DE GRUYTER

Mony Almalech*

Cultural unit red in the Old Testament

Abstract: The paper describes and analyzes the full presence of red in the Old Testament – in Hebrew and translations. The approach is interdisciplinary, which includes: the treatment of color as a cultural unit, according to the idea of Umberto Eco; lexical and contextual semantics; examining Basic Color Terms (BCT – adjective, noun, verb), Prototype Terms (PT *blood* and *fire*), Rival Terms of Prototypes (RT), e.g. *ruby*; Ters for Basic Features of the Prototypes (TBFP *burn*); translation as a criterion and semiotic value; semiotic osmosis (semio-osmosis) as a process that aims equivalence between Hebrew PT and TBFP; semio-osmosis and accommodation; cultural and linguistic context; the interplay of old information (topic/theme) – new information (focus/rheme); rhizome of Hebrew root *Aleph-Dalet-Mem* deriving untranslatable set of words; well-structured and always translatable terms for PTs. Some links between the Old and New Testaments based on red color are explicit.

Keywords: color; cultural unit; Hebrew; rhizome; semiotic osmosis

1 Introduction

An important feature of red is its ability to signify positive and negative meanings. This peculiarity has been demonstrated in the study of visual colors in folklore rituals of passage (marriage and burial, see Almalech 1996), and the Norm of Word Associations to Basic Color Terms, as well as the function of verbal red in novels (Almalech 2001, 2011). The norm is an exploration of the verbal color language by Kent and Rozanoff's (1910) test instructions.

We remember the images in the churches of the "red serpent", "enormous red dragon" (Rev 12:3–7), "the great dragon was thrown down, that ancient serpent, who is called the devil and Satan" (12:9), "a scarlet beast" (Rev 17:3), "woman was dressed in purple and scarlet" (Rev 17:4–5). We know from Isaiah 1:18 that red is the symbol of sin, and white is the symbol of righteousness. But how do we associate the giant red satanic serpent with the seraphim, the archangels standing next to the Throne of the Lord in Isaiah 6:6? There is no way to connect them unless we understand Hebrew. In

*Corresponding author: Mony Almalech**, New Bulgarian University, Sofia, Bulgaria,
E-mail: almalech@abv.bg. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1382-2826

the Hebrew worldview, *seraphìm* is a plural form of *saràph* appearing only in Isaiah 6 for the six-winged archangels faithful to the Lord. At the same time, the Hebrew *saràph* means *fire, burn, destroy with fire.* What is the logic that red is a sign of sin, Satan, the red serpent, and the faithful to Lord seraphìm? Why the meek Lamb, Jesus Christ has been described as "His eyes were like blazing fire", "His feet were like bronze glowing in a furnace" (Rev 1:14–15). Red describes health and beauty: "My beloved is dazzling and reddish/ruddy [adòm], Outstanding among ten thousand" (Cant 5:10).

Even from these examples, it is clear that red in the Bible's symbolic language is a union of different types of red codes. All that needs examination, understanding, and explanation. The Hebrew different types of red present the Hebrew worldview revealing unfamiliar mental connections and unknown contents of the Bible, a theological system with new key points of understanding. In addition, some red codes remain after translation, and others are encrypted in Hebrew. Besides, the Jewish cultural heritage accepts that Hebrew spelling and pronunciation have moral and theological values.

2 Methods

Color as a cultural unit is an approach defined by Eco (1985: 157–75). He rhetorically declares that we must assume that he is a blind person, although he often comments on visual color in the text. Eco's approach is from the point of view of general semiotics (157).

> When one utters a color term one is not directly pointing to a state of the world (process of reference), but, on the contrary, one is connecting or correlating that term with a cultural unit or concept. The utterance of the term is determined, obviously, by a given sensation, but the transformation of the sensory stimuli into a percept is in some way determined by the semiotic relationship between the linguistic expression and the meaning or content culturally correlated to it. (Eco 1985: 161)

My modern interpretation of color as a cultural unit is that the cultural unit color includes visual and verbal color.

The definition of Eco points to a basic color term. We know from the B&K tradition, its development in the World Color Survey (WCS), a project of Kay and collaborators, and from their critics color is signified by other terms in natural languages. If we want to reflect all the linguistic possibilities for color signification in language text, we need other classes of words.

Opponent theory and all its followers use three visual features of visual colors – hue, saturation, and brightness. These physical characteristics are not enough to

study the secondary meanings of verbal and visual colors. Secondary meanings are semanticized or cultural units.

The basic methodological element is the linguistic semiotic approach (linguo-semiotic). It includes the basic color terms (BCT *white*, *black*, *red*, etc.); the prototype terms (PT). The rival terms of the prototype (RT *linen*, *cherry*, *duckling*, *ruby*, *sapphire*, etc.), and terms for the basic features of the prototypes (TBFP *clean*, *pure* for light; *hot*, *warm* for fire; *fresh* for plants, etc.). According to Rosch (1972, 1973) and Wierzbicka (1990), the prototypes of colors are *light*, *darkness*, the *sun at noon*, *fire*, *blood*, *sky*, *sea*, and *all plants*).

BCT, PT, RT, and TBFP are the verbal colors. They form a cultural unit, in the sense of Eco (1996).

The semiotics of color should be based on the cognitive approach and completeness of communication. Humans do not have a biological speech apparatus for colors as they do for speech sounds. For this reason, visual colors represent a defective sign system. Kress and van Leeuwen (2002) never used the Theory of Prototypes and the Free Word Association test (Almalech 2011). The same is true of the French author Pastoureau (2001).

The interface between verbal and visual color language is the prototype. We have prototypes for white, black, red, green, yellow, and blue, but not for mixed colors (brown, pink, purple, orange, and gray). This approach corresponds to Hering's opponent theory. Prototypes are universal and have evolved into cultural units in all cultures and languages. Wierzbicka (1990) presented the interface between color prototypes and the B&K tradition. This is despite her never endorsing the B&K method.

My method includes the norm of free word associations with BCTs (Almalech 2001, 2011). The norm proves that prototypes are the most frequent and common verbal associations of BCTs. The norm shows that except color there is another important feature of prototypes through high frequency. The basic features are: pure for white, hot for red, fresh for green, space for blue, and black makes things invisible. I call such verbal associations a Term for a Basic Feature of the Prototype. Visual color and the other main feature of the prototype are the basis of the cultural unit of color. They motivate the secondary meanings of color, such as 'love', 'hate', 'innocence', 'sin', 'righteousness', 'luck', 'health', 'funeral', 'murder', 'sadness', 'elegant', 'formal', etc. All of them are Verbal Associations of the BCTs. They are all color values for human notions and feelings. They are not related to the influence of colors' interior on human psychology. In the depths of the secondary meanings of verbal color lay personal diverse visual impressions of the prototype. Nonverbal consciousness and the subconscious express both the prototype and the cultural units in verbal associations. The universal prototype becomes a cultural unit and part of

rites of passage such as weddings and funerals. Colors in rites of passage and religion are opposite to diachronic changes. Rituals are conservative to accept radical changes.

My approach requires that color prototypes and prototype basic features (e.g. purity and clean) be placed at the heart of color categorization and symbolism in a routine, unchanging text like the Bible or conservative rituals of passage like marriage and burial. Cultural unit color includes verbal colors and visual colors in rituals and advertising (Almalech 1996, 2011, 2019).

An important element of the method is the development of the Berlin and Kay (B&K) tradition for BCT (Berlin and Kay 1969; Kay and Maffi 1999). Although the B&K tradition is limited to the basic terms of color, it has yielded many useful scientific achievements. One of them is the classification of colors as macro-light and macro-dark. Macro-light is white, yellow, and red, while macro-dark is black, green, and blue (Kay and McDaniel 1978). Macro-light and macro-dark are considered macro color categories Kay and McDaniel (1978) developed scheme (1969) as the successive division of macro-categories into smaller categories focused on the Hering primaries, and then the partition of the Hering categories into the other basic, or derived categories plus narrower versions of Hering's six. Macro-light and macro-dark are organized as fuzzy-sets intersections of pairs of the Hering six. Munsel Color theory, Berlin and Kay tradition, and Prototype Theory (Rosch 1972; Wierzbicka 1990) are developments and applications of Hering opponent theory/perceptual salience of color's best examples or 'foci'. 'Hering primaries' black, white, unique red, unique yellow, unique green, and unique blue (Hering 1964) are particularly salient in visual experience prior to their representation in either language or thought. Briscoe recalls Hardin's opinion: "The 'basic linguistic categories themselves', Hardin writes, "have been induced by perceptual saliencies common to the human race" (1988: 168). The perceptual salience or 'attention-grabbingnes's of these shades is often said to arise from their distinctively pure or non-mixed appearance.

The division of macro-categories is a piece of basic knowledge. We shall see contextual psychological meanings opposing macro-light and macro-dark in terms of B&K tradition. BCTs for red explicitly signify 'sin' in opposition to white BCTs in Isa 1:18; Isa 63:1–3. PTs *blood* and *fire* do not function as macro-light, but as psychological and cultural macro-dark – 'death', 'bloodshed', 'punishment', 'destruction by fire', 'suffering' (Job 16:16; Deu 9:3; Ps 66:12, and many others).

Translation as a criterion and semiotic value, inter-language symmetry, asymmetry, and dissymmetry.

Biblical colors are a text within a text (Lotman 1994).

Rhizome in terms of Deleuze (2018) and Deleuze and Guattari (2004) is a key tool for the examination of red codes.

Statistics for different color words have semantic and semiotic values.

We meet speculations on 'Topic-Focus values in the discursive context' (Curteanu et al. 2009) in our days. This idea could be applied to analyzing the sacral structure 'first-last use' of a particular BCT.

Some additional approaches are given in Almalech (2017a, 2021a).

3 Basic color terms (BCT)

Cultural unit red encompasses several shades of red that would be different chips in Munsell (2008) color chart, and they will be treated as BCT for red. In Hebrew, these are אָדֹם [adòm], תּוֹלַעַת שָׁנִי [tolàat shanì], אַרְגָּמָן [argamàn], שָׁשַׁר [shashàr], and חָמַר [hamàr]. These lexemes will be internally arranged under the Red because they are nuances of red color under the heading of a color reference.

Every language has its norm for translation of the Hebrew terms for red, e.g. English translations use red, purple, scarlet, and vermilion, but the translations differ in some particular cases. NRS rendition of [tolàat shanì] with *crimson* while most of the English translations use *scarlet*; for Hebrew [argamàn] all English translations use *purple*.

3.1 *Red* אָדֹם [adòm] and the root Aleph-Dalet-Mem

The root Aleph-Dalet-Mem אדם has the unique ability to produce simultaneously BCT (red), PT (blood), and RT (ruby). Therefore, they will be discussed together. The goal is to examine the rhizome (Deleuze 2018; Deleuze and Guattari 2004 [1988]) of the root. The Aleph-Dalet-Mem אדם root is a very appropriate example of both word-formation and contextual interpretation, and the creation of irreducible complex models of Hebrew worldview grounded theology.

Words from the root Aleph-Dalet-Mem permeate the entire Old Testament and participate in various situations, plots and intrigues – the creation of the world, the Jewish patriarchs (Israel and Edom), blood as a sign of murder, and as a sign of sacrifice. They also reach the cultural and historical aspects of the New Testament.

From a word-forming point of view, some expressions produce a whole new meaning if we are guided by the Hebrew worldview embedded in word-formation. The phrase "the ground, which opened its mouth to receive your brother's blood from your hand" (Gen 4:11) is a metaphor. It is insufficient because the creation of the man-אָדָם [adàm] was sculpted by his feminine gender, the *ground* אֲדָמָה [adamà] (Gen 2:7). The *ground* אֲדָמָה [adamà] not only receives the blood of the slain Abel, but the blood itself can weep: "Your brother's blood cries out to me from the ground" (Gen 4:10). All three objects – man, ground, and blood – are linked with red אָדֹם

[adòm]. As concepts, they are derivatives of the Aleph-Dalet-Mem connected logically in a way that does not exist in verbal Indo-European thinking. The logic encoded in the Hebrew gives a completely different idea of the creation and the relationship in between the *ground* and *man*, amongst *Israel* and *Edom*, between *blood* and *man*.

The most common and standard term for red is the word אָדֹם [adòm]. The root Aleph-Dalet-Mem has unusual derivatives compared to Indo-European languages. In Indo-European languages, there is no logical connection among Hebrew derivatives, and this is not only a linguistic but also a theological problem.

