

HESYCHIUS AND RABBINIC LOANWORDS*

Introduction

Many years ago Professor Saul Lieberman¹ pointed out “the importance of Palestinian writings (including rabbinic) for the knowledge of the sources of Hesychius”,² the fifth century(?) Alexandrine lexicographer.³ Clearly, the converse is equally true, namely that a knowledge of Hesychius may be the key to understanding difficult words in Rabbinic literature. The following study will present a selection of examples in this direction.

1. *Batnon* — בטנון

This word appears in Mishna Kelim 15.6. The Geonim⁴ (who record a reading: בטנינון)⁵ explain it as a musical instrument, a kind of large lyre (*kinner*) which is laid across the belly. Clearly, this is a popular etymology based upon the similarity between בט[י]נון and בטן, the Hebrew for belly. However, it appears that there was a tradition that the *batnon* was some kind of musical instrument. The popular etymology caused the tradition to be enlarged upon, suggesting the “belly lyre”.

The Aruch also followed this etymological line of thinking. For in the entry בטן⁶ we first find the Gaonic explanation, and then “another

* This article continues the author's studies in classical loanwords in Rabbinic literature. See *SCI* 1, 1974, 124 note*, *ibid.* 2, 1975, 163 note*.

¹ *JQR* 35 (1944) 47 n. 70; cf. *idem.*, *Greek in Jewish Palestine* (New York 1942) 32, n. 21.

² Ed. Albertus (Lugdunum Batavum 1746); and ed. H. Latte (Denmark 1963–1966), up to 0.

³ See my incidental comments on Hesychius, his sources and methodology, in *SCI* 2 (1975) 172.

⁴ See J.N. Epstein, *Der Gaonäische Kommentar zur Mischnaordnung Teharoth* (Berlin 1921, 1924), (a text probably from the X cent.) 40 line 3. (Hereafter GK).

⁵ See *infra* note 11.

⁶ By Nathan ben Yehiel of Rome (XI cent.), ed. A. Kohut (called: *Aruch ha-Shalem*, Vienna 1878–92), 2, 42a.

explanation: a kind of apron which workers and craftsmen wear across their belly so as not to dirty their clothes". The modern dictionaries (of Jastrow⁷ and Levy⁸) take much the same line. N. Brüll⁹ accepted the Gaonic tradition of a musical instrument, but with a different etymological tack. He suggested: *φωτίγγιον* = flute. However, this is a far-fetched call, in view of the considerable dissimilarity of this word from our *batnon*.¹⁰

The correct explanation is very straightforward when we look to Hesychius. There we find the word *βάτνος* explained as *αυλός* (Messen.),¹¹ which, of course, is a pipe, flute or clarinet. The Rabbinic form *batnon* is from the accusative, a common phenomenon in Rabbinic loan-words, as has been often pointed out.¹²

Perhaps we may even conjecturally suggest that the original Gaonic tradition was accurate, and indeed identified the *batnon* with a wind-instrument. At a later time this was derived by popular etymology from *beten*-stomach, used for exhaling air. This enlarged tradition was later corrupted through some kind of misunderstanding into the "belly lyre".

2. *Dukni* — דוקני

This word appears in two separate loci: (1) Yerushalmi Maasrot 3.10, 51a7, and (2) Tosefta Kelim Bava Me'zia 3.9, ed. Zuckerman p. 581 line 27. The first text is (apparently) talking of an instrument with which

⁷ M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi and the Midrashic Literature* (New York 1903), 158a s.v.

⁸ J. Levy, *Neuhebräisches und Chadäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim und Midrashim* (Leipzig 1876-89), 1, 213a s.v.

⁹ *Jahrbücher für Jüdische Geschichte und Literature* (Frankfurt am Main) 5 (1883) 122.

¹⁰ S. Krauss, *Griechische und Lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud Midrasch und Targum* 2 (Berlin 1899) (hereafter: LW), 148a s.v. left the word unexplained.

