

EPILOGUE

Untold χρήματα, מַעָרִי/مَعَارِي have been poured on to the foregoing pages—glittering χρυσός ἀπείθετος; אֶזְרָחַם כְּהֵם and scintillating ἀδάμας אֶזְרָחַם; besides δραχμαί; דְּרַחְמַי; دَرَاهِمُ past counting—and it is time to take stock of these precious Graeco-Hebraic-Arabic finds. It is therefore proposed to contrast change in sound and form with semantic sameness and similarity of expression, to establish the multilateral connection between homologies, to point out exceptional ones, and to outline the pattern of life which emerges from the general survey. So that, looked at from any and every aspect, it should be manifest that Hebrew is Greek by another name.

There is not much new in what I am about to say. An open-minded scholar who has studied what I have so far elaborated, and mastered it, would find most of my new-style colophon to be a leisurely exercise in dotting the *is* and crossing the *ts*. But if my experience is anything to go by—and I cannot be expected to ignore my own experience—his kind, if not exactly a *rara avis*, is by no means a common bird. There are bound to be prejudiced and sceptical readers. I hope that to them my valedictory observations would act as a gentle reminder of some crucial points, and might stimulate them to examine further some of the past six hundred and thirty illuminating pages.

IDENTITY OF HOMOLOGUES

In the course of the evolution of a language, letters—even when preserving their shape—alter their pronunciation; words, too, metamorphose in various ways. These usual, nay, inevitable phonetic and morphological mutations which—with the passage of time and change of circumstance—occur in one and the same language, are reflected in the differences prevailing between Greek and Hebrew words. So that Hebrew is Greek, albeit somewhat altered Greek—Asiatic or Continental Greek, as distinct from European Greek—and it altered as to sound and form in an

unparalleled manner, resulting in a differentiation which is peculiar and defies comparison.

Words also change and extend their meaning or become obsolete in the course of philological development. Since they clothe our concepts, they in some respects resemble clothes. Like clothes, they are subject to the vagaries of fashion; like old clothes, old words are turned to new uses or discarded and replaced. Here again, the relation between Greek and Hebrew is unique. In contrast to so much phonetic and morphological change undergone by Greek homologues, despite the exposure over many generations by Hebrew homologues to the likelihood of a multitude of semantic alterations, the meanings of respective Greek and Hebrew homologues almost invariably coincide with uncanny precision.

Take Ψ as an example: it is not derived from $\delta\rho\theta\acute{o}s$, any more than $\delta\rho\theta\acute{o}s$ derives from Ψ ; nor is Ψ a dialectal variant of $\delta\rho\theta\acute{o}s$; Ψ is $\delta\rho\theta\acute{o}s$ —despite their obvious phonetic dissimilarities—because (a) these can be fully accounted for, and (b) the several meanings of these two words are identical. It is submitted that as one generation succeeded another, the Continental Greeks, or $\eta\pi\epsilon\iota\omega\tau\alpha\iota$ —the Hebrews, that is—pronounced $\delta\rho\theta\acute{o}s$ more and more differently from their European kinsmen: the spiritus lenis changed into ψ , according to Proposition 11; the first and second σ turned into α , according to Prop. 5 (A); and ρ dropped out, according to Prop. 17 (5); θ became Ψ (a letter, though not necessarily the sound it represents, unknown in ancient Greece), according to Prop. 9 (5); and terminal σ became ρ , according to Prop. 5 (P).

The changes undergone by $\delta\rho\theta\acute{o}s$ to assume the phonetic disguise of Ψ , have been analysed from the viewpoint of Baghdadi and Sephardi pronunciations. An Ashkenazi or Yemenite, however, would have dispensed with the conversion of σ into α , for he sees Ψ and reads Ψ —pronouncing the proper noun Ψ (oxytone), as the others would the abstract noun Ψ (paroxytone). This fact is of exceptional significance, because it seems to show that, among a section of the Jews, Greek sounds and words have, to this day, preserved—partly, at any rate—their original Hellenic pronunciation; and that the Jews have, to that limited extent, preserved their Hellenic identity.

None of these changes occurred abruptly or arbitrarily; they, like numerous others, must have come about by usage and abuse, slowly and almost imperceptibly permeating the whole vocabulary. It is characteristic of them, however, that they followed a distinct pattern, mirrored in the variation of letters and vocalization found throughout the Bible, and in similar variations which distinguish the Greek dialects. This is so true, that certain Hebrew homologues show both the complete and the incomplete alterations undergone by the Greek words to become their respective Hebrew homologues, in accordance with the said biblical and dialectal modifications, e.g. μέσος: מֵסוֹת/מֵסוֹת; and μόριον/מְעוֹר/מְעוֹר, עָרִיחַ, עָרִיחַ according to Props. 5 (M), 9 (4); γαληνός: גַּלְיָנוֹן, גַּלְיָנוֹן, according to Props. 9 (5), 17.

עָרִיחַ is ὀρθός, and not vice versa, because ὀρθός resulted in עָרִיחַ and not the other way about; for there is no rule in Hebrew whereby terminal ט turns into ע, whereas final σ turns dialectally into ρ. Similarly, as regards the homology עָרִיחַ, ἀκούρος: it is more correct to state that עָרִיחַ resembles ἀκούρος than vice versa—on the analogy that a son resembles his father rather than the father the son—because the Hebrew adjective developed from the Greek adjective. This is a compound made up of two independent constituents—a privativum and κοῦρος, κόρος (δογ, son)—whereas עָרִיחַ seems to be, and has always been considered to be, a simple word. There is no ע and ק in Hebrew. It is submitted that ἀκούρος was pronounced עָרִיחַ, and not עָרִיחַ ἀκούρος; because it is Greek that anciently—long before the Trojan War—started altering into Hebrew, and not Hebrew into Greek.

Semantically, however, עָרִיחַ covers the meanings of ὀρθός: in line, *straight* (opp. σκολιός crooked (W), *bent* (עָרִיחַ עָרִיחַ) and πλάγιος *aslant* (W), *athwart*; metaph., *crooked*, *treacherous* (עָרִיחַ)) Ez 1. 7; *right*, *safe*, *prosperous* Jer 31. 9 (8) Ps 107. 7 Esr 8. 21; *right*, *true*, *correct* IIS 1. 18, 19. 7; *true*, *real*, *genuine* IS 29. 6 IIR 10. 15; *upright*, *just* Dt 32. 4 Ps 33. 1 Job 1. 1; of persons, *'straight'*, *straightforward* IS 29. 6 Job 1. 1; ἡ ὀρθή (sc. ὁδός) *straight*, *right* Hos 14. 10.

This is equally true of the kindred homologies of *ὄρθος*, although not all their Hebrew constituents are cognates of *יָשָׁר*:

ὄρθιος: steep, uphill; *ὄρθιον*: steep descent מוֹרָד Mich 1. 4 (prefix-suffix metathesis, *תִּרַם* Nu 22. 32).

ὄρθότης: straightness, opp. *κάμψις* (דִּמְיוֹן), metaph., rightness, correctness יָשָׁר Dt 9. 5 Ps 25. 21 יִשְׂרָה IR 3. 6 יָהָר Prv 17. 7 (יָהָר, *תִּשְׁרָה*, *תִּשְׁרָה*, *תִּשְׁרָה*).

