

πολίτης, ó, *citizen, freeman* לַצַּב Jos 24. 11 Jud 9. 2 IS 23. 11 IIS 21. 12.

πολύς, in several compounds: πολύγλωσσος, *on, many-tongued* לַצַּב רִשְׁלֵה Eccl 10. 11; πολυειδήμων, *on, knowing much* עֲרֵךְ ICh 14. 7; πολύθριξ, ó, ἡ, *with much hair* רַצַּב לַצַּב IIR 1. 8; πολύκερως, ó, ἡ, *many-horned* עֲרֵךְ דָּן Dan 8. 6; πολύμητις, ó, ἡ, *of many counsels* נִשְׁוֹן לַצַּב Prv 24. 8.

πόσις, ó, *husband, spouse; esp. lawful husband*: rare in prose. (Indo-European *potis* 'lord, master', cf. πάτρια, δεσπότης, Skt. *pátis* 'lord, master, husband', *pátni* 'lady, wife', Lat. *potis* (*sum*), etc.) לַצַּב Gn 20. 3 Hos 2. 18.

πόσις has another homologue, namely, בָּשָׂה (Jer 11. 13). This noun is masculine; but it is feminine in form, because direct homologues of nouns ending in *-is* terminate in a letter characteristic of a feminine noun, e.g. *ἰεσπις* יֵשָׁע, *μάντις* מַנְיָה, *מִיכָה/מַעֲכָה*, *δούλωσις* דּוּלָה. תִּשָּׁה has two homonyms, the homologues of which are *αἰδώς* (as a moral feeling, *reverence, awe, respect* for the feeling or opinion of others or for one's own conscience, and so *shame, self-respect*) and or *αἰσχύνη* IS 20. 30 (cf. *תִּשָּׁה* Hos 10. 6), and *όύσις* Mich 1. 11. But *בָּשָׂה* in Zeph 3. 19 means *reverence, sense of honour*, and not *shame*.

With the passage of time people forgot that ἥλιος and בעל, the Phoenician deity, were interchangeable; and בעל came to be assimilated to, and confused with, בעל, *husband*. That is why the deity was also called בָּשָׂה. Far from being a pejorative nickname of Baal, it was an appreciative alias, since it especially indicated a *lawful husband*. However, the Bible provides conclusive proof that בעל and ἥλιος are interchangeable, for בית בעל ברית in Jud 9. 4, is referred to by בית אל ברית in verse 46; and אל is a homologue of ἥλιος, e.g. ἥλιος Ὑπερίων: אֵל עֲלִיִן (Gn 14. 18). This is further corroborated by עַבְדֵי אֵל (IIS 6. 10) —the attendant of the Sun(-god)—אֵל, like שֶׁשׁ, being a homologue of ξανθός. Which brings us to the consideration of בעל פֶּעוֹר.

The homologue of פֶּעוֹר is: φοῖβος, η, *on: pure, bright, radiant*: as pr. n. Φοῖβος, ó, *Phoebus, i.e. the Bright or Pure*, an old

epithet of Apollo, Φ . Ἀπόλλων ; rarely inverted, Ἀπόλλων Φοῖβος בעל פעור (Dt 4. 3); then alone as pr. n. פעור Nu 23. 28. I cannot help thinking that בעל, and especially בעלים, may well be a direct homologue also of Ἀπόλλων .

Lastly, תפת, the homologue of which is—by the suffix/prefix construction— $\sigma\pi\tau\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ (*roasting, frying; baking of bread, of pottery*). Hence תפינים Lev 6. 14.

To round off the terminology of Moloch-worship, it is necessary to advert to a list of compounds of בעל and בשת—which confirms the Hellenic character of that terminology, and incidentally corrects the Bible as well as the *Lexicon*—that is: אִש־בִּשְׁתַּ, מריבעל, מריב בעל, מפיבשת, ירבשת, ירבעל, אתבעל, אשבעל.

To begin with, אִש־בִּשְׁתַּ is אשבעל (IIS 2. 8 ICh 8. 33), מריב בעל is ירבשת (Jud 9. 1 IIS 11. 21). מריב בעל is מריב בעל and מפיבשת (IIS 9. 12 ICh 8. 34, 9. 40). It seems that בעל and בשת were used according to fashion or taste, if not indiscriminately. But since these form compounds they must have a meaning, though the interchangeable names need not have the same meaning.

We are told that ירבעל, the surname of Gideon (Jud 8. 35), is a contraction of the phrase ירב בו הבעל (Ib 6. 32). If this is more than a *ben trovato* pun, why was the son of Jonathan called בעל מריב? There is no evidence that *he* had any difference with Baal. The *Lexicon* tries to get over the obvious difficulty by unaccountably suggesting that מריב בעל might mean 'Baal is (our, my, his) advocate (?)', and cites an authority who thinks that it actually means 'hero of Baal', on the assumption that the original form was מריב בעל. But, then, how is one to explain that the same person is also referred to as מפיבשת, for which name no meaning is vouchsafed? Again, the *Lexicon* interprets אתבעל to mean 'with Baal, i.e. living under B.'s favour'. Moreover, in the entry *sub voce* ירבעל, it cites an authority who suggests that ירבעל stems from the root ירה (*throw, shoot*), and draws attention to ירואל (ICh 20. 16) and יריאל (ICh 7. 2), saying they mean 'founded of El'. My theory reconciles the differences between these compounds, and puts an end to legend and fancy alike.

