

ἡ ἀ ΓΕΓΡΑΦΗ ΧΑΙΡΕ' (= αὐτὸ τὸ Γραβίτο)

 PROLOGUE

XXV

הַיְיִת הַכְּתוּבִים

 restores to the Greeks the twenty-four books of the Old Testament, which were written in their language—an adventitious reward for their having preserved the parts of the Hebrew heritage enshrined in the Septuagint, the New Testament, and the books by Josephus and Philo. At the same time and in precisely the same way, ἡδε ἡ γραφή offers to the Jews the forty-eight books of Homer, together with the rest of the literature of Hellas—a kind of compensation for the sufferings endured by them at the hands of the Greeks. Lastly, هذا الكتاب gives orientalist a peep into pre-Islamic Arabia that invites further research.

This oecumenical work should have been undertaken by a team of at least three seasoned scholars: each an accomplished expert in one of the three languages immediately involved, and having more than a nodding acquaintance with the other two. It is not my fault that I have done it single-handed.

As a matter of fact, I repeatedly tried to get others to join me in the venture, without success. Thus early on, at the end of a two-hour session with one of the prospective collaborators, he exclaimed: 'All this is rubbish, and we've wasted each other's time.' My response was: 'You, as well as I, will be judged by these words which I shall quote whenever I discuss my work again.' There was no animus or acrimony in this exchange; indeed, as the research progressed, I tried twice more to interest him in it, but in vain.

Shortly after the aforesaid encounter, I quoted the disparaging remark uttered at its conclusion to the late Christodoulos Hourmouzios, a graduate of the University of Athens and an expert on Homer, who said to me: 'But I think you are one of the greatest glossologists I know.' He readily promised his full co-operation, but unfortunately died before we could settle down to working together.

There were those who confessed to being persuaded that there was 'something' in my theory, yet thought that my claim about the identity of Hebrew with Greek was rather exaggerated. They

maintained that I was 'aiming too high', and suggested that, in my own interest, I should lower my sights and adopt a 'less uncompromising attitude'. One of them was the late Sir Leon Simon, an acknowledged classicist who knew Hebrew. In fulfilment of his promise—in spite of the thick fog and his heavy cold—the old man came a long way on the evening of 14 January 1959 to preside at my first lecture on the subject. He introduced me briefly and with caution, expressly reserving his comments to the end of my address. Then, before calling for questions, he said the following which I noted down immediately after the meeting:

'I don't suppose everybody will agree with everything Mr. Yahuda has told us, assuming we have all understood him all the way. But whatever the doubts about it may be, of one thing I for one am certain. He has solved a mystery which has puzzled scholars for over two thousand years. Because if he is right—that several Greek words with *σκ* are transformed in Hebrew as if *σκ* were a digraph or one of the two letters dropped—then Homer did not nod when he left the short vowel preceding *Σκάμαιθρον* short, in the famous line:

ὄν Ξάνθον καλέουσι θεοί, ἄνδρες δὲ Σκάμαιθρον.'

On the other hand, I had a fruitful interview with a scholar of world-wide repute, which was followed by an exchange of long memoranda. But for some reason he put an end to the correspondence with a curt communication in which he wrote: 'You might as well derive the English "ball" from the Gr. *βάλλω* "to throw" or seek a connection between "chow" and "show" because chows are exhibited at shows!'

In the result, I had to fall back on my own resources and rely solely on my efforts, devoting to this research much of my leisure over a period of more than thirty years. Two things kept me going: the unflagging moral support of my beloved wife, and the thrills we both experienced at every major discovery. I also received encouragement from Professor Cyrus H. Gordon, of Brandeis and New York Universities; and the Revd. Rabbi Solomon D. Sassoon, of Jerusalem.

One day, in the course of a social conversation with a friend, darling Cecile became more than usually enthusiastic—in fact, exuberant—over my research. Whereupon her friend said: 'You don't know Greek or Hebrew, how can you be so sure?' To which Cecile replied: 'But I know my husband. He hates guessing and

always insists on evidence. As a lawyer, he can weigh up evidence. He tells me that he has plenty of convincing evidence, and I believe him.' *Have I?*

The following pages will show, in logical classification and due detail, to what extent, if any, I have such evidence. Here I shall only give a bird's eye view of the evidence which, I submit, justifies my 'uncompromising attitude' that Hebrew is Greek. It is fourfold, that is to say: the number of homologies and their quality, the grammatical similarities, and the interpretation of enigmatic words. The number of homologies is vast, and their percentage of the biblical vocabulary is very high: I estimate it at 90 per cent. Witness the long lists set out in support of the Propositions. As to the grammatical similarities, they are dealt with in Chapter VI; while the enigmatic words are encountered everywhere. Let me, then, advert briefly to the quality of the homologies.

