

XVIII. COMPARISONS

L.VI. Comparison between homologies and authoritative interpretations establishes the validity and virtues of the former, while exposing the flaws and failures of the latter.

SOME of the homologies set out in the previous chapter will be examined and explained here with reference to the Septuagint, the Authorized Version, the New English Bible, and/or one of the dictionaries which embody the distillation of modern research, namely: *A Hebrew and English Lexicon*, edited by Professors Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs—as revised by Professor G. R. Driver who played a major role in the translation of the N.E.B.—in order to demonstrate at one and the same time the validity of my theory and the limited reliability of the biblical translations and authoritative commentaries.

In their Preface to the *Lexicon*, the editors stated:

In the matter of etymologies they (the editors) have endeavoured to carry out the method of sound philology, making it their aim to exclude arbitrary and fanciful conjectures, and in cases of uncertainty to afford the student the means of judging of the materials on which a decision depends... It has been the purpose to recognize good textual emendations, but not to swell the list by conjectures which appeared to lack a sound basis.

However, it will be my bounden duty to the truth, as I see it, to take them and their authorities to task precisely for their *arbitrary and fanciful conjectures* and far from *good textual emendations*, among other errors. *Βυβλοπάται* (a variation of *Ὀμηροπάται*) is not too strong an epithet for them. As to Professor G. R. Driver's hope—expressed in his Note to the reprint of the *Lexicon*—that its readers would send him 'corrections and improvements for future editions', I made available to him the substance of this book on 29 December 1966.

ἄγαλμα—This neuter Greek noun embraces in its various meanings abstract 'glory' and concrete 'statue', 'gift' and 'ornament', 'sculpture' and 'picture'. This quirk of language is a fact of Greek life which must be accepted without question. Then, quite understandably, this fact results in different Arabic and Hebrew

words being synonymous with that Greek noun, and individually homologizing with it according to rule: some in one of its meanings, others with another. This explains why הָלַל and הָלִיָּהּ, הִלֵּל and הִלִּיָּהּ, הִלֵּל and הִלִּיָּהּ, הִלֵּל and הִלִּיָּהּ—and to a lesser extent جَلَّل and جَلَّلٌ and جَلَّلٌ and جَلَّلٌ—bear a close resemblance one to the other, but not زخرف and حليه, צלמא and הלי, or גלם and מְהַלֵּל. All these masculine and feminine nouns are—semantically no less than phonetically—identical with one neuter Greek word, though not with one another. That is conclusively proved by means of tried rules of Graeco-Hebrew homology, confirming the trite saying that things are not always what they seem.

הָלַל is a noun, and part of the crowd's response: 'And all the people said: "Amen!" and "Glory to the Lord".' Either some of them shouted 'Amen' and others 'Glory to the Lord' simultaneously, or all shouted both in succession.

The first-fruits of a tree were dedicated as הִלּוּלִים, 'pleasing gifts' to God. Similarly, הִלֵּל and מְהַלֵּלִים were men who had been, notionally at least, dedicated to the Deity by, and/or granted by the Deity to, their parents (cf. IS 1. 11). Again, the citizens of Shechem gathered in their grapes and pressed wine: then they made הִלּוּלִים, *votive offerings* , which they brought into the temple of their god, and proceeded to make merry.

Just as the refining pot is used for testing silver, and the crucible for testing gold, so is a man tested by the kind of מְהַלֵּל, *gift or offering* , he makes (cf. Gn 4. 3-5 Lev 5. 7, 12. 8).

Here are four relevant entries in the *Lexicon*:

'[הִלּוּלִים] n. [m.] . . . only pl. הִלּוּלִים rejoicing, praise: 1. הַשְׂעִיָּהּ Ju 9. 27 i.e. a vintage-rejoicing, merry-making, connected with thanksgiving . . . 2. of praise to ", ' קָדַשׁ ה' Lev 19. 24 (Code of Holiness) *holiness of praise*, i.e. a consecrated thing in token of thanksgiving for fruit, offered in 4th year . . .'

'[מְהַלֵּל] n. [m.] praise;—only in מְהַלֵּל לְפִי מְהַלֵּלִים Prv 27. 21 the refining pot for silver, and the furnace for gold, and a man according to his praise, i.e. prob. acc. to the praise of him by others, which tests him; so Franz Delitzsch, H. L. Strack, al.; perh. however *so let a man be to the mouth of his praise*, i.e. *that praises him*,—testing the praise to determine its worth, . . . other views are: *according to the measure of his*

No attempt is made to explain the alternative name to צַעַר (בלע Gn 14. 2) or to שַׁעֲרִים (שְׂרוּחַן) or those to קְרִית יַעֲרִים (קרית יעל Jos 15. 60 and בְּעֵלָה Ib 15. 9 or קְרִית עֲרִים Esr 2. 25), especially as there is some phonetic similarity between בלע on one side, and בעל and בעלה on the other; and a vast semantic difference between יַעֲרִים and עֲרִים. At the same time, it is difficult to understand what could be meant by בַּעֲלֵי עַמִּים, an entirely novel expression suggested by the *Lexicon*. Nor is there much to choose between the rendering of עֲדָה עַמִּים בעלֵי עַמִּים by the A.V. ('the multitude of the bulls, with the calves of the people') and by the N.E.B. ('that herd of bulls, the bull-calf warriors of the nations'). According to the *Lexicon*, עֲדָה אֲבִירִים (s.v. I. עֲדָה) means a 'pack of animals (fig. of nobles)'.¹

