

Hebrew homologues are of four kinds: simple, compound, hybrid, and mixed, primary and secondary.

Those comprised in the first and second categories respectively homologize with simple and compound Greek words, e.g. *בָּשָׁה/ψηφίζω*, *בָּשָׁה/καταψηφίζω*, *בְּהַשְׁבָּה/מחשבת/ψηφισμα*; *סָחַח/παραμυθέομαι*, *יָמַח/παραμυθητικός*; *סָבַח/שׁוּב/στρέφω*, *בָּרַח/בִּשְׁבִי/ἀπο-/μετα-*, *בָּרַח/שׁוּב/στρέμμα*; *הָרָא/ὄραω*, *הָרָא/מְרָא/ὄραμα*.

The hybrid homologues incorporate the affixes of the Greek word, including *-ζω*, or combine more than one Greek word, e.g. *סָחַח/ὄραμα*, *זָכַח/ἀγαπάζω*, *זָכַח/καταπραύνω*, *זָכַח/κατακροάομαι*, *סָחַח/τὰ τόξα*, *סָחַח/ἀλλ' οὖν*.

The mixed category includes: (a) verbs with the built-in M.V. 1 and their derivatives, e.g. *לָבַח/κληρόω*, *לָבַח/κλήρος*, *לָבַח/πίπτω*, *לָבַח/προσ-*; (b) verbs on the scale *עָלָה/הָרָא* which homologize with simple Greek verbs, e.g. *עָלָה/הָרָא/έρχομαι*, *עָלָה/הָרָא/νοέω*; (c) simple verbs (extremely few) which homologize with compound Greek verbs, mostly with prepositions *para-*, *pro-*, *pros-*, e.g. *פָּרַח/παράδιδωμι/דָּרַח*, *פָּרַח/προστίθω/דָּרַח*; and (d) such verbs as are followed by the personal pronoun in the dative case, e.g. *לִי עָלָה/έρχωμαι*.

As to the Hebrew homologues of Greek derivatives and compounds, they usually preserve the original letters of the simple Hebrew homologues, and their forms fall into four different categories:

The first, the hybrid, comprises words which reproduce the Greek derivatives and compounds as if they were simple words, e.g. *עֹשֶׂה/εὐθύτης/הַפְּעֵה*, *עֹשֶׂה/ἀκουρος/קָרַע*, *עֹשֶׂה/οἰκουρός/תָּקַע*, *עֹשֶׂה/ἐπιγουνίς/תָּקַע*.

The second comprises words which follow Hebrew grammatical constructions, e.g. *עֹשֶׂה/ἀγαπητός/הָרָא*, *עֹשֶׂה/δανειστής/הָרָא*.

The third category comprises words the construction of which follows directly the Greek forms, e.g. *עֹשֶׂה/ὄραμα/סָחַח*, *עֹשֶׂה/ῥύσιον/הָרָא*; *עֹשֶׂה/χρήμα/הָרָא*; *עֹשֶׂה/חרים/הָרָא*; *עֹשֶׂה/חריב/הָרָא*; *עֹשֶׂה/למה/הָרָא*; *עֹשֶׂה/למה/הָרָא*; *עֹשֶׂה/קריאה/הָרָא*; *עֹשֶׂה/אין/הָרָא*; *עֹשֶׂה/אין/הָרָא*; *עֹשֶׂה/אין/הָרָא*.

The fourth comprises words the construction of which follows indirectly the Greek forms, by having as a prefix the equivalent of the Greek suffix of the homologue concerned, e.g. *עֹשֶׂה/ὄραμα/*

מְרָאָה, *ōraais*/תְּפֹאֶרֶת, *δόσις*/תְּשׁוּבָה, *ὀπτάμιον*/תְּבִיבָה, *χρημα*/
מְקָרָה/מְקָרָא/מְכַר/מְחִיר/מָרָי/בְּצָרִים/בְּצָע.

In the result, farcical situations would inevitably arise, unless strict precautions were taken, and great care was exercised, in scrutinizing each disguise, and studying the processes of form-construction and literal replacements of each homologue, in faithful conformity to my empirical rules or Propositions of tried efficacy.

Obviously, each homologue must stand on its merit or fall by its defect. It must speak for itself, and speak precisely and clearly: no stretching of points, no interpretations, no commentaries. Either the word in question bears a definite meaning which fits, or it does not. A doubtful homologue is discarded or put aside for further consideration; to a likely one, tests are applied and the homology is kept under review until finally approved or abandoned. But few false homologies can survive such scrutiny.

