



τὴν ὑπογραφήν σου ἐπιπέμωσιν ἡ ἀρχαία σου ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑσπερίου ἀποστολέου.

'Assus, King of the Lacedaemonians, to Onias, greeting. We have come upon a certain document from which we have discovered that both the Jews and Lacedaemonians are of one race, and originate from the kindred of Abraham. It is but just, therefore, that you, who are our brethren, should send us in response about any of your concerns as you please. We will also do the same to you, and esteem your concerns as our own, and will look upon our concerns as yours. Duncoslos, who brings you this letter, will bring your letter back. This writing is square, and the seal is an eagle holding fast a serpent.'

'Such', adds Josephus with unwavering neutrality and dryness, 'were the contents of the letter which was sent by the king of the Lacedaemonians.' As a matter of fact, it is difficult to find anywhere else in his works a note so bare, so non-committal—not to say indifferent—especially having regard to the novelty of the suggestion. One is therefore forced to the conclusion that although Josephus did not doubt the genuineness of the diplomatic letter—or he would not have reproduced it in extenso—he may have felt rather sceptical about the authenticity of the 'document' referred to therein. But perhaps his priestly background and anti-Hellenic proclivity unconsciously prejudiced him against the apparently spontaneous Greek proclamation of common ancestry with the Jews.

To return to the Bible, the first mention of 'Hebrews' occurs in Genesis (14, 13), where Abraham—when informed of Lot's capture by the sackmen of Sodom—is described as a 'Hebrew'.

Now were Abraham and his nephews the only Hebrews in the region at the time? It does not look like it, for three reasons. First, Joseph refers to it about an uneventful century later as 'the land of the Hebrews' (Gen 20, 15). Secondly, both Potiphar's wife (Ib 39, 17) and Pharaoh's chief hater (Ib 42, 12) refer to Joseph as a 'Hebrew' slave or youth, in much the same way—one imagines—as the Greeks used to refer to one of the familiar Phoenicians in their service as a 'Phoenician' woman (ὀφθαλμῶν 13, 417). Thirdly, the Egyptians would not eat at the same table with the Hebrews (Gen 43, 32), including them in the taboo against the abominated Sycambards (Ib 46, 34). None of these references is consistent with the Hebrews being an isolated family of nomadic herdsmen roaming about in the land of Canaan.

Later, the word 'Hebrew'—in juxtaposition with others—undoubtedly means one of the people of Israel, without tribal specification. Thus it is used to distinguish Israelites from Egyptians (Ex 2. 11), Israelite citizens from the denizens in their midst (Dt 15. 12 Jer 34. 9, 14), Israelites from Philistines (IS 14. 11), and generally Israelites from other nations (Jon 1. 3).

Clearly, therefore, one cannot depend on Jewish sources for a reliable account of the ethnic identity of the Hebrews.

An investigation into their language, on the other hand, meets with an initial obstacle: the extraordinary fact that in ancient times it was not called after their name—as if they never existed as a distinct ethnic or national unit. Isaiah (19. 18) refers to it as 'the language of Canaan'; while Rabshakeh, who spoke Aramaic, called it 'Judean' (Jer 38. 11); as indeed did Nehemiah (13. 23-4) to distinguish it from 'Assyrian', a relic of the language originally spoken by the Philistines. But in Jer 34. 9 'Judean' and 'Hebrew' are interchangeable terms.

Besides, we do not know in what language or languages the Patriarchs spoke to their various neighbours: Abraham in Egypt or in the popular assembly of Hebron, Lot in Sodom, Isaac in the course of his transactions with the King of Gerar, Jacob in Gn 29. 4-8, he and his sons in their controversy with Hamor. Much later, the Israelite spies and Rahab seem to have understood each other perfectly well. One thing is certain, the Gibeonites who were Hivites conversed with Joshua in a language which was spoken both locally and in distant parts (Jos 9. 7-10). Is it without significance that the Bible mentions the interposition of an interpreter on one occasion only, when Joseph pretended to his brothers to be an Egyptian (Gn 43. 23)?

In this connection it is vital to identify by my theory the different peoples who inhabited Canaan at the time of Joshua, namely: the Amorites (Ἀμορῆται), the Canaanites (Φοινίκιοι), the Gergashites (Γεργῆσιοι), the Hittites (Ἰτιταῖοι), the Hivites (Ἰβῆται), the Jebusites (Ἰβουσαῖοι), the Perizzites (Περιζῆται)—besides the Caphroim (Καφροῖται) and the Philistines (Φιλισταῖοι). These inhabitants were by no means exterminated, and their survival and ultimate assimilation must have influenced the Israelites in various ways, including lingually (Jud 1. 27-36, 3. 1-6). It is a fact that the Jebusites preserved their identity till the reign of David (Jos 15. 63, Jud 1. 21, 19. 10-12 IIS 5. 6-8, 24.

(8-24), while the semi-assimilated descendants of the Philistines continued to speak a distinct dialect down to the time of the Second Temple.

