context of Rashi's own linguistic methodology, the mechanisms of which must be derived from Rashi's own writing.

For many students of the Torah and Talmud, Rashi's commentary serves both to interpret and to translate the text. To use Rashi's writings as interpretive commentaries on primary texts presumes a degree of proficiency in the source languages of those texts. Such proficiency may well be lacking among many who desire to approach the Bible and Talmud intelligently. Instead, it is necessary for the average student to use Rashi as a sort of translation of the text.

For particularly difficult texts, a running commentary more translates than interprets. Specifically with regard to the Talmud, the structure and syntax of which are often simultaneously concise and complex, a student may keep one finger on the text and another at all times on the corresponding commentary of Rashi. As only limited understanding of the original is attainable without Rashi's help, it is possible to say that Rashi, by providing the medium through which a source language text passes into the target language consciousness of the student, is as much a translator as a commentator.

Interpretation of the Bible poses a challenge different from that of the Talmud. Classical Biblical commentators, such as Rashi, write their interpretations with the assumption that their readers have mastered the fundamental vocabulary and grammar of Biblical Hebrew before approaching a text with the sophistication of Rabbinical exegesis, philological experimentation, or sociological metaphor. Clarification of a text by means of the elucidation of words begins at the point where the writer believes the reader's basic proficiency may prove to be lacking.

Rashi employs his contemporary French vernacular as an explicatory device in relatively few places throughout his commentary on the Torah. In fact, fewer than three hundred French words feature throughout the entire work. Rashi more regularly explains the meanings of difficult words or passages by means of description, synonymy, and exemplification.[1] Rashi refers his readers to the Aramaic translation of Onkelos more often than he provides a French translation of his own. Were Rashi's intention in his commentary merely to popularize the Torah, to render it accessible to the masses,[2] translation into the common contemporary parlance might have been Rashi's primary expedient. Quite to the contrary, it seems that, as a means of defining enigmatic terms, translation into French is, to Rashi, a last resort.

Careful scrutiny of Rashi's commentaries in general reveals that Rashi's straightforward and concise style belies his meticulous methodology. Similarly, close attention to each of Rashi's French glosses within his commentary to the Torah illustrates clearly that Rashi uses French only rarely to translate difficult words or to identify specific referents. More often, a French word is used to provide the equivalent of a verbal image of the original Biblical term. It is possible for the modern reader to find in almost every one of Rashi's glosses a similarity to the source language term so striking as to suggest that Rashi's intentions in providing the word ran deeper than simple translation. To a contemporary native speaker of Rashi's Champagne French, the message behind the gloss undoubtedly rang with clarity and without need for interpretation beyond the first reading.

Modern scholars of Rashi's glosses recognize that Rashi was meticulous in selecting the precise, semantically equivalent translation for Biblical terms. Rashi's famous biographer, Maurice Liber,[3] writes:

> In the Biblical commentaries, concerned, as a rule not so much with the meaning of a word as with its grammatical form, the *laazim* (glosses) reproduce the person, tense, or gender of the Hebrew word; in the Talmudic commentaries, where the difficulty resides in the very sense of the word, the *laazim* give a translation without regard to grammatical form.

Liber thus recognizes that information beyond the definition of a word both lies beneath the Biblical gloss and justifies its use. The Romance philologist Arsène Darmesteter correctly implies, in fact, that Rashi may introduce a gloss with no interest at all in conveying the definitions of words, particularly if the words themselves are within the reader's presumed level of Hebrew competence. He exemplifies this point in this frequently cited comment:[4]

> When he finds in the Biblical text certain unique and inexplicable constructions, Rashi, to illustrate their construct, translates them literally, in phrases which are French in vocabulary alone. Thus, this passage in Exodus XIV: 11, "Because *there were* no graves in Egypt, hast thou taken us away to die in the wilderness?"[5] wherein the first clause employs, in Hebrew, a double negative which, far from negating, strengthens, is translated by Rashi in the following manner: *Si por faillance de non fosses.* With this barbaric sentence, Rashi evidently wanted only to point out the double negative contained in *faillance* and *non.*

Both in concession to Darmesteter's unchallenged authority in French philology and in defense of Rashi's so-called barbarism, it is possible perhaps to surmise that some vernacular form of double negation, one that could not necessarily be corroborated by either contemporary literature or by glossaries concerned with words alone, circulated around the farms and villages of eleventh century France. The grammatically requisite double negation of verbs with *ne...pas* is still today used in linguistics texts to illustrate that grammar rules eschewing double negatives are, like all grammar rules, the result more of convention than of imperative logic.[6] In any event, Darmesteter articulates the proposition that Rashi intended more than simple linkage between symbols and referents in his glosses.

