

Referring to the interpretation of the phrase in Ez 27. 35, the *Lexicon* states that it lacks etymological support. Quite apart from my theory which renders the whole *Lexicon* obsolete, this comment can, in my submission, be reasonably made on many interpretations put forward by the *Lexicon*. However, by what right is the word 'loud' slipped in parenthetically? It props up the analogy with Aramaic, and is therefore deceptive. Again, the *Lexicon* adduces رَغْم as etymological material helping to understand רָעַם. This attempt is worse than useless for two reasons: firstly, because it is valueless and misleading in this particular case; secondly, it deceives the student into believing that such far-fetched evidence is relevant, so that he might be tempted to accept such a perverse process as a valid standard of research.

The irony of it is that here, as often elsewhere, Arabic fails to come to the assistance of Hebrew, because the Arabic homologue of the Greek word concerned differs from the Hebrew one. Thus the *Lexicon* ignores رَعَد, the Arabic for thunder, presumably because it includes a consonant which is not found in רָעַם. Yet رَعَد is a direct and better homologue of βροντή than רָעַם. In fact, Arabic can be positively misleading, because رَعَد has two homologues: βροντάω and βρομέω. Thus, the *Lexicon* adduces رَعَد 'thunder (said of sky), VIII tremble, quiver', in the entry s.v. רָעַם; but رَعَد 'to thunder' has no etymological or emotional affinity with رَعَد 'to shudder, shiver', notwithstanding the identity of spelling between them. Therefore, it is quite wrong to adduce رَعَد (in its meaning 'to thunder') as having any affiliation with רָעַם which means 'to tremble' exclusively, just as it is absolutely right to adduce رَعَد in its meaning 'to shudder'. And what is one to say about the perversion of רָעַם פָּנִים into רָעַם פָּנִים? (J. p. 367.)

ῥος—طور corroborates צור, and the second ר in הרר replaces the terminal σ. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that only Greek accounts for the presence of the second ר, and that הרר is a more complete homologue than הר. The *Lexicon* states that הרר is the root of הר, and adds that its meaning is dubious.

πληγή—The *Lexicon* wonders whether שָׁלֵט means 'shield', and quotes authorities who opine that it means 'quiver' and 'arms, equipment'. The N.E.B. translates it sometimes by 'shield'

(IIR 11. 10 Ez 27. 11 Cant 4. 4), at others by 'quiver' (IIS 8. 7 Jer 51. 11 ICh 18. 7), and once by 'buckler' (ICh 23. 9). In the A.V., however, the rendering is uniformly 'shield', the challenging phrase מלאו השלטים (Jer 51. 11) being translated 'gather the shields', although under no circumstances could the verb מלא conceivably mean 'gather'. Such perversion of language and violation of reason are the penalty of misunderstanding the original text. Obviously, they do not help solve the difficulty presented by מלאו השלטים, הברו החצים. For it resembles two other phrases, i.e. באשפתו הסתירני (Jes 49. 2), and אטר מלא את-אשפתו מהם (Ps 127. 5); and אשפה (θήκη, θήκη) has hitherto been the universally acknowledged word for *quiver*. Yet this word too presents a similar difficulty in two verses, i.e. Jes 22. 6 and Job 39. 23. The verb נשא—which occurs in the former—is used in connection with צנה IS 17. 7 ICh 12. 24 (25) ICh 14. 7; while רנה—which occurs in the latter—seems to suggest a *shield* rather than a *quiver*, since it is the homologue of βρέμω: *clang, clash, ring*. In fact, I hold that אשפה also means 'shield', it being the homologue of ἀσπίς; for it seems that the shield did duty for a quiver also, housing arrows on the inside of it. Jes 49. 2 seems to lend support to this explanation.

πάλις—π exchanges dialectally with (μ) מ, א, (κ) ק, צ, and (γ) ג; so does φ with (θ) ט. π changes into ב, e.g. παλαιός/בלה, παρδαιός/ברד, πόσις/בטה. To this day the Sephardim pronounce *ng*; yet it is difficult to assert that π exchanges with נ, because it is possible that the π drops and that נ exchanges with the vowel that follows the π. λ exchanges dialectally with (δ) ד and (ρ) ר, ר; so does σ with (δ) ד. Moreover, σ exchanges indirectly with ט, since it exchanges dialectally with δ and θ, and either of them dialectally changes with ח. (In fact, the second person suffix ט stands for σ.) Alternatively, the suffix -is exchanges with ה, and this interchanges with ט as gutturals. The ל in מדינה, like the ن in مدينة, is terminal, followed by the feminine suffix ה. Therefore, all the Hebrew and Arabic words reproduce their common Greek homologue in full—except, perhaps, עיר which possibly drops the π; but the genuine homologue of עיר and קיר is γή.

33. 28 *his heavens drop dew*; fig., of speech, intrans., יַעֲרַף כְּמָטָר לִקְחֵי 32. 2 *let my teaching drop like the rain* (see parallel תִּזְלַח כְּטַל אִמְרָתִי).—Cf. יַרְעַף.

יַרְעַף means 'trickle, drip, synon. of נוֹל, II. עֲרַף (cf. Ar. رَعَفَ *flow* (of blood), *bleed* (of the nose)); Qal Impf. 3 mpl. יִרְעְפוּ. of clouds Jb 36. 28.'

To expose the errors of the *Lexicon*, it is necessary to appreciate two opposites:

- (1) That there exist two entirely different verbs which are pronounced and spelt identically, that is: גָּרַע, the homologue of *πέω*; and גָּרַע, the homologue of both *αἰπέω* (*take away*) and *ἀγγιζειν* (*subtract, deduct*)—גָּרַע being a Continental variant of *αἰπέω*, and *ἀγγιζειν* having been atavistically borrowed from גָּרַע.
- (2) That יַרְעַף is not a mere *synonym* of נוֹל and עֲרַף, any more than שְׁלֵאֵן is a mere *synonym* of שְׂאֵן. The former three words are the *same* verb which happens to be pronounced and spelt differently, just as the latter two words are the *same* adjective which happens to be pronounced and spelt differently.