The high quality of Graeco-Hebraic homologies—which inestimably enhances the value of their large proportion and great number, as proof of the identity of one language with the other—is manifested by several important features, that is to say:

1. *Peculiarity of Meaning.* There are commonplace Greek words which, in addition to their ordinary meaning (or meanings), bear a peculiar one that makes them typically Greek. Some of them have demonstrably genuine homologies which bear both meanings, the peculiar as well as the ordinary, e.g. πλήρης/πληρῆς,

φάρμακον/φάρμακός, ἄθρονος/ἄθρονος, ἰργαστήριον/ἰργαστήριος. πλῆρης/πληρῆς is an adjectival noun derived from πλῆρῆς the homologue of πληρῆς. The Adjective πλῆρῆς of which πλῆρης is the feminine, shares with πλήρης all its meanings, including: 'of wine, full-bodied, with a persistent flavour' Ex 22. 28 Nu 18. 27. It is absolutely clear from the contexts, especially in the latter verse, that wine is indicated; but Hebrew does not provide the reason for referring to wine by 'full' or 'fulness'. For that, one must go to Greek.

A footnote to Ex 22. 29 in the N.E.B. reads: 'the first . . . wine: mng. of Heb. words uncertain'. In Nu 18. 27, however, πλῆρης is rendered by 'juice'.

πλῆρης derives from πλῆρῆς, the homologue of οἶνον and/or non-existent ἐνέγκω, the two alternative verbs to φέρω. πλῆρης belongs to

the class of verbs with the Middle Voice λ , and shares with $\phi\epsilon\rho\omega$ many of its meanings. $\kappa\upsilon\delta$ equalizes with $\phi\epsilon\rho\mu\alpha$ through the suffix-prefix phenomenon, and shares with λ three meanings: that which is carried, load Ex 23. 5; metaph., burden, load Nu 11. 11; of a harp ICh 15. 22, 27. The last two verbs occur in a paragraph entirely devoted to music, and $\kappa\upsilon\delta$ refers to an instrument played by skilled strummers. Yet neither Greek nor Hebrew provides an explanation for such a strange nomenclature.

No difficulty seems to have been encountered by the editors of the N.E.B. in translating (or rather mistranslating) ICh 15. 22, but a footnote to verse 27 reads: 'the precentor: prob. rdg.; Heb. obscure'. I sympathize with them, especially as I offered to put my experience at their disposal.

Here is the complete homology of $\alpha\theta\rho\upsilon\omega$: joint, مفصل, عطف, تنصیل , مفصله ; esp. the socket [of the ankle-joint] نقره, ثغره ; ball of joint 7572 7573 7574 7575 7576 7577 7578 7579 7580 7581 7582 7583 7584 7585 7586 7587 7588 7589 7590 7591 7592 7593 7594 7595 7596 7597 7598 7599 7600 7601 7602 7603 7604 7605 7606 7607 7608 7609 7610 7611 7612 7613 7614 7615 7616 7617 7618 7619 7620 7621 7622 7623 7624 7625 7626 7627 7628 7629 7630 7631 7632 7633 7634 7635 7636 7637 7638 7639 7640 7641 7642 7643 7644 7645 7646 7647 7648 7649 7650 7651 7652 7653 7654 7655 7656 7657 7658 7659 7660 7661 7662 7663 7664 7665 7666 7667 7668 7669 7670 7671 7672 7673 7674 7675 7676 7677 7678 7679 7680 7681 7682 7683 7684 7685 7686 7687 7688 7689 7690 7691 7692 7693 7694 7695 7696 7697 7698 7699 7700 7701 7702 7703 7704 7705 7706 7707 7708 7709 7710 7711 7712 7713 7714 7715 7716 7717 7718 7719 7720 7721 7722 7723 7724 7725 7726 7727 7728 7729 7730 7731 7732 7733 7734 7735 7736 7737 7738 7739 7740 7741 7742 7743 7744 7745 7746 7747 7748 7749 7750 7751 7752 7753 7754 7755 7756 7757 7758 7759 7760 7761 7762 7763 7764 7765 7766 7767 7768 7769 7770 7771 7772 7773 7774 7775 7776 7777 7778 7779 7780 7781 7782 7783 7784 7785 7786 7787 7788 7789 7790 7791 7792 7793 7794 7795 7796 7797 7798 7799 7800 7801 7802 7803 7804 7805 7806 7807 7808 7809 7810 7811 7812 7813 7814 7815 7816 7817 7818 7819 7820 7821 7822 7823 7824 7825 7826 7827 7828 7829 7830 7831 7832 7833 7834 7835 7836 7837 7838 7839 7840 7841 7842 7843 7844 7845 7846 7847 7848 7849 7850 7851 7852 7853 7854 7855 7856 7857 7858 7859 7860 7861 7862 7863 7864 7865 7866 7867 7868 7869 7870 7871 7872 7873 7874 7875 7876 7877 7878 7879 7880 7881 7882 7883 7884 7885 7886 7887 7888 7889 7890 7891 7892 7893 7894 7895 7896 7897 7898 7899 7900 7901 7902 7903 7904 7905 7906 7907 7908 7909 7910 7911 7912 7913 7914 7915 7916 7917 7918 7919 7920 7921 7922 7923 7924 7925 7926 7927 7928 7929 7930 7931 7932 7933 7934 7935 7936 7937 7938 7939 7940 7941 7942 7943 7944 7945 7946 7947 7948 7949 7950 7951 7952 7953 7954 7955 7956 7957 7958 7959 7960 7961 7962 7963 7964 7965 7966 7967 7968 7969 7970 7971 7972 7973 7974 7975 7976 7977 7978 7979 7980 7981 7982 7983 7984 7985 7986 7987 7988 7989 7990 7991 7992 7993 7994 7995 7996 7997 7998 7999 8000

