

What is OBRY and Why Does it Matter by Jon Machtemes of The OBRY Projekt

It has been brought to my attention recently that it has been some time since I've produced any really definitive information concerning OBRY: what it is, exactly, and why it is as important to grasp and begin to utilize it as it is. I will try, to the best of my abilities, and current knowledge level, to do that herein.

Plainly stated, OBRY is the language of the Bible in it's purest possible form. What we know of today as "Biblical Hebrew" is a language within a language, or atop the pure language of the Bible. It is a system contrived, as we are told, by Rabbis called Masoretes between the 7th and 10th centuries, or more properly, this is the time frame in which they were said to have standardized it; although it's very obvious that they've been "standardizing" it as late as just a century ago. What Masoretic has done is to not only change the sound and look of the language, but it also has parsed (or divided) the same word often into varied, sometimes quite different, words. It also dictates similarities that may or may not exist in different words, and frequently classifies clearly distinct words together, such as "Cushi" a man in David's kingdom along with Cushi as in "Ethiopian" (who were never KUSHY/Cushites) under the same listing, Strong's H3569. And lastly, it dictates grammar, word meaning and use, i.e. nouns, verbs, adjectives, and so on.

These influences Masoretic (or so called "Hebrew", the word itself being a Masoretic contrivance) has had on the pure text form are of far greater significance than we've been led to believe. Adam Clark, a well known 18th-19th century Bible Scholar, is alleged to have said that the Masorah (which includes but is not limited to Nikkudot, being all the dots and dashes added to the pure character form), are the longest running commentary on the "Hebrew" Bible. If he did indeed say this, he's certainly not alone, as scores of marginalized Bible scholars have intimated or outright accused in the direction of the Masorah and the Rabbinic excuses for it. And what are those excuses for the presence of this parasitic language accessory? Let us begin there.

It is claimed in all standard mainline Jewish reference books that the Masorah was simply a system of annotations employed from the earliest times (most claim as early as Ezra the Priest and Scribe) to essentially keep the books of the Old Testament in a standard, coherent form. Here, I must paraphrase for sake of time, but please do go read what they say in their sources such as Encyclopedia Judaica, Jewish Encyclopedia, etc. What it boils down to is that they make a number of unsubstantiated claims concerning, what they claim, was the state of the Old Testament including changes made by men such as Ezra. And since no one understood the mysteries of this unreadable text, the Rabbis, being the great saints they imagine themselves to be, employed Masorah to keep the text of the Old Testament in tact, just as G-D intended.

What they claim is that the Rabbis began making markings to signal word spacing and placing various notes in the text, simply to "help" one to better understand, thus looking out for the little guy who may not have been aware of how disorganized and confusing G-D was. These notes, as they say, became the foundation of how "Hebrew" is interpreted today: it's sound, it's look, it's grammar, and it's Lexicon. Eventually, vowel markings were inserted, as their story goes, to "preserve" the traditions of pronunciation since, according to them, "Hebrew" has no vowels and therefore all the pronunciations have always been passed down via tradition. Luckily for us, these "traditions" have been kept in trust by our friends the Rabbis. These problems, of course, could only be problems, however, if their claims were true, and we have no reason to believe they are. In fact, they've offered all of no proof whatsoever to affirm these pretexts, nor is there a shred of Biblical evidence that any scribe, prophet, or chronologist at any time changed anything about the text.

What this comes down to is if you believe these Jewish Rabbis, (about what a mystery and mess the text used to be and how it has been made accessible by their efforts... via their lens... their Masorah), you are now entirely at their mercy when it comes to understanding anything and everything about the Old (and you'd better believe the New) Testament. Something that cannot be overstated is that these "Masoretic Rabbis" are in no way distinct from the same Rabbis who have produced the Kabbalistic writings: the Talmuds and Zohars, and all forms of sadistic, mystical, anti-Christian (and well, really, anti everyone) writings. This means, in no uncertain terms, that everyone out there who uses both the pronunciations generated by these Rabbis such as "Yahweh", "Hebrew", "Yeshua", "Torah", etc., and the literary form and function dictated by them, i.e. syntax, verb conjugations, gender specifications, noun tenses and forms, et al are using an inorganic system generated by these Rabbis as a means of coming between the reader and the pure form and message of the text.