ὄρθόω: generally, build, raise יָרָה Gn 31. 51 Job 38. 6; rise from one's seat, stand up קָוָה Gn 37. 7 Lev 19. 32 IIS 13. 15 Esth 5. 9, 7. 7 לָוָה Cant 2. 10; go straight אִשְׁרָה Prv 9. 6 [cf. *ὀδεύω*] צָלַח Jer 12. 1; Pass., of actions or persons acting, succeed, prosper צָלַח Nu 14. 41 Jer 22. 30; of persons and places, to be safe and happy, flourish צָלַח Ez 17. 10 (יָשָׁר, *תִּשְׁרָה*; *תִּשְׁרָה*, *תִּשְׁרָה*; *תִּשְׁרָה*, *תִּשְׁרָה*); = *ὀρθιάζω*; cf. *θάλλω*.

διορθόω: make straight יָשָׁר Jes 40. 3 Prv 3. 6 אִשְׁרָה Jes 45. 2 הִשְׁרָה Ps 5. 9.

ἐξορθόω: set upright הִקְיָה Lev 26. 1 Dt 27. 2 IR 7. 21.

κατορθόω: set up, erect הִקְיָה Ex 26. 30 IIS 24. 18 Jer 10. 20 הִקְיָה Ex 40. 17; metaph., keep straight, set right אִשְׁרָה Jer 3. 12, 9. 15 הִצְלִיחַ Gn 24. 21 Dt 28. 29; accomplish successfully, bring to a successful issue הִצְלִיחַ Gn 39. 3; go on prosperously, succeed הִצְלִיחַ Gn 39. 2 Ps 1. 3 ICh 29. 23; of success in war הִצְלִיחַ IR 22. 12 Jer 32. 5 הִרְשִׁיעַ IS 14. 47 (*תִּשְׁרָה*, *תִּשְׁרָה*).

κατόρθωμα: that which is done rightly, virtuous action מִישָׁר Ps 67. 5; in pl. opp. *ἀμαρτήματα* (מַרְדּוֹת) sinful actions) מִישָׁרִים Jes 26. 7 Dan 11. 6 ICh 29. 17; perfection מִישָׁר Jes 11. 4 (prefix-suffix metathesis).

Compare, or rather contrast with the above homologies, the explanations of two English words set out in *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*: one descended from Old English, the other derived from another modern Aryan language. Unlike Hebrew words *vis-à-vis* their respective homologues, these two words bear hardly any semantic relation to their respective origins, because they have undergone derivative developments.

I. 'true' (-ōō), adjective, adverb, and verb transitive. 1. In accordance with fact or reality, not false or erroneous . . . 2. In accordance with reason or correct principles or received

standard, rightly so called, genuine, not spurious or hybrid or counterfeit or merely apparent, having all the attributes implied in the name . . . 3. Accurately conforming to (type, etc.). 4. (Of voice) in perfect tune. 5. Loyal, constant, adhering faithfully . . . 6. (Of wheel, post, beam, etc.) in correct position, balanced or upright or level. 7 (arch.) Not given to lying, veracious; honest . . . 8. ~ *bill*, bill of indictment endorsed by grand jury as being sustained by evidence; ~-*blue* adjective and noun, (person) of uncompromising principles or loyalty . . . 9. adverb Truly . . . 10. verb transitive Bring (tool, wheel, frame, etc.) into exact position or form required . . . [Old English *tréowe* (*tréow*, see TRUCE), cf. Dutch *getrouw*, German *treu*, Old Norse *trygg*]'

'true . . . [Middle English *trewes*, pl. of Old English *tréow* compact, faith, see TRUE]'

II. 'sutler, noun Camp-follower selling provisions etc. [from Dutch *soeteler* (*soetelen* besoul, cf. German *sudlen* to sully)]'

The question naturally arises, and it is a standing question, one that is implicitly put at every turn: Is it a mere coincidence that a variety of shades of meaning should be shared by two words which in effect closely resemble each other, one Hebrew and the other Greek? If it is not, if indeed it cannot be an accidental happening, then one is, one must be—both in logic and common sense—inevitably and forcibly driven to the conclusion that these are twin-words, identical words; that, practically and realistically speaking, they are one and the same word which happens to be *differently pronounced*.

RIVALRY

As a rule, suitable Greek candidates to form a sound homology are scarce, but occasionally several present themselves with plausible credentials. Then one suffers from *embarras de richesse*, and one has to exercise great care in choosing between the rivals, allowing each one of them to press its suit to the utmost. A classic example is: *κουρίζω* (B), *ξυρίζω*, *ποκίζω*. Phonetically, every one of them is a good match for $\Pi\lambda$; while semantically, all three treat of hair-cutting, though each conveys a different shade of meaning. In the circumstances, which of them—if any—would properly homologize with $\Pi\lambda$? Clearly, this is a typical case where the prescribed tests have to be applied in order to resolve

the obvious dilemma. After due consideration of the several claims, the palm in this contest easily goes to *ποκίζω*, for two reasons: first, the contexts point to *Πλ* being mostly used in connection with wool shearing; and secondly, *Πλ* has three cognates—*Πλ*, *Πλ*, and *Πλ*—and *ποκίζω* provides excellent homologies for them. The two losing verbs now dispute the homology of *Πλ*; and on the same tests being applied, *ξυρίζω* wins. Lastly, *κουρίζω* (B) is related to *κείρω*/לָרַע and *κουρά*/הִלְרַע. And so it goes on—via homonyms and synonyms, via various phonetic and morphological similarities and dissimilarities, in an endless chain of interconnected homologies.

ποκίζω: *shear wool* *Πλ* Gn 38. 12, 13 Dt 15. 19 Jes 53. 7; = *πέκω*.

πεκτέω: (*πέκω*) *shear, clip*; *πέκω*: *shear* *Πλ* Jer 7. 29 Mich 1. 16 Job 1. 20.

πεκτήρ: *shearer* *Πλ* IS 25. 11; = *ποκτήρ*.

πόκος: (*πέκω*) *wool in its raw state, fleece* *Πλ* Ps 72. 6 *Πλ* Jud 6. 37; *shearing* *Πλ* Dt 18. 4; = *πόκτος*.

ξυρίζω: = *ξυρέω*, -άω (*shave*) *Πλ* Lev 21. 5 Jer 16. 6; *ξύρω* is collat.

καταξυράω: *shave close* *Πλ* Gn 41. 14 Lev 14. 8, 9 Nu 6. 9 *Πλ* Jud 16. 17 *Πλ* Lev 13. 33 *Πλ* Ez 27. 31 *Πλ* Ib 29. 18.

ξυρήκης: *Pass.*, *close-shaven* *Πλ* Lev 13. 40.

ξύρησις: *baldness* *Πλ* Jer 15. 2.

άνθραξ: *carbuncle, malignant pustule* *Πλ* Jer 3. 24 *قرحة*.

κάρα (A): *head; peak, top* *Πλ* Lev 13. 42.

ποκίζω → *κιζω* (*πο* dropping by apharesis or as a syllable with *π*) → *κιζω* (*κ* changing to *γ*) → *κισδω* (*ζ* splitting into its constituents) → *κισ* (*σ* and *δ* each changing to *ι*): *Πλ*. Alternatively, *ποκίζω* → *λοκίζω* (*π/γ*) → *λακίζω* (*ο/α*) → *λαϊζω* (*κ/ι*) → *λαϊω*: *Πλ*. E.g.: *κυρέω*: *Πλ*, *κόμη*: *Πλ*, *σειώ* *Πλ*, *δωρον* *Πλ*.

