

# THE NEPHILIM; ELVES; FAIRIES; THE UNDEAD; GHOSTS; AND GIANTS.

© 2022, James Strider, and JamesStrider.com

Wæs ðæs fugles flyht dyrne and dégol ðám ðe deorc gewit hæfdon on hréðre  
Exon. 17a. (Codex Exoniensis - the Exeter Book, 900s A.D.)

The secret behind the bird's flying wing was known only to those who held obscure knowledge in their hearts.

This quotation from the Old English language, followed by my own translation of it, is a good place to begin today's report on Giants, the Nephilim, the Undead, Elves, Fairies and Ghosts, with a focus on how they were recorded outside of the traditional Biblical and classical Greek texts. Those other sources and that other side of the story, is my focus for today.

And I call it a good place to start because it mentions secrets, knowledge of flight, wings, and obscure knowledge held in the hearts (and minds) of a few select people.

My take on history is somewhat different from that of many traditional historians but I like to believe that my work consists of an honest examination, free of agendas or bias. George Orwell, in his 1949 novel "1984" warned us that "Who controls the past controls the future". I like to reword that slightly with "Those who control our present shape our beliefs about our own past."

Today I would like to relate just a bit about a topic that is on the minds of many readers today - and that is the evidence for Giants in our world. But I will approach this from a linguistics standpoint, and especially using ancient testimony, since I found some fascinating connections to that theme.

The original Sumerians lived from sometime prior to 6000 BC until just about 2004 BC, when their culture was completely wiped off the board by invading Gutian and Amorite warriors, thus beginning the period known as Old Babylonian. But in the most ancient version of their writing we find a word defined as "to be powerful, to be big, huge, over, above, to project, to build high, and to exceed and surpass." It's the closest that they came to our word "Giant", and it was used to describe people, animals and objects that today we would refer to as being giant in size. The word for this in Sumerian is transliterated as "dirig", however this is deceiving, and much of our knowledge about the Sumerian culture is full of deception on the part of some of our scholars. Because dirig is written using a compound form consisting of two characters, that of "si" and "a".

The Sumerian word that we transliterate as "si" is presently defined as "horn, point, prow, bow, fret, finger", but we should keep in mind that horn is the most common meaning. And to those early Sumerians, as it was with the earliest Hebrew tribes and other cultures, their word for horn has an additional meaning of "light or lights, rays, beams".

For those who may be skeptical of my statement that the points of horns or the idea of a tube shape that seems to terminate in a smaller focal-point area was also associated with the idea of rays of light, radiance or to emit beams, here are some examples from the Bible and from translators of Canaanite (Ugaritic), a language associated with the biblical lands and the Hebrews as well.

The Brown-Driver-Briggs (Old Testament Hebrew-English Lexicon) tells us that the Strong's word that is designated as H for Hebrew and number 7160, is to be defined as a horn (as projecting), a corner, a peak of a mountain, and as a ray (of light); and figuratively power.

The Strong's (Hebrew & Chaldee Dictionary of the Old Testament) own entry for their H7161, also spelled with qrn, provides the meanings of "hill, horn, horns, rays, might, strength, tusks".

Gesenius' Hebrew and Chaldee Definitions tells us that the consonants qrn, used to define horns, was also used for "to shine, to radiate, to emit beams" and "to shine as used of the face of Moses", and he provides examples in Exodus 34:29, 30 Exodus 34:30, 35 Exodus 34:35.

And in "A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition" in Volume 112, published in 2015 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands, authored by Gregorio del Olmo Lete, Joaquín Sanmartín, we learn that qrn is a noun, feminine, with two meanings. The first is the traditional "horn" and the second is "lighting flash, rays". And as an example they provide a translated text: "The Charioteer ignites his lightning flashes, he shoots his rays".