¹¹ Ed. Albertus 1, 707 note 1, ed. Latte p. 317 line 34. Note that the reading in the Latte edition is *βάτμος*, which reminds us of *בטינון* in the Geonim. As to Latte's reading *δαιλός* in place of *αυλός*, see his remark in the apparatus. Here the Rabbinic text confirms Albertus' reading. It would further appear that there were two forms: *βάτνον* and *βάτνον*, both recorded in different mss. of Hesychius; and so also: *בטינון* and *בטינון* are recorded in Rabbinic and Geonic sources.

¹² E.g., Krauss, *ibid.* 1 (Berlin 1898) 71, etc.

one can pick up (at least) two fruits at the same time. Hence, Krauss'¹³ identification with the Greek word δίκελλα = *bidens* = a two pronged hoe or pick.¹⁴ Here it is of interest to note that the reading given by R. Solomon (ben Joseph) Sirilio (or Sirillo, died circa 1558)¹⁵ is דיקרנון = δίκρανον = pitchfork,¹⁶ a reading, which, though it makes excellent sense in this context, is probably not a primary one.

The second text speaks of the blade (זמל = σμίλη)¹⁷ of the *dukni*, and it is clear from the legal context that the (metal) blade is not an integral part of the wooden body of the *dukni*, though it is connected to it.¹⁸ This is, indeed, true of a δίκελλα — *bidens*, which has a wooden handle to which is attached the metal double-blade section.¹⁹ However, *dukni* has no easy correspondence with δίκελλα. Furthermore, a δίκελλα is usually understood to be drag-hoe, i.e. a kind of mattock, and not a pitchfork which is more usually called δίκρανον, *furcilla*, etc.

Furthermore, it is extremely likely that the correct reading in Tosefta Kelim *ibid.* is רוקני *rukni* = ῥοκάνη = a plane.²⁰ A plane consists, of

¹³ In LW 2, 193a s.v. See further L. Ginzberg's comments in *Festschrift Schwarz* (1917), where he suggests that דקן = דקר (N<R, a frequent consonantal shift) = sharp pointed instrument. דקר is, of course, a good Semitic root, and the word would have nothing to do with Greek. However, this is a farfetched call, and may be readily rejected.

¹⁴ See on this in detail, in K.D. White's *Agricultural Instruments of the Roman World* (Cambridge 1967) 47–52. See also *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, p. 232c, s.v., *bidens*² 2.

¹⁵ A major commentator of (parts of) the Palestinian Talmud (= Yerushalmi), born in Spain, and then, after the expulsion of the Jews from there in 1492, moved on to Adrianople, Salonika and finally Safad in Palestine. See the important study on him and the methodology he used in his commentary, by S. Lieberman in *A. Marx Jubilee Volume* (New York 1950), Hebrew section, 301–02, and especially 301 n. 89.

¹⁶ LW, 2, 193–194 s.v. דוקרין, see Löw's detailed note ad loc. See also G. Dalman, *Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina*, 3 (Gutersloh 1933) 95.

¹⁷ See LW 2, 28ab s.v. (On different forms of this word see H. Schoene, *Hermes* 38 [1903] 283.)

¹⁸ See e.g., J. Neusner, *A History of Mishnaic Purities*, 2 (Leiden 1974) 23, where, however, he reads *rukni*; see below.

¹⁹ White, *ibid.* (n. 14 supra) 50.

²⁰ See Löw's detailed discussion apud LW 2, 193a s.v. דוקני, and cf. *ibid.* 578ab s.v. רוקני, (and 575ab s.v. רהטני). See further, S. Lieberman, *Tosefeth Rishonim* 3 (Jerusalem 1939) 43, who notes that Ms. Vienna to the Tosefta in Kelim *ibid.* reads ריקני. He cites further attestations to this reading, or a variant one רומקי. See also W. Bacher's *Liklutim min Sefer ha-Meliza*, 35 line 178: רומקי, explained as plane. So also Tanḥum Yerushalmi, ed. Shay, 2, 412 s.v. רוקני explained by Arabic אלקון = אלאפאה = plane of sorts.

course, of a wooden body into which a distinctly separate blade is fitted.²¹ It therefore fits the legal context perfectly.

