STUDIES IN GREEK AND LATIN LOAN-WORDS IN RABBINIC LITERATURE*

Preamble

Anyone who dips into Talmudic lexica will at times be perplexed by the diversity of etymological explanations offered for a given word. Indeed, at times he finds himself at a loss even as to the correct reading.[1] It is thus possible that both the correct reading and the correct etymology are already to be found in one of the lexica, and yet the student will nonetheless be in a quandary as to which reading to accept and which explanation to choose. In the following lines we shall attempt to clarify both the reading(s) and etymology of one such example, (קרר). This particular example is methodologically instructive in that it demonstrates, *inter alia,* the critical caution with which manuscript evidence must be treated. Indeed, on occasions the readings recorded by the overwhelming majority of manuscripts should be disregarded in favour of sound contextual sense and etymological reasoning.

And furthermore, a plea to classical philologists. Rabbinic lexical material has for the major part been totally neglected by classicists. And this despite the fact that there are many thousands of classical loan-words in Rabbinic literature, a literature which spans much of the Roman and Byzantine periods. A goodly part of this material is readily available in one form or another in European languages. A significant

[1] See the example in my article in *Erchei* 2 pp. 102–107.

example in point is the second volume of S. Krauss' *Griechische und Lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum* (hereafter *LW* 2), which was first published in Berlin in 1899 (reprinted in Hildesheim, 1964). This is more than a dictionary in that it refers one to almost every classical Rabbinic source (then known) in which the word appears. It includes the very valuable comments of the great philologist I. Löw. It may readily be used by a classicist with no knowledge of the Hebrew language, since all Hebrew characters are transliterated, and the work contains detailed indices of the Greek and Latin words cited, arranged both thematically as well as alphabetically. A further example is the English writings of S. Lieberman, foremost of which are his two books, *Greek in Jewish Palestine* (New York, 1942), and *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*[2] (New York, 1962). This considerable body of material may be utilized by classicists for the further clarification of readings, semantic meanings, the dating of the appearance of a word, and for dialect research. The following study, without presenting anything really new, will attempt to exemplify some of these points.

1. קרר *(Krr)-Carrarius*

The word קרר appears in a number of Talmudic sources,[2] though not always clearly in this reading. First in order is *T. Berachot* 3.20, (ed. Zuckermandel, p. 8), probably of the late first or early second century C.E., where we read that a person praying in a street or public square moves out of the way of a donkey, a donkey-driver or a קדר (*kdr*), but does not interrupt his prayers. קדר, a potter, does not make good sense in the context, and parallel sources[3] read מפני הקרון (*mipnei ha-karon*) — out of the way of the wagon. Thus, both the context and the parallel

---

[2] A list of *loci* in which the word appears is given by Krauss in *LW* 2, p. 571b *s.v.* However, as to the reading to *T. Yom Tov* 4.6, where Zuckermandel's text (p. 207, line 22), based on the *Erfurt Ms.*, reads קדר (*kdr*) and which is corrected to קרר, (Krauss *ibid.*, etc.), the reading in a number of other mss. and the printed edition is איכר (*ikar*), which makes better sense in the context. See Lieberman's edition of the *Tosefta ad. loc.* 2 (New York, 1962) p. 300, line 25, and his *Tosefta ki-fshutah* 5 (New York, 1962) p. 1004. I shall therefore not discuss this text below. The reading in the *Erfurt Ms.* seems to be influenced by *T. Berachot* 3.20, discussed below, where the muleteer (חמר *(hamar)*) is followed by the קרר-קדר. Here too first we read of the donkey-driver and then of the קדר-איכר.