Once this is appreciated, it is not difficult to realize that נוֹל has nothing to do with נוֹל, or to recognize the old trick in operation once more: twisting 'roll away' to mean 'flow down'. On the contrary, it is difficult to overlook the dragging of נוֹל into the explanation, because it means 'descend' exclusively; so that the example of the *milk descending into the udder* is as misleading as it is selective. Again, faced with the difficulty of 'flowing' (or is it 'descending') mountains, the *Lexicon* ascribes the *flowing* to their torrents. Yet in thus doing violence to the text, it unwittingly robs it of the implied wonder; for there is hardly a miracle in torrents flowing on account of the Lord. Those responsible for the N.E.B. resolved the difficulty by altering the text altogether to read: 'Mountains shook in fear before the Lord.' As a matter of fact, the A.V. had fared much better than both the *Lexicon* and the N.E.B.; for it has: 'The mountains melted from before the Lord.' It was not a bad guess, but the merit of Greek is that it dispenses with guessing. (V. p. 369.)

Even if תרפ"ע were not the homologue of *δροφος* or *πρόθυρον* and *πρόπυλον*—*θύρα* (*θύρη*) and *πύλη* being the same word, differently pronounced and differently applied—the suggestion that 'portico' is called תרפ"ע, because rain drips from it, is pathetic. However, to render absurdity even more absurd, we are referred to *غرفة* (*ὑπερωῶν*) as meaning 'upper-room', with the implication that it is so called because rain is liable to leak through its roof!

ρίζα—Note that the spiritus asper is dialectally replaced by ρ—e.g. *ρόδον/βρόδον*—and that Arabic has preserved the first vowel of the Greek word in its original pronunciation.

The *Lexicon* states: that in Ex 25. 31 קר"ב means 'base (loins) of candlestick'; that in Ps 80. 12 קציר means 'boughs, branches'—confusing it with קציר/όζος, e.g. Job 29. 19; that קרקע means 'floor', 'floor of temple': K 6. 15 . . . קרקע הים Am 9. 3 *the floor, bottom of the sea*; that in Ex 30. 23 and Cant 4. 14 ראש means 'chief, choicest, best'; that in Ps 118. 22 פנה ראש means 'top of (the) corner, i.e. most conspicuous stone (fig.)'; and, in a separate entry: 'ראש n.f. top; appos. ראש הנהלך Zc 4. 7 i.e. the topmost stone'; that שרש means 'root . . . 3. root, fig. = lowest stratum, of mt. Job 28. 9, of sea 30. 30 = bottom' text strange and dub.: B. Duhm ראש הרים, with אדו in v³); of feet, שרשי רגלי 13. 27, i.e. soles . . . (elsewhere פה), K. Budde place of treading, footholds; B. Duhm (arbitrarily) שרשי, *deies*: 'רגלי.' Curiously enough, the LXX translates ראש by *κληρονομία* (*inheritance, possession, property*)—apparently confusing it with ראש *παράδοσις* (Dt 2. 12); and the N.E.B. meekly follows the LXX. (I. p. 370.)

צבאות (IS 1. 3) may be (or also be) the homologue of *σεπτός* (*σέβωμαι*) or *σεβαστός* (*σεβάζωμαι*), *august*. (I. p. 370.)

In contrast with the above simple, clear, direct exposition involving four homologues—*σέβας*, *σέβωμαι*, *σημα*, and *σημειον*—the following fictitious and confused explanations occur in the *Lexicon*:

'[צבא] vb. wage war, serve (Sabeans אבא *wage war with*, also n. *army, campaign* . . . As. *šābu, man, soldier*; . . . Ar. *تَبَا* *conceal oneself*, hence *lie in wait*; this is phonetically suitable, but better in mng. would be *تَبَا* *go or come forth* (against one), etc. . . . S. Fränkel²²

compare *עֵבֶר* *young man* . . . 1. *wage war, fight, c.* *עַל* *against*, Nu 31. 7 . . .
2. *serve* at sacred tent, Levites c. acc. *עָבְדוּ* Nu 4. 23, 8. 24 (P); women
Ex 38. 8, 8 (P) IS 2. 22 . . . (Cf. *ἑβραῖος*).

'*עָבְדוּ* n.m. 2 Ch 28, 9 (Poss. f. Is 40. 2 Dn 8. 12 . . .) *army, war, warfare* . . . pl. *עֲבָדוֹת* Nu 20. 9 [for 2. 9] + 278 times; . . . 1. *army, host*: a. organized for war Ju 8. 6 . . . 'עַל (ה) צ' *over the host* (as captain) Nu 10. 14, 15 + 10 times Nu 10 (P) . . . b. *host* (organized body) of angels (cf. Luke 2. 13), *צְבָא הַשָּׁמַיִם* (כל) *all the host of heaven* 1K 22. 19 . . . *צְבָא הַקְּדוֹשׁ* Is 24. 21 *host of the high* (angel-princes; contrasted with earthly monarchs) . . . c. of sun, moon and stars . . . כל צבאם Neh 9. 6 . . . כל צבאם Is 40. 26 . . . d. of the entire creation. כל צבאם Gn 2. 1. 2. . . 3. *service*: a. of Levites in sacred places Nu 4. 3 . . . 4. *עֲבָדוֹת*, in name of $\bar{\omega}$ as God of war, prob. first in time of warlike David (some connect with sacred ark, but ark older), explained *עֲבָדוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל* IS 17. 45 $\bar{\omega}$ *Sebaoth God of the battle array of Israel* (the thought of angels and stars as army of God is later); a. earliest form c. art. : *עֲבָדוֹת הַצְּבָאוֹת* Am 3. 13, 6. 14, 9. 5 (*עֲבָדוֹת* om. by error, cf. J. Wellhausen), Hos 12. 6 . . . (Cf. *στρατιά*).

