Restoring a Vernacular Jewish Voice:
The Old French Elegy of Troyes*

Kirsten A. Fudeman

Ms. ebr. 322 of the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana contains two sister elegies, one in Hebrew and the other in Old French (f. 188v–189v). The latter, written in semi-cursive Ashkenazic Hebrew script, is the best-known vernacular work produced by medieval French-speaking Jews, as well as one of the most detailed sources available to us regarding the martyrdom of thirteen Jews in Troyes in the spring of 1288. Scarcely a decade has passed since its original publication by Arsène Darmesteter in 1874 that scholars have not praised its realism, pathos, and apparent spontaneity, offered full or partial translations, or called attention to its literary and historical value (in addition to the many works cited below, see, for example, Renan 1877: 475–82, Fleg 1951: 281–3,[1] Lehrmann 1941: 40–1, Zumthor 1954: 289–90, Holmes 1962: 315, Kukenheim 1963: 97, Rosenberg 1992: 23 [n. 1]).

My own engagement with the elegy began when, as a graduate student, I first started exploring the diversity of spellings found in Old French texts written in the Hebrew alphabet (henceforth Hebraico-French texts). Over time, my engagement with the elegy intensified

---

[1] Fleg reprints Darmesteter's (1881: 215–8) translation of the elegy.

and came to encompass not only its spelling and language, but also its cultural and historical context. In this paper, I present some of the fruits of this work, correcting what I consider to be errors and misunderstandings in all previous editions of the elegy and offering solutions to outstanding historical questions regarding the martyrs and their last moments.

The historical context of the martyrdom has been treated before (Darmesteter 1874: 480–5, 1881: 237–47, Chazan 1973: 180–1, Jordan 1989: 190–1, Einbinder 2002: 126–31), so I present only selected facts here. From various medieval Jewish sources presented by Darmesteter (1874, 1881), it appears that on March 26 – Good Friday – of 1288, which also happened to be the seventh day of Passover, a corpse was planted in the home of the Jew Isaac Châtelain, scholar, poet, and property owner. It was discovered, and Jews were accused of murder. Isaac, his pregnant wife, his two sons, his daughter-in-law, and eight other Jews were arrested and condemned to die. The names of the eight were as follows: R. Samson, *surnommé Ḥatan* (*le Gendre*) and *ha-Qadmon* 'the Ancient one/Easterner'; R. Solomon; Dan Bandit (Bendit) or *Baruch* of Avirey; R. Simeon the Scribe; R. Jonah (*Colon* in Old French); R. Isaac Cohen; R. Ḥayyim (or *Vivant*) of Brinon; and R. Ḥayyim (*Vivant*) of Chaource. They met their death in flames on Saturday, April 24, 1288.

The manuscript in which the two elegies are found dates from the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century. The elegies occupy the final two folios, which measure 227 mm × 178 mm and 230 mm × 175 mm, respectively, although the original dimensions were somewhat different: during restoration, parchment was added at the bottom of both; furthermore, the width of f. 189 is not uniform (it measures 175 mm at its widest). The particular damage suffered by the folio containing the French text is due to its being at the end of the manuscript, a position to which Hebraico-French texts were often relegated. Photocopied images of the elegies were published by Einbinder (1999: 203–5).[2]

Both elegies consist of seventeen mono-rhymed quatrains, with the number of syllables in each line varying considerably. Such variation is normal in Hebraico-French poetry (see, for example, Blondheim 1926: 19, 1927b: 3). The title "R[abbi]" appears several times, but I agree with Darmesteter (1881: 212–3), who believed it was not intended to be pronounced. Pfeffer (2005: 146) has written, "there is a clear sense of caesura in many of [the lines]." More precisely, the caesura coincides in

---

[2] Einbinder's original labels to f. 188b and 189a were reversed during production.

most lines with punctuation in the form of a raised dot. Its placement, like the syllable count, is somewhat irregular.

The author of the Hebrew elegy is identified twice, first by acrostic and then by a note, as Jacob bar Judah of *Lotra*, or Lorraine. Based on structural similarities between it and the Old French elegy, Darmesteter (1881: 218–9) thought it likely that they were the work of a single man, and I agree. Nonetheless, it is possible that they were composed by different people, so I conservatively refer to "the poet" of the French elegy in what follows.

Previous Studies of the Elegy

The elegy's first editor, Arsène Darmesteter, dedicated two philological and historical studies to it (1874, 1881; the first and part of the second are reprinted in Darmesteter 1890: I, 217–307). These included a translation of the text in modern French (1881: 215–8). More recently, the elegy has been treated from a historical and literary perspective by Einbinder (1999, 2002: 126–54) and Pfeffer (2005, 2007) and newly edited by Kiwitt (2003). Since Darmesteter's studies were published, it has been translated into modern French at least twice, albeit only in part (Schwarzfuchs 1975: 87–8 translates seven of the elegy's seventeen stanzas; Abramovitsch 1966: 6 translates fourteen), and three times into English (Einbinder 1999: 228–30, Pfeffer 2005: 149–50, Pfeffer 2007: 79–80; the differences between Pfeffer's two translations are slight). In addition, a partial English translation in verse appeared in Lowenthal (1933: 90). And yet this poem merits further attention.

Darmesteter did not examine the manuscript himself, relying on the notes of and communication with Adolf Neubauer and an Italian Jewish man, Angelo G. G. di Capua (Darmesteter 1874: 443). Nor was he able to obtain a photograph of the text. Despite the care with which Darmesteter approached his studies, the transliteration and Romanization of the Hebraico-French text presented in his articles display some serious misunderstandings and lacunae, as well as minor typological substitutions, omissions, and additions. Blondheim (1926: 34–5, 1927a: 159–61) published two different lists of corrections to Darmesteter's edition, reproduced in Blondheim (1927b: 18–19, 79–81), but neither is comprehensive.

In her two studies, Einbinder compares the literary conventions of the Hebrew and Old French elegies, which she provides with English translations. She also examines three other Hebrew elegies to the Troyes mar-

tyrs. She places the elegies within their diglossic cultural context and provides a comprehensive and moving analysis of the historical events. As Einbinder (1999: 209) states, the Hebrew elegy, in particular, "naturally compels associations with biblical situations and their exegetical traditions," and in the final section of this paper, I frequently apply her interpretive methodology.

In 2003, Kiwitt published a critical edition of the Old French elegy next to a strict transliteration of the original text. He analyzes words of particular lexical interest and presents a concise summary of the spelling conventions of the text, comparing them to conventions found in other Hebraico-French texts as well as Yiddish. Kiwitt comments on the meaning of certain lines but does not offer a full translation of the text.

Pfeffer's expertise in medieval French literature is apparent from her discussion of literary aspects of the elegy. In her first article, she addresses possible models for the representation of the two women martyrs, and in the second she offers a detailed and innovative analysis of poetic features of the text. In both studies, she also provides a new edition of the elegy, along with translations into English.

Despite their many merits, these recent studies have in common the retention of numerous misunderstandings originally found in Darmesteter's edition and a sense of puzzlement before certain terms such as *Qadmeneth/Qadmeneis* (l. 36) and *adesa* (l. 50). I would also question my predecessors' translations of specific words and phrases.[3] Why have talented scholars been so challenged by this text? One reason is that they have not realized to what extent Darmesteter's editions were flawed and Blondheim's lists of corrections incomplete. These men are two of the greatest figures in the field of Hebraico-French studies. But Darmesteter never saw the manuscript, and at the time that Blondheim consulted it, he was focused on other projects. Even Kiwitt's and Pfeffer's new editions closely follow Darmesteter's text, as it was corrected by Blondheim. Another reason is that, since Darmesteter's first study of the elegy, scholars have been convinced that the text has been substantially corrupted by copying.[4] Some of the emendations they have proposed or accepted become unnecessary once we reparse lines or re-examine letter

---

[3] Einbinder's translation has already been commented upon by Kiwitt (2003: *passim*) and Pfeffer (2005: 147, 2007: 69).

[4] Darmesteter (1874: 473, 476), having noted that *n* is regularly suppressed in syllable codas, asked whether the scribe of the Vatican elegy might have been copying from an original in the Latin alphabet. At the 38th Annual Association for Jewish Studies Conference in San Diego (2006), I argued that this is unlikely. Syllable-final *n*'s are frequently omitted by scribes of Hebraico-French texts, including marginal jottings that were surely spontaneous and not copied from other sources.

forms. Still another reason is that, with the exception of Kiwitt, recent scholars have focused on literary and historical, as opposed to philological, analysis of the text.

Finally, I would maintain that when editing a text like this, whose chief difficulty lies not in the language, but in the fact that it is written in the Hebrew alphabet, expertise not only in Old French and medieval Hebrew paleography, but also in Hebraico-French spelling conventions is essential. Of the scholars who have worked on the elegy most recently, only Kiwitt has had this combination of skills. Furthermore, it is not enough to work with the French text. Where the use of the Hebrew script leads to ambiguities, or where the sense of particular lines has consistently eluded scholars, one must also consult Hebrew sources on the Troyes martyrs, in the tradition of Darmesteter and Einbinder.

Paleographical Considerations and Dialect

The elegy text is genuinely difficult. As in other Hebrew and Hebraico-French texts, vowels are sometimes represented ambiguously or not at all. Consonants are also sometimes represented ambiguously, and function words are often attached to content words. However, Darmesteter's characterization of the difficulties the elegy poses is overly pessimistic, as he would have realized, no doubt, had he been able to examine the manuscript. His illustrious colleague Adolf Neubauer, editor and translator of various Hebrew works and cataloguer of Hebrew manuscripts in the Bodleian library and college libraries of Oxford, was certainly adept at reading Hebrew manuscripts. But his notes about this Old French text, which he seems to have understood only partially, must have conveyed doubts about the forms of certain words that Darmesteter carried over into his article. For the most part, the elegy's Hebrew letters are neatly written: even the *resh* is usually differentiated from *dalet*, contra Darmesteter (1874: 458). The letters *s, m* and *n* are often omitted, but in predictable contexts. Vowels are often indicated by *matres lectionis* (Hebrew consonant letters that came to represent selected vowels as well). Thus, *aleph* (') represents *a, e*; *waw* represents *o, u*, and when doubled, *v*; and *yod* represents *j, e, ei, i*, and when doubled, *ei, ai*, or [ž] (earlier [dž]). A horizontal bar called a *rafe* and a scribal mark resembling a modern *hachek* (both indicated by a *rafe* in the present edition), usually indicating an affricate or a fricative variant of a consonant letter, are used only irregularly, but such inconsistency is typical of Hebraico-French texts.

