

Ireneusz KIDA

University of Silesia, Institute of Linguistics

e-mail: ireneusz.kida@us.edu.pl

**DIVINE INTERFERENCE INTO LANGUAGE TRIPLET CODE
AS A NEW PERSPECTIVE
ON THE MYSTERIOUS CONFUSION AT BABEL**

Abstract: This paper proposes a possible scenario, a novel one as far as is believed, which might have taken place at Babel in the land of Shin'ar, Lower Mesopotamia, where a major language change occurred, here referred to as the Confusion. The correlation of the structure of Semitic languages with the genetic code of organic matter, including that of human organisms, may give new insights into what might have happened at Babel and in its aftermath. Not only may it provide a key to understanding language split, change and its subsequent development and differentiation but also to the nature of the very original language itself and its divinity. The paper has an interdisciplinary character, as it includes elements of historical linguistics, biology, chemistry, archaeology and anthropology, though with strong theological (creationist) undertones. The notion of the triplet code will particularly be in the spotlight here.

Key words: language change; genetic and linguistic code; triplet radicals; Babel; God; confusion of languages

Introduction

There is a great deal of speculation going on around the biblical Confusion of languages and a number of scenarios have already been propounded by scholars, as they do not exactly know what really happened at Babel.¹ Burridge (2015) observes that although we are not told in the Bible by what mechanisms God broke up the unity of languages and people, scholars have distinguished two versions of what might have happened at Babel: either 1) God miraculously and suddenly caused people to speak with different languages making them scatter to

¹ See: Oaks (1991; 2015); Drescher (2010); Hiebert (2007); Seely (2001); Plaut (1981); McWhorter (2003); Taylor (1983; 1997); Dugdale (2016); Kramer (1968); Day (2014); Koutoupis (2014).

and settle in different places, or 2) God caused them to scatter to other places in which different languages then developed in order to hinder them from easily working together again. He also says that the events at Babel seem to be the origin of language diversity but it is not determined by the text of the Scripture taken by itself whether it happened suddenly or developed because of the isolation and scattering which God brought about. Nevertheless, he continues, philologists have traced similarities in ancient writings which indicate that the current wide variety of languages seems to have diversified over long periods of time. Oaks (2015) confirms the above mentioned bi-directionality in the research concerning the Confusion. He additionally says that “[t]he biblical account of the Tower of Babel constitutes one of the most well-known explanations for the diversification of the world’s languages. Among language historians and academics, however, this account is seldom taken seriously. [...] But although many scholars reject the historicity of the account and relegate it to myth or legend status, they should recognize that it is in their own interest to examine carefully such “myths” because of the information those accounts could reveal about actual events” (Oaks 2015: 42).

Bearing in mind the last observation, hereby we intend to contribute to the broader problem by proposing that the events at Babel should rather be associated with a mysterious divine interference into the Semitic-like triplet code underlying the uniform language spoken then – most likely identical with the original language spoken by the first man. That the original language, used at least until Babel, was based on a triplet code is supported by the inherited-from-Shem Semitic languages, via which this code can be accessed, as they seem to be the most faithful reflection of the original language uninterruptedly continued from the beginnings of humanity, and later confounded at Babel.² Since Semitic languages rely on triplets, just like any organic matter does, it can be said that also genetics speaks in favour of the original language being based on a triplet code. Thus genetics indirectly speaks also in favour of the divinity of the original language, just as it does directly about the divinity of the design of organic matter – if the latter, having been designed by God, relies on triplets, then also the former could have been designed by God as it relies on triplets. It is probably not a coincidence that the two fundamental aspects of the human being, namely language and genetic body structure, should rely on triplets – the number three is generally considered as (Triune) God’s number and thus anything based on it, especially when it concerns the principle of creation, may be a particular manifestation of His thought and idea. Although there are numerous studies focusing on genetic relationship among

² It should be noted that we by no means claim that Hebrew, for example, was the original language, as has been suggested on multiple occasions (see Sullivan 2013 for a recapitulation of such claims), though it, similar to other Semitic languages like Classical Arabic, does hide some important clues and implications regarding what this language might have looked like.

groups of people and the languages they use, as well as on analogies between genetic and linguistic phenomena,³ to the best of our knowledge the similarity between the structure of Semitic languages and the genetic code of organic matter has not yet been used to explain the linguistic events that took place at Babel, neither has it been proposed that this correlation may have anything to do with the original language, as well as with the possibility of its being divine. We believe that this correlation may not only help better understand what might have happened at Babel, but also give new insights into what the original language might have looked like and how it subsequently might have split and developed.