Paradigm and semanticizing Aleph-Dalet-Mem root:

red אָדֹם [adòm]

man, human אָדָם [adàm]

Adam אָדָם [adàm]

ground, land אֲדָמָה [adamà]

blood דָם [dam]

Edom אֱדֹם [edòm]

redness, a ruby or garnet אֹדֶם [òdem]

red painted מְאָדָמִים [meadumìm]

reddish אַדְמוֹנִי [admonì]

The paradigm is semanticized as follows:

{'earthly – 'low' – 'sinful' – 'brotherly murder' – 'death' – 'sin'} —

{'punishment the enemies of the Israelites'} + {'selling the birthright' – 'wrongdoing'} — {'lamb/goat blood as salvation'} — {'sacrificial blood brings salvation and purification'}.

In terms of macro-light and macro-dark (Kay and Maffi 1999) and the cultural values established by the Bible, this chain of meanings can be decoded as follows:

{macro-dark red} — {macro-dark red} — {macro-light red} — {macro-light red}.

3.1.1 The man אָדָם [adàm] and types of man by the presence of red

In Biblical and Modern Hebrew, there are four words for man: אָדָם [adàm], אִש [ish], אֱנֹש [enòsh], and גֶבֶר [gèver]. Among them, the word אָדָם [adàm] is distinguished by the fact that it is motivated as something red – once with the basic term *red* אָדֹם [adòm] and a second time with *blood* דָם [dam] the name of one of the two prototypes for red color.

Concerning red color, the word [ish] is a partial synonym of [adàm] because it may be associated with one of the main terms of the other prototype of red – fire אֵש [esh]. This can be done if we remember that the letter Yud י is mobile – it appears and disappears in different word forms. The resemblance of a *man* אִש [ish] with *fire* אֵש

[esh] is obvious. Then we can say that symbolically the *man* is both fire and blood. In general, the human type-[adam] should be referred to the macro-dark red, while the human type-[ish] should be referred to the macro-light red. This word-forming motivation should always be synchronized with the context, and then a final decision must be made.

The man-[adam] and the man-[ish] are in opposition to the other two words for a man in Hebrew [enòsh] and [gèver]. In [adam] and [ish], there is an indication for red for the two prototypes of red (blood and fire), and in [enòsh] and [gèver] – it is absent. Thus, adàm and ish are red antonyms to enòsh and gèver. אֱנֹשׁ [enòsh] and גֶּבֶר [gèver] have completely different inner forms and no link to red, blood, and fire. The words [enòsh] and [gèver] appear for the first time in Gen 6:4 in the description of the fallen angels:

> The Nephilim were on the earth in those days – and also afterward – when the sons of God went to the daughters of men [adàm] and had children by them. They were the heroes [geburìm] of old, men [anashèi] of renown (NIV).

Thus, different types of men are involved in different hierarchies, in the relationship of 'high-low', 'heaven-earth', in the plot with the fallen angels and their descendants of 'daughters of men-[adam]'. In Deut 22:5, [gèver] is of one of God's commandments: "A woman must not wear men's clothing, or a man wear women's clothing, for the LORD your God detests anyone who does this." (NIV). This is the structure of the first occurrences of different words for a man. The Hebrew set of terms for man does not correspond to the facts in the Indo-European languages.

3.1.2 The man becomes Adam

In Hebrew, *man* and *Adam* are the same word, spelled the same way –אָדָם [adàm]. In Gen 1:1–3, the primordial man אָדָם [adàm] was created and he was given the proper name Adam אָדָם [adàm]. Different translations of Gen 1–3 use for the first time the proper name Adam in different places: Septuagint Gen 2:16; Vulgate Gen 2:19; La Sacra Bibblia Nouva Reveduta and La Nuova Diodati Gen 3:17; King's James Version Gen 2:20; The Estonian Bible Gen 2:22; Bulgarian and Russian Synodal versions Gen 2:25; The German Luther Bible Gen 3:8; Some English Protestant versions Gen 3:17; Bulgarian Protestant and many English Protestant versions Gen 3:20–21. Studying the Hebrew original and several semiotic views on common and proper names (Lotman 2009; Топоров 1993; Losev 1929) helps to decode the phenomena. The analysis interfaces with the new linguistic relativity theory after 1990 (Underhill 2009).

Four layers of symbolism are decoded: 1. The man becomes Adam; 2. The two men – in Gen 1:27 ("Let us make man in Our image, after Our likeness") and in Gen 2:7

the man is made by *ground* אֲדָמָה [adamà]; 3. The two men in the New Testament (1Cor 15:45–49); 4. Edom, Adam, and cultural discourses in both Testaments. The detailed examination of this set of layers is published in the Proceedings of the 13th World Congress of IASS/AIS (Almalech 2018a). Primordial man and the layers of symbolism are part of the cultural unit red within the Biblical Text. The redness of the first man gives different perspectives for interpretation and presents the Hebrew worldview corresponding to Plato's Timeus.

3.1.3 The celestial and earthly man

The book of Genesis is overloaded with Hebrew commentaries. The question "Who is first–the man made in the image and likeness of God (Gen 1:26) or the man made of ground (Gen 2:7)?" had more than one answer. The literature talked about the celestial and earthly man, and there is a great deal of confusion about who is who. Paul (1Cor 15:45–49) and Philo of Alexandria, speculated on the issue but there is no consensus. This discussion also is a part of the cultural unit red in the Old Testament.

The Hebrew worldview always has been a major difficulty for translators. In any case, the cultural unit red in Biblical and Modern Hebrew should include the problem with proper (*Adam, Edom*) and common name *man* אָדָם [adàm] and their connection with *red* אָדֹם [adòm], *blood* דָם [dam], and *earth, ground* אֲדָמָה [adamà]. The inner form is a reflex of a logical feature, which posits a semantic basis for any word. The inner form is implanted into the word-derivation processes and etymology. Another Jewish heritage rank list is formed by the different words/terms for man in Hebrew – [adàm], [ish], [enòsh], [gèver].

3.1.4 Edom – biblical and historical aspects

The cultural unit red in the Edom case combines biblical narration with culture and historical events. Chapters 25–50 of Genesis treat the remarkable scenery of the brothers Esau/Edom and Jacob/Israel. This plot is related to both the red color and all of Jewish history up to the time of Jesus Christ, when the Roman province of Judea was ruled by the Roman-installed king Herod of Edomite descent.

Ever since their appearance, the two characters of the patriarchs Esau/Edom and Jacob/Israel have been introducing basic color terms into the text of the Old Testament – white, red and brown. This is where the term red is used for the first time in the Old Testament. "And the first came forth red, all over like a hairy garment. And they called his name Esau." (Gen 25:25 ASV). Esau is born *reddish* אַדְמוֹנִי [admonì]. Translators prefer to transmit the Hebrew *reddish* אַדְמוֹנִי [admonì] with the basic term *red* in most translations: πυράκης (LXX), *rufus* (VUL), *czerwony* (BTP), красный "red" (RST), червен "red" (all Bulgarian translations). *ryšavý*, "red-haired" (BKR)

corresponds to Bulgarian *риж* ("red-haired"). Only a few translations are precise to Hebrew *reddish*, e.g. Ukrainian *червонуватий* (UKR).

Jacob's twin brother was named Esau עֵשָׂו [esàv] but later renamed Edom אֱדֹם [edòm], which is a word-forming version of the Basic color term *red* אָדֹם [adòm]. He received the name Edom because of the red color of a soup (Gen 25:29–30). Against this soup, Esau sells his birthright to Jacob and God punished him with the "red" name. The whole story of this "red pottage" occurs in Gen 25:26–34. In the Hebrew original, red is repeated twice *lit.* "from the red the red" הָאָדֹם מִן־הָאָדֹם [min-ha-adòm ha-adòm]. Moreover, the first occurrence of the term for red is not the genuine basic color term אָדֹם [adòm], but the diminutive derivative *redish* [admonì]. Until then, the basic term *red* has not been used in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, even though we already have *man, earth,* and *Adam*, which are of the same root.

This is a significant code that has not been sufficiently decoded. The repetition of the word "red", as Esau calls the stew, has been the subject of numerous comments from various researchers. In my opinion, the use of *red* and *reddish* in Gen 25 does not imply the appearance of these terms in the Hebrew language at the historical moment consistent with the story of Jacob and Esau. The appearance of the derivative first and then of the original basic color term indicates that they have long been present in the language. Moreover, the use of red terms for the first time in the story of Jacob and Esau, in the presence of developed terminology of the spoken language, is a highly intentional prophetic textual strategy. Further in the text, repeatedly, with repetitions, it is said, "Esau who is Edom", "Esau is Edom" (Gen 36:1; 36:8) which clearly implies 'Esau who is Red'. Esau/Edom became the forefather of the Edomites (Gen 36:9) and Gen 36:31 already speaks of the "land of Edom".

The situations and contexts necessitate a negative semanticizing of the red color, starting from *man* [adàm] – *earth, ground* [adamà] – *Adam* [adàm] – blood [dam] – red [adom] – Edom [edòm], the 'unreason' Esau (he lost his birthright) and became "red", "the red one" [edòm] as a punishment. In the historical plan, the Edomites became wicked enemies of the Israelites, with the secondary meaning of red color 'negative things'. The native speaker of Hebrew clearly understands the word-forming and religious-mystical connections in the chain 'earth/land/ground – man – Adam – Esau/Edom – red' = 'low' – 'earthly' – 'sinfulness' – 'unreasonableness' – 'negative things'. For a native speaker of a language other than Hebrew, this chain remains hidden as a contextual string of red things.

The Old Testament testifies in four long oracles against Edom (Isa 34; Jer 49:7–22; Eze 35–36; Oba), see Dicou (1994). In addition, Isaiah 63:1–3 provides a fearsome example of Edom's punishment where red color is involved as the color of the blood of the punished Edom. No one should forget, however, that despite the declared enmity between Edom and Israel, there is a Deuteronomy commandment: "Do not abhor an Edomite, for he is your brother. Do not abhor an Egyptian, because you

lived as an alien in his country." (Deut 23:7 NIV). There is evidence in the Old Testament that this commandment was not disregarded–the brilliant scholar of Hebrew and related languages, the Prophet Job, was an Edomite. The Jewish Virtual Library provides reliable biblical and historical (Josephus, Ant. 13:257; 14: 10; Wars 3:55 https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/edom) information on Jewish-Edomite relations.

The name Edom was used by the Sages of the Talmud (Bava Batra 16b, BT) and Midrash (Megillah 6b – Sefaria; Deuteronomy Raba. 1, BT) as a symbol of the Roman Empire. Edom and Rome equalized, using red as an additional sign for this alignment. The Jews accepted the Herodian dynasty as something "red" – they were Edomites ("red") and ruled Judea with the help of the "Red Roman legions".

Antipater the Edomite (died 43 BC) was the founder of the dynasty of Herod and the father of Herod the Great. Antipater became a powerful official under the later Hasmonean kings and subsequently became a client of the Roman Republic when Pompey the Great conquered Judea in the name of the Roman Republic. Herod the Great was the second son of Antipater the Edomite. To be accepted by the Jews, he marries the Jewish Mariamne. Salome, the sister of Herod, wishes for the head of John the Baptist. To prevent the true king of Judaism from coming, the son of Herod the Great killed all the babies in Bethlehem. The plot with Edom and Israel not only stretches forward to the time of Jesus Christ but confirms that we cannot understand the New Testament well unless we are aware of its Jewish cultural character. Finally, the cultural heritage of Hebrew speakers requires their conscious connection between Edom and red, while the name Adam and the term man are always expressed by the noun phrase *son of man* [ben Adam] has no conscious connection with red.

3.1.5 Red [adòm] in color duads, and tetrads

In addition to the communicative space of man [adàm], red [adòm] was incorporated into a completely different paradigm – the sacred space and the symbols of the Tabernacle. Red אָדֹם [adòm] did not participate in the interior of the Tabernacle, but the exterior of the tent of the Tabernacle. The tent consists of skins painted red, and blue (badger/dolphin skins). Blue, badger skins עוֹר תָּחַשׁ [or tahàsh] covered the ram skins dyed red מְאָדָּמִים [meadumìm]: "And thou shalt make a covering for the tent of rams' skins dyed red, and a covering above of badgers' skins." (Ex 26:14 KJV).