Darmesteter, in his own Romanization, transliterates Hebrew *qof* as *k*. I generally prefer *c* or *qu*, depending on context. I consistently add *n* and *m* between brackets, although they are often omitted by the scribe syllable-finally, because in most contexts the preceding vowel was probably nasalized, even if the nasal consonant itself was no longer pronounced. Where they have been omitted by the scribe, I do not insert *l*'s and *s*'s.

The 3pl stressed oblique pronoun written *'ws* could be transcribed either *os*, *ous/us*, or *eus*. I follow Darmesteter (as does Pfeffer) in preferring *os*. Although I agree with Kiwitt (2003: 265) that *eu* is sometimes written with a *waw* in Hebraico-French texts, the material in Dees (1980: maps 19–23) suggests that *eus* was less typical of the region from which our elegy comes.

The dialect of the elegy is usually identified as Champenois, following Darmesteter (1874: 476).[5] Darmesteter wrote: "Il faut sans doute supposer un dialecte intermédiaire entre le français et le lorrain, le champenois, le dialecte de Troyes, par exemple." As these words suggest, determination of dialect is a delicate matter. Based on linguistic features of the text and the fact that its author was probably Jacob bar Judah of Lorraine, I identify its dialect instead as Lotharingian. Boundaries between dialects are porous, and I also note Champenois and Burgundian features in the text. The Burgundian dialectal region lay to the south of the Champenois and Lotharingian regions, and it is not surprising to find features of all three dialects represented in a text that commemorates an event that took place in Troyes, in southern Champagne.

Particularly characteristic of Lotharingian in our text is effacement of /ɫ/ in syllable-final position rather than vocalization, and not merely after high vowels, where this process was more widespread. Hence we find *vorent < volrent* and *nu < nul* (l. 4), *medeie[n]t < meldeient* (l. 6), *ma < mal* (l. 18), *tie < tiel* (*tel*) (l. 19), *hat < halt* (l. 29), *atres < altres* (l. 35), *atre < altre* (l. 42), *madit < maldit* (l. 41), *bia* or *bea < bel* (l. 49). (See Kibler 1984: 292, Dees 1987: map 128.)

In both Lotharingian and Burgundian, differentiation of *ei* to *oi* after a labial consonant was not checked by a following nasal (Pope 1952: 495 [§ xix], Kibler 1984: 292).Our text clearly has *poine* for *peine* (ll. 20, 64), whereas it has the equivalent of *ei* elsewhere (including *peines*, l. 57). It is as if the scribe wished to specify a dialectal pronunciation

---

[5] See also Einbinder (1999: 209), Kiwitt (2003: 266), Pfeffer (2005: 146). I wrote this section before seeing Pfeffer (2007: 73), where she revises her original assessment and considers the dialect to be that of Lorraine.

of this word.[6] Our text also contains at least two unambiguous examples of the reduction of *ie* to *e*, common in Burgundian (Kibler 1984: 238): *bein* (l. 10), *devein* (l. 58).

The following features are found in Champenois, Lotharingian, and Burgundian, though not exclusively:

(1) Retention of *nr* clusters without epenthesis to *ndr*; *lr* clusters were also retained originally, with subsequent effacement of /ł/, as discussed above. Examples: *tenra* (l. 26), *genre* (l. 36) [ms.: *ğrn'*],[7] *vinrent* (l. 53), *quevanret* (l. 54), and *prenra* (l. 65) [ms: *prinera*); *vorent* (< *volrent*; l. 4). See Pope (1952: 194), Dees (1980: maps 241, 252), Dees (1987: maps 373, 410–412, 429).

(2) *An* in place of *on* (l. 60, 62). See Kibler (1984: 293), Dees (1987: map 57).

(3) The masculine singular oblique article *lo/lou* is occasionally used instead of *le* (ll. 38, 60).[8] See Pope (1952: 496), Kibler (1984: 291, 293), Dees (1980: map 35–36 and 1987: map 78).

(4) *Mont* instead of *molt, mout, mot*, etc. Clear examples can be found in ll. 1, 18. Instances of *mot* (ll. 18, 26, 37, 41, 44, 66) can also be read *mo[n]t*. See Dees (1987: map 504).

Finally, we must note that Latin tonic free *a* developed to *ei* in many dialects, including Champenois, Lotharingian, and Burgundian (Pope 1952: 491 [§iv], 494 [§iv]). Most class 1 infinitives in our text end in -*yr*, which could accordingly be Romanized as -*eir*, and class I past participle endings in our text could be Romanized as -*ei, eiz*, for example. However, because of the indeterminacy of the Hebrew spelling and inconsistency on the part of the scribe, I have often opted for the simpler spelling (e. g., -*er* vs. -*eir*) in my Romanization.

The author uses occasional Hebrew words, such as *ḥatan* 'bridegroom, son-in-law' (l. 9), *tosafot* 'collections of comments on the Tal-

---

[6] Kiwitt (2003: 265) writes that the spelling *poine* may be due to Latin influence, which would be most unusual in a non-scientific Hebraico-French text like this one, or to retention of an earlier and hypothetical Hebraico-French *graphie*.

[7] Pfeffer (2007: 82–3 [n. 21]) disputes the conventional wisdom that the manuscript has the letters *lwğrn'* (the apostrophe represents *aleph*). See, for example, Darmesteter (1874: 465, note on IX, 3 [*sic*], 1881: 209, note on IX, 4), Kiwitt (2003: 264). (Typographical errors in Pfeffer 2007: 83 [n. 21] give the false impression that Kiwitt saw the letters *lwqrn* – he read *lwğrn'*, as I do.) Instead, Pfeffer reads the *gimel* (*g*) as *waw* (*v*). The *gimel* is clearly written and consists of two strokes, one vertical, the other nearly horizontal. Someone unaccustomed to working with semi-cursive Ashkenazic script might easily mistake the vertical stroke for a *waw*. This, however, leaves the second, nearly horizontal stroke, unaccounted for.

[8] Note that *lo* is also sometimes used in nominative contexts (ll. 22, 41, 49, 58).

mud' (l. 16),[9] and *qedushah* 'sanctification, benediction', used here to refer to martyrdom (l. 34), as well as a hybrid verb, *asqer* (l. 7) 'engage in study of the law', which has a Hebrew-Aramaic root, *'sq-*, and a French infinitival ending (see Commentary below). I identify Hebrew words in the Romanization and translation below using small capitals.

My transcription in Hebrew characters, below, is as faithful to the manuscript as possible, with suggestions for damaged portions between square brackets. In ll. 2 and 4, two letters ('t' and 'r') have been cut off by a binder, and a hole has left a gap in l. 14 whose reconstruction would require an act of *divinatio*. Punctuation and pointing of the Hebrew transcription, both inconsistent, are original. I found two clear examples of metathesis, *tnat* for *tant* (l. 25) and *grne* for *genre* (l. 36) (and possibly *en* for *n'e[n]* in l. 32). In a couple of instances (see l. 7, and note on l. 46), the scribe appears to have left off or added a letter. He occasionally writes *waw* for *yod* (ll. 6, 33). He does not always maintain the Old French case distinctions, since at the time he was writing, the system was in decline. More serious are the errors in lines 22 and 65–6 (see Commentary), which have led me to conclude that the Vatican version of the elegy is a copy. The editorial decisions I made in preparing the Romanization of the Hebrew-letter text were guided, in part, by the guidelines on editing Old French texts laid out in Foulet and Speer (1979). I silently expanded one abbreviation (*Israel*, l. 1). A marginal * indicates that a line is treated in the commentary that follows the English translation.

Text

1	מוֹנְט שונט אמיאקִיף ישר׳. ליאגריאה גֹאנט.	Mont sont a mecheif Israel, l'egaree gent,	
	אוש נאפואט מיש . ש[או]ש שאוונט אנראגֹ[.]ט.	Os n'e[n] poë[n]t meis se [o]s s'e[n] vont enrajan[t];[10]	*
	קרדאנטרא אוש פֿורט ארש מינץ פרוץ קורשיֹיא איגֹנט.	Car d'entre os fure[n]t ars meinz proz corsage e gent,	*
	קי פור ל[ור ו][יוורא נוורט דוני[ר] נואש ראקִיט דארגֹנט:	Qui por l[or v]ivre ne vor-e[n]t done[r] nu as racheit d'argent.	*

---

[9] "In general the point of departure of the *tosafot* is not the Talmud itself but the comments on it by the earlier authorities, principally Rashi" (Ta-Shma 2007: 67).

[10] The Hebrew letters spelling *vont* are difficult to make out in my photograph; I follow Darmesteter's transcription of it.

	Hebrew		
2	טרובליאה איט נוטראה גוֹאייאה. אי נוטראה דידוייט[.]	Troblee eit notre joie e notre deduit	5
	ד[י']שוש קימדיאט לתורה. אילאוֹיאט אנלוֹר קודוייט.	D'[i]sos qui medeie[n]t la Torah e l'aveie[n]t en lor co[n]duit.	*
	אוש נפֿיניאט עסקר אילווֹיר אילנוייֹט.	Os ne fineie[n]t [d']asqer e le jor e la nuit.	*
	אורש שונט ארש איפֿניש קיקון גֹי ווראייאה רקנווייֹט:	Ores sont ars e finés; checun Gé vrai ja requenuit.	*
3	דלטרימלא פֿלוֹנא גֹאנט . שופֿרוש שיטא דולוֹר.	De la tré male felone jant sofro[n]s sete dolor;	
	בֵיין נוש פֿוט קנגֹיר . אימואר לקולוֹר.	Bein nos fo[n]t changer e müer la color.	*10
	גֹי פרנטן פיטי אי אנטן קרי איפלוֹר.	Gé! prent en pité e enten cri e plor,	*
	קר פור נייֹט א[ון]ש פירדו מיט אומא דוֹלוֹר:	Car por nie[n]t a[von]s perdu mei[n]t ome de valor.	*
4	אנפלשא פֿו אמני ר' יצחק קֹאטליין.	En place fu amené R. Yit-ṣḥaq Chatelein,	*
	קיפור גֹי...א לֵשׁא רנטש אימיזֹואש טוט אפליין.	Qui por Gé … lessa rentes e mezo[n]s tot a plein.	*
	אגֹי וֹיף שרנדי ציל קידטוש בינש א[י']טיט פליין[.]	A Gé vif se rendi cil qui de tos biens eteit plein;	15
	בון רפורטור איטייט דתוספות אידפליין:	Bon reportor eteit de TOSA-FOT et de plain.	*
5	לאפרואדא פֿאנמא קנט אילא וויאט. ארדיר שון מרי.	La pruede fanme quant ele vit ardir son mari	
	מונט ליפֿיט מֵאה לאדפרטיאה. דצא גֹיטא. מוט גרנט קרי.	Mont li fit ma la departie; de ce jeta mot grant cri.	
	אילא דיט גֹוֹאה מוריר דטיא מורט קוממון אמי מורי.	Ele dit: "je ve morir de tie mort com mon ami mori."	
	דאפֿנט איטיט גרושא. פורצא גרנט פוייֹנא שופֿרי:	D'e[n]fant eteit grosse; por ce grant poine sofri.	20
6	דוש פֿרירש איפורט ארש. און פטיט איאון גרנט.	Dos freres i fure[n]t ars, un petit e un grant.	
	לופטיט פֿו אבהי . דופֿואה קישי שאפֿרנט.	Lo petit fu ebahi de [la] föee qui si s'eprent	*