Possible continuity of the original language until Babel

The biblical Confusion of languages took place some 4,000 years ago at Babel situated in the land of Shin‘ar⁴ somewhere in Lower Mesopotamia, thus around 2,000 years after the first man Adam and 2,000 years before Christ (Pardes Lauder 2001: 39; Valkanet 2010). We can read about this event in the Book of Genesis, namely in passage 11:1–9 mentioning the construction of the Tower of Babel – the people of the earth were one at that time and they spoke only one language, which God decided to confound in order to prevent them from understanding one another and continuing the construction of the Tower.⁵ In the mentioned passage we may not only be dealing with divine interference into the basic means of communication among people, but also with strong implications for the divine origins of the first human language itself and for its continuity through the Flood and at least until Babel, the reasons for that being the following. As Burrige (2015) observes, Noah’s immediate descendants (i.e. Shem, Ham and Japheth) obviously spoke the same language in the years directly following the Flood (c. 1658 after Adam; Pardes Lauder 2001: 39). To this observation we could add that all of them happened to live in the time when the biblical Tower of Babel was being constructed, although Noah died shortly afterwards (Pardes Lauder 2001: 39). Therefore, it can be concluded that if only one language was spoken at Babel, then it must have been the same language spoken by Noah and his sons, thanks to whom humanity survived. It can further be concluded that Lamech, Noah’s father, who died shortly before the Flood,

³ Cf. Baker et al. (2017); Nasidze et al. (2008); Shanon (1978); Balanovsky et al. (2011); Duursma (2002); Steel (2000); Adamthwaite (2016); Stone and Lurquin (2005, 2007).

⁴ See Genesis 11:2.

⁵ In verse 9 of the Hebrew text there is an interesting play on words between /bā·ḅel/ ‘Babel’ and /bā·lal/ ‘confused’, ‘confounded’, ‘mixed’ (Strong 1890), from which it can be inferred that Babel actually means ‘confusion’; see Britannica at <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Tower-of-Babel> [11.02.2021].

spoke this language too. Moreover, since the Bible implies that Lamech knew Adam personally and communicated with him,⁶ then it means that he himself, Noah, Shem, Ham and Japheth actually used the language of the first man, to whom it was given by God, either via teaching or via building it in, or at least the predisposition thereof, into his brain as an integral part of the creation.⁷ It can also be inferred that this language was of divine nature and that it resembled Semitic languages, first of all in terms of structure, predominantly based on triplets, but perhaps also in terms of the linguistic material clothing it – as a matter of fact the Semitic languages we know of today already belong to the period from after the Confusion, so they have undergone certain changes, but nevertheless they derive from Shem’s language, who spoke the language of his father Noah and of his grandfather Lamech, who spoke the language of Adam, who was somehow equipped with language by God. Being the eldest son of Noah, Shem was perhaps the most likely one to have preserved his father’s language intact, as out of Noah’s offspring he lived the longest before the Confusion, though his brothers surely also spoke it, but might have been “less careful” about it, especially after the events at Babel as it seems; Shem was born 100 years before the Flood and almost 440 years before the Tower of Babel, after which he continued to live for some 160 years and then died at the age of 600 (Pardes Lauder 2001: 39). Therefore, Semitic languages may actually be the closest to the original language of the days of yore. Interestingly, Abraham too seems to have witnessed the construction of the Tower of Babel, as he was born some fifty years before it took place, and he lived for 175 years. What is important is that his life-span overlaps with that of Noah and Noah’s eldest son Shem, who continued living for some 50 years after his (i.e. Abraham’s) death, and whom he probably knew. Therefore, Abraham also must have known the very unique language spoken at the time of Babel, and perhaps it was his only language. Moreover, even Isaak and Ishmael, who were Abraham’s sons, as well as Isaak’s son Jacob, might have met with Shem, as their life-spans overlap long enough for that to have happened (Pardes Lauder 2001: 39), though we now cannot speak of a uniform language in the post-Babel period they happened to live in. The above strongly implies a continuity of the original language, starting from the time of Adam

⁶ Their life-spans overlap by some 54 years – counting from the beginning, Lamech was born in 874, whereas Adam died in 930 (Pardes Lauder 2001: 39). Moreover, the inhabited area of the earth at that time probably was small enough for people, not numerous then, to actually meet and know one another personally.

⁷ The aspect of teaching is stressed in the Qur’ān (55:3-4; 2:31), whereas the Bible seems to be suggesting that the language, or at least the predisposition thereof, was inbuilt into Adam’s brain (Gen. 2:19). Nevertheless, the Bible does not exclude the aspect of teaching either. Moreover, what follows from both the Qur’ān and the Bible is that the moment Adam and Eve were expelled from Paradise and found themselves on earth, they already spoke a language, which was divine by definition, as it was used for communication between them and God prior to that.

until at least the Confusion at Babel, the period of which involved comparatively few generations due to the long life-spans of contemporary humans, who inhabited a relatively small area and thus might have known one another personally.