ξυρίζω → *ξυριζω* (*ξ* changing to *ρ*) → *ρυριζω* (*ξ* changing to *π*): *Πλ*. E.g.: *δόξα*; *ρῆ*, *ζυμίτης*/ζυμίτ.

άνθραξ → *αθραξ* (*ν* dropping out) → *θαραξ* → *θαρφα* (consonant/vowel metathesis) → *θορφα* (*α* changing to *ο*) → *χορφα* (*θ* changing to *χ*) → *ρορφα* (*χ* changing to *ρ*) → *ρορπα* (*ξ* changing to *π*): *Πλ*. Alternatively: *άνθραξ* → *άνθρακος* (gen.) → *ανθρακος* (consonant/vowel metathesis) → *θαρκος* (aphesis) → *χαρκος*

(θ/χ) → χαρκας (σ/α) → ραρκας (χ/ρ) → ραρῖτας (κ/π) → ραρῖτα (apocope): קרחה. E.g. ζώνη/רה, βρία/ירה, ἔπος/דבר, θεσπίζω/פִּשְׁרָה, χρησημός/קסם, κόμη/מה, καινίζω/חנך.

VARIETY OF CO-HOMOLOGUES

Now and again one comes across a Greek noun or verb with several homologues the morphological, phonetic and/or semantic variety of which renders them suspect, e.g. ἡγεμών, πιάζω, φέρω.

ἡγεμών: חשמן זעם וזומים לטאן הימן, הוהם יאם אמים
 شَيْخٌ نَشَأَ شَيْخٌ نَسِخٌ هَادِي تَائِدٌ لِيدٌ مَنُذِرٌ مَنُذِرٌ حَكِيمٌ
 πιάζω: עשק עטה, עסס, מצה, מעך, מחק, מחץ, וור, פצפץ.

φέρω, φορέω: ערך, ערה, ערב, עבר, ושא, וער, הרה, ברא, פרה, פרה.

It would not be surprising if the sceptic were to jibe at the sight of these three lists; and I expect my readers to suffer in a greater or smaller degree from scepticism, in view of the novelty of my theory and its revolutionary character. Yet on investigation, each homologue would be justified, some of them would be found to be mutually corroborative, and all of them would exemplify and confirm the relevant Propositions. Thus:

ἡγεμών: one who leads—guide מנהל Jes 51. 18 Esth 3. 1 הימן
 IR 5. 11 هَادِي; one who does a thing first, shows the way to others חקם
 68. Ps 68. חשמן וזומים Dt 2. 10, 11 אים Gn 14. 5 לטאן; leader
 זעם יאם Mich 5. 4 Ps 83. 12 נשיא Gn 23. 6, 25. 16 Jos 13. 21
 32 Jer 20. 1 Neh 11. 11 ICh 26. commander, chief ליד
 24, 27. 16 IICh 28. 7 נסיה Ez 32. 30 Nu 16. 2, 17. 17 Ez 26. 16, 32. 29 טאד; chief, sovereign הוהם Jos 10. 3 ליד
 IS 9. 16 IIS 6. 21 IR 1. 35 IIR 20. 5 Ez 28. 2 Dan 9. 25 נשיא
 Ex 22. 27 Ez 34. 24, 37. 25, 46. 18; leader of a chorus מנצח
 Ps 109. 1.

πιάζω, πιάζω: press tight מחץ Ps 68. 24 מעך IS 26. 7 עסס
 Mal 3. 21; squeeze זור Jud 6. 38 מעך Ez 23. 3 מצה Jud 6. 38
 Jes 51. 17 עטה Ez 23. 3 עטר Job 16. 12; compress מעך
 Lev 22. 24 עטה Ps 139. 15; press or weigh down, of a heavy
 weight; bear heavily upon זור Job 39. 15 מחץ Jud 5. 26

Ib.; metaph., *oppress, distress* קָשַׁע Lev 5. 21 IS 12. 3 Jer 50. 33 Zach 7. 10 Prv 22. 16 Eccl 4. 1 קָשַׁע Jes 23. 12; of a river, *to be exhausted* from the heat of the sun קָשַׁע Job 40. 23 (v. p. 195); *press hard*, of a victorious army קָשַׁע Nu 24. 17.

φέρω, φέρω: impf. ἔφερον, Ep. φέρον (without the augment, like the tense לָבַח); fut. οἴσω, οἴσομαι; from ἐνεγκ-, (προσ-), aor. 1 ἤνεγκα, aor. 2 ἤνεγκον, inf. ἐνεγκεῖν; from ἐνεικ- comes aor. 1 ἤνεικα, aor. 1 ἤνικα; and other tenses; *bear or carry a load* נָשָׂא Dt 1. 12, 32. 11 Jud 9. 54 IR 2. 26 Am 5. 26 עָרַב Ez 27. 9; *bear* (as a device) on one's shield נָשָׂא Ex 28. 12; of a pregnant woman הָרָה Gn 16. 4, 11, 38. 24-5 Jud 13. 3 IIS 11. 5 Jes 7. 14 Ps 7. 15; *bear, carry*, with collateral notion of *motion* נָשָׂא Ex 10. 13 Jes 40. 24; *lead, direct; point to, incline* נָשָׂא Ex 35. 21 Nu 6. 26 Dt 32. 40 Ez 18. 6 Ps 24. 4 Job 11. 15; of wind, *bear along* נָשָׂא Jes 41. 16 Ez 3. 12, 14; *endure, suffer* נָשָׂא Gn 50. 17 Ex 34. 7 IIR 18. 14 Jes 46. 4, 53. 4, 12 Ez 18. 19 Mich 7. 9 Job 21. 3; *bear thing impatiently* נָשָׂא Jer 10. 19 Ps 55. 13; *bring, fetch* נָשָׂא Jes 38. 21 Ps 96. 8; *bring, offer, present* נָשָׂא IIS 19. 43 IR 9. 11 ICh 21. 24; *bring, produce, cause* נָשָׂא Ez 17. 23 Joel 2. 22 Hag 2. 19 פָּרַח Ex 9. 10 Cant 7. 13; *bring one word, bring a message; hence, tell, announce, report* נָשָׂא Ex 23. 1 Nu 23. 7 IIR 9. 25 Jes 14. 4 Ps 15. 3 עָבַר Jer 5. 28; *bring forth, produce*, whether of the earth or trees נָשָׂא Ez 17. 8, 23, 36. 8; *bear fruit, be fruitful*, also of living beings הָרָה ICh 4. 17 פָּרַח Gn 1. 22 Ex 1. 7; generally, *create, form* בָּרָא Gn 1. 1, 27 Jer 31. 22 (21); *carry off or away* נָשָׂא IS 17. 34 Hos 5. 14; *carry away as booty or prize* נָשָׂא IIR 20. 17 ICh 18. 11; *rob, plunder* נָשָׂא Ps 139. 20; *get for oneself, receive* נָשָׂא Ps 24. 5; generally, *get for one's own use and benefit, take and carry away*, esp. *to one's own home* נָשָׂא Nu 16. 15; *stretch, extend to or towards* נָשָׂא Lev 9. 22 Dt 32. 40 IIS 20. 21; *carry or have in the mouth*, i.e. *speak* נָשָׂא Nu 23. 7 Jes 3. 7, 42. 2 Jer 7. 29 Ps 16. 4; *to be borne or carried; to drift* (W) נָשָׂא Ps 109. 23.