Since most people only see the Rabbi's Nikkudot, (those dots and dashes above, below, and amid the characters), and the modern block text, (which does vary significantly from older forms of the language), they may tend to believe that look and pronunciation are the only manipulations that Masoretic brings to the text. How big a deal is it really that the "letters" look a bit different and sound a bit different? You may have a nice "Hebrew" tattoo from your favorite Bible verse or you might like the sound of Yahweh or Yahuwah as opposed to YEUE (YEh-uWEh). Maybe I'm making too big a deal out of things that are trivial and superficial. Remember, there are two factors here that aren't as visible that are under girding this scam, and those (along with the not insignificant alteration of the look and sound of the language), are the very dangerous elements to Masoretic Hebrew. One is the aforementioned claim that the text and language was unreadable without all of their additions, adjustments, and modifications, and the other is just how many changes they've effected via those Nikkudot you see in nearly every "Hebrew" Old Testament. Even versions and fragments we have of Old Testament books without Nikkudot in them are never interpreted apart from our modern understanding of the Old Testament via the Masoretic Nikkud. Pay attention to the linguistic meanderings of any Bible scholar (especially the ones responsible for all our available translations and current digital tools) and you'll notice their foundations and extrapolations invariably go back to the Masorete.

The Nikkudot, far beyond just pronunciation, dictate grammar and the very meanings of words. This took them a very long time to get just right and standardized, ergo the Masoretic wasn't even a standardized system until only a few brief centuries ago, nor was "Hebrew" a language synonymous with Jewry until the early 1900s. Jewish sources tend to minimize the fact that there was no concrete standardization of the Masorah until recently. It does make one wonder just how many libraries had to be ransacked and burnt down in order to keep such a scant amount of official manuscripts and fragments in circulation. Most of what we accept and understand today, (via the Masorized Old Testament), has come down through one man, Aaron ben Moses ben Asher, who is credited with the Aleppo Codex. Until his ideas were applied to the Leningrad Codex and thus agreed upon by organized Jewry, there was no universal agreement within organized Jewry on the correct application of Masorah. This is further reflected in the scant Lexicons produced before the 20th century, often drawing on all manner of linguistic sources in their handling of Biblical Hebrew. Although their official sources very much downplay the universal lack of agreement and application of Masorah (and, really, just about anything and everything), they nevertheless are forced to cite innumerable examples of it in their works concerning Masorah, languages, and linguists. All of these relevant details may be found easily enough. It's not my desire to argue or cite them here, but to best

help you to understand why you must not trust the mode and form in which the Bible has been presented to us.

So, to review, what do we know about the Bible in Masoretic "Hebrew"?

1. The text itself looks different than older fragments and artifacts we have, and was therefore changed into what is now deemed "Biblical Hebrew". We don't know for certain who did this, but all things considered, the Masoretes are the prime suspect.
2. It likely sounds very different to the original. If the wild variations of vocalizations were not a smoking gun, there is also the fact that the original OBRY glyph set so closely resembles our modern Western Alphabets: the order is strikingly similar, and the glyphs in original form bear an uncanny resemblance to our own in look, sound, and order, and it has five vowels, just like our modern alphabets. Even the names they've imposed onto the glyphs (not letters) is simply another distraction from how much OBRY and Western European dialects resemble one another. All the Masoretic rules of voicings simply serve to detract from the obviousness that OBRY is the predecessor to our Western European languages.
3. Its rules of grammar are inconsistent, therefore often excuses are made for these various inconsistencies, including ignoring them altogether at times.
4. It's Lexicon is based on the nikkudot applied by Masoretes, thus changing word meanings at whim and categorizing words as it suited them. This often resulted in the arbitrary division of the same word(s) or the same meaning being applied to very different words. There is no complete agreement between their Lexicons as often they would be influenced by what other language the author most preferred.
5. "Standardization" is a myth, and even though a general consensus was reached relatively recently, there is still contention over the "standardized" system because of its many still present inconsistencies.
6. Masoretic Hebrew assigns numbers to the glyphs ("letters" as they call them) and use this Gematria to often interpret the Bible. The original OBRY has no numerical assignment to glyphs. Numbers are words, such as AHD, ShNYM, ShLSh, etc.
7. All aspects to the Masoretic Bible and all who've brought it to us are, without controversy, are entirely Jewish.