Now it hardly needs stating that a Hebrew word that conforms to all the rules of *phonetics* and *morphology*, in relation to a similar Greek word, cannot—by these two qualifications alone—claim to homologize with it. If it could, we would have such monstrosities as *ἀτονος* תְּהוֹא, *ἀτονος*/תְּהוֹ, or *ἀτονος* קֵטָן.

Nor could a Hebrew word that bore the same *meaning* as a Greek word, for that reason alone claim to be its homologue. Otherwise, any Hebrew word would homologize with all the Greek words of its own meaning. This would be impossible because synonyms in the same language are mostly of different sound, form, shade of meaning and origin one from the other.

To qualify as homologues, such two words must not only relate as to sound and form, but also share the same meaning, e.g. *גֵּרָע*/*ōpéγω*.

Yet two such acoustically and formally similar words might frequently coincide in meaning as well, without attaining homological status, except in a certain context. This is obviously the case where *homonyms* are concerned; and there are many hitherto unsuspected homonyms in the Bible, e.g. *הִבֵּל* or *הִבֵּל*, the homologues of which differ according to context. Thus:

βολή, *ἡ*, *bangs* or *throes of childbirth* *Jes* 13. 8, 66. 7; *καταβολή*, *ἡ*, *throwing down*: hence, *csp.* of *begetting* *Job* 39. 3; *periodical attack of illness, fit* *Ps* 18. 5;

ἀγκαλῖς, ἡ, pl., *arms* Jer 38. 12;

ἀμπελος, ἡ, *measure of length* = 20 παλαιστοί (palm, four fingers' breadth) IIS 8. 2; γύης, ὁ, *a measure of land* Am 7. 17;

ἵππος, ὁ, *horse*; καβάλλης, ὁ, *nag*, Latin *caballus*; κέλης, ὁ, *courser, riding-horse, horse* Ez 27. 24 خيل;

κεφαλῆ, ἡ, *band of men*; or νέφος, τό, *metaph., a cloud of men* IS 10. 5;

κοῖλος, ἡ, ον, of Places, *lying in a hollow or forming a hollow*, κ. Λακεδαιμῶν *the tale of L.*, κ. Θεσσαλίη Zach 2. 5, κ. Ἄργος כנרת זבן Dt 3. 4, as proper noun, K. Συρία *the district between Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon* Dt 3. 4; cf. κύβος *die*, πάλος *lot* Dt 32. 9 Ps 16. 6;

νεφέλη, ἡ, *fine bird-net*, in pl.; χηλή, ἡ, *net, plait* Ps 140. 6 Job 18. 10;

ὑπλον, τό, *a ship's tackle, tackling*; esp. *ropes, halyards*, etc. Jes 33. 23; generally, *any ropes* Jos 2. 15 Jer 38. 11; v. χηλή, p. 315.

On rare occasions even the formal, acoustic, semantic, and contextual conformity of a Hebrew word with its Greek equivalent will not suffice to qualify them to constitute a proper homology, e.g. קָרַן/παρα-καλέομαι. To be considered definitely sound, a homology must—in addition to fulfilling all these requirements—pass one or more tests, each of which qualifies as a touchstone by virtue of two characteristics: its independence of either of the two words constituting the homology, and its capacity to connect them to each other in a certain material particular, e.g. קָרַן/ρέφανις (Jud 8. 7). This homology is confirmed beyond a shadow of doubt by an ancient Greek custom.

The word קָרַן occurs twice, both times in the same chapter and in similar contexts, that is, Jud 8. 7 and 16. On the two occasions the Septuagint bypasses the difficulty of translation by transliteration; whereas the *Lexicon* states that the root of the word is unknown, and explains קָרַן as *briars*. It quotes authorities who opine that קָרַן means 'threshing sledges furnished with sharp (glittering) stones'—supposing the root to be קָרַן, the homologue of which is βόστροχος. In fact, there is clear evidence of such a contraction in the homologue קָרַן/τριγάνη: *tribula* (a threshing sledge with sharp pieces of flint or with iron teeth) IIS 24. 22 Jes 41. 15 ICh 21. 23. However, the Ben Yehuda Dictionary—which states that קָרַן is a kind of thorn—rightly considers the said supposition to be far-fetched.

However, in the first verse קָרַן is associated with the verb קָרַן, and in the second with the verb קָרַן. The *Lexicon* resorts to

the familiar and facile slander that the text suffers from a clerical error: it should read עִדָּךְ , instead of עִדְךָ . Once more Greek homology vindicates the authenticity of the record and the reliability of the scribes.