	Hebrew	French	
	אידיט הרוא גֵאר טוש[.] איליגרנט ליאפרנט.	E dit: "haro! j'ar tos!" E li grant li aprent	
	אילידיט אפראדיש שרש טוט יֵטא אקרנט:	E li dit: "a paradis seras tot, je te acrant."	
7	לברוש קי טנאט איטיט בילא. אנלא וֹוינט פור פריקֵיר.	La brus qui tant eteit bele, an la vint por prechier,	25
	אונאקואיר ריקא דדונרוש. קיטאטנרא מוט קֵיאר.	"Un ecuier riche [re]don-ro[n]s qui te tenra mot chier."	*
	טנטואט אילא אקמנשא אנקונטרא אש אקרקֵיר.	Tantot ele a quemensé en-contre as a crachier:	
	יֵא נלירי לגֵי ווִיף. פורטט מפוריש אקורקֵיר:	"Je ne leirei le Gé vif; porta[n]t me poreis ecorchier."	
8	אה און וֵוֵיש טוש אנשבלא קָנטיאט האט איקלֵיר.	A un' veis tos ense[m]ble chanteie[n]t hat e cler.	
	פור נֵיט פֻויֵישיאט גֵאט דפֵיטא קידושֵיאט קרולֵיר.	Por nie[n]t fuisse[n]t ja[n]t de fete qui dusse[n]t caroler:	*30
	לימינש לור איטיאט ליאיֵאש. פר קאוש נפואיאט בלֵיר.	Lé mains lor eteie[n]t liees, par que os ne pöeie[n]t baler.	*
	אונקש גֵנש אנוֹוִיט שיהיטיאמנט אלֵיר:	Onques gens [n']en vi[n]t si hetiement a l'er.	*
9	אנפֿוא אונילמנט קומא חתן פֿו אמני̇ק.	En foe [i]nelement come ḤATHAN fu amenez.	
	דפֵירא שאבֵילא קדושה. פורמנטש שֵאיפֵני̇ק.	De fere sa bele qedushah formentes s'é penez.	*
	טוט ליאטרֵש אה אהרדיש . דבונא אורא פֿוני̇ק.	Tot lé atres a a[n]hardis : de bone ore fu nez!	*35
	אילאוֹוִיט אנון ר׳ שמשון לוגֵרנא אלאקדמנֵת:	Il aveit a non R. Shimshon lo Genre e le Qadmeneis.	*
10	אפרֵיש איוֹוינט ר׳ שלמה קי מוט איטֵיט פריֹזֵי..	Aprés i vint R. Shelomo qui mot eteit prisé.	
	איפֿו גֵ̇יטֵיש דדנש לופֿוא. קיאיטֵיט אבראזי.	E fu getés dedans lo foe qui eteit e[m]brasé.	
	דאופריר שון קורש פור גֵי. אינניט פאש רוזי.	D'ofrir son cors por Gé i nen [o]t pas rusé :	*
	קר פור שאמור מורט שופֿרי . בֵיין אנפֿו אנוֹוֵיזֵי:	Car por s'amor mort sofri; bein en fu enveisé.	*40

	Hebrew	French	
11	מוט איטיט אנוׄנימי . לוׄפׄלון למאדיאט.	Mot eteit envenimé lo felon, le madit	*
	דָָארדיר לון אפריש לאטרא. אדון לוקדוש לידיט,	D'ardir l'un aprés l'atre. ADON lo QADOSH li dit,	*
	פֿיטש גרנט פֿו מוׄיש און דבלאמיר שאהרדיט.	"Fetes grant fo, mavés on!" De blamer s'a[n]hardit.	*
	מוט בילא פֿו שאפֿין דאנוׄירי דאנבאדׄיט :	Mot bele fu sa fin d'enivré (Dan Avirey), Dan Ba[n]dit.	*
12	איליאוט און פרודומא . קי פֿורמנט פרינט אפלוׄריר.	Il i ot un prodome qui for- ment print a plorer	45
	אידיט שאיט פור מאמיניאה . קמוׄיאש צי דזיאיפֿריר.	E dit: "c'eit por ma meinie que me veés ci deseperer,	*
	שניט פאש פור מוקורש [.] ארדיר שפֿיט שאן דמוריר.	Ce n'eit pas por mo[n] cors." Ardir se fit san demorer.	*
	שפֿו ר׳ שמעון סופר קי שי ביאן שוׄיט אוריר :	Ce fu R. Shim'on SOFER qui si bien saveit orer.	*
13	לוׄבֵיָיא קולון איוׄיט. קישון פֿו [מ]ׄימש אַטיׄזָה.	Lo bea colon i vint qui son fo [m]eimes atisa.	*
	שְׁפֿיטי פון[ר] [...]שֵׁריר. ווׄטמט איאׄדַזָה.	Ce fit i po[r] [?] sorir, vite- ment i adesa.	*50
	לוׄאיׄיש פור רַנְדְרָא אגֵׄי שוׄיׄיש [אַ]שֵׁיָיׄזָה.	Loa[n]ges por randre a Gé sa veis [a]sei[n]za.[11]	*
	פור [ייׄו]אָׄזָא קָאֵליפֵֿיט אוׄקש נְנוׄייַׄזָה : קולון שמו.	Por [jui]se qu'a[n] li fit o[n]ques ne noisa. — *Colon* WAS HIS NAME.	*
14	פְרֵיקֹואָׄרש וֵֿינְרט ר׳ יצחק כהן רֶקְרִיר.	Prechoers vinr[en]t R. Yitsḥaq Cohen requerir:	
	קיצָא טורְנַט וֵֿיר לוׄר קרֵיאַצָא . אוׄאיׄלי קוׄלַוֶנרֶת פְרִיר.	Qu'i se tornat ver lor crea[n]ce o il li quevanret perir.	
	אידיט קאבֵּייׄש טַנְט גָׄאוׄׄל פֿור גֵׄי מוׄריר.	I dit: "que abeïs tant? Je vuel por Gé morir."	*55
	גָֿשׁוׄיׄי כהן אֵי אוׄפֿרַנְדָא דְמוׄן קורש וׄש אוׄפְֿריר :	"Je sui COHEN. E ofrande de mon cors vues ofrir!"	*
15	אַפֵּיׄנְש אַקַֿפֵּרַש . פֿוׄיׄש ... טְטְנוׄן.	"A peines echaperas, puis [que] te tenon,"	

---

[11] The Hebrew letters spelling *Gé* are difficult to make out in my photograph due to a crease in the manuscript; I therefore follow Darmesteter's transcription of it.

פִּיש לוֹבַלִּיֹּ דְוֵין קְרִיטַיְן . אִי אִירְפוֹנְדִי טַאן טוֹט נוֹן.	Fis lo bailli, "devein cri-tain." E i repondi tantot: "non".	*
פור ל[ור] קֵימְיְן גָּא נְלֵירֵי לְגֵּי וְוִיף נְשוֹן שֵיט נוֹן.	"Por l[or] chemin, je ne leirei le Gé vif ne son se[n]t non."	*
אַנְלַאפְלֵיט ר׳ חיים לוֹשְרוֹרְ[גָ]א אַמֵיטְרָא דְבְרִינוֹן :	An l'apeleit R. Ḥayyim, lo serorge a metre de Brinon.	60
אָקוֹרֵש אִיאוֹט אֵון קדוש . קִיפֿוֹ אַמֵנֵי אוַֹנְט.	E[n]cores i ot un qadosh qui fu amené avant.	16
אַנְלִי פִּיט אֵון פְּטִיט פֿוֹ . אִילֵלֵיטַאן גְרִיוַֹנְט.	An li fit un petit fo, il aleit an grivant.	*
אִי הוּקֵיט גֵּי דבון קאור מְנוּא אִישוֹוַֹנְט.	I hucheit Gé de bon cor menu e sovant.	
דוֹצַֹמֵנְט צוֹפֿרִי פוֹיְינָא . פור שֵירְוֹוִיר לְגֵּי וְוַנְט : כך שמו..	Docemant çofri poine por servir le Gé vivant. (THAT WAS HIS NAME.)	*
גֵּי וַֹנְקֵירָא אִי אַן פְּרִינְירָא· וַֹנְקְנוּש [וַֹנְקְטש] דְצִיפֿלוֹנְש..	Gé vanchera e an prin(e)ra vanch[ance] de cé felons !	*65
דְאַטַאדְרָא טַאוַֹקַאצָא . מוֹט נוש שַאבְלַא לֵיגֹּוֹרֵש לוֹנְש..	De ata[n]dre ta va[n]cha[n]ce mot nos sa[m]ble l[i] jors lons,	*
דְטַאפְרֵיאֵיר דְקוֹר אַנְטֵיר . לַאאוֹנֵישִׁיאוֹש אִיאַלוֹש··	De te preer de cor anteir la o neissio[n]s e alo[n]s.	*
פְרֵיאַש שוֹמֵש אֵיאַפַרְלֵיֹּש· רְפוֹן גֵּי קַאט טַאפְלוֹש :	Preis somes e apareleis. Re-pon, Gé, qua[n]t t'apelo[n]s!	
חסלת הלעז השם יצילני מגוי עז..	HA-SELAT HA-LAʿAZ. HA-SHEM YATSILENI MI-GOI ʿAZ.[12]	

Translation

1 Israel, the abandoned people, is suffering great hardship,
   They cannot help it if they are all enraged;
   For many fine bodies and souls among them were burned,
   Who in exchange for their lives did not want to give even a
                                        [penny of ransom.