In his recent dictionary, the late scholar J. Greenberg of the Hebrew University also recognizes Rashi's underlying intentions in the employment of glosses:[7]

> Unlike most other exegetes, Rashi used "le'azim" not only to explain difficult words. Any student knows what *mishpat* means, yet it is one of the most glossed words in the ta'nach. In Is. 32.7, Rashi gives this simple word three meanings, corresponding to the three stages in a trial: counsel's speech, verdict, sentence. This is but one example of Rashi's concern to give the precise meanings of words, especially in identifying animals, birds, and parts of the body, both human and animal. The vehicle for his precision the la'az, the rich, living language. And none of the other commentators could use his mother tongue so skilfully (sic).

Greenberg implies that Rashi's glosses are intended to do more than merely to translate difficult words, or words derived from unfamiliar roots. Unfortunately, however, his examples of Rashi's precision indicate no more than that proper referents are linked with Biblical words, or symbols. It is indeed important to know that, in a given usage, a word like *mishpat* can carry one of several definitions, but to propose such a claim is simultaneously to suggest that the Bible's message to the generations is ambiguous, that its words bear only general or approximate values. This is a claim Rashi would have been unlikely to support.

Even in instances intended clearly to merge a symbol with its referent, as would seem to be the case with the identification of animals and the like, a sincere and intellectual desire to derive all one's knowledge from the Torah would demand close attention to the nature of the symbol itself. To know what a word means is at most only equally as important as to know how a word means what it does. Attention to

Rashi's careful choice of French words and constructions, coupled with some understanding of Rashi's philological methodology, would serve to release those of Rashi's interpretive messages which have lain silent to generations of students who knew no French.

Rashi himself implies that even straight translation requires circumspection. In reference to a particular agricultural product (*botnim*),[8] he writes:

> I do not know what they are. In Rabbi Makir's glossary I have seen "pistachios," which I believe are (or, "nonetheless, I believe they are") peaches.

In this case, Rashi articulates the notion that to know a referent for a particular symbol is not the same as to know the definition of a word.[9] In the absence of the ability to link this word with another Biblical use of it, it is impossible for Rashi to establish the root's true meaning. Ostensibly, Rashi could have accounted for the shape of the produce through an association with some contemporary version of the modern word "bud" or "button," but Rashi was too careful a scholar to engage in conjecture without the evidence to confirm his theories.

All scholarly works to date on the subject of Rashi's glosses to the Torah have noted the problems of working without autograph manuscripts. They further lament the corrupt state of the glosses as they appear in printed editions of the Torah. These failures, ironically, represent a vibrant, healthy characteristic of the exiled Jewish nation which can never sufficiently quench its thirst for learning. Generations of copyists, speakers of hundreds of the languages of the Diaspora, refused ever to omit a single of Rashi's invaluable words, even those in the French tongue they could not decipher. In the process of copying again and again from copies of copies, well-intentioned publishers attempted to preserve, as best they could, every letter of Rashi's language.

As modern students of Rashi must necessarily contend with corrupt texts, the various works on this subject have focused on the faithful reconstruction of Rashi's glosses. Despite their recognition of Rashi's objectives in using glosses, it is only occasionally and marginally that any explanation of the glosses' intent is articulated.[10] The task of reconstruction has principally been executed by masters of Romance philology such as Arséne Darmesteter and Menachem Banitt rather than by scholars of Rabbinics or even of Hebrew.

Eventually a critical, authoritative version of Rashi's glossary may emerge from the various speculative reconstructions. For now, their

efforts have provided sufficient information to allow interest in Rashi, the commentator, to include treatments of Rashi's glosses. New works should integrate the gloss with the commentary and should treat these two aspects of Rashi's work as they undoubtedly were intended to be viewed, as two parts of a cohesive whole.

If Rashi, indeed, used his glosses to illustrate linguistic phenomena, it is important for the modern scholar to view Rashi as a philologist. However, to describe Rashi's philological methodology with the terminology of modern linguistic science would be misleading. First, it would suggest that Rashi employed modern scientific techniques in his observations of language phenomena. Moreover, it would imply that, with the introduction of confirmed, authoritative linguistic data, Rashi might have reconsidered some of his propositions regarding language.

