CHAPTER 42
The Evidence of Language

Convincing evidence for the influence of Iberi tribes upon Europe is found in language, in the words we use from day to day.

Literally thousands of modern English words have cognates in Hebrew roots. I shall spend the next few chapters showing this evidence.

It is utterly incomprehensible to me that these linguistic ties have not been explored by modern scholars. Some of the roots are so apparent it is impossible that someone, somewhere did not notice. I can only grasp this failure by the principle that God simply did not want us to know. We so deluded ourselves with intellectual and academic arrogance, and with assumptions about godless planetary history, we were unable to come to grips with our social and spiritual past.

My sources in the following presentations are too numerous to list. Some of the more important are:

1. *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance.* I shall give his dictionary numbers for convenience of reference.

2. *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, by Brown, Driver and Briggs.

3. *201 Hebrew Verbs*, fully conjugated in all the forms, by Abraham S. Halkin.

4. *Modern Hebrew Grammar and Composition* by Harry Blumberg.

5. *The Oxford English Dictionary.*

6. *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology.*

7. *The Indo-European and Semitic Languages*, by Saul Levin.

Saul Levin gave us a most profound, and complex, analysis of relationships between Semitic Hebrew and the Indo-European Sanskrit and Greek, comprising more than 700 pages of text filled with appropriate symbology. Because his work was motivated to find original common sources, he takes us back beyond the influence of the Iberi tribes in Europe. However, this goal blinded him to more practical understanding of the Hebrew linguistic influence which later came into Greek.

Another unfortunate aspect of Levin's work is its high level of erudition. He exhausts exhaustion to demonstrate his many theses. This minute detail, in every possible aspect of sound and inflection, probably was motivated by recognition of the strenuous objections and total disbelief he would receive from his fellow linguists. In spite of these difficulties he has some truly significant observations. In a section on the *Genesis of the Indo-European and Semitic Languages* he offers thoughts and conclusions derived from his work.

1. In the correspondences between Semitic Hebrew on the one hand, and Indo-European Greek and Sanskrit on the other, he states that *such correspondences could not have originated independently and without contact*. Somewhere deep in the past there was a time when both groups of languages shared a common influence, or one had a deep impact upon the other.

2. In his discussion on morphology, he remarks that *"The features common to Hebrew and Sanskrit but not Greek concern mainly the verb and also seem primeval to me . . ."* This shows an awareness of an origin in the remote past which came down into both languages. *"On the other hand, Greek but not Sanskrit shares with Hebrew some striking nominal formations which look less archaic."* In this sense Levin recognizes two different influences, one very old, and the other more recent that is represented by vocabulary. His studies support the very ancient common Semitic place name phenomenon derived from that original *lingua franca*, but evidenced in Sanskrit verb comparisons. This shows a morphological relationship among very ancient languages that goes beyond mere vocabulary. The more recent influence from migrating Iberi tribes is shown more by vocabulary and not as much by morphology. As he states, *"All this tends to prove, although not conclusively, that they came into Greek by borrowing."* Unfortunately, Levin then misses the cultural process when he says *"So my present theory concerning those parts of Greek morphology derives them from a Semitic source, in an early period when the forerunner of Greek still had a structure flexible enough, though prevalently I-E, to fit these Semitic features in."* As a linguist he became too linguistic. He does not envision the possibility of a noble elite contributing to the every day language of a foreign culture which accepted them because of their superior blood.

3. He then returns to that most ancient of linguistic origins when he states:*"But the rest of the morphology which cuts across the IE-Semitic line seems not to have been grafted on, either to Greek or Sanskrit or Hebrew, but rather to a heritage from the earliest stage than any research into the pre-history of language can discern."*

4. In a section on the semitization of Hebrew he struggles with the strange differences between Hebrew and the other Semitic languages. *"The phonetic and morphological resemblances of Hebrew to Greek or Sanskrit make Hebrew*(and north Semitic) *an aberrant Semitic language." ". . . by far the greater part of the vocabulary and morphology common to the Semitic languages appears in Hebrew actualized with a phonology nearly IE in many respects. I cannot conceive how Hebrew could have borrowed those IE traits after it had assumed a definitely Semitic character."* Although one might believe other Semitic languages display the original morphological structure, Levin did not consider the possibility that the reverse may be true. The other Semitic tongues may have evolved from a common branch to attain their "Semitic character," whereas Hebrew retained more of the morphological structure and phonology of the original Semitic. The IE languages are patterned after that more original structure, to provide the similarities Levin discovered.