I rejected these elaborate inanities, and put aside the suggestion that the name צַעַר was related to μῆκερ (μικρός)—the living example of Littlehampton notwithstanding. Once I ascertained that שַׁעַר homologized with ἀγορά, I was not slow in realizing that שַׁעֲרִים did not indicate a two-gate city, but one ruled by two assemblies, a people's assembly and a Council of Chiefs. Similarly, עֲדֵיטָם (Jos 15. 36)—עֲדָה being a variant of עֲדָה (ἐθνος, company, body of men) which is the synonym of סֵד (σύνοδος) in Ps 111. 1, and of קָהָל (σὺλη) in Prv 5. 14. I already knew that יַעַר meant ἀγριος (wild, savage) in the phrase יַעַר בְּמֹת יַעַר Jer 26. 18, 'wild animals'; and, by analogy, concluded that יַעַר homologized with ἀγορά, and that עֲרִים was short for יַעֲרִים. Then, in a flash, I solved the puzzle which had seemed insoluble: בלע, בעל, and בעלה were homologues of βουλή; עֲדָה אֲבִירִים בעלֵי עַמִּים means 'a group of leaders in peoples' assemblies'; צַהֲרִים is related to צַעַר and not to צָהָר (θυρίς); and עֲרַבִים is, like שְׂרוּחַן and צַהֲרִים, the direct homologue of ἀγοραῖν—a far cry from עֲרַב, the homologue of ἄσπερος: evening Gn 1. 5, darkness Prv 7. 9, the west غرب. Owing to the conjunction of עֵין נָדִי, however, I readily concede the possibility that עֵין עֲלִים has likewise a pastoral and not a political import (Ez 47. 10).

שְׂרוּחַ is included in a list of towns recorded in Joshua, which is duplicated in I Chronicles with certain variations. For instance: בְּלָהַ in Jos 19. 3, בְּתוּל in 19. 4, and שְׂרוּחַ in 19. 6, respectively appear as בְּלָהָה in ICh 4. 29, בְּתוּאֵל in 4. 30, and שְׂעָרִים in 4. 31. It has apparently escaped notice that the internal gutturals—א, ה, ע—were consistently dropped in the earlier list, most probably due to popular pronunciation. The שְׂרוּחַ stands for the diphthong *ai* in ἀγοραῖν.

In the result—seeing that עדה is the homologue of ἐθνος ('number of people living together, company, body of men'), and that one of the four homologues of אביר is ἀγός ('leader, chief' IS 21. 8)—the true translation of the phrase עדת אבירים בעלי עמים is: 'a company of leaders in the councils/assemblies of the nations.'

Clearly, at the time of the Israelite invasion Canaan was strewn with republican city-states—no 'city of forests' among them—modelled on the Greek pattern, whose founders spoke different dialects of a language closely resembling Greek—i.e. Continental Greek—of which Arabic and Hebrew are examples. The last democratic city was Shechem, whose בעלים/πολιται were betrayed to and annihilated by Abimelech.

αἶμα—The ט in טָ exchanges with the spiritus asper, as in ἄβος/דְּבִשָׁה, and as it does with the spiritus lenis in ἔπος/דְּבַר (Gn 37. 14, 44. 18 Dt 4. 12), דְּבָרָה (Ps 110. 4 Eccl 8. 2), דְּבַר Jer 5. 13; so does ט in δόφαλος/טַבַּחַר (Jud 9. 37). As to the ה in הַמֶּץ, it is not—as has hitherto been taken for granted—the definite article, but the initial letter of the radical. This is doubly corroborated: once, by the similar phrase, אָפֶס כֶּסֶף (Gn 47. 15, 16); and again, by the fact that שֶׂד—the subject of the next verb in the verse—and רֶמֶס, the subject of the next verb but one, are indefinite: אָפֶס הַמֶּץ, כֹּלֵה שֶׂד, תִּמְצֵר רֶמֶס.

הַמֶּץ, הָמָס and הַמָּת homologize with αἶματος—the genitive of αἶμα—as do כֶּבֶד (Ex 29. 13), כָּבוֹד (Gn 49. 6), כְּבוֹד (Ps 16. 9, 30. 13, 57. 9, 108. 2, 149. 5), with ἡπατος, the genitive of ἡπαρ. They corroborate each other phonetically, and are confirmed by חֲמוֹץ (Jes 63. 1), the homologue of αἵματόεις, bloodstained.

That חָמָס is actually a synonym of חַמִּים derives support from the fact that, whereas one version of the Bible has חָמָס in

Ez 9. 9, another has דמים. That it is also synonymous with צמח—in fact, a variant of it—finds support in the fact that צמח, too, is coupled with שד; indeed, no less than five times: Jer 6. 7, 20. 8 Ez 45. 9 Am 3. 10 Hab 1. 3.