Rashi's opinions on linguistic matters stemmed from his keen observation and his close attention to every detail of the Torah, and the Torah, of course, is a linguistically transmitted document. In a manner akin to such early philologists as Grimm, he recognized certain phenomena and derived generalizations about them. Traditional Jewish literature was the only relevant testing ground for Rashi's theories because to Rashi the Torah was the sole source of truth and reality in the world. Only in retrospect is it possible to ascribe the terminology of modern science to the methodology of ancient masters. To use a different analogy, it is impossible to say of Kant that he was a Kantian.

Even had Rashi known[11] of modern methods of establishing etymology and etymological cognates, he would certainly not have adjusted his commentaries to conform with them. He did not do so with the contemporary equivalent of science, that is, the philosophical theories of his own day.[12] Rather, Rashi apparently worked under the assumption that a word which traditional Jewish literature, Biblical or Rabbinical, associates with another word is indeed a cognate to that word. The cognateness is not established by common etymology, as, to Rashi all Hebrew words constitute the language by which the world was created and they must therefore all have been in existence at the same, first moment of history.[13] Cognateness is, rather, semantic; all words with a phonemically similar root must somehow bear a common meaning.

In Rashi's linguistic method, a root word and its meaning are forged into one indivisible symbol. To discover a root's basic meaning, it is necessary to examine the Biblical usage of every word constructed around that root.[14] Rashi often cites the definitions of Menachem b. Saruk, whose *Mahberet* illustrates the meanings of root words by joining together the various Biblical verses in which the roots appear. Thus,

Rashi will define a difficult word and comment, "This is how Mena-chem compounded it."[15]

Rashi describes how this method works by citing the Midrash[16] to explain the passage, "She shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man."[17] Says Rashi, "One term (*isha*) falls on the other (*ish*),[18] indicating that the world was created in the Holy Language." Again, commenting on Moses' choice of copper to form the snake he had been commanded to place in view of all Israel,[19] Rashi comments, "God[20] called it a snake (*nahash*), so I shall fashion it from copper (*nehoshet*). One term falls on the other." Inasmuch as Rashi, based on Midrashic tradition, assumes that both God and Moses participated in this latter discourse, it is reasonable to assume that he would have accepted their etymological findings. Had the Bible been delivered in English, an Anglophone Moses might have fashioned a "cobra" of "copper," similarly accounting for "one term falling on the other."

For the purposes of illustration, Rashi often employs the "one term falls on the other" method in his glosses. That his French words and Biblical Hebrew words stem from what modern linguists would consider to be different language stocks is irrelevant to Rashi's methodology. First, the gloss serves the purpose of illustration; words need not actually be related to imply a semantic association. More importantly, Rashi's commentary naturally assumes all elements of the universe to have originated at a single Divine source. Differences are illusions in a world where, ultimately, all is One.

To explain one of the names of Mount Hermon, Rashi[21] notes the phonemic similarity between the Biblical name *Senir* and the German word *Schnee*.[22] In his commentary on Rashi, *Siftei Hakhamim* proposes that the German Biblical word had undergone a process of metathesis, deriving from another of the mountain's names, *Siryon*, resulting in a Canaanite word and, ultimately, the German one.[23] A modern linguist would argue that the majority of Indo-European languages employ the same root for "snow" and that the French *neige*, as Rashi might have glossed the word, is no exception. To Rashi, however, a word must display its cognateness to another in its phonemic structure. A translation cannot serve the purposes of illustration unless it does so in an evident manner.

Rashi implies an etymological affinity between the ritual herb *tsari* and the palliative *thériaque*.[24] It is possible, perhaps, to surmise that it is this very assumption of cognateness that explains Rashi's translation of the word. Ramban disagrees with the translation,[25] though ostensibly not for ignorance of French.

Allowing again for metathesis, it is possible that Rashi associates the Hebrew *kitor*[26] with the French *torche*, or "torch." Rashi's commentary further explains that the pillar of smoke twisted as it rose, like a palm tree.[27] Applying his technique of etymological derivation intralingually (i.e. within French itself), Rashi may have been indicating as well that *torche* signifies both the shape ("tower") and the motion ("turn") of the smoke.