φορέω, -εύω: Frequentat. of φέρω, implying *repeated or habitual* action; *be pregnant, v.s.*; most commonly of clothes, armour, and the like, *bear constantly, wear* נָשָׂא IS 14. 3, 22. 18 Jes 22. 6 Zach 6. 13 (cf. Ps 104. 1 Job 40. 10) הָרָה Jes 22. 6 עָרַב ICh 12. 8 (9); *to be borne along, v.s.*; *fetch for oneself, fetch regularly, v.s.*

φέρω belongs to the mixed class of verbs, including: αἰρέω:

דבר, אמר; *εἶπον*: התודה, הודה, ידע; *εἶδον*: בחר, ברה, ברר; אכל; *ἐσθίω*: עלה, סלק, נסק, ירד, זרח, הלך; *ἔρχομαι*: חוה; שור; ראה, וראה, הביט, ידע, אור; *ὄραω*: נשק, חוש; *πάσχω*: רקד, רוץ, דלק, דהר; *τρέχω*: שטה; *πίνω*: כאב, בצע.

I. אָא: asper to lenis under Prop. 11, syncope by eliminating γ under Prop. 15, apocope regarding $-\omega\nu$. Similarly, إِسْم ; except that there is no apocope, and ν turns into م under Prop. 5 (M).

הַהוּהָ is a compound made up of the definite article הַה, and הוּהָ—a noun which undergoes the same metamorphosis as אָא, except that the spiritus asper remains unchanged.

הִימָן: syncope as in אָא and הַה; no syncope in הִימָן.

זִמּוֹם: this noun is duplicated, like the verb פָּצַץ; asper to ז under Prop. 11, syncope and apocope as in אָא and הַה.

زَعِيمٌ: asper to ز , γ to ع under Prop. 9 (3), apocope regarding $-\omega\nu$.

זִשְׁמָן: asper to ז under Prop. 11, γ to ש under Prop. 9 (5).

זִייד: MIV 1, asper to ז under Prop. 11, γ to י , e.g. *ἔργω/ἔρδω*, under Props. 6 and 10 (3), apocope regarding $-\mu\omega\nu$.

זִייד: MIV 1, asper to ז under Prop. 5 (Σ), γ to י under Prop. 5 (Γ), apocope regarding $-\mu\omega\nu$.

זִייד: MIV 1, asper to ז under Prop. 5 (Σ), apocope regarding $-\gamma\epsilon\mu\omega\nu$.

זִייד/הָגְעוֹמַי, *ἔφ*: MIV 1, γ to ל under Prop. 5 (Γ); cf. *הָגְעוֹמַי/הָגְעוֹמַי*, *ἔφ/הָגְעוֹמַי*.

זִייד/הָגְעוֹמַי, *ἔφ*: MIV 1, asper to ז under Prop. 11, γ to ל under Prop. 9 (2).

זִייד: asper to ش under Prop. 9 (3), γ to خ , e.g. *γεννάω/خلف*, and Props. 6 and 10 (3), apocope regarding $-\mu\omega\nu$; cf. *זִייד*, ÷ MIV 1.

زائد: asper to ق under Prop. 11, γ to د , e.g. *γαργαλίω/دغدغ*, apocope regarding $-\mu\omega\nu$; cf. *زائد/הָגְעוֹמַי*: *guide, lead, conduct, command*.

لَتَمَان is a compound made up of the definite article ل(أ), for *δ*, and تَمَان for *ἡγεμών*— ق interchanging with γ or the asper, and/or γ dropping out by syncope.

In *شَيْخ*, *ἡγεμών* undergoes prefix-suffix metathesis, and

μ drops out under Prop. 5 (M); whereas شیخ follows the Greek pattern.

هادی also follows the Greek pattern— γ turning into ד, and $-\mu\omega\nu$ dropping away by apocope; cf. هَاد.

Similarly, حکیم: the asper turns into ح under Prop. 11, and γ into א under Prop. 5 (N), while $-\omega\nu$ drops away by apocope.

II. π dialectally changes into מ in מחץ, מחק, מעך and מצה under Prop. 5 (N), and drops out of עסט, עשה and עשר by apharesis and/or under Prop. 17 (4); the internal vowel ϵ changes into פ in מחץ and מחק, and into ע in מעך under Prop. 9 (3); ζ changes into צ in מצה and into ص in عسر, into ט in עסט, into ש in עשה, and into ש in עשק under Props. 5 (4), 9 (4), (5); עשק exhibits terminal ק, and עור and עשר terminal ר/י.

אים and إمام, והוהם, והימן and והמן and زعيم, and זעמן, and شیخ and شیخ corroborate each other. So do מחץ and מחק, מחק and מעך, עסט and עשה. Moreover, the soundness of the multihomology עסר/עסט/מצה/מחץ/עשק is strongly corroborated by the multihomology Πέσιμος/ץ/מץ Prop. 30. 33; עס' Cant 8. 2' עסיר: juice pressed out. Furthermore, the fact that עשק bears two totally different meanings of Πέσιμος confirms the soundness of the homology. Lastly, only through Greek and the prefix-suffix metathesis can the initial מ in משיח, as distinct from שיח, be accounted for.

III. Since φέρω is one of the mixed class of verbs, נשא homologizes with ἐνεγκείν. Otherwise, φ converts to ב in נשא and עבר (Prop. 6), and drops out of the rest (Prop. 17). The ע in עבר is prosthetic (Prop. 18), while the נ, the ה, the ו and the כ are terminal (Prop. 19). ϵ and α interchange—except in ערה (σ/ϵ) which is in the קל and not פעל—and so do σ and ω (Prop. 5). נער and נשא display the MV נ (Prop. 48).

HYBRIDS

Change did not exclusively occur between the two constituents of single Graeco-Hebraic homologies—such as κάμψις/כמץ, where כמץ and κάμψις have each a single homologue with one

meaning; and κλέπτω/לָבַב, where לָבַב and κλέπτω have each a single homologue, though both homologues share more than one common meaning. For certain Greek words, which differed from each other semantically as well as phonetically, so altered individually that they approximated each other's *pronunciation*, became assimilated to each other and coalesced into a single Hebrew homologue. Such a hybrid Hebrew word embodied and signified the various meanings of its Greek components—the words that had merged to form it—while these formative words lost their independent and individual existence, and fused into Hebrew homonyms or homophones, respectively conveying the several meanings of the Greek formative words. As a matter of fact, יָשָׁר is such a hybrid, since two other adjectives joined ὀρθός to form it, namely: εὐθύς and ἴσος:

εὐθύς, εἶα, ὕ, ἰθύς: *straight, direct*, whether vertically or horizontally (opp. σκολιός (עֲקִלְקֵל), καμπύλος (κάμπτω) (כַּפּוּרָה)) יָשָׁר Ez 1. 7 Hos 14. 10; in moral sense, *straightforward, frank*, of persons, יָשָׁר Dt 32. 4 Ps 33. 1 Job 1. 1.