[3] *Y. Berachot* 5.1, and cf. *B. Berachot* 32b. But regarding the latter text, cf. R. Rabbinovicz, *Variae Lectiones in Mischnam et in Talmud Babylonicum*, ad. loc. p. 174.

sources lead one away from the manuscript testimonia, to seek a word paleographically similar to קדר, probably roughly comparable in meaning with "a donkey-driver", out of whose way the man praying in the street would be likely to move. For reasons such as these Lieberman (as others), in his edition of the *Tosefta*, reads קרר, explaining that it means a wagon-driver.[4]

Next in turn it appears in a Mishna in *Bava Mezia* 6.1, where we read that: If a man hired a donkey-driver or a קדר to bring litter-bearers and pipers for a bride or corpse ... etc. Rashi *(ad loc., ap. Bavli Bava Mezia* 75b) explains that a קדר-potter is a בעל קרון, (*ba'al karon*), a wagoner. But *Tosafot (ibid.)* reads "with two *reshim, (i.e.* קרר, that is a wagoner; and according to those who read קדר, one may explain that it (the *Mishna*) mentioned the potter, because potters generally have wagons." Clearly then the *Tosafot* knew of two readings, and preferred the one "with two *reshim*". The overwhelming majority of manuscripts read with Rashi קדר, (thus: *Cod. Flor. Nat. Libr.* II1.7.9, p. CCLII, p. 252; *Cod. Parma De Rossi* 138 p. 182; *Cod.* Kaufmann p. 273; *Cod.* Hamburg 165 (19); *Mishna* ed. Napoli, 1492), though two manuscripts do record the reading קרר, (*Cod. Parma De Rossi* 984, p. 264; Cambridge Ms., ed. W. H. Lowe 114b). Once again the sense of the context points away from a word meaning "potter" to one meaning "wagoner".

Finally, the word appears in its correct reading in *T. Kelim Bava Batra* 1.13, (ed. Zuckermandel, p. 591, a text probably of the late first or first half of the second cent. C.E.), where we read of the seat of the קארר (*k'rr*) and the reins being ritually pure, and so also the back of the wagon (קרון) (*karon*) ...[5]

In all three cases the meaning is clear: a wagoner.[6] Jastrow,[7]

---

[4] *Tosefta* 1 (New York, 1955) p. 17, and see his *Tosefta ki-fshutah* 1 (New York, 1955) p. 46 to line 81.

[5] But cf. R. David Pardo *Hasdei David* (Jerusalem, 1970) *ad. loc.* p. 139. See also S. Lieberman(n), *Tosefeth Rishonim* 3 (Jerusalem, 1939) p. 77, line 22, and cf. *ibid.* 1 printed in *Azkarah*, ed. Y. L. Fishman (Jerusalem, 1937) part 2 p. 212.

[6] See, for example, J. Schönhak *Ha-Mashbir* 2 (Warsaw, 1858) 84b *s.v.*, (where *carrarius* is spelled *cararius*); also G. H. Dalman, *Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch*[2] (Göttingen, 1938) p. 393a *s.v.*

[7] *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (New York, 1886–1903) p. 1427b *s.v.*

consistent with his general tendency to seek Semitic (and more specifically Hebrew) etymologies for Talmudic words[8] writes: קרר to roll, drag, comp. גרר (*grr*) II.[9] This is patently absurd. J. Levy[10] and Krauss[11] relate the word to קרון, while Levy[12] refers to the Syriac קררא (*krr'*). Löw (in his remarks to Krauss *LW ad. loc.*)[13] refers to Payne Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus* (3763), and Brockelmann, *Lexicon Syriacum*[2] (p. 689b), קררא – *carrarius*, noting that it also appears as קארר (just as in *Tosefta Kelim*). Kohut[14] also refers to the "mediaeval Latin" *carrarius*, and to Syriac. Payne Smith himself (*ibid.*) realized that the "Chaldaic" קרר or קארר = *auriga*.[15]

The weight of the evidence is overwhelming. Despite the relative paucity of manuscript testimonia,[16] the correct reading in all three cases should be קרר (or קארר), and the meaning a "wagoner", as indeed it is in Syriac. The word is not, however, as Krauss writes (*LW ibid.*): Neubildung von קרון,[17] but from the Latin *carrarius*, (as indicated above), which in turn is derived from *carrus + arius*.[18] The word is not merely mediaeval Latin as Kohut thought, but already appears in an Egyptian papyrus of the first cent. C.E. *i.e.* of roughly the same period as our Tannaitic sources. It is in *P. Gen. (Lat.)* i, IV col. b line 6,[19] dated

---

[8] On Jastrow's etymological tendentiousness see, most recently, the very enlightening comments of E. Y. Kutscher, in *Erchei* 1 (ed. E. Y. Kutscher, 1972) pp. 6–8 (Hebrew) and p. iv (English summary), and *Erchei* 2 (ed. M. Z. Kaddari, 1974) p. 101.