And finally here is the definition of the Hebrew term qrn from HALOT (The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament, Brill). Primary noun, qar'n, qa'ra'ni, q-r-n, "horn, corner, tip; ray, strength etc.," (see Dalman Wb. 391a; DSS (Kuhn Konkordanz 195)).

Now, as to examples of it being used that way in the Bible, in the Old Testament Book of Habakkuk, Chapter 3, Verse 4 (King James Version) we find "His brightness was like the light; He had rays flashing from His hand; And there His power was hidden." The Book of Habakkuk is the eighth book of the twelve minor prophets and was probably composed in the late 7th century B.C.

The crux of Moses' shining face in Exodus 34 is explained by first-millennium Mesopotamian astronomical and lexical sources which attest an ancient understanding of light as a material. Moses' face could, quite literally, radiate horns or rays of light; this divine radiance was displayed when he was inspired by God. While no human could see God and live, in Exodus we find the Israelites recoiling from a transformed Moses whose face and hands glowed with light.

We also find agreement with the Sumerian use of their word for horn to additionally define rays or beams of light in the later Akkadian and Babylonian periods of Mesopotamia. Jeremy Allen Black (1951 – 2004) was a British Assyriologist and Sumerologist, founder of the online Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature. The ETCSL is the most extensive collection of texts from all of the Mesopotamian historical periods. His Alma mater was the University of Oxford, and his published work **"Sumerian Grammar in Babylonian Theory"**, Rome 1984, was described by A.R. George as **"the only book-length examination of the linguistic thinking that underpinned the Babylonians' understanding of Sumerian"**. Black also collaborated with Andrew R. George and J. Nicholas Postgate on **A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian**, 1999 (reprinted 2000).

Dr. Black researched the meaning and use of the Sumerian compound noun si-mus3, along with its graphic variants. Mus3 is defined as face or countenance, and this **"si"** is the same word that I defined above as indicating horn or rays of light. He tells us that the aspects of **"horn-like"** and **"brilliant"** appear to be closely related in Sumerian, because even the independent noun si can have both meanings, **"horn"** and **"brilliance"**, and the logogram SI is used in learned Akkadian texts for both **"horn"** (qarnu) and **"radiance"** (šaruru).

As to why they simply do not amend the definition for the Sumerian word si to include an additional meaning of **"rays of light, beams, brilliance, etc."** in the online and published Sumerian dictionaries I can offer no answer other than the fact that their funding has been cut severely in the past ten years or so.

Now that we have seen the evidence indicating that **"si"** means, in addition to horn, **"rays of light, beams of light, brilliance, lights"**, we will cover the second part of the compound word that the Sumerians used to indicate **"Giants"**.

The second part of the two-syllable Sumerian compound is "a", which is defined as "arm; plow handle; wing; strength; power; weapon".

Taken together, their compound word to indicate giants is composed of two word parts that give us "wing with lights, light weapon, powerful ray beams, weapon with lights, power of light", etc. So to the early Sumerians, the giants were associated with a wing and with rays of light, (possibly a UFO or UAP), a weapon of light or a weapon with lights, or perhaps the strength of light, whatever those phrases might mean to us. It's not easy for me to choose the best or preferred meaning for this phrase, at least at this point, but it is certainly interesting. Let's keep these ideas in mind as we continue with our report on Giants in ancient times.

I'm not qualified to offer translations in Middle English. I should make that clear up front. I've simply never developed an interest in the Norman-French texts. However, I am proficient in the much earlier Old English writing (also known as Anglo-Saxon) and so I will offer a few examples from the time period prior to the Norman invasion of Britain in 1066. I mention this because my work is primarily with the Old English period but there are additional meanings to be gleaned from the later Middle English texts as well, for those that desire to continue this research. I should caution you, however, that the Norman-French were absolutely some of the strongest followers of the Catholic faith in Europe of their time - and many of their writings reflect this influence, which can be noted in their substitution of the terms Angels and Devils for anything relating to the supernatural.