It was clear to me, at the start of my investigation into Moloch-worship, that these names were—like יְרוּאֵל and יְרִיאֵל—composed of a deity plus a prefix: אֵשׁ, אֶשׁ, אַתַּח, יֵר, יְרוּ, יְרִי, מְרִיב, מְרִי, מְפִי. Obviously, אֵשׁ and אֶשׁ resembled each other, as did אֶשׁ and אַתַּח, מְרִי and מְרִיב; but מְפִי stood on its own. It suddenly struck me that—like פִּי in פִּיפִיּוֹת (Ps 149. 6)—מְפִי might be the homologue of ἀμφί (*about, around*; of persons grouped *about* one, οἱ ἀ. Πρίαμον Priam and his train; οἱ ἀ. Πρωταγόραν the school of Protagoras; οἱ ἀ. Εὐθύφρονα Euthyphro's friends; of a single person). This led to my finding that יְרִי and מְרִיב were the homologues of περί (*about, near*; of persons who are *about* one, ἔχειν τιὰ π. αὐτόν; esp. οἱ π. τιὰ a person's attendants, connexions, associates or colleagues, οἱ π. τὸν Πείσανδρον πρέσβεις; οἱ π. Ἡράκλειτον his school; οἱ π. Αρχίαν πολέμαρχοι Archias and his colleagues; οἱ π. τιὰ so-and-so and his family). אֶשׁבַעַל, then, meant 'an adherent or follower of בַּעַל'. But I was at a loss about the other prefixes, and only by pure chance did I, in one leap, reach their happy solution. Thus, in the course of my research, I came across פִּי־בָשֶׁת (Ez 30. 17) which, if it be *Bubastis* in Egypt, of course, had no connection with מְפִיבֶשֶׁת. Yet בְּחֹרֵךְ אֵן, the phrase next to it, caught and riveted my attention. I argued with myself: If On had young men about him, why not Baal? And there and then I set out in search of 'young men'. Within minutes I found: εἶρην or ἰρήν (*Lacedaemonian youth who had completed his twentieth year*), and ἡθεός, בְּחֹרֵךְ (*unmarried youth just come to manhood*). The former homologizes with יֵר, יְרוּ, and יְרִי; while the latter homologizes with אֵשׁ, אֶשׁ, and אַתַּח. In the result, the situation became crystal clear: the compounds were surnames of persons who, when young, had been initiated in Baal's worship, or dedicated to his service, or had served an apprenticeship as acolytes in his temple, helping his long-haired priests in the discharge of their sacred duties—like Samuel at Shiloh (IS 1. 22, 28)—or, again like Samuel, a gift of the deity prayed for by his parents. The נְתִיבִים or נְתִיבִים, however, were originally laymen permanently attached to the Temple, who formed a class of Temple-attendants inferior to the Levites (Est 8. 17 ICh 9. 2).

It is not to be wondered at that יְרִבְשֶׁת or יְרִבְשֶׁת and מְפִיבֶשֶׁת were novices at the shrine of Baal, or Baal's gifts to their parents;

for the concept of monotheism had a hard struggle to monopolize religious belief among the Hebrews, and probably never completely prevailed in biblical times.

UNDERSTANDING GREEK THROUGH HEBREW

LVI. A better understanding of Greek can be obtained through Hebrew and Arabic.

There are two ways in which knowledge of Hebrew helps understanding Greek: one, by tracing to their Greek origin words which the Greeks borrowed from foreign sources; the other, by applying to Greek words the rules of decoding Hebrew words.

I. The Asiatic Greeks called Arabia עֲרַב (Jer 25. 24) or עֲרַבָּ (Dt. 2. 8), and its inhabitants עֲרַבִּי (Jes 13. 20), עֲרַב (IR 10. 15), עֲרַבִּים (Ib 17. 4), עֲרַבָּאִים (IICh 17. 11), עֲרַבִּים (Ib 21. 16), עֲרַבִּיִּים (Ib 26. 7). There occurs also עֲרַבְתִּי (IIS 23. 31). These words form the following homologies:

עֲרַב, עֲרַבָּ, עֲרַבִּים, ἄρημία, ἡ, a solitude, desert, wilderness.

עֲרַבִּי, etc. ἄρημικός, ἡ, ὄν, living in the desert.

עֲרַבִּי עֲרַבִּי, ἄρημίτης, of the desert.

Many generations later, when all this had long been forgotten, the European Greeks borrowed Ἀραβία, Ἀραβί, Ἀράβιος, Ἀραβικός—as they did Νεῖλος. For Νεῖλος is identical with נַיִל, the homologue of ῥόος, a noun which derives from ῥέω, ῥέομαι, flow, run, stream, gush. The homologue of this verb is רָוַן; and the noun derived from it, רִוּוּן, resembles ῥόος more closely than נַיִל. The main difference between the Greek words and their respective homologues is the $\text{MV} \lambda$. The fact is that when, at the time of the Patriarchs, the Greeks ruled over Egypt, they referred to the stream that flows through it simply as the 'River'. Then the Egyptians rebelled against them and enslaved the Hebrews, but the name ὁ Νεῖλος persisted and has survived to this day—النيل, a name given to a tributary of the Euphrates. Another name that persisted for more than a millennium is Φαραώ which is, to this day, believed to be an Egyptian word; but I think it is a relic of ἔφορος or φρουρός, or of both.

II. ἀραβών, and III. μάγδαλος are dealt with elsewhere.

IV. κάμηλος is supposed to be of so-called Semitic origin, the Hebrew homologue being לָמָּל; but جَمَل is nearer to κάμηλος, because it happens to be paroxytone. I submit, however, that לָמָּל is a compound word made up of μέγα and μῆλον—*big sheep*—and that the Hebrew oxytone is therefore the correct accent. The following are the seven reasons for which I make this claim:

1. The ostriches were called στρουθοί αἱ μεγάλαι or οἱ μεγάλοι στρουθοί, *large sparrows*.

2. The homologue הַטִּוִּן (Job 39. 13) suggests that these words underwent crasis (to γασουθος) by dropping the first syllable με (as in לָמָּל), and τ and ρ, which is not uncommon—under Props. 14 and 17.

3. ζαμελής = μέγα μέλος ἔχων, *possessing a large limb* (—με).