2 Our joy and pleasure are troubled   5
   By those who studied Torah and had it in their safe-keeping.
   They did not stop studying the law by day or by night.

---

[12] Dt 28:50, Ps 34:20.

Now they are burned and dead, each one has already recognized
[the true God.

3   At the hands of the very evil people we suffer this pain;
    Indeed they make us switch and change color.   10
    God! take pity on us and hear our call and our cry,
    For we have needlessly lost many a man of worth.

4   To the square was led Rabbi Isaac Châtelain,
    Who for God left income and houses there and then.
    This man who was rich in all things gave himself to   10
    [the living God;
    He was a good teacher of TOSAFOT and plain commentary.

5   When the good wife saw her husband burn
    The separation was very hard for her, so she uttered a loud cry.
    She said: "I am going to die such a death, as my beloved one
    [died."
    She was big with child; for this reason she suffered great pain.   20

6   Two brothers were burned there, one a child, one grown.
    The little one was terrified of the pyre that was catching fire
    And he said: "Help! I am burning up!" And his older brother
    [instructed him
    And said to him, "You will soon be in Paradise, I promise you."

7   They came to preach to the daughter-in-law who was so   25
    [beautiful,
    "We will give you a rich squire who will hold you most dear."
    She at once began to spit at them:
    "I will not give up the living God, therefore you could flay me
    [alive."

8   With one voice, all together, they sang loud and clear.
    They might have been merrymakers who should perform the   30
    [*carole*, but in vain:
    Their hands were bound so that they could not dance it.
    Never did a group of people come so joyfully out into the open
    [air.

9   Like a BRIDEGROOM he was quickly brought to the fire.
    He took great pains to make his beautiful death.
    At once he strengthened the others: how fortunate that he was   35
    [born!

His name was Rabbi Samson the Son-in-Law and the Eastern/
                                      [Ancient One.

10 Afterwards came Rabbi Solomon who was highly esteemed.
   And he was thrown into the fire which was all aflame.
   He did not hold back from offering his body to God:
   He suffered death for love of him; to do so gave him much joy.   40

11 The evildoer, the cursed one, he was filled with poisonous desire
   To burn one after the other. Adon the Holy said to him,
   "Make a big fire, evil man!" and he became emboldened to
                                    [reproach him.
   Of great beauty was his end, like that of a man intoxicated, Dan
                                    [Bandit.

12 There was a good man who began to weep heavily   45
   And said: "It is for my household that you see me here despair,"
   "It is not for myself." He went to burn without tarrying.
   This was Rabbi Simon the Scribe who knew how to chant so well.

13 The handsome dove [*colon*] came there and poked his own fire.
   He did this so as to toast; it took hold fast.   50
   His voice gave instruction for praises to give unto God.
   But in response to the punishment they gave him, he never
                    [made a noise. Colon was his name.

14 Friars came entreating Rabbi Isaac Cohen:
   He could convert to their faith; if not, he would have to die.
   He said: "Why are you so dismayed? I want to die for God."   55
   "I am a cohen. And you want to offer my body as a sacrifice!"

15 "You will scarcely escape, for we have you,"
   Said the bailiff, "Become a Christian." And at once he
                         [answered "No."
   "For their path I will not give up the living God or his holy
                           [name."
   They called him Rabbi Ḥayyim, the brother-in-law of the   60
                       [Rabbi of Brinon.

16 There was yet another holy one who was brought forward.
   They made him a little fire, and he went forward in distress.
   He called to God with all his heart over and over again.
   He suffered meekly to serve the *Living* God. (That was his name.)

17 God will punish and take vengeance upon these evil-doers   65
                                             [for these things!
    The day seems very long to us as we wait for your revenge,
    And as we pray to you with our whole heart, where we are born
                                                      [and where we go.
    We are ready and prepared. Answer, Lord, when we call you!

THE END OF THE FRENCH VERSION [LAʿAZ]. MAY GOD SAVE ME FROM THE
FIERCE PEOPLE.[13]

Commentary

l. 2: *Os* or *E os*. There is a hole in the manuscript here.

n'e[n]: The presence of an *aleph* after the *nun* indicates that there is a clitic, *en*, after the marker of negation. *Ne* in our text is consistently written with a simple *nun*, not followed by *aleph* (see ll. 7, 28, 31, 52, 59). Indeed, the expression, now archaic or literary, is *n'en pouvoir mais*, meaning "n'y pouvoir rien, ne rien pouvoir à quelque chose" (Ménard 1988: §§ 287, 309; *GR*, vol. 4, p. 1052; *TLF*, vol. 11, p. 197).

l. 3: *Corsage e gent*, literally 'bodies and people', although I translate 'bodies and souls'. Our author has a penchant for such near-synonymic doublets. Pfeffer's interpretation, "many noble and worthy people," is also possible. For her, the noun *corsage* is both preceded and followed by an adjective (*proz, gent*).

l. 4: Change all previous editors' *nus* (sometimes emended to *nul*) to *nu as* 'not an ace (object of little or no value)'. Both vowels are indicated in the spelling. Note that *nu(l)*, not *nus*, is the Old French oblique singular form.

l. 6: *En lor conduit* 'in their protection'. See T–L, *AND*, s. v. *conduit*. This should not be confused with modern French *conduite* (f.), one of whose meanings is 'behavior'.

l. 6: *Medeient*: 3pl imperfect (as indicated by the ending *-y't*) of *me(l)der* 'study [the law]'. This is a well-known item of Jewish-French vocabulary, originally from Greek. Blondheim (1925) discusses it at length, s. v. *meletare*. See also Darmesteter (1881: 206–7).[14]

---

[13] *Laʿaz* here, as in most northern French Jewish texts, means 'French'. It is used here nominally, hence my English translation "the French version."

[14] Pfeffer (2007: 71, 79) considers this a form of *maudire*. She translates this line: "Our joy and our pleasure are disturbed by those who slander the Torah and kept it in their behavior."

l. 7: *[d']asqer*: Blondheim correctly explained this word as the Hebrew-Aramaic root *'sq*, which is well attested (see, e. g., Sokoloff 2002a: 873–4, 2002b: 414), with a French infinitival suffix. Kiwitt (2003: 263) followed Darmesteter in emending this form to *tascher*. However, the Hebrew letter *samekh*, used in this word, occurs in Hebraico-French texts only in words of Hebrew-Aramaic origin. Another hybrid form occurs in l. 26 (*qadmeneis*) and is discussed under "Notes on the Martyrs."

l. 8: *fenis* or *finés*: The Hebrew spelling admits both.

ja: The manuscript clearly has three letters after the word *vrai*, *y'h*, best read as Old French *ja*. (On the use of a single *yod* for [ž] and [dž] in Hebraico-French texts, see Banitt 1997: 195.) My predecessors have skipped the final three letters altogether, read them as forming an auxiliary verb (Pfeffer: *e rekenuit*; note, however, that *requenuit* is a preterite), or treated *'h* as a feminine ending on *vrai* (however, *Gé* 'God' is masculine, requiring masculine concord).

requenuit: The typical 3sg preterites of *reconoistre* are *reconut, recognut*, but *reconuit* is also attested. It may have arisen based on the model of *paruit*, a 3sg preterite of *paroistre*.[15] For other instances of *e* where we expect *o*, see ll. 27, 54.

l. 10: *Fo[n]t*. Darmesteter's Romanization *pot* (see, e. g., Darmesteter 1881: 207) is echoed by Kiwitt (2003: 263), Einbinder (1999: 225), and Pfeffer (2005: 147, 2007: 71). Pfeffer (2007) translates this sentence: "it can change our color and make us pale." The reading *pot*, while certainly possible, is less felicitous if one accepts my proposed interpretation of *changer e müer la color* below.

Changer e müer la color: I believe this expression has multiple meanings here. It can refer to the physical effect of emotions, such as anger, sorrow, and fear, felt by the Jews, as well as to the martyrs' bodies turning red and black in the flames (T–L, s. v. *color*, *müer*). Furthermore, I suggest that it refers specifically to the conversions that, like the executions, cause the community to lose "meint ome de valor" (l. 12), Jews who literally "change their colors." These converts are referred to through allusions to Deut 29:17 and Is 24:6 in the final stanza of the Hebrew elegy (see Einbinder 1999: 225 [n. 107]). The wormwood (representing those who turn away from God) is fruitful, but the faithful are few in number. While T–L has no examples of *color* with this meaning, *TLF* (vol. 6) and *GR* (vol. 2) give a number of examples of modern

---

[15] I found two examples of *reconuit* when I searched the ARTFL database "Textes de Français Ancien" (TFA) in August 2007.

French *couleur* in the sense 'opinion, tendency' (one's *couleur politique*), 'appearance', or 'symbol of one's profession or loyalties (e. g., heraldic colors)'.

l. 11: *En* here is a postposed object pronoun (< Lat. *inde*) and not a preposition. There is no need to delete it or to add a pronoun after it, as my predecessors have done. This line is grammatical as it stands.

l. 13: *place*: this might have been a square or simply a spot chosen for the burning.

l. 14: *tot a plein* 'at once, without further ado' (Greimas 1992, s. v. *plain*). I translate it 'there and then'. This phrase has been skipped in English translations of the elegy.

l. 16: *plain*: Plain exegesis or *peshat*, the interpretation of Scripture in its own context or "the simple meaning of the biblical text" (Lockshin 1993: 271), as opposed to Midrashic interpretation.

l. 22: *de la föee* (ms.: *du föee*): The final *he* of the noun clearly indicates that it ends in *a* or atonic *e*, differentiating it from examples of *fo, foe/fue* elsewhere. I therefore break with my predecessors and read it as *föee* 'firewood, pyre', which, however, is typically feminine (T–L, s. v. *föee*). I therefore emend *du* to *de la* and assume scribal error.