Similarity between the structure of Semitic languages and the genetic code

Before we elaborate on what we think that might have happened at Babel with respect to language, we shall provide some further information, which this time concerns the general idea lying behind Semitic languages and the genetic code of organic matter, since the two are similar from the point of view of triplets and, as has already been mentioned, may be indicative of the structure of the original divine language inherited from Adam and later on confounded at Babel.

To start with, since all Semitic languages are similar both in terms of their structure and the linguistic material clothing it,⁸ we will restrict ourselves to briefly discussing the one we have the best command of, namely Classical Arabic, in order to provide a general idea of how they more or less work; this language at the same time seems to be the most illustrative of the whole problem. To start with, here are a few examples of three-consonantal roots (triplets) that are common in this language: S-L-M – expresses the notions of ‘peace’, ‘saluting’, ‘greeting’; SH-K-R – expresses the notions of ‘being grateful’, ‘thanking’; K-T-B – expresses the notions of ‘writing’, ‘a book’, ‘a desk’. Each of these radicals can occur together with vowels, both short and long, to produce numerous configurations of related meanings. The table below, in which we used the root S-L-M as an example, illustrates this problem:⁹

Table 1: Classical Arabic verb forms and their variants

Verb Form	Perfect tense; active voice	Imperfect tense; active voice	Present participle	Past participle	Verbal noun
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>
I	SaLaMa	yaSLuMu	SāLiM	maSLūM	SaLāMa
II	SaLLaMa	yuSaLLiMu	muSaLLiM	muSaLLaM	taSLiM
III	SāLaMa	yuSāLiMu	muSāLiM	muSāLaM	muSāLaMa
IV	aSLaMa	yuSLiMu	muSLiM	muSLaM	iSLāM
V	taSaLLaMa	yataSaLLaMu	mutaSaLLiM	mutaSaLLaM	taSaLLuM

⁸ See Huehnergard and Pat-El (eds.) 2019; Tomal (2000).

⁹ The table was prepared and described on the basis of Danecki and Kozłowska (1996) with the help of Arabic Learning Resources to be found at the following website: https://arabic.desert-sky.net/g_vforms.html, [03.02.2021].

1	2	3	4	5	6
VI	taSāLaMa	yataSāLaMu	mutaSāLiM	mutaSāLaM	taSāLuM
VII	inSaLaMa	yanSaLiMu	munSaLiM	munSaLaM	inSiLāM
VIII	iStaLaMa	yaStaLiMu	muStaLiM	muStaLaM	iStiLāM
IX	iSLaMMa	yaSLaMMu	muSLaMM	-----	iSLiMāM
X	istaSLaMa	yastaSLiMu	mustaSLiM	mustaSLaM	istiSLāM

Generally speaking, the individual forms of verbs express the following notions:

- I. – basic, expresses a specific concept;
- II. – built on form I, expresses causativity and intensity in relation to form I;
- III. – built on form I, has a social character in relation to form I;
- IV. – built on form I, is similar to form II and expresses causativity and intensity;
- V. – built on the 2nd form, expresses reflexivity in relation to the 2nd form and intensity in relation to the 1st form;
- VI. – built on the third form, expresses reflexivity in relation to the third form and has a social dimension;
- VII. – built on the 1st form, expresses reflexivity and passivity in relation to the 1st form;
- VIII. – built on the 1st form, expresses reflexivity in relation to the 1st form and reflexive causativity;
- IX. – built on form I, it refers to colors and expresses state or becoming;
- X. – built on the first form, it is associated with consideration, searching and asking; it has a reflexive meaning in relation to the fourth form;

Although the above table provides many options for the S-L-M root (50 for a start), and potentially for othes too, in practice the individual roots come in only a few forms, usually from three to five.

Semitic radicals can also be rearranged into various configurations (up to 6) with related meanings (from the Semitic point of view) and a good example of this phenomenon is the root K-M-L associated with ‘fullness’, which offers the following possibilities:

Table 2: Rearrangement of Semitic radicals (own work).

Root	Meaning
1. K-M-L	‘full’, ‘entire’, ‘fullness’, etc.; eg. Kamila (a female name)
2. K-L-M	‘speech’, ‘word’, etc.; eg. Kalima (one of Jesus’ names in the Quran)
3. M-L-K	‘king’, ‘angel’, ‘holy’, etc.; eg. Malaika (a female name), Malik (a male name)
4. M-K-L	‘who (is) like God?’, eg. Michael (one of God’s archangels; a male name); in Hebrew the K changes into CH.
5. L-K-M	‘food’, ‘bread’, ‘meat’, etc.; eg. Betlehem (house of meat, house of bread)
6. L-M-K	‘low’, ‘to be low’, ‘humble’, ‘humility’, etc.; eg. Lamech (the son of Enoch); in Hebrew the K changes into CH.