4. One of the many names for the camel in Arabic is إِبِلٌ, the homologue of οἰς, לֵיָא and לֵיָא (Zach 11. 15).

5. Like the sheep, the camel yields milk and wool.

6. The young of the camel is called κάμηλος ἀρνός, *a camel-lamb*.

7. Like κάμηλος, לָמָּל is of epicene gender (Gn 32. 16 Lev 11. 4).

It is therefore safe to assume that when the very ancient Greeks first came upon the camel, they called it 'big sheep'—as they quaintly called the ostrich 'big sparrow', when they were first introduced to the giant bird. This appellation was preserved, in abbreviated form, לָמָּל, by the descendants of the Ancient Asiatic Greeks; but its meaning—and much else besides—had been lost at the time it was borrowed by the European Greeks.

V. The joint operation of two phonetic Rules—Prop. 11 concerning the change of the spiritus asper into ʾ; and Prop. 17 about the dropping of π out of Hebrew homologues—have solved at least one puzzle, that is, the relation between ὀπλή and χηλή. They are simply identical and—together with χήλιος, χηλός—are akin to ὄπλον. This is proved conclusively by the following table of *homologues* and *synonyms*:

The homologues of ὀπλή, ῆ, (ὄπλον) hoof רַפֹּס Dan 7. 19 ظَنَفٌ; in Homer always *the solid hoof* of the horse حَافِرٌ; after Homer, like χηλή, *the cloven hoof* of horned cattle רַפֹּס Dan 7. 19 ظَنَفٌ; distinguished from χηλή, Galenus Medicus, *de Usu Partium* 3. 4.

The homologues and synonyms of χηλή, ῆ, *horse's hoof* حَافِرٌ; of

oxen and the like, *cloven hoof* פֶּסַח Dan 7. 19 ظَلْفٌ ظَلْفٌ; crab's *claw* פֶּסַח Dan 4. 30 פֶּסַח Dt 21. 12 مَخْلَبٌ يَخْلَبُ فُظْرٌ; poetic pl., *talons* פֶּסַח Dan 4. 30 مَخْلَبٌ مَخْلَبٌ; *breakwater*, formed of stones laid at the base of a sea-wall, mostly in pl., so called because it projected like a hoof *سد*; *spur of a mountain* or *ridge of rocks* answering a like purpose حَرَفٌ قَمَّةٌ; of various *cloven* or *hooked implements* كَلَّابٌ; *rims of the eyelids* حَرَفٌ; *crack* in the heels or other parts פֶּסַח Ex 13. 12; *net* פֶּסַח Ps 140. 6 Job 36. 8 أَحْبَلُهُ (which also means 'noose'); *plait* פֶּסַח Dt 22. 12 ضَفِيرُهُ جَدِيلُهُ.

The homologues of *χηλωτός, η, ον* = *χηλευτός, ἄγγος*: *χηλευτός* (*netted, plaited*) פֶּסַח Jud 5. 25 פֶּסַח Ps 56. 9 דָּלָו Nu 19. 17 IR 17. 10 דָּלָו Jes 40. 15 דָּלָו.

The homologues of *ὄπλον, τό, tool, implement* כֶּלִי IR 6. 7 אֵלֶּה; *a ship's tackle, tackling, esp. ropes, halyards* חַבְלֵי חַבְלֵי; *any ropes* חַבְלֵי Jos 2. 15 חַבְלֵי Ps 129. 8; *implements of war, arms, weapon, armour* כֶּלִי Dt 1. 41; *heavy arms* חַבְלֵי IS 2. 4; *men-at-arms* חַבְלֵי IICh 13. 3 חַבְלֵי IR 15. 20; *place of arms, camp* עֵבֶר Neh 3. 27 מַחֲלֵה; *large shield* חַבְלֵי Jos 15. 15 (cf. ἄστυμα) חַבְלֵי Ib 15. 49 (cf. σκηπή) חַבְלֵי IS 17. 7; *membrum virile* חַבְלֵי IS 6. 4 חַבְלֵי Dt 7. 13 זֶבֶר זֶבֶר אֵיִר.

The homologue of *χηλός, ἡ, large chest, coffer* כֶּלִי Lev 15. 4 Jon 1. 5.

Note that the homologues and synonyms of *χηλή* are, for the most part, phonetically similar to *ὄπλη*, a derivative of *ὄπλον*. Moreover, there is semantic evidence of the affiliation between *χηλή* and *ὄπλον*, in that 'net' and 'plait' are related to 'rope'. Again, in one of its meanings—'netted, plaited'—*χηλωτός* is directly related to *χηλή*; while by the other—*ἄγγος*—it is directly linked with *ὄπλον*. Lastly, the homologies corroborate each other most strongly—whether Hebrew, Aramaic, or Arabic. Accordingly, there is cumulative evidence that *ὄπλη* was pronounced *χηλή*, and that these two words were interchangeable.

VI. My theory sheds new light on the word *Σκάμαιδος*, both on the phonetic and semantic aspects. We have seen that homologues of words with *σκ* show that these two consonants may be pronounced together as a digraph, or individually and separately, or by dropping one of the letters (Prop. 12). The late Sir Leon Simon thought this was the reason why Homer did not find it necessary to lengthen the short vowel before *σκ* in *Iliad* 20. 74:

ὄν Ξάνθον καλέουσι θεοί, ἄνδρες δὲ Σκάμανδρον.

Again, this verse seems to imply that *ξανθός* and *σκάμανδρος* are synonymous adjectives; yet there is no trace of such equation or, indeed, of any other meaning ascribed to *σκάμανδρος* by the Greeks. If one turns to Hebrew and Arabic, however, one finds that both languages have preserved several obvious homologues which confirm the implication; while my rules of phonetics establish that these two adjectives are identical: *Σκάμανδρος*: סָךְ Gn 10. 6 רָדָרְדָר Cant 2. 13 רָדָרְדָר Gn 10. 18 סָךְ Ib 10. 21 *شام* (*Syria*), *أحمر* (*red*), *أَسْمَر* (*brown*), *أَصْفَر* (*yellow*), *شَمَنْدُور* (*beet*).