My reading is supported by the semantics of the reflexive verb *s'e-prenre (s'esprendre)*, which has various meanings such as 'catch fire, be consumed by fire (of fuel or an object), be afire with passion or rage (of a person)', but not 'light up (of fire)' (see detailed review of dictionary entries and attestations in Kiwitt 2003: 269).

l. 26: *redonrons*: The manuscript has *ddonros*, but *resh* and *dalet* are frequently confused by scribes, making the emendation to *rdonros* a simple one. Another possibility is to emend this to *te donrons*, following Blondheim. Note the articulatory similarity between [d] and [t].

chier: Although grammatical context seems to demand the feminine form *chiere*, the author has deliberately used *chier* to maintain the rhyme.

l. 30: *por nient*: This phrase means 'in vain' (Buridant 2000: § 611) and helps to establish the meaning of this stanza.

l. 31: The *carole*: a dance, generally to singing, in which the dancers formed a chain, open or closed (see T–L, s. v. *carole*; Bédier 1906: 398; Butterfield 2002: 45). The martyrs formed a chain, and they were singing, and so they looked for all the world like carolers, but in vain: they were not at a party, and they also could not dance the *carole*, because their hands were bound. My addition of "it" after "dance" is in accordance with Old French syntax; when a noun phrase served as the direct object of two verbs, it did not have to be expressed twice. Previous Eng-

lish translations of ll. 30–31 have been problematic in part because they leave out the reference to the *carole*, an essential element of the comparison here.

l. 32: *En* (< Lat. *inde*) frequently accompanies verbs of movement (Buridant 2000: § 328). Used here with *venir*, it indicates movement from a particular point of origin, presumably the building in which the martyrs were held immediately before the burning. *Vi[n]t*: As already noted, the scribe regularly omits *n* before consonants. *A l'er* (attested variant of *air*): 'into the open air, daylight' (see T–L, *AND*). My predecessors have read this line, *Onques gens en* [Pfeffer: *ne*] *vit si hetiement aler,* literally 'Never did people see any [merrymakers] go so joyfully', but the new reading is more in keeping with the style of our poet: it is clearer and more descriptive, and it maintains a focus on the martyrs, rather than shifting to the onlookers. Regardless of our reading of this line, we expect a *ne* to follow *onques*. I prefer an emendation of *en* to *n'e[n]* to Pfeffer's emendation of *en* to *ne*, since the scribe writes *ne* with a single *nun*, as opposed to a *nun aleph* sequence (see comment on l. 2).

l. 34: *formentes*: The Old French adverbial *s* is sometimes found on adverbs ending in *–ment* (Buridant 2000: § 407). While until now the final *s* of this form has been considered a scribal error, it might be deliberate.

s'é penez: When reflexive, *pener* means 'make an effort, take pains'. Here it governs the phrase *de fere sa bele qedushah*.[16] Samson made a great effort to achieve his "beautiful death" (Einbinder's phrase), meaning a dignified, seemly one. He approached the fire with dignity and composure, "like a bridegroom" (l. 33) about to be wed.

l. 35: *Tot*: I read this as *tost* 'at once, speedily'. Preconsonantal 's' is routinely omitted by our scribe. There is no need to emend this form to read *tos* or *toz* 'all', as other editors have done.

l. 36: See discussion under "Notes on the martyrs."

l. 39: As Darmesteter and Kiwitt have already indicated, the manuscript here reads *'ynnyt*. All the scholars working on the elegy have preferred various emendations, of which I consider Pfeffer's *i nen ot* to be the most satisfactory given the consonants in the manuscript. Without emendation, the line is grammatical (*i nen eit pas rusé*), although it fits less gracefully into the context.

---

[16] Searches of TFA turn up several examples that are parallel to ours, e. g.: *E de lui nurrir se penerent* (Wace, *Roman de Brut*, l. 5662), *de li servir mult se penerent* (Marie de France, *Lais*), *Tuit de lui servir se penerent* (Chrétien de Troyes, *Erec et Enide*, l. 2397).

l. 40: *enveisé*: Banitt (1963: 286) noted that Rashi (1040–1105) defined this term as follows (Banitt's translation from the Hebrew): "se dit de celui qui suit l'inclination de son cœur."

l. 41: Note the apparent change in spelling, within a single coordinated structure, of the definite article from *lo* to *le*. The same dissimilation occurs in l. 36.

l. 42: *Adon* is the Hebrew equivalent of *Dan* (a title of respect that we could translate 'lord' or 'sir') and *Qadosh* of *Bandit*. This wordplay has not been commented on before.

l. 43: The object pronoun understood to be governed by *blamer* is left unexpressed here because context makes its referent sufficiently clear (Buridant 2000: § 365.1.a).

l. 44: *d'enivré* or *Dan Avirey*. The spelling admits both. This play on words has not yet been mentioned in studies of the elegy. When sung, I believe that *enivré* was the pronunciation of choice. It can mean 'intoxicated' or simply 'satisfied, filled', and it triggers a number of biblical associations, among them Is 51:21–3, Jer 51: 38–9, and Nah 1:10, all evoked in Jacob bar Judah's Hebrew elegy (stanzas 8 and 16; on the latter, see below). The Romanization *d'Anvirey* sometimes encountered in the literature is problematic, since the name of the town did not contain an *n*.

l. 46: There seems to be a stray *yod* after the *zayin* in *deseperer*.

l. 48: The Hebrew spelling clearly indicates *bien*, in contrast to what we find in ll. 10, 40. The verb *orer* means 'pray', but here it seems to refer to praying out loud. I follow Einbinder in translating it 'chant'.

Stanza 13: All my predecessors follow Darmesteter (1874: 467) in considering this stanza a *locus desperatus*. Most of the stanza is indeed legible, but as the following notes indicate, several words have proven to be challenging for scholars.

l. 49: The first letter of *meimes* has been cut off by a binder, but I follow Blondheim in considering the identification of this word fairly certain.

l. 50: As noted by Darmesteter, the words *ce fit i* are written at the end of the stanza and meant to be inserted here.

A hole has partially destroyed the *r* of *por* and possibly one other letter. The verb seems to be intact, though until now it has eluded identification. I read it as *sorir* 'grill, toast'. Its *o* is represented by a simple *ḥolem* (diacritic unambiguously representing [o]) instead of by *waw*. Compare *jor* of l. 7, which is also written without a *waw*.

i adesa: Blondheim established this reading, but no one has offered an interpretation. *Adeser* is listed in the standard Old French dictionaries

with meanings such as 'draw near, approach (intrans.); touch (trans.)'. It has two Latin sources (see T–L, Greimas 1992, s. v. *adeser*), **addensāre* and **adhaesāre* (< Cl. Lat. [*ad*]*haerēre*), and one of the meanings of *haerēre* was 'take a hold (of fire, infection)' (Glare 1982, s. v. *haereō*). Context supports the hypothesis that *adeser* is used with that meaning here.

l. 51: The first letter of *[a]sei[n]za* has been partially cut off by a binder, but along with the other scholars who worked with the manuscript, I believe it is an *aleph*. *Assenser* 'advise, guide, tell, instruct' is well attested (see T–L, s. v. *assenser* and *ensenser*, *AND*, s. v. *assenser*). The thirteenth-century Hebrew-French wedding song, written in the same dialect as our elegy, also contains an example of a rhyme that disregards a nasal/non-nasal alternation (*anprins, antreprins, prins*, and *pris*; see Fudeman 2006: 562–3).

This word eluded identification by my predecessors. Blondheim, Pfeffer, and Kiwitt read *asésa/aseisa*, with Blondheim and Kiwitt expressing reserves because the word is otherwise unattested. Banitt (1963: 283), cited by Pfeffer, postulated that *asseser* meant "'raffermir' sa voix, quand on est brûlé vif," but his apparent evidence (superficial similarity with vb. *asseser* 'assess, value; assess for tax purposes', n. *asseseance*; see Godefroy 1965, *AND*) does not support his conclusion.

l. 52: *juize*: The part of the word still legible, אֹ[וֹ] – (perhaps אָזְא –), could represent the end of *juize/juise* 'sentence, punishment, trial by ordeal, torture'. Blondheim's restitution, *chose*, generally accepted, is impossible given the diacritics that are visible.

ne noisa: *ne neisa*. In both Hebraico-French texts and Old French texts written in the Roman alphabet, the spellings *oi* and *ei* are often used to indicate the same sound, sometimes alternating within a single text, hence my reading. Darmesteter transcribed this word as *ne nuisa*, and Blondheim as *ne taisa* (this was a simple emendation: our scribe writes Hebrew *tet* with the same strokes as a *nun waw* sequence.) Einbinder and Kiwitt followed Blondheim, while Pfeffer followed Darmesteter, translating "For whatever was done to him, he was not harmed." Our interpretation *neisa* is to be preferred for the following reasons: (1) it fits the rhyme scheme, unlike *nuisa*; (2) a *ḥolem* above the *waw* indicates that *waw yod* in this word should be transcribed *oi*, not *ui* or *ai/e*; (3) the proposed alternative preterites are rare or inexistent: the 3sg preterite of *taire, taisir (taisier)* was commonly *tot, tout,* as opposed to *taisa*, and the 3sg preterite of *nuisir* was *nuist*; (4) the reading *nuisa* makes sense only if Jonah was viewed as a fireproof martyr, and there is no indication that this was the case; (5) the Hebrew version of our

elegy emphasizes Colon's impassivity before the fire, and in his elegy, Solomon Simḥa wrote that Colon 'Dove' was called *yonat elem* 'dove of silence' (see Darmesteter 1881: 230). The sense in this elegy and in the other is that Colon lifted his voice in praise to God before his death but refused to cry out in response to the punishment he suffered.

l. 55–6: *que abeïs tant … vues:*[17] *Abeïs*: the *bet* has a *dagesh*, a central dot, which establishes the phonetic value [b] and not [v]. This is precisely the type of context in which we sometimes find *que* with the meaning 'why?' (Buridant 2000: § 585.1).

l. 56: *vues* (or *vos*) 'want': In the thirteenth century, this is still a 2sg form; cf. 1sg *vuel* in the preceding line (Pope 1952: § 956, § 957; Buridant 2000: § 227). Isaac's name marks him as Jewish and is thus a source of pride for him and one of the reasons he is being executed. His final words are ironic, of course: the *kohanim* of Leviticus made burnt-offerings. Isaac, though a *kohen*, was himself made into a burnt-offering. He is innocent, like the sacrifices in the Bible, who were animals "without blemish" (Lev 1:3, 1:10, 3:1, 3:6, etc.).

l. 58: *devein*: The final letter is *nun*, not *tsade*, as Blondheim has already noted. Although modern French has *deviens*, the normal 2sg imperative of *devenir* in Old French is *devien*, and the vocalization of this form has as precedent *bein* for *bien* in l. 10.

fis: *fist*. In the northeastern region, final *st* often reduced to *s* (Pope 1952: § 378 and p. 492 [§ xiii]).

l. 59: *Por lor chemin*: Darmesteter's Romanization, *por lor chien* ('for their dog'), went uncorrected in all previous work.[18] There is a hole in the manuscript here, enough space "pour deux ou trois lettres" (Blondheim 1926: 35). Although a crease in the manuscript meant that I could not read *l[or]* in its entirety based on my photograph, the rest of the line is legible.

ne son se[n]t nom: This is a reference to the practice of converted Jews taking a new name. Ḥayyim/Vivant clearly considered his name to come from the phrase *elohim ḥayyim* 'Living God', which occurs in Dt 5:26, 1Sam 17:26, 1Sam 17:36, Jer 10:10, Jer 23:36. (Daniel 6:20, 6:26 contain the Aramaic equivalent.) Ḥayyim held fast to his name and God's, and he held fast to God.