At this point, some may say, "Well, then it's a good thing we have the Septuagint." And I might honestly agree except for the fact that there is, again, no proof it was written when and how it's claimed (in the letter of Aristeas), in fact, all evidence points to it being created much later. And though we are able to use it for some limited checks and balances, it clearly employs many of the same word parsings, meanings, and phonetic renderings dictated by the Masoretic. Do those facts not support the accuracy of the Masoretic text? No. All they do is tell us that the same people, with the same agenda, had their hands in bringing both to us. But what about the fact that YEUSHO "Jesus" and others in the New Testament quote more from the LXX translation? That argument is a trick. If quotations in most copies of the New Testament follow the LXX better than the Masoretic, the most that means is that there were texts they knew of that were closer in structure and form to the LXX than the very limited copies we have of so called "Hebrew". It doesn't prove that YEUSHO "Jesus" spoke Greek or that there was any Greek translation in their day. And this goes for all other texts: the Samaritan Pentateuch, Peshitta, Targums, and whatever other texts may exist. None of them actually help the Masoretic beyond showing that the structure has remained basically the same, and in the case of the Dead Sea Scrolls, that often the wording (letter for letter) has remained mostly in tact. Those facts say nothing in defense of the aforementioned points against the Masorah, which is the inorganic system we all view the text through.

You see, something that may get a mention, as you go, but without the deep implications being drawn out is, for one, the fact that OBRY or "Hebrew" has no capital letters nor punctuation. This means that you have to rely on the Rabbis to tell you when ADM is "man in general", or the "Adam of the garden", or "Edom" (as in Esau), or "red or reddish", or "a sardius stone", and when ADME is "soil", or "a city's proper named Admah", or one of the ADM variations with a softening or generalizing E suffix. And that's just one word this can be done with. Is it important to know if it's "man" or "something red" or "Esau" being spoken of? But we can sort that out based on context using rules of grammar and proper syntax right? Certainly, but who's rules? Are we using the Rabbi's rules that don't always work? Are we going to trust a set of rules regarding tenses, voices, and conjugations that are often so inconsistent that they are still argued over... albeit quietly, as they wouldn't want anyone to get wind of the fact that their system isn't based on consistent, repetitive text forms, but extensive Masoretic notes that have been solidified by way of a complex system of varying dots and dashes and fluctuating Lexicons.

If at this point you're saying, "yes, I'm fine with that system", then there's likely no way of helping you get any more understanding of the Bible than the Masoretic Rabbis will allow. If you're willing to believe the same "letter" can bear six different sounds and that a word can bear a dozen different meanings, and all by the whim of Jewish Rabbis, then there isn't much you won't believe from them. But if you're ready to go past their fences; their artificial barriers; their modifications and morphing; their slight of hand; their hiding of the real truth to be found within the Bible, then you're ready to start examining the Bible in OBRY. But, what is OBRY again?

OBRY, for one, is the word that "Hebrew" was derived from, without any Masoretic influence. It is pertaining to things, including language, associated with the patriarch OBR who was three generations after ShM and six generations before ABRM. He is where the tongue of the OBRY came from. He was contemporary to the BBL incident in Gen 11 and his ancestors became known as OBRYM and spoke the language of the OBRYM. Now some may argue, based on the form of other languages' names in the Bible, that it should be called OBRYT; however, OBRY is not entirely inappropriate and would depend on context. Besides, the instances we see OBRYT in the Bible are referring to the OBRY women. I'll digress from there, just know that even those who speak "Hebrew" know it's perfectly acceptable to call it "Hebrew" or "Ebrit". So, if OBRYT just suits you down to the ground... crack on. What the term OBRY generally pertains to is the tongue, culture, and all else having to do with the subject people of the Bible.