VII. Only the so-called Semitic languages provide the key to the philological riddle presented by the two idiomatic words, *ἐνεία* and *ὀκτώ*. They are not, as has hitherto been supposed, simple words; but compounds respectively made up of *εν* and *εκα*, and *εκα* and *τω*—meaning 'ten minus one' and 'ten minus two'. This is proved by their several homologues הַעֲשָׂרָה and הַשְּׁמֹנֶה . The first syllable in the former (עֲשָׂ) stands for *εἰς*, and the second (הַעֲ) for *-κα* in *δέκα*, *δ* dropping out and *κ* interchanging with ע as gutturals, or dropping out. Whereas the first syllable in the latter (שְׁמֹ) stands for *δύο*, the second and the third letters (הַשְּׁ) for *ἀπό*, and the last letter for *-κα* in *δέκα* (two from ten). Thus, *ἐνεία* consists of *ἐν-νεί-α* → *ἐν ἀπὸ δέκα* (one from ten), like *undeciginti* (twenty lacking one); whereas *ὀκτώ* consists of *ὀκ-τώ* → *-δέκα δώ*, an order of words on the prefix-suffix pattern, to avoid confusion with *δώδεκα*—like *δυσὶν δέοντα εἴκοσι* (twenty save two):

ἐνεία → *εν νε α* → *εν με α* → *εν με (δ) α* → *εν ἀπὸ α* → *εν ἀπὸ δέκα*
ὀκτώ → *οκ τω* → *ακ τω* → *κα τω* → *δέκα τω* → *δέκα δώ* →
δέκα δύω

Besides, it is quite possible that the *δ* in *δέκα* is prosthetic—*εκα* עֲשָׂרָה —because Aristotle held that the *ν* at the end of *εἴκοσιν* is not movable *ν* but part of the word, *εἴκοσιν* being thus homologous with עֲשָׂרִים (or עֲשָׂרִים , 'two tens').

VIII. The verb $\text{לִי לָא, לָךְ לָךְ, לִי לָךְ}$ (Cant 4. 6, Gn 12. 1, Cant 2. 11) not only shows that the Middle Voice, a characteristically Greek feature, exists in Hebrew, but also that the Middle Voice suffixes: *-μαι*, *-σαι*, *-ται*, were originally *-μοι*, *-σοι*, *αὐτῷ* (*to me, to you, to him*), to indicate the reflexive nature of the action—just as לִי (in לִי אֲנִי) and לָךְ (in לָךְ אַתָּה) (*ἐν*) do.

IX. Arabic joins Hebrew in proving at one and the same time both the etymological origin and true meaning of *Ἰδως* and its Epic variant *Ἰδωνεύς*, the homologue of *הַיָּדוּשׁ* (Prv 27. 20), *הַיָּדוּשׁ* (Ib 15. 11), *آيد*.

Strangely enough, the traditional derivation of *Ἰδωνεύς*, 'unseen place', differs fundamentally from the traditional derivation of *הַיָּדוּשׁ*, 'destruction, perdition'. It will emerge from the following analysis that both alleged derivations are spurious, and that these two words are identical with *ἀίδιος*, *everlasting, eternal*.

Hebrew provides the true derivation and meaning of *Ἰδωνεύς*, the homologue of *הַיָּדוּשׁ*.

According to the Greeks, *Ἰδωνεύς* is a lengthened poetical variant of *Ἰδως* or *ἰδως*, which is said to be somehow made up of a *privativum* and *ιδεῖν*, and somehow to mean 'the unseen place'. On the other hand, the regular genitive of *Ἰδως* is *Ἰδου*, and the Homeric *Ἰδωο* and *Ἰδωω*; there is also a genitive *Ἰδωο* and the dative *Ἰδωι*, as if from *Ἰδω*. None of these words seems to have the remotest relation to the said derivation or meaning of *Ἰδωνεύς*, which seems to have been suggested by *Iliad* 20. 62-5, rather than based on firm philological foundations. Indeed, two biblical verses situated widely apart show that—like the Greeks—the Hebrews believed that *הַיָּדוּשׁ* was hidden from mortals' view: Prv 15. 11 and Job 26. 6. Yet *this particular belief* need not necessarily import etymological implications. Therefore, let us turn from this unsatisfactory explanation to a consideration of the homologies involving the words with the root *דָּשׁן*.

ἀποβάλλω—lose *דָּשׁן* Prv 29. 3 Eccl 3. 6.

ἀποβολή—loss *הַיָּדוּשׁ* Lev 5. 22.

ἀφανίζω—make away with person *דָּשׁן* IIR 11. 1 Ps 119. 95 *הַיָּדוּשׁ*

Lev 23. 30 Nu 24. 19; *destroy* *דָּשׁן* IIR 21. 3 *הַיָּדוּשׁ* Mich 5. 9 *אָבָה*; *obscure, mar one's good name* *דָּשׁן* Dt 12. 3 *הַיָּדוּשׁ* Dt 7. 24; *wipe out* *דָּשׁן* Dt 12. 3 IIR 11. 1 Esth 3. 9 *הַיָּדוּשׁ* Nu 24. 19 Dt 7. 24 *אָבָה*; *make away with property* *דָּשׁן* Prv 29. 3.

ἀφανής—missing *דָּשׁן* IS 9. 20; *uncertain, doubtful, obscure* *דָּשׁן* Dt 32. 28.

ἀφανισμός—extermination *הַיָּדוּשׁ* Esth 9. 5 *אָבָה*; *destruction* *הַיָּדוּשׁ* Ib 8. 6 *אָבָה*.