ἴσος, ἦ, ον, Ep. ἴσος and ἴσος, Cret., Arc. ἴσος; later ἴσος: *equal* יָשָׁר; *equal, like* יָשָׁר Esth 7. 4 יָשָׁר; *ἴσον, τό, κοινόν* of a document, *the same* יָשָׁר Jos 10. 13; *just, fair* יָשָׁר Dt 6. 18, 12. 8 IIS 19. 7 Jer 18. 4 Mich 3. 9 Ps 7. 11 Job 1. 1; of persons, *equal in rights* יָשָׁר Dt 32. 15; generally, *τὸ ἴσα equality* מִישָׁר Ps 45. 7 מִישָׁרִים Ib 9. 9, 58. 2 Prv 1. 3; of persons, *fair, impartial* יָשָׁר Job 1. 1 יָשָׁר Dt 32. 15, 33. 26; of ground, *even, flat* שָׁוֶה Gn 14. 5, 17 מִישָׁר Dt 3. 10 Jos 20. 8 Ps 143. 10; Adv., *ἴσως fairly, equally, equitably* מִישָׁר Mal 2. 6 Ps 67. 5 מִישָׁרִים Ib 9. 9, 58. 2 (מִישָׁרִים). [Technically and strictly, מִישָׁר and מִישָׁרִים are not homologues but equivalents.]

So we now *know*, inter alia, that Israel was called יָשָׁר because it espoused equality of rights, that the epithet יָשָׁר was given to God because he is fair and impartial (cf. 'Ορθωσία: = 'Ορθεία, a name of Artemis; 'Ορθώσιος: a name of Poseidon, and an epithet of Zeus), that סֵפֶר הַיָּשָׁר was a national miscellany of Hebrew epics faithfully recorded.

Hybridization embraces nouns and verbs as well as adjectives. Thus, there is יָד and יָד, נָפֶל and נָפֶל, הַפִּיל and הַפִּיל—as

well as ישר and ישר. For יד, in יד תחת יד (Ex 21. 24), is not the same as in ויהפך יהורם ידיו (IIR 9. 23), or as in ושימו לה ידיים (Ib 11. 16), or as in יד אבשלם (IIS 18. 18), or as in חמש ידות (Gn 43. 34), and certainly not as in ידי נגרה לילה (Ps 77. 3) or in יד יקוש (Prv 6. 5); *v. p.* 404.

Again, נפל, in אל-יפל דמי ארצה (IS 26. 20), is not the same as in בין רגליה כרע נפל באשר כרע שם נפל שדוד (Jud 5. 27), or in אש אלהים נפלה מן-השמים (Job 1. 16), or in ויפל אברם על-פניו (Gn 17. 3), or in אנה נפל (IIR 6. 6), or in ותפל שבא (Job 1. 15), or in והפל על-רגליו (IS 25. 24), or in נפלו גבורים (IIS 1. 19), or in ויפל הבית (Jud 16. 30), or in לא-נפל דבר (Jos 21. 45), or in נפלו אל-הכשדים (Jer 38. 19), or in יפל דבר (Ruth 3. 18), or in הכלים נפלו-לי (Ps 16. 6), or in נפלת איך כתפי משכמה (Nu 5. 27), or in ונפלה ירכה (Jes 14. 12), or in על פני כל אחיו נפל (Gn 25. 18), or in תפול (Job 31. 22).

Likewise, הפיל, in להפיל את-דוד ביד-פלשתים (IS 18. 25), differs from הפיל in להפיל תחנתכם (Jer 42. 9), in הפיל פור (Esth 3. 7), in להפיל החומה (IIS 20. 15) and in וכל-עץ טוב תפילו (IIR 3. 19), and in ולנפל ירך (Nu 5. 22).

That is why each of these three words—יד, נפל and הפיל—has hitherto been ascribed various meanings. But a Hebrew word with more than one meaning raises a presumption that the several meanings concerned indicate the existence of Greek homologues bearing these respective meanings. This presumption is rebuttable; so that if and in so far as the Hebrew word in hand has separate Greek homologues bearing the said different meanings or some of them, then it is a hybrid word, and the presumption would be confirmed. If, however, the Hebrew word in hand has a Greek homologue which bears all the said meanings, then the presumption would be rebutted, the possibility of coincidence would be excluded, and the soundness of the homology would be established. The following homologies illustrate both aspects of the presumption.

יד, in Ex 21. 24 and IIR 9. 23, is the homologue of *γυῖον*: *hand, foot*; *πούς, ποδός*: *foot*; cf. IR 22. 34;

in IIR 11. 16, that of *ἀγυία*: *street, highway*, chiefly in pl.; or of *ὁδός*: *way, road*; cf. Ps 107. 17 Job 8. 4;

in IIS 18. 18, that of ἄγυιός: *pointed pillar, set up as a statue of Apollo or his altar at the street door*;

in Gn 43. 34, that of λάχος: *allotted portion, portion obtained by a lot, share*; and

in Ps 77. 3, that of ἀγή: *eye* [אָג]; cf. Thr 1. 16, 3. 48-9.

Similarly, לָפַל in IS 26. 20 is the homologue of βάλλω: *pour*; and in Jud 5. 27 (the second לָפַל), βάλλω: *lie down*;

in Jud 5. 27 (the first לָפַל) and Job 1. 16, that of πίπτω: *fall down*; in Gn 17. 3, πίπτω: *fall down*, and, when intentional, *cast oneself down*; in IIR 6. 6, πίπτω: *fall*; in Job 1. 15, πίπτω: *fall violently upon, attack*; in IS 25. 24, πίπτω: *throw oneself down, fall down*, ἀμφὶ σὸν γόνυ Euripides *Hecuba* 787; in IS 31. 8 and IIS 1. 19, πίπτω: *fall in battle*; cf. Ib 1. 4; in Jud 16. 30, πίπτω: *fall, be ruined*; in Jos 21. 45 Job 12. 3, πίπτω: *fall short, fail*; in IS 29. 3 and Jer 38. 19, πίπτω: *escape*; in Ruth 3. 18, πίπτω: *generally, fall, turn out*; and in Ps 16. 6, πίπτω: *fall to one, i.e. to his lot*; cf. Jud 18. 1;

in Jes 14. 12, that of σφάλλω: *Pass., to be overthrown, fall, esp. of persons falling from high fortunes*;

in Nu 5. 27 Job 31. 22, that of διαπίπτω: *fall away, slip away, fall asunder*;

in Gn 25. 18 that of νέμω: *abs., hold land, occupy, dwell*; cf. Gn 16. 12; cf. לָפַל'μελαίνω: *turn black* Gn 4. 5 (μ. 3).

Likewise, לָפַל in IS 18. 25 is the homologue of ἐμβάλλω: *let fall into the hands of*; in Jer 42. 9, ἐμβάλλω: *hand in, submit a petition*; and in Esth 3. 7, ἐμβάλλω: *draw lots*;

in IIS 20. 15 IIR 3. 19, that of καταβάλλω: *throw down, overthrow, fell (W)*; and

in Nu 5. 22, that of διαπίπτω: *v. sup.* [Is it לָפַל and not לָפַל?]