ITS 22. 37; generally, of limbs, etc., esp. in pl طرف of the leg 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200 201 202 203 204 205 206 207 208 209 210 211 212 213 214 215 216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227 228 229 230 231 232 233 234 235 236 237 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247 248 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275 276 277 278 279 280 281 282 283 284 285 286 287 288 289 290 291 292 293 294 295 296 297 298 299 300 301 302 303 304 305 306 307 308 309 310 311 312 313 314 315 316 317 318 319 320 321 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331 332 333 334 335 336 337 338 339 340 341 342 343 344 345 346 347 348 349 350 351 352 353 354 355 356 357 358 359 360 361 362 363 364 365 366 367 368 369 370 371 372 373 374 375 376 377 378 379 380 381 382 383 384 385 386 387 388 389 390 391 392 393 394 395 396 397 398 399 400 401 402 403 404 405 406 407 408 409 410 411 412 413 414 415 416 417 418 419 420 421 422 423 424 425 426 427 428 429 430 431 432 433 434 435 436 437 438 439 440 441 442 443 444 445 446 447 448 449 450 451 452 453 454 455 456 457 458 459 460 461 462 463 464 465 466 467 468 469 470 471 472 473 474 475 476 477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486 487 488 489 490 491 492 493 494 495 496 497 498 499 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 508 509 510 511 512 513 514 515 516 517 518 519 520 521 522 523 524 525 526 527 528 529 530 531 532 533 534 535 536 537 538 539 540 541 542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549 550 551 552 553 554 555 556 557 558 559 560 561 562 563 564 565 566 567 568 569 570 571 572 573 574 575 576 577 578 579 580 581 582 583 584 585 586 587 588 589 590 591 592 593 594 595 596 597 598 599 600 601 602 603 604 605 606 607 608 609 610 611 612 613 614 615 616 617 618 619 620 621 622 623 624 625 626 627 628 629 630 631 632 633 634 635 636 637 638 639 640 641 642 643 644 645 646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660 661 662 663 664 665 666 667 668 669 670 671 672 673 674 675 676 677 678 679 680 681 682 $\text{68$

2. *Identical Phrases.* The similarity of certain Hebrew words to their Greek counterparts establishes an identity of expression in both languages beyond the words concerned.

Thus, there are three words in Hebrew for 'yesterday': **שְׂמַח** **שְׂמַח** **שְׂמַח**—which respectively relate to the Greek phrases of two words each: *ἡμέρα χθές, ἐχθές ἡμέρα, χθές ἡμέρα*—and two in Arabic: *أمس* and *البارحه*, both of which homologize with the first phrase. It is remarkable that **שְׂמַח** is augmented with **שְׂמַח** when *é* is added to lengthen *χθές*; and that only the phrase *χθές ἡμέρα* is known. Moreover, it is not less significant that the suffix-prefix phenomenon—by reversing the order of the last two words, *ἡμέρα χθές*—should account for three homologues (one Hebrew **שְׂמַח**, and the two Arabic), two of which (**שְׂמַח** and *أمس*) are quasi-homophones.