φθίω, -ίνω, -ύθω—decay *דָּשׁן* Jon 4. 10; *wane* *דָּשׁן* Prv 11. 10,

28. 28 פִּחַ Cant 2. 17 [cf. φεύγω]; *be wasted* אֲבַד Jer 9. 11 Joel 1. 11 Eccl 5. 13; *perish* אֲבַד Nu 17. 27 Jes 57. 1 Job 18. 17 Eccl 7. 15 נִאָסַף Jes 57. 1; *disappear* אֲבַד IS 9. 3 Mich 7. 2 נִכָּח Job 30. 8.

φθινύθω—poet. for φθίω, *waste away* אֲבַד Jer 4. 9; *decay* אֲבַד Jon 4. 10; *perish* אֲבַד Nu 17. 27 Jes 57. 1 Job 18. 17 Eccl 7. 15 אָבַד; as an imprecation אֲבַד Jud 5. 31 Job 3. 3.

ἀποφθινύθω—*make perish* אֲבַד IIR 11. 1 Ps 119. 95 נִאָבִיד Lev 23. 30 Nu 24. 19 אָבַד; ἀποφθίνω—*make perish* אֲבַד IIR 11. 1 נִאָבִיד Lev 23. 30 Nu 24. 19; *destroy* אֲבַד IIR 13. 7, 21. 3 אָבַד.

καταφθίω, -ινύθω—*ruin, destroy* אֲבַד IIR 13. 7, 21. 3 אָבַד.
φοιτάζω, -άω, -τιζω—*go to and fro, backwards and forwards; roam wildly about, wander* אֲבַד Lev 26. 38 Jes 27. 13 Jer 4. 9 Job 4. 11 חָסַד Nu 11. 8 Job 1. 7 חָסַד Jer 5. 1 Am 8. 12 הִתְחַסַּס Jer 49. 3 חָסַד Gn 21. 14, 37. 15 Jes 21. 4 (cf. Jer 4. 9) Ps 107. 4, 19. 176 טָה.

φοιτάς—*roaming wildly about, wandering* אֲבַד Dt 26. 5 Jer 50. 6 Ez 34. 4 Ps 119. 176 Prv 31. 6 Job 4. 11, 29. 13, 31. 19 אִקְרָה Gn 37. 15 Ex 23. 4.

Ἅιδης or ἄδης—the *nether world, place of departed spirits* אֲבַד Prv 27. 20 אֲבַדִּין Job 26. 6; Ἅιδου οἰκλήτωρ, *of one dead* חֲסִי הַדָּל Jer 38. 11; אֲבַדִּין Gn 2. 8 Ez 28. 13 אֲבַדִּין Dt 32. 22 Jes 14. 9, 23. 18 אֲבַדִּין Ps 9. 18 אֲבַדִּין الحياه الماخيه غفله Ps 9. 18 אֲבַדִּין Ps 88. 12 אֲבַדִּין IIS 22. 6 Hos 13. 14; Ἅιδόσθε, *Adv. to the nether world* אֲבַדִּין Gn 37. 35 Jes 7. 11.

ἀίδιος—*everlasting, eternal* אֲבַד Hab 3. 6 אֲבַד; ἐς ἀίδιον, *for ever* אֲבַד Jer 30. 8 אֲבַד Nu 24. 20 אֲבַדִּין Job 31. 12 אֲבַדִּין Ps 132. 12 אֲבַדִּין إلى الأبد; ἀίδιος, *eternally* אֲבַד Ps 21. 5, 119. 44.

ἡδωμένος—*lengthened poetical form of ἡδης, אֲבַדִּין Prv 27. 20 אֲבַדִּין Ps 88. 12 Job 26. 6, 28. 22 אֲבַדִּין Gn 2. 8 Ez 28. 13 אֲבַדִּין.*

ἀεί, Aeolian αἰ(ν), αἰ(ν); Boeotian ἦι, Epic, Ionic, Poetic and early Attic αἰεῖ, Doric ἀέσ, αἰέσ—*ever, always* אֲבַד Jer 31. 20 (19); (δεῦρ) ἀεί *until now* (עַתָּה) אֲבַד Gn 32. 5; αἰεῖ *more, more from of old* אֲבַד Jer 45. 21 Ps 93. 2; ὁ αἰεῖ *every one* אֲבַד כל אֲבַד Ex 35. 21; αἰεῖ *for ever* אֲבַד Lev 27. 20 אֲבַד Ex 15. 18 אֲבַדִּין Ib.; τὸ ἀεί *eternity* אֲבַד Ps 36. 7 אֲבַד Hab 3. 6 (cf. εἰς/אל/עד) אֲבַד Nu 24. 20 אֲבַד; ἐς ἀεί *χρόνος* אֲבַד Ps 19. 10 אֲבַדִּין Nu 24. 20 אֲבַדִּין Ps 83. 18 אֲבַדִּין [The Dictionary goes on to say: 'The statement of Harp. that ἀεί = ἔως in Att. is based on misinterpretation of such phrases as ἐς τόνδε αἰεῖ τὸν πόλεμον Thucydides 1. 18.']

Here are the homologues of ἔως(B), Epic εἰως, ἦος, Dor. ἄς, Aeo. ἄς, Boeotian ἄς and ἄως—*relative particle, expressing the point of Time up to which an action goes, with reference to the end of the action, until,*

till; or to its continuance, *while*: *until, till* עד, עוד; ε. ἄν or κε with Subjunctive (mostly of aorist), of an event at an uncertain future time עד אמ Gn 24. 33 כי עד Ib 49. 10 עד עד Jud 5. 7 Cant 2. 7, 17; ε. ὅτε till the time when עד-עה IIS 24. 15 حتی; ε. ὀψέ (*ēs ὀψέ*) till late עד-בֹּשֶׁת Jud 3. 25; ε. ἄρτι till now עד עתה Dt 12. 9; ε. πρωί until morning עד-בֹּקֶר Ex 12. 10 עד-הַבֹּקֶר Jud 19. 25; *while, so long as* עד IIS 1. 9 Job 27. 3 Esth 6. 14 Dan 9. 20.