The term for red [adòm] on the roof is not a member of the interior sacral color tetrad but other kinds of red – *scarlet* [tolàat shanì] and *purple* [argamàn]. The red-blood-ground [adòm] of the goatskins marks a 'preserving' meaning of what is beneath the skins. If we change the perspective, another possibility is a 'sign for the human three-dimensional world' – "the Tabernacle stopped, and was built. This

semanticizing opposes the semanticizing of the discrete text structure man [adàm] – ground [adamà] – Adam [adàm] – red [adòm] – blood [dam] – Edom [edòm].

The blue skins in the red-blue duad provide a connection with the vertical dimensions, to the Throne of the Lord; while the red [meadamìm] ram skins provide the horizontal and unfolding in the human world of the values of the Tabernacle. Isaiah 1:18 presents a basic semanticizing of the red-blood-earth [adòm] as a sin while white is a sign of righteousness. Red and white are juxtaposed against each other in opposition.

The red horses of Zechariah 6 are part of a four-color symbol of red, white, gray and black horses. In the Revelation of John 6:1–7, this symbol was transformed into four colored horses and their riders. The four-colored horses in Zechariah are the prototype of the four-colored horses in Revelation of John. The grammatical gender and number and the comparison of the definitions of four-colored horses in the Old and New Testaments are used as deciphers. In the Old Testament, Zechariah's four-colored horses are called heavenly spirits, and in the New Testament, the spirits of God. Their quality is to stand by the throne of the Lord and not to die (See the Biblical text and all Biblical Dictionaries and Encyclopedia in References). Therefore, four-colored horses are comparable to the level of archangels seraphim, cherubim, and ophanim, which have the same quality. In this sense, the four-colored horses can be unequivocally referred to as macro-light red presentations in the Bible.

The four-colored horses can also be compared to the sacral four-colored Priestly Code. In the sacral four-color clothes, the red is not named with the red type-[adòm], but with the scarlet [tolàat shanì]. Both tetrads (horses and clothes) have the same structure as parts of speech – three adjectives BCTs and one noun RT (*linen* for priests robe, *hail* for horse). The Hebrew term *hail* very often is translated as *gray* or *dappled* in Zeh 6:6. Red, black and white are available in Zechariah and Revelation 6:1–7. In the New Testament the word that means *green*, also *pale* in Greek χλωρώς [hloròs] is used for the fourth horse. The symbol of OT and NT four-color horses remains a highly mystical symbol.

3.1.6 Rhizome of Aleph-Dalet-Mem root

The root Aleph-Dalet-Mem is the only root deriving BCT, RT, and RT *ruby* אֹדֶם [òdem] in Hebrew. The territory of the Aleph-Dalet-Mem root expands through such ability to the rhizome phenomenon. Gesenius (1996: 227) arranges the *blood* דָם [dam] in the Aleph-Dalet-Mem root derivative chain along with *red* אָדֹם [adòm], *man* אָדָם [adàm], *to be red* אָדַם [adàm], *ground* אֲדָמָה [adamà], Adam אָדָם [adàm]. The rhizome appearances of this root include different contexts and discourses from the creation of the first man to the Herodian dynasty during the Roman Empire. The diversity and non-hierarchy of nomination, the emergence in different contexts as well as the

different semanticizing give reasons to think of it as a biblical rhizome. Rhizomatous spread of the Aleph-Dalet-Mem root is manifested in many linguistic facts: the basic color term *red* [adòm], the redness of the primordial *man* [adàm], the redness of the *ground* [adamà], the proper names *Adam* and *Edom*, the words *blood* [dam], *ruby* [òdem] in Biblical Hebrew.

Here are two points of view. The first one is the atheist point of view. The creation of the cosmos, the stars, the sun, and all kinds of plants and animals, the man, the paradise, the woman, the primordial sin, and the expelling from the garden of Eden is an Ancient Near East mythology. It includes the intention of God to create the man (Gen 1:26–27) and created [adàm] from a *ground* [adamà] a feminine of [adàm] (Gen 2:7). Hebrew worldview points to the proper name Adam in Gen 1:26 where the intention of God to create man in His likeness is but everywhere after that moment it should be *the man* because the word is used everywhere in Gen 1–3 with a definite article. The translations show a very different picture – the proper name Adam is always absent from Genesis 1:26 but appears for the first time at different places in Genesis 2–3 and never at the correct according to Hebrew (Gen 1:26). The truth is that if the translations followed the spelling and logic of Hebrew, they would remain incomprehensible. The mythology continues with the establishment of the Jews. It is a story with the concrete personages of the twins Jacob and Esau. Esau "came forth reddish [admonì], all over like a hairy garment", he "sold" his birthright to Jacob for a red soup. The punishment – he was renamed Edom. This was the beginning of the people of Edom and the kingdom of Edomea. The story leaves the mythology and reaches facts of history when an Edomean family becomes vassal King of the Roman provinces of Judea and Edomea, as described by the Roman historian Josephus. Meanwhile, if we turn back to mythology, Jacob has renamed Israel because he wrestled with God. The 12 sons of Jacob/Israel are the patriarchs of the 12 Jewish tribes. At the time of King Herod, the Edomite, only one of the tribes is considered to survive – that of Judas.

The second point is that of a believer. The whole picture is different. God created the cosmos and man by speaking. It is a mystical (or Plato) type of thinking. The transcendent God made twice the man: first, in His intention, where being closer to God, the man should be Adam. After that moment, the materialization caused distance from God, and Adam was no longer Adam [adàm] but *man* [adàm]. The transcendent God invented two more terms for man, male, masculine [zahàr] (Gen 1:27), and man, husband [ish] (Gen 2:23), also two more terms for the *woman* [nekevà] (Gen 1:27), and *woman, wife* [ishà] (Gen 2:23). The term *man, husband* [ish] is hypothetically close to the other prototype for red – the *fire* [esh]. Possibly, the man is related explicitly to the blood and implicitly (hypothetically) to the fire, i.e. to the red color prototypes. Edom and Israel are the grandsons of Abraham. They gave birth to the Edomites and the sons of Israel. When an Edomite became the vassal king of Judea,

he was considered twice red (by his offspring and by the red of imperial legions). Thus, red became a symbol of evil. Apostle Paul, as a representative of Jerusalem Judaism, argues with Alexandrian Judaism on the question "Who is first – the heavenly man (Gen 1:26) or the earthly man (Gen 2:7)?" For Apostle Paul, the logic is anti-Philo of Alexandria: first was the earthly man and second was the heavenly man (1Cor 15:39–49).

The Aleph-Dalet-Mem root may be called cultural and semiotic palimpsest because Edomites hostile attitude toward the Israelites changed into Jewish allies in the rebellion against the Romans. "Zealots send to Idumaeans for help […] Simon son of Giora led 10,000 warriors and 5000 Idumeans" (Josephus, War 5.248). In the opinion of Josephus, this made them proselytes of justice, or entire Jews, as here and elsewhere (Antiq. B. XIV. ch. 8. sect. 1; B. XIII). With the construction of Solomon's Temple, the man-earth-blood-red red אָדֹם [adòm] of Tabernacle's tent disappears from the exterior of the building made of stone and wood. Thus, this red disappears from the temple exterior.

The red rhizome phenomenon exists in the biblical color text or color language. In addition to being an example of inter-linguistic dissymmetry, the Aleph-Dalet-Mem root derivative chain leads to the use of Lotman's idea of Text within the Text for rhizomatic facts in Hebrew alongside hierarchical structures.

3.1.7 Prototype term (PT) blood דָּם [dam] is part of Aleph-Dalet-Mem rhizome

The place of *blood* as a red code is in the prototype codes for red. Being an element of the derivative power of Aleph-Dalet-Mem, the *blood* is placed here, not in the red prototype examination. Unlike the other prototype of red – fire, for which there are many terms in Hebrew – blood is named by only one word in Hebrew.

For the first use of the word דָּם [dam] is in the story of Cain and Abel in Gen 4. The first use of a word in the Bible has a rhematic status but this is not informative for the history of Hebrew. Blood was shed in fratricide and becomes its symbol: "And He said, what have you done? The voice of your brother's blood is crying to Me from the ground. And now you are cursed from the ground, which has opened its mouth to receive your brother's blood from your hand." (Gen 4:10–11 NAS). The blood [dam] has a voice and cries, and the ground [adamà] curses and opens its mouth. Looking at the expressions, however, makes one think that the blood and the ground are animate beings that have a mouth and voices. The idea that the expressions "the voice of your brother's blood is crying" and "cursed from the ground, which has opened its mouth" is a metaphor or phraseology is insufficient because the Hebrew worldview represents red in animate Creation. All three things – man [adàm], earth [adamà], and blood [dam] are red [adòm] – are concepts formed by one root. They have a common inner form, i.e. logically connected in a way that does not exist in

Indo-European verbal thinking. Of course, metaphorical expressions are arsenal in language. In the context of the Hebrew metaphorical complexities of Genesis, earth, and man have the quality of heavenly substances. In its subsequent appearances in the text (Gen 37–42), the word *blood* continues to accompany the theme of brotherhood with the conspiracy of Joseph's brothers.

The last use of the word blood in the Pentateuch is in the prophecy of Jacob/Israel for the future of the 12 tribes. The presence of blood is the future of the only tribe surviving in history – Judah – from which the pedigree of David and Jesus Christ is derived. Also significant is the service of the word *blood* – this time it is not the true blood, but the blood of the grapes – a prophecy about the symbolic role of the red wine and the bread in the rituals of Essenes and Christianity: "He will tether his donkey to a vine, his colt to the choicest branch; he will wash his garments in wine, his robes in the blood of grapes." (Gen 49:11 NIV).

The word *blood* appears in the book of Leviticus for the sacrifices made in the Temple. It is here, as in Exodus, that blood becomes a purifying substance, i.e. the semantics of 'murder' gives way to ritual purifying blood. Blood semanticizing registers into two paradigms. The first is 'sin', 'murder-fratricide', 'bloodshed', 'death of innocent (blood)', 'blood-guiltiness' 'bloody man'. The other paradigm is sacrificial blood and the semanticizing of 'salvation' and 'cleansing of sin'.

The semantics of 'purifying blood' is not only settled throughout the Old Testament but also transmitted as the main symbol throughout the New Testament. The 'purifying blood' is equated with the universal meaning and use of the other prototype of red color – the fire as a purifying and ritual element – in Jewish and Christian cultures. 'Salvation' is linked to the understanding that 'blood is life'. As Stibbs pointed out "the term blood suggests the thought of life, the seat of life, the offering of the blood to God was an offering of life" (Stibbs 1947), commenting on the other biblical meaning of blood 'death' in TWBB. The textual meanings of blood are described in detail in the classical works of Gesenius, Driver & Brigs, Strong's Hebrew dictionary, ISBE, Jewish Encyclopedia, etc. Blood of judgment is a special version, see Isa 63:1–2 and Rev 19:13.

3.1.8 Rival term (RT) ruby אֹדֶם [òdem] is part of Aleph-Dalet-Mem rhizome

The word is used three times in the OT, Ex 28:17; 39:10; Eze 28:13. Although with only three uses, the word אֹדֶם [òdem] reveals yet other unexpected and diverse presences of the Aleph-Dalet-Mem root, and the corresponding contextual and discourse semanticizing. The prevailing opinion is that of Encyclopedia Britannica "Although the word *ruby* is used in the English translation of the Old Testament, it is improbable that ruby was known to the ancient Hebrews". Whatever the stone is, the term אֹדֶם [òdem] in all three uses is part of the Aleph-Dalet-Mem rhizome.

Ginzberg (2003) collected different Jewish monotheistic folklore tales:

> The very names of the tribes point to the redemption of Israel. Reuben is so called because God
> 'sees' the affliction of His people. (:433). […] Reuben's stone was the ruby, that has the property,
> when grated by a woman and tasted by her, of promoting pregnancy, for it was Reuben who
> found the mandrakes which induce pregnancy. (:651)

The red color and the name Reuben became a significant cultural unit in Jewish
tradition. The term *ruby* entered the Indo-European languages for precious stone
with the color of blood. In Hebrew, there is no derivative link between [òdem] and
the proper name Reuben. The stones on the breastplate of the High priest symbolize
the 12 tribes. The *ruby* אֹדֶם [òdem] is for the tribe of Reuben.