As regards any organic matter, including living organisms, it is made up of proteins, which in turn are made up of amino acids, the order of which is written in triplet genetic codes called codons. There are mainly 20 amino acids, each of

which is encoded with a sequence of three nucleotides. Since there are 64 possible sequences that make up the entire genetic code, in practice it means that, exactly as in the case of Semitic languages, we deal with a significant excess of information resulting from the possibility of encoding one and the same amino acid by means of a few codons. Below is a table that summarizes all the relationships between the triplet codons and the amino acids.¹⁰ They comprise the universal genetic code that practically all living organisms use for protein synthesis:

Table 3: The genetic code

	U	C	A	G
U	UUU (Phe) UUC (Phe) UUA (Leu) UUG (Leu)	UCU (Ser) UCC (Ser) UCA (Ser) UCG (Ser)	UAU (Tyr) UAC (Tyr) UAA Stop UAG Stop	UGU (Cys) UGC (Cys) UGA Stop UGG (Trp)
C	CUU (Leu) CUC (Leu) CUA (Leu) CUG (Leu)	CCU (Pro) CCC (Pro) CCA (Pro) CCG (Pro)	CAU (His) CAC (His) CAA (Gln) CAG (Gln)	CGU (Arg) CGC (Arg) CGA (Arg) CGG (Arg)
A	AUU (Ile) AUC (Ile) AUA (Ile) AUG (Met)	ACU (Thr) ACC (Thr) ACA (Thr) ACG (Thr)	AAU (Asn) AAC (Asn) AAA (Lys) AAG (Lys)	AGU (Ser) AGC (Ser) AGA (Arg) AGG (Arg)
G	GUU (Val) GUC (Val) GUA (Val) GUG (Val)	GCU (Ala) GCC (Ala) GCA (Ala) GCG (Ala)	GAU (Asp) GAC (Asp) GAA (Glu) GAG (Glu)	GGU (Gly) GGC (Gly) GGA (Gly) GGG (Gly)

The mentioned excess of information manifests itself in the possibility of encrypting individual amino acids in several ways. For example, arginine (Arg) has 6 codons, serine (Ser) has 6 codons, and glutamine (Gln) has 2 codons. It is interesting to note by the way that there are claims that the number of amino acids strictly corresponds to the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet (see for example Cohanim 2021; Wade 2007; Bluementhal 1978).

The existence of triplets in the most fundamental aspect of the human being, i.e. the genetic structure of the body and the structure of the language, may actually be indicative of the presence of the Divine Hand in them, as the convergence

¹⁰ It is a modified and simplified table that can be found at: <https://www.khanacademy.org/science/ap-biology/> [04.02.2021]. Some of the content used for the description of the genetic code and the table also comes from this website. For more information on this issue see also: Britannica; <https://www.britannica.com/science/genetic-code> [04.02.2021].

between biology and language in terms of number three probably is not due to a mere coincidence. The whole system based on triplets looks as if it were “pre-fabricated” and constructed *a priori* by Somebody else, and it is rather unlikely that in the case of language it sprang naturally as a product of human intellect, not to speak of the genetic code of living organisms, which obviously cannot result from this intellect. In language, this system seems to have been maintained until the events at Babel, where it suddenly experienced a major impact – the Confusion.

Yet another possible scenario at Babel and in the aftermath

It can theoretically be assumed that at Babel it was enough for God, or His angels, to miraculously confuse, either externally¹¹ or internally,¹² the order of consonants constituting the Semitic-like triplet word-roots of the original language, or to shorten these roots, or to mix them with other ones, or to do something else to them that would seriously disrupt the so-far successful maintenance of the rather complicated abstract linguistic system inherited from the most distant past. The uninterrupted continuity of the original language until the time of Babel was secured not only because in the intermediate period there were few generations but first of all because there was actually no contact between this language and other languages, as they did not exist. The divine interference at Babel led to a sudden disruption of the so-far uniform language, which, after a time, made it impossible, or hardly possible, to further maintain and use it as a universal means of communication among the highly cooperative people at Babel. It eventually led to a slowing down of the project of the Tower first and then to its complete halt and abandonment. Subsequently, the mentioned interference triggered unprecedented language diversification, which combined with a gradual growth in population, naturally caused people to scatter to other parts of the world – it can be imagined that increasing distance and loss of contact among them contributed to further diversification, not only linguistic but also cultural, religious, economic, social, political, etc.