The homologue of עִד is δαίζω , and that of עִדָּךְ is εἶδω , a non-extant verb meaning *to see* (second aorist εἶδον) and *to know* (perfect οἶδα). It belongs to the mixed class of verbs, sharing tenses in the first meaning with ὁράω , and in the second with γινώσκω . Of εἶδω in the first meaning the homologue is עִד Dt 34. 10; otherwise, עִדָּךְ —like γινώσκω —means *to know* Gn 4. 9, and *to know carnally* Ib 4. 1 Jud 8. 16. The identity of these Hebrew and Greek homologues is reinforced by the identity of relevant Hebrew and Greek expressions. Thus עִטָּו , Boeotian, εἶטω , 3 per. sg. imper. of οἶδα , esp. in the phrase עִטָּו Ζεὺς , *Zeus be witness!* Cf. עִד יְהוָה בְּכֶם IS 12. 5; $\text{עִטָּו τὸν Ζεὺς αὐτὸς}$ *Iliad* 10. 329, *now be my witness Zeus himself*; $\text{θεοὶ δ' ἐπὶ μάρτυροι ἔστων}$ *Odyssey* 1. 273, *and let the gods be the witnesses*; cf. $\text{יְהוָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים עִד בֵּינִי וּבֵינֶךָ}$ Gn 31. 50; יְהוָה עֲלֵיכֶם יְהוָה Ex 5. 21; $\text{יְהוָה יְהוָה אֱדַע בְּכֶם לְעַד}$ Mich 1. 2; $\text{יְהוָה יְהוָה אֱדַע בְּכֶם לְעַד}$ Ich 12. 18; $\text{יְהוָה יְהוָה אֱדַע בְּכֶם לְעַד}$ IICh 24. 22. Moreover, the participle εἰδώς means *one who knows*, *one acquainted with the fact*, *one skilled in*; cf. $\text{יְדַע הַעֲדוֹתֶיךָ}$ Esth 1. 13.

As to the homology בְּרָקָה / ράφανος itself, it raises two problems which can easily be solved: the interchange between the spiritus asper and ב , and that between φ and ק . The first interchange occurs in dialectal Greek, e.g. βῆ , Aeolian for ῆ ; βῆδιον (i.e. ῆῆδιον), Aeolian for ῆῆδιον ; βραιδῖως , Aeolian for ῆῆδῖως ; βράδινος , Aeolian for ῆῆδινός ; βράκετρον , Aeolian for ῆῆκετρον ; βράκος , Aeolian for ῆῆκος ; βρατάναν , ῆῆτάναν ; βρινός , ῆῆνός ; βρίζα , Aeolian for ῆῆζα ; βρόδον , Aeolian for ῆῆδον ; βρυτίς , Aeolian for ῆῆτίς ; βρύχειν , ῆῆχειν ; ῆλιος , ῆῆῆλιος (i.e. ῆῆ-). Besides, consider the homologies, ῆῆτρα (ῆῆτρα), בְּרִית and ῆῆλιος , בְּעַל . Regarding the interchange between ק and φ , let the double-homology $\text{φοῖνιξ/קָנִי קָנִי}$ suffice as an example.

Yet however sound these three homologies may appear when standing separately and independently of each other, they fail to support each other—or so it seems—when conjoint. For how on earth could radishes be related to 'piercing' and/or 'carnal

knowledge'? In the event, an old Greek custom provides an unbreakable link between them. In ancient Athens adulterers used to be punished by having a radish (presumably of enormous carrot shape and size, the kind still cultivated in Israel—*ράφη*, *ράφα*) thrust up their fundament (Aristophanes, *Nubes* 1083).

It does not need a great deal of imagination to visualize the cruel torture to which the inhospitable elders of Succoth were subjected when victorious Gideon returned to vent his threatened vengeance on them. By the light of this Greek custom, the two verses concerned become probatively complementary, each containing a verb (פָּרַד, עָדַד) which matches a particular meaning of the other verb (piercing, knowing carnally), although both verbs are susceptible of more than one meaning. Obviously, the peculiar way of piercing rendered the use of radishes more humiliating, if less painful, than the use of thorns. No doubt, both thorns and radishes were employed to achieve the maximum mental and physical pain.

Another way of punishing marital infidelity among the ancient Greeks was by means of scorpions (Plato, *Comicus* 173. 21). Which recalls another incident in the history of Israel, and confirms the homology σκορπίος:שָׂרָפָה IR 12. 11 *scorpion*.

Thus in each case an ancient Greek custom has served as an ideal test whereby to corroborate the homologies concerned. For it is independent of the homologues involved, while linking them together by a common usage. It appears that those who fail to support their leader in distress, as well as those who betray their new king, incur the penalties reserved for disloyal spouses. Hence the scorpions and the radishes—adding the thorns for good measure.