**SUPERNATURAL BEINGS** from the Anglo-Saxon texts of circa 600-1066 A.D.

There are a fairly large number of words in Old English that have meanings aligned with supernatural beings. And during this early period and later, Giants fell into that broad category. Some of the more general terms, which apply to evil spirits or monsters rather vaguely, are *aglaeca* and *aeglaeca*, defined as "a wretch, monster or miscreant." This is one of

the terms used to describe Grendel in the epic Beowulf, along with his description as being a giant. It may have its origins in the noun *aglaec*, meaning "**trouble, misery.**" According to the depictions of Grendel and his mother found in Beowulf, there were no "**good**" giants. And if you will notice, in addition to their being troublesome and bringing misery, they are described as monsters or wretches, and not simply overly-tall humans.

Another Old English noun that describes an "**evil spirit**" or "**monster**" is *wearg*. In the later Middle English period this same term was watered down to mean "**villain**" or "**felons**". As we go along in this report you will notice that most if not all of the terms for supernatural beings were amended by the French-Normans to mean either something silly, such as fairies and elves, or something like simple law breakers and delinquents, rather than the pure monstrous evil that they represented to the Anglo-Saxons and Britain natives of hundreds of years earlier. I don't believe that the giants changed, nor did evil monsters become less malignant - the changes were made in the terms used in the "**official**" historical records, made by the new powers that be, which reminds us once again of George Orwell's caution about controlling history.

Perhaps the better known and most interesting of terms is *wiht*, which was actually used by the Anglo Saxons to indicate a "**creature, person or thing**" and it was frequently used in such phrases as "**unfaele wiht**" for uncanny creature, "**yfel wiht**" as evil creature, and in "**werge wiht**", defined as "**accursed creature.**"

Middle English authors such as the Norman-French Robert of Gloucester (died **1147** A.D., illegitimate son of King Henry I of England) uses *wigtes* (the Middle English variation of the original Old English *wiht*) to define "**spirits of the air**", and equates it with ghosts. And Geoffrey Chaucer (died **1400** A.D., author and civil servant best known for *The Canterbury Tales*), in his "**Miller's Tale**", had the carpenter saying to Nicholas: "**I crouche thee from elves and from wightes.**"

Their use of the word *crouche* (to protect) attempts to link the elves with wightes, and this once again changes the theme from one of evil creatures to a new idea of ghosts, fairies and elves. How sweet. This is somewhat similar to changing Dracula into a Blue Smurf. This is yet another clear example of rewriting history to fit an agenda by changing the very language that we speak and its meanings.

Speaking of Elves, there is an actual, living language called Elfdalian. It is still spoken by about 3,000 people who live in the area of Alvdalen, located in the southeastern part of north Dalarna in Sweden. Elfdalian developed from Old Norse, the language spoken by the inhabitants of Scandinavia and in their overseas settlements during the Viking Ages, and until about 1300 A.D.

In Alvdalen they used Germanic type runes (called Elfdalian Runes) until about 1929 A.D., however they had developed their own alphabet in the 1700s. I bring this up because in my research on terms for "giants", I noticed that the Proto-Germanic term *stora*, or *stura*, was used to describe "big". But it has an Elfdalian equivalent in their word *stur*.

So let's look at some of the other languages that used a cognate term for the 500 B.C. Proto-Germanic form, and what meanings were attached to them. These are terms that are spelled nearly the same and have a common theme, and all of those themes relate to big or giant.

Old Norse (early Vikings) used *storr*, for "big".

Faroese (Faroe Islands) used *storrur* for "big".

Old Swedish used *stur* and *star*, for "big".

Old English used *stor* and *star* to indicate "giant".

Elfdalian *stur* - also indicated "big".

Middle Dutch word *stuur* means "strong, bold, tough, harsh."

Indo-European group used *sthur* for "big, excellent".

Sanskrit used their *sthiira* to mean "big, strong, thick, massy".