In another legend the link is pointed to Esau/Edom, i.e. the red is a symbol of the
plot Jacob – Esau and becomes an important cultural unit in Jewish culture. In
ancient times, there were no appropriate tools for working such hard stones. This
explains the fluctuation between σάρδιον, sardius, ruby, carnelian, and coral in
translations. Two of the three uses of [òdem] are instructions for the high priest's
breastplate (Ex 28:17; 39:10). The third and last use of אֹדֶם [òdem] is in Ez 28:13 where
chapter 28 is dedicated to the fall of the king of Tyre. The fall of the ruler of Tyre is
commented on as a description of the fall of man or angels. In this case, the אֹדֶם
[òdem] is an element of paradise.

Rhizomatous spread of the Aleph-Dalet-Mem in the Bible is untranslatable in
Indo-European languages because of inter-language dissymmetry. All logical links
also remain in the Hebrew inner form of the derivates.

3.2 Scarlet [tolàat shanì] is a sacral red nuance

From a statistical point of view, shanì is the most frequent basic term for red.
However, the semantic territory of this term is not diverse and rich. This type of red
occurs in three main cases: 1. In the sacral color tetrad of the Tabernacle and the First
Temple. The color tetrad comprise of *white linen* (fine linen) שֵׁשׁ [shesh] or בּוּץ [butz],
blue תְּכֵלֶת [tehèlet], purple אַרְגָּמָן [argamàn], and scarlet תּוֹלַעַת שָׁנִי [tolàat shanì] (Ex
35); 2. In the Tabernacle, when it was carried from place to place, the worm-like red
(the scarlet wool) is one of the elements of the sacral duad. The scarlet wool and the
blue fabrics were the coverings of the seven pieces of furniture of the Tabernacle.
That was the cloak of the Tabernacle when Jews moved from place to place. The
[tolàat shanì] marks 'horizontal non-linear movement'; 3. Curing and purifying
rituals.

The term [tolàat shanì] is a significant code for red nuance. The term is a Hebrew
compound of two words: תּוֹלַעַת [tolàat] is a Hebrew case from (*smihut*) of a *worm,*

maggot, larva תּוֹלֵעָה [toleà], a *worm, scarlet, crimson* תּוֹלָע [tolà]. The word שָׁנִי [shanì] means *scarlet*. The etymology of the term is strongly linked to the technology of scarlet extraction. The art of dyeing is well known to the Israelites when they dye skins with juices of cochineal insects "coccus ilicis", "coccus polonicus" or "Margarodes polonicus" during the Exodus of Egypt (Ex 26:1). Boyd specifies the technics of production:

> […] Harvesters collect the female insect and spray it with an acid solution to kill it. The insects are dried, then dissolved in water to produce a colorfast red dye. Lat. *kermes,* from which English *carmine* and *crimson* are derived means 'worm', as Hebrew [tolaà], 'scarlet'." (Boyd 2000: 2791).

All Slavic languages use the same logical feature for the inner form – the technology of producing the scarlet dye, i.e. from the word чрьвь ("worm") – of the BCT (see Фасмер 1986 [1950–1958]: 335). In one of the older versions of the Bulgarian Protestant translations (BUL4), this red nuance was called *червячено червено* "wormy red". This corresponds to the Hebrew etymology.

Hebrew and Slavic etymology are the same based on the technology to produce this red extract from the body and the eggs of cochineal insects. Indo-European linguistic consciousness coincides with the Semitic. It means a common logical matrix or psychological gestalt between different ethnicities underlies such intrinsic motivation for the term. In Humboldt's terms, the inner form of the word has an epistemological and psychological aspect. Very often the two aspects are intertwined and it is difficult to distinguish which is the predominant one. In the case of the basic terms for this shade of red, it is obvious that both the ancient Slavs and the Jews forged the term on the basis of the technology for obtaining the dye. Jews and Slavs related to the outside world the same way for this expensive hue. The knowledge and cognitive processes of the Jews and Indo-European peoples about the objects red-blood-ground-man were constructed in a very different ways. For Jews, the external world had one specific form of language of dictionary items (words) and was completely different for Indo-Europeans when it comes to red, blood, ground, and man. For Jews, these objects are an indivisible whole, and their outer forms are fixed in one Hebrew root – Aleph-Dalet-Mem. Here epistemology is leading, but it implies not only differences in understanding (uniting/dividing) the structure of the external world but psychological differences. After all, this is an important theological aspect of the biblical text.

In the more recent Protestant versions (BUL1, BUL3) [tolàat shanì] becomes червено ("red") as in the Orthodox translation (BUL2). The Russian Synodal Translation preserves the Old-Slavic and the Hebrew etymology with *чревленый* [chrèvlenji] ("wormy-red") (Ex 35:23 RSV). The word remained in the Russian biblical language preserving the Old Bulgarian basis of the Rusian Bible. The word remained

even after 1515 when it was officially replaced by "beautiful" (красный [krasnji]) meaning *red* after 1515. For instance, Red Square in Moskow is *красная площадь* [krasnajia plòshchad] lit. "beautiful square". In Russian, the word *красный* [krasnji] meaning "red" is a later phenomenon. For the first time, this meaning is held in 1515 (1515 "Памятниках дипломатических сношений Московского государства с Крымом" Иссерлин, *РЯШ* 1951, №3 85:86; см. также Фасмер, II: 368). (1515 in the "Monuments of Diplomatic Relations of the Moscow State with the Crimea" *Isserlin, RIASH* 1951, No 3, 85:86; see also Фасмер 1986, vol. 2: 368).

English translations prefer *scarlet* for [tolàat shanì]. TWOT in BW pretends this shade of red is related to blood. It is hard to agree that "shanì was the color of blood". Color of blood was, and still is, red type-adom. The worm-red, the scarlet, was not chosen by any chance for sacral use. It accommodates additional non-color semantic features. These semantic features have to do with the ideology motivating the choice of the term. The semantic features can be deduced from the signs of the natural object – the worm – and also, from the sacral position of this kind of red – to be at the sacral point which is a mediator between God and man. Sacral red (worm-red) includes the semantics of 'non-linear motion', 'spiral motion'. That means the movement can be both vertical and horizontal. That is the specialization of move- ment according to the sign 'way of movement' but not 'direction of movement'. The 'mode of movement' is an actual sign when we think of the worm-red among the group in the sacral four colors.

The hypothesis is that it refers to the qualities of the worm-red as 'eternal movement' + 'movement through the mystical channels connecting the material and ideal worlds' + 'flexibility' + 'softness (no hardcover)' + 'ground penetration'. The semanticizing of [tolàat shanì] follows these directions. Sacral red, the scarlet, does not bind itself to the prototypes of red (fire or blood) or the RTs, e.g. raspberry, strawberry, apple, etc. Worm-red has the macro meaning of 'help from the Lord for the wretched people', which causes a 'protective' meaning.

Due to its location in the temple, this red code should refer to the macro-light red, although in the visual this red is darker than the red type-[adòm]. In the sacred text of the Bible, the two terms have a different status as a code meaning different things. Moreover, there are differences in the red-blood line in Hebrew words *earth* and *man*, which are derived and form a theological picture remaining hidden for Indo- Europeans. Just as the linguistic-based hidden theology of the worm-red remains in the bosom of sacred space and the meaning 'God – man connection'.

In the Old Testament way of thinking, this type of red is specialized in sacral use and does not fit into the habit and use of the usual red, marked by the semantic line of fall, derived from the root Aleph-Dalet-Mem. In pra-Indo-European linguistic con- sciousness and pra-Semitic linguistic consciousness, the term *red* is mentally asso- ciated with the subject-prototype for red – the blood. Skeat (1993: 395) cites the

Sanskrit term *rudhira*, "blood", as the basis for the English term *red*, German *Roth*, Swedish *rőd*, etc. If the technology of producing scarlet dye is the basis of Slavic and Semitic languages, it means that the term does not follow the prototype blood. The term [tolàat shanì] binds Hebrew and the Jewish mind with the sacred origin but not the red-blood, 'earthly', 'sinful', 'murder and bloodshed'. Isa 1:18 braked this general semanticizing and loaded on the worm-red (scarlet) with a meaning more typical for adom-red: "Come now, and let us reason together, saith the LORD: though your sins be as scarlet [shanì] all be as white as snow; though they be red [adòm] like crimson [tolà], they shall be as wool". Isaiah is a master of exceptions – the term for the six-winged archangels, the seraphim, is found only in his text, the term *Lilith* (*hapax legomena*) associated with the night female demon Lilith, all found only in Isaiah.

3.2.1 Scarlet and the curing power mirroring the sacral color tetrad

A purifying use of שְׁנֵי תוֹלָעַת [shnèi tolàat] appears in the commandment for the *red heifer* [parà adumà] (Numbers 19:2–13; Hebrews 9:11–13). Scarlet [shnèi tolàat] has curing energy as a member of a color tetrad in Lev 4:6; 14:49; 14:51–52, i.e. 5 times: "the priest shall order that two live clean birds and some cedar wood, scarlet yarn and hyssop be brought for the one to be cleansed." (Lev 14:4 NIV). There are two semiotic challenges in these verses. The first one is a hypothesis for the color tetrad from Tabernacle and the First Temple. The chapter of Leviticus describes healing magic. The tetrad, in this case, marks a description of a gift, a contribution to God, made by a priest to cure leprosy or to clean a house of disease. The tetrad is structured according to matrix 1:3 used in the interior of the Tabernacle. But here, the structure is a mirror[1] of one of the sacral color tetrad: 1 BCT + 3 non-color substances. It appears that this is not a literal repetition with three BCTs + 1 RT for the color of the sacral tetrad. The word order in the five uses is reversed. In the Tabernacle, it is [tolàat shanì] while in Leviticus is [shnèi tolàat]. The healing magical sacral tetrad from Leviticus reduplicates the temple color tetrad as a numeral structure, reversing in a mirror the presence of the BCT and RT. The mirror, i.e. inverted structure (3 BCTs + 1 RT vs. 1 BCT + 3 non-color substances), and the inability to find steady color among the three substances give an end to further speculations.

    The second challenge is connected to the forms שְׁנֵי [shnèi] and שְׁתֵי [shtèi]. The form of [shnèi tolàat] is contradictory at first glance. The usual form of this compound for color is [tolàat shanì]. Only in the described healing instruction is there a shift in the word order and a phonetic change שָׁנִי [shanì] becomes שְׁנֵי [shnèi]. The form [tolàat shanì] consists of two nouns – *worm* and *scarlet material/wool*. Both forms, שְׁנֵי [shnèi] and שְׁתֵי [shtèi] mean the numerical name *two* in the case form for

---

1 A mirror is treated as an inversion of the order.

the Hebrew compound "smihut". The form שְׁתֵּי [shtèi] is used for "two birds". Maybe the worm-scarlet has a deep association with the number two. In Jewish tradition, this is interpreted as the need for the red threads to be twinned before weaving.

3.3 Two cases of remarkable *hapax legomena*

3.3.1 חֲמוּץ [hamùtz] – The Lord's Day of Vengeance in "fermented" red

The Het-Mem-Tzadi root brings an additional shade to the red present in the Old Testament, though there is only one use (Isa 63:1) in the red (painted) meaning of a ruler coming from Edom. Gesenius describes of Het-Mem-Tzadi:

> 1. As to taste, to be sour, acid, leavened, e.g. fermented or leavened bread Ex 12:39. Hos 7:4; or vinegar; 2. As to sight, color, to be bright, splendid, so as to dazzle the eyes; spoken especially of a bright red or scarlet color. Passive Participle חָמוּץ [hamùtz]; 3. *Trope* of the mind: a) to be eager, vehement; to do violence. b) to be sharp, bitter, spoken of pain, see Hitpael. HITPAEL to be embittered, pained, i.e. moved with anger, pain, Ps 73:21. (Gesenius 1996: 325–326)

TWOT in BW confirms the meanings pointed by Gesenius but adds one meaning *to be red* for the Het-Mem-Tzadi root, recognizing status as the basic color term for the eccentric *hapax legomenon* "fermented" red of Isaiah 63:1.