5. This same phenomenon of similarity of phonology and morphology between two languages was noted by Kenneth Jackson in his *Language and History of Early Britain*. He stated that *"On the whole, the phonetic and morphological systems of Latin and English were unusually similar to one another. Consequently it was easy for Britons to adopt Latin words into their speech with very little change."* Jackson then goes on to compare modern French and English, and the great difference in phonology between the two, not considering the possibility that the ancient tongues

more nearly resembled one another, while the great differences among tongues today is a recent development from cultural isolation and loss of linguistic interaction.

　　6. Levin goes on to comment on the differences between the "southern" Semitic tongues and the "northern." According to prevalent linguistic views Arabic most resembles the proto-Semitic tongue. "*Arabic therefore affords little basis for a convincing comparison with the IE languages.*" He continues with the thought that Semitic linguists have cut themselves off from comparisons with IE simply because they see all Semitic tongues as deriving from that proto-Semitic without other influences. "*The purpose of this book, as I conceive it, is to bring out how Hebrew and Aramaic (but especially Hebrew) have, besides the Semitic heritage which they share with Arabic, another heritage that links them to the IE languages.*"

　　7. Again, Levin seeks to find a common "evolutionary" origin in both language groups, with no acknowledgement of the later Hebrew influence which impacted so heavily upon the European languages. "*Conceivably, still further back there lay some common origin — proto-"Nostratic," out of which proto-IE and proto-Hamitic-Semitic emerged. . . . the question remains in suspense whether any definable features . . . go back to a primeval speech-community existing before the very inception of a distinction between IE and Hamito-Semitic.*"He then makes a curiously unsuitable remark. "*The vocabulary seems altogether unfitted to prove any such thing; for the best-founded etymologies (like horn and earth) can establish, at the most, that certain words spread very early . . .*" By his theoretical focus on evolution from the primitive he prevents himself from recognizing the tremendous wealth of cognates now present in European languages. Like all other modern scholars, he prevents himself from thus discerning a process of cultural sifting which is startling. He demonstrates that modern scholarship is not objective. It has a paradigm, a scheme which it attempts to preserve, only to lose sight of the larger world reality.

　　8. Levin goes on to propose that the Hebrew verb root system was originally biconsonantal rather than triconsonantal. This view again is conditioned by that ever-present belief that languages evolved, along with human kind, from primitive origins, not considering that Hebrew may be descended from an intelligently structured language.

　　 Many Hebrew scholars have noted the curious structure of the verb root system. I shall now illustrate this to demonstrate that Hebrew is descended from a proto-Semitic language which was intelligently planned. I am unaware that any persons have attempted a rigorous analysis. What follows is my attempt to show this intelligent structure.

　　To avoid contamination of my work from modern Hebrew I use biblical sources exclusively except where etymologies provide undoubted ancient origins.

　　I use the following abbreviations:

　　Am = Aramaic
　　Ar = Arabic
　　Ak = Akkadian
　　As = Assyrian

　　I shall begin with an arbitrary selection from a group of verbs beginning with

"n" and with a second phoneme represented by the Hebrew *wav.* In modern notation we might represent this by "u." I use the double "o" to indicate the English vocalization.

Strong's Number	English Vocalization	Definition: Strong & B-D-B	English Cognate Definition from OED
5106	noo	to forbid, dissuade, restrain, frustrate	no – proposed reduction from *none,* in turn derived from OE *ne + an,* = no (nay) + one.
5110	nood	to nod, waver, move to and fro, flutter Am: shake, be disturbed, agitated	nod**
5120	noot	to quake, dangle, shake	
5127	noos	to flit, vanish, to flee, escape Am: move to and fro.	
5128	noo'ah	to waver, quiver, tremble	
5130	noof	to move to and fro, wave (the hand) be sprinkle	
5132	noots	to flash, fly away, to blossom	
5136	noosh	to be sick, distressed	

**"Of obscure origin: no equivalent form with the same sense is found in any of the cognate languages. Connection with MHG *notten* 'to move about, shake' is doubtful."

It is curious to note the proposed etymology for no. In somewhat circular fashion OED derives it from none, which came from the two words no + one. In the older Teutonic languages this form was pronounced with a sharp vowel, as in "nay"

and German "nein." Obviously, the exact origin of no is uncertain. But the modern English comparison with the ancient Hebrew word is vivid.

The seeming reversion of modern English phonetics to ancient Hebrew pronunciation is found time and again.

OED also has difficulty explaining nod. The Middle High German "to move about, shake" is exactly the sense of the ancient Hebrew word.