Since עד-אֲבָדֶן means εἰς αἰῶνα, it obviously follows that אֲבָדֶן means αἰῶνιος, *everlasting, eternal*. Again, as אֲבָדֶן is identical with Αἰδωνεύς, so must also αἰῶνιος be. The syllogism is impeccable.

The above analytical recital shows: (1) That the radical אֲבָדֶן involves four different Greek verbs, none of which is ἰδεῖν; (2) that one of them, ἀφανίζω, means primarily 'to make unseen'; (3) that one of the derivatives of this verb homologizes with אֲבָדֶן and أَبَادَهُ, and not with אֲבָדוֹן or آبَدَهُ; (4) that even if אֲבָדוֹן and آبَدَهُ had been variants of אֲבָדֶן and أَبَادَهُ respectively, they would have indicated 'extermination, destruction', not *occultation*; (5) that the phrase עד-אֲבָדֶן—like עדֵי אֲבָד, עדֵי אֲבָדָה—homologizes with εἰς αἰῶνα; (6) that אֲבָדֶן and אֲבָדָה are genuine homologues of Αἰδωνεύς and Αἰδώς; and (7) that these two Greek words denote eternity.

Complete confirmation of this well-founded conclusion comes from the weighty evidence supplied by four synonymous phrases—all euphemisms for 'cemetery': two biblical, בַּיַּת עוֹלָם Eccl 12. 5, אֶרֶץ חַיִּים Ez 32. 23, 32, and the other two—though not to be found in the Bible—are not necessarily post-biblical in origin, namely: בַּיַּת הַחַיִּים and בַּיַּת עֵלְמַן. בַּיַּת הַחַיִּים is supposed to mean 'the abode of the living'; and it might plausibly be explained that a cemetery is so described to indicate the continuity of life hereafter.

Fortunately, however, עוֹלָם Gn 3. 22, and עֵלְמָא Dan 2. 20, and עֵלְמַן Ib 2. 4 are biblical terms of no uncertain meaning, and they give a clue to the true meaning of חַיִּים in the third phrase. In fact, עֵלְמַן is a variant of עֵלְמָא Dan 2. 20, 44 and plural of עֵלְמַן Dan 3. 33 which—like its Hebrew equivalent, עוֹלָם Ps 90. 2 or, *more accurately*, עֵילוֹם IICh 33. 7 (which

happens to be the Ashkenazi pronunciation of עולם)—is the homologue of *τέλος*, *end*. This is in agreement with the Septuagint's rendering of אֵל-בֵּית עוֹלָמוֹ by *εἰς οἶκον αἰῶνος αὐτοῦ*—that is, *to his eternal abode*—and with *αἰδίοι οἶκοι* (*eternal homes*), i.e. 'tombs'. In fact, the context in Gn 3. 22 suggests that עץ חַיִּים means 'the tree of eternity'.

As to חַיִּים, it is the homologue of *αἰών* in its various meanings: period of existence חַיִּים Gn 3. 14 Eccl 9. 9 *حِين*; *lifetime* חַיִּים Lev 18. 18 *حياة*; *life* חַיִּים Dt 30. 19 Job 24. 22 Dan 7. 12 *حياة*; *eternity* חַיִּים Gn 2. 9 Ps 30. 6; *space of time* clearly defined and marked out חַיִּים Gn 18. 10 IS 25. 6 *عام* (*year*), *أوان*, *أوان* (*season*); as title of various divine beings חַיִּים Gn 16. 14 IIR 19. 4 Dan 12. 7 חַיִּים Dt 5. 23 Jer 10. 10 חַיִּים Job 27. 2 חַיִּים Dan 6. 27.

Therefore, according to the Bible, as well as to ancient Jewish tradition, the dead explicitly pass on to an eternal abode, and the belief is Greek.

THE NEW TESTAMENT

LVII. The names of 'Seeva' and 'Thomas' can be explained by my theory.

Whatever my qualifications to interpret the Old Testament may be, I have no pretension to be able to interpret the New Testament; although I am not altogether unacquainted with this part of Israel's gift to mankind. But I have reason to believe that my theory sheds some light on at least two names mentioned in it, viz. *Nathanael* and *Seeva*.

נְתַנְאֵל (Nu 1. 8) may be the equivalent, not the homologue, of *θεόδοτος* or *θεόδοτος* (*given by God*)—just as תְּתַנֵּה (IIR 25. 23) may be the equivalent of *Διόδοτος* or *Διόδοτος* (*given by Zeus*). It is vital to appreciate that the names are נְתַנְאֵל and תְּתַנֵּה, not נְתַנְאֵל and תְּתַנֵּה; for תְּנֵה may be either the construct of תְּנֵה, the synonym of תְּתַנֵּה and homologue of *δῶρον* (*gift, present, gift of honour; votive gift or offering* to a god), or the homologue of *ἔδνον* (*gift*) and variant of תְּנֵה. This interpretation would imply that the bearer of either name had been prayed for by, and was

granted as a gift to, his parents. Yet the names are susceptible of an alternative and more likely interpretation: either of them may mean 'a gift', 'a votive offering', *by* his parents *to* God, in recognition of the divine favour. In that case, $\lambda\alpha\lambda\eta\lambda$ would be equivalent to $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\theta\eta\mu\alpha$. Now John 21. 2 reads:

ἦσαν ὀνόμου Σίμων Πέτρος, καὶ Θωμᾶς ὁ λεγόμενος Δίδυμος, καὶ Ναθαναὴλ ὁ ἀπὸ Κανὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ οἱ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου, καὶ ἄλλοι ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ δύο.