---

[17] My reading differs substantially from that of my predecessors, who read *abeïs* as a form of *avoir* and *veus/vues/vos* as 'I want'.

[18] By 2007, Pfeffer has retracted her earlier translation, "For those dogs," but in note 36 (p. 84), she reports that she is not confident enough of the letter forms to offer a new reading.

l. 64: That was his name: Hebrew note following *Vivant*. "[Vivant] was his name."

l. 65: *Gé vanchera e an prin(e)ra vanchance de cé felons.* Most scholars working with the elegy have treated the two verbs here as apparently feminine adjectives, *vanchère* and *anprine(i)re* (e. g., Pfeffer 2005: 150, 'vengeful and jealous'), even though the second word is unattested with such a meaning (see Kiwitt 2003: 268–9), and context demands masculine forms. Einbinder, apparently following the Hebrew elegy, translates them into English as commands, "take revenge! be zealous!" (1999: 228, 230).

While Kiwitt's proposal to relate *anpreneire* to words associated with fire and jealousy is at first glance plausible, this line is best read as containing a sequence of two 3sg future verbs 'will punish, avenge' and 'will take', the latter preceded by *an* (translated here "for these things") and followed by the noun 'vengeance'.[19] They are paralleled by the final words of the corresponding Hebrew stanza: *yishpot ''' vayire'* 'God will punish and will see [what you have done]', an allusion, as noted by Darmesteter, to Ex 5: 21: "[May] The Lord look upon you and judge!"

Some letters in the Hebrew alphabet have two forms, one used word-finally, and the other elsewhere. What Darmesteter transliterated as one word, *anprinere,* is without any doubt two words. *An* is not only separated from the other letters by a space, but it also ends in the word-final form of the *nun*. *(En) pren(d)re venjance de* is a common Old French expression. A final *aleph* indicating the future ending [a] is also found in the spelling of *tenra* (l. 26). The *yod* (which generally represents /j/, /i/, or /e/) between the *n* and *r* of *prenra* (here *prinera*) is probably a transmission error.

l. 66: "the day seems very long" or "the days seem very long." I prefer the former, because it requires only that we consider the diacritic under the *yod* of the definite article a faulty addition by the copyist or a later reader.

l. 66–7: I believe that *De te preer de cor anter la o neissio[n]s e alo[n]s* and *De ata[n]dre ta va[n]cha[n]ce* should be read as coordinated expressions depending on *mot nos sa[m]ble l[i] jors lons.* As Blondheim

---

[19] It is difficult to tell from the photograph whether the manuscript has "vancha[n]ts" (wwnqts) or "vanche nos" (wwnqnws) because *t* (*tet*) is written with the same two strokes as *nw* (*nun+waw*). There is no space between the two strokes, and so I lean towards the reading "vancha[n]ts." Although there may be a *ḥolem* (diacritic indicating "o") above the letters indicating *t/nw*, I believe it is part of a *segol* beneath the *s* of *servir*.

tentatively recognized and Kiwitt affirmed, we have *neissions* 'we are born' in this line, as opposed to *nos seons*, which is retained by other editors. Our text thus refers explicitly to Jewish migration and exile.

Notes on the Martyrs

The identification of two martyrs, R. Samson Ḥatan ha-Qadmeneth and the second R. Ḥayyim, requires special attention. Following Darmesteter (1881: 239), my predecessors have considered *Qadmeneth* to be a woman's name, either that of Samson's mother-in-law (Einbinder 1999: 226–7 [n. 124], 229, Pfeffer 2005: 150) or his wife (Kiwitt 2003: 264 [n. 45], 270). This has required the emendation of the word *e* 'and' preceding *Qadmeneth* to *a* 'to' and, for Kiwitt, the *ad hoc* proposal that "genre" in our text means 'husband'. Pfeffer's reluctance to accept this treatment of *Qadmeneth* is reflected in her choice to leave it untranslated in her second paper; Darmesteter, Einbinder, and Kiwitt all seem to express subtle reservations as well. In his lists, Blondheim remarked only that *Qadmeneth* fit the stanza in terms of rhyme according to medieval Hebrew pronunciation conventions. He offered no advice on translating it.

   Qadmeneth is not attested as a name for medieval Jewish women. In fact, it is not attested at all in Hebrew, the feminine form of *qadmon* being *qadmonah* (see Ezekiel 47:8 where it is an adjective meaning 'eastern'). Although *qadmonah* could take a *tav* in the so-called construct form, giving *qadmonath*, we do not have the relevant construction here. *Qadmeneth* is also unattested in Aramaic (Sokoloff 2002a, 2000b, 2003).

   The key to the correct interpretation of *Qadmeneth* can be found in the Vatican manuscript itself. In a note that follows the Hebrew version of the elegy, Samson is called *R. Shimshon ha-Qadmon*. *Ha-Qadmon* can be translated in two different ways: 'the Eastern One (man of the East)' and 'the Ancient One'. If Samson is called *ha-Qadmon* on one folio, and "the *Qadmeneth*" on another, *Qadmon* and *Qadmeneth* most likely have the same gender (masculine) and meaning. We know from l. 7 that the elegy's author sometimes added vernacular suffixes to Hebrew roots. I propose that *–eth*, pronounced *–es/-eis,* as clear from the rhyme and confirmed by our knowledge of medieval Hebrew pronunciation conventions,[20] is the Old French adjectival suffix *–eis* (mod. Fr. *–ais*) 'belonging to, originating in', and that *qadmeneis* is an adjective whose primary

---

   [20] *amenez, penez, nez*: By the end of the thirteenth century, these words, with which *Qadmeneth* rhymes, had come to be pronounced with a final [s]; see Pope (1952: § 194).

meaning, given the nature of the suffix, is 'eastern'. Cultural contacts between French- and German-speaking Jews were close, and linguistic boundaries were porous, and so for many, *qadmeneis* also would have evoked Yiddish *kadmoynish* 'ancient, primeval'.[21] It is perhaps no accident that the word *Qadmeneth* is also found in Samson's entry in the list of the Troyes martyrs in the Mainz *Memorbuch* (Darmesteter 1881: 234–5). The use of the Hebrew letter *tav* for spelling the suffix can be explained by the fact that the root is a Hebrew-Aramaic loanword.

According to Solomon Simḥa, the Troyes victims ranged from young to old (Darmesteter 1881: 227). Samson, referred to by Solomon Simḥa as *shevet taḥkemoni* "seat of wisdom" (Darmesteter 1881: 231), was probably quite old at the time he was executed. Note that the Old French case system is respected more consistently in stanza 9 than elsewhere (contrast *fu amenez* here with *fu amené* in ll. 13, 61) and that it is integral to the rhyme: we might wonder if the poet was deliberately evoking the speech of an old man. In addition, l. 35 tells us, *de bone ore fu nez*: He was born at a good hour (i. e., it is fortunate that he was born). Our poet was fond of word play (see below), and it is possible that already in the late thirteenth century this expression could carry the sense 'early' (cf. mod. Fr. *de bonne heure*).

Ḥatan, given as part of Samson's name in the Mainz *Memorbuch*, as well, also has two meanings, 'son-in-law' and 'bridegroom'. In the first sense, it often served to distinguish between Jews of the same name, as seen in the lists of Jews published by Loeb (1880: 63–70, 1884: 167–9). Evidence that *Ḥatan* is a surname here comes from the description of Samson in the French elegy: *En foe inelement come Ḥathan fu amenez* 'Like a bridegroom he was brought into the fire.' *Ḥatan*, which the poet wants us to understand as 'bridegroom' in this line, plays on Samson's name just as other stanzas play with the names of other male martyrs. Isaac *Châtelain* (stanza 4) was an owner of properties, though not necessarily of a *chatel*; Solomon (stanza 10) *nen ot pas rusé* (did not hold back) from offering his body to God, with the past participle *rusé* (*rëusé*) evoking Solomon's intelligent or 'cunning' (*rëusé*) biblical namesake; the end of Avirey's Dan Bandit's is like that of an *enivré* (stanza 11); the

---

[21] This word is listed in U. Weinreich's dictionary. Although I cannot prove that this word was used by medieval Jewish speakers of German/Yiddish, they were clearly capable of creating and understanding it: it consists of Hebrew and Aramaic *qadmon* plus the Middle High German adjectival suffix *–isch*, *-esch* (Paul, Wiehl, and Grosse 1989: 87). Much has been written about the porous cultural and linguistic boundaries between northeastern France and the Rhineland. See, for example, M. Weinreich (1980).

biblical namesake of Simon, *qui si bien saveit orer* 'who knew how to pray so well' (stanza 12), was so named because "The Lord heard" (Gen 29:33); the man named Colon (the French equivalent of Hebrew *Jonah* 'dove') is described as a beautiful *colon* 'dove' (stanza 13), and like a dove he raises his voice, probably in a sorrowful way;[22] Isaac Cohen says *je sui cohen* 'I am a priest' and is ironically offered as a sacrifice (stanza 14); the first Vivant 'Living' refuses to "give up the living God" (stanza 15), while the second *çofri poine por servir le Gé Vivant* (stanza 16).[23] This word play has been only partially addressed before, although it is one of the most striking literary devices used in the elegy and a key point of similarity between it and the Hebrew version.[24]

Line 60, about Ḥayyim of Brinon, also requires special comment. It reads: *An l'apeleit R. Ḥayyim, lo serorge a metre de Brinon*. The vowels are unambiguous, thanks to the scribe's careful pointing. But Darmesteter emended *a metre* to *e metre* and believed that *serorge* meant 'surgeon'. As Blondheim (1923: 366–7, wrongly listed as 1925 in Blondheim's lists) first noted, however, *serorge* in Old French means 'brother-in-law' or 'sister-in-law', and *metre*, like Latin *magister*, was a synonym for 'rabbi'. Darmesteter was misled by his interpretation of Meïr ben Eliav's elegy: of Ḥayyim of Chaource, Meïr proclaims: "He found favor [in the eyes of the Lord], Ḥayyim who gave sight to eyes of the blind" (cf. Gen 6: 8, Prov 29:13; see Darmesteter 1881: 225). Darmesteter mistakenly understood this as applying to Ḥayyim of Brinon. But the true Ḥayyim of Brinon is discussed two stanzas earlier in Meïr's elegy. As reported by Meïr, he was bound together with Solomon and Samson, while all available evidence suggests that Ḥayyim of Chaource died last and alone. Although Kiwitt and Pfeffer follow Blondheim in translating *serorge* correctly, they do not address the cross-identification of Ḥayyim of Chaource in the Vatican elegies and that of Meïr.