Even if we were to accept the reading דוקני as the primary one, we can find yet a closer suitable equivalent than δίκελλα, namely δουκάνη (= τρικάνη) = *tribula*²² = a threshing machine consisting of a heavy wooden board with (flint or) iron teeth embedded in the underside.²³

However, neither a plane nor a threshing machine will fit the context of the Yerushalmi Maasrot text. It seems, therefore, that we must again look to Hesychius, and indeed we are not disappointed. For there we find the word δοκάνη = a forked pole (on which hunting nets are fixed).²⁴ This amply satisfies our contextual requirements.

It appears then that we have before us two distinct homomorphic words, each of which must be given a separate lexicographic entry.²⁵

3. *Signiot* — סיגניות

Yet another difficult word appears in Mishna Kelim, this time in 16.5. A Gaonic source²⁶ explains it as a small basket made of leaves into which fruit is put etc.²⁷ In Solomon ben Samuel's *Sefer ha-Meliza* (compiled around 1339),²⁸ s.v. סיגניות, the word is explained as woven matting (כנתא) which farm-hands make out of stalks, and carry in them

²¹ See Ducange, *Glossarium ad Scriptores Mediae et Infimae Graecitatis* (1688 reprint Graz 1958), p. 325 s.v., (comparing with δόκανον = *trabs*, *ibid.* 317 s.v.).

²² See Ducange, *Glossarium ad Scriptores Mediae et Infimae Graecitatis* (1688 reprint Graz 1958), p. 325 s.v., (comparing with δόκανον = *trabs*, *ibid.* 317 s.v.).

²³ Varro, *RR* 1. 52. 2; White *ibid.* (n. 14 supra) 153–55. For illustration of such instruments as were used by the Arab fellahin in Palestine in recent times, see S. Avitsur, *Implements for Harvesting and similar purposes used in the traditional agriculture of Eretz Israel* (Tel-Aviv 1966), illustrations 8.9, plates 32–37, discussed *ibid.*, 63–73 (Hebrew). See further Dalman, *Arbeit und Sitte* 3, 78 ff., and figs. 16–19. (For a picture of a pitchfork see *ibid.* illustr. 11.)

²⁴ Ed. Latte, p. 469₁₁, ed. Albertus 1, 673 (see n. 6): δοκάναι· αἱ στάλικες αἷς ἴστανται τὰ λίνα, ἢ κάλαμοι. (Cited in LSJ⁹ p. 441b s.v.)

²⁵ I have discussed the methodological problems presented by homonyms in my study in *Bar-Ilan* 14 (1977) 344–5 n. 41.

²⁶ GK 46 line 2.

²⁷ Cf. *ibid.* p. 16 n. 12 on הקלתות.

²⁸ See W. Bacher, *Likkutim min Sefer ha-Meliza* (Budapest 1900) 32 line 139. (The author lived in Urgench, Transoxiana, Uzbekistan of today, and his dictionary is Hebrew-Persian.)

fruit to the owner of the field. A similar explanation is found in Tanḥum (ben Joseph) Yerushalmi's dictionary (XIII cent.) s.v. סגניות.²⁹

The traditional etymology given by the Geonim linked the word with the Hebrew סוגה, (Canticles 7.3, a hapax legomenon). However, this has been rightly rejected.³⁰ Kohut³¹ suggested that it derives from σαγήνη = *sagena* = a drag net (or snare). But this meaning clearly argues against such an etymology.

The correct explanation is surely found in Hesychius s.v. σεγάμιον, which is explained as: γοργαθώδες πλέγμα = plaited baskets.³² Such a meaning fits the Mishnaic context perfectly, which speaks of *signiot* or more exactly: *seганиot*, made of leaves or twigs.