> Isaiah 63:1
>
> Who is this that cometh from Edom, with deep-red [חָמוּץ hamùtz]; garments from Bozrah, this that is glorious in his apparel, traveling in the greatness of his strength? – I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save. (DBY)
>
> Who is this coming from Edom, from Bozrah, with his garments stained crimson [hamùtz]? Who is this, robed in splendor, striding forward in the greatness of his strength? "It is I, speaking in righteousness, mighty to save". (NIV)
>
> Who is this who comes from Edom, With garments of glowing colors [hamùtz]; from Bozrah, This One who is majestic in His apparel, Marching in the greatness of His strength? "It is I who speak in righteousness, mighty to save." (NAU)
>
> Τίς οὗτος ὁ παραγινόμενος ἐξ Εδωμ, ἐρύθημα [hamùtz]; ἱματίων ἐκ Βοσορ οὕτως ὡραῖος ἐν στοῇ βία μετὰ ἰσχύος; ἐγὼ διαλέγομαι δικακισύνην καὶ κρίσιν σωτηρίου. (LXX)
>
> quis est iste qui venit de Edom tinctis vestibus [dyed clothes] de Bosra iste formosus in stola sua gradiens in multitudine fortitudinis suae ego qui loquor iustitiam et propugnator sum ad salvandum (VUL)

In Hebrew, it is a BCT, i.e. adjective. In some of the translations, it is BCT *crimson, deep-red, червени* ("red" BUL1, BUL2), *szkarłatnych* ("scarlet" Polish), *червленых* (RST), *ἐρύθημα* noun (LS) "a redness on the skin", "redness" (BLM), *rötlichen* ("reddish" LUT, LUO), *rouges* ("red" LSG, BFC, DRB), *cramoisy* ("crimson" TOB), *vivo colore* ("vivid color" IEP), *scarlatto* ("scarlet" NRV), *tinte di scarlatto* ("scarlet tints" LND), *червоных* ("red" UKR). For fluent Hebrew speakers who are interested in meticulous study of the details of the biblical text, Isaiah 63:1–3 has several red presences: *Edom* (אֱדֹם [edòm]), *red* (אָדֹם [adòm]), *blood* (דָם [dam]), *crimson/deep-red/glowing colors* (חָמוּץ [hamùtz]). The man comes from Edom. We remember that Edom means red from the root of Aleph-Dalet-Mem:

> Isaiah 63:2–3
>
> Why are your garments red [adòm], like those of one treading the winepress? "I have trodden the winepress alone; from the nations no one was with me. I trampled them in my anger and trod them down in my wrath; their blood [dam] spattered my garments, and I stained all my clothing. (NIV)

Isa 63:1–3 is filled with various red codes. These are the "fermented red" [hamùtz], the basic term for red [adòm], the proper name Edom, and the metaphoric "the blood of the grape", blood. It is hard to tell if these are macro-dark or macro-light red codes. On the one hand, these are signs of punishment, explicit with the words anger, wrath, and sentences "I have trodden the winepress alone; from the nations no one was with me. I trampled them in my anger and trod them down in my wrath; their blood [dam] spattered my garments". On the other hand, it is both the wrath of the Lord and "righteousness, mighty to save" the Savior. If the punishment comes from the Divine, it is probably macro-light red.

The proper name Edom אֱדֹם [edòm] is not connected to the red color in the Indo-European mind and חָמוּץ [hamùtz] as we have seen above is a translation problem. We must add the constant biblical symbol of winepress which can produce red juice/blood to stain the garment, i.e. "the blood of the grape" (Deut 32:14). To say that "the blood of the grape" is a metaphor for human blood is not enough. On apparel of a man who traveled from Edom means the blood has dried up along the way and has ceased to have the color אָדֹם [adòm] and became חָמוּץ [hamùtz] "deep-red" (DBY), "crimson" (NIV, NIB, NRS). Hebrew word חָמוּץ [hamùtz] is from Het-Mem-Tzady חמץ that produces derivates as *vinegar* חֹמֶץ [hòmetz], *be sour, leavened* חָמֵץ [hàmàtz].

The peculiarities of the meaning of the word חָמוּץ [hamùtz] lead to fluctuations in translation. Many authoritative translations avoid using BCT by replacing it with *dyed garments*: VUL *tinctis vestibus* ("dyed garments"), NRV *vestito splendidament* ("splendidly dressed"), KJV, NKJ, NAU (garments of glowing colors), *ubroceném rouše* BKR ("a turbulent robe"). German ELB changes the deep-red of the dried blood to

"bright red" *grellroten*. Similar is the Spanish LBA *colores brillantes* ("bright colors"), RVA *brillantes* ("bright"), SRV *bermejos* ("vermilion"), etc.

The Hebrew term חָמוּץ [hamùtz] includes the idea of fermented human blood. Fermented substances are considered a symbol of weakness, of sin. The regular red [adòm] appears in Isaiah 63:2. God's anger and Judgment are in red in the Old and New Testaments. It is known as The Lord's Day of Vengeance. Isaiah 63:1–4 introduces the Savior's judgment through verse 1, where the prophet used the verb *to save* לְהוֹשִׁיעַ [lehoshia]. The verb is infinitive of the root Yud-Shin-Ayn יש. The name *Jesus* יְהוֹשֻׁיֹ [iehoshùa] is a derivate of the same root meaning Saviour. It is a standard Jewish proper name, documented in the sixth book of the Old Testament. Revelation 19:13 translated in Hebrew (HNT) is an example of how Isaiah 63:1 and the word חָמוּץ [hamùtz] is transmitted in the New Testament. The choice corresponds straight to the tradition of Isaiah 63:1–4, literary *dressed in red from blood* [lavùsh me-adòm be-dàm], but not with Hebrew "hamùtz". The Rev 19:15 uses the winepress known from Isaiah:

> Revelation 19:13–16
>
> 13 And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood and his name is called The Word of God. 14 And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. 15 And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. 16 And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of Kings, and Lord of Lords.

Isaiah gave a color code for Saviour's anger and wrath with the fermented deep-red (חָמוּץ [hamùtz]). Isaiah 63 prophesied the Lord's Day of Vengeance developed in Revelation.

3.3.2 Red or dark [hahlilì]

As mentioned above, in the B&K tradition, the red color belongs to the macro-light, not to the macro-dark. Biblical contexts, however, offer psychological and cultural interpretations of red as macro-dark. The use of the word חַכְלִילִי [hahlilì] is a *hapax* in the Old Testament. It appears in Gen 49:12 for the tribe of Judah:

> His eyes shall be red with wine, And his teeth white with milk. (ASV)
>
> His eyes will be darker than wine, his teeth whiter than milk. (NIV)
>
> His eyes are dull from wine, And his teeth white from milk (NAS)

The text motivates both meanings "red with wine" and "darker than wine". The third translation solution "dull from wine/drunk" is a translation in a sense that gives reason to appreciate red as a macro-dark. When restoring Hebrew in modern times [hahlilì] was adopted as a term for red in modern Hebrew, an adjective meaning 1. colored; 2. reddish.

This second case of hapax differs significantly from the first. In the first case, we are dealing with the unique ability of the prophet Isaiah to introduce eccentric meanings and uses of different words. More importantly, these eccentric meanings have been adopted into the biblical code by the sacred community and are an integral part of the biblical canon. The second case is interesting from a completely different position. It is indicative that Biblical Hebrew is not the spoken Hebrew of the Pentateuch era, but the use of Hebrew with great care and careful selection of every word. The adoption of biblical hapax in Modern Hebrew with a diminutive meaning of a shade of red, different from the popular basic term for red [adòm], indicates the Jewish attitude to tradition. Both cases are evidence of the functioning of the red cultural unit in Hebrew and Jewish culture. An additional meaning of this definition [hahlilì] is that it refers to the tribe of Judah. The definition is in the prophetic testament of Jacob/Israel to the 12 Tribes. As is known, King David was of the tribe of Judah, and the genealogy of Jesus Christ is derived in the New Testament from the same tribe. Theologically, this is disturbing – the tribe would be drunk. We, the readers, do not know whether it was/is red or dark. In any case, this is a macro-dark ambiguous red biblical code.

3.4 To be red חָמַר [hamàr]

Het-Mem-Reish חָמַר [hamàr] root is common in Hebrew and Aramaic. This red code in the Old Testament contexture is very different from other verbally-motivated codes – the standard *red* [adòm], the sacral *scarlet* [toaàt shanì], the eccentric "fermented" red [hamùtz], the macro-dark [hahlilì]. It presents a different universe of meanings, linking the Old to the New Testament through the messiah's donkey. The other peculiarity is the semantics and spelling of the similar root of Haf-Mem-Reish כמר [hamàr] with the mental unrest and the black color, as well as the opacity where the macro-dark red prevails. In Biblical Hebrew, Het-Mem-Reish חמר [hamàr] root has two sides, like a mental coin in the worldview of Biblical Hebrew. One side is black, and the other side of the coin is red.

In the Old Testament, this root has only one use as a BCT red, as a verb חֳמַרְמְרָה [homarmerà] in Job 16:16: "My face is red with weeping, And on my eyelids is the shadow of death". English translators are divided between two BCTs: *red* (ASV, NIB, NIV, NRS, DBY, and RSV) and *flushed* (NAS, NAU, NKJ). NAB puts equality between

Hebrew BCT and English PT: "My face is inflamed with weeping and there is darkness over my eyes." while WEB and RWB prefer other stylistic decision, *foul*: "My face is foul with weeping, and on my eyelids *are* the shadow of death". In Bulgarian translations, only BUL2 used red (*почервеня*) and all protestant versions use *подпухна* "foul". Septuagint, followed by NAB, preferred to use PT συγκέκαυται "set on fire with" or "burn up": η′ γαστήρ μου συγκέκαυται ἀπὸ κλαθμοῦ ἐπὶ δὲ βλεφάροις σκιά (LXX). According to TWOT in BibleWorks98, this Greek word in Latin is *comburere*, but Vulgate does not use it, preferring the word *intumuit* meaning both *red* but also *foul*: "facies mea intumuit a fletu et palpebrae meae caligaverunt" (VUL Job 16:17). Slavic translations into Russian, Polish, Bulgarian Orthodox, and Czech adhere to the redness of Hebrew [hèmer].

According to Gesenius, the root Hebrew has few areas. The one is red: *to be red*, from the idea of boiling, foaming, becoming heated or inflamed חָמַר [hamàr]; wine so-called as being fermented חֶמֶר [hèmer]; to be made to boil, to be in a ferment, to be troubled, to become red, e.g. the countenance as inflamed by weeping חֲמַרְמְרָה [homarmerà] in Job 16:16; a he-donkey חֲמֹר [hamòr]. The other is black: bitumen, from to boil up, to ferment, to foam; or from its redness, the best kind being of that color חֵמָר [hemàr]; clay, the loam of a reddish color, potter's clay; cement, mire; a boiling, foaming, e.g. of waters, waves; a heap, homer, a measure for things dry, containing ten ephahs חֹמֶר [hòmer]; smear with asphalt חָמַר [hamàr]; a he-ass חֲמֹר [hamòr]; to boil up, to ferment, to foam, to swell, to rise in bubbles or heaps, foaming, like the sea, leaven חָמַר [hamàr].

From the expanded semantics of the root, it can be concluded that the red he-donkey is not loaded with positive semanticizing. Therefore, it can be characterized as a macro-dark red. The Bible has no negative attitude towards the donkey. On the contrary, the donkey is forbidden food; the donkey and the ox have to rest on Saturday; the first-born donkey is not subject to destruction in Egyptian punishments. Unlike mules and horses that are associated with war, donkeys are associated with peace (2Ki 19: 16/27) and the messiah (Zech 9:9; Mat 21:5, 7).

Basic semanticization has an attachment to the idea of the donkey as a royal ritual animal and as the donkey of the messiah. The male donkey is a code for subconsciously suggesting red. However, the she-donkey [atòn] formed from a completely different root. The royal donkey [pirdà] is from a third root. Donkey child [ar] is of the fourth root. In this chain, there is an opposition of the red male donkey to the white she-donkeys of Judg 5:10.

Biblical donkey's terminology is related to the Jewish king, the Messiah, and the New Testament. Root community of the red male donkey [hamòr] with the word [hòmer] meaning material, substance; the material, the physical, is the reason to accept Messiah must ride a donkey as a symbol of having mastered the material, the physical in Judaism.

King David's sons ride she-mules פִּרְדָה [pirdà]. Solomon's anointment as king with such a female mule changes the spectrum of romanticizing this word: from the usual animal ridden by the king's sons in times of peace, this kind of donkey transformed into a royal animal. The donkey is the king's ritual animal made understandable why Jesus Christ is called the king of the Jews. The occurrences of Het-Mem-Reish חמר root as *clay, mud, foam, to ferment, to foam, to swell* are directly referred to as black color and/or impure objects.