The *Lexicon* adopts the general belief that צמח—the word stripped of the initial ח, of course—derives from צמצם and means 'squeezer, i.e. extortioner, oppressor'. But, to harmonize with this personal-agent noun, the *Lexicon* refers to an authority who opines that שד ought to read שדד. The N.E.B., on the other hand, translates צמח by 'extortion', in harmony with the abstract noun שד (*ἀρπαγή*). However, both are in error.

ἀκουρος: Homologies like *ἀκουρος*/عاقِر/عاقِرَة, ἐξορυσσω/עַקֵר/עַקֵרָה, and ἐπιγούνης/פָּחַד/פָּחַדָה—composed as they are of analysable Greek compounds which can be broken down into their constituent prepositions, other affixes, and nouns or verbs, on one hand; and apparently simple Arabic and/or Hebrew words, on the other—prove that Arabic and Hebrew are modelled on Greek, and not vice versa.

The *Lexicon* derives עקר from the radical עקר, of 'doubtful meaning'; and states that עַקֵרָה (Ps 113. 9) is the construct of עַקֵרָה; but I think that עַקֵרָה is the homologue of *oikouros* (*mistress of the house, housekeeper*; used in praise of a good wife).

Moreover, according to the *Lexicon*, עָרִיר means 'stripped, specif. childless', and derives from עָרַר, a verb which means 'strip oneself'. Hence,

'Qal imperative עָרֵה Is 32. 11 . . . Poal Perfect 3 pl. עָרְרוּ אֶרְמְנוֹתֵיהֶם Is 23. 13 *they have laid bare* (the foundations of) *her palaces*, i.e. destroyed them; so Pilpel Infinitive absolute and Hithpaipel Imperfect 3 feminine singular עָרְרָה אֶרְמְנוֹתֵיהֶם Je 51. 58 *be laid utterly bare*, cf. עָרָה Piel 1.'

In fact, the second ע in עָרַר and עָרְרָה stands for the ε in their homologue καθαίρω, whereas עָרַר homologizes with καθαίρω as if it were spelt καθάρω. The homologue of עָרָה is ἐρημός, a cognate of עָרַם/ἐρημος.

ἀμαρτία—Where 'failure' and 'fault' end, and 'error' begins, and when any of them borders on 'guilt' or 'sin', the context is not always helpful; so that surmise takes over from judgement in

the determination of some of these homologies. But mark the elimination of a syllable and the change in gender from מְרַדֵּף to מֶרֶד, and the further shortening to מְרִי and מֶרֶס, while the spiritus asper changes to lenis in מֶרֶס—a phonetic phenomenon not unknown in Greek, e.g. ἡμέρα, Doric ἀμέρα. Moreover, reference to Greek shows that there is no metathesis between מְרַדֵּף and מְרַמֵּל.

מְרַמֵּל/ἀμαρτία is similar to מִיָּבֵיט/μετά (in the midst of, among, between Prv 8. 2), and Μεγνήτης λίθος/בְּהֵן אֲבֵן (the magnet Jos 15. 6)—μ dialectally turning into ב, and γ into ה, as in ἀγαπάω/בְּהָא. Relevant examples are: βασανισμός, ó, torture מִצְרָה Job 9. 23 בְּהֵן Ez 21. 18. Also βέσσανος, ἡ, generally, test, trial of genuineness מִסָּה Dt 4. 34; inquiry by torture מִסָּה Job 9. 23 (cf. Ez 21. 18); touchstone, on which pure gold leaves a yellow streak בְּהֵן אֲבֵן Jes 28. 16 (cf. Zach 13. 9). Another example is βόλιμος = μόλιβος, ó, Epic form of μόλυβδος, ó, lead בְּדִיל Ez 22. 18; *plumbago*, used as a test of gold בְּדִיל Zach 4. 10. Note, too, that βόλυβδος is a variant of μόλυβδος. Lastly, μάρμαρος = Latin *marmer* and English *marble*.

According to the *Lexicon*, מְרַמֵּל is akin to 'Ar. مَغْلِبٌ *whisper, backbite, بغالہ perfidy, fraud*'; whereas מְרַמֵּל is akin to 'Ar. عَمِلٌ *labour, make*'. It states that מְרַמֵּל in Lev 5. 15 means 'unfaithful, treacherous act'; and that מְרַמֵּל in Nu 23. 21 and Job 11. 16 means 'trouble (parallel with *sorrow*): one's own suffering', whereas in Ps 7. 17 it means 'trouble, mischief, as done to others', 'labour' in Eccl 2. 21, 'toil, labour' in Eccl 4. 6 and 6. 7. In the N.E.B., however, מְרַמֵּל is rendered by 'offence' in Lev 5. 15, and by 'grievous fault' in Lev 5. 21; while מְרַמֵּל is rendered by 'mischief' in Nu 23. 21 and by 'trouble' in Ps 7. 17 (cf. ἀμύλλας).