4. *Kruna* — קרונה

This word means a spring, and is usually associated with the Greek κρήνη. However, if this etymology were correct we would expect קריני or קרינה. The dictionaries did not actually go so far as to suggest an emendation, but Krauss³³ did use it to exemplify the use of U for η.

However, the late Y. Brand in his *Klei Haḥeres besifrut Hatalmud (Ceramics in Talmudic Literature)*³⁴ pointed to the existence of a word κρουνός = a spring. He could have gone yet one stage further. For Hesychius s.v. κρούναι writes: κρήναι τέλεια.³⁵ In other words, he knew of a different word κρούνα (apparently etymologically unrelated

²⁹ Ed. H. Shay, (Hebrew University doctoral dissertation — unpublished, Jerusalem 1975), part 2, 119–20. I am greatly obliged to Dr. Shay for supplying me with a copy of her important work. The author lived in Palestine and Egypt, and knew a number of languages, including Arabic and Greek.

³⁰ See, e.g. S. Fraenkel, *Die Aramäischen Fremdwörter im Arabischen* (Leiden 1886), 109.

³¹ *Aruch ha-Shalem* 6, 20 a s.v.

³² Ed. Albertus 2, 1162, and see n. 21. Also cited in LSJ⁹ p. 1588a, s.v. σεγάμιον, comparing with σαργάνη, (as does already Albertus).

³³ LW 1, p. 87.

³⁴ P. 41 n. 52.

³⁵ Ed. Latte, p. 535 line 24, ed. Albertus 2, 355 (and see n. 9). Cf. further Latte p. 535 line 24: κρουνόν· ρεῖθρα, ὄχετοῖ, ὑδάτων ἐκβολαί, and *ibid.* p. 535 line 27: κρουνών· ῥευμάτων.

to κρητή)³⁶, and it is just this word which appears in Rabbinic sources.³⁷

5. *Riainot* — ריאנות > ריאנות

In a very difficult passage in Midrash Psalms to Psalms 48.13 (ed. Buber p. 276) we read:

“Tell the towers thereof” (Psalms *ibid.*) —
 ... How many נִיטפאות? One thousand and
 nine-hundred and seventy-six. And where (הֵיכֵן)
 do the waters rise? On nine-hundred רִיאנות.

The latter section “And where do the waters rise ... רִיאנות” appears only in Ms. Parma, de Rossi 1232, and Ms. Halberstam³⁸ (כ”י ר’ in Buber’s sigla), and is absent in the other six mss. which Buber used in the preparation of his edition.³⁹ However, it is brought by the Aruch,⁴⁰ who records it as reading:

“And how (הֵיכֵן) do the waters rise?
 On nine-hundred and ninety (תתקצ”ט)
 דיכואות”.

It is also found in the Yalkut Shimoni Psalms ad loc. (2, section 756), and there the reading is:

“... On nine-hundred and ninety two (תתקצ”ב)
 בִּירְנִיּוֹת”.

³⁶ See Charvaine, *Dictionnaire etymologique de la langue Grec* (Paris 1968) 587–88, s.v. κρητός.

³⁷ E.g., Bavli Ketubot 15a: קרונות. But note the well-attested reading קרונה there; see *Dikdukei Soferim ha-Shalem*, ed. M. Hershler (Jerusalem 1972) 94 line 1 in apparat. See on this S. Lieberman, *Sinai* 55, 4–5 (1964) 278–79, (contra D. Halivni, *ibid.* 55/3, 121–26, and see *idem*, *Mekorot u-Masorot — Nashim* [Tel-Aviv 1968] 146–151).

³⁸ This is the number given in the introduction p. 82. However, the title-pages list it as no. 1332.

³⁹ So also it is absent in the parallel in Yalkut Machiri, Psalms and loc., ed. Buber, p. 266 section 17.