Young Avestan (Indo-Iranian) used *stiira* for "strong".

Oscan (ancient Italy) used *styr* to mean "big, great".

In Sanskrit sthivara means "**broad, thick, immovable, lasting**".  
Old Saxon word stori means "**renowned**".  
And the Armenian stuar means "**fat**".

All of these terms and their definitions are from the Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic, part of the Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series, Volume II, by Guus Kroonen, and published by Brill, Leiden, in **2013**. It's an excellent resource - I keep a copy on the top of my desk.

So, with all of these cultures, from Iran and India through the far northern islands in the North Atlantic, and as far south in Europe as southern Italy, there was a similar word used to describe an oversized, perhaps giant being. And additionally this creature was said to be strong, thick, immovable, lasting (or everlasting?) and renowned. But there were no Giants, our skeptics tell us. If there were not, then where did this idea originate; with which group of people or beings, and more importantly, where did they disappear to?

And what about the time span? Young Avestian is closely related to Old Persian, and it was spoken in the first Millennium B.C. Oscan has not been used since the first century A.D. Proto-Germanic is dated to **500 B.C.** and earlier. We're looking at a span of over fifteen hundred years and a geographical spread of half of the known world at that time. And if we add in the Sumerian words for Giant we are talking about a time span of over five thousand years. They all had a similar word in common for the term giants, and yet giants never existed?

For the skeptics in the crowd, there were quite a few other terms available, in each of these languages, for large, tall, fat, etc., all of them relating to humans. So this is not some "**great leader**" or some "**big man of the tribe**". This is a larger than human type of being, especially when we tie in what our own Anglo-Saxon ancestors had to say about them. And don't forget the description of them as "**undead, evil, demons, monsters, beasts, un-human, etc.**"

A related Old English compound is found in their phrase "aelwihta eard", also from Beowulf, and traditionally translated as "the abode of alien spirits". That sounds comfortable and somewhat nice, but it's not entirely what was meant by the original authors. Ael-wihta means "strange creatures, monsters" and eard refers to "native soil or land, country, province, region, place of residence, dwelling, or home". In Beowulf it was originally defined as "the Realm of Monsters". The native home of monsters is technically what they are telling us. Or creatures that originated in the land of monsters - which is hardly the same thing as the "home of alien spirits", especially since to the Middle English writers spirits were aligned to ghosts and elves.

But more importantly, the Monks and Scribes of that time period, who wrote in Latin, glossed the Anglo-Saxon aelwihta eard with their own Latin phrases of "alieni generis entia" and "monstra". So they were telling their readers who only read Latin that this phrase was the equivalent of the Anglo-Saxon phrase aelwihta eard.

Let's peel apart the meanings behind those terms that were used in these Latin glosses. A gloss is a word inserted between the lines or in the margins as an explanatory equivalent of a foreign or otherwise difficult word in the text. It's inserted so that speakers of Latin could better understand what was meant by this Anglo-Saxon phrase. It represents the closest equivalent meaning in Latin.

The first gloss that they provided was alieni generis entia, so let's take a look at those terms.

The Latin term alieni is the plural form of "alien, foreign, distant - far off or away, and unknown". And no, we can't simply link this to the modern idea of an alien from space, although it does indicate strange, strangers, outsiders, and thus people from distant lands. And it speaks of far distant lands or far off and away lands, which might include the skies and outer space. But certainly it indicates beings that were different, and thus not

normal, to be sure. And yes, the modern word alien does have its roots in the Latin term alienus, and alieni is an inflection of alienus.

The Latin term generis, from the root genus, indicates "birth, origin, offspring, descent, race, family, ancestry".

Entia is from the Late Latin ens, and it indicates a "thing". This is an entity or being; a thing as opposed to a quality or attribute. Not a human, but a thing, that much is clear.