In my diffident submission, the punctuation is deceptive: there ought to be no comma after $\Delta\acute{\iota}\delta\upsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma$, as I think that Thomas had two other names, Didymus and Nathanael. I suggest that his original name was $\lambda\alpha\lambda\eta\lambda$, and that—in their attempt to translate it to the Greeks—the Jews used such words as $\delta\epsilon\delta\omicron\mu\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ (*given*) and $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\theta\eta\mu\alpha$ (*a votive offering; a slave in a temple*), which were perverted to $\Delta\acute{\iota}\delta\upsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma$ and $\Theta\omega\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ respectively.

In support of my theory, I would refer to two texts in the Old Testament and two others in the New. Samuel was prayed for and dedicated to the service of God in the Tabernacle at Shiloh (IS 1. 11, 28). Moreover, in ICh 9. 2 דָּוִדָּיִם is translated in the Septuagint by οἱ δεδομένοι , דָּוִדָּיִם being laymen dedicated to serve in the Temple (Esr 8. 20). Then mark the similarity of reaction in two different contexts by Nathanael and Thomas, remembering that 'Rabbi' is identical with 'Lord'.

'Nathanael answered him, Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art King of Israel' (John 1. 49).

'Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God' (Ib 20. 28). Cf. Mark 3. 13-19.

As to Sceva, Acts 19. 14 reads:

ἦσαν δὲ τινος Σκευᾶ Ἰουδαίου ἀρχιερέως ἑπτὰ υἱοὶ τοῦτο ποιοῦντες.

It is spelt *Sceva* in the Vulgate, while it is respectively rendered שֵׁבַע and سبع in the Hebrew and Arabic translations. Neither of these two renderings resembles any Hebrew word, any more than *Sceva* or Σκευᾶ seems to do. However, those acquainted with my homological Propositions will not be slow in seeing through the disguise of Σκευᾶ the true faces of שֵׁבַע or הַעֲבָע and its homologue, ἑπτὰ . For according to them, σκ —as a digraph—is equivalent to ש , and so is the spiritus asper; v is equivalent

to \beth , and so is π ; α is equivalent to \beth or $\eta\psi$; while τ drops. So it seems that the priest concerned was nicknamed 'seven' because of the number of his sons. Indeed, this must have been the reason for mentioning the fact that he had 'seven' sons, which number is otherwise irrelevant.

On the other hand, the fact that he had seven sons may have been sheer coincidence, and his real name may well have been $\psi\beta\epsilon$ ($\psi\beta\epsilon$), after the rebel who fought against the resumption of the kingdom by David when its brief usurpation by Absalom had collapsed (IIS 20. 1). Yet that would not affect my reading of $\Sigma\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\alpha$, although the homologue would then be $\sigma\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma$ (*lion's whelp*) instead of $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\tau\acute{\alpha}$, thus: $\sigma\kappa\iota\psi$, ν/ψ , μ/\beth , $\nu\omicron/\omicron\nu$, \omicron/ψ , ν/ψ . Curiously enough, the rebel's name is rendered $\Sigma\alpha\beta\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}$ in the Septuagint and *Seba* in the Vulgate.

THE KORAN

LVIII. A Greek word which occurs in the Koran can only be explained through the Bible.

Hebrew is my mother tongue, but Arabic was spoken in my paternal grandfather's house, and Ladino or Sephardi at my maternal grandfather's. Besides, I heard Arabic all round me in my native Jerusalem and in Cairo, where we lived for eight years. Indeed, at one time I knew two سَعَفَات (among many poems) and about half the Koran by heart; so that Arabic is not foreign to me.

My remote ancestors, too, were familiar with Arabic; but the Sephardi they knew was Spartan, and their Ladino was not Latin but Attic. For the Children of Israel maintained contact with their maritime as well as their land kindred (Jud 6. 1 IR 10. 15 Ob 20 Jon 1. 3 IIC 17. 11), and there was a mutual love-hatred between them. The Midianites ($\mu\epsilon\sigma\eta\mu\beta\epsilon\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$) raided the Land of Israel (Jud 6. 1), and the Aramites ruled over it for a time (Ib 3. 8); while the Philistines were a thorn in the side of Israel. However, King David changed all that: his armies established a base on the Euphrates (IIS 8. 3), and a governorate in Damascus (IIS 8. 3, 6); they carried out a systematic genocide in Edom (IR 11. 15, 16), and subdued the Moabites and the Philistines

(IIS 8. 1, 2). Arab princes brought Solomon (and Jehoshaphat) tribute (IR 10. 15 IICh 9. 14, 17. 11), and the Queen of Sheba paid him a State visit (IR 10. 1-2) while his and his ally Hiram's ships used Aden as their port of call on their voyages to East Africa (Ib 10. 22). But throughout the Assyro-Babylonian crises which resulted in the Captivities, the Syrians and the Phoenicians in the north, the Philistines and the desert-dwellers in the south, joined the enemies of Israel (Jer 35. 11 Joel 4. 4-6 Ps 137. 7). Nevertheless, the Midianites never molested the shrine of Shiloh, and Israelites settled in Arabia (as they did in Greece); so that the priests of Apollo at Mecca—even if they did not maintain regular intercourse with the priests in Jerusalem—must have been conversant with their laws, customs, and way of life generally. Of this there is ample and clear evidence in the Koran. Part of that evidence is philological; and it is not less convincing because it has lain there unsuspected for fourteen hundred years.