[9] Jastrow, Dictionary *ibid.* p. 272a.

[10] *Neuhebräisches und Chaldäisches Wörterbuch* 4 (Leipzig, 1889) p. 392 *s.v.*

[11] *LW* 2, p. 571b *s.v.*

[12] *Ibid.* (*v.* supra n. 10).

[13] *Ibid.* (*v.* supra n. 11).

[14] *Aruch Completum* 7 (Vienna, 1879–1892) p. 218a.

[15] In Syriac (2 *Mac.* 9.4.7) it corresponds to Greek ἁρματηλάτης, a charioteer (see Brockelmann *ibid.*).

[16] Indeed, in the case of *M. Baṿa Mezia* 6.1 we should follow the rule of *praestat lectio difficilior.*

[17] On קרון see *LW* 2, p. 565ab *s.v.* The Greek form κάρρον (Latin *carrum*) is found in the *Edict of Diocletian* (of 301 C.E.) 15, 38a; *v.* S. Lauffer, *Diokletians Preisedikt* (Berlin, 1971) p. 256.

[18] *Oxford Latin Dictionary (hereafter cited OLD)* p. 279 c *s.v.*

[19] First published by J. Nichole and Ch. Morel (Geneva, 1900). The text has since been published wholly or partially a number of times. See for example, Th. Mommsen, *Hermes* 35 (1900) p. 446; A. von Premerstein, *Klio* 3 (1903) p. 23, etc. More recently in *Chartae Latinae Antiquiores* (*CLA*), ed. A. Bruckner and R. Marichal 1 (Olten and Lausanne, 1954) no. 7, p. 17 with a copious bibliography on the text *ibid.* p. 12; and most recently in

close to the end of the first cent. C.E.,[20] and occurs in a context with
armorum custos ... conductor ... secutor ... librarius ...

The word is not known from other sources in classical Latin literature,
and its interpretation is based primarily on the material found in
mediaeval glossaries. The general meaning is, of course, fairly clear,
someone somehow or other connected with wagons. However, the
precise nature of this connection is less clear. On this subject the
glossaries yield considerable information, yet here again it should always
be borne in mind that they are of about a millenium later (or more), and
though they undoubtedly reflect ancient classical traditions, they may at
times also be influenced by later or even by their contemporary
linguistic setting, etc. This information may be set out as follows:
carpentarii carrarii,[21] ἀμαξσποις (= *ἀμαξοποίος) *carrarius;*[22] *amazospus
carrarius;*[23] *amozspoys carrarius;*[24] and *plustrarius* (= *plaustrarius)
carrarius.*[25] On the basis of this material *carrarius* has been explained to
mean "one who makes or repairs wagons",[26] or even more fanciful
"sapper charged to repair the park (pack?) wagons".[27] *Plaustrarius,*
equated in one of the glossaries (above) with *carrarius,* was also taken
there to bear that meaning. This interpretation of the word as it appears
in the papyrological source, though quite feasible, is by no means
certain. After all, the Rabbinic material of a closely contemporary date,
as well as the Syriac data are quite unambiguous in meaning. There the
word means "a wagon-driver". Furthermore, the word *plaustrarius,*

Corpus Papyrorum Latinarum (= *CPL*) ed. R. Cavenaile (Wiesbaden, 1958) no. 106, p. 210,
with a full bibliography *ibid.* p. 207.

[20]According to *CLA,* p. 18, it is dated 1–10 October 87 C.E.; according to *CPL,* p. 207,
the first few days of October, 90 C.E.