How does OBRY function? First off, the OBRY alphabet or "glyph set" is an arranged group of 22 glyphs, icons, or characters that not only have an extraordinarily close phonetic character to our modern "Proto Indo European", Germanic, English, and other Western European tongues, but also bear striking resemblances to them. In fact, if one removed all the diaphones (like C is a diaphone of K and S and Y is a diaphone of I or E) and derivative letters (such as F and J) in the aforementioned Western European languages' alphabets, what would be left is an alphabet of remarkable similarity to the OBRY glyph set. When one looks into all obtainable pre-Masorah examples of so called Hebrew, the Western vowels are very obvious to see, as they also bear a striking similarity to the European vowels. Careful etymological searches reveal that we English speaking Europeans have still held onto a number of our old OBRY words. MHR is "morrow", AHR is "after", BYN is "between", OBR is "over, as in to cross", PRS is "parse", SUP is "sup, as in to sup... one's final meal of the day", QEL has become "collect, collate, coalition, etc" (and is likely the basis for the Greek word ekklesia - "church"), and on and on it goes. Even people names and terms have strong indications of an OBRY origin. Gaelic or Celts derived from the GLUT or the expulsion of the ten tribes comprising the House of Israel. Irish, Scottish, English, Welsh, Deutsch, Dutch, Danish, Swedish, etc all bear the suffix "ish" or AYSh "man".

Even Saxon most likely derived from YTSHQ "Isaac" or TSHQUN "like Isaac", and it's entirely arguable that even the term German was derived from GR "sojourn" and MHNE "camp", and GR-MHN-Y being "of the camp(s) of sojourner"... Germany... like YEUDY, YShRALY, APRTY, etc.

The nature and function of OBRY, to the best of my current understanding, is as follows: it is a language not comprised of thin, meaningless "letters", but of meaningful elemental ideograms or "glyphs". These glyphs are not simple symbols such as "this one is an ox and that one is a foot", but represent ideas and cannot stand alone without the presence of a second glyph. This is one of the great weaknesses in the ideology those who profess to teach Ancient or Paleo "Hebrew". Them, like their Masoretic predecessors, keep the language imprisoned by offering ideas about it that do not practically work. If Y (the OBRY equivalent to our letter y or i) or "yod" as they call it, represented a hand, there would be no need to have words like YD - "hand; force; influence". We'd just say or write the single glyph "Y" for hand or "B" for house. But we don't and you will never see an OBRY glyph sitting by itself, except the cantillation marks that Rabbis have inserted into the text, and they only have meaning to the Rabbis, not apart from them, and certainly not original to the text.

Again, why does it take two or more glyphs to form a bonafide OBRY word? Because they are ideas or concepts that need at least a second idea or concept to solidify their intent and meaning. If I said to you "big" you'd have nothing to go on; however, if I said "you're big", "he's big", or "big deal" you'd then have a coherent expression to work with. Even the latter of the three, being more an expression than complete thought allows for the receiver's mind to formulate action or imagery and thus intent. S, the glyph called "samick" by the Rabbis, carries with it the idea of a curve. This is obvious in our modern S. Add N, which bears the idea of "flow", in front of S and you have "a waving banner", add B, which bears the idea of spacial relevance dependent on it's position in a word, at the end of S and you have "to compass; go around". Glyphs carry ideas with them and when added together can convey thoughts, ideas, actions, and concepts. A good question is: are the glyphs representing things, or actions, or descriptions? The answer to that is, Yes. Example: Although most modern words in these over-embellished yet absent of inherent meaning languages we speak can't adequately demonstrate the depth of how OBRY works, we still have a few words hanging on, such as:

Broadside- named so because its a side and broad and is an action as it articulates a thing done in a general way. A broadside broadsides a broadside. It is what I would call, in OBRY, a "complete" or "universal word". Even is another modern word not far from the OBRY word ORB: the even is even because it's even. One houses a house in a house. Something is last because it lasts down to the last one. Most OBRY words I've examined fall within this category and without claiming to know which is first, a thing is because it does, or it does because it is, therefore it's attribute(s) exist because of what it is and it's attributes are because what it is is what it does. Once we grasp the way the mind thinks, in concepts not phrases, and realize a language once existed, and still does, tailored to best suit the way our mind was designed, then we come closer to understanding and utilizing OBRY as it was intended.