So the learned Latin scribes are telling us that the Anglo-Saxon phrase means "strangers or outsiders whose origins or ancestry is from away things, entities or beings (non-humans)." They don't seem comfortable with getting any closer than "outsider from far away" but they are firm on the idea that these outsiders were from a lineage of entities or beings, things in other words, and not from the line of Adamic mankind. Interestingly, they also do not seem comfortable with simply labeling them as "devils or satanic creatures", so perhaps we are to understand that these are things born of strangers from far away, but they are not connected to fallen angels.

The other gloss that they use is "monstra", and in Latin this is defined as a monster or unnatural thing. This is something that is not a part of nature, and thus not part of the natural world of our Earth. It was also regarded as having a link to an omen or portent, and a portent is a sign or warning that something, especially something momentous or calamitous, is likely to happen.

When they offer us two glosses for one Anglo-Saxon phrase, it is not only appropriate but natural that we link the two together, as each meaning complements and expands upon the other. In this case we have: "Outsiders from far away; not a part of human nature and whose origins and parentage is to be found in things and non-human beings or entities." To me that seems even further apart than the Middle English offering of "home of alien spirits". Please keep in mind that these were the Realm of

the Monsters in Beowulf, and by Monsters they were speaking of the Giants.

Before we leave this phrase, you should know that the first part, the Ael of ael-wiht, was additionally defined by the Anglo-Saxons as "**hook, fork and awl**". An awl is a pointed tool much like an ice-pick. And the hook and fork have curves that remind us of horns. Additionally these bring us back to the Sumerian term "**si**", which as we uncovered previously in this report has a meaning of horn, point, prow, finger, etc., all of which are also pointed and curved.

And I should mention that the Old English wihta or wiht is a sentient being who is often considered to be among the "**undead**". The term is cognate with the Old Dutch wicht and Old High German wicht, both of which indicate a "**little creature, child, baby**" and some connection to "**girl**". So to the nearby Dutch and Germanic peoples this "**undead entity or thing**" was seen as small in stature, and possibly feminine. The early Norwegians (Old Norse) and Swedes both linked this term to an additional meaning of "**underground creature**". So we have a child-sized undead entity or thing, perhaps a female, and one that lives underneath the Earth. Wow. That's a lot to process.

Just to be clear, the Anglo-Saxon authors were hardly the first to use a word similar to wiht; the Proto-Germanic (prior to the fifth century B.C.) words wihtiz (feminine) and wihta (neutral) mean "**thing**" and the Proto-Indo-European (4500 B.C. to 2500 B.C.) term \*wekti was also defined as a "**thing**", and not part of humanity.

The Sumerian language was not part of the Proto-Indo-European family of languages - it's a language isolate – unrelated to any other languages. So here we have the Proto-Indo-European speakers, whose words eventually formed a part of all of the languages of Europe and beyond, and confirmation in the Middle Eastern languages of Sumerian and Babylonian. And so the idea of a "**thing**", that was not of human origin or part of the natural order of Earth was understood by humanity as early as 6,500 or

more years ago. The Anglo-Saxons simply continued and expanded our knowledge of that tradition.

But you and I, as members of the general public, do not get to write our own version of history. Those that control our present shape what we think we "**know**" of our past. Only by sharing what we have learned in reports such as this can we uncover the truth about our past. And by learning that truth we have achieved an important first step towards shaping our own futures.

The other day I had a skeptical friend explain to me his profound thoughts on the subject. Spontaneously I might add. He claimed that our ancestors among the Vikings and the Anglo-Saxons were afraid of many things, and especially the unknown. And that these ideas of giant monsters simply reflect those fears. I didn't argue with him - I just asked myself how it could be possible that tribes of people who crossed the unknown and very harsh North Atlantic, in small boats, in winter, without a compass, and then took on whatever army or armies awaited them - usually with their winning the day, could be that afraid? Viking warriors? Trembling over elves? How believable is it that the Germanic tribes who brought down the Roman Empire would cry in their beds at night over thoughts of a boogey man? Or how could the super intelligent Sumerians, who gave us mathematics, map-making, degrees and longitudes, writing, the wheel, (and beer making), be dumb enough to believe in monsters, unless they had seen them with their own eyes that is?