Again, the *Lexicon* states that מִסָּה in Job 9. 23 derives from מִסָּה and means 'despair (lit. *melting, failure*)';—only in מִסָּה לְמַסָּה Job 9. 23'. Yet this exclusive meaning seems to have been forgotten by the learned editors when dealing with מִסָּה in Dt 4. 34, where it is said to derive from מִסָּה and means: 'test, trial, proving; construct מִסָּה Job 9. 23'. As to בְּהֵן, it means 'trial' in Ez 21. 18, while בְּהֵן אֲבֵן in Jes 28. 16 means 'a tested, tried stone, i.e. approved for use as a foundation-stone'. However,

the N.E.B. translates מִסָּה in Job 9. 23 by 'plight', and in Dt 4. 34 by 'challenge'; and בִּהוֹן in Ez 21. 18 by 'test', and in Jes 28. 16 by 'granite'. A confusing variety of imaginary explanations, leaving the inquirer in a state of bewilderment.

ἀριθμέω—חָדָה, חִצָּה, and עָד corroborate each other; so do חָרַךְ and עָרַךְ, θ and χ interchanging dialectally. The *Lexicon* has:

s.v. II. חָדָה: 'rejoice . . . jussive אֶל־יִחַדְךָ Jb 3. 6 *let it not rejoice among (ךְ) the days of the year, i.e. not take its place joyfully among them (fig. of day of Job's birth)'*; s.v. חִצָּה: 'vb. divide . . . 2. 'appar. denom. from חָצָה' ψ 55. 24 *shall not halve their days, i.e. enjoy even half of the normal number'*; s.v. חָרַךְ: 'vb. set in motion, start . . . only Qal Imperfect 3 m. s. לֹא יִחַרְךָ רִמְיָה צִידוֹ Prov 12. 27 *slackness (i.e. a slack or slothful man) doth not start its game'*; under חָרַךְ: 'vb. cut, sharpen, decide . . . 3. *decide . . . participle passive חִרְצִים* Jb 14. 5 *his days are determined, fixed'*; under עָרַךְ: 'vb. arrange or set in order . . . 2. a. *compare (as a result of arranging in order) . . . b. intrans. be comparable . . . cum suffix of thing compared* Jb 28. 17, 19.'

All this is utter rubbish; but the *Lexicon* excels itself in the above quotation from the entry under חִצָּה. For in order to achieve its perverse objective, not only does it follow a tortuous process, but it also makes חִצָּה do double-duty for 'halving' as well as 'enjoying'.

ἀρᾶλζω—According to the *Lexicon*, חָרַךְ in IIS 23. 9 means 'reproach—prop. *say sharp things against—taunt*'. (The N.E.B. arbitrarily adopts here the different version set out in ICh 11. 13.) עֲפָה נִחְרַפְתָּ לְאִשָּׁה means 'a maidservant acquired for a man (viz. as his concubine) Lev 19. 20'. The N.E.B. translates 'has been assigned'. In fact, it is passive of אָפַע חָרַךְ, and means 'chosen'. עָרַךְ means 'break the neck of an animal . . . Impf. 3 ms. יַעְרֶךְ Hos 10. 2 fig. of breaking down altars'. The N.E.B. translates 'hack down'. רָבַע means 'lie stretched out, lie down (Aram. form of רָבַץ . . . Ar. رَجَع, *abide, dwell*) . . . for copulation (woman with beast) לְרִבְעָה אִתָּה Lev 20. 16, but read אִתָּה (with suffix of beast)'. The N.E.B. translates 'to have intercourse with it'. As a matter of fact, the suggestion that the reading should be altered is, as usual, presumptuous; for here, as in 18. 23, the

verb is transitive and the text speaks of the woman ravishing the animal. This is realistic, because the initiative and the inducement originate in her, and she controls the operation throughout.

קָרַח, עָרַף, and עָרַף corroborate each other. Strangely enough, עָרַף has been overlooked by the authorities in their approach to the interpretation of the two similar Hebrew verbs. The fact is, they have not faced up to the existence of so many homonyms in the language. Rather than reconcile themselves to the reasonable possibility of a given word having a homonym—or yet another homonym—they distorted its meaning, in a vain attempt to fit a square peg into a round hole. Hence such monstrosities as equating the 'breaking of an animal's neck' with the 'breaking down of altars'.

ἀρχαῖος—The *Lexicon* refers to ראש כלב twice, without explaining the expression: once, s.v. כלב: 'כלב . . . applied, fig., to men, in contempt . . . still more emphatically . . . 2S 9. 8'; and again, s.v. ראש: 'ראש . . . head, of animal . . . dog 2S 3. 8'. But the N.E.B., unaccountably it seems, renders ראש כלב by 'baboon'.

The *Lexicon* states: 'בראשו Lev 5. 24 in its sum, i.e. in full, so Nu 5. 7.' Strangely enough, no reference is made to رأس مأل, which indicates the specific sum both ראש and ἀρχαῖον refer to. (Cf. ἀρχή.) The important thing to bear in mind is that, according to the *Lexicon*, ראש means 'head' in all texts: it has secondary meanings, but no homonyms. Thus it means 'head' in Gn 2. 10, but there 'head' means 'river-heads'; it equally means 'head' in IS 11. 11, but there 'head' = 'division of army, company, band'. I, however, hold that ראש has several well-founded and distinct homologues.