What the Confusion exactly constituted remains a mystery and it may be impossible to crack it fully, nonetheless we are quite convinced it somehow must have been about the linguistic code, whose tangible aspects, or rather the very abstract idea of it, are still predominantly continued in Semitic languages, inherited from Shem, and less so in Indo-European ones. Moreover, we may be pretty sure that the new dialects emerging after Babel followed different paths of development,

¹¹ The angels might have become a part of the contemporary society in order to deliberately confuse (certain) people about the language, for example by speaking it differently.

¹² God might have influenced somehow the minds of (certain) contemporary people, which resulted in a general confusion of the existing Semitic-like linguistic code.

including an entire loss of both the original linguistic material and the very idea of the underlying abstract triplet-based code. Therefore, in the case of some languages a sudden major deterioration of the system might have happened which subsequently needed to be (re-)built as if from scratch, of course naturally, in order for communication to continue. Moreover, upon a closer investigation of Semitic languages, one will notice that they have a great potential for the development of any type of language based on their foundation – as a matter of fact this potential exists in any other highly inflecting language, but in our opinion Semitic languages seem to be particularly predisposed for that. Thus following the Confusion at Babel, some languages, emerging from the original Semitic-like language, which was very rich in inflexions, became predominantly isolating, some tonal, some agglutinative, some polysynthetic and some continued to be inflecting, and some become of yet another type, but of course time was needed for that. As can be imagined, this process might have entailed a reliance, conscious or subconscious, on onomatopoeias, iconicity and sound symbolism. In all this, we could actually talk of language devolution across time, whereby languages would develop from more advanced to less advanced states and not the other way round.

As regards the Indo-European languages, also referred to as Japhetic, after Hamitic they seem to be the closest to the Semitic branch in terms of both the physical linguistic material and the abstract idea of the code. The events at Babel might actually mark the beginnings of Proto-Indo-European, whose precise point is not exactly known but it is likely that it dates to some 2000 BC – 3000 BC or so, similar to Proto-Hamito-Semitic¹³. In other words, the beginnings of the two may more or less coincide with the time of the Confusion at Babel, marking among other events the split of the original language into Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Hamito-Semitic, which by the way are the oldest attested languages of the world – the Mesopotamian centre of writing on which they predominantly rely is the oldest one too and only afterwards there follow the two other independent centres, namely Chinese and Mesoamerican.¹⁴ Thus in the case of both subgroups, but especially in the Semitic branch, we may actually be dealing with pretty much the original divine linguistic material, or at least with the very primitive divine abstract idea of the code underlying it – these might have even been inherited from the time of Adam, who appeared on earth before 4,000 BC at the latest.¹⁵ In the remaining world subgroups (i.e. families) of languages, around 30 in number, the continuation of the original material, and even of the very idea of the code, is not that obvious, although the implications are that these formerly partially existed there too, at least for some time after the Confusion. In Indo-European, although after Hamitic languages they are the closest to the Semitic

¹³ See Huehnergard and Pat-El (eds.) 2019; Duursma (2002).

¹⁴ See Omniglot at: <https://omniglot.com/writing/protosinaitc.htm> [11.02.2021].

¹⁵ Valkanet 2010. *Bible Timeline*; <https://biblehub.com/timeline/> [10.02.2021].

branch, the mentioned idea of the code has significantly been disrupted too. It is still possible to identify quite a number of common triplets in them,¹⁶ if not entire then partial ones, which in certain cases might still be clothed with the very original linguistic material, though oftentimes eroded and altered by merciless *a posteriori* changes, and thus disguised, but as to the remaining groups of languages, the challenge increases immensely in this respect¹⁷ – all this may have important implications for general language reconstruction, which could be based on the identification of triples, or parts of them, in world languages. Out of Indo-European, Germanic languages seem to be of particular interest, as some continuation of its “divine” past in terms of the triplet code is still evident in their ablaut, especially in the area of the verb; examples of ablaut can be found in many Indo-European languages, not necessarily in the area of the verb (Lotspeich 1917; Kloekhorst 2011, 2013; Kortlandt 1983; Schindler 1975a, 1975b; Pulleyblank 1965; Kroonen 2009).