At the end of this quest one is mostly left under the impression that the language of the Patriarchs must have been somewhat modified by reason of the contact of their descendants with the colonists of Canaan, so it must have altered slightly in the course of the Israelites' sojourn in Egypt. We still do not know by whom, other than the Patriarchs, their language was spoken.

There remains yet one more track to follow. The Hebrews are supposed to derive their name from Elber whose numerous progeny is said to have settled in the region covering Syria, Mesopotamia, Eastern Asia Minor, and the Arabian Peninsula (Gen. 10, 30). Traditionally, however, the word "Canaan" is said to refer to Abraham's migration south-westward ~~across the Euphrates~~ <sup>to the Nile</sup>: 'Your forefathers settled on the other side of the River from of old—Terah, the father of Abraham and the father of Nahor—and they worshipped other gods' (Gen. 12, 6).

This general reference to 'other gods', coupled with the specification of two of them— $\text{Elohim}$  and  $\text{El}$ —worshipped by the three Patriarchs (Gen. 17, 1; 28, 2; 28, 21) ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> traditionally recognized by Isaac and Jacob (Is. 31, 21, 22), together with the  $\text{Elohim}$  or  $\text{El}$  ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> the sacred wrappings associated with Laban's writings (Is. 31, 24)—given, through my philological research, a sure clue to the identity of the Hebrew race as well as to the essentially Hellenic character of its religion and language. For the written word is like a fossil or an artefact: its form, if not its pronunciation, is fixed and permanent and lends itself to repeated scrutiny. So that philology can be the handmaid of archaeology.

I maintain that biblical Aramaic and Hebrew are demonstrably Greek, in grammar as well as in vocabulary.

True, distinct phonetic and morphological differences exist between almost all biblical words and their respective Greek homologues, but they are superficial and dispensable. By contrast, the Hebrew homologues fully preserve their semantic identity with their Greek counterparts, notwithstanding that biblical Hebrew and ancient Greek developed apparently independently of each other during two eventual millennia. At

for grammar, there are one or two minor similarities which are obvious, whereas several fundamental resemblances have gone unsuspected.

If my theory be correct, it would automatically follow that the six languages, Arabic and Aramaic, are affiliated to Greek; similarly, English and French—among other European tongues—must somehow be related to Hebrew. In fact, my theory establishes precisely that, *That*, Latin and *and* *the* English are and *the* French are and *the* are identical, two by two; and they are all *directly* *traceable* to Greek. Beyond call, the segregation of the Semitic from the Indo-European languages fits in the face of the philological facts and principles which I am about to prove. Indeed, it will emerge that just as knowledge of Greek is essential to the thorough understanding of the Bible, a better understanding of Greek would be achieved through knowledge of Arabic and Hebrew.

Admittedly, the logical conclusions of my philological theory—geographical, historical, racial, religious, and social—are far-reaching and revolutionary indeed. Yet their apparent strangeness is due to generations of neglect and prejudice, and should not deter scholars from apprehending the perceptible reality which sparkles in the brilliant light shed by my conclusive demonstration. It is positively astonishing that no one has hitherto suspected the identity of these two languages—a fact which raises a strong presumption against the soundness of my theory—especially as, a common alphabet apart, there have been in the course of the past twenty-three centuries many a favourable opportunity for discovering any resemblance which might exist between them, that is to say:

1. Over two thousand years ago Jewish scholars translated the Scriptures into Greek, producing the Septuagint which has remained unchallenged as an authentic source of biblical cognate.
2. About that time, as we have seen, the Spartans claimed kinship with the Jews.
3. Jews played a leading part in the development of the Hellenistic culture in Alexandria.
4. In the last two centuries of the Jewish State, many well-born and educated Jews assumed Hellenism and tried to spread the Greek way of life among their countrymen (I Macc. i. 11-13).

3. Josephus wrote his autobiography, the tract against Apion, the Jewish War, and the Antiquities in Greek—as well as in Aramaic or Hebrew—the Greek versions being the only ones extant.
4. The Apostles who introduced the Messianic creed into Greece and the Asiatic-Greek or Continental settlements discussed the Pentateuch and the Prophets in Greek, provoking widespread interest in the Scriptures among the Greeks.
5. A large number of Talmudic words were borrowed from Greek, and many of them have kept their original form and exotic flavour, rendering obvious the existence of a mixture or amalgam.
6. Jewish scholars have learned Greek in order to gain direct access to the Septuagint and the works of Josephus, and the better to understand the Talmud.
7. Jewish scholars, well-versed in Hebrew, entered in the Renaissance by translating the Greek classics into Arabic.
8. At that time Muslim scholars, whose mother tongue was Arabic, studied Greek.
9. Since then countless classical scholars of all nationalities have spent all their academic lives at the universities of Europe and America in the study of Arabic and Hebrew.
10. Homer and the New Testament have been translated into Arabic and Hebrew.

None of these thousands upon tens of thousands of learned men in different climes and succeeding ages has ever ceased to admit that these three languages are genetically interrelated, let alone that Hebrew is identical with Greek.