ἀρχή—Grammatically, בראשו in Lev 5. 24 is not the same as בראשו in Lev 13. 44: in the former the ב is the homologue of ἀπό, whereas in the latter the ב is the homologue of ἐν or ἐπί. As a rule, the homologue of ἀπό is the prefix ב, π and μ interchanging dialectally; but ב represents ἀπό in at least three other verses: IIS 22. 16, Ps 10. 1, Job 36. 15. In fact, Ps 18. 16 reproduces IIS 22. 16 with one variation: מְנַעַרְת instead of בְּנַעַרְת; and both are correct; in one the π changes into ב, in the other into ב.

It is the LXX which translates אֲרָחָה in Gn 2. 10 and IS 11. 11 by ἀρχάς; but the true homologue of אֲרָחָה in both verses is κέρας.

The homology אֲרָחָה/ἀρχή is corroborated by the reference in the following verse to the inhabitants of Arabia, and in the next verse but three to its archers. Now אֲרָחָה in Gn 37. 25 most probably means 'caravan' and is the likely homologue of ἀρχάδην (adv., *in a row, one after another, man by man*) which aptly describes the Ishmaelite cameleers trudging in single file by their laden mounts. Now 'caravan' is in Arabic كَرَّارٌ, the homologue of κεφαλή (*band of men, right hand half of a phalanx*). In olden times caravans were often escorted by a body of troops (cf. Est 8. 22), and might therefore have been identified with and by their protective guards. Hence, it is arguable that אֲרָחָה in this meaning is also the homologue of ἀρχή. The *Lexicon*, however, derives אֲרָחָה from אֲרָחָה (Job 34. 8), the homologue of ἔρχομαι (*walk*). In fact, κέλευθος—which, I submit, is kindred to ἔρχομαι and ἐλθεῖν (κ exchanging with the spiritus lenis according to rule, while λ and θ dialectally exchange with ρ and χ respectively)—means 'road, path' (אֲרָחָה Jud 5. 6 Jes 30. 11); and κελυθειότες is explained as meaning ὁδοιποροῦντες *travellers*. Yet there is no noun derived from ἔρχομαι, or from a collateral, to homologize with אֲרָחָה. On the whole, therefore, I do not feel enthusiastic over the relationship אֲרָחָה κελυθειότες, any more than over אֲרָחָה (caravan) being the homologue of ἀρχή. In such circumstances it is advisable to keep an open mind, pending further inquiries. (*Vide κελυθήτης: wayfarer.*)

ἀρχός—Strangely enough, the *Lexicon* does not refer to אֲרָחָה in IICh 22. 1, while the N.E.B. translates it by 'elder sons'. There is in IICh 21. 17 a semblance of an excuse for this blunder; and if I thought that—in view of this verse—it was to be inferred that the historian had written כָּל־אֲרָחָה הַרְאֵשׁוֹנִים, and the scribe had omitted אֲרָחָה, I would have concluded that אֲרָחָה was homologous with ἀρχαῖος (*former*). But neither of the said inferences is warranted by history as expressly recorded. For according to IICh 21. 17 the raiders *took captive* all Jehoram's sons, except the youngest (Jehoahaz/Ahaziah—mark, incidentally, the prefix-suffix phenomenon at work); whereas IICh 22. 1 informs

us that they *killed* כל־הַרְאֲשִׁיִּים. In fact, IIR 10. 13-14 relate how Ahaziah's forty-two *brothers* (so have the original and the A.V., but the N.E.B. arbitrarily mistranslates 'kinsmen')—who must have been ransomed from their captors—were butchered at Jehu's behest. On the other hand, two clues point to the killing of the *leaders* of Judah by the raiders: First, because of their disappearance from the scene, Ahaziah was proclaimed king by the *inhabitants* of Jerusalem. Secondly, for the same reason, his counsellors were his mother and the members of Ahab's dynasty (IICh 22. 3-4). Thus, history and philology help each other; while the N.E.B. falsifies one and perverts the other. The homology ἀρχός-הָרֵד, although phonetically passable and semantically plausible, is actually a spurious homology.

βῆμα—I think this word was borrowed from בהמה, pronounced twice בהמה. The genuine homologue of בהמה is βόσκημα, while the homonym of בהמה (IR 3. 4, 11. 7) has for homologues the truly Greek words, βῆμα, βῆμα and βωμός which derive from βείω. The phrase בְּמִן יַעַר (Jer 26. 18) means 'wild animals'. Another homologue of βῆμα (βαίνω) is בַּי (Ez 16. 31, 39).

γεμίζω—Strong corroboration is to be found in the following homologies: הַמְצִיבֵי גֵמִימָה (load Zach 12. 3), הַמְצִיבֵי/גֵמִימָה (laden Jes 46. 1).

As usual, the *Lexicon* finds fault with the scribes, suggesting that הַמְצִיבֵי (Neh 4. 11) should probably read הַמְצִיבֵי, although the suggestion runs contrary to the context. For Nehemiah states that half his men worked, while the other half stood guard variously armed; and that even the builders at the city-wall and the porter-loaders had weapons. Evidently, the editors of the *Lexicon* had a mania for 'correcting' the text—*mania corrigendi*, to coin a phrase parallel to the bad surgeon's *mania secandi*.