This analysis of *torche* indicates that even if a French word does not, in its phonemic structure, share what Rashi would deem to be a common root with a Biblical word, it may nonetheless do so on its morphemic level. A basic root meaning in one language extends metaphorically to provide the word for another, semantically associated, referent. For example, the English word "give" provides a basic meaning which extends into a word such as "forgive," being a metaphorical form of giving. Another language may begin with its own phonemic version of the same meaning and extend it into the same metaphorical usage. Thus, French *donner* becomes, not coincidentally, *pardonner*.

When Rashi encounters the expression *marbe raglayim*[28] in reference to an insect-like creature, he presents the French word *centepiede*, indicating in the reader's own language that the same metaphor extends the same semantic root to denote the same referent. To describe how a Hebrew root meaning "to lean" can refer to a small house attached to another, larger house, Rashi offers *appendiz*.[29] The French word illustrates how the name for one object can signify its general association with another object. The *appendiz* appears to hang (*pendre*) from the main house. In a parallel fashion, an English speaker might call it a "penthouse" or a "lean-to." Elsewhere, Rashi notices that the word *nedava*[30] suggests both the desire to contribute and the contribution itself. He thus translates the word as *présent*, noting the combination of "presence," or "goodwill," and the "present" itself.

Often, Rashi recognizes that a word, regardless of its etymological or semantic derivation, carries a particular connotation by virtue of its association with a particular environment. The etymological meaning of the English word "knight," for example, means simply "servant." The word's constant use in the service of royalty caused its meaning to ameliorate such that it connotes a degree of royalty.

In this way, Rashi in one place translates *mishpat*[31] as *justice* when its connotation is "punishment." The Old French term is legal in tenor, thus associating it with *mishpat*. The word's connotation is "a legally meted punishment." The English expression, "to see that justice is done," retains this connotation, as does the Modern French, *"faire*

justice." On the premise that Rashi's translation of *kehuna*[32] is *serventrie,* the gloss is a cognate of the Modern French and English word "service," a word implying work in general but with special application to religious practices.

Sometimes Rashi uses a gloss to illustrate how a French word can bear the same double meaning as a Hebrew one does. Thus the reader is instructed not to confuse a specific use of a root with its general use. He translates *hokhahta,*[33] which usually means, "you have proven," as *aprover.* By doing so, he shows how a French root meaning "to prove" implies in a particular instance "approval," in a fashion precisely parallel to the Hebrew semantic shift. While the Modern French *approuver* bears a slightly different connotation, Rashi's use of the word certainly fits with English "to approve." After all, Rashi lived during the Norman Conquest, and it was a dialect of the French of his day that invaded England and its language. A word adopted from another tongue will always preserve its original meaning more faithfully in the host language than in the source language.[34]

The word *hagmi'ini*[35] describes a very specific way of drinking while simultaneously taking in air. It is similar to how people sip hot drinks, but more hearty. Rashi's translation, *humer,* denotes a sort of breathing in, while it connotes in its evident Latin stem the idea of a liquid, as in the word "humidity."

Similarly, Rashi may provide a gloss to distinguish among putative synonyms to prevent the reader from using a general translation for all of them. A Jew's first exposure to the Torah in its original language occurs at a young age. Fine distinctions may elude a young mind. Teachers, therefore, find a need to generalize concepts in order to convey them. Later, the general translation needs to be corrected and refined to foster a degree of sophistication in Bible study.

The difference between *shevira* and *bikua* may be too subtle for a child, who will, therefore, probably be taught to translate both as "to break." Rashi provides the adult student with *fendre*[36] to clarify the specific idea of "breaking through," or "splitting." Further, Rashi could deduce the etymology of the word by association with other words like "defend" and "offend," and, by Menahem b. Saruk's method of linkage applied translingually, define it correctly to mean "to strike."