A third relevant custom worth recalling is referred to in Mich 7. 19; although Homer (*Iliad* 1. 314) uses εἰς, the homologue of פָּרַד, and not εἰς αὐτὸν. This ritual continues to be solemnly performed by the Jews once a year.

Lastly, but not of least interest, is the ἀκχῆ —the customary dance at the Baalbek Festival—a homologue of ἡ Βάκχη/ἡ Βακχίς or τὰ Βάκχεια.

However, there is seldom such a custom at hand wherewith to back up an homology. Fortunately, no less than eight tests are available, whereby it is possible systematically to determine—or at least to help to determine—the soundness of Graeco-Hebraic

homologies. We may, therefore, lay down the following Proposition:—

LIX. It is not enough for a Hebrew word to accord in form, sound and sense with a Greek word to become its rightful homologue; the provisional homology must—in addition—pass one or more of the following tests:

1. Comparison with other biblical homologues.
2. The context.
3. Comparison with Arabic homologues.
4. Resemblance in more than one meaning.
5. Resemblance of derivatives.
6. Semantics.
7. The Septuagint.
8. The supreme test.

1. *Comparison with other biblical homologues.* Comparing any homologue in hand with another biblical homologue often has a decisive effect, e.g. $\text{יָנֵשׁ}/\gamma\alpha\lambda\eta\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$. This homology is easily explained by the phenomenon whereby certain letters—including λ —drop out of Greek words in Graeco-Hebraic homology. That this phenomenon has been operating here will readily be conceded when it is pointed out that the truant λ keeps its place in a variant of יָנֵשׁ (Jes 32. 9), namely, יָנֵשׁ־לָנֵשׁ (Job 21. 23).

A similar homology is $\kappa\lambda\iota\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha/\kappa\tau\sigma\tau$ (Esth 1. 2), where the λ has been absorbed by the שׁ־ד in the ס . As a matter of fact, it turns up under the guise of ך in Aramaic כְּרִסְט (Dan 5. 20), which is confirmed by Arabic كُرسِي . Cf. $\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\iota\varsigma/\text{מַטֵּה מַטֵּה}$.

Somewhat different, but not less characteristic, is the homology $\text{פִּיטָאָ}/\phi\omicron\iota\tau\acute{\alpha}\omega$. The lengthened form of פִּיטָאָ (Nu 11. 8) is פִּיטָאָ־טָאָ (Jer 5. 1) which homologizes with $\phi\omicron\iota\tau\acute{\alpha}\omega$, the lengthened form of $\phi\omicron\iota\tau\acute{\alpha}\omega$. Compare these two homologies with another pair— $\text{אַגָּאָאָ}/\beta\alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\acute{\alpha}\omega$ and $\text{אַגָּאָאָ־זָאָ}/\beta\alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\acute{\alpha}\omega$ —where the פִּי and טָאָ in the latter homology respectively replace the equivalents of the π and the α in the former. Cf. מִוֹתָהּ, מוֹתָהּ ; $\text{רַפּוּזָהּ, רַפּוּזָהּ}$.

It happens that in order to make absolutely sure that the homology in hand is correct, one has to make more than one comparison e.g. $\text{הָדָה}/\acute{\omega}\delta\omega\nu\iota\varsigma$. $\acute{\omega}\delta\omega\nu\iota\varsigma$ is crasis for $\acute{\omega}\delta\omega\nu\iota\varsigma$, and the phenomenon of duplication—widespread in the Bible—suggests that הָדָה is equivalent to הָדָה־הָדָה (Jer 22. 18). Since הָדָה is,

in the context, the homologue of Ἄδωνις, it is possible that הַדָּהּ is the right homologue of ᾠδωνις. This possibility is converted into a certainty by the conjunction of two facts: that הַדָּהּ (Prv 15. 11) is homologous with Ἄδωνεύς, and that it is a variant of הַדָּהּ (Ib 27. 20), as הַדָּהּ is of הַדָּהּ.

Similarly, the homology מַתָּה/θάνατος is confirmed by comparison with other homologues, one Hebrew and the others Greek. To begin with, הַמָּתָה (Ps 79. 11)—another homologue of θάνατος—resembles הַמָּתָה (Ez 8. 14). Then, some more support may be got from the puzzling equation, ἀδώνια = θανάσιμα. For the first member of the equation resembles Ἄδωνια, τὰ—mourning for Adonis, celebrated yearly by the Greek matrons. Whereas the second member seems to be the plural of θανάσιμον, the adjectival noun of θανάσιμος which means *belonging to the dead*. Clearly, the mourning for Adonis bore a funereal character, and the women of Jerusalem used to bewail הַמָּתָה, the death (of Adonis), after the fashion of their Hellenic sisters, holding a ritual session at the very gates of the Temple.