[21] *Exerpta ex Codice Cassinensi* 90, (X cent.), in *Corpus Glossarium Latinorum (CGL)*
ed. G. Goetz 5 (Leipzig, 1894) p. 564, line 14.

[22] Hermineumata Montepessulana (IX cent.), *CGL* 3 (Leipzig, 1892) p. 307, line 14.

[23] Glossae Bernenses, *Cod. Bern.* 688 (VIII cent.) *CGL* 3 p. 488, line 20.

[24] Glossae Vaticanae, *Cod. Palat.* 1773 (X cent.), *CGL* 3 p. 507, line 48.

[25] Gloss. Werth. Gallee 361; see *CGL* 1 (Leipzig, 1873) p. 42. (Also cited in *Thesaurus
Linguae Latinae* 3 p. 497, lines 41.5.) Compare with this: ἀμαξοποιός *plostrarius* (variant:
plostarius), Hermeneumata Einsidlensia, *Cod. Einsidl.* 1 written in 1503, *CGL* 3 p. 271, line
41.

[26] *OLD ibid.,* (above note 19).

[27] *CLA,* p. 18.

equated in a glossary with *carrarius,* bears this meaning too,[28] and so indeed does *carrarius* in mediaeval Latin.[29] Clearly, both words are semantically parallel. Both derive from a word meaning wagon: *plaustrum, carrus;* semantically both mean basically: one belonging to or connected with a wagon, and hence both have the two meanings, a wagon-mender (or maker),[30] and a wagon-driver. However, while the meaning *ἁμαξοποίος or *carpentarius* is attested for *carrarius* only in the mediaeval period, there is as yet no clear proof that this was its meaning in the first century. And even if we posit that the mediaeval glossaries faithfully preserve classical meanings, one cannot deny that in the imperial period *carrar(ius)* also meant a wagon-driver. It may therefore by that in *P. Gen.* too we should explain *carrarius* as a wagon-driver, a meaning equally acceptable in that context.[31] In this way Rabbinic, Syriac and Latin sources will all lead us to the same lexicographic conclusion.

2. חטיטוס *(hatitos)-καταῖτυξ*

The word חטיטוס appears, it would seem, twice in Rabbinic literature, or more exactly, in one beraitha which appears in two different places. In *Tosefta Bava Mezia* 3.24 (ed. Zuckermandel, p. 378, line 9 = *Ms. Erfurt*) it appears in the guise of חטיטוב *(hatitov),* while the regular printed editions have חטיטוס. In Babylonian Talmud *Bava Mezia* 58b we again find חטיטוב in some manuscripts,[32] while the printed edition has חטיטוס.[33] The context states that a person may sell certain objects for any price, *i.e.* even far above their normal market-price, without transgressing the law of *ona'a*–overselling, (which limits the vendor's

---

[28] E.g. Ulpian, (died 228), *Digesta* 9.2.27.33. See Lewis and Short, p. 1385c, *s.v. plaustrarius* IIB.

[29] *V.* J. F. Niemeyer, *Mediae Latinati Lexicon Minus* 2 (Leiden, 1955) p. 147a, *s.v. carrarius,* = carter, citing *Gregor. Latin. Chron. Farfense,* ed. Balzani, 136a.

[30] *HA. Alex. Sev* 24; *v.* Lewis and Short *ibid.* (n. 29), IIA. Yet another parallel example is *raedarius* (raeda-coach + -*arius*), meaning a "coachman" or a "coach-builder"; *v.* Lewis & Short, p. 1521a, *s.v.*

[31] Contra A. von Premerstein in *Klio* 3 (1903) p. 33, n. 5, who refers *inter alia* to A. Funck, *Archiv für Lateinische Lexicographie und Grammatik* 7 (Leipzig, 1893) p. 372, no. 13.

[32] See *VL ad. loc.* p. 160, n. 6, referring to *Mss. Florence,* Rome 1, and Rome 2.

