

231ff.). ἀπτεσθαι²²) ist mehr als θιγεῖν (vgl. ἀθίκτων Ag. 371), wie folgende Euripidesverse lehren (Ba. 615–617):

Chor: οὐδέ σου συνῆψε χεῖρε δεσμίοισιν ἐν βρόχοις;

Dion.: ταῦτα καὶ καθύβρις' αὐτόν, ὅτι με δεσμεύειν δοκῶν
οὐτ' ἐθίγεν οὐθ' ἦψαθ' ἡμῶν, ἐλπίσιν δ' ἐβόσκετο.

Das ἀ-privativum in ἀ-άπτοις andererseits erhält seine Erklärung in den Epitheta von θυσιαν ἑτέραν, nämlich ἀνομόν τιν' ἄδαιτον, νεικέων τέκτονα σύμφροντον οὐ δεισήμερον (150f.), sowie in der folgenden Begründung (bis 155). Iphigenie ist „un-antastbar“, „un-angreifbar“, weil das Menschenopfer nicht nur gegen göttliches und menschliches Gesetz verstößt (ἀνομον), sondern auch den Groll (μῆνις) und die Rache (τεκνόποιος) der „Löwenmutter“ Klytaimestra herausfordert. Vor diesem Hintergrund gewinnt auch μαλερῶν in 141 Prägnanz und Deutlichkeit. Wie verzehrend und vernichtend die „Löwin“ Klytaimestra sein wird, deutet Kalchas mit dem Ausdruck οὐ δεισήμερον an. Dem Attribut ἀάπτοις steht in 142 das Epitheton φιλομάστοις gegenüber. Es bezieht sich auf den Lebenswillen der Trojaner. Die beiden Kola 140–141 und 142–143 sprechen also, kurz gesagt, folgende Mahnungen der Artemis aus: „Iphigenie darf nicht angetastet werden“ und „Troja soll leben“!

δρόμος again

By DANIEL SPERBER, Ramat-Gan, Israel

In *Glotta* 55/3–4, 1973, p. 213, D. F. Sutton pointed to a meaning of the word δρόμος unrecorded in the lexica. In *P. Bodm.* 28.19 this word appears, and she argues convincingly that there it means a “runner” or “messenger”. Her assertion is certainly persuasive, and furthermore it seems to be borne out by Rabbinic literature¹). For in *Bavli Kiddushin* 63a we find a *beraita* (Palestinian statement of the second century C.E.) which reads:

[If he said to her:] Sit together with me and I will betroth thee, play before me, dance²) before me, do as this דרומס (*dromos*)³),

²²) Zu ἀπτομαι bei Aischylos vgl. Ag. 1608f. und fr. 255, 3 N. = fr. 399, 3 M.

¹) On the whole subject of Greek (and Latin) words in Rabbinic literature, see my detailed essay in *Bar-Ilan*, 14–15, 1977, pp. 9–60.

²) *Aruch*, ed. Venice 1531 (fol. 69a) reads *deqor*. But this is clearly a misprint for *reqod* = dance.

³) This is the reading in the *Aruch*; see A. Kohut, *Aruch Completum* (Vienna 1878–92) 3, p. 154b. The printed editions, and even some Mss.

we assess if there is (in these activities) the value of a *peruta* (minimum-size coin⁴), required for betrothal).—If there is, she is betrothed; if not, she is not.

S. Krauss, in his *Griechische und Lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum*, vol. 2 (Berlin 1899, reprint: Hildesheim 1964)⁵, p. 217a s.v., wrote "Rennbahn". However, Löw, in his note *ad loc.*, rightly pointed out that: "In den Zusammenhang paßt nur *δρομεύς*, Laufer". So indeed Kohut explained it in his *Aruch Completum* (above note 3). However, the reading is quite clear as to its termination -os⁶). Surely we have here another independent testimony of the use of *dromos* in the sense of "runner"⁷), "messenger"⁸).

(e.g., Ms. Vat. Ebr. 111), have a corrupt reading כְּדִימוֹס (*ke-dimos*), which some early commentators (such as Rashi) explained as a "house". However, this reading makes no sense.

⁴) On the value of the *peruta*, see my *Roman Palestine 200–400: Money and Prices* (Ramat-Gan, 1974), *passim*.

⁵) On this work, its importance and its defects, see my article in *Bar-Ilan* *ibid.*, pp. 9–19.

⁶) See Krauss, *Lehnwörter* etc., vol. 1 (Berlin 1898), pp. 23–24, on the forms in which the diphthong *eu* can be transliterated in Rabbinic parlance. Although he also gives a single *vav* as one of the possible forms, an examination of his examples will show that this is not the case.

⁷) The author of the *Aruch*, Nathan ben Yehiel of Rome (10 cent.) understood it in the more usual sense of "a large open space" (*rehavah*). As there is hardly any difference in Hebrew (especially in Mss.) between the *bet* (B) and the *kaf* (K), perhaps the *Aruch* read: *be-dromos*, i.e. do (= run) in this *dromos*. This, however, is not a good reading: for the verb required should be "run" and not "do", etc.

⁸) On the *cursor* in Rabbinic literature, see my remarks in *Sinai* 82/3–4 499–500, 1978, p. 169 note 15 (Hebrew).