Mark that γεμίζω, since it ends in -ζω, is capable of having both simple and compound homologues: עָמַר, עָמַר, הַעֲמִיט. However, the context of הַעֲמִיט seems to favour the compound καταγεμίζω as its homologue, for it means 'load heavily'. Mark also that μ interchanges with ב in صبر (v. p. 243).

The following analysis illustrates a frequent phenomenon in Graeco-Hebraic-Arabic homology.

עָמַר and עָמַר belong to different scales (עָמַר and עָמַר) and have different final letters. עָמַר and עָמַר belong to the same scale and have one common consonant, but they begin with different gutturals and terminate with different linguals. עָמַר and עָמַר belong to different scales and differ in all their letters. Each one of these six verbs differs appreciably from עָמַר. Nevertheless, my theory shows that all seven are cognates, deriving their genetic relationship from a common Greek homologue with several meanings (z. p. 360).

δέμας—The ע in עָמַר is prosthetic, and the ז stands for δ, as in *δερμή, ἡ: neck* עָמַר Jer 28. 10; *throat* עָמַר Ps 75. 6; *collar* עָמַר Cant 4. 9. The ל in עָמַר, as in עָמַר, is terminal. ל in עָמַר interchanges dialectally with δ.

עָמַר may well be the homologue of δέμας or δῶμα (עָמַר Ps 115. 17), *the nether world*. עָמַר, too, has a rival candidate to homology with it, namely, σῶμα. So strong are its claims, that it is right to accept it as a co-suitor with δέμας. In fact, Homer always uses δέμας for the living body and σῶμα for the dead body. But it looks as though עָמַר was specialized among the Hebrews to indicate a corpse.

As the student might by now anticipate, the last sentence in the *Lexicon's* entry s.v. עָמַר reads: 'עָמַר Ez 19. 10 prob. text. error cf. Variorum Bible; A. B. Davidson prop. עָמַר in her height.' The mischief of such systematic fault-finding whenever a difficulty arises is that it inhibits, if it does not altogether block research where it is most needed. So that a budding investigator is discouraged by his mentors from making every effort to find out what the word, *as it stands*, means. He is fobbed off with substitutes the real validity of which is their emanation from the whim of pundits (z. p. 360).

עָמַר is a homologue of both δίδωμι and τίθημι. The initial ל is the MV ל. It drops regularly from the imperative because it is not an integral letter of the radical, and is also omitted from the infinitive עָמַר (Gn 4. 12) and quite exceptionally from the past

תתה (IIS 22. 41). The second ת in the infinitive is only accountable by the presence of two δ s in one homologue, and that of τ and θ in the other. The elimination of the final ך in תת shows that it is merely a terminal letter, but it turns up exceptionally in the infinitive תתה (IR 17. 14) and לתתה (Ib 6. 19).

תתה is the plural of תתה in precisely the same way that the plural of a neuter noun is formed in Greek; but תתה is a variant of תתה, the final ך turning into ת as it does in תתה (Prv 27. 20), the variant of תתה (Ib 15. 11).

The scholars are uncertain about the derivation of *εἶδον* (*gifi*). I diffidently suggest that it is the European Greek rendering of תתה, just as *ἀπαθών* is of תתה. However, the structure of תתה suggests that sometimes the homologue of *δίδωμι* was תתה (with prosthetic ט, like its fellow-homologue, אֲדִי), as others תתה—as צב and נצב are the twin homologues of *ἵστημι*—which would explain why the Septuagint give *ἠδινείμ* (Esr 8. 17) and *Ναθινίμ* (Ib 8. 20) for תתה and תתה respectively. It would be rash to dismiss such exceptions as mistakes or freaks.

Apparently the ancient Hebrews occasionally dropped the sound of *t*, as do the Cockneys and the Americans, e.g. *εταίρος* תתה (Cant 1. 7) and *εταίρα/תתה* (Mal 2. 14). The ת also drops out of תתה to form תתה. Is it possible that, in the same way, ת drops out of תתה to form תת? It might have been absorbed by the *shaddah* in *سق*. However, תתה has another homologue, *είμαρμένη* (*μείρομαι* (A))—*ἡ εἶμαρμένη* (sc. *μοῖρα*) *destiny*.

High up among the intriguing texts stands out the first half of the verse Ez 26. 9: ומהי קבלו יתן בהמהותה. To begin with, the LXX omits it altogether; then, the commentators and lexicographers vie with one another in their guesses as to its precise meaning. According to some, it refers to a kind of catapult, others think it refers to a battering-ram. The A.V. renders: 'And he shall set engines of war against thy walls'; whereas the N.E.B. has: 'He will launch his battering-ram on your walls.' As to the *Lexicon*, it states that מוח means 'stroke'—as the verbal noun of II. מוחה (*strike*), a weakened variant of מוחה 'smite through, wound severely, shatter'—and קבל 'something in front, spec. an attacking-engine . . . Ez 26. 9 מוחי קבלו the stroke of his

attacking-engine . . . 2. construct קָבֵל-קָבֵל (*kobol*) 2 K 15. 10, explained formerly as *before* the people, i.e. publicly (cf. Biblical Aramaic קָבֵל *before*); but the Aram. is surprising, and עָפֵי needed: rd. עֵפֵי לְעָפֵי in *Ibleam*, with LXX of Lucian . . .'