There is an etymological link between ἀγυιά and ἄγυιός, but none between them and ἀγή or γυῖον; yet they are short words, and include among their few letters a vocal *v*, and *γ* which changes into *δ*. These factors make them quasi-homophonous, and must have facilitated their assimilation to one another and their coalescence into the monosyllabic ἄγ. Neither is there such a link between βάλλω, πίπτω and σφάλλω; but here, too, there exist factors which work assimilation; *β*, *π*, and *φ* are interchangeable as labials, under Prop. 6, and the three verbs have

two letters in common: the MV λ , and λ through the intervention of the terminal λ , under Prop. 19 (2). On the other hand, $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\chi\omicron\varsigma$ became τ by aphaesis, under Prop. 14; by apocope, under Prop. 16; by the interchange of χ and θ dialectally, under Prop. 5 (θ); and the conversion of θ into τ , under Props. 6 and 10 (4), e.g. $\pi\acute{\alpha}\theta\omicron\varsigma/\tau\eta\theta$ Prv 3. 25 Job 22. 10 τ τ Ib 31. 29.

Indeed, $\pi\acute{\iota}\pi\tau\omega$ and $\sigma\acute{\phi}\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$ have coalesced so closely as to have derivatives the respective homologues of which are also homonyms, namely: $\pi\tau\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha/\tau\eta\lambda\epsilon\tau\eta$ Jud 14. 8 Ez 31. 13 (*fallen body; corpse, carcase*), and $\sigma\acute{\phi}\acute{\alpha}\lambda\mu\epsilon/\tau\eta\lambda\epsilon\tau\eta$ Prv 29. 16 (*fall, failure, defeat*). To round off the kinship, $\pi\tau\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$ also means: 'of buildings, ruin'; its homologue here being $\tau\eta\lambda\epsilon\tau\eta$ Jes 23. 13, 25. 2; while in its meaning, 'payment which falls due', the homologue is the homophonous $\lambda\epsilon\tau\eta$ Am 8. 6. V. $\lambda\epsilon\tau\eta/\sigma\pi\lambda\omicron\nu$, p. 342.

The homology $\lambda\epsilon\tau\eta/\nu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omega$ is fundamentally different. For one thing, the initial λ is not prosthetic but radical; for another, the τ interchanges with μ dialectally under Prop. 5 (M). This is corroborated by the homology $\tau\eta\lambda\epsilon\tau\eta$ Job 20. 5/ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$: *lawless, impious*. Cf. $\lambda\epsilon\tau\eta/\omicron\iota\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\omega$: *dwelt, live* (MV λ , κ π).

As to $\lambda\epsilon\tau\eta$, in Nu 24. 4, 16, its homologue is $\acute{\alpha}\mu\beta\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$: metaph., *dim, faint of sight*; while that of $\lambda\epsilon\tau\eta$, in Eccl 6. 3, and $\tau\eta\lambda\epsilon\tau\eta$ in Ps 58. 9, is $\acute{\alpha}\mu\beta\lambda\omega\theta\omicron\rho\iota\delta\iota\omicron\nu$: *abortize child*; and that of $\tau\eta\lambda\epsilon\tau\eta$ in Gn 6. 4 and Nu 13. 33, is $\nu\acute{\epsilon}\phi\omicron\varsigma$: metaph., *a cloud of men*: applied by Pindar, *Nemean Odes* 10. 9, to a single hero. I submit that $\tau\eta\lambda\epsilon\tau\eta$ is not a term consisting of two words, the first being the same as the one in Eccl 6. 3, and the second being a variant of $\tau\eta\lambda\epsilon\tau\eta$ —but a single word, the complete homologue of $\acute{\alpha}\mu\beta\lambda\omega\theta\omicron\rho\iota\delta\iota\omicron\nu$, of which $\lambda\epsilon\tau\eta$ is an incomplete one. It must have been split through a misunderstanding.

Let me observe in passing: (1) that the verb $\lambda\epsilon\tau\eta$ illustrates a peculiar change in philology, that is, the advent of MV λ , a functional prosthetic built into the verb by incorporating with it the reflexive prefix $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$, under Prop. 48; (2) that the three homophonous homologues— $\lambda\epsilon\tau\eta$, $\tau\eta\lambda\epsilon\tau\eta$, $\tau\eta\lambda\epsilon\tau\eta$ —illustrate another peculiar change, namely, the many-sided prefix-suffix phenomenon, under Prop. 21; and (3) that these three nouns confirm the general rule that the Hebrew homologues of Greek derivatives preserve the original letters of the principal homologues

from which they are respectively derived, since they embody the MV 1 in **לפל**.

Incidentally, it is just possible, but unlikely, that the suffix-prefix phenomenon is not peculiar to Hebrew; for it might be paralleled by the conversion of the suffix *-δε* into the prefixed word *ad*, the suffix undergoing consonant/vowel metathesis in the process. Yet it must be remembered that *ad* has other independent functions in which, like **לע**, it is the homologue of *εις*.

However, a further point to make is that the homologies **ר** / *γυῖον; ἄγυιεύς* and **ר** / *ὁδός* derive strong support from the synonymous homologies, **ר** / **ר** / **ר** / **ר** / **ר** Gn 34. 21 / *εὐρύγυια* (*with wide streets*); *εὐρὸδοεῖα* (*with broad ways*). **ר** / *αὐγή* acquires strong corroborative support from an unexpected quarter—a secondary meaning of **ר**, apparently developed in Hebrew. Because, since the *spokes* of a wheel issuing from its hub to the felloe look like radii, they were known as *rays*—another meaning of *αὐγή* (IR 7. 33). Similarly, the two *tenons* at the bottom of the boards which formed the walls of the tabernacle (Ex 26. 17).

Moreover **לפל** / *βάλλω* has two fellow-homologues free from the MV 1, namely: **לע** Ex 29. 2 Ps 92. 11—*bathe*; and **לע** Prv 20. 16—*place on deposit*; whereas **לפל** / *πίπτω* has one fellow-homologue with the MV 1, **לפל** Ps 38. 3 Dan 4. 10—*fall*. These homologies are amply corroborated, as follows:

לפל Dt 9. 25 / *ἀντιβολέω*: *meet as a suppliant, entreat, supplicate* [*βολέω* = *βάλλω*]; *προσπίπτω*, *-ίτνω* (poet.), *ποσιπ-*: *supplicate*;

לפל Hos 7. 8 / *συμβάλλω*: *jumble up together*;

לפל Prv 20. 16 / *καταβάλλω*: *deposit*;

לפל Ex 22. 25 / *συμβάλλω*: *lend on bond*;

לפל Ez 18. 12, **לפל** Ib 18. 7 / *καταβολή*: *deposit*;

לפל / *βολή*, **לפל** Hos 13. 13 / *βολαί*: *ώδίνες* (*travail, throes* (W));

לפל Job 39. 3 / *καταβολή*: *throwing down, esp. begetting*;

לפל IIS 22. 6 Ps 18. 5 / *καταβολή*: *periodical attack of illness, fit*;

לפל Eccl 5. 5 / *καταβάλλω*: *overthrow, bring down to nothing*;

and **לפל** Dan 5. 20 / *ἀποπίπτω*: *fall off from*.