There were those who—like W. Miss-Arnob—discovered a limited number of Greek words with Semitic affinity, and promptly classed them as borrowed (*On Semitic Words in Greek and Latin*, 1893). This, in defiance to the time-hallowed dogma which has erected a barrier—not less forbidding because bogus—between the Semitic and the Aryan languages.

At the opposite pole stood Revd. John Parkhurst, author of *de Hebraeae and English Lexicon without Points*. He lived two hundred years ago and supported the untenable Rabbinical theory that Hebrew was the *lingua primæva*, the mother of all tongues, including Greek (*Mishnah Sebbe Senuah*, chaps. 18 and 31; *Touchelet*, *Mapile* 1. 11). Sheikh Muhammad Ahmed Muthar

—a scholar of the Ahmadiah sect—on the other hand, contends that all languages—including Chinese and Greek—derive from Arabic, the language of the Koran.

There exists a third school which has attempted to build a bridge between the Chamito-Semitic and Indo-European languages—one of its foremost exponents being A. Cury, author of *América e Índia comparativa das línguas indo-europeias e das línguas chamito-sêmicas*.

Lastly, Professor Cyrus H. Gordon—a scholar of broad vision and deep understanding—holds that the Hebrew and the Hellenic cultures were twins.

On going to print, I learn of Professor Saul Levin, of Harper College, State University of New York, Binghamton, New York, author of *The Indo-European and Semitic Languages*—an exploration of structural similarities related to accent, chiefly in Greek, Sanskrit, and Hebrew. On p. 8 he writes:

...many things still puzzled me—above all, why were the correspondences closer between Greek and Hebrew than between any other Indo-European and Semitic languages? Just because I knew those better? Slowly I discovered that in many respects Sanskrit rather than Greek affords the more cogent parallel to Hebrew.

Thus, I venture to submit with hesitation (not knowing Sanskrit), was this courageous orientist shunted off *en route* (the way to truth) and away from the reality that Hebrew is Greek; although he broke free of the shackles of traditional linguistics, refused to join in the wild goose chase of proto Indo-European and proto Semitic, and tackled directly Greek and Hebrew *toxa*.

My research over thirty years has been conducted independently of others. Starting from scratch, I have consistently investigated the language of the Bible by the language of the Bible, with the assistance of Arabic and the Septuagint. I have worked autonomously throughout, fashioning and re-fashioning my own laws as I went along. In the result, I have been led irresistibly to the following conclusions:

1. That about four thousand years ago the whole of the Middle East was overrun, colonized, and controlled by Greek and allied tribes.

II. That the Hebrews were Asiatic Greeks—*αἰγῶν* and *ἰσραηλῖται*, probably the Khabira and Hopkins of Syrian and Egyptian annals—and that their language was Continental Greek.

III. That, judging by the proportion of epic and poetic homologies, and by the primitive grammatical structures to be found in the Bible, one is impelled to the conclusion that the ancestors of the Jews must have been among the noblest and/or the most ancient of the Hellenes, and that they spoke a language far more ancient than classical Greek.

IV. That the Philistines were colonists, continuously flowing in from the mainland of Greece and the adjoining islands, who settled on the southern shore of Canaan—*ἡ γῆ τῶν φιλισταίων*—the Asiatic *Philistia*—and were consequently called of *Ἰλλυρῶν* (*Ἰλλυρῶν*) as distinct from the *Ἰσραηλῖται* (*ἰσραηλῖται*).

V. That when the Hellenic affinity of the Phoenicians had long been forgotten, it was assumed that the identity of the Greek with the Phoenician alphabet was simply a matter of borrowing (Herodotus 2. 28).

VI. That the inhabitants of Iraq (*Ἰρακ*), Syria, and Arabia (*Ἄραβία*) are mainly of Scythian and Cimmerian origin.

VII. That the Hebrews were Israelites (*Ἰσραηλῖται*).

VIII. That the Hebrews worshipped Greek gods and followed Greek customs.

IX. That Hebrew has a multiplicity of unexpected dialects and homonyms.

X. That many proper nouns in the Bible—whether divine, ethnic, geographical, or personal—resemble Greek proper nouns, while others have Greek adjectives and common nouns as homologies.

XI. That certain Greek words, pronounced by Continental Greeks differently from their European brethren, found their way back to Greek in a spelling conforming to their Continental pronunciation. I call them *αἰσῖται*.

XII. That certain non-biblical words found in Rabbinical writings can be proved to have been used in biblical times.

XIII. That the Ashkenazi and Yemenite pronunciations—like the Bagdadî and the Sephardî—are as old and as genuine as Greek itself.

ἰσραηλῖται  
 ἰσραηλῖται

ἰσραηλῖται



XIV. That Judean and Ashdodite were not more different one from the other than Hebrew is from Arabic or Acanitic.

XV. That only by my theory is it possible to establish securely the true meaning of obscure biblical words, and the right interpretation of puzzling passages.

XVI. That only through the knowledge of Hebrew and Arabic is it possible to attain a firmer understanding of Greek.

XVII. That the Jewish, the Christo-European, and the Islamic cultures—the triple aspect of modern civilization—all originate from Hellas.