Furthermore, communication is, or certainly ought to be, basic. Though there is room in OBRY for embellishing and lofty verbiage, it is also very well equipped for getting to the point in the most cerebral-adaptive way possible. Remember, sounds or symbols go into the mind where processing is done apart from formalities like sentences. The least number of parts needed to complete a thought in the mind of the receiver is two. For example: "I went" in First Person Singular; "be quiet" in Second Person; "they did" in 3PP. Because the mind thinks in concepts, often trivialities like "of" and certain tenses are not always required. Therefore, OBRY doesn't often present words in the same tense and with the same modifiers we do. Often, a thing will be modified by placing another thing before it: TsUBE of ARM is just ARM TsUBE... no "of" word. Also, terms like HY ShDE would be

translated "beasts of the field" for ease of English reading but in OBRY there is no "of" or "the" in there. There are, of course times when we will see phrases that demand "of" (due more to the wide application of "of" than a direct equivalency). BShNE ShLUSH LMLKUT BLAShTsR is most often translated "In the third year of the reign of king Belshazzar", but in OBRY its the article L preceding MLKUT, (mechanically meaning "to", in English becoming "of") that is telling us, in OBRY, that the third year is "to" the kingdom of Belshazzar. These articles, like the B that precedes ShNE "year" are allowing our minds to envision and organize correctly in a time and spacial way. EELK QDMT ASHUR "that goeth to the east of Assyria" is another in which the T at the end of QDM is directing our minds spacially.

Again, a good language should be able to generate the exact thoughts, ideas, concepts, and relays from the mouth or pen of the bearer into the mind of the receiver. These relays can be simple, LMNTsH MZMUR LDUD "To the Chief Musician a Psalm of David", or complex, such as the Psalms that will go on for many verses of space without using the article U to break or begin a new, separate thought, but instead will build expression upon expression, question upon question before any significant break occurs. The mind of the reader or hearer will tend to achieve the same state of exasperation as the author had who wished to communicate such things. In this way, the author's desperation and suffocation is aptly communicated. Mission accomplished.

But, having said all these things about the way a language ought to function, and giving examples with translations, the truth of it is that in these examples I've been providing Anglo-Jewish renderings of the language based on Masorah. Without challenging this foundation we are stuck. Thus I present "Theoretical OBRY"... a means of textual examination without the Masorah whatsoever. It is based on reasoning and that reasoning based on what may be extrapolated from what body of the text can be understood as ideas least likely to have been changed or influenced by the Masoretes. You see, not everything could have been altered or influenced by the Rabbis. Words that appear hundreds of times in similar but varying contexts can't be altered too much without it becoming obvious what is going on. Therefore a large amount of the text had to remain at least very close to it's original meaning or else the jig would be up. This isn't to suggest the Rabbis and Western language scholars did not alter a word's rendering from one occurrence to the next, but that they only had so much play before their machinations would be abundantly apparent. Verses like Exo 20:13 "LA TRTsH" only allows for so much variation over and beyond "not murder" given the fact that LA "no; not" appears over 500 times and TRTsH "murder; slay" nearly 50 times and within other contexts, and has varied cognates, so if they'd have tried to insert "wash" or "execute" instead of the more appropriate "slay" or "murder" it would be apparent (such as the KJVs use of the inappropriate "kill").