One of the Anglo-Saxon or Old English words for a giant was "**pyrs**", and it was written using that special "**p**" or thorn symbol that most modern fonts will not duplicate easily. This comes from the Proto-Germanic (500 B.C.) word *purisa*, which also meant giant. We're told that there is no clear etymology or origin for this term, and it may be very ancient indeed. Additional meanings associated with this word for giants are "**a creature of evil, a beast, a monstrous creature, an enchanter and a demon**". Here we see that the Sumerian idea of giants, which were not considered to be humans by them, was continued throughout the ages, down to the 500 B.C.

period of the earliest Germanic tribes and on through the Anglo-Saxon period of England, only to become magically transformed into spirits and ghosts after the capture and domination of those lands by the Norman French in 1066 A. D.

In the Codex Exoniensis, an early collection of Anglo-Saxon poetry, we find the phrases "**Pyrsa oððe wyrmgalera Marsorum**" and "**pyrsas l wyrmgaleras Marsi**". Let's unpack those terms.

Pyrsa = Giant/Beast/Evil Creature, as we have seen.

odde = is

wyrm galera = A serpent or reptile charmer or sorcerer

Marsorum = ancient people of South central Italy regarded as tough warriors

Here we have the evil Giants, who were tough warriors, additionally equated with sorcerers or those who charmed reptiles and serpents. So they were not human, and they were the evil practitioners of the dark arts as well. Or perhaps they were simply ones with advanced knowledge.

And by the way, the Marsorum, or the people of the Marsi region, were pre-Roman inhabitants of southern Italy. They practiced a religion that was dedicated to a goddess they called Angitia. Angitia was associated in antiquity with snake-charmers, who claimed her as their ancestor. She had powers of witchcraft, magic and medicine, and was a master in the arts of miraculous and herbal healing. She was also attributed with a wide range of powers over snakes, including the power to kill serpents with a single touch.

This magical knowledge (with medicine and healing being thought of in those early days as a form of "**magic**") tends to verify my idea that they may simply have been giants who had advanced knowledge - certainly more advanced than the humans of their time.

Un-human, and perhaps undead, evil because anything not understood is of course evil, giant in size, outsiders or strangers from far, far away, with advanced knowledge. A picture is beginning to form, and it seems to be extraterrestrial in style.

However, there is absolutely nothing that demands an extraterrestrial answer. It's certainly not off the table in my opinion, but all of these mentions of undead, evil, intelligent people with advanced knowledge, outsiders from far away, and physically depicted as giants, can be explained equally well by a missing civilization. One that produced larger than normal beings, perhaps not even of our own Cro-Magnon line, who independently developed into a more advanced culture, and who were seen as evil monsters by the local populations. So either or neither could explain this - we simply don't have all of the cards showing yet - or the dealers have decided to keep those cards for themselves.

J. R. R. Tolkien was, from 1925 to 1945, the Rawlinson and Bosworth Professor of Anglo-Saxon and a Fellow of Pembroke College, both at the University of Oxford. He was certainly an experienced and talented translator of Anglo-Saxon or Old English. After Tolkien's death, his son Christopher published a series of works based on his father's extensive notes and unpublished manuscripts. These, together with *The Hobbit* and *The Lord of the Rings*, form a connected body of tales, poems, fictional histories, invented languages, and literary essays about a fantasy world called Arda and, within it, Middle-earth. This saga is highly entertaining, well scripted and imaginative, in my opinion.