In this list I did not attempt to be exhaustive. Nor did I offer evidence of several other words which could have been fit into the framework, but which would have involved extended discussion. For example, Hebrew noor (5135) = "to shine," Ar: "give light," is related to 'or (215) = "to be luminous," "to become light," "to shine." The list is merely used to illustrate.

The common concept behind the words ending in "d," "t," "s," "ayin," and "ph," is vibratory motion. This, in turn, is related to a higher concept, that of transience, seen in 5132, or even 5136. This is also seen in 5106 and (not included in the tabulation) 5107 noob = "to germinate," hence "to flourish," or "bear fruit."

If we refer to *Roget's International Thesaurus*, and changeableness, Section 141, we get the impression that these words did not evolve in random sound from mere common use, but that they were somehow designed into a larger structure of relationship between sound and meaning. To group them in this manner strongly suggests a living personality laid out a grand system, and then intelligently categorized into this pattern.

This idea can be expanded into all middle phoneme *wav* words. What of those beginning with "aleph," "b," or "g," and so on?

Consider moo_ words.

4127 moog To melt, to disappear
4128 mood To shake, stretch
4131 moot To totter, to slip, to fall**(1)**
4134 mook To become thin, impoverished
4135 mool To curtail, cut-off
4160 moots To press, chaff, to oppress
4167 mooq To corrupt, deride, mock**(2)**
4171 moor To dispose, alter
4185 moosh To withdraw, remove, depart
4191 mooth To die, murder**(3)**

Again, there is a strong relationship among these verbs. All denote unpleasant action in moving to a weaker, poorer, or final state of being. These range from melting away, to slipping, to becoming thin, to being cut-off, to being oppressed, to being corrupted, to being disposed or altered, to being withdrawn or removed, and to death.

English cognates are noted by the bold numbers.

(1) The English *moat* denotes a deep and wide ditch surrounding a castle or other place of fortification, usually filled with water. The form *mote* is now obsolete, but meant a hillock, mound, or castle-hill. The word is found in Spanish, Portuguese, Old French, Medieval Latin where it meant terrace, embankment, rampart or dam. OED states: "*The Italian motta = landslip and mota = mud are commonly cited as cognates but this is doubtful.*" "*The Roman word is commonly supposed to be of*

Teutonic origin; compare MG mot = moor, bog or HG mott = peaty soil." The word mud is found in the German languages where it means *bog, bog-earth, or peat*. All of these forms could easily have derived from the danger one faces in such environments from tottering, slipping, or falling, the Hebrew meaning, and found in the Italian *landslip*.

(2) The English *mock* means to deride or jeer, identical in sense to the Hebrew. OED offers no clear origin. Some scholars speculate it may come through OF *mocqer* from Latin *muccare* = "to wipe the nose." Others suggest it may come from the German *mucksen* = "to growl or grumble." Of course, either route would show a relationship in "mock sound."

(3) The English word *murder* has a much clearer linguistic path than the previous two examples. Cognates are found in the IE Sanskrit*mur*= "to die," *morti* = "death" and *marta* = "mortal," Greek *mortos*, whence English *mortal*, Latin *morti* = "to die," with *mors*= "death," Lithuanian *murti* = "to die," and Irish *marth* = "dead." Old English used the "t" and "th" forms (*morthor*) which evolved to the modern English "d." Gothic and Old Teutonic had *maurthr* and *murthro*. This is an example of a word that cuts across IE and Semitic lines, with origins deep in the past. It may have come into the European languages prior to the Hebrew Iberi influence. Next consider zoo_ words:

2100 zoob = To flow, gush, overflow
2102 zood = To boil up, seethe
2123 zooz = To be abundant, fullness
2107 zook = To shake out, scatter profusely
2109 zoon = To be plump, feed copiously
2111 zoo'ah = To tremble, to shake off
2114 zoor = To turn aside, to refuse friendship, be a stranger

These examples show a relationship among the verbs with the sense of a copious amount or abundance in the actions.

Although this study could be extended into tabulation of all the verb phonetic combinations, such research requires major commitment of time and energy, and perhaps would not significantly add to the thesis that an intelligent structure underlies the Hebrew verb root system. It certainly is a fruitful area of study, and might reveal how much Hebrew had deteriorated by the time it came into historical record, and also perhaps something of the pattern of the mind which devised the original sound relationships.

For example, many of the initial phonemes, such as *ab* = "father,"*akh*= "brother," *zeh* = "this, that," and so on are used for the most basic human relationships, and for pronouns, conjunctions, prepositions, and so on.