It is obvious that one of the customary dirges intoned at funerals in ancient Israel was the lament on the death of Adonis, the refrain of which was: הַי אֲדוֹן וְהַי אֲדוֹנָי. Another was entitled or began with the words, 'Alas, my brother, sister' (Jer 22. 18). For three millennia the scene did not change; for when I lived in Cairo sixty years ago, I attended several funeral parties at which hired women mourners (cf. Ib 9. 16) ritually whined and chanted traditional dirges adapted to suit the particular occasion, such as the death of a father or a mother, a young man or a maiden (cf. Ez 19. 14 IICh 35. 25). Indeed, faithful to and in conformity with such adaptation, the Septuagint only translates הַי אֲדוֹנָי—leaving out הַי אֲדוֹנָי—to fit the lamentation of the male concerned, namely, King Jehoiakim; just as the same lamentation is recorded in IR 13. 30, where it related to the punished prophet. There is, however, an old traditional dirge specially for women, הַי אֲדוֹנָי, in the 31st chapter of the Book of Proverbs; and another for men, Ps 91.

2. *The context.* The context is the best test for a genuine homology, e.g. הַדָּהּ/Ἄδωνεύς. The Bible and Homer are at one, that the nether world is hidden from the sight of men. This is vividly expressed in *Iliad* 20. 61–5, with reference to the realm of

Ἰδωνεύς; and made clear in Prv 15. 11 and Job 26. 6, with reference to יָדָן. The homology suggests that the word *Ἰδωνεύς* originated among the Asiatic Greeks, although the belief in *Ἰδης* was common to both European and Continental Greeks.

The context is also a very good guide, leading to the accurate Greek homologue, where the meaning of a Hebrew word is obscure. In the absence of other clues, it informs one's guessing, where necessity not only warrants guessing, but also compels it. In the light shed by the context, one endeavours first to ascertain the likely meaning of the Hebrew word concerned, and then to find a Greek homologue that conforms to that meaning as well as being agreeable to the context, e.g. יָפַח in Cant 2. 7, 8. 4.

Now I found it impossible to accept that in this setting יָפַח could reasonably be related to ἀγαπάζω, seeing that the subject of יָפַח was אֱהָבָה, ἀγάπη. So I set about getting the exact sense of each other word in the context. First, comparing the two verses, one observes that the relevant passages in both differ in one word. In one, the passage runs: אֱהָבָה וְאֵשׁ תִּעֲרָר אֶת־הָאֱהָבָה עַד שֶׁתִּחַפֵּץ; in the other: כִּי תִעֲרָר וְכִי תִעֲרָר אֶת־הָאֱהָבָה עַד שֶׁתִּחַפֵּץ. I made up my mind that כִּי could not be a conditional conjunction, simply because the verse ended with the supposed protasis and there was no apodosis. As to כִּי, it might well have been an interrogative adverb, short for לִכִּי; but in that case, the character of the passage in this verse would unaccountably differ from the apparently identical passage in the other verse. I came to the conclusion that *here*—as in Jud 5. 8 Prv 27. 24—כִּי has for homologue οὐ, and not εἰ; and *that*—as in IR 12. 16, Jer 3. 9, Prv 31. 2 (cf. לֹא Ib 31. 3, 4 and וְ Ib.), IICh 10. 16—כִּי has for homologue μή, and not ποῖος or τί γάρμα. I had long since established the homology ἐξείρω the עֲרָר הָעֵר, so that I was now well equipped to cast about for the homologue of the isolated word, יָפַח; but no amount of conjecture availed, and I abandoned—or rather suspended—the speculative search.

Then one day, while I was dealing with εἶω and ἐφέσω as the respective homologues of בָּשַׁל and בָּשַׁל, I recalled the above passage. Some time later, while I was dealing with the homology ἐφθός/יָפַח, I again remembered it. And that is how I came across the alternative or joint homologues of יָפַח, ἐφθόω and ἐψω.

Such accidental finds come about because of my habit of continually murmuring to myself puzzling words and phrases, as I go along in my research, and one of them accidentally relates to the Greek word which happens to be under consideration. One enigmatic verse that I have tirelessly repeated to myself for years, without the benefit of such a coincidence, is the last in the sixth chapter of Canticles. It is the penultimate in the N.E.B., and does not seem to have baffled its scholarly editors, who are not noted for their sensitivity to ticklish passages.