Conclusion

The Confusion triggered such language differentiation that it led to misunderstandings and inabilities to successfully communicate between people. In this way new languages appeared, many of which have been continued until now. Some of them, especially Semitic, in the second place Hamitic, and in the third place Indo-European, remain the closest to the original divine language, if not in terms of the linguistic material, then at least in terms of the underlying idea of the code – they may actually be witnesses of a significant portion of the “divine” past, which seems to be not that distant. It is very likely that humans and their language in general are much younger than has been suggested by archaeology, anthropology and evolutionist theories – if homo sapiens were as old as at least 100,000 years, as is generally suggested,¹⁸ then the question is what was he doing for over 90,000 years, given that his brain-size and mental capacities thereof were like those of the modern man – serious indicators of civilisation (e.g. towns, writing, agriculture, etc.) started developing not earlier than 5,000 to 3,000 BC, the time of 8,000 BC perhaps already being their very generous limit, though the development of agriculture is said to have started around 10,000 BC at the earliest.¹⁹ Moreover, Roser and Ortiz-Ospina (2017)

¹⁶ Cf. Levin (1995).

¹⁷ Of much help here are the following: Dolgopolsky, A. (2012); Kassian, et al. (2016); Starostin (1998-2003).

¹⁸ See Janson (2002).

¹⁹ See Barbier (2011), especially chapters: The Rise of Cities (from 3000 BC to 1000 AD); cc. 84-56 and The Agricultural Transition (from 10 000 to 3000 BC); cc. 47–83. Also see Renfrew (2005).

demonstrate that 12 millenia ago the world population was around 4 million,²⁰ i.e. the equivalent of half of the current population of London, and they estimate that it will reach some 11,2 billion by the year 2100, whereas according to Thomlinson (1975), some 10,000 years ago the total number of people on earth might have even been as low as 1 million. No matter what the estimates, it goes without saying that the further back in time we move, the less population there is and not too much time is required for reaching point zero. Supposing that so many people appeared within 12,000 years (from c. 4 million to nearly 8 billion now)²¹ in a relatively short span of time, it is very unlikely, or even unthinkable, that 4 million people, or so, needed as many as some 90,000 years to have emerged on Earth, not to speak of 1 million or less. And what if the data, though already acceptable, has been exaggerated? And how about if we allowed the span of 200,000, 300,000 or even 500,000 years for homo sapiens? Therefore, the Bible, according to which man is around 6,000 years old, and which in many respects more or less coincides with some of the data provided, should not be disregarded in scientific discourse, as already remarked by Oaks (2015) above. Evolutionists have been trapped by the similarity existing among different species. We think that God, like some architect, painter or sculptor, had a certain vision of the world and of the creatures living in it, hence there is a similarity among species of plants and animals, just as there is a similarity between the works of an architect, painter or sculptor. If one stacks them into a single string, a continuum, from the simplest to the most complex ones, from the least intelligent to the most intelligent ones, it will give the impression of evolution, but God actually set strict boundaries among them, although sometimes not visible. Thus the whole idea of creation existed *a priori*, just as did its Author, who nevertheless allowed that within the individual species, both of plants and animals, there exist mini-evolutions, though retractable ones, allowing them to adapt to specific climatic, geographic and social conditions. This is what we call *crea-volution*, as it offers a compromise between evolutionists and creationists. Nevertheless, we understand and accept that certain exaggerated datings, evolutionary and anthropological ideas and so on have been based on atheism and do not take the Bible seriously, and even attempt to discredit it, whereas in fact it hides the answers to many questions and solutions to unresolved problems, as well as being confirmed by “common-sense” science. Evolution may actually concern only God’s thought and not the living organisms, which were introduced independently, without having to evolve from one another.

And yet a final reflection. Judging by the way Semitic languages are constructed, perhaps the Biblical Tower of Babel is nothing else than a mere metaphor for the inherited-from-Adam original divine Semitic-like language itself that was divinely

²⁰ McEvedy and Jones (1980) similarly say at that time it amounted to 4 million.

²¹ See: <https://www.worldometers.info/world-population/> [13.02.2021].

confounded – as a matter of fact their structure resembles that of a tower, since their different verb forms for example are built one upon another as if they were a tower. This would bring us on a different level in the discussion of the problem in question which is perhaps worthy of the attentions of a separate paper.