For good measure, let me add the following homologies:

לפל / *νοσάζω*, *-ίζω*: *to be ill*; causal, *produce sickness* Gn 12. 17

HIR 15. 5 IICH 26. 20; וַיִּשָּׁן Pass. Ps 73. 5 הָלַךְ Jes 19. 22
IICH 21. 18; v. p. 139.

וַיִּשָּׁן/νόσημα: *disease*; of any *grievous affliction* Ex 11. 1 Lev 13. 3
IR 8. 37 Ps 38. 12, 89. 33, 91. 10 IICH 6. 29 הָלַךְ Ex 12. 13, 30. 12.

הָלַךְ/πταίω: *trs. cause to stumble, fall* Jud 20. 35 IICH 14. 11;
Pass. הָלַךְ Lev 26. 17 Jud 20. 32, 36, 39 IIS 10. 15; *intr. stumble,*
trip, fall הָלַךְ Ps 91. 12 Prv 3. 23 הָלַךְ Jer 13. 16; v. p. 139.

הָלַךְ/πταίσμα: *stumble, trip, false step; failure, misfortune, euphem.*
for *defeat* Jes 8. 14 הָלַךְ IIS 17. 9, 18. 7.

Here again, we have two verbs—this time widely different in
pronunciation and literal content—so closely and fully coalescing
together, that their derivatives (νόσημα and πταίσμα) have the
same homologue—הָלַךְ. Mark, incidentally, that νοσάζω—by
virtue of the terminal -ζω—homologizes both with הָלַךְ in the
לָקַץ, and with וַיִּשָּׁן in the לָקַץ.

REMARKABLE HOMONYMS

פָּרַח in Gn 40. 10 means 'blossom', but a kind of bird in Lev
11. 16. These two homonyms are involved in a remarkable
coincidence, since the first is the homologue of ἀνθος (A) (*blossom*),
while the second is that of ἀνθος (B) (*a kind of bird, perh. the*
yellow wagtail): ἀνθος → ναθος (Prop. 20) → ναθ (Prop. 16) →
νεθ (Prop. 5 (A)) → νεץ (Prop. 9 (4)): פָּרַח.

The first homology is buttressed up by three others: פָּרַח/
ἀνθος (A) Cant 2. 12, in which no apocope takes place, and a
terminal ל is added under Prop. 19 (4); פָּרַח/ἀνθέω: *metaph., be*
brilliant, shine with colour Ez 1. 7 (cf. ἀνθίζω); פָּרַח/ἐξανθέω: *put*
out flowers, blossom Cant 6. 11—not to mention פָּרַח/ἀνθέω
Zach 9. 16, and פָּרַח/ἐξανθέω Jes 27. 6.

No less extraordinary are the homologies פָּרַח/κακκάβη (A)
(*three-legged pot*) and פָּרַח/κακκάβη (B) (*partridge*). Not only
are the Hebrew proper and the Arabic common nouns homo-
phonous, but also the meaning of the former Greek word
seems to confirm the biblical account of Jacob's birth (Gn
25. 26). For the sight of the second twin's hand holding the
heel of the first twin, as the two issued out of their mother's

body, one after the other, must have naturally conjured up in the midwife's mind the picture of a three-legged pot.

חַבְרֹתָי (Gn 5. 2), the homologue of διακοπή (*gash, cleft; cutting* or *canal* through an isthmus or mountain), exemplifies to perfection the existence of fashion in the use of words. It was used for *female* among the Hebrews, as θήλυς was among the Greeks.

The corresponding word in Arabic is اثنى, the homologue of γυνή, γυναικός (*woman, opp. man; female, mate* of animals) and/or ἀνδρίς (fem. of ἀνήρ, *woman*). Curiously enough, a synonym of διακοπή—namely: ραγή, with significant Arabic and Hebrew homologues—strongly supports the homology חַבְרֹתָי/διακοπή.

ράγῃ = ραγᾶς, ῥήγμα.

ράγᾶς: *fissure* فلق فرجه شق شرم شرح; *chink* فلق شق شرح; *stevie* فلق شق; = *rima*, γυναικεία φύσις פֶּיַח Jud 5. 30.

This last word, which must originally have referred to *female pudenda*, as it does here, came to be used in Arabic (رحم) as well as Hebrew exclusively for *uterus*—Gn 20. 18, 29. 31 Ex 13. 2 Nu 12. 12 IS 1. 5 Job 31. 15—yet another example of change in philological fashion.

ῥήγμα: *cleft* فلق شق; *chasm* شق سيل; *chink, c.s.*

But the strongest and most direct corroboration comes from an entirely independent and external source—the inscription on the Siloam stone—in which חַבְרֹתָי, however pronounced, refers to the *water-tunnel* cut through the mountain during the reign of King Hezekiah. In the circumstances, what other language than Greek did he speak?

Two pairs of homophonous homologies also attract attention by reason of their exceptional similarity, namely: חַבְרֹתָי/ῥήγμα: c.s. IR 19. 3, and חַבְרֹתָי/ῥήγμιν, -μῖς: *sea breaking on the beach, surf* Jon 2. 4 Ps 93. 4; חַבְרֹתָי/συγκλείς: (καλέω) *an assembly specially summoned* Ex 19. 5 Dt 7. 6 Mal 3. 17, and חַבְרֹתָי/σύγκλεισις: (κλείω) *safe storage* Eccl 2. 8 ICh 29. 3.

Of the same genre are חַבְרֹתָי/κομιδή and חַבְרֹתָי/κομίση, חַבְרֹתָי/ἀγνία and חַבְרֹתָי/γυῖον, and others. Hence the challenging question: What would he have said, had my namesake (who was aptly surnamed חַבְרֹתָי) been asked by Pharaoh to interpret

these oracular voices? Would he not have answered: "These are one and the same language *differently pronounced*"? And he would have probably added, would he not, in accordance with Gn 41. 32: ועל השנות ההלום אל-פרעה פעמים כי נכון הדבר.

CHANGES IN HEBREW

Hebrew words are not only different from their Greek homologues, they also differ among themselves—consonantly as well as in vocalization—the same word appearing with a different consonantal content and/or vocalization. Hitherto these differences have not been adequately explained, because they can only be accounted for by reference to Greek, affording further confirmation of the identity of Hebrew with Greek. For instance, where do they come from—the א in אָחַד, אֵיךְ, אֶסוּר, or אֶתְמוּל; the ב in בִּיעַן; the ה in אֵיכָה; the second ט in שׁוֹטֵט; the second כ in אֵיכָה; the ל in שְׁלֹאנָן; the ך in עֵדָן; the syllable נה in עֲדָנָה, and the third letter in עֲמָדָי? And how does אָחַד come to mean אחד, אהת תַּחַת, אֶל אַחַד, אֵל, אַתְּ אֵל, עַם אֵת, בֵּין בֵּית, or כְּמוֹ? The simple and correct answers lie in their several Greek homologues. Thus:

אָחַד, אַחַר and תַּחַת are homologues of εἷς; all three follow the Epic form εἷς: the א and the initial ה replace the spiritus asper, under Prop. 11; the ה replaces the diphthong, under Prop. 9 (2); the ד replaces the σ, under Prop. 5 (Δ), and so does the ך dialectally, under another Proposition.