So to crown the revealing researches and complete the scholarly speculations to perfection, the inevitable copyist's mistake is discovered: *אלהי* is missing from Am 9. 5. And once more the errant copyist emerges as the ignorant's scapegoat, the cover for the fraud and/or the palladium of the presumptuous.

σκαυτάλη—Note that Jud 5. 14 discloses a common custom between the Hebrews and the Greeks (cf. the Spartan epistle, pp. 1-2 *sup.*).

The *v* changes into *ב*, silent *ל*, and pronounced *ו*. There is at least one other example of *ב* and *ל* interchanging: *בַּת־שֶׁבַע* (IS 11. 3) and *בַּת־שֶׁבַע* (1Ch 3. 5). Incidentally, note the prefix-suffix phenomenon at work in *עֲבָדוֹת*—*עֲבָדוֹת* being the homologue of *γαμμήτης*.

In the proverb *בְּפִי אֵרֶל חֶסֶד נֶאֱוָה* (Prv 14. 3), *חֶסֶד* means 'scourge, whip'. Analogous phrases are: *חָרַב נֶאֱוָה* (Dt 33. 29), *בִּשְׁבֹט פִּי* (Jer 9. 2), *חֵץ שׁוֹחֵט לְשׁוֹנָם* (Ib 9. 7), *בִּשְׁבֹט פִּי* (Jes 11. 4), *הִרְגֵתִים בְּאִמְרֵי פִי* (Ib 49. 2), *חָרַב הִדָּה* (Hos 6. 5), *שָׁנָה כְּחָרַב לְשׁוֹנָם* (Ps 57. 5), *שָׁנָה כְּחָרַב הִדָּה* (Ib 64. 4), *בְּשׁוֹט לְשׁוֹן תַּחְבָּא* (Job 5. 21).

שטט must be read שטם for six reasons, that is to say: (1) the object concerned is to be in 'your sides', and therefore should naturally be in the plural; (2) this is immediately followed by another object in the plural, which is to be stuck in 'your eyes'; (3) the expression ולשטט בצדיכם ולצנינם בעיניכם closely resembles לשכים בעיניכם ולצנינם בצדיכם (Nu 33. 55), where the object to pierce the sides, as well as that to pierce the eyes, is in the plural; (4) ט closely resembles נ and ם, so that the final נ might well be mistaken for ט or ט written for נ; (5) the omission of plural ך is not fatal to the suggestion—in fact, it is absent from ולצנינם in Nu 33. 55; and (6) the LXX translates שטט by ἡλούς (nails).

The *Lexicon* lumps up together שטט; σκυστή with שטט; σκηπτρον, and arbitrarily declares that שרביט (Esth 4. 11)—the homologue of ῥάβδος—is an extension of שטט. As usual, when semantic difficulties arise, blame is almost automatically attached to the dead, defenceless copyists. Thus שְׁלֵהִים is preferred to שטטים in IIS 18. 14, under the lame excuse that the LXX has βέλη (βέλος, missile, esp. arrow, dart). Needless to add that שטט and שוט are differently derived in the *Lexicon*, and both given fanciful origins. As to שטר, it means 'branch or twig, rod—metaphorically', and is to be compared with 'لَحْظٌ lash with the tail, move spear up and down, shake, quiver (said of spear), etc.' A more ridiculous comparison can hardly be imagined. Had the erudite editors pursued their search for the truth, they would have discovered that خِطْرٌ is 'branch or twig'.

And yet, it is on the false foundation of such pseudo-scholarship, mere semblance of science, that a sham 'Semitic' folly was erected. It is on such nonsense that generations of students have been fed, until they took that folly to be a veritable fortress and looked upon it with awestruck wonder. Indeed, it is only after a great deal of systematic questioning and independent research that I dared lay siege to it and subjected it to Aryan bombardment. (V. p. 370.)

It is to be observed that ט and ן are interchangeable, e.g. שטט (Jer 49. 24) and שׂטט (Hos 13. 1); so are צ and ק, as in צלע (IR 6. 34) and קלע (Ib.), צלה (Jes 44. 19) and קלה (Jer 29. 22), צלי (Ex 12. 8) and קלי (Ruth 2. 14) or קליא (IS 17. 17),

מחק (Jud 5. 26) and מהק (Ib.); so are צ and ש, as in צחק (Ex 3. 6) and שחק (Jer 33. 26), פצה (Ps 66. 14) and פשק (Prov 13. 3); so are ה and ע, as in אשתמה (Jos 15. 50) and אשתמע (IS 30. 28); so are ה and ק, as in פצה and פשק (*sup.*).

σπάραγμα—According to the *Lexicon*, הוריה here is 'separation . . . separate place . . . i.e. yard, or space adjoining temple on three sides'. So the meaning shifts from 'separation' to 'separate place', and this in its turn is explained away as 'yard or space'. It is clear from the homologue that the area located and measured in the text was covered with a kind of concrete reinforced with stone-chippings. It is not the *space* that was *separated* into a kind of *yard*, so that הוריה means 'yard'. It means nothing of the sort. What the text actually tells us is that the area therein delineated was paved in a certain way, which gave it its name.

פג means 'corpse, carcass', and derives from [פג] vb. Pi. be exhausted, faint'; while פג means 'plunder (as snatched away)', Na 3. 1'. (F. p. 371.)