[33] Or חטיטום *(hatitom).* There is hardly any difference between a *samekh* and a final *mem.*

gain to one sixth).[34] Several examples are given, and among them R. Judah b. Batira lists: a horse, a sword and a חטיטוב/חטיטוס in times of battle. Thus in the *Tosefta;* and the Babylonian Talmud adds to this: because one's life depends on them. Clearly then the text is talking of various instruments of war, or of defence. In the parallel in the Palestinian Talmud (*Bava Mezia* 4.5, 9d 65) the word חטיטוס does not appear. There we find: a sword, a horse and a shield– תרים (*tris*).

The word חטיטוס or חטיטוב has variously been explained with little success. Levy[35] suggests τοξίτης (not in L-S-J), Kohut[36]: *scutum*, N. Brüll[37]: ξυστόν. Jastrow is, however, closest to approaching the absurd in that he makes two separate words of the two readings. In *s.v.* חטיטוב he writes: reduplic. of חטב–(*hatav*)–battle–axe, and *s.v.* חטיטום (*hatitom*) (! so he reads): reduplic. of חטם (*hatam*) v. חוטם (*hotam*)-buckler[38].

However, Krauss (*LW* 2, p. 250c *s.v.*)[39] surely hit upon the right solution: καταῖτυξ. (According to this we should prefer the reading ending with a *samekh*).[40] Only strangely enough he translated it "Schwert" — sword. Löw, in his comments (*ad loc.*) writes concerning the interpretations of Levy, Kohut and Brüll: "Alles unbefriedigend", adding with regard to Krauss' suggestion: "καταῖτυξ ausgeschlossen, da סייף (*sayaf*) (sword) daneben steht". As a result of this criticism Krauss himself later rejected this identification, and in his *Talmudische Archäologie* 1 (Leipzig, 1910) p. 646, note 842, proposes instead emending to read החיטוס (*hachitos*)—χαίτας (! = χαίτη), a horse's mane, or the crest of a helmet.[41] He again refers one to this latter

---

[34] On *ona'ah* see my article in *Israel Law Review* 8/2 (1973) pp. 254–274.

[35] 2, p. 39a *s.v.*(*v.* supra n. 10). Cf also S. Fraenkel, ZDMG 55 (1901) p. 356.

[36] 3, p. 373a *s.v.*

[37] *Jahrbuch für Jüdische Geschichte und Literatur* (1893) p. 126.

[38] p. 449b (*v.* supra n. 7), and cf. supra n. 8.

[39] *V.* supra. He first suggested this etymology in his critique of Jastrow in *Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 39 (1895) p. 284.

[40] May one conjecture that originally the word was written חטיטוכס-(*hatitochs*). The final *samekh* fell out in some readings (through abbreviation?–but usually rare words are not abbreviated!), leaving a *kaf*, which because it was not in the final form was misunderstood to be a *beit*. In other cases the *kaf* fell out, leaving a *samekh*, which in turn was at times exchanged for a final *mem*. (However, it is rare for letters to fall out in the middle of a word.) Normally the *xi* appears as כס, see Krauss, *LW* 1 (Berlin, 1898) p. 6. The *tau* usually appears as a ט, *ibid.* p. 10.

[41] But cf. *ibid.* 2 (Leipzig, 1911) p. 310, where he ignores his new interpretation.

explanation in his more authoritative *Additamenta ad Aruch Completum* (Vienna, 1937) p. 182a *s.v.*, explaining that "both (a horse's mane and the crest of a helmet) are necessary in war" — a free translation of his obscure formulation. And in 1945 he still held to this view, as we see from his *Kadmoniyot ha-Talmud* (which is a revised version in Hebrew of part of his *Talmudische Archäologie*) 2/2 (Tel-Aviv, 1945) p. 286, note 3.[42] However, it is difficult to see why anyone wishing to save his skin in time of war would purchase at great expense a horse's mane or the crest of a helmet.