εἷς, μία, ἓν (μία only in late Ionic Prose): Ep. εἷς, Dor ἧς; (orig. εἷς, assim. ἐνδ), from εἶμς; μία from sm-ία); as a Numeral, a single one, one alone אֶחָד Ez 18. 10 אָחַד Gn 1. 9 Dt 6. 4 אַחַד Gn 22. 13 אֵישׁ Gn 15. 10 Jes 40. 26 Ez 1. 9, 11, 23 אֶשֶׁר Ez 40. 44 [rendered by μία in the LXX] הָאֶחָד Ez 33. 30 תַּחַת Prv 17. 10; in oppos. made emphatic by the article ὁ εἷς אֶחָד Gn 19. 9; εἷς οὐδεὶς no single man אֶחָד־עַד Jud 4. 16; εἷς ἕκαστος each one אֵישׁ אֵישׁ Lev 17. 10; ἀπὸ μιᾶς with one accord אֶחָד IR 22. 13; ἐφ' ἓν at once תַּחַת בְּאַחַת Prv 28. 18; the first אֶחָד Gn 1. 5, 8. 5. [εἷς τε (δέκα) eleven (עֶשְׂרֵה) עֶשְׂרֵי Nu 7. 72 (עֶשְׂרֵה) Ex 26. 7;

ἐνδέκα עשר אחד Dt 1. 2 אחת עשרה Jos 15. 51; εἰς (δέκα) nine (עַה) Nu 29. 26.] *V.* p. 361.

אֵיךְ, אֵיכָה, אֵיכָה, אֵיכָה and הֵיךְ are the homologues of ὅπη—אֵיכָה homologizing with the epic version, the two כּ representing the double π being separately vocalized (Prop. 13). In הֵיךְ, ה turns into ε, under Prop. 5 (E); π turns dialectally into κ, under Prop. 5 (K); and η drops out by apocope, under Prop. 16. In addition, the spiritus asper and the spiritus lenis interchange in אֵיךְ, under Prop. 11. These two homologues are incomplete, while the other three are complete.

ὅπη, Ep. ὅπη, both in Hom., (better written ὅπη), ὅπα, ὅπα: of Place, *by which* or *what way*, *in which* or *what direction* or *part*: sometimes nearly = ὅπου, *where* אֵיךְ Jer 3. 19 אֵיכָה Cant 1. 7 אֵיכָה IIR 6. 13; of Manner, *in what way*, *how* אֵיךְ Ps 137. 4 אֵיכָה Thr 1. 1 אֵיכָה Cant 5. 3 הֵיךְ ICh 13. 12. [Perhaps אֵיכָה is—or is also—the homologue of ὅπου.]

אֵיךְ and אֵיכָה are homologues of δία: in אֵיךְ, δ drops out, under Prop. 17 (1), and ך is terminal; whereas in אֵיכָה, δ interchanges with כּ dialectally, under Prop. 5 (B).

δία: Prep., causal—*by reason of*, *on account of* אֵיךְ IIR 19. 28 Ez 5. 9; *because of* אֵיךְ Hag 1. 9; because (W) אֵיךְ Gn 22. 16 Lev 26. 43 IS 15. 23 Ez 20. 16 אֵיכָה Lev 26. 43 (*v.* p. 169).

אֵיךְ, אֵיכָה, אֵיכָה and אֵיכָה (rather אֵיכָה) are the homologues of μετά. In אֵיךְ, μ and α drop out by apharesis and apocope respectively, under Props. 14, 16; in אֵיכָה, μ and β interchange dialectally, under Prop. 5 (B); the second syllable drops out by apocope; and the ך is terminal; in אֵיכָה, only the α drops out; in אֵיכָה, there is consonant-vowel metathesis between μ and ε; while the second syllable drops out by apocope (cf. μέ, σύν); a similar metathesis occurs in אֵיכָה, not only between μ and ε, but also between τ and α; while אֵיכָה and אֵיכָה interchange dialectally, under Prop. 5 (A); cf. μετά.

μετά, μετά: Prep., *in the midst of*, *among*, *between*, with pl. Nouns אֵיךְ Gn 1. 4, 15. 17, 31. 37 Ex 12. 6 Lev 27. 12 Nu 30. 17 Dt 25. 1 Jud 5. 27 IIS 19. 36 IR 18. 42 Jes 2. 4 אֵיכָה Prv 8. 2; *with*, *together with* אֵיכָה Gn 18. 23, 24. 12 אֵיכָה Ib 3. 12, 19. 19, 29. 19; *with*, *and* אֵיכָה Ex 1. 1 Jud 8. 7 [Latin, *et*] (*v.* p. 171).

לָא and אָא are homologues of *ēs/eīs*: in one, the spiritus changes into א, the final *σ* turns dialectally into ρ, and ρ into λ; while in the other, the diphthong changes into א, under Prop. 9 (2), and the final *σ* into ρ.

ēs or *ēs* (orig. *ēvs*): Radical sense into אָא Job 29. 19; and then more loosely, to אָא Ex 3. 1 אָא Gn 1. 9, 3. 16 אָא Jud 16. 26, 19. 18 אָא Gn 24. 28 אָא Nu 23. 18 IS 20. 8 Ps 118. 27 אָא IS 1. 10, 2. 11 Jes 31. 1; of Place, to אָא Eccl 12. 5 אָא Job 5. 26 אָא Ex 23. 31; to denote a certain point or limit of time, *up to, until* אָא Gn 3. 19, 32. 25 אָא Ps 104. 23; *as far as* אָא Jud 19. 18 [Latin, *ad*]; *eis τὸ νῦν hitherto* אָא Eccl 4. 3 אָא Ib 4. 2; *eis αἰδίου for ever, ad infinitum* אָא Nu 24. 20 אָא Job 31. 12 אָא Jes 65. 18 (*v. p.* 169).

I submit that אָא, in Job 36. 15, means אָא, and that the former spelling is as correct as the latter; because א and א are interchangeable, and both homologize with *ἀπό*: by apheresis, μ and π interchange dialectally, while א and π interchange in Graeco-Hebraic homology. Similarly, אָא in IIS 22. 16 is, *mutatis mutandis*, precisely the same as אָא in the almost identical verse and chapter, Ps 18. 16. Incidentally, אָא in the previous verse, Ib 18. 15, is the variant of אָא *ἐρύω* (A): *draw* the bowstring, *draw* [the bow] Ib 78. 9—not אָא, the homologue of *ρίπτω*: *throw, hurl* Ex 15. 1—where א and א interchange and both interchange with π. As to אָא in Zach 9. 15, 10. 7, it is like *ἀπό*, in that the spiritus lenis interchanges with א, and π with א, under Props. 5 (M), 6, and 11.

Mark, on one hand, the phonetic similarity between the homologies אָא/*οὐδεὶς* and אָא/*αἰδίου*; and on the other, the difference in sequence of words in the phrases *ēs (eīs) αἰδίου, אָא* and *eīs οὐδεὶς אָא*. Of course, the latter is one of the numerous examples which illustrate the prefix-suffix metathesis in words, as distinct from that in letters, e.g. אָא *πῶμα*. But if the Greek phrase were superimposed on the Hebrew one, their homologous constituents would tally; because Greek is written from left to right, and Hebrew from right to left. This, it seems, is the origin of the prefix-suffix phenomenon.

The difference between אָא/*φοιτάω* and אָא/*φοιτάζω* is explained elsewhere.