One of the creatures from his fictional tales is the Orc. But were Tolkien's Orcs undead? No, they were said to be neither dead nor undead. Tolkien tells us that Morgoth, incapable of creation, could make evil creatures like the Orcs by distorting and debasing good ones. So they were evil but not undead. And they were created by Morgoth Bauglir, originally called Melkor, who is a character, one of the godlike Valar from Tolkien's novels. Melkor was the most powerful of the Valar but turned to darkness. All evil in the world of Middle-earth ultimately stems from him. Scholars have

noted that the Valar resemble angels in Christianity but that Tolkien presented them rather more like pagan gods. Tolkien's Orcs are nothing like the undead monsters that the Scandinavians defined for that same term.

But what's interesting is that the Anglo-Saxons did indeed use the term Orc. Their phrase *blod-orc* is defined as *blod*, meaning blood and gore, along with *Orc*, indicating the underworld and the undead. So historically the Orc were indeed considered to be members of the undead.

In fact the term *Orc* is a Latin word. As a masculine noun it is *Orcus*, otherwise known as *Hades*, (or *Hell*) the kingdom of the dead. *Orcus* himself was god of the underworld, and later identified with *Hades*, who was the Greek god of the dead and king of the underworld, and with *Dis Pater*, the Roman god of the underworld.

When Tolkien wrote his novels he decided to follow the Norman-French idea that Orcs were neither dead nor undead (and thus a ghost or phantom), which differs from the original Anglo-Saxon meaning that he was familiar with as a translator of Anglo-Saxon and a professor of the early Middle Ages time period.. He was not alone in this - scholars such as Thomas Wright in 1873 on through modern authors of the 1970s tell us that *Orc* is, in Anglo-Saxon, like *þyr*, and that it means specter or goblin. We can see here that the original, intended meaning of a Giant, "**a creature of evil, a beast, a monstrous creature, an enchanter and a demon**" has now become a ghost or goblin, through historical modifications by the people in power, in both governments, religious centers and in Universities. Again, *Dracula* becomes a blue Smurf.

We have saved our historians and scholars quite a bit of time and effort, however. They don't have to investigate why our ancestors would have described these undead creatures as being evil giants from outside of human nature and strangers to our lands, with highly advanced knowledge - since they have now been conveniently re-painted as fairy goblins and Smurfs by the very ones that teach us in our Universities. And by

implanting these ideas inside of highly popular fiction works (and the Lord of the Rings saga surely is a prime example of this), over time these fabrications repeated over and over become what we presently accept as the truth.

And speaking of Orcs and Elves, there is an actual, living language called Elfdalian. It is still spoken by about 3,000 people who live in the area of Alvdalen, located in the southeastern part of north Dalarna in Sweden. Elfdalian developed from Old Norse, the language spoken by the inhabitants of Scandinavia and their overseas settlements during the Viking Ages, and until about 1300 A.D.

In Alvdalen they used Germanic type runes (called Elfdalian Runes) until about 1929 A.D., however they had developed their own alphabet in the 1700s. I bring this up because in my research on terms for "giants", I noticed that the Proto-Germanic term *stora*, or *stura*, was used to describe "big". But it has an Elfdalian equivalent in their word *stur*.

So let's look at the various languages that used a cognate term for the 500 B.C. Proto-Germanic form, and what meanings were attached to them. These are terms that are spelled nearly the same and have a common theme, and all of those themes relate to big or giant.

Old Norse (early Vikings) used *storr*, for "big".

Faroese (Faroe Islands) used *storrur* for "big".

Old Swedish used *stur* and *star*, for "big".

Old English used *stor* and *star* to indicate "giant".

Elfdalian language *stur* - also for "big".

Middle Dutch word *stuur* means "strong, bold, tough, harsh."

Indo-European group used *sthur* for "big, excellent".

Sanskrit used their *sthiira* to mean "big, strong, thick, massy".

Young Avestan (Indo-Iranian) used *stiira* for "strong".

Oscan (ancient Italy) used *styr* to mean "big, great".

In Sanskrit *sthiivara* means "broad, thick, immovable, lasting".

Old Saxon word *stori* indicates "renowned".

And in Armenian stuar mens "fat".