3.4.1 Semio-osmosis PT-BCT

Semio-osmosis process was introduced in Almalech (2021a). The verb חֲמַרְמְרָה [homarmerà] (Job 16:16) is a member of the extended paradigm of the root Het-Mem-Reish חמר. The equality between Hebrew BCT (to be red, to become red) and English PT translation (inflamed) along with other derivative (the idea of boiling, foaming, becoming heated or inflamed; clay, the loam of a reddish color, potter's clay, redness) presents semio-osmosis in both Hebrew – English translation and Hebrew – Hebrew. Hebrew – Hebrew case demonstrates cognitive link between Hebrew PT ('idea becoming heated or inflamed') and BCT (the verb *to become red*). Besides inter-language and cognitive semio-osmosis, the root is a demonstration of the unity of two colors – black (bitumen, smear with asphalt) and red. This is not a case of inter-language semio-osmosis but rather a manifestation of black and red as a macro-dark phenomenon in the Hebrew worldview without producing a basic color term for black but deriving a basic color term for red.

3.5　The red of disgrace – *vermilion* [shashèr]

There are two uses of the term שָׁשֵׁר [shashèr] meaning *vermilion, cinnabar, red ochre,* and *red chalk*. They reflect the language of Jeremiah and Ezekiel (VII-VI BC). This is the period before and during the 50 years of exile in Mesopotamia. The influence of Aramaic can be sought here, though Jeremiah lived and prophesied during the time of the five kings of Judah before the First Temple was destroyed. It means possible original Hebrew use of the Shin-Shin-Reish שׁשׁר root before the exile meaning *to twist, to turn (a cord)*. Gesenius (1996: 1114) accepts it as an obsolete root. According to Gesenius, Sinn-Shin-Reish is a Semitic root that has remained undeveloped in Hebrew but with a cognitive connection to the Shin-Kuf-Reish שקר and Shin-Reish-Kuf שׁרק. The first root forms *lie, cheat*, and the second – *whistle*. This cognitive link explains the negative semanticizing, as well as the infrequent use, of [shashèr] for vermilion-painted objects. Jer 22:13 explains "Woe to him who builds his palace by unrighteousness, his upper rooms by injustice, making his countrymen

work for nothing, not paying them for their labor." The semanticizing of [shashèr] from Jer 22:13 is explicit and clearly expressed – 'unrighteousness', 'injustice', 'to make your fellow work without pay is wrongdoing'. For Jer 22:13 Septuagint uses the word μίλτος – *red chalk, ruddle,* and Vulgate uses another word – *sinopide* ("vermillion"). Jeremiah accuses Judah and Israel of the same injustice doings that led to his exile in Babylon. Correspondingly, using the Shin-Shin-Reish root and vermilion:

> Ezekiel 23:14

> But she carried her whorings further; she saw male figures carved on the wall, images of the Chaldeans portrayed in vermilion, (NRS)

> καὶ προέθετο πρὸς τῆς προνίν αὐτῆς καὶ εἶδεν ἄνδρας ἐζωγραφημένος ἐπὶ τοῦ τοίχου εἰκόνας Χαλδαίων ἐζωγραφημένους ἐν γραφίδι (LXX)

> et auxit fornicationes suas cumque vidisset viros depictos in pariete imagines Chaldeorum expressas coloribus (VUL)

The Septuagint skips over this exotic term for red in Eze 23:14. Instead, *Haldeian-style* (Χαλδαίων ἐζωγραφημένους) colors were used. Vulgate uses the same expression imagines Chaldeorum expressas coloribus. Probably following the Septuagint, so does the Bulgarian Orthodox version (BUL2), unlike the Protestant one using "cinnabar" (*киновар*). BUL3 prefers "red paint".

In Jeremiah, contextual semanticizing is 'wealth built on injustice and iniquity', in Ezekiel, 'paganism', 'impurity', 'betrayal of monotheism'. Consistent with the context, in both cases, semanticizing is about negative, impure things, and can be attributed to the macro-dark spectrum of red. However, vermilion שָׁשֵׁר [shashèr] is macro-light-red in color. The term [shashèr] is in opposition to the red type [adòm] because the red-[adòm] was used for dyeing the ram skins for the tent of the Tabernacle. Thus, שָׁשֵׁר [shashèr] and אָדֹם [adòm] are two terms for red in semantic opposition 'macro-dark red' שָׁשֵׁר [shashèr] – 'macro-light red' אָדֹם [adòm] when *blood* means 'soul', 'life' (Gen 9:4–6; Lev 17:11; 14; Deut 12: 21–25). Everywhere in these verses instead of life is one of the two words for a soul in Hebrew [nèfesh].

> Only you shall not eat flesh with its life, that is, its blood. (Gen 9:4 NAS)

> And surely I will require your lifeblood; from every beast I will require it. And from every man, from every man's brother I will require the life of man. (Gen 9:5 ASV)

> For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life. (Lev 17:11 ASV)

> But be sure you do not eat the blood, because the blood is the life, and you must not eat the life with the meat. (Deut 12:23 NIB)

The beauty of David is described with BCT *red* אָדֹם [adòm] (1Sam 16:12) translated as *ruddy* in English: "So he sent and had him brought in. He was ruddy, with a fine appearance and handsome features. Then the LORD said, Rise and anoint him; he is the one." Bulgarian translations accommodate this to рус ("blond"). This is a Hebrew macro-light red saved in English.

However, [shashèr] is used only with negative semanticizing, while [adòm] has many and varied semanticizing.

4 Prototype term (PT) *fire*

The prototypes of red are fire and blood. The blood [dam] was considered above as an element of the rhizome of the root Aleph-Dalet-Mem. The prototypes of red in biblical Hebrew are arranged paradoxically. There is only one word for blood [dam], derived from one root, Aleph-Dalet-Mem, while fire is signified by 25 words (nouns, verbs, and adjectives) derived from 18 different roots. The blood is a member of the semiotic rhizome of the Aleph-Dalet-Mem root, while the words for fire are much more a structure where the contextual meanings are not particularly different. In mono-theistic culture, *fire* is well-studied, probably because it is an important element in folklore rituals, polytheistic mythologies, and Ancient Greek philosophy. For this reason, the various lexical and textual meanings of fire will not be traced here. The symbolism of fire is presented in detail in Bible dictionaries and encyclopedias (XIXth and XXth centuries). The semanticizing of fire is explicit in a number of biblical dictionaries and encyclopedias.[2] The language is highly metaphorical, conveying the idea of a terrible judgment.

For the needs of the students at The New Bulgarian University, the words for blood and all manifestations of the 25 words for the fire were counted until Leviticus 7. Both manual and electronic approvals have been established. It turns out that the use of blood and all the words for fire are equal in number for each of the two

---

2 ISBE, JE, TWOT, Easton's Bible Dictionary, Smith's Bible Dictionary, Torrey's Topical Textbook, Baker's Evangelical Dictionary of Biblical Theology, Gesenius, DBI, DDDB, EBD, CE, IER, all copyright sources in BW. ISBE also mentions several meanings of fire and flame in the New Testament, indicating the Old Testament prototype: the possibility of baptism by fire (Mat 3:11); the lake of fire (Rev 9:20; 20:10, 14–15; 21:8); the everlasting/unquenchable fire, i.e. Gehenna or hell (Mat 3:12; Luke 3:17; Mark 9:43; 48); fiery Gehenna, hell (Mat 5:22; 13:40–42; 50). In the Old Testament, analogs are Isa 1:31; 34:10; 66:24; Jer 4:4; 7:20; 17:27; 21:12; Eze 20:47–48. It cannot be denied that the biblical uses and meanings of fire are influenced by mutual elements of Middle East culture.

prototypes. This fact is independent of the root universe of the root Aleph-Dalet-Mem and the various roots meaning fire, flame, to burn.

4.1 Complexity of *fire* phenomenon and semio-osmosis PT-TBFP

Significantly, the first occurrence of a word for fire is *flame* in Gen 3:24. Bible keeps the universal folklore meaning of the fire 'protective/preserving' (see Almalech 1996): *The flaming sword* and the *cherub* preserve the path to the Tree of Life.

Flames and fire have many meanings in the Old and New Testaments – 'help from the Lord', 'punishment from God', 'love', and more. Given the structure of red in the Old Testament, it is important that by the fourth chapter of the Bible (Gen 4) both prototypes of red – flame, and blood – appeared but the basic color term for red has not yet appeared. BCT red is used for the first time 20 chapters later, in Gen 25. This mega theme-rheme (in terms of Prague Functional linguistics rheme corresponds to the provision of new information) structure should not mislead that the BCT red does not exist in Hebrew before the story of Jacob/Israel and Esau/Edom in Gen 25.

It should be very clear that the macro-light red, inspired by the prototype fire and its most typical features (burn, heat), is a complex problem. The first aspect of the problem is the high incidence – a total of over 1,000 times. The second aspect is linguistic and cognitive – the ability of the Hebrew language to nuance and focus on individual concepts (words) and different aspects of the prototype's most typical features. The third aspect is that most uses, but not all, suggest a macro-light red and some signify macro-dark red.

Very often the most typical features of the prototype (TBFP) are used in conjunction with words for the prototype (PT). This is a semio-osmosis in synergy. The examples are numerous: *burning fire* [esh boèret], *burn in fire* [bièr ba-èsh], *kindle a fire, light fires, burning coals, glowing coals, flaming torches, firebrands, the flame has burned up*, and many others. Some uses cannot be translated in Indo-European languages, e.g. "burn them thoroughly" in Hebrew is "burn them in fire" [nisrefa li-srefa], where both the verb and the noun are derived from the same root – Shin-Resh-Fe.

Semiotic osmosis occurs in cultural units black and green. For black it is between the BCT and PT (Almalech 2018b), for green the semio-osmosis appears between BCT and TBFP (Almalech 2017a). Red PT and TBFP are in semio-osmosis. The following examples demonstrate the semiotic osmosis between fire (PT) and its typical features (TBFP).

> And the angel of Jehovah appeared unto him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush: and he looked, and, behold, the bush burned with fire, and the bush was not consumed. (Ex 3:2 ASV)

The LORD said to Satan, "The LORD rebuke you, Satan! The LORD, who has chosen Jerusalem, rebuke you! Is not this man a burning stick snatched from the fire?" (Zech 3:2 NIV)

Therefore he poured upon him the fierceness [hemà] of his anger, and the strength of battle; and it set him on fire [làhat] round about, yet he knew not; and it burned [baar] him, yet he laid it not to heart. (Isa 42:25 ASV)

Behold, all ye that kindle a fire [karah esh], that gird yourselves about with firebrands [zika "spark"]; walk ye in the flame [ur] of your fire [esh], and among the brands that ye have kindled [zika]. This shall ye have of my hand; ye shall lie down in sorrow. (Isa 50:11 ASV)

Let burning coals [gahal] fall upon them: Let them be cast into the fire [esh], Into deep pits, whence they shall not rise. (Ps 140:10 ASV)

For they have made ready their heart like an oven [tanur], while they lie in wait: their baker sleepeth all the night; in the morning it burneth [baar] as a flaming fire [esh lehavà]. (Hos 7:6 ASV)

4.2 The Seraphim שְׂרָפִים [serafim][3]

Seraphim are not only a neologism and a cultural innovation presented by Isaiah. The word is a derivte the *Sin-Reish-Fe* root meaning *fire* שָׂרַף [saràf], *burn, to destroy by fire* שָׂרַף [saràf], *fiery serpent* שָׂרָף [saràf] (Num 21:6, 8; Deut 8:15; Isa 6:2, 6; 14:29; 30:6), identified as *red cobra Naja pallida* (Provençal 2005).

In any case, speaking of Seraphim, we will have to get into the topic of angelology. Very often in Christian drawings, cherubs are mixed with seraphim, though these are two different types of archangels. In the biblical text, cherubim are described with two wings in the Tabernacle and the Temple of Solomon, while the seraphim are with six wings and fiery mentioned in only one place – Isaiah 6. Seraphim and Uriel are archangels linguistically bound to the prototype of red, the fire, regardless of the various Judaic interpretations (multitude, and often confusing), and the charts of angels in Neoplatonism.