Then, based on a great deal of text within the Old Testament that we can count on being able to understand, we can ascertain that it was written by authorized men in a consistent language created and kept in tact for thousands of years by YEUE, the ALEYM "God" of the Bible. It was intended for a certain people and preserved for this certain people. And although Jewish Masoretic Rabbis have changed the look of glyphs and added Masorah, including nikkudot thus changing features of the text, other examples have been kept in tact as have the people it was written by and for, thereby giving us the tools to reconstruct the original intent and use of the language. The only way a language can be understood, apart from a system like Masorah and it's assertions and Lexicons, is if the language itself were self-defining... that is if there were meaning inherent in the language itself. This is, theoretically, exactly what OBRY is... a language with built-in meaning, thereby rendering the Masorah, and all other inorganic alterations moot. But how can a language have this feature?

It does this, at it's base level, as has been already stated, via the glyph. The glyph represents an idea. That idea is combined with other ideas which cause a specific thought, idea, or

concept to emerge. This is the simple two glyph or bi-glyph root. That now developed concept is further refined via articles affixed or additional roots being combined to form mature roots or compound roots. All these root types are then combined with one another using additional articles to signal word type and arrangement and thus a complete thought is created and subsequently communicated. What we are able to currently do is see and document patterns in these things, though, as of yet, the complete understanding and explanation is still elusive. For example: M can be witnessed as being associated with many words associated with water, multiplicity, and/or chaos, as well as present tense "being" or movement when appearing late in a word (YM "sea", MYM "waters", YM-as the plural suffix "NERYM - rivers", AGM "pool", DM "blood", HM "churn; heat; a thing mixed", etc.) and when appearing early, it has much to do with derivatives. It is often seen as a prefixed article and translated as "from", indicating source. It also tends to form a type of noun from a verb, attribute, or another noun, such as MOBR "crossing" from OBR "across", or MBUA "entrance" from BUA "enter". We see preeminence in A, spacial projection inward/outward in B, verticals in G, and so on. So, there are real patterns, relationships, and effects of these glyphs, but to fully realize them is simply a process that takes time.

Now, some may find this really big and complicated, and I'm certainly not trying to complicate it any worse than it already is. I mean, it's still an unknown language that differs from what we are used to knowing in languages. But I'll give you a "rubber meeting the road" example that I hope will really help to illustrate the potential of looking at the language of the OBRYM in this way. Some of this will be examining the character and roots and some will be ways of cross referencing. All means and techniques are good to know and use.

Let's just say you're looking at the whole idea of dinosaurs in the Bible, as many claim there are references to dinosaurs therein. So you read that they are described in the book of Job. Job chapter 40 to be precise: verse 15. So you open up your E Sword and reference Job 40:15 on the good ol' (many would say "flawless") KJV "bibles" tab. And there it is, "Behold now behemoth...". Behemoth is an interesting word. What's a behemoth, exactly? So you switch to the KJV+ "bibles" tab and click on it. H930 comes up down below. So, you see it presented in it's backward Jewish form as "בְּהֵמוֹת", and because of the Rabbinical Jewish Masorah attached to it, it says it should be pronounced "beh-hee-moth". However, if you understand that OBRY pronunciations are simpler and very much like our European languages, you reference it in the OBRY Strong's list provided at obryprojekt.info at the "resources" tab. Besides the ease of now reading it from left to right, you find (by using the key at the top of the OBRY Strong's list) that it should likely be pronounced "BEMUT".

Now you go on to defining it. Brown-Driver and Briggs (which is based on Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon) says "1) perhaps an extinct dinosaur 1a) a Diplodocus or Brachiosaurus, exact meaning unknown". Then at the bottom, it reads, "in form a plural of H929, but really a singular of Egyptian derivation". I'm not too sure about that whole "of Egyptian derivation" part. That starts getting back to those spurious claims and "mysteries only the Rabbis can solve". This too is besides the fact that neither is Egypt anywhere in the Old Testament, nor is there any provable Egyptian influence on the Old Testament. So, moving forward...