Krauss' first explanation was undoubtedly correct. Only that he got the wrong meaning for the Greek word καταῖτυξ which is not a sword but a leathern helmet.[43] It is the equivalent of the Roman *cudo(n)*, which is a "helmet of simple form fitting close like a skull-cap made of leather or skins of wild animals."[44] It is very strange to note that the great philologist Löw was unaware of this fact, and had to resort to the albeit sound reasoning that חטיטוס could not be a sword, since the sword—סייף—appears earlier in the list. This comment is now seen to be quite irrelevant to καταῖτυξ, the helmet. Thus, we find R. Judah b. Batira — there were two, grandfather and grandson, one in the mid first century C.E., and the other in the mid second century — referring to three basic means of defense: the horse, the sword, and the helmet. And the helmet he refers to is a very simple and basic one, ironically enough bereft of a crest![45]

We have already mentioned above in passing that the parallel text in the Palestinian Talmud brings a different item as the third in the list, תרים — a shield, an obvious candidate for one of the essentials of defense in battle. Was this word intended to replace the obscure

[42] However, he partially corrected himself in 1948, in his *Paras ve-Romi ba-Talmud u-va-Midrash* (Jerusalem, 1948) pp. 209–210, n. 2.

[43] Liddell, Scott & Jones², (= *LSJ*) p. 892b, *s.v.* And so in F. Passow, *Handwörterbuch der Griechischen Sprache* 1/2 (Leipzig, 1847) p. 1613a *s.v.*

[44] Thus according to Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities³* (London, 1890) 1, p. 571b *s.v. cudo*, referring to Silius Italicus (8.493, 16.59). Cf. *ibid.* p. 899a, *s.v. galea.*

[45] V. Smith's Dictionary etc., *ibid. s.v. cudo*, that the Homeric καταῖτυξ was ἄφαλον and ἄλοφον "without plume or horse-hair crest". For the etymology of the word, *v.* E. Boisacq, *Dictionnaire Etymologique de la langue Grecque* (Paris and Heidelberg, 1923) p. 421 *s.v.*

καταῖτυξ with the more familiar תרים, as Löw and Krauss and Jastrow (above) appear to have thought? And may we deduce from this that already in the Palestinian Talmud's time the word was largely unknown? This is certainly possible. However, it is equally possible that we have here two incomplete versions of a longer list that should be used to supplement one another. For there are manuscripts of the Babylonian Talmud which include both תרים and חטיטוס in their list. Thus, for example *Cod. Florence*[46] reads: סוס וסייף ותרים וחטיטוב — a horse and a sword and a shield and a helmet.[47] On the other hand it might be argued that this list was conflated on the basis of the Palestinian Talmud (or some similar such text no longer known to us). And thus the argument swings back and forth.[48]

There remain two serious objections to this etymology, the first that the καταῖτυξ is Homeric and thus belongs to a period of the Greek language of maybe as much as a millenium before our Rabbinic texts, and the second that the *ḥet* of חטיטוס could hardly represent a Greek *kappa*.

Concerning the first point: the word is indeed Homeric, and rare too, appearing only once, in the *Iliad* 10 (K) 258.[49] However, it was known in later times. It was explained by a scholiast thus: παρὰ τὸ κάτω τετύχθαι. λοφον γὰρ οὐκ ἔχει, and in yet another anonymous gloss thus: ἡ δὲ εἰς τὸ κάτω τετυγμένη λέγεται καταῖτυξ.[50] Hesychius, in his lexicon (of the fifth century C.E. ?) brings the word twice: once explaining it as εἶδος

---

[46] *Flor. Nat. Libr.* ii.i.7–9, facsimile edition by Makor (Jerusalem, 1972) vol. 2, p. 229. This is generally a very good manuscript.

[47] See also *VL ad. loc.*, referring to *Ms. Rome¹*.

[48] Prof. S. Friedman (Jerusalem, *v.* infra n. 59) tends to prefer the conflation answer. He points out that words tend to fall in more often than they fall out, and that lists with *three* items are very common. (My thanks to him for these comments.)

[49] This was already pointed out by Krauss in *LW 2 ibid.* It should be noted in passing that classical loanwords in Rabbinic literature are generally not of a poetic nature. See also Zuntz JSS 1 (1956) 134.