References

- Adamthwaite, Murray R. (2016) “Languages of the post-Deluvian World.” *Journal of Creation*. Vol. 30(1), April; 112–121.
- Baker, Jennifer L., Rotimi Charles N. and Shriner Daniel (2017) “Human ancestry correlates with language and reveals that race is not an objective genomic classifier.” *Scientific Reports* [online:] <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5431528/>, [11.12.2021].
- Balanovsky, Oleg et al. (2011) “Parallel evolution of Genes and Languages in the Caucasus Region.” *Europe PMC Funders Group. Mol Biol Evol*; 2905–2920, [online:] <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3355373/> [12.02.2021].
- Barbier, Edward B. (2011) *Security and Frontiers. How Economies Have Developed Through Natural Resource Exploitation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Blumenthal, David R. (1978) *Understanding Jewish Mysticism: A Source Reader*. New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc.
- Burridge, Bob (2015) “What really happened at Babel?” *Genevan Institute for Reformed Studies* [online:] <http://genevaninstitute.org/articles/what-really-happened-at-babel/> [09.02.2021].
- Cohanim, Amir B. (2021) “God Code. Amino-acid to Hebrew letters conversion.” [online:] https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Amino-acid-to-Hebrew-letters-conversion-This-was-used-to-translate-the-SVB-DNA_tbl1_348416037, [11.12.2021].
- Danecki, Janusz, Kozłowska Jolanta (1996) *Słownik arabsko-polski*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.
- Day, John (2014) “From Creation to Babel: Studies in Genesis 1–11.” Bloomsbury Publishing; 179–180.
- Dresher, Elan B. (2010) “The tower of Babel.” *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics*. Vol. 32; 1–4.
- Dolgopolsky, Aharon (2012) *Nostratic Dictionary*. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research. [online:] <https://www.repository.cam.ac.uk/handle/1810/244080>, [18.02.2021].
- Dugdale, Kyle (2016) “Babel’s Present.” *Standpunkte Dokumente No. 5.*, Basel.
- Duursma, Klaas-Jan (2002) “The Tower of Babel account affirmed by linguistics.” *Journal of Creation*. Vol. 16(3) December; 27–31.
- Hiebert, Theodore (2007) “The tower of Babel and the origin of the world’s cultures.” *Journal of Biblical Literature*. Vol. 126 (1); 29–58.
- Huehnergard John, Pat-El N. (eds.) (2019) *The Semitic Languages*. London and New York: Routledge Language Family Series.
- Janson, Tore (2002) *Speak a short history of languages*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kassian Alexwi, Starostin George, Zhivlov Mikhail (2016) “The “Nostratic” roots of Indo-European: from Illich-Svitych to Dolgopolsky to future horizons.” *Slovo a slovesnost*. Vol. 77. Moscow. [online:] https://www.academia.edu/30579032/The_Nostratic_roots_of_Indo_European_from_Illich_Svitych_to_Dolgopolsky_to_future_horizons_2016_, [18.02.2021]
- Kloekhorst, Alwin (2011) “Nominal ablaut patterns in Anatolian and Proto-Indo-European.” *Arbeitsung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft. Das Nomen im Indogermanischen. Erlagen*. Vol. 14–16; 1–12.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin (2013) “Indo-European nominal ablaut patterns: the Anatolian evidence.” [In:] Götz Keydana, Paul Widmer, Thomas Olander (eds.) *Indo-European Accent and Ablaut*. Copenhagen; 107–128.