Seraphim, cherubim, and ophanim are archangels who stand before the Lord and do not die; they carry out special tasks and serve as the company and guardians of the One God. Their names are derived from common names – fire, and red cobra (for seraphim), wheel (for ophanim). The other high archangels – Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, and Uriel are presented by proper names with two components – the word God [el], as a suffix + another component. For instance, Michael = [mi-ka-el] = "who is

---

3 For a detailed analysis of the verbal and visual color language of the Seraphim, as well as their linguistic, theological and cultural aspects, see Almalech (2021b).

like God", Uriel = [ur + el] = "fire" + "God". The word *fire* [ur] is formed by the basic term for *light* in Hebrew – [or]. Gabriel is also called the "prince of fire", and in one passage of the Talmud Michael is named "prince of fire".

4.3 The vast majority of different roots for *fire* and *burn* are translatable and well-structured

The vast majority of different roots for fire and burn are unambiguous, and it is a real exception to the structure of the Hebrew language. The potential for diversity is realized through multiple phrases comprising the generic term fire [esh]. In most cases, [esh] is combined with another kind of fire (e.g. saràf), or with one of the verbs for *burn* or both together.

The text contains the varied and massive presence of fire but also presents a complex structure of red that is always translated into another language because fire is a prototype of red. Thus, the structure of fiery presence is one of those structures that is stored after translation. Another such structure is light, in which important details about the types of light are lost, but ultimately, as a prototype of white, it is available through linguistic and cognitive mechanisms in all languages and all translations. The same is with darkness. The prototype structures of red, white, and black provide the presence of color after translation, which explains the rare and very specific use of basic color terms.

The huge incidence of prototype structures (for each of the three colors circa 1,000) does not guarantee that PT is always an implied color. Often, the somatization of *fire* and *combustion* pushes the color and takes the focus. The communicative message 'punishment', 'judgment', 'help', etc. remain in the reader's/listener's consciousness and the red color of the fire remains in the linguistic subconscious (without completely disappearing) of the reader/listener. Of course, important details are also lost in red. This happens much more with basic red terms, such as the non-Indo-European language paradigm of the Aleph-Dalet-Mem root, and much less with the names of the fire.

The other prototype of the red – the blood – also remains in translation as in the Hebrew original, although without its logical connection with the rhizoma of the universe of Aleph-Dalet-Mem. The semanticization of blood is also straightforward – 'murder', 'fratricide', 'wrongdoing', or 'sacrificial blood', 'purifying blood'. The potential of the different names of fire is realized kinetically in different accumulations of types/roots of fire in combination with burning, incineration, and destruction with fire. Perhaps the most impressive combination is the *consuming/devouring fire*, as the Lord God Himself is called the devouring fire: "for the Lord your God is a devouring fire, a jealous God." (Deut 4: 24)

Paul, as a well-trained theologian of the Pharisees' party, reaffirms the definition of God as a consuming fire: "for our God is a consuming fire" (Hebrews 12:29). In the New Testament, Christ, as the son of God will not only baptize with fire but will also cleanse the chaff among men with fire (Mat 3:11–12; Luke 3:16–17). The definitions are of John the Baptist:

> I baptize you with water for repentance. But after me will come one who is more powerful than I, whose sandals I am not fit to carry. He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire. His winnowing fork is in his hand, and he will clear his threshing-floor, gathering his wheat into the barn and burning up the chaff with unquenchable fire. (Mat 3:11–12 NIB)

In Luke 12:49 Christ declared: "I have come to bring fire on the earth, and how I wish it were already kindled!" (NIB)

5 The lacework of the red codes, concluding remarks

The lacework is a metaphor for the intertwining of various red structures in several variations, cited, thought, and used for centuries in the New Testament.

The red presence in the Old Testament is presented by two opposite phenomena – the untranslatable rhizome of Aleph-Dalet-Mem root and the translatable structure of numerous roots for prototype *fire* and its basic features, *to burn*, and *heat*.

Aleph-Dalet-Mem is the rhizome due to the following properties:

- Aleph-Dalet-Mem forms a BCT red [adòm], a PT blood [dam], and an RT ruby [òdem]. No other root, producing BCTs in Hebrew, has such a diverse derivational and cultural range.
- In Hebrew, root derivatives are bound by a common inner form.
- A *man* [adàm] is derived from Aleph-Dalet-Mem.
- The *man* [adàm] was created by his female gender, *ground* [adamà].
- The word *man* [adàm] leaves the bosom of the root and enters into a relationship of synonymy and rankings with three other different words denoting a man, [ish], [enòsh], [gèver] having three different inner forms.
- Red color is the inner form of the proper names Adam and Edom. The Israel-Edom relationships reach the New Testament in which the king of the Roman province of Judea is Edomite, Herod. The Herodian Dynasty discerned twice red and hostile by Edomean offspring and the support of the Roman legions.
- The logical link between the root derivatives is untranslatable in another language, and this has logical and theological aspects.

The resemblance of a *man* אִשׁ [ish] with the red PT *fire* אֵשׁ [esh] and *man* אָדָם [adàm] with the PT *blood* דָם [dam] allows thinking of man symbolically as fire and blood. Beyond this prototype, is the generic connection of *man* אָדָם [adàm] with the *ground* אֲדָמָה [adamà], and with the BCT *red* אָדֹם [adòm]. The Old Testament uses the well-structured opposition red ("sin") – white ("righteousness"): "Come now, let us settle the matter, says the LORD. Though your sins are like scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they are red as crimson, they shall be like wool." (Isa 1:18). Red is expressed by BCTs.

There are accumulations with various red presences. In Isaiah 63:1–2, the paradigm of the red-[adòm] is revealed – it turns out that the garment of the man coming from Edom is red [adòm] from the blood-[dam] of the nations. Isaiah 63:2–5 states that while this man trod the nations in the winepress, he spattered his garments. Thus, the garment is not the [adòm]-red but the [hamùtz]-red, where the red-[hamùtz] indicates the impurity of the fermented matters. Translations speak for *their blood*, *their lifeblood, anguis eorum (Lat.), кръвта им (Bul.), кровь их (Rus.), posoka ich (Pol.), krev (Ch.)*, but in Hebrew, the word is [nitzhàm] – *the juice of their grapes*. Blood-translation of Hebrew "juice of their grapes" is for the Indo-European worldviews and introduces the metaphors of the winepress, grape juice as the blood of death and punishment. Also, it corresponds to the meaning of the root of the word *grape juice* – Nun-Tzadi-Het producing *strength, victory, eternity; to be eternal, to be excellent, to excel, to win*. Consequently, man's garments were tainted by the redness of the wine juice, by the unclean energy of fermentation. In this manner, the translation of the word [nètzah] with "their blood" is appropriate as a deprivation of the *strength,* and *victories* of peoples, even theological refusal to admit them to eternity. Fermentation is a code for ritual impurity in Judaism. In these verses dominated by red color, the universal associations of the Word-association Norm of red appeared – 'anger', 'rage' (see Almalech 1999, 2001, 2011), and 'revenge', to which the biblical terms are added 'retribution', 'redemption'.

Isaiah 63 says that the Israelites and the nations have forsaken God. The hint is that Israel has become Edom. The Saviour appears in verses 1 and 8 after the root Yud-Shin-Ain derives *Ye(h)ushua* (Jesus) meaning Saviour. Thus, Jesus, the Saviour, the "priest of the Melchizedek rank", "who saves the circumcised", and the "angel of His presence who saves" are encoded in various red codes in the Old and New Testaments. These codes reveal a theological doctrine linking the two testaments. This intertwining of the New and Old Testaments, of fire-[esh] with the unique "fermented" red-[hamùtz], with red blood-[dam] is like a lacework, which is a contextually located code of various red things. Each type of red is like a different thread in a mutual lacework. Some of the red threads in this verbal lacework are kept after translations, but others remain in Hebrew where the full picture can be seen.

The impact of the red codes is on the linguistic and cultural subconscious. Most of the meanings are based on the universal semanticizing of red. They are also deployed in the Hebrew worldview through BCT and the PT – blood, and fire. This type of lacework is virtually incalculable, and it is unlikely that a computer will soon be able to trace the threads – the rhizome and the structures of layouts of basic color terms and prototype terms. The research would be impossible without computer concordances and Bible software. However, no computer can properly evaluate the contexts in which the various words suggesting red work.

Abbreviations

Biblical dictionaries and encyclopedias

BW – BibleWorks. Software of Biblical exegesis and research. Copyright BibleWorks, LLC. Hermeneutika, Big Fork, Montana; P.O. Box 6158 Norfolk, Virginia.

BLM – The BLM morphology database is an extensive, thorough adaptation and correction of the 1991 LXX/OG Morphology and Lemma Database (LXM-2) from the CATSS project at the University of Pennsylvania. According to BibleWoks4 1998.

CE – *Catholic Encyclopedia* 1913. Retrieved from http://www.catholic.org/encyclopedia/

DBI – *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery*. Edited by Leland Ryken, James Wilhoit, Tremper Longman, 1998. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.

DBS – *Dictionary of Biblical Symbols.*

DDDB – *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. 1999 [1995]. Edited by Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, Pieter van der Horst. 2-nd ed. Leiden: Brill.

DY – *A dictionary of angels, including the fallen angels*. 1967. Edited by Gustav Davidson. New York: Free Press.

EB – *Encyclopaedia Biblica*. 1950–1982. "תחש" in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, vol. 8. Museum of Jewish Antiquities, Mosad Bialik, Universita ha-Ivrit be Yeruhalayim: 520–521. Text in Hebrew.

EBD – *Easton's Bible Dictionary*. Matthew Easton M.A., D.D. *Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, Third Edition, published by Thomas Nelson, 1897. ASCII edition, 1988 Ellis Enterprises, Inc. Public Domain. Franz Delitzsch adds his comments to Easton's Scottish Presbyterian edition.

Fri – According to BibleWoks4 1998. Friberg Lexicon. The Greek New Testament (GNT), edited by Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, and Allen Wikgren, in cooperation with the Institute for New Testament Textual Research, Münster/Westphalia, Fourth Edition (with exactly the same text as the

Nestle-Aland 27th Edition of the Greek New Testament), Copyright © 1966, 1968, 1975 by the United Bible Societies (UBS) and 1993, 1994 by Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft (German Bible Society), Stuttgart. Used by permission. Used by arrangement through United Bible Societies and Drs. Timothy and Barbara Friberg (AGNT/ANLEX). The computer form for the UBS Second Edition (© 1968) was prepared by the TLG Project. The computer form for the UBS Third Edition (© 1975) was derived from the MRT (machine readable text) created by Timothy and Barbara Friberg at the University of Minnesota, Academic Computing Services and Systems.

EJ – *Encyclopaedia Judaica.* 2nd ed. Edited by Michael Berenbaum and Fred Skolnik. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 2007. 22 vols.

IER – *The Internet Encyclopedia of Religions.*

ISBE – *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia.* 5 vol. set, 1939 [1915]. James Orr (general ed.) Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co; 1915. Chicago: Howard-Severance Co. Online: https://www.internationalstandardbible.com/S/seraphim.html

James Orr, M.A., D.D. General Editor, John L. Nuelsen, D.D., LL.D. Edgar Y. Mullins, D.D., LL.D., Assistant Editors Morris O. Evans, D.D., PhD. Managing Editor, Melvin Grove Kyle, D.D., JJ.D. Revising Editor, Copyright, 1939, by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

JE – *The Jewish Encyclopedia: A Descriptive Record of the History, Religion, Literature, and Customs of the Jewish People from the Earliest Times to the Present Day.* 1901–1906. 5 vol. set. Managing ed. Isidore Singe. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company. Available at: http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/Jewish Encyclopedia. com website contains the complete contents of the 12-volume *Jewish Encyclopedia*, which was originally published between 1901 and 1906. *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, which recently became part of the public domain, contains over 15, 000 articles and illustrations. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company. 1912.

LS – Lexicon-Analytical Greek New Testament AGNT2 (GNM) Greek NT Grammatical Analysis Database, Version 2 Copyright © 1994 Timothy and Barbara Friberg. According to BibleWoks4 1998.

NIDNTT – *New international dictionary of New Testament theology*, 4 vol. set. 1975 – Brown, Colin (gen. ed.; transl.), Lothar Coenen, Erich Beyreuther and Hans Bietenhard (eds.). The Zondervan Corporation Grand Rapids, Michigan, U.S.A & The Paternoster Press, Ltd. Exeter, Devon, U.K.