In this, as in other difficulties, the resolving efficacy of my theory is manifest. What is more, besides providing an accurate explanation of the text in hand, I think it improves our understanding of two Greek words, i.e. ἐμβολή and ἔμβολος.

קָבֵל is a variant of קָבֵל (Job 21. 24) or its construct, and its homologue is μυελός (*marrow, brain*); קָבֵל is the homologue of κεφαλή (*head*), the Macedonian of which is κεβλή or κεβυλή. Accordingly, the prophet predicts that Nebuchadnezzar will ram Tyre's walls so much and with such force that the head of his battering-ram will wear out, so that the battering will continue with the brain or inner part of the head. So the passage would read: δώσει τὸν τῆς κεφαλῆς μυελὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν αἰμασίαις σου. (Cf. ἐμβολῶν δόσις *ramming* in naval tactics, Diodorus Siculus 13. 10.)

Now ἐμβολή has several meanings, one of them being 'battering-ram' or 'the head of a battering-ram'. It is supposed to derive from ἐμβάλλω; but in my submission, whatever may be the word from which ἐμβολή is derived in its other meanings, it has no etymological link with ἐμβάλλω as regards the above meaning. Similarly, one of the meanings of ἔμβολος is 'the brazen beak, ram' of a ship. ἔμβολος, too, is supposed to be derived from ἐμβάλλω; but here again, I suggest that as far as the above meaning is concerned, its derivation is totally different.

It seems that the Phoenicians used to call the animal-head at the prow of their ships קָבֵל or קָבֵל (from κεφαλή); but the sailors probably pronounced the ק like κ, as it is done to this day on the south-eastern shores of the Mediterranean; so that these two words were pronounced קָבֵל or קָבֵל and קָבֵל or קָבֵל. In due course, the Greeks 'borrowed' them, as they did קָבֵל, inserting a μ to facilitate pronunciation. Hence, ἔμβολος and ἐμβολή. This must have taken place in pre-Homeric times, when Greek and Phoenician approximated each other even as do nowadays the Celtic dialects spoken on both sides of the English Channel. Is it a mere coincidence that Polybius uses the expression ἐμβολὰς δοῦναι—for the ramming of one ship by another—

which is practically identical with יתן (מחוי) קבלו, the expression used by Ezekiel for charging a city-wall with a battering-ram?

δῶρον has several meanings which vary greatly one from the other; indeed, as much as 'present' does from 'hand's breadth'. Yet its respective homologues are شبر and شبر—the internal ω changing into β, as it does into β in γδβη, on account of the ω in δίδωμι. What better proof that these two Arabic words are perfect homologues of δῶρον?

εἰς—אח homologizes with εἰ, אחד and אחד with εἰς, אחד with εἰς, and מאה with μία. It seems that the Continental Greeks used μία in a specialized way, to mean 'one hundred'. This is slightly corroborated by the fact that in vernacular Arabic مئة (hundred) is pronounced like میة.

עשר is not a simple word: it is composed of עש and ת (and); so that עשתי-עשרה (Ex 26. 7) or עשתי-עשר (Nu 29. 20) means 'one-and ten', as distinct respectively from אחד עשר (Dt 1. 2) and אחת עשרה (Jos 15. 51), the homologue of which is ἐνδεκα. Accordingly, אחת עשרה (Ez 30. 20) is, but עשתי-עשר (Dt 1. 3) is not, a homologue of ἐνδεκάτος (eleventh).

The spiritus asper is dialectally replaced by σ; but in תחת it is replaced by ת, which exchanges dialectically with σ. The same process operates in תלע, תליל, תלש—and תשעה.

The initial letter in באתה stands for ἀπό—as in בערת (IIS 22. 16), בעניו (Job 36. 15), בלחץ (Ib.)—and not for ἐπί, as in בשדה Ex 9. 3; or for π, as in ברחק (Ps 10. 1) πόρρω.

Obviously, the expression פתע פתאם in Nu 6. 9 and Jes 29. 5 indicates emphasis by tautology.

ἐνδικος—Note that Arabic has preserved the Arcadian pronunciation in جديق and جديق.

The *Lexicon* states that צדיק means 'just, righteous', and צדק 'rightness, righteousness'; then these meanings are varied, supposedly to suit the context. Thus, צדיק in Jes 41. 26 means 'right, correct'; while צדק in Ps 52. 5 and Prv 16. 13 means 'rightness in speech', in Lev 19. 15 and Dt 1. 16 it conveys 'righteousness, in government'.

The entry s.v. קִדְדָק ends as follows:

'... 6. *righteousness* as vindicated, *justification* in controversy with enemies and troubles, *deliverance*, *victory*, *prosperity*: a. . . d. of Cyrus, יִקְרָאֵהוּ לְרֵגְלוֹ: Is 41. 2 (who) in *victory* calleth him at every step (T. K. Cheyne, *Isaiah*, Paul Haupt's *Sacred Books of the O.T. on whose steps attends victory*, so A. Dillmann, B. Duhm).' As to אָדָס, the comment is characteristic: 'usu. (malicious) purpose', being akin to אָדָס; 'preferably, it should read אָדָס.'