⁴⁰ *Aruch ha-Shalem* 4, p. 68b, s.v. טפף ad fin.

Buber and others⁴¹ already rightly pointed out that נִיטְפָאוֹת should be emended to read: נִימְפָאוֹת = νεμφαια = (street-) fountains.⁴² Such an interpretation makes sense of the continuation of the text: "And where do the waters rise?" However, the final word in this passage is most perplexing. We may safely assume that it is related to water and to fountains. We find it in three different versions, which appear to be parallel traditions, i.e. one should not emend the one reading on the basis of another.⁴³ Let us examine each of these readings separately.

Concerning the Aruch's reading דִּיכּוּאוֹת (sic.), there have been many attempts to make something of it. Thus Krauss⁴⁴ suggested emending it to: דּוּכְטָאוֹת = ductus = conveyance of water (aqueduct), (but ductus ought to be דּוּקְטוּסִין); Löw⁴⁵: רַמְאוֹת = *ῥύμη = street; Kohut⁴⁶: δοχή = δοχεῖον = cistern⁴⁷ (or διάχυσις = diffusion). None of these interpretations are wholly satisfactory, but the most likely is surely that of Kohut. And in the light of his suggestion perhaps we should even emend to: דּוּכִיאוֹת = δοχή + fem. plural termination.

As to our רַאטוֹת, here too many suggestions were put forward. In some cases it was emended to agree with the Aruch's reading;⁴⁸ in others it was independently corrected: e.g., Kohut⁴⁹: רַטְרָאוֹת = ῥεῖθρον = stream, or רַמְאוֹת = ῥεῦμα = stream, current, etc. Here again, none of these suggestions are really convincing. They also involve a radical

⁴¹ Buber, *Midrash Psalms* *ibid.* note 14, which requires slight corrections. See also LW 2, p. 358b, s.v. נִיטְפָאוֹת, in Löw's comment; Kohut, *Aruch ha-Shalem* *ibid.* note 15. See also I.B. Schönhak, *Ha-Miluim* (or *Ha-Mashbir ha-Ḥadash*) (Warsaw 1869), introduction on *tet*, examples of the interchange between *tet* and *mem*.

⁴² See A.M.M. Jones, *The Greek City* (Oxford 1940) 215, 349 n. 8, referring to *IGR* 3.811, 1273; *-Klio* 10, p. 235; *RE* 17, 1517-24. Also see: *CIG* 4616 (Syria, II cent. C.E.); Philostratus, *Vit. Apol.* 8.12.

⁴³ I have discussed this issue at length on a number of occasions: *Sinai* 40 (1976) 55-59; *Bar-Ilan* 14/15 (1976-77) 359-62, etc.

⁴⁴ LW 2, p. 578^b s.v. רַיֵּאוֹת.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ *Aruch ha-Shalem* 4, p. 68b s.v. טַפֵּי.

⁴⁷ *Thphn. chron.* p. 370 (Migne 108. 888b), cited by B.W. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford 1961) 385b s.v. δοχεῖον in this meaning. However, I have not yet found δοχή with this specific meaning, (though it is used as a measure of water in the Testament of Solomon (early III cent. C.E.) 16.7 (Migne 122. 1349c), Lampe *ibid.* s.v. δοχή, as well as a receptacle). Nonetheless, that δοχή could mean cistern is very plausible.

⁴⁸ LW *ibid.*

⁴⁹ *Aruch Ha-Shalem*, 8, Supplement p. 18a s.v. רַיֵּאוֹת.

degree of emendation, both juggling the order of the letters, and/or putting in an additional letter.