TWOT – *The Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* by Laird Harris, Gleason Archer, Bruce Waltke. Illinois: Moody Press. 1980 [2003]. According to BibleWoks4 1998.

TWBB – A Theological Word Book of the Bible. Edited by Alan Richardson. New York: Macmillan Pub Co; Fifth or Later Edition 1962.

Bibles

BFC – French Bible en français courant, édition révisée. 1997

BKR – Czech Bible Kralická: Bible svatá aneb všecka svatá písma Starého i Nového Zákona podle posledního vydání kralického z roku 1613

BTP – The Polish Millennium Bible 1984, 4th ed.

BUL1 – Bulgarian Protestant Version 1940, 1995, 2005

BUL2 – Bulgarian Orthodox Version 1925, 1991

BUL3 – Protestant "Veren" edition, 2000

BUL4 – Protestant 1873 with newer versions 1914; 1924

DRB – French Version Darby 1885 [1991]

ELB – Revidierte Elberfelder 1993

ESV – English Standard Version. Retrieved from http://biblehub.com/interlinear/

IEP – The Italian NVB Nuovissima Versione della Bibbia 1995–1996

HNT – Hebrew New Testament 1886 [1999]. Salkinson-Ginsburg edition of 1886, revised 1999

KJV – King James Bible. 1769 [1988–1997]. Retrieved from http://biblehub.com/interlinear

LBA – La Biblia de Las Americas 1986

LND – The Italian La Nuova Diodati 1991

LSG – The French Louis Segond Version 1910 [1988–1997]

LUO – The German Luther Bibel 1912 [1995]

LUT – Revidierte Lutherbibel 1984

LXX – Septuagint. Retrieved from http://biblehub.com/interlinear/

NAB – The New American Bible 1991

NAS – New American Standard Bible. Retrieved from http://biblehub.com/interlinear/

NT – New Testament

NRS – New Revised Standard Version 1989

RSV – Revised Standard Version 1952/1971

RVA – Reina-Valera Actualizada 1989

SRV – Versión Reina-Valera 1909 [1988–1997]

OT – Old Testament

RST – Russian Synodal Text of the Bible 1917 [1996]

TOB – Topical Bible

UKR – Ukrainian Orthodox Version

VUL – Latin Vulgate

Books from the Bible

Deut – Deuteronomy
Chr – Chronicles
Cant – Song of Solomon
1 Cor – 1Corinthians
Ex – Exodus
Ez – Ezekiel
Gen – Genesis
Hab – Habakkuk
Hos – Hosea
Isa – Isaiah
Jer – Jeremiah
Judg – Judges
1Ki – 1Kings
2Ki – 2Kings
Lev – Leviticus
Mat – Matthew
Num – Numbers
Oba – Obadiah
Rev – Revelation
Ps – Psalms
1Sam – 1Samuel
Zech – Zechariah

Languages

Bul. – Bulgarian
Cze. – Czech
Pol. – Polish
Rus. – Russian

Colors

BCT – basic color terms
B&K – Berlin&Kay
PT – prototype terms
RT – rival terms of the prototype

TBFP – terms for the basic features of the prototypes
WCS – World Color Survey

General

Ant. – Antiquities

Periodicals, reference works and serials

JSOT – Journal for the Study of the Old Testament
PMLA – Proceedings of the Modern Language Association of America

References

Almalech, Mony. 1996. *Balkan folk color language. Significance of color in Balkan Folkore – marriage and burial*. Sofia: Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski" Press.

Almalech, Mony. 1999. Bulgarian norm of word associations for color terms. In Maria de Graca Pinto, Joao Veloso & Belinda Maia (eds.), *Psycholinguistics on the threshold of the year 2000: Proceedings of the 5-th International Congress of the International Society of Applied Psycholinguistics*, 103–105. Porto: Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto.

Almalech, Mony. 2001. *Цвят и слово: Психолингвистични и прагматични аспекти*. София: Академично издателство. „Проф. Марин Дринов" [Color Language and Natural Language: Psycholinguistic and Pragmatic Approaches, Sofia: Prof. Marin Drinov Academic Publishing House].

Almalech, Mony. 2011. *Advertisements: Signs of femininity and their corresponding color meanings*. Sofia: Prof. Marin Drinov Academic Publishing House.

Almalech, Mony. 2017a. Cultural unit green. *Language and Semiotic Studies* 3. 222–250.

Almalech, Mony. 2017b. Colour as cultural unit. Challenges and developments. In Torkild Thellefsen & Bent Sørensen (eds.), *Umberto Eco in his own words*. (Semiotics, Communication and Cognition vol. 19), 206–213. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Almalech, Mony. 2018a. The man becomes Adam. In Dario Martinelli (ed. in chief), Audronė Daubarienė, Simona Stano, Ulrika Varankaitė (eds.), *Cross-Inter-Multi-Trans: Proceedings of the 13th World Congress of the International Association for Semiotic Studies (IASS/AIS)*, 476–485. Kaunas: IASS Publications & Kaunas International Semiotics Institute.

Almalech, Mony. 2018b. The cultural unit black in the Old Testament. In: Dorota Gonigroszek (ed.), Revew by Aleksandra Majdzinska-Koczorowicz (University of Lodz). *Discourses on colour*, 27–60. Piotrów Trybunalski: Uniwersytet Jana Kochanowskiego w Kielcach.

Almalech, Mony. 2019. Rebranding marlboro with colours. In Evripides Zantides (ed.), *Semiotics and visual communication III: Cultures of branding*, 146–156. Cambridge Scholar Publishing & Cyprus University of Technology Lemesos.

Almalech, Mony. 2021a. Colors as a semiotic tool for Bible analysis. In Jason Cronbach Van Boom & Thomas-Andreas Põder (eds.), *Sign, method and the sacred. New directions in semiotic methodologies*

for the study of religion. (Religion and Reason vol. 64, Semiotics of Religion vol. 5), 243–266. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter.

Almalech, Mony. 2021b. Linguistic, cultural, and theological aspects of Seraphim. *Sofia University St. Kliment Ohridski, Annual of Faculty of Classical and Modern Philology* 114. 86–122.

Berlin, Brent & Paul Kay. 1969. *Basic colour terms: Their universality and evolution*. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Boyd, Mary. 2000. Scarlet, crimson. In David Freedman (ed. in chief), *Eerdmans dictionary of the bible*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.

Briscoe, Robert. 2021. Colour categorization and categorical perception. In Derek. Brown & Fiona Macpherson (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of philosophy of colour*, 456–474. London & New York: Routledge.

Curteanu, Neculai, Diana Trandabat & Mihai Moruz. 2009. Discourse theories vs. Topic-focus articulation applied to prosodic focus assignment in Romanian. In Corneliu Burileanu & Horia-Nicolai Teodorescu (eds.), *2009 Proceedings of the 5th Conference on Speech Technology and Human-Computer Dialogue*. Constanţa, Romania, June 18–21, 1–10. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.

Deleuze, Gilles. 2018. Gilles Deleuze. In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2018 Ed.). Smith, Daniel, John Protevi & Daniela Voss, (Summer 2022 Edition), Edward Zalta (ed.). https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2022/entries/deleuze/. Accessed at: & https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2018/entries/deleuze. Visited 20.07.2019 & 30.10.2022.

Deleuze, Gilles & Felix Guattari. 2004 [1988]. *A thousand plateaus*. Brian Massumi (transl). London & New York: Continuum; 2004. vol. 2 *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translation of Mille plateau. London: Continuum.

Dicou, Bert. 1994. *Edom, Israel's brother and antagonist: The role of Edom in biblical prophecy and story* (JSOT Supplement Series 169). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Eco, Umberto. 1985 [1996]. How culture conditions the colours we see. In Marshall Blonsky (ed.), *On signs*, 157–175. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gesenius, Wilhelm. 1996 [1865]. *Hebrew-Chaldee lexicon to the old testament*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books.

Ginzberg, Louis. 2003. *Legends of the jews*. Henrieta Szold & Paul Radin (transl.) 2-vol. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society.

Hardin, Clyde L. 1988. *Color for philosophers: Unweaving the rainbow*. Indianapolis, Ind.: Hackett Publishing.

Hering, Ewald. 1964 [1892]. *Outlines of a theory of the light sense*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Kay, Paul & Chad McDaniel. 1978. The linguistic significance of the meanings of basic color terms. *Language* 54(3). 610–646.

Kay, Paul & Luisa Maffi. 1999. Colour appearance and the emergence and evolution of basic colour lexicons. *American Anthropologist* 101(4). 743–760.

Kent, Helen & Aaron Rosanoff. 1910. A study of association in insanity. *American Journal of Insanity* 67(1). 37–96. Part II, vol. 67(2), pp. 317–390.

Kress, Gunther & Theo van Leeuwen. 2002. Colour as a semiotic mode: Notes for a grammar of colour. *Visual Communication* 1(3). 343–368.

Losev, Alexei. 1929. Вещ и имя [Thing and name], 1st edn. Moscow.

Lotman, Yuri. 1994. The text within the text. Jerry Leo & Amy Mandelker (transl.), PMLA, 109(3). 377–384.

Lotman, Yuri. 2009. In Marina Grishakova (ed.), Wilma Clark (transl.), *Culture and Explosion*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Munsell, Albert. 2008 [1905]. A color notation. A measured color system, based on the three qualities Hue, Value and Chroma. The Project Gutenberg EBook of A Color Notation, by Albert H. Munsell. First published 1905.

Pastoureau, Michel. 2001. *Blue: The history of a colour*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Provençal, Philippe. 2005. Regarding the noun שרף in the Hebrew Bible. *JSOT* 3. 371–379.

Rosch, Eleanor. 1972. Universals in colour naming and memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 93(1). 10–20.

Rosch, Eleanor. 1973. Natural categories. *Cognitive Psychology* 4. 328–350.

Skeat, Walter. 1993 [1911]. *The concise dictionary of English etymology*. Ware: Wordsword Reference.

Stibbs, Alan. 1947. The meaning of the word 'blood' in scripture. The Tyndale New Testament lecture, 1947. https://theologicalstudies.org.uk/pdf/blood_stibbs.pdf (accessed 12 December 2019).

Underhill, James. 2009. *Humboldt, worldview and acknowledgements*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1990. The meaning of colour terms: Semantics, cultures and cognition. *Cognitive Linguistics* 1(1). 99–150.

Топоров, Владимир. 1993. О языке загадки: к реконструкции „загадачного" прототекста" ["On the language of riddle: to a reconstruction of the proto-text of the riddle"]. *Contrastive Linguistics* 3–4. 201–210.

Фасмер, Макс. 1986. *Этимологический словарь русского языка*. т. 2. Москва: „Прогресс". [Original work publihsed in 1950–1958, Vasmer, Max. Russisches etymologisches wörterbuch, vol. 2. Heidelberg: Winter].

Ancient authors and texts

Josephus, Anticuities. Accessed at: http://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/03d/0037-0103,_Flavius_Josephus,_The_Antiquities_Of_The_Jews,_EN.pdf. Visited at 21.08.2019.

Josephus, Jewish Wars. Available at: http://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/03d/0037-0103,_Flavius_Josephus,_De_Bello_Judaico,_EN.pdf. Visited at 21.08.2019.

Plato, Cratylus. Accessed at: http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0172%3Atext%3DCrat.%3Asection%3D383b. Visited at 23.06.2019.

BT, *Soncino Babylonian Talmud*. Translated into English with notes, glossary and indices under the editorship of rabbi Dr. I. Epstein B.A, Ph.D., D.Lit. Foreword by the very Rev. the late chief rabbi Dr. J.H.Hertz. Introduction by the editor. London: The Soncino Press, 1935–1948. 12 800 p.

Bionote

Mony Almalech
New Bulgarian University, Sofia, Bulgaria
almalech@abv.bg
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1382-2826

Mony Almalech is full Professor in Department of New Bulgarian Studies and South-East European Center for Semiotic Studies, New Bulgarian University. His scientific interests are in the fields of semiotics, Biblical

studies, General, Contrastive and Structural linguistics, Bulgarian and Hebrew studies. Dr. Habil. dissertation "Colours in the Pentateuch: on Hebrew and Indo-European Languages"; Professorship "The Light in the Old Testament: on Hebrew and Indo-European languages". He is author of Hebrew-Bulgarian dictionary and 14 monographs on color in Bible, Balkan folklore, Bulgarian literature, and advertisements.