[50] The former *B.T.* (close to A), see *Lexicologus zu Homer*, by F. Bechtel (Halle-Saale, 1914) pp. 187–188. The second *Schol. ad. Iliad.* Σ 479 *et* 607 *et ad Iliad.* E 118, *anon.*, cited in *Etymologicum Magnum*, (a Byzantine compilation of uncertain date, but probably from some time before the late XII cent.), ed. T. Gaisford (Oxford, 1898) p. 114, line 41. See also *Suidas*, ed. Adler 1 (Leipzig, 1928) p. 425, lines 12–13 (no. 4549) and 4 (Leipzig, 1935) p. 696, line 61.

περικεφαλαίας,[51] and again a little later on (under κατέτυξ) as: γένος
περικεφαλαίας.[52] Here it should be noted that Hesychius' knowledge of
the word and its meaning was almost certainly based on one of the
earlier Homeric glossaries upon which he relied so heavily.[53] Thus, the
word was known in the Roman[54] and Byzantine periods, perhaps
primarily as an archaic dictionary word, rather than one in current
usage.

Yet the classical sources teach us no more than that the word was
known in later times, but not whether it was in any kind of current use.
An acceptance of the fact that it reappears as a loanword in Rabbinic
sources, however, must posit its being a word in regular (if limited)

[51] Ed. Alberti *(Lugdunum Batavorum* 1766) 2 *p.* 169 (and n. 8); ed. H. Latte 2
(Denmark, 1966) p. 425, line 1139. Latte prefixes the word with an asteric meaning *in textu
glossae Cyrillianae notantur.* On the relationship between Cyrillus' glossaries and
Hesychius, see Latte's prolegomena, 1 pp. XLIV–LI. Cf. following note.

[52] Ed. Alberti, *ibid.* p. 199; ed. Latte *ibid.* p. 443 line 1709 (in square brackets). In
Alberti *ibid.* note 3 the editors refer one to Cyrillus' glossae which have the spelling
κατέτυξ (cf. supra n. 51). The position of the word in this second locus demands a reading
in Hesychius of κατέτυξ, as indeed it appears in Latte's text. Alberti gives us καταῖτυξ
again, which is alphabetically misplaced. Furthermore, why should the same word appear
twice, once in an alphabetically correct position and once in an alphabetically incorrect
position with different explanations? Surely Hesychius knew of two different spellings of
the same word, each coming from a different source and each with its own explanation.
This casts some incidental light on Hesychius' method of work. The latter spelling with an
epsilon would appear to be a misspelling, probably due to the fact that *alpha iota* and
epsilon were pronounced in a more or less identical fashion. (My thanks to Prof. A.
Wasserstein for clarifying this point for me.)

[53] Hesychius' main sources were the specialized glossaries of Aristarchus (ca. 215–ca.
143 B.C.E.), Heliodorus (first cent. B.C.E.), Apion (under Tiberius and Claudius),
Appollonius (ca. 100 C.E.), Diogenianus of Heraclea (time of Hadrian) and Herodian
(time of Marcus Aurelius). All these authors, most of who depended upon one
another—Appollonius was Apion's pupil—and go back to Aristarchus, dealt with Homeric
lexicography. Apollonius compiled a *lexicon Homericum,* Herodian, a work on accentua-
tion in the Iliad and the Odyssey, Hesychius seems to have a particularly heavy
dependence on Diogenianus. All this suggest that his knowledge of the word was a
dictionary knowledge, and not an acquaintance with a word in current usage. (Cf. supra
nn. 51 and 52). Originally his work included sources to the rare words he listed. But
unfortunately the sources disappeared in the process of abridgement which reduced the
lexicon to a glossary. However, most of them belong to a period roughly contemporary
with our Tannaitic sources. (*v. OCD,*[2] *s.v.* Hesychius.)