We would therefore suggest a very small emendation, altering the letter *tet* and splitting it up into *yod nun*, which gives us: רִיאִינֹת. The phenomenon of two letters combining to become one, and vice-versa, is well known in Rabbinic texts.⁵⁰ Indeed, cases closely similar to that which we are suggesting here have already been noted by scholars.⁵¹ As to רִיאִינֹת, we propose that it is the word found in Hesychius: ῥίαυνα·πηγή, λυβάς, i.e. a spring, stream or pool. Here then is the connection with water and fountains. What the text seems to mean is either that the water from the *nymphaia* rises above (i.e. from?)⁵² some nine-hundred springs, or that it rises over (i.e. fills up) so many pools.

And finally to the reading in the Yalkut Shimoni. Here too we would expect something related to water. בִּירְנִיֹת, however, is usually explained as some kind of tower.⁵³ Indeed, the word בִּירְנִיֹת appears shortly after, in the continuation of our text, probably with the meaning "castle".⁵⁴ In our context such a meaning makes little sense.

The key to the solution of this puzzle lies, we believe, in the strange (and inexplicable) numbers preceding the words. We find three such numbers: 900 in Midrash Psalms, 990 in the Aruch, and 992 in the Yalkut Shimoni. It seems clear that the number in Midrash Psalms is simply incomplete, and the missing elements should be supplied: ... תשע מאות [ותשעים]: We would further suggest that the Aruch preserved for us the correct reading, 990, and the Yalkut should be emended accordingly. What happened may be reconstructed as follows:

The Yalkut's original reading read: תתקצ"צ (990 =) בִּירְנִיֹת. Since the word בִּירְנִיֹת appears just a couple of lines further on, under its influence, our text was "corrected" to read תתקצ"ב (992 =) בִּירְנִיֹת. What then is בִּירְנִיֹת? It would seem to be a corrupt form of בִּירְנִיֹת

⁵⁰ See S. Lieberman, *On the Yerushalmi* (Jerusalem 1929, Hebrew) 8.

⁵¹ טיחוסים = טיחוסים = τεύχευσις, Lieberman, *Debarim Rabba'* (Jerusalem 1964) p. 19 n. 10 and note ב. Also טרגיה < כורגיה, in Tanḥuma Buber, Exodus p. 20 note 33, etc.

⁵² Stylistically problematic.

⁵³ See LW 2, pp. 145b–146a s.v. בורני II and בורנית, where, however, the etymology is to be rejected. Cf. *Aruch Ha-Shalem* 2, p. 195 ab s.v. ברן, relating it to the Semitic בירה = town, castle, etc., and so also Jastrow p. 166b s.v. בירנית.

⁵⁴ See Buber, *ibid.* note 16.

= *vivarium* (with plural termination) = (fish) ponds.⁵⁵ This again brings us back to our fountains, pools and springs. The water rises onto (= into) nine-hundred and ninety pools.

We stated at the outset of this section, that this text — of which we have discussed only a fragment⁵⁶ — is very problematic indeed. Our suggestions are somewhat conjectural, and by no means conclusive. However, they do make some sort of sense of the text. Furthermore, if we are right in our emendation to רִיאִינוּה, we have uncovered yet another “Hesychian” word, one which was hitherto hidden away under a “mask of corruption”.

6. *Daxa* — דִּכְסָא

In an interesting passage in Genesis Rabba 5.1, ed. Theodor-Albeck pp. 33–34, we read:

The Lord took all the waters of “Genesis” and pressed them down⁵⁷ into Oceanus ...

R. Levi said: The waters said to one another: Let us go and carry out the Lord’s command (קִילִיפְסִים — κέλευσας), as it is written (Psalms 93.3) “... the floods have lifted up their voices ...” They said: To where shall we go? He said: “Let the floods lift up דְּכָיִם ...”

R. Joshua ben Hanania said: To דִּכְסָאִים, to יִם דִּכְסָא.
(Variants: דּוּכְסָאִה, etc.)

Theodor discussed this latter portion in detail, in the end leaving it unexplained. What is יִם דִּכְסָא (ה) or דּוּכְסָא (ה), which is obviously a play on דְּכָיִם — *dochyam*?