Now I am no more qualified to comment on the Koran than I am to comment on the New Testament; but here, too, my theory helps to explain at least four puzzling words that occur in it and nowhere else. They are: أَبَائِيل and بَجِيل (Sura CV, The Elephant), صَد (Sura CXII, The Unity), and طَائِوت (Sura II, The Cow), in alphabetical order. The first three are easily disposed of: أَبَائِيل is the homologue of *πάμπολυς*, *very great, large, or numerous*; بَجِيل, I submit, is the homologue of *θέαγον*, a variant of *θειον* (A): *brimstone*; and صَد—akin to ΠΝΨ Lev 25. 23, 30—is that of *ἀθάνατος*: *undying, immortal*; *ἐμπεδως*: *permanently* (W). Here they are in their inimitable settings:

أَلَمْ تَرَ كَيْفَ فَعَلَ رَبُّكَ بِأَصْحَابِ الْفِيلِ . أَلَمْ يَجْعَلْ كَيْدَهُمْ

فِي تَضَلُّلٍ . وَارْسَلَ عَلَيْهِمْ طَيْرًا أَبَائِيلَ . تَرْتَبِيحِهِمْ بِحِجَارَةٍ

مِّنْ بَجِيلٍ . فَجَعَلْنَاهُمْ كَعَصْفٍ مَّأْكُولٍ .

قُلْ هُوَ اللَّهُ أَحَدٌ . اللَّهُ الصَّمَدُ . لَمْ يَلِدْ وَلَمْ يُولَدْ . وَلَمْ يَكُنْ

لَهُ كُفُوًا أَحَدٌ .

طالبوت, however, is in a class apart. Its context is no guide to its far-fetched homophonous Greek homologue, *τελευταῖος*. What is more, one cannot get to it outside the context of the Bible "as a whole. The way I came by this homology is so characteristic of my method, and so relevant to the evolution and effectiveness of my theory, that I feel I must report it, if only briefly.

Traditionally طالبوت is the Arabic for *לָוֶן*, and the context accords with the biblical account and confirms the tradition. But since the Arabic alternative to *לָוֶן* is phonetically unaccountable, I wondered whether it might have some semantic affinity to the Hebrew name which I—in common with everybody else—thought was the original, an affinity that would show up in a Greek homologue. This suspicion crept into my mind when my research had led me to two conclusions: one, that because of its vast vocabulary, the isolation of the Arabs by and within their desert fastness, and the further conservation of their language through their deep attachment to tradition, Arabic claimed a wider—though not closer—relationship to Greek than Hebrew did, so that it had many more Greek homologues than Hebrew had, while Greek had a very much larger number of Arabic than Hebrew homologues; the other, that although Mahomet—like other Arabs before him—was obviously influenced by biblical and rabbinical accounts and concepts, he undoubtedly spoke *Arabic*, even as Moses had spoken *Hebrew*, whatever the proximate or remote origin or origins of the words they uttered. Therefore, I shifted the investigation from طالبوت on to *לָוֶן*, and tried to find the equivalents in Greek of 'requested' and 'borrowed'—apart from the homologues connected with *לָוֶן* (*לָוֶן* *αἰτέω* Jud 5. 25, *לָוֶן* *ἠτημένος* IIR 6. 5; *לָוֶן* *αἴτημα* IR 2. 16, *לָוֶן* *αἰτητός* IS 9. 2)—in the hope of discovering a word which would homologize with طالبوت. I drew blank, except that incidentally I came across—*s.v.* *ἀητός*: *prayed for, desirable*—*Ἀητός* (حائت) and *Ἀήτη*, proper nouns, *the Prayed for*. This proved that the Greeks had the equivalent of *לָוֶן* for women as well as for men, and confirmed the biblical reason for the name—that the parents of its bearer had longed and prayed for his birth (IS 1. 17, 20, 27 IIR 4. 28).

This prompted me to study individually the four different

Sauls in the Bible, and what I detected was decisive. For one of them—the first king of Israel—was an only child (IS 10. 21 ICh 8. 33, 9. 39); another was the Benjamin of the brood (Gn 46. 10 Ex 6. 15 ICh 4. 24); while the remaining two were indeterminate. Hence, the finding of *τελευταῖος* (*last*) and *τηλύγετος* (old Ep. epith., of children, of uncertain origin and sense; sometimes clearly of a *darling son, petted child* . . . so of an *only son*). The best of the ancient interpretations is *latest-born*, i.e. *after whom no more are born* . . . including *only children*, these being the best-beloved) was practically automatic.

Consistently with this concept, the Septuagint renders $\tau\eta\lambda\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ by *ἀγαπητός* in Gn 22. 2, 12, 16 Jer 6. 26 Am 8. 10 Zach 12. 10; and by *ἀγαπώμενος* in Prv 4. 3; elsewhere literally by *μονογενής*.

The significance of this discovery—the result of determined and sustained efforts to ascertain and proclaim the truth—cannot be overrated. It establishes beyond doubt that the *word* طالوت is a *genuine, independent, Arabic word*, that it was known to the *Arabs* to be an alias of لَوْل ; and that by Mahomet's time its meaning had been forgotten—like that of טל , also an only child. The implication is inescapable that knowledge of the Bible is essential to the understanding of the language of the Koran. Because the marriage contracted by Moses not only resumed the contact first made by the Fathers with their Scythian neighbours, but also developed in the course of time into regular social intercourse between their descendants—raids, treacheries, wars, tortures, among other manifestations of mutual love-hatred, notwithstanding—over a period approaching two thousand years; indeed, down to the advent of Islam, when the Jewish communities in Arabia were wiped out, the remote Yemenite excepted.

The following is laid down in Deuteronomy 19. 15: $\text{על־שני עדים או על־שלושה עדים יקום דבר}$. Let, then, two witnesses suffice—although they do not stand alone, if corroborative evidence counts—further to support my contention: the books of Ruth and Job. Ruth, the great-grandmother of King David, was a Moabite—as Uriah was a Hittite (*Σκυθης*)—and Job, one of the outstanding philosophers of antiquity, lived in עַרְבַּיִם (which, there are strong indications, was Northern Arabia) long before السَّوَال .