---

[22] The moaning of doves is frequently heard in medieval Hebrew and Arabic poetry in the context of separation. See Brener (2005: 52–3).

[23] Pfeffer (2007: 75) notes that "Vivant" is "a word closely related to the meaning of *hayim* 'life'." I would add that it is one of its direct translations (in addition to being a noun, *ḥayyim* is a masculine plural participle and adjective), and also one of the names by which Ḥayyim of Chaource was known, as the Hebrew note on l. 64 tells us. (For more on the name Ḥayyim, see comments on l. 59.) In medieval times, as today, Jews often had two names, one Hebrew, the other from the vernacular culture, and in northern France, Jews named Ḥayyim often went by *Vivant* as well. The name "Hagin" simply reflects the medieval French Jewish pronunciation of Ḥayyim; double *yod*, when it had a consonantal value, was pronounced like *g* in this context.

[24] This paragraph is not meant to be exhaustive. For example, I have left out the play on the name "Samson." See Pfeffer (2007: 77–8).

The thirteenth martyr, Ḥayyim of Chaource, was also the last, and he was burned on "un petit fo." This detail has long fascinated readers of the elegy. Darmesteter and Einbinder believed that the little fire was a form of torture and that Ḥayyim had been subjected to it because he had tried to escape. However, the second part of this hypothesis arose from Darmesteter's misunderstanding of an entry in the king's accounts for Champagne, covering July 18 to the eight days of Christmas (the *Octaves de Noel*). The entry reports that two men, Robert Chenonele and Baudoin de Sanliz, received pay for keeping Ḥayyim's possessions safe, bringing them to Troyes for him,[25] and – a fact left unexplained by previous scholars – paying for his lodgings: "pour garder les biens Hagin [=Ḥayyim] de Chaoursse, li mener a Troies, e pour le loier de l'ostel ou il demouroit" (Darmesteter 1881: 236).

Darmesteter misunderstood *li* – an indirect object pronoun – as a direct object pronoun and thus "li mener a Troies" as "to bring him [Ḥayyim] back to Troyes." Darmesteter deduced from this that Ḥayyim had unsuccessfully tried to flee. Einbinder developed this hypothesis, insisting that Ḥayyim was treated differently from the others and subjected to "agonizing tortures" above and beyond what the others experienced (1999: 214; 2002: 138).[26] But none of the Troyes laments indicate that Ḥayyim was tortured, or even that he tried to flee.[27]

---

[25] *li mener a Troies*: Direct object pronouns in Old French were normally omitted in the presence of the indirect object pronouns *li, lor* (Buridant 2000: § 365, 1b). (Although *mener* usually takes a personal direct object, it can also govern an inanimate direct object; see T–L, s. v. *mener*, 1414–5). An anonymous reader has asked why Robert and Baudoin might have been sent to bring some of Ḥayyim's possessions to Troyes for him. One possibility is that these were things he needed to sustain himself during his imprisonment or to sell or trade for the same. There are alternative explanations, one being that Ḥayyim requested certain belongings because he considered paying for his release, despite the poet's vehemence that the martyred Jews refused to pay ransom, or thought he could prove his innocence by them.

[26] An anonymous reader has pointed out that Einbinder (2006: 8) establishes an analogy between Ḥayyim of Chaource and a Jewish martyr from Grenoble that might support the claim that Ḥayyim was singled out for special tortures because he had tried to flee. The analogy hinges on Einbinder's proposal that both Ḥayyim and the martyr of Grenoble were grilled. That the Grenoble martyr was grilled is suggested by the description of his death *ʿal ha-maḥavat* 'on the griddle'. No similar words or other references to grilling are used to describe Ḥayyim's death in Old French or Hebrew elegies or the king's accounts, and Einbinder himself writes, "grilling … is not prescribed in penal codes from medieval northern Europe."

[27] We should note that even if there is a scribal error in the king's accounts (or in editors' rendering of them), and *li mener* was intended to read *le mener*, *mener* means 'bring', and not necessarily 'bring back', as *ramener* would. As I demonstrate below, evidence suggests that Ḥayyim of Chaource did not live in Troyes. Therefore, even if Robert Chenonele and Baudoin de Sanliz did bring him to Troyes, we cannot assume that it was because he had tried to flee.

I believe Ḥayyim of Chaource's death must be read another way, and that the detail of his being lodged in an *ostel* is significant. It seems likely that Ḥayyim of Chaource lived in or near Chaource, a village to the south of Troyes. Whether he was visiting Troyes at the time the other Jews were arrested, or whether he was at home in Chaource, it so happened that he was accused and arrested along with them. Ḥayyim's temporary lodgings in Troyes had to be paid for, as the accounts tell us, an indication that he did not have a home in Troyes, and perhaps that he did not even have friends or family members there. Another item in the king's accounts quoted by Darmesteter (1881: 236) supports this hypothesis: it specifically locates Ḥayyim's possessions in "Chaoursse" or "Estourvy," rather than Troyes: "[Chaourrse et Estourvy] Des biens Hagin [Ḥayyim] le juif, joutisié à Troies, XXXVII lb."[28] It is possible that Ḥayyim of Chaource tried to escape, just as any of the other Jews might have tried to escape. But there is no compelling evidence of such an attempt.[29]

Consider now the "petit fo," which may indeed have been a form of torture. In modern French, burning (someone) *à petit feu* or dying *à petit feu*, literally or figuratively, means 'slowly and cruelly', as the entries for *feu* in the *GR* and *TLF* show. Why was Ḥayyim burned on a small fire? Was it because of who he was (an outsider, perhaps), something he had done, or something he had been accused of doing? Was the small fire simply a means of prolonging the spectacle and creating a memorable and barbaric finale? These are all possibilities. It may even be that Ḥayyim's fire only looked small. We know from both Vatican elegies that Isaac's two sons were burned at the same time, and from Meïr ben Eliav's elegy that Samson, Solomon, and Ḥayyim of Brinon were bound together. I quote Darmesteter's translation of the first part of Meïr's stanza 16 (1881: 225):

> [Samson] fut donc attaché sur le bûcher, et avec lui ses amis,
> Notables de la communauté, hommes de nom, Haïm et Salomon.

Even had it been of normal size, Ḥayyim of Chaource's fire would have looked small compared to the pyre of the three Jews burned immediately before him, or compared to the devastating remains of all the other

---

[28] This material has also been published in Longnon (1901–1914: vol. 3, pp. 71–72, 74, 88), as I learned from Marc Kiwitt (Universities of Heidelberg and Paris-Sorbonne – Paris IV), to whom I am very grateful. Darmesteter's source for this information was Longnon himself (Darmesteter 1881: 235).

[29] Einbinder considers "the image of doves returning to their roosts" as a possible allusion to Ḥayyim's attempted escape and return to Troyes. I analyze it below as a reference to returning to God.

twelve. As a literary detail, the smallness of Ḥayyim's fire and his repeated calls to God communicate great loneliness and pain.[30] These also come through in Jacob bar Judah's Hebrew elegy, where Ḥayyim declares, "Let them burn my body with my companions, like them." Hebrew *gew*, generally understood by modern scholars as 'back' when it occurs in the Bible,[31] was understood by thirteenth-century French Jews as 'body'. In the three instances where it is included in the thirteenth-century Hebrew-French glossary edited by Lambert and Brandin (1977: 125, 126, 192), it is translated as "kors" (mod. French *corps*). Our poet chose it deliberately because of its association in the Bible with mistreatment and humiliation. For example, Isaiah 50:6 reads: "I gave my back [body] to those who struck me, and my cheeks to those who pulled out the beard; I did not hide my face from insult and spitting." The word is used with similar connotations in Isaiah 51:23, and in Proverbs 10:13, 19:29, and 26:3 it is used in the context of beating. (In the last three instances the mistreatment is considered deserved.)

Darmesteter, who translated this line, "Que mon corps soit brûlé avec mes amis!" believed it had been corrupted through copying. The full sense becomes clear once we understand the context. Ḥayyim of Chaource died last of the thirteen martyrs, alone and probably deeply traumatized. He knew that he had to die but wished he could do so with friends beside or around him, like all of the Jews who had preceded him.

In closing, let us consider in full the stanza about Ḥayyim of Chaource in Jacob bar Judah's Hebrew elegy. I have renumbered lines 61–64 from 1–4; the translation is my own:

1 זך כתית למאור ככפיר נוהם
נאם ייקדו[32] גווי עם רעיי כהם
כיונים תעופינה אל ארובותיהם
4 כי חיים הם למוצאיהם

Pure oil of beaten olives for the light, like a groaning lion,   1
He said, "Let them burn my body with my friends, like them."

---

[30] Pfeffer (2007: 76) nicely analyzes the "smallness" of Ḥayyim's stanza.

[31] See, for example, Ben Yehuda 1960: II: 714, as well as the New Revised Standard Version's and the Jewish Publication Society's English translations of the Bible verses cited later in this paragraph.

[32] Darmesteter disregarded the final letter of this form, believing it was a *yod* and a scribal error. In fact, the final letter is a partially-effaced *waw*, and this word is a 3pl jussive 'let them burn' from a root *y-q-d*. Blondheim also discarded the final letter, and he furthermore believed that the consonants should be read *y-q-r* 'be precious'. He translated this line, "Que mon corps soit (un sacrifice) précieux comme celui de mes amis" (see also Einbinder 1999: 224, who follows Blondheim).