The key to the puzzle seems to lie in a line in Hesychius, (ed. Latte, 1, p. 404 line 37): δάξα· Θάλασσα· Ἡπειρώται. In other words, in the

⁵⁵ See LW 2, pp. 148b–149a s.v. בִּיבֵר for the references. Add: Gaster, *Maasiyot* cc, p. 134 lines 22, 23. The singular is usually: בִּיבְרִי.

⁵⁶ There is also a partial parallel in B. Bara Batra 75b. I hope to deal with this text in detail elsewhere.

⁵⁷ The word used there is צוּלְקֵן = צוּנְקֵן. See M. Sokoloff, *The Geniza Fragments of Genesis Rabba and Ms. Vat. Ebr. 60 of Genesis Rabba* (unpublished doctoral thesis, Jerusalem 1971, Hebrew) 1, p. 165, note to line 1.

language of Epirus (Albania) the sea is called *daxa*. This line in Hesychius is from (the lost lexicon of) Diogenianus (Latte's D), who flourished in the Hadrianic period, exactly when R. Joshua ben Ḥanania lived. The homiletic passage seems to be saying that the floods were told to go to the δάξα — sea.⁵⁸ Explained in this manner, R. Joshua ben Ḥanania's statement closely parallels other similar statements made in the same context in the names of other authorities. Thus, R. Levi (ibid.) said: דַּרְךְ הַיָּם = (probably) to (literally: through, by way of) the sea, (a play on דַּרְךְ . . . דַּכּ). R. Abba bar Kahana said: לְדוֹךְ פֶּלֶךְ וּלְזוּי פִּלְנִית — to that place, and that spot ... (a play on דוֹךְ . . . דַּכּ). R. Huna said: לְהַדְדֵךְ יָמָא — to that sea (a play on הַדְדֵךְ . . . דַּכּ). It may also be that θάλασσα in Hesychius means, as indeed it often does, the Mediterranean Sea (see references in LSJ⁹ p. 781b s.v.). In that case δάξα יָם — (sea) is not merely a tautologous repetition necessitated by the Biblical word on which the word-play was based (*dochyam*), but the description of the specific place to which the floods were told to go. This further strengthens the similarity to the other statements — “to that (specific) sea”, “to that (specific) place”, etc.

If our interpretation be correct, this passage has additional significance. For Latte, in his *Mantissa Adnotationes* (ibid. p. 504) wrote on this Hesychian passage:

Haec glossa, quae a Bechteli sylloga abest, forsitan maximi momenti sit ad dialectam Epirotarum cognoscendam. Si enim recte n. pr. Illyricum Daxes (Krahe, Lex. altill. Personennam. 39) contuli, sequitur Epirotarum linguae voces Illyricas infuisse, quod in confinibus populis minime mirum. Sed hoc unicum si quid video exemplum est, quo res probari possit ...

According to what we have suggested above, the knowledge of the word *daxa*, perhaps in a modified dialectical form (see above note 34) penetrated further than to the neighbouring Illyricum (Albania), and

⁵⁸ As noted above the mss. contain two major readings: דַּיִכְסָא, and דוֹכְסָא. The Greek *alpha* changes into both a U in Rabbinic Graecitas (see Krauss, LW 1, p. 87), and an I (ibid. p. 88). The use of — כַּס — for the Greek *xi* is usual, see ibid. p. 6.

⁵⁹ On זוּי meaning “place, spot”, see Sokoloff ibid., note to line 5.

even so far east as to Palestine. Indeed the word was sufficiently well-known there that it could be used in a homiletic sermon, and be understood by the audience. The full significance of such a suggestion leads one on to the realm of conjecture⁶⁰, an exercise we shall leave to someone else.

BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY

DANIEL SPERBER

⁶⁰ We may call attention to Rosen's observation in *JSS*, 8, 1963, pp. 67-68, that some elements of Pamphylian (and perhaps Bythnian, note 3) were imported into Palestinian κοινή. Perhaps we have here a similar phenomenon.