σπαρέσω—σ and π constitute a double consonant, and behave as such. Thus, in σπέω שפא and שרם and שق stands for both σ and π, as a digraph, or for σ alone, while π drops out. On the other hand, in גור, טרף, פרם, פרק, فرق, فلع, σ is dropped. In גר, π exchanges dialectally with λ—as in γωνία; פגה—ρ is dropped; at the same time a terminal ר is added, as in ר' / ὀρθός; then י stands for σσ, ππ—or the γ they conceal, as in σείω; איו, γωνία; אר' / زاوية; ζαμέλα (-με, γλζ+λ); ζαμέλης; μέγα μέλος έχων. פרם exhibits the terminal מ; in פרק, ק changes dialectally with the concealed radical γ, as does ق in شق, מ being absorbed by the ش. There is a double exchange in فلع: λ' / ρ, and γ' / ע.

IIR 6. 4 tells us that Elisha's disciples were *rending* the trunks of trees into planks of wood, to build themselves a shack. According to the *Lexicon*, the verb גור is akin to جزر, means 'cut, divide', and has no homonyms. More particularly, it means 'divide' in Ps 136. 13, 'cut down' in IIR 6. 4, and 'cut off', i.e. 'destroy, exterminate' in Hab 3. 17. Here again, the meaning alters from 'cutting' to 'cutting down' and 'cutting off', and this is extended to import 'destruction and extermination'. *Per*

contra, it is typical of Hebrew-Greek homology to provide the exact meaning and accompanying contextual nuances.

As to הָרַט, in the *Lexicon* it means 'tear, rend, pluck', has no homonyms, and is akin to 'طَرَفَ depasture, said of camel'. I can imagine the fury of my critics had I put forward, as homologue to הָרַט, a Greek verb meaning 'depasture'. Their howl would have reached high heaven and reverberated to the ends of the world. *Aliter*, with פָּרַט which means 'tear, rend garment', and is akin to 'قَرَمَ chop up onions, etc.'; and פָּרַק which means 'tear apart, away', and is akin to 'فَرَّقَ split, divide'. (I. p. 371.)

συγκλίνω—There is complete confirmation of these homologies: σύγκλινος = συγκλίτης, one who lies with one הָגַל Ps 45. 10; companion at table הַשְׂכֵּן Jcs 49. 20.

This is a unique set of homologies:

1. Mark the close likeness between הָגַל and הָשַׁל—remembering that γ interchanges with κ—and the even closer resemblance between הָשַׁל and הָשַׁל.
2. Because the Hebrew homologues incorporate the preposition of the compound verb, they appear in the הָשַׁל and הָשַׁל as well as in the הָשַׁל; cf. pp. 240, 646.
3. One who shares one's couch sexually might not share it as a commensal; hence the difference in spelling to distinguish one act from the other.
4. Usually, there is a similar inflection of the bodies of the participants in coitus; but the similar inflection referred to in Genesis applied to Jacob's arms.
5. הָשַׁן, like הָשַׁן, means 'to dwell'; and both are the homologues of οἰκέω and σκηπέω, הָשַׁן being the homologue of οἰκημα and σκήνημα. At first sight, therefore, one would be inclined to think—as Arabic scholars do—that הָשַׁן is a compound of הָשַׁן, with an implied sexual relationship; just as the verbs 'cohabit' and 'live with' import such a relationship. Nevertheless, Greek proves that the two Arabic verbs are of different origin, and that there is no etymological connection between them.

6. Mark that *ساكن* is on the scale of *فاعِل*, because it is the homologue of a compound Greek verb.

However—against the clearest context of solicited fornication and shameless prostitution in Jer 3. 2—the *Lexicon* states that *שגל* means 'violate, ravish'; yet according to it *שגל* means '(queen-) consort'. Furthermore, an authority is referred to who opines that *שגל* is a loan-word, and not derived from *שגל*. To cap it all—again, against a context of obvious booty and apportioned plunder—it suggests that *שָׁלַל* in Jud 5. 30 might be a mistake for *שָׁגַל*.

Then occurs the following entry: '[*שָׁכַל*] n.pl. abstr. bereavement, childlessness;—*בְּנֵי שָׁכַלְךָ* Is 49. 20, i.e. *sons of thee, the bereaved*'. For the noun is alleged to be derived from *שָׁכַל* (the homologue of which is *χρηύω, -ρώ*). True, part of the context appears to afford an excuse for the error, but this error leads to another which is not warranted in any way. For the particular identity of those who are being requested to make room for the 'sons of thee' is not at all clear; nor is it possible to know or even guess where it is that the place is narrow for *thy sons*. The N.E.B. has: 'The children born in your bereavement shall yet say in your hearing, "This place is too narrow; make room for me to live in."' But the plain version runs: 'The sons of your commensals shall yet say in your hearing: "This place is too narrow for me; please move a little that I may sit down."'

Here is another relevant entry: 'II. [*שָׁכַל*] vb. Pi. lay crosswise (so, and not root I. *שָׁכַל*, [vb. be prudent] . . . Ar. *شكّل* bind legs of beast, *plait* locks of hair);—*Pf.* 3 ms. *שָׁכַל אֶת-יָדָיו* Gn 48. 14 (Jehovist); W. Gesenius, *Thesaurus Linguae Hebraeae*, S. R. Driver, however, *prudenter fecit*, from root I. 'ש'. In fact, *شكّل* by *شكّل . . . الدابة، شدّ قوائمها بحبل . . . والمرأه* بطرس البستاني says: *شكّل* . . . *شعرها ففترت خصلتين من مقدم رأسها عن اليمين والشمال*. Therefore, it is not a question of merely plaiting, but plaiting in a special way, consonant with *συγκλίνω*: that is, plaiting two locks of hair from the front of the head (crosswise) away from the right and the left.