> Like doves they will fly to their roosts,
> For they are life to those who find them.   4

As is typical of medieval Hebrew poetry, this stanza can only be appreciated against the backdrop of the Bible. The first part of l. 1 is from Exodus 27:20 and Lev 24:2, but the pure olive oil to be burned here is Ḥayyim's body. As noted by Einbinder (2002: 138), the light, or luminary, may be a reference to his "little fire" that burned slowly and was lit after the others. The second part evokes Proverbs 19:12 and 20:2, both of which compare the anger of a king to the growling of a lion (Einbinder 1999: 213): Ḥayyim and his twelve companions were all at the mercy of the authorities. But medieval Jews who understood Hebrew well would have also known that the verb *n-h-m* 'growl' has a second meaning: in Proverbs 5:11 and Ezekiel 24:23, it refers to the groaning of those who suffer. The Hebrew word *kefir* 'young lion', triggers a number of associations with young lions in the Bible who were torn apart (Jgs 14:5–6), treaded upon (Ps 91:13), or trapped and led away (Ez 19:1–14), leaving their mother desolate. The parallel between our martyrs and the young lions of Ezekiel is an extended one: the lions symbolize the "princes of Israel" whose voices will "be heard no more on the mountains of Israel." Of their mother and her fruit, the prophet writes: "Your mother was like a vine in a vineyard … its strong stem was withered; the fire consumed it… And fire has gone out from its stem, has consumed its branches and fruit … This is a lamentation, and it is used as a lamentation."

Line 2, as we have already discussed, is Ḥayyim's own plaint: why could he not die with friends? But his loneliness was only temporary. After death, he rejoined the other martyrs as smoke in the sky as their souls returned to God, as l. 3, from Isaiah 60:8, tells us. The full verse reads: "Who are these that fly like a cloud, and like doves to their windows?" Finally, l. 4 offers comfort; and those familiar with Proverbs 4:21–22 would have also heard a command: "Do not let them escape from your sight; keep them within your heart. For they are life to those who find them, and healing to all their flesh." Let us do the same.

Abbreviations

AND   Rothwell 2005
GR   Rey, Alain 2001
T–L   Tobler, Lommatzsch, Christmann 1925–2002
TLF   Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique 1971–94

Works Cited

Abramovitsch, Samuel. 1966. "L'Autodafé de Troyes: Un fait historique sur le XIIIᵉ siècle." *La Vie en Champagne* 143: 3–8.

Banitt, Menahem. 1963. "Une langue fantôme: le judéo-français." *Revue de Linguistique Romane* 27: 245–94.

Banitt, Menahem. 1997. "Une vue d'ensemble sur les glossaires bibliques juifs de France au Moyen Age." In Gilbert Dahan, Gérard Nahon, Elie Nicolas (eds.), *Rashi et la culture juive en France du nord au Moyen Age*, 191–201. Paris: Peeters.

Bédier, Joseph. 1906. "Les plus anciennes danses françaises." *Revue des deux mondes* 31 (76th year): 398–424.

Ben Yehuda, Eliezer. 1960. *A Complete Dictionary of Ancient and Modern Hebrew*, 8 vols. [in Hebrew]. New York: Thomas Yoseloff.

Blondheim, D. S. 1923. "Essai d'un vocabulaire comparatif des parlers romans des Juifs au moyen âge (*suite*)." *Romania* 49: 343–88.

Blondheim, D. S. 1925. *Les parlers judéo-romans et la Vetus Latina*. Paris: E. Champion.

Blondheim, D. S. 1926. "Poésies judéo-françaises." *Romania* 52: 17–36. ["Corrections à l'Elégie de Troyes", 34–5.]

Blondheim, D. S. 1927a. "Contribution à l'étude de la poésie judéo-française." *Revue des études juives* 83: 22–51, 146–61.

Blondheim, D. S. 1927b. *Poèmes judéo-français du moyen âge*. Paris: Honoré Champion.

Brener, Ann. 2005. *Judah Halevi and his Circle of Hebrew Poets in Granada*. Leiden: Brill.

Buridant, Claude. 2000. *Grammaire nouvelle de l'ancien français.* Paris: SEDES.

Butterfield, Ardis. 2002. *Poetry and Music in Medieval France: From Jean Renart to Guillaume de Machaut*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. 1971–94. *Trésor de la langue française: Dictionnaire de la langue du XIXᵉ et du XXᵉ siècle (1789–1960)*, 16 vol. Paris: CNRS, Gallimard.

Chazan, Robert. 1973. *Medieval Jewry in Northern France: A Political and Social History.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Darmesteter, Arsène. 1874. "Deux élégies du Vatican." *Romania* 3: 443–86.

Darmesteter, Arsène. 1881. "L'Autodafé de Troyes." *Revue des études juives* 2: 199–247.

Darmesteter, Arsène. 1890. *Reliques scientifiques recueillies par son frère.* 2 vols. Paris: Léopold Cerf.

Dees, Anthonij. 1980. *Atlas des formes et des constructions des chartes françaises du 13ᵉ siècle.* Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie, Beiheft 178. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Dees, Anthonij. 1987. *Atlas des formes linguistiques des textes littéraires de l'ancien français.* Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie, Beiheft 212. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Einbinder, Susan. 1999. "The Troyes elegies: Jewish martyrology in Hebrew and Old French." *Viator* 30: 201–30.

Einbinder, Susan. 2002. *Beautiful Death: Jewish Poetry and Martyrdom in Medieval France.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Einbinder, Susan. 2006. "The Jewish martyrs of Grenoble: Martyrdom and bio-graphy." In Philip M. Soergel (ed.), *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History: Nation, Ethnicity, and Identity in Medieval and Renaissance Europe*. Third series, vol. 3, 1–24. New York: AMS Press.

Fleg, Edmond. 1951. *Anthologie juive des origines à nos jours*. Paris: Sulliver. First published 1923, then revised and augmented.

Foulet, Alfred and Mary Blakely Speer. 1979. *On Editing Old French Texts*. Lawrence: The Regents Press of Kansas.

Fudeman, Kirsten. 2006. "They have ears but do not hear: Gendered access to Hebrew and the medieval Hebrew-French wedding song." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 96: 542–67.

Glare, P. G. W. 1982. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Godefroy, Frédéric. 1965. *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française et de tous ses dialectes du IXe au XVe siècle*. Vaduz: Klaus Reprint. [Paris: Honoré Champion, F. Vieweg, 1881–1902.]

Greimas, Algirdas Julien. 1992. *Dictionnaire de l'ancien français*, 2nd ed. Paris: Larousse.

Holmes, Urban T., Jr. 1962. *A History of Old French Literature from the Origins to 1300*. New York: Russell & Russell.

[Jewish Publication Society.] 1985. *Tanakh: The Holy Scriptures. The New JPS Translation According to the Traditional Hebrew Text*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.

Jordan, William C. 1989. *The French Monarchy and the Jews: From Philip Augustus to the Last Capetians*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Kibler, William W. 1984. *An Introduction to Old French*. New York: Modern Language Association.

Kiwitt, Marc. 2003. "L'Elégie de Troyes: Une nouvelle lecture." *Etudes Médiévales* (Amiens) 5: 259–72.

Kukenheim, Louis. 1963. "Judeo-Gallica or Gallo-Judaïca?" *Neophilologus* 47: 89–111.

Lambert, Mayer and Louis Brandin. 1977. *Glossaire hébreu-français du XIIIe siècle: Recueil de mots hébreux bibliques avec traduction française*. Geneva: Slatkine Reprints. First published 1905.

Lehrmann, Charles C. 1941. *L'Elément juif dans la littérature française*. Zurich: Editions "die Gestaltung." [Available in English as *The Jewish Element in French Literature*, George Klin (trans.). Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1971.]

Lockshin, Martin. 1993. "Truth or [*peshat*]: Issues in law and exegesis." In Baruch Halpern and Deborah W. Hobson (eds.), *Law, Politics, and Society in the Ancient Mediterranean World*, 271–79. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press.

Loeb, Isidore. 1880. "Le rôle des Juifs de Paris en 1296 et 1297." *Revue des études juives* 1: 61–71.

Loeb, Isidore. 1884. "Deux livres de commerce du commencement du XIVe siècle." *Revue des études juives* 9 (1884): 161–96.

Longnon, Auguste. 1901–14. *Documents relatifs au comté de Champagne et de Brie, 1172–1361*, 3 vol. Paris: Imprimerie nationale.

Lowenthal, Marvin. 1933. *A World Passed By: Scenes and Memories of Jewish Civilization in Europe and North Africa*. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Ménard, Philippe. 1988. *Syntaxe de l'ancien français*, 3rd rev. ed. Bordeaux: Editions Bière.

New Revised Standard Version with Apocrypha. Holy Bible. 1989. New York: Oxford University Press.

Paul, Hermann, Peter Wiehl, and Siegfried Grosse. 1989. *Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik*, 23rd ed. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Pfeffer, Wendy. 2005. "Women stand strong: Two Jewish female martyrs." *Mediaevistik* 18: 145–55.

Pfeffer, Wendy. 2007. "Yet another look at the Troyes elegy." In Karen Fresco and Wendy Pfeffer (eds.), *"Chançon legiere a chanter": Essays on Old French Literature in Honor of Samuel N. Rosenberg*, 67–84. Birmingham, Alabama: Summa Publications.

Pope, Mildred K. 1952. *From Latin to Modern French with Especial Consideration of Anglo-Norman*, rev. ed. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Renan, Ernest. 1877. "Elégies sur l'auto-da-fé de Troyes en 1288." In Félix Lajard, Paulin Paris, Émile Littré, Ernest Renan, ed. Barthélemy Hauréau, *Histoire littéraire de la France* vol. 27, 475–82. Paris: Imprimerie nationale. [Facsimile edition Paris: Librairie Universitaire, 1900.]

Rey, Alain, director. 2001. *Le Grand Robert de la langue française*, 2nd ed. Paris: Dictionnaires le Robert.

Rosenberg, Samuel N. 1992. "The medieval Hebrew-French wedding song." *Shofar* 11: 22–37.

Rothwell, William, ed. 2005. *Anglo-Norman Dictionary*. 2nd ed. London: Manley. Available online: http://www.anglo-norman.net/.

Schwarzfuchs, Simon. 1975. *Les Juifs de France*. Paris: Albin Michel.

Sokoloff, Michael. 2002a. *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Periods*. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press.

Sokoloff, Michael. 2002b. *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period*, 2nd ed. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press.

Sokoloff, Michael. 2003. *A Dictionary of Judean Aramaic*. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press.

Ta-Shma, Israel Moses. 2007. "Tosafot." In *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 2nd ed. Detroit: Thomson/Gale in association with Keter Publishing House, 67–71.

Tobler, Adolf, Erhard Lommatzsch, and Hans Helmut Christmann. 1925–2002. *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Weinreich, Max. 1980. *History of the Yiddish Language*, trans. Shlomo Noble. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Weinreich, Uriel. 1968. *Modern English-Yiddish, Yiddish-English Dictionary*. YIVO Institute for Jewish Research. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Zumthor, Paul. 1954. *Histoire littéraire de la France médiévale*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.