[54] See also Servius (IV cent. C.E.) in his commentary to Vergil, *Aeneid* 9.307, referred
to in Stephanus, *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae* 4 (Paris, 1841) p. 1080 *s.v.*

usage. For the language of the Tannaim was a living language, and their vocabulary was that of contemporary speech,[55] and not based on specialist glossaries to Homer!

It has been argued that there were Rabbis who read Homer in Greek and were therefore somewhat acquainted with his writings.[56] Someone who knew his Homer well and was mentally compiling a list of basic weapons of war might possibly recall the passage in the *Iliad (ibid.)* which tells that:

> To Tydea's son Thrasymedes, staunch in fight, gave a two-edged sword ... and a shield, and about his head he set a helm of bull's hide without horn and without crest,[57] a helmet that is called a skull-cap (καταῖτυξ), that guards the heads of lusty youths.[58]

It may be recalled that these three items, the sword, the shield and the helmet, appear in the (fuller) list cited above (from *Cod. Florence).* Indeed, they do so in the same order,[59] (only that the Rabbinic horse is absent from the Homeric list). It may therefore be — and this is highly conjectural — that an associative recollection of the Homeric passage also played a part in dictating the choice of this term.

As to the second point, that the Hebrew letter *ḥet* does not represent the Greek *kappa*, one may answer that there are some, albeit rare, cases of k > ח, as, for example κλεψύδρα — חלף סדרה *(ḥalaf sidrah),*[60] (though here the popular etymology played a prominent role in introducing the *ḥet*).[61]

[55] *V.* most recently, Kutscher's summarizing remarks in *Erchei* 1 pp. 29, 40, with bibliography.

[56] *V.* S. Lieberman, *Greek and Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (Jerusalem, 1962, Hebrew) p. 235 and pp. 231–234. A. A. Halevy, in his *Olamah shel ha-Aggadah* (Tel-Aviv, 1972), brought further examples to prove this point, but all-too-often his comparisons seem a little far-fetched and forced.

[57] Cf. supra n. 45.

[58] *Iliad* 10.258, Loeb ed. and transl. 1, p.455.

[59] On the principle determining the order in Rabbinic lists, see the very important article of S. Friedman, in *Leshonenu* 35 (1971) pp. 117–129, 192–206.

[60] Krauss, *LW* 2 p. 252a, *s.v.*

[61] The case of חולסית-κάχληξ (Krauss, *LW* 2 p. 249b *s.v.*) is problematic, (*v.* Löw *ad. loc.*). Likewise חליקוסתא - καλυκώσις, (*LW* 2, 251b, *s.v.*), is rejected by Löw (*ad.loc.*, and see his *Die Flora der Juden,* 4 (Vienna, 1934) p. 126). The problem of ח > κ interchanges is one which requires a more detailed examination. It may be noted in passing that in

To summarize in brief: despite some nagging doubts which have not been totally banished, on balance, Krauss' etymology of חטיטוס from καταῖτυξ seems the most satisfactory. Certainly it is infinitely more acceptable than any other suggestion thus far offered. And if we accept this etymology, we may also conclude that the Homeric word continued to be in use (or was resurrected into use)[62] in the Roman period, perhaps in a dialectically different form.

BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY   DANIEL SPERBER

Greek itself there are occasional dialect interchanges between *kappa* and *chi*, as in κίδαλον - χίδαλον; κίβδηλος - χίδηλος; κιτών (κιθών) – χιτών. Here, however, the *kappa* of κατα– or κατω– would, of course, not change into *chi*, (which in any case is more usually transcribed by a *khaf* than a *het*, see *LW* 1 p. 12). In *Ms. Rome* 1 (cited in *VL ad. loc, v.* supra n. 47), we find הטיטוב וחתיתום. These last two items appear to be the same word in different spellings (and varying degrees of corruption). The copyist apparently found two separate (alternative) scribal traditions, and thinking them to be different words entered them both into his text. The Greek *tau* may be represented by a *tet* or a *tav* (*LW* 1 pp. 10–11).

[62] On the phenomenon of words suddenly reappearing after the interval of many hundreds of years and more, see Kutscher's remarks in *Erchei* 2 p. 18.