Now *شكّل*, in so far as it means 'fetter the legs of a beast of

burden', is the homologue of ἐκδέω (קָצַע Gn 22. 9); but the homonym which means 'plait two locks of hair from the right and left', is the homologue of συγκλίνω. These two homonyms are etymologically different, in spite of their phonetic identity; just as קָצַע and شَكَلَ are etymologically and semantically identical, despite their phonetic dissimilarity. For in קָצַע the spiritus lenis has changed into צ, and κ into ק; whereas in شَكَلَ the respective replacements are ش and ك, while δ exchanges dialectally with λ, ل.

It is because sometimes Arabic and Hebrew homologize with Greek in different ways, that phonetic similarity between an Arabic and a Hebrew word is not a sure guide as regards meaning. For instance, the fact that شَلَحَ and שָׁלַח are phonetically identical, does not make it likely that שָׁלַח means 'strip', or شَلَحَ 'send away'. Yet phonetic similarity between an Arabic and a Hebrew word of different meanings is an excellent test as to the soundness of their homology with a phonetically similar Greek word which bears the two meanings concerned. For example, στέλλω and שָׁלַח are phonetically similar, and they both mean 'send'. This concurrence of phonetics and semantics leads to the firm belief that these two words are homologues. But the fact that شَلَحَ and שָׁלַח or شَلَحَ and שָׁלַח are spelt and pronounced alike does not indicate that they—two by two—bear similar meanings or share a common kinship. On the other hand, the fact that شَلَحَ, שָׁלַח, and στέλλω are pronounced similarly, plus the fact that ἀποστέλλω and שָׁלַח are the respective compounds of στέλλω and שָׁלַח, and bear the same meaning as each other—i.e. 'send away'—makes it practically certain that the two compound verbs are also homologues. This is confirmed and established, beyond a shadow of doubt or flicker of suspicion, by the additional facts that شَلَحَ means 'strip' and that ἀποστέλλω means 'doff' as well as 'send away'.

Accordingly, we may formulate the rule that—when an Arabic homologue of a Greek word happens to be a homophone (or quasi-homonym) of a Hebrew word which is also a homologue of the same Greek word, then each of these two co-homologues

acts as a check on and a confirmation of the accuracy of the homology formed by the other with the said Greek word, e.g. *κουφίζω*; *קָנַץ*/خَفَضَ.

Two propositions, one particular and the other general, logically follow:

1. *שָׂכָה* is as genuine a homologue of *συγκλίνω* as *קָנַץ* itself.
2. Through Greek and not Arabic is Hebrew correctly interpreted, although Arabic may be useful as a test of the accuracy of certain Graeco-Hebraic homologies (v. p. 371).

σχιζω—Contrast the straightforward meanings herein obtained, and distinct differences clearly defined—by reference to Greek—with the babel and fantasy which pervade the *Lexicon*. According to it, for instance: *קָנַץ* means 'divide' and is related to *חָצִי*, 'be fortunate, happy with one's husband or wife, etc., i.e. have a share in happiness'. This far-fetched comparison is completely out of place here, but would be apt in relation to *קָנַץ* (Job 34. 6)—the homologue of which is *τύχη*, *حَصَدَ*, *حَظَّ*—and which the *Lexicon* misinterprets as meaning 'wound'.

לֹא יִחַצְּוּ יָמֵיהֶם (Ps 55. 24) means 'shall not halve their days, i.e. enjoy even half of the normal number'. Of course, this is merely guesswork, and very funny guesswork to boot. Nobody out of bedlam speaks like that. The N.E.B., however, has: 'they shall not live out half their days'. This is also a piece of divination, though not an unreasonable effort. But I suggest the homologue of *קָנַץ* in this context is *ψηφίζω*, Ar. *أحصى* (cf. *ἀριθμέω*); similar to *וּמִסְפָּרָם יִחַצְּוּ יָמֵיהֶם* (Job 21. 21), which the *Lexicon* renders: 'the number of his months, they have been cut in two (fig. for curtailed)', but the N.E.B. has: 'if his very months and days are numbered?'

עַד צוֹאֵר יִחַצְּוּ (Jes 30. 28) means 'shall halve unto the neck = shall reach to the neck and so divide the man in half'. It might seem incredible, but the erudite editors not only persuaded themselves of the accuracy of this interpretation, but also appear to have managed to induce thousands and thousands of other right-minded men to accept it. The N.E.B., however, has: 'rising neck-high'. I suggest the homologue of *קָנַץ* here is *ἤκω*: reach a point; *ἴκω*: attain, reach *حاصل*, *وصل*—terminal *ل*. (V. p. 371.)

σχολή—In these homologues we have examples of the two consonants σχ exchanging as a digraph with ש and שׁ, or severally with שׁ and שׂ; also of ב/θ exchanging dialectally with χ, while the σ drops out. But since ש exchanges with χ—as in χαλκίον/חֶלֶץ (ICh 35. 13)/חֶלֶץ (IIR 2. 20)/חֶלֶץ (Ib 21. 13)/חֶלֶץ (IIS 6. 5)—it can cogently be argued that here, too, it exchanges with χ alone while the σ drops out. Alternatively, that it exchanges with σ alone—as in σήμα/שָׁמָ (Dt 4. 19), σημεία/שָׁמָ (Gn 21. 22 Nu 10. 14), σπίζω/שָׁפָץ (Jes 10. 14), σοφίζω/שָׁפָץ (Prv 31. 27), σπυρές/שָׁפָץ (Ez 4. 15), σπυρίς/שָׁפָץ (Jes 22. 24), σάπων/سَابُون. Similarly with שׁ, which also exchanges with σ and χ, e.g. σάρξ/שָׂרָ (Lev 18. 12 Jer 51. 35 Mich 3. 2, 3); שָׂרָ (Prv 3. 8); χαμαιδρυσ/שָׂרָ (Nu 11. 5), χῶς/שָׂרָ (Jes 40. 12); χράω/שָׂרָ (Ex 3. 22 Nu 27. 21 IS 22. 15 Ez 21. 26 ICh 10. 13).