The most obvious feature of this entry on "behemoth" or "BEMUT" more properly, is that BDB claims it to likely be derivative of H929 "BEME" (or "behemah" according to the Masoretes), which appears almost 200 times and is variously translated as "cattle; beast; beasts". Interesting. What would we find if we ran a ctrl+F search in the OBRY Old Testament (also available at obryprojekt.info) for the exact same word as in Job 40:15? It first appears, as the exact same word from Job 40:15, in Deu 32:24, "...I will also send the teeth of beasts (BEMUT) upon them...". Do you suppose YEUE would send Brachiosaurs against them? Would Brachiosaurs attack or act carnivorously? Would cattle for

that matter? Next, we find an occurrence in Joe 1:20, "The beasts (BEMUT) of the field cry also unto thee...", and again in Joe 2:22, "Be not afraid, ye beasts (BEMUT) of the field: for the pastures of the wilderness do spring...". Who would have thought there were dinosaurs grazing in the fields of Palestine in Joel's day? Also, Isa 30:6, "The burden of the beasts (BEMUT) of the south: into the land of trouble and anguish, from whence come the young and old lion...". This verse, if one knows what to look for, is loaded with possibilities for translational variation: there are words claimed to be nouns that could be verbs and/or proper nouns. It has various words with very few occurrences that could very well be something entirely different. These are also the opportunities OBRY presents.

It next appears in Mic 5:8, "And the remnant of Jacob shall be among the Gentiles in the midst of many people as a lion among the beasts (BEMUT) of the forest...". Next, Hab 2:17, "For the violence of Lebanon shall cover thee, and the spoil of beasts (BEMUT)...". And Jer 12:4, "How long shall the land mourn, and the herbs of every field wither, for the wickedness of them that dwell therein? the beasts (BEMUT) are consumed...", another verse fraught with problems and potential. Job 12:7, "But ask now the beasts, (BEMUT) and they shall teach thee..." and Job 35:11, "Who teacheth us more than the beasts (BEMUT) of the earth, and maketh us wiser than the fowls of heaven?" That's the very same book as our target word. Psa 8:7, "...and the beasts (BEMUT) of the field..." and 49:12 and 20, "he is like the beasts (BEMUT) that perish" Psa 50:10, "For every beast (BEMUT) of the forest is mine, and the cattle upon a thousand hills." and, finally Psalm 73:22, "So foolish was I, and ignorant: I was as a beast (BEMUT) before thee." Incidentally, ShDE, translated "field" is an entirely domestic term. Therefore, a number of times, we see BEMUT, (translated "behemoth" in Job 40:15), and claimed by a great many Lexicons, Bible commentaries, and "teachers" today to be some sort of dinosaur, with the modifier ShDE "of the field", thus implying domestication.

This presentation would quickly become epic if I were to even begin to talk about the issues of wording potential present in all these verses. But there we have 14 examples of the exact same word, in similar contexts, and not one other instance is bold enough to use the loaded term "behemoth". So, why the distinction in Job 40:15? Mostly, the difference is in the nikkudot. Therefore we are having Rabbinic opinion forced upon us without our consent. And every Bible translation in existence is either perfectly fine with that or ignorant of it's ramifications, and I must seriously doubt the latter. We could go on to examine the text around and after Job 40:15 to help us fully determine what is, in fact, being spoken of as BEMUT, which again, in the present context we don't have time for. Were this a personal study session, that would also be done, as there are many loaded and obscure words throughout the passage in question. We can, however, using just the OBRY glyphs and cross-referencing, boil BEMUT down a bit and see what emerges.

One thing that is no small matter is the effect that articles and/or prefixed, suffixed, and affixed glyphs can have on the text. In Job 40:15, YEUE is saying "ENE NA BEMUT" which may well be "take consideration now, I pray, in the death" as BEMUT can literally be "in the death" as H4191-94 MUT "death" is presented quite often as "EMUT" and B is a prefixed article meaning "near, in, by" and it's not uncommon to see phrases that, mechanically translated, have a verb followed by a B prefix on a noun: "consider in the death", "look in the land", "go to in the people". This happens often, and is just adjusted to make a language that has many terms and expressions that sometimes feel very difficult in English flow better for the English reader. It's also well worth noting that H4962, listed as "MT" and typically translated as "men" (of a sort) would very possibly have some relationship to MUT and even appears in very similar form to the BEMUT of Job 40:15... as in "BMTY". Also, H1993, listed as EME and translated "roar, noise, disquieted", and is a cognate of EM H1990 (the name of a region near YM EORBE "sea of the plain") from which a type of fierce giant once inhabited and may still have borne a similar title in at least Job's time.