A reader can translate *bor* as a "well" in most of the places it appears in the Bible. When the word is used to refer to a prison, however, Rashi provides the gloss *fosse,*[37] which he elsewhere uses to mean "grave,"[38] as it means yet today. Rashi's implication is that a *bor* is so

named because it is dug, as *fosse* denotes etymologically. The absence of earth, rather than the presence of water, distinguishes it from a well. Rashi does not gloss the word at its earliest appearance,[39] because there, confusion with a well is insignificant. Rashi himself interprets one passage to imply that the lack of water in that particular *bor* was noteworthy.[40]

In another instance, Rashi prevents the student from translating *miksha*[41] simply as "solid." His fear is perhaps confusion with "solder," which would lead to faulty conclusions about the construction of the *menora* in the Tabernacle. He shows that the same Hebrew root, *k.sh.h.*, can, by metaphorical extension, mean "hammer." He ultimately translates the term as "*batediç*," denoting the "beating" process by which the *menora* was formed. It is interesting to note that according to Rashi, both possibilities can be read into this word. The verse instructs Moses how to form the *menora* for the Tabernacle alone, but may perhaps as well imply, according to Rashi, instructions for the *menora* in the Temple, which may, in fact, have comprised discrete elements.[42]

Many of Rashi's glosses deal with problematic grammatical structures of Biblical words. Many simple root words are translated to reveal their participial construct. Thus, he provides: *alant, audant, disant, faisant, gardant,* and *molant.*[43] In the case of *faisant*, Rashi is presenting the syntactical unit only and is not even addressing a specific word in the Bible. A gloss may illustrate how an affix can change the word for a specific noun into the word for a general one. The word *erbiç*[44] shows the difference between a blade of grass and its general growth, or "herbage." Rashi explains the quality of reflexiveness of verbs by describing the French reflexive *se* independently of the entire gloss, *decomplesent se.*[45]

A small but intriguing class of Rashi's glosses compares Biblical descriptions to sociological features familiar to eleventh century Frenchmen. Of the baskets in the baker's dream,[46] Rashi, after describing the appearance of these baskets, comments:

> In our land, there are many such (baskets). It is the custom of those who sell the cakes called *obledes* to place them in the same baskets.

Although he ultimately excuses the fault, Liber writes of this aspect of Rashi's commentary:[47]

> Rashi was not always familiar with natural products, or with the creations of art, or with the customs and usages of distant countries. Still

less was a rabbi of the eleventh century likely to have an idea of what even Maimonides was acquainted with, the local color and the spirit of dead civilizations. Rashi—to exemplify this ignorance—explained Biblical expressions by customs obtaining in his own day: "to fill the hand,"[48] he thinks he explains by comparing it with a feudal ceremony and discovering in it something analogous to the act of putting on gauntlets.

Rashi, in fact, displays no degree of ignorance at all in the comparison. Attention to the full text of the commentary reveals that Rashi was drawing only a linguistic parallel between the initiation of the *kohen* and the gauntlet ceremony. Furthermore, had Rashi, famous for his brevity, wanted to propose that the Biblical account was in fact a gauntlet ceremony, he would have needed to do no more than to provide the gloss *gant* alone. The long Hebrew description that precedes the gloss shows that it, like all the other glosses, is only a complementary element of Rashi's complete commentary. He is suggesting, rather, that there is a universal quality to certain rituals, including the presentation of the implements or vestments of an office upon inauguration into that office. The gauntlet is indeed an example of one category of such rituals. It was Liber who said of Rashi, "Though methodical, he lacked the power to generalize."[49] In this case, Rashi evidently is generalizing and then exemplifying, as a good teacher must, with a familiar, indeed comparable, referent.

This examination of a small number of Rashi's glosses has attempted to illustrate how Rashi, in his glosses, paid careful attention to the complete semantic load of a meaning both in source and in target language. In the process, several categories have been established by which the various purposes, Rashi may have had for his use of French can be classified. Semantic, non-definitional aspects of French words have been viewed from the perspective of a native, contemporary speaker of Rashi's French. Mostly, Rashi's glosses have been treated as Rashi undoubtedly treated them, as elements of his commentary rather than as supplements to it. It is this overall approach which must direct a more comprehensive study of Rashi's Biblical glosses.

Students of the Torah unanimously laud Rashi's genius and acumen. Studies of his interpretive use of translation have focused principally on areas relevant to Romance philology. Such studies are essentially complete, and it is time for their findings to be reintroduced into studies of Rashi's exegetic methodology. The few examples treated in this study have attempted to draw several of the broad categories into

which Rashi's glosses may be classified. Each of Rashi's glosses in the Torah must be examined individually, and the results must be compared both with Rashi's glosses in the rest of the Bible and to the glosses and methodologies of other commentators. Perhaps the time has come to reassess assumptions regarding the putatively more purely translative nature of Rashi's Talmudic glosses. Even a search for codes to reveal whether Rashi himself ever hinted to his own translation policy may prove to be fruitful. A new study can attempt to discern which classes of words Rashi prefers not to translate when translation may seem helpful. As one area of Rashi studies, that of transcriptional reconstruction, reaches its close, a new field, that of rediscovering Rashi's translative purpose, can now open. Initial examinations indicate that this latter endeavor is one in which Rashi, the master, expected generations of his students to engage themselves.