In considering the interchangeability of σ and ש, one should remember that between שׁ and ש, e.g. שָׁפָץ (also שָׁפָץ, שָׁפָץ, v. pp. 35-6), שָׁפָץ (Prv 7. 18 ἀγλαίζω) and שָׁפָץ (IS 2. 1). Similarly, in considering the similarity between שָׁפָץ and שָׁפָץ, one should remember that ש and שׁ are interchangeable, e.g. שָׁפָץ (κόπτω Jos 9. 21), שָׁפָץ (Jes 10. 15), שָׁפָץ (IIR 6. 6).

The א substitutes χ, as the ה does in the homology χωλεύω/חֶלֶץ, and as כ substitutes the spiritus asper in ὄλος/כָּלִיל (Lev 6. 15), ὄλος/כָּלִיל (Jes 2. 18), and ὄλος/כָּלִיל.

τελέω—חֶלֶץ has six other homologues, i.e. κλαίω (Thr 2. 11), κλάω (Jer 14. 6), κλείω (IS 6. 10), κωλύω (Gn 23. 6), πυρόω (Ps 37. 20), χρήζω (Ps 84. 3); חֶלֶץ has two: κλείω (Jer 32. 3) and κωλύω (Ps 119. 101); חֶלֶץ has six: αείρω (Gn 19. 15, 28 IR 18. 42), ελαύνω (Gn 31. 10), έρχομαι (Ex 2. 23, 12. 38 Jos 15. 3), ὀλοκαυτέω (Lev 17. 8), πυρόω (Lev 17. 8 Jer 48. 15), τέλλω (Gn 19. 15, 41. 5); חֶלֶץ has two homonyms, both adjectives, namely: ὄλος (Gn 33. 18 Dt 25. 15 IR 8. 61) and τέλειος (Am 1. 6).

In the *Lexicon* none of the three verbs חֶלֶץ, חֶלֶץ, חֶלֶץ has any homonyms. For instance, both חֶלֶץ (Ruth 2. 23, τέλειω) and חֶלֶץ (ICh 29. 28, πυρόω) mean 'be complete, at an end . . . of action or event, with emphasis on time'. Again חֶלֶץ means:

'be complete, at an end, finished, accomplished, spent . . . Qal . . . 2. b waste away, be exhausted, fail . . . esp. of eyes exhausted by weeping La 2. 11, strained by looking (fig.) for relief or refreshment, fail, languish . . . Je 14. 6 (of wild asses); . . . similarly (sq. ל) of עָבַד exhausted by longing Ps 84. 3.'

Yet כָּלָה in Jer 14. 6 simply means 'enfeeble', with special reference to eyes (Aristotle, *Physiognomonica* 808^a9), and has nothing to do with weeping, pining, or languishing, or being strained in any way. Nor has כָּלָה in Ps 84. 3 any connection with exhaustion; it is the homologue of *ἄρηξω* which means 'desire, long for, crave'. (I. p. 372.)

τῖθημι has sixteen homologues, namely: טָמַן, הִדָּה, אָצַר, אָצַל, טָמַן, טָמַן, טָמַן, טָמַן, טָמַן, טָמַן, טָמַן, טָמַן, טָמַן, טָמַן, טָמַן, טָמַן. It is instructive to compare them with each other and to classify them.

The מִן features in six, the terminal ל appears in two, the terminal ׀ in three, the terminal ׀, ׀, and ׀ once; whereas the ׀ and ׀ are prosthetic. That the ל in נָטַל is terminal is clearly and conclusively proved by collating the two verses, IIS 24. 12 and ICh 21. 10. They refer to the same incident, tally in almost every word, and the former has נָטַל while the latter has נָטָה instead. Note that while הִדָּה ends in ה and טָמַן in ׀, וָצַר and וָצַר have terminal ׀ and ׀, respectively.

יָשַׁם in Jer 44. 19 is exactly the same as אָל . . . יָשַׁם in IIS 13. 33—both יָשַׁם and יָשַׁם being in the Qal, like יָשַׁם in Gn 46. 4—and the structure of the infinitive is either יָשַׁם, like יָשַׁם; or יָשַׁם, like יָשַׁם. The ׀ and the terminal ׀ interchange here, as they do in רָבָה קָשַׁת (Gn 21. 20) and רָבָה קָשַׁת (Jer 4. 29)—רָבָה and רָבָה being homologues of *ῥέω* (A): drag רָבָה, רָבָה Ex 15. 1, 4; draw the bowstring, the bow יָרָה IIR 13. 17 רָבָה, רָבָה. Furthermore, the river mentioned in IIR 5. 12 is spelt אַבְנָה, but read אַמְנָה; and אַבְנָה, the homologue of *μαντείον*, was also known as אַבְנָה. (Yet אַבְנָה may well be a homologue of *Βακχεῖον*, and a cognomen given to אַבְנָה by its pre-Islamic critics.)

The first syllable is dropped in all the homologues, except the

last three; and Δ is epenthetic in $\Delta\text{ממ}$ —as it is in $\epsilon\rho\omega/\Delta\text{מ}$, and as μ is in $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\mu\text{πανον}$, etc.—to facilitate pronunciation.