We can also go back to H929 listed as BEME and translated "beast; cattle". Just from running a check on all the listings of H929 BEME, in E Sword, it is interesting to note that when it appears as BEMT. "BEMT" is "BEMUT" minus the U, and the frequent dropping of U is the most copious demonstrable phenomenon of variation or copiest's blunder in the same word. When BEME appears as BEMT it either seems to be redundant, such as in Gen 36:6, "and his cattle, and all his beasts (BEMT), and all his substance" as MQNE "cattle" or QNYN "acquisitions" would seem to be sufficient, which appear before and after BEMT "beasts", or it seems in very odd company, as in Exo 20:10, which lists people types, then BEMT, then people again "thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle (BEMT), nor thy stranger that is within thy gates:". And there are many many oddities having to do with calling H929 BEME "cattle" and/or "beasts" exclusively.

Now, I'm not drawing any conclusions about BEMUT in this brief and inexhaustive study as it only serves as an example, though from what little I've discovered by using my OBRY Strong's list, OBRY Old Testament, E Sword, and a good understanding of common articles and common glyph affixations and eliminations, I certainly could begin forming some solid theories to then further test using the same tools and perhaps a good etymological dictionary.

Don't get me wrong. The techniques of examining the Bible in OBRY and potentials, as far as theory or variations in translations, is not presented here to even begin to suggest that we know nothing of the original language and it's intent, nor that the Bible as it is currently available to us is wrought with error, for as I stated earlier, because it is written in a stable language filled with linguistic patterns, there is really only so much that Masoretic was able to manipulate before it would be blatantly obvious, (which, surprisingly, much still is and is not called out more often by so called "scholars"). These patterns in the text have not only restrained the vulgarity of the Masorettes, but also have afforded us a decent amount of text we know must still be in tact to a degree... text we can work from. For if a word, article, prefix, etc appears a thousand times and is translated a thousand times in the same (or notably similar way) while working in varied contexts, the odds are that it is a very close representation of the original intent of that word, article, prefix, etc.

By utilizing the concept of OBRY we can now test all assumptions, all "rules", all word, all articles. We can find out if they are hiding a location's proper name under a common word entry thus disorienting us; if they are hiding the repetition of words within commonly provable variations thus limiting our understanding of any given word; if all their applied conjugations are consistent thus drastically changing the events being relayed to us; if they have obscured large portions of the prophets through their demands of vocabulary thus hiding the unfolding of YEUE's great plan; if they've, in fact, misrepresented the character of YEUE through relatively simple word replacement thus causing many to shy away from Him before even finding out about Him; and even if they've, via their nikkudot, applied codes that can be discovered and exposed as malicious thus exposing them as the true enemies of YEUE and His covenant people. We can test the meaning carried by glyphs via their use as articles and in their smallest form as a decided concept: the bi-glyph root. We can begin to formulate answers to why words that are said to be verbs appear with articles said to be noun specific and vice-versa. We can begin to understand language as it was meant to be, wherein a noun must be linked to it's action and attribute(s). We can also, by way of abandoning the Masoretic vocalizations in favor of the obvious OBRY phonetics, begin to more accurately pursue these word's true etymological histories.

We will rewrite the concordances and lexicons based on the provable meanings of the glyph set and relationships within the roots until both a concordance and lexicon is regarded as illegitimate tools of the ages of darkness. We will, through understanding and application of the truth,

leave no room for the works of darkness; the secrets of the priesthood; the abuses of our enemies; the injustices of a world saturated in the gospel of the equality of ignorance; the absence of knowing the character and mind of the ALEYM of the Bible.

All the obscured wisdom of ages of time are waiting for us to find them out. Therefore, I offer you... OBRY.

for the OBRY Projekt, I'm Jon Machtemes