All of these terms and their definitions are from the Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic, part of the Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series, Volume II, by Guus Kroonen, and published by Brill, Leiden, in 2013. It's an excellent resource - I keep a copy of it on my desk.

So, with all of these cultures, from Iran and India through the far northern islands in the North Atlantic, and as far south in Europe as southern Italy, there was a similar word used to describe an oversized, perhaps giant being. And additionally this creature was said to be strong, thick, immovable, lasting (or everlasting?) and renowned. But there were no Giants, our skeptics tell us. If there were not, then where did this idea originate, with which group of people or beings, and more importantly; where did they disappear to?

And what about the time span? The Young Avestian language is closely related to Old Persian, and it was spoken in the first Millennium B.C. Oscan has not been used since the first century A.D. Proto-Germanic is dated to 500 B.C. and earlier. We're looking at a span of over fifteen hundred years and a geographical spread of half of the known world at that time. They all had a similar word in common for the term giants, and yet giants never existed? And if you include the Sumerian terms for giants, then reports of giants worldwide goes back more than eight thousand years.

For the skeptics in the crowd, there were quite a few other terms available, in each of these languages, for large, tall, fat, etc., all of them relating to humans. So this is not some "great leader" or some "big man of the tribe". This is a larger than human type of being, especially when we tie in what our own Anglo-Saxon ancestors had to say about them. And don't forget the description of them as "undead, evil, demons, monsters, beasts, un-human, etc."

To close I would like to off this final translation, in order to clear up a misunderstanding that has been propagated by skeptics for way too long, in my opinion. It involves the Biblical mention of giants, the Nephilim in fact.

A great many people, and Christians are certainly prominent among this group, have the idea that Giants came down to the Earth, found the local women desirable, and took them as wives. And this is based on the testimony from the Book of Genesis and the Books of Enoch. Skeptics are quick to rush in - they assure us that the word Naphilim or Nephlim means **"those who fell"**. No Giants to see here - move along please.

Here's the part that they are not telling you. Certain portions of the Bible, such as the books of Daniel and Ezra, are written in Aramaic, as are the Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmuds. In fact, among the Jews, Aramaic was used by the common people, while Hebrew remained the language of religion and government and of the upper class. So the general public used Aramaic, (and Jesus Christ spoke Aramaic as well, by the way), and the powers that be used Hebrew.

In the Aramaic language, the noun Naphila does exist. The consonants used are n-ph-l, the same as the Hebrew Nephil (n-ph-l) plus the im suffix in Hebrew that indicates a plural. (As in Eloh for God and Elohim meaning gods). And Naphila in Aramaic means **"giant"**. This explains why the Septuagint (the ancient Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible) translated the word Nephilim as gigantes (**"giant"**).

Much like the Anglo-Saxons and Scandinavians from our own recent ancestry, the Hebrew people of Biblical times understood that those who came down from the sky were the Giants - that's why we see David fighting one of the Giants by the name of Goliath.

It was the higher religious leaders, the governments and the upper class that told them it meant something different - like **"those that fell"** or **"ghosts and goblins"**. So the next time you hear a Skeptic claiming that there were no giants - remind him of the above. Or heck, send this page to him or her.

I'm sure they are already aware of this, but it would be entertaining at least.

I promise to bring you even more examples from history - as it was experienced by the locals that survived it, in the following weeks. I'm working on a report about "Cinnebar", a reddish material that is associated with Mercury. It's also called the Tears of Dragons by those early humans, and it was associated with volcanic fire as well as the color red. Why was Mercury found, in pools no less, under the pyramids in Egypt, in Sumer and Babylonia, in Africa, in the lands of the Incas, in the Mayan pyramids and in the rivers of liquid Mercury underneath the great structures of Mexico? Was it an important association to the "flying dragons", also known as the giant reptiles, which early man reported? Oh, wait. There's no such thing as dragons either. Well, we shall see.