θ exchanges three times with Δ , Σ , Ψ , and Π ; twice with Θ ; and once with Γ and ק —cf. $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma/\Sigma\text{ור}$, $\theta\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha\varsigma/\Psi\text{ור}$, $\theta\epsilon\omega\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega/\Psi\text{ור}$, $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\rho\alpha/\Delta\text{לת}$; besides θ exchanges dialectally with τ and χ —cf. $\mu\text{מממ}/\mu\text{מממ}/\theta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\mu$ —and χ exchanges dialectally with κ .

It is interesting to note in passing that among the Hebrews mortgage affected movable property, and was in the nature of a pledge effected by way of deposit—very much like $\acute{\upsilon}\rho\theta\eta\kappa\eta$; $\epsilon\beta\omicron\text{וט}$ (Dt 24. 10) and $\rho\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\iota\omicron\nu/\epsilon\text{רב}$ (Prv 17. 18); $\epsilon\text{רב}$ (Gn 38. 17). Like the Greeks, they used to give their hand as a pledge, actually using the expression כפף תקעת כפף (Prv 6. 1), literally: $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha$. Sophocles, however, has: $\pi\rho\sigma\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha$ $\delta\epsilon\zeta\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu$ (*Philoctetes* 942). But a most remarkable philological double somersault occurred when the European Greeks adapted to their own pronunciation the Asiatic Greek $\epsilon\text{רב}$ —pronouncing it $\acute{\alpha}\rho\rho\alpha\beta\acute{\omega}\nu$ —which was itself an adaptation to the Asiatic pronunciation of their own word, $\rho\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\iota\omicron\nu$. What is more, they proceeded to develop this so-called borrowed word into the verb $\acute{\alpha}\rho\rho\alpha\beta\omega\nu\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, when centuries earlier the Hebrews had turned the begetter of $\rho\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\iota\omicron\nu$ —namely, the verb $\epsilon\rho\acute{\upsilon}\omega$ (B)—to $\epsilon\text{רב}$ (Gn 43. 9). Thus, in the course of numerous generations, the European Greeks could not recognize their kith and kin, any more than the Hebrews could their ancestors. Therefore, a protracted mutual disavowal is hereby turned into immediate mutual recognition; and I call this 'the philological law of return'.

There is not an inkling of the homonyms of the homologues of $\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\mu\iota$ in the *Lexicon*, according to which:

הדה means 'stretch out', and is to be compared with 'هدى *lead, guide*'. (In fact, the homologue of هدى is $\eta\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, a possible alternative.)

(s.v. נטל) 'lift, c. acc. Is 40. 15 (fig. subj. $\text{נָּהַ$); lift over thee (על) i.e. offer 2 S 24. 12, but rd. $\text{נָּהַ$ (as parallel 1 Ch 21. 10) ... lift (and lay) upon (על) La 3. 28.'

In Jes 40. 15, the homologue of נטל is $\delta\rho\sigma\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$, *besprinkle*.

' נָּהַ vb. stretch out, spread out, extend, incline, bend . . . = offer, only נָּהַ עָלַי 1 Ch 21. 10 *three things do I offer unto thee* (so rd. prob. also parallel 2 S 24. 12, v. נטל).'

'I. [נָשָׂא] vb. lend on interest, or usury, be a creditor (cf. Ar. *נָשָׂא* postpone, delay; sell on credit; parallel form of I. *נָשָׂא* . . .) . . . 1 K 8. 31 2 Ch 6. 22 v. *נָשָׂא* Qal 1b (5).'

(s.v. *נָשָׂא*) 'בּוֹ אָלָהּ' 1 put on him (require of him) an oath 1 K 8. 31 = 2 Ch 6. 22 . . . correct Massoretic Text *נָשָׂא* . . . but sense hardly possible'. This appears in the left-hand column of p. 670, yet in the right-hand one appears the following: 'וְנָשָׂא בּוֹ אָלָהּ' 1 K 8. 31 and he shall lift up against him an oath = 2 Ch 6. 22 (Massoretic Text *נָשָׂא* . . . but sense difficult; read rather *נָשָׂא*!). Indeed, a house divided against itself.

The homologue here is *εύχομαι*, and the passage means: 'and he shall utter an imprecation against him in prayer to curse him'.

'שָׂרָה' n.m. garment . . . compare Syriac . . . *appearance* . . .;—construct *שָׂרָה וְזָהָה* Prv 7. 10; fig. *שָׂרָה וְזָהָה* ψ 73. 6 (v. II. *שָׂרָה*).

The homologue in Prv 7. 10 is *θησοσα*, later Att *θηττα*, *η*, hired servant-girl; and the expression *θ. γυνή, θ. υἱή* occurs in Apollonius Rhodius 1. 193.

'II. [שָׂרָה] vb. envelop oneself . . . *שָׂרָה וְזָהָה* ψ 73. 6 they put on for themselves (each) a garb of violence.'

The homologies here are: *χαιτών/שָׂרָה, δύω. עָטָה, αίματος σῆμα*; and the passage reads: 'they put on a blood-stained coat of mail'. 'שָׂרָה וְזָהָה' is instead of *שָׂרָה וְזָהָה*; and *שָׂרָה* is the MV of *שָׂרָה*, meaning 'put on oneself'. (V. p. 372.)

τροφόν—*שָׂרָה* has two other homologues, namely: *τροφόν* (Ez 17. 9) and *τροφός* (Nah 2. 13). These nouns derive from *θρύπτω* which has yet another derivative, *θρύμμα*, the homologue of *שָׂרָה* (Ib.). Here we have examples of unsuspected homonyms, and of words of different derivation hitherto wrongly treated as cognate.