Another example of contextual help is the ascertainment of the homologue of מלל in Jes 51. 6. As a matter of fact, the homology מלל/μελαίνω was one of my earliest discoveries. It seemed plain enough to me that in the prophet's imagining the sky might become overcast and darken like smoke. Yet I had my reservations, pending the discovery of other words where the *v* changes into Π, although at a pinch one might allow the diphthong to account for the π. In those early years I was full of reservations, as indeed was my note-book full of provisional homologies many of which have been discarded.

But the context not only helps to ascertain a genuine homologue or to confirm a sound homology; it also determines the rejection of a plausible one. An example in point is a compound of μελαίνω—namely, ἐπιμελαίνομαι—which means, of fruit, *blacken in ripening*. At first, I almost jumped with glee at the idea that here was an excellent homologue for מלל in Ez 16. 4, which would incidentally corroborate the homology מלל/μελαίνω. I thought the prophet was legitimately using poetic imagery by transferring to human beings a chromatic expression which only fits certain fruit. I imagined he meant that Jerusalem (a personification) had not as yet attained maturity and full development. For a moment I jibbed at a metaphor of my own creation; for a moment or two I hesitated to erect an unsteady superstructure on an as yet unfirm foundation. But the imagery was too attractive to bypass, so I provisionally adopted the homology מלל/ἐπιμελαίνομαι, ever mindful of a possible error of judgment.

Much later, as is my wont, I reviewed this homology—among others—and went back to the text with a fresh mind. The verse visualizes Jerusalem on her birthday, with her umbilical cord still unsevered, and herself not yet washed for a show or wrapped

up in swaddling clothes. All this is infantile and far too early for adulthood, I thought. The next verse goes on to say: 'No eye pitied thee to do any one of these things unto thyself, in compassion towards thee.' Clearly, then, $\Pi\lambda\lambda\eta$ was a service to be rendered to a new-born child, and not to an individual at an advanced stage of growth. Needless to add, the much favoured homologue did not survive this belated scrutiny: it was scrapped and consigned to oblivion, where so many other provisionals had and have been relegated. Instead, I have substituted $\mu\alpha\lambda\alpha\kappa\iota\zeta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ (*to be softened, appeased*); and/or $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\mu\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omega$ (*soften, appease*). At first sight it would seem that there was a conflict of claims between these two verbs; yet none actually exists, since both derive from $\mu\alpha\lambda\alpha\kappa\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$.

Finally, the context can be helpful even where proper nouns are concerned, e.g. $\Pi\lambda\lambda\eta$ σχολαῖος. According to the context, the flow of the $\Pi\lambda\lambda\eta$ is *slow*. Therefore, *assuming* that the brook took its name from the sluggish nature of its waters, the homology is sound. The Septuagint refers to it as $\Sigma\lambda\omega\lambda\acute{\iota}\mu$, and to this day it is known locally as سَلْوَان —an ancient variant of $\Pi\lambda\lambda\eta$, because the ν exchanges with all the gutturals in Greek-Hebraic homologies. This explains why Joshua's father, $\eta\lambda$, is called $\text{נַחֲשִׁי} \Pi\lambda\lambda\eta$ in the LXX—like $\eta\lambda$ and $\eta\lambda$ (Ez 16. 33), צַרְרִין (IR 7. 46) and צַרְרִיה (ICh 4. 17). Cf. $\text{فَرَعُونَ} \text{سَلْوَان}$, and $\text{נַחֲשִׁי} \text{سَلْوَان}$ (Prv 27. 13) and $\text{נַחֲשִׁי} \text{سَلْوَان}$ (Ib 20. 16), $\text{נַחֲשִׁי} \text{אֲבִיה}$ (ICh 12. 16) and $\text{נַחֲשִׁי} \text{אֲבִים}$ (IR 14. 31). However, it is submitted that the context precludes the possibility of the formal resemblance between $\Pi\lambda\lambda\eta$ (Jes 8. 6) and $\sigma\chi\omicron\lambda\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$ being purely coincidental.