Again, **שְׂמַח** in *Jes 27. 2* is the homologue of *ἡμερίς*, fem. of *ἡμερος*; as *Subst.*, *ἡμερίς* (sc. *ἀμπελος*), *ἡ*, the cultivated vine *Od. 5. 69*. The biblical text, however, actually expresses what Homer implies, i.e. **שְׂמַח** **שְׂמַח**. As usual, Driver's *Lexicon* finds fault with the text, asserting that it should 'rd. here **שְׂמַח** **שְׂמַח**' I dread to think what would have happened to our Scriptures if they had been effectively subjected to such vandalism.

Yet another word is **שְׂמַח** in *IS 14. 14*. According to the *Lexicon*, **שְׂמַח** is a 'field for ploughing', the text here also is corrupt and the meaning dubious. In fact, **שְׂמַח** is the homologue of *ἡμίονος*, mule; the text, as almost always, is quite sound (although, had the usual order in a construct been observed, it would have read **שְׂמַח** **שְׂמַח** like **שְׂמַח** **שְׂמַח** *Ib 11. 7*; cf. **שְׂמַח** **שְׂמַח** *Jud 13. 14*); and the certainty of the meaning is vouched for by Homer himself: 'a field about as broad as half the area of a day's ploughing by a pair of mules'. Cf. *Ps 129. 3, Il. 10. 351, Od. 8. 124*. Therefore, I feel I am entitled to assert not only that Hebrew is Greek, but also that it is as Greek as Homer.

3. *Complete Series.* Graeco-Hebraic homologues are not formed of disconnected words picked up here and there at random. Most of the homologues are consistently inter-related, belonging as they do to various series of kindred words which afford evidence as conclusive as it is massive, e.g. names (a) of parts of the anatomy, (b) of members of the family, (c) of weapons, (d) of military

formations; and words relating to (ϵ) numbers, and especially to (ζ) worship, since Israel was intended to be 'a kingdom of priests and a holy nation' Ex 19. 6. If all the Hebrew words in these six lists (which will be found in Chapter XIII) are Greek, it would be difficult to imagine the rest of the language being other than Greek.

Indeed, there is 'plenty of convincing evidence', and I have attempted to make it available not only to the technical experts, but to the ordinary student as well. For this is a self-contained, comprehensive and *speaking* book: one that is so arranged as readily to provide answers to the relevant questions which might confront its users. Thus in the second chapter I relate how my theory evolved and the way I embodied my principal discoveries in a series of Propositions, each of which—like an ordinary theorem—is capable of being tested and demonstrated individually and in conjunction with the others. Here I shall reverse the process and point out to the reader the way he can relate a particular homology to any and all the Propositions which govern it. In this way he will be able to understand thoroughly the homologies herein mentioned, to detect the false ones—for there must be a few which have slipped past my scrutiny—and to discover new genuine ones of his own. For there still remain many such to discover in Hebrew, and innumerable ones in Arabic—not to speak of other so-called Semitic languages with which I am unacquainted. What is more, there are further Propositions to be formulated.

Now there are several keys to this crammed book: apart from the Table of Contents, the Table of Propositions, and the Index, there are several lists of explained homologies, the main one being the Catalogue of General Homologies.

Take, for instance, the homology $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\eta\varsigma \cdot \tau\iota\kappa\tau\epsilon\tau\iota$, dealt with above. First, dear reader, you consult this Catalogue and you find, *inter alia*, that the whole family of $\pi\iota\mu\pi\lambda\eta\mu\iota$, from which $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\eta\varsigma$ is derived, happens to be fully dealt with on pp. 343-4. Then you notice that the syllable $-\rho\eta\varsigma$ is missing and that $\tau\iota$ replaces π . Accordingly, you look up the Index, *s.v. interchanges*, and find several examples of such replacement. Next, you refer to the Table of Propositions, and find out the one on apocope, which will provide you with other words of similar elimination. Finally,

handle

just
(written)

you consult, *inter alia*, the LXX, the A.V., and the N.E.B. In this way you would test for yourself the validity of any homology and find out whether or not the Propositions which govern it are supported and confirmed thereby.