χαράσσω—Whether *χαράσσω* is cognate with *ἔρτι* or not, I would not know; but I am trying to prove that—far from being a Semitic loan-word—it is a variant of several Greek words as pronounced on the Continent in Arabic and Hebrew. In fact, some of its homologues drop the ρ, *שָׂרָה* drops the χ, while *שָׂרָה* begins with the MV *ش*—all in accordance with tested rules of homology. (V. p. 373.)

According to the *Lexicon*, פָּרַח in Leviticus and פָּרַח in Isaiah are the same word, respectively meaning 'mutilated' and 'sharp', and it is so translated in the N.E.B. Similarly, the *Lexicon* states that עָרַב in Jer 4. 30 and עָרַב in Gn 37. 29 are the same word, respectively meaning 'make wide, large, eyes, with (כ) stibium', and 'tear, rend'. The N.E.B. translates the passage in the former verse: 'make your eyes big with antimony'. עָרַב in Gn 37. 29 is the homologue of ῥήγνυμι; while עָרַב in Jer 4. 30 is also the homologue of χροῖζω, χρωῖζω, χρώνυμι—like עָרַב Job 31. 10, 39. 3—since χροῖζω means both *lie with* and *colour, stain*.

χῆλιος—I think this word was borrowed from כְּלִי, the homologue of ὄπλον—as ἀραβών was borrowed from עָרַב (Gn 38. 17), the homologue of ῥύσιον. They are both atavisms.

χῆλος—To lighten their cargo the crew of Jonah's ship did not throw overboard the kitchen utensils or the ship carpenter's tools, but jettisoned the heavy chests packed with commercial goods and personal effects, which constituted the freight. Similarly, the כֶּלֶב referred to in Lev 15. 4, 6, 26 was probably a chest. In my childhood days, chests containing clothes and linen were used not only as wardrobes, but also as settees in modest Jewish homes in Jerusalem and Cairo. (I. p. 373.)

χράω—אָרַב and אָרַב involve the consonant-vowel metathesis between ρ and α.

χ changes dialectally into γ, e.g. χῆλιος, γῆλι; and into ψ, e.g. ψυχῆ; נָפְשׁוֹ (Ex 1. 5). ζ also changes into ψ, e.g. Ζήν; שָׁנָן (Jer 48. 45); אָרַב (Jos 17. 11); אָרַב (ICh 13. 6); אָרַב (IS 31. 10). χράω also means: 'furnish the use of a thing, i.e. lend, usu. in a friendly way, δαρείζω being the word applied to usurers'; but the homologue for *lend* is in the אָרַב—הַפְעִיל (Ex 12. 36). The homologues of δαρείζω are: לוּוֹה, הַלוּוֹה, וְשָׂא, וְשָׂה, וְשָׂךְ; cf. τοκίζω.

χρημα—Mark how ה, פ, and כ interchange. The כ in כֶּמֶה preserves the χ, while the ρ is dropped or absorbed by the שָׁנָן. On the other hand, the ל in לֶמֶה and the ל in לֶמֶה dialectally replace the ρ, while the χ drops out. The כ in כֶּצֶר and כֶּצֶר, like the ב in בָּצַע—which corroborates כֶּצֶע—exchanges with μ. These

three homologues, together with מְקַר, מְקַס, מְקַרָּה and معارى, illustrate the prefix-suffix metathetic phenomenon.

מְקַרָּה in Jes 4. 5 means 'the seat of an oracle', from קָרָה (IIR 3. 10)/*χρηζω*; the meaning 'convocation, sacred assembly'—ascribed to it by the *Lexicon*—is not justified by the context. Nor is קְרִיאָה a 'proclamation', but an 'oracular or prophetic utterance'—*قرآن*. Lastly, מְקַרָּה in IS 6. 9 and 20. 26 is generally accepted to mean 'accident, chance', a homologue of κύρμα, from κύρω, *κυρέω*; קָרָה (Ex 1. 10)/קָרָה (Gn 44. 29); but it possibly means 'a strange and unusual phenomenon'. (I. p. 374.)

χਾਲεύω—Just as ה interchanges with χ, here and in *χρήματα*/חֲרִי, so does כ interchange with the spiritus asper in *ήπαρ*/כֶּבֶד and *ωσ*/כֹּכַב. In fact, most interchanges are reciprocal.

ψυχή—*نفس* and *نفس* are formed by dropping the π in ψ, while *נפש* and *نفس* are formed by dropping ψ—the second נ and the second פ, as well as the פ and ת, exchanging with χ, e.g. *χάρις*/שֶׁכֶל/שֶׁכֶל/אֱתֵכֶם, *χάρισμα*: *נְסִיחָה* (IIS 1. 22), and *χρίσις*/سُرور. The נ in *נפש* is the MV נ, and it indicates that *ψυχή* must be derived from *ψύχω*. This is corroborated by the homology *ἀραψύχομαι* *נְפִשׁוּ* (Ex 31. 17). The *Lexicon* would have us read *נְפִשׁוּ* instead of *נְפִשׁוּ* in Ez 13. 20, an emendation which fails to clarify an obscure passage. (I. p. 374.)

In short, the *Lexicon* is typical for its failure to recognize the existence of innumerable homonyms; its reckless emendations of the text; its perverse and fantastic exegesis; its false etymologies; its distortion of any meaning of any word to meet the various requirements—or supposed requirements—of the different contexts. Common words and ordinary passages excepted, the A.V. and the N.E.B. are equally unreliable, their pages teeming with innumerable errors.

Students of this book will be left in no doubt as to the urgent need for the present philology of the Bible to be fundamentally overhauled and revised, and for a new translation to be undertaken, in the light of the theory herein expounded. Because this theory is inherently sound, and because it alone offers the right methodology whereby to discover the correct interpretation of biblical words.