3. *Comparison with Arabic homologues.* Since Arabic and Hebrew are sister languages, scholars (including my late father) have—from the Middle Ages down to our times—freely resorted to Arabic for assistance in the interpretation of obscure Hebrew words. But such assistance has sometimes been illusory, for four reasons: first, because the formal and phonetic resemblance between the Hebrew and the Arabic words involved is insufficient; secondly, because resemblance in form does not invariably accompany resemblance in meaning; thirdly, because Arabic and Hebrew words often differ from each other in the sound and

morphology of their homology with Greek; and lastly, because the Arabic and Hebrew homologues of a Greek word do not always bear the same meaning—the Arabic homologue bearing one meaning of the Greek word, and its Hebrew fellow homologue bearing another meaning of the same Greek word. *Per contra*, the assistance given by Arabic, in ascertaining and testing the Greek homologues of Hebrew words, is most reliable as well as very generous—whether the Arabic and Hebrew fellow homologues tally or not phonetically, morphologically, or semantically. Yet, for the reasons stated above, semantic difference between such homologues may be even more important than phonetic and morphological resemblance or identity of meaning, for the purpose of testing. Several examples will convincingly illustrate the various aspects of my contention.

A. *φῶς*, τὸ, Attic contraction *φῶς*:

light אור Gn 1. 3 אור Jes 31. 9 אורה Ps 139. 12 יר IR 11. 36
 יר; IIS 22. 29 יר Prv 20. 27 בה Job 12. 5 נהרה Ib 3. 4 עין
 Ex 10. 5 IIS 20. 6 נהרא, נהורא Dan 2. 22 נור;

esp. *daylight* אור Jud 19. 26;

also of *moonlight* אור Jes 30. 26;

and *starlight* אור Jes 13. 10;

τὰ δῶα, sc. sun and moon, אורים Ps 136. 7 באורה Gn 1. 16;

in poets, frequently in phrases concerning the life of men, אור
 Job 33. 30;

into *the light*, i.e. *public* אור Zeph 3. 5 Job 28. 11 עינים Gn 20. 16,
 38. 21;

simply *a day* נהאר;

the light of a torch בה Job 12. 5, lamp אור Jer 25. 10, fire אור
 Ps 78. 14 אור Jes 50. 11, etc. עין Ez 1. 4;

fire אור Jes 44. 16 יר Dan 3. 27 נרא Ib 3. 26, 27, נאר;

τὰ δῶα the *illuminations* נוספת Ex 13. 16 הנהר Jes 31. 9;

the light of the eyes אור Ps 38. 11 מאור Prv 15. 30;

pl., *idea eyes* עינים Gn 49. 12 עינן; *idea* sg. עין Ex 21. 24 עין;

window חור Cant 5. 4;

opening חור IIR 12. 10 חר Jes 11. 8 באורה Jes 11. 8 נער נערه جحر;

light as a metaphor for deliverance אורה Esth 8. 16, happiness עין

זי 33. 28, glory פאה Neh 9. 22;

of God אור Job 24. 13;

with reference to *illumination* of mind נהירו Dan 5. 11.

The homologies לִי, לִי, לִי/פָאָס (*light*) are tested and found to be sound by the homologies נֹר/פָאָס (*light*) and נָר/פָאָס (*fire*).

Again, the homologies הַנֹּר, אֶנְרָר/פָאָס (*light*) and הַנִּרְרָר/פָאָס (*illumination of mind*) are tested and found to be sound by the homology נְהָר/פָאָס (*a day*).

Similarly, the homologies נֹר, אֶנְרָר/פָאָס (*fire*) are tested and found to be sound by the homologies נֹר/פָאָס (*light*) and נָר/פָאָס (*fire*).

Also the homologies הַנֹּר, הַנִּרְרָר and הַנִּרְרָר are tested and found to be sound by their fellow homologues جحر and ثغر—although they do not tally with each other in sound—because the differences between them are accounted for. Thus, the ج in جحر, and the ث in ثغر, stand for the φ which drops from הַנֹּר, הַנִּרְרָר and הַנִּרְרָר; while the غ in ثغر—like the ה in הַנֹּר, הַנִּרְרָר and הַנִּרְרָר, and the ح in جحر—interchanges with the internal vowel as a guttural.

Note that the initial ל or נ in the homologues is the Middle Voice ל and נ; and that the initial מ in מֶאֱרָר, מֶאֱרָר, and מֶאֱרָר is not a prefix but a substitute for φ, the aspirate of =.

B. στέλλω, ἀπο-, ἐξαπο-, ἀποστολή, etc.

στέλλω, *make ready, prepare* أَعَدَّ;

dispatch, send שְׁלַח Gn 42. 4, 45. 23 ح-;

journey سَفَر;

repress صَدَّ;

draw in شَدَّ.