- Kortlandt, Frederik (1983) "Proto-Indo-European verbal syntax." *Journal of Indo-European Studies*. Vol. 11; 307–324.
- Koutoupis, Petros (2014) "Gateway to the Heavens: The Assyrian Account to the Tower of Babel." *Ancient Origins*; [online:] [https://www.ancient-origins.net/myths-legends-asia/gateway-heavens-assyrian-account-tower-babel-001751?utm_ =](https://www.ancient-origins.net/myths-legends-asia/gateway-heavens-assyrian-account-tower-babel-001751?utm_=)
- Kroonen, Guus J. (2009) *Consonant and vowel gradation in the Proto-Germanic n-stems; Doctoral Dissertation*; [online:] <https://scholarlypublications.universiteitleiden.nl/access/item%3A2933146/view> [13.02.2021].
- Kramer, Samuel N. (1968) "The 'Babel of Tongues': A Sumerian Version." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*. Vol. 88(1); 108–111.
- Lehmann, Winfred P. (2007) "A Grammar of Proto-Germanic." [In:] Jonathan Slocum (ed.), University of Texas at Austin.
- Levin, Saul (1995) *Semitic and Indo-European. The Principal Etymologies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lotspeich C.M. (1917) "A Theory of Ablaut." *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*. Vol. 16, No. 2; 173–186.
- McEvedy, Colin, Jones Richard (1980) *Atlas of World Population History*. Penguin Books.
- McWhorter, John (2003) *The Power of Babel: a Natural History of Language*. Harper Perennial.
- Nasidze, Ivan et al. (2008) "Close genetic relationship between Semitic-speaking and Indo-European-speaking groups in Iran." [online:] National Library of Medicine; <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18205892/> [04.02.2021]
- Oaks, Dallin D. (1991) "The tower of Babel Reexamined." *Deseret Language and Linguistic Society*; [online:] <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/dlls/vol17/iss1/15>
- Oaks, Dallin D. (2015) "The tower of Babel account: A linguistic consideration." *Science, Religion and Culture*. Vol. 1(2); 42–60.
- Pardes Lauder (eds). (2011) *Tora*. Kraków: Stowarzyszenie Pardes.
- Plaut, Gunther W. (1981) "Babel and after: The end of prehistory." [In:] Gunther W. Plaut (ed.) *The Torah: A modern commentary*; 79–86. New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
- Pulleyblank, Edwin G. (1965) "The Indo-European Vowel System and the Qualitative Ablaut." *Word*. Vol. 21:1; 86–101.
- Romaine, Suzanne (1998) *Pidgin and Creole Languages*. London: Longman.
- Renfrew, Colin (2005) "Inception of Agriculture and Rearing in the Middle East." *Comptes Rendus Palevol*. Vol. 5(2006), *Human Paleontology and Prehistory*; 395–404.
- Roser, Max, Ortiz-Ospina Esteban (2017) "World Population Growth." [online:] http://www.go-vtgirlsekbalpur.com/Study_Materials/Geography/World_Population_Growth.pdf, [13.02.2021].
- Schindler, Jochem (1975a) "Zum Ablaut der neutralen s-Stämme des Indogermanischen." [In:] Helmut Rix (ed.) *Flexion und Wortbildung*. 259–267.
- Schindler, Jochem (1975b) "L'apophonie des thèmes indo-européens en -r/n." *Bulletin de la société de linguistique de Paris*. Vol. 70; 1–10.
- Seely, Paul. (2001) "The date of the Tower of Babel and some theological implications." *Westminster Theological Journal*. Vol. 63; 15–38.
- Shanon, Benny (1978) "The Genetic Code and Human Language." *Automaton-Theoretical Foundations of Psychology and Biology*. Part II (Nov.), Vol. 39, No. 3; 401–415.
- Starostin, Sergei (1998–2003) *Nostratic Etymology Database*, [online:] <https://starling.rinet.ru/> [18.02.2021].
- Steel, Allan K. (2000) "The development of languages is nothing like biological evolution." *Journal of Creation*. Vol. 14(2); 31–40.
- Stone, Linda, Lurquin Paul F. (2005) *A genetic and cultural odyssey: The life and work of L. Luca Cavalli-Sforza*. New York: Columbia UP.

- Stone, Linda, Lurquin Paul F. (2007) *Genes, culture, and human evolution: A synthesis*. Malden, MA; Oxford; & Victoria, Australia: Blackwell Publishing.
- Strong, James (1890) *The Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*. Cincinnati: Jennings & Graham.
- Sullivan, Charles A. (2013) "Hebrew and the first language of mankind." [online:] <https://charlesullivan.com/3965/hebrew-and-the-first-language-of-mankind/>, [18.02.2021].
- Taylor, Charles V. (1983) "What happened at Babel." *Creation*. Vol. 6(2), November; 20–23; <https://creation.com/babel-language>, [13.02.2021].
- Taylor, Charles V. (1997) "The origin of language." *Journal of Creation*. Vol. 11(1), April; 76–81.
- Thomlinson, Ralph (1975) *Demographic Problems, Controversy Over Population Control*. Dickenson Publishing Company.
- Tomal, Maciej (2000) *Język Hebrajski Biblijny*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie DIALOG.
- Valkanet, Rich (2010) *Bible Timeline*. [online:] <https://biblehub.com/timeline/>, [10.02.2021].
- Wade, David (2007) "The tetragrammaton, YHWH and YHVH." [online:] https://www.researchgate.net/publication/216766851_The_tetragrammaton_peptides_YHWH_and_YHVH

Internet resources

- Arabic Learning Resources – https://arabic.desert-sky.net/g_vforms.html, [11.12.2021].
- <https://www.etymonline.com/columns/post/imutate>, [11.02.2021].
- Britannica – <https://www.britannica.com/science/genetic-code>, [11.02.2021].
- Khan Academy – <https://www.khanacademy.org/science/ap-biology>, [09.12.2021].
- Merriam-Webster Dictionary – <http://www.merriam-webster.com>, [11.02.2021].
- Omniglot – <https://omniglot.com/writing/protosinaitc.htm>, [13.12.2021].
- Online Etymology Dictionary, I-mutation – <https://www.etymonline.com>, [11.12.2021].
- Quranic Arabic Corpus – <https://corpus.quran.com>, [03.02.2021].
- United States Census Bureau – <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/international-programs/historical-est-worldpop.html>, [16.12.2021].
- Worldometer – <https://www.worldometers.info/world-population/>, [11.12.2021].