θεός—θ interchanges dialectally with כ in (פ)כל, and is dropped in אול, איל, and אל, where the ל is terminal—as it is in כל (פ)כ. θ changes into צ and ש, e.g. θεός θεός, θεμίζω, θεμίζω, θήγω; θη, θεράπων, θέρων, θίς/θיה, θύς. ι (in θεός and σιός) exchanges with ב and ו, e.g. μύσσοι, μύσσοι, ούς, ούς; σ changes dialectally to τ.

The homologue of פִּיכָל is Ημφίθεος, a compound resembling פִּיכָל, פִּיכָל, פִּיכָל.

According to the *Lexicon*, צוֹר means 'rock, cliff'; it derives from Aramaic טוֹרָא 'cliff', and has no homonyms. But it should read צוֹר in Ps 81. 17; while it indicates a 'look-out' in Nu 23. 9, and a 'home of goats' in IS 24. 3. צוֹר is fig. of God as support and defence of his people; yet the erudite editors do not seem to find it incongruous that heathen gods should also be referred to as *rock* in Dt 32. 31, 37. כִּי בֵיהַ יְהוָה צוֹר עוֹלָמִים (Jes 26. 4) is rendered by 'for in Yah there is a rock of ages'—instead of 'healer Zeus is the everlasting God'—but no explanation is vouchsafed for בֵּיהַ שְׁמוֹ (Ps 68. 5), except that it is suggested that יְהוָה in Jes 26. 4 'may be a mistake for שְׁמוֹ, cf. Ps 68. 5'. It is therefore not surprising that צוֹר יֵאל (Nu 3. 35) is translated 'my rock is El'—instead of 'my God is Hlios' or 'God's gift'—and צוֹר יֵאל (Is 1. 6) 'my rock is Shadday', instead of 'my God or creator is Zeus'. Lastly, צוֹרִים in Jes 45. 16 are 'idols'. In the N.E.B., however, צוֹר is rendered by 'rock' throughout and בֵּיהַ שְׁמוֹ is translated in a footnote: 'In the LORD is his name'—instead of 'Παζάν is his name'. *Pazan* or *Paeon*, the physician of the gods, title of Apollo, Zeus and other gods. Obviously, ν and η interchange, since η is a guttural; and the first syllable is dropped in יה (Ex 15. 2) because it includes π.

Cf. Gn 20. 17 Ex 15. 26 Nu 12. 13 Dt 32. 39, 33. 3 IS 6. 3 IIR 2. 21, 22, 20. 5, 8 Jes 6. 10, 19. 22, 30. 26, 57. 18, 19 Jer 3. 22, 17. 14, 30. 17, 33. 6 Ez 47. 8, 9, 11, 13 Hos 6. 1, 7. 1, 11. 3, 14. 5 Mal 3. 20 Ps 6. 3, 30. 3, 41. 5, 60. 4, 103. 3, 107. 20, 147. 3, Job 5. 18, IICl 7. 14, 30. 20—in all of which God's healing power is referred to.

There is an incredible touch of irony compounded with a comedy of errors about the presumptuous correction of רָצַח into רָצוּחַ : The fruits of my research constitute an interminable indictment against countless scholars of all nationalities and races down the ages, who have had as many opportunities of making my discoveries as it contains valid counts. Yet none seized a single opportunity. For there exist many, many words in Arabic and Hebrew—the only two so-called Semitic languages I know—not to speak of others, which closely resemble their respective Greek homologues, but their similarity has nevertheless escaped these galaxies of truly learned men. One instance to hand is רָצַח / κηρίον (κηρός , Latin *cera*, for good measure). For רָצַח in Ps 81. 17 is wrongly rendered by πέτρα in the LXX, and wrongly thought to be רָצַח (όπος) by the *Lexicon*; while רָצַח in its turn is wrongly rendered in the LXX by κηρίον ! (V. p. 363.)

θεραπεύω —I have included רָצַח (IR 18. 30) although it is in the רָצַח . because the compound ἐκθεραπεύω , which homologizes with it, is a strengthened form of θεραπεύω .

רָצַח is strongly corroborative, and has rightly been invoked by the *Lexicon* and heeded by the N.E.B. (v. p. 344).

When scholars doubt whether Hebrew is really Greek, let them ponder the homologues of θεραπεύω —that רָצַח , its homologue by dropping the θ -syllable, should happen to convey such varied meanings as 'to serve the gods, reconcile, treat medically, cultivate, mend, or repair'—and consult the *Lexicon* and the N.E.B. Let them carefully consider the homologues of other Greek words dealt with herein, and compare them also with the relevant entries in the *Lexicon* and translations in the N.E.B. It would not be long before they distinguished the genuine from the spurious.

θεωπέω —As might be expected, the *Lexicon* confuses and distorts the meanings of these different verbs. Thus:

'I. [רָצַח] vb. perh. travel, journey . . . $\text{וְהָטָרְ לְמַלְךְ בְּשָׂמַן}$ Is 57. 9 and