ἀποστέλλω, *send off or away from* שְׁלַח Gn 3. 23, 25. 6 Ex 12. 33 Nu 5. 2

Dt 24. 1 IS 20. 13 שְׁלַח Gn 44. 3;

send away שְׁלַח Ex 3. 20, 4. 23;

banish שְׁלַח Jud 1. 25 Ob 7;

go away, depart سَافَرَ;

dispatch on some mission or service; freq. of messengers or forces

שְׁלַח Dt 28. 48 IIR 24. 2 Jes 57. 9 Joel 2. 25 IICh 32. 31 שְׁלַח

Ob 1 Prv 17. 11 שְׁלַח Lev 26. 22 IIR 15. 37;

put off, doff شَلَحَ.

ἐξαποστέλλω, *dispatch* שְׁלַח Gn 8. 7-8, 10, 38. 17 IS 5. 11, 6. 8

Neh 8. 12;

send forth שְׁלַח Ex 8. 28 Jud 12. 9;

- send away, dismiss, e.g. prisoner, פִּלְשׁוֹ Ex 21. 26 Dt 15. 12, 21. 14
 IR 20. 42 Jes 58. 6 Jer 34. 9, 50. 33 Zach 9. 11 Job 39. 5;
 divorce פִּלְשׁוֹ Dt 22. 19, 24. 4 Jes 50. 1 Jer 3. 1 Mal 2. 16 פִּלְשׁוֹ
 Jes 50. 1 طَلَّقَ سَرَحَ;
 discharge a projectile פִּלְשׁוֹ Ez 5. 16 أَطْلَقَ;
 destroy פִּלְשׁוֹ Jes 27. 10.
- ἀποστολή, ἡ, sending off or away פִּלְשׁוֹ Ex 18. 2;
 as a parting gift פִּלְשׁוֹ IR 9. 16 פִּלְשׁוֹ Cant 4. 13;
 dispatching פִּלְשׁוֹ Esth 9. 19;
 expedition פִּלְשׁוֹ Ps 78. 49.
- στήλη, ἡ, prop or buttress to a wall פִּלְשׁוֹ Ez 41. 6 عِضَانَةٌ;
 block or slab used as a memorial, monument inscribed with record
 of victories, dedications, votes of thanks, treaties, laws, decrees,
 etc. לֹהֵ Ex 24. 12 Dt 9. 9 Jes 30. 8.
- ἀπόστολος, ὁ, dispatching, of envoys פִּלְשׁוֹ Ps 78. 49 Eccl 8. 8.
 στολή, ἡ, armament עָרִי Ex 33. 4 פִּלְשׁוֹ Neh 4. 11 IICh 32. 5 سَلَاح;
 equipment in clothes, raiment, garment, robe, full dress פִּלְשׁוֹ Job 38. 9
 עָרִי Jes 49. 18.
- στολίξω, dress חָלַק Ez 16. 4 פִּלְשׁוֹ Ez 16. 4; cf. χυσιδάξω;
 deck, adorn עָדָה, חָלַק Ez 16. 11, 13. Cf. ἐνδύω.
- στολίσ, ἡ, garment, robe פִּלְשׁוֹ Job 38. 9 شَال حَتَّةَ; pl., folds in a woman's
 robe פִּלְשׁוֹ Ex 28. 33 Jes 6. 1 Jer 13. 22 Thr 1. 9.
- στόλισις, ἡ, dressing פִּלְשׁוֹ Ez 30. 21.
- στόλος, ὁ, gen. λου, expedition פִּלְשׁוֹ Jes 7. 4;
 generally, journey or (oftener) voyage سفر;
 vestment פִּלְשׁוֹ Job 38. 9 حَتَّةَ;
 equipment עָרִי Ps 32. 9;
 army פִּלְשׁוֹ Jes 7. 4 חֵייל Nu 31. 14 IIR 6. 15 Joel 2. 25;
 armament פִּלְשׁוֹ IIS 22. 40; cf. σπλον;
 sea force, fleet פִּלְשׁוֹ Zach 9. 4 צִיָּר Jes 33. 21 צִיָּר Ib 18. 2 أُصُول;
 generally, party, band, troop, pl., פִּלְשׁוֹ Jes 16. 8;
 the people פִּלְשׁוֹ Ob 20; cf. ὄχλος;
 stump of the tail, in animals פִּלְשׁוֹ Dt 26. 13 ذَيْبِل ذَنْبِ جَذَل;
 = πάσσαλος (peg, pale, stake) צִיָּר Prv 26. 14; spurious, cf. θαιρός.

The homologue פִּלְשׁוֹ is tested and found to be sound by its fellow homologue سَرَحَ—although they do not tally with each other—because the sound-differences between them are slight and can easily be accounted for. Thus—as with פִּלְשׁוֹ—one of the