But the $\alpha\lambda\eta\theta\eta\varsigma$ (אֱלֹהִים) homology is accompanied above by its meaning and the relevant texts. Let me take one from the body of the book, which is accompanied by neither: $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\alpha\varsigma$ (דֵּם). At first, you will probably react with traumatic incredulity; because (דֵּם) means *blood*, the Greek word for 'blood' is $\alpha\iota\mu\alpha$, and you have never before met with a homonym of (דֵּם). Besides, from what you know of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\alpha\varsigma$, it could not conceivably have any connection with 'blood'. Well, you must be prepared for surprises; this book is full of them. Therefore, you look up the Catalogue and find that one of the meanings of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\alpha\varsigma$ is 'vine-shoot', that (דֵּם) homologizes with $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\alpha\varsigma$ in that meaning, and that the text referred to is actually concerned with the vine. So after all, sense and sound combine to render the suspect homology a safe one.

However, no sooner you become reconciled to it, than the other homologue of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\alpha\varsigma$, (דָּבָר), attracts your misgivings. For (דָּבָר) homologizes with $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\alpha\varsigma$ in respect of its meaning, 'corpse', and you have always known (דָּבָר) to mean 'dung'—as دَبْن does in Arabic. Yet (דָּבָר) invariably refers to dead human beings who lie 'upon the face of the earth', ungathered, unmourned, and unburied—a prey to bird and beast (Jer 8. 2, 16. 4). Furthermore, (דָּבָר) is associated with contempt and indifference, not with manuring or stench (IIR 9. 37 Jer 9. 21; cf. IR 14. 11 Jer 22. 18, 19; cf. Od. 3. 258-61). Besides, there are two words for 'dung' in Hebrew—(בֹּלֵיט) ($\beta\acute{o}\lambda\epsilon\tau\omicron\nu$) and (שִׁפְטָא) ($\sigma\mu\pi\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, $\sigma\phi\tau\alpha$)—neither of which occurs in a context resembling any context of (דָּבָר)—except Zeph 1. 17 (where their (דָּבָר) $\kappa\rho\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\varsigma$, would be cast like (בֹּלֵיט) which may be compared with Jer 9. 21. Again, (בֹּלֵיט) occurs in four other verses—including the only one in which (שִׁפְטָא) appears—yet none of them mentions (דָּבָר) (IR 14. 10 Ez 4. 12, 15 Job 20. 7). Lastly, is it without significance that Alexander Rhetor uses $\delta\omicron\mu\acute{\eta}$ for $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\alpha\varsigma$?

If nevertheless you remain unconvinced, I should not hold it against you. Clearly, when—as in the circumstances of this particular instance—the validity of any homology is not proved

with complete objectivity, so that subjective influences come openly into play, an individual's scepticism would not be altogether unjustified. (Cf. $\Theta\Gamma$ $\delta\eta\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$: *sat* Ez 44. 7; cf. Jl. 23. 2; 3. 1)

Consistently with this principle, occasionally—when there was a large measure of likelihood of an homology being sound on the balance of probabilities, and it could not be further and better tested by means of my technical tests—I have included it in this book, notwithstanding that the persuasive character of the evidence was not compelling to a degree of certainty. This, for two reasons: first, to give students an opportunity to advance further facts and arguments for or against it; secondly, to let them distinguish for themselves between incontrovertibly sound homologies and such as should be accepted subject to reservations. At all events, the number of such homologies is quite small, while my theory stands four-square on what I have established beyond doubt by means of tried technical tests.

Finally, this book could be useful even to those who have no Greek and know neither Arabic nor Hebrew. For all the homologies are explained and referred to texts; so that one may read the explanation, refer to the indicated text or texts in any biblical translation, and decide for oneself as to the merit of the explanation—and, inferentially, as to the validity of the homology concerned.

A word about Arabic. This book does not deal with Arabic in its own right, but merely as an invaluable auxiliary language in the ascertainment and confirmation of Graeco-Hebraic homologies. Accordingly, several Propositions are devoted to the characteristics of this tripartite relationship; but they also constitute a valid general guide to Graeco-Arabic homology.

Lastly, no account is taken of the difference between classical Arabic and the vernacular, nor of the date or of the document in which any Greek word first appears; for the simple reason that I am only concerned with undoubted phonetic, morphological, and semantic similarities wherever I find them together—not as isolated phenomena, but as inter-related examples in a systematic survey of what I try to prove is an unsuspected and forgotten branch of Greek literature: the Hebrew Bible.