NOTES

1. E.g. Gn. 3:13 & 3:16.
2. See Silver, Daniel Jeremy: *A History of Judaism*, v. 1., New York, 1974 (p. 330).
3. Liber, Maurice: *Rashi*, Philadelphia, 1906. (p. 99).
4. "*Glosses et Glossaires Hébreux-Français du Moyen-Age*," *Romania* I, 1872. (p. 157).
5. Translation from *The Holy Scriptures, According to the Masoretic Text*, Tel Aviv, 1971.
6. See Bréal, Michel, *Semantics* (translated by Mrs. Henry Crust), New York, 1964 (p. 200).
7. Greenberg, J. *Foreign Words in the Bible Commentary of Rashi*, Jerusalem, 1988. (Introduction).
8. Gen. 43:11.
9. This distinction is evident in the works of Bertrand Russell, Frege, S. I. Hayakawa, and many other twentieth century scholars. See, for example, Russell's *Principles of Mathematics*, p. 47.
10. See Catane, Mochè, *Otsar La'azei Rashi*, Jerusalem, 1984 (Introduction).
11. See Berliner, A. *Raschi - Kommentar über den Pentateuch*.
12. Liber, p. 76.
13. n.c. Rashi to Gen. 2:23, cited below.
14. In Rashi's system, a cognate is established by the use, elsewhere in the Bible, of the same root with a similar but not identical meaning. Rashi calls the revealing, other usage its *"Rei'a beMikra."*
15. *E.g.* Gen. 35:16.
16. *Gen. Rabba* 18:4.
17. Gen. 2:23.
18. *"Lashon nofel al lashon."*
19. Nu. 21:9.

20. Written thus at the author's request.
21. Dt. 3:9.
22. This work concentrates on Rashi's intentions behind his use of French glosses in his commentary to the Torah. Other works have already undertaken the task of reconstructing Rashi's original French words and of transcribing them back into Roman characters. I base this work on their findings. When I present a gloss for the purposes of illustration, I do not, unless I expressly state otherwise, necessarily concern myself with the precise reconstructed gloss as long as the relevant phonemic, morphemic, or syntactic element is evident. The morphemic information for the root word of "pastry," for example, is identical whether the Old French, Modern French, or English word is presented as a representative.
23. Ibn Ezra to Obadiah 1:20 claims that Germany was populated by Canaanites who had escaped the Hebrew conquest of the Land of Israel.
24. Ex. 30:34.
25. To Ramban, "thériaque" is a class of species, not a particular one.
26. Gen. 28:19
27. *timur-tamar.*
28. Lev. 11:42.
29. Nu. 34:7.
30. Ex. 25:2, and see *Siftei Hakhamim*.
31. Dt. 32:41.
32. Ex. 28:3. Dayan I. Gukovitzky, in his *Targum haLa'az*, London, 1992, uses this transcription. Others, including Greenberg and many of the printed editions of the Torah, differ.
33. Gen. 24:14.
34. See Myers, L.M. & Hoffman, Richard L., *The Roots of Modern English*, Boston, 1979. Second edition (p. 124).
35. Gen. 24:17.
36. Gen. 22:3.
37. Gen. 41:14.
38. Ex. 14:11.
39. Gen. 37:20.
40. See *Rashi* to Gen. 37:24.
41. Ex. 25:31.
42. See *Kesef Mishne* to Rambam, *Yad haHazaka*, *Bet haBehira*, 3:4. Nonetheless, it is important to determine whether Rashi would concur with Rambam on this specific matter. See Tal. B., *Men.* 28-29 with attention to the relevant comments of Rashi.
43. Respectively, Nu. 15:35, Dt. 1:16, Dt. 6:23, Nu. 15:35, Dt. 27:1, Dt. 29:21.
44. Gen. 1:11.
45. Ex. 15:24.
46. Gen. 40:16.
47. P. 89.
48. Ex. 28:41.
49. P. 93.