

Angelical Linguistics

There are two primary sources available for the Celestial Speech: The Holy Book of *Loagaeth* and the Forty-Eight Angelical Keys. The First (“hidden”) Table of *Loagaeth* (sides A and B) contains approximately 4802 words compiled into 98 lines of text. It is a wonderful sample of the Language, which could be used to analyze the letters of the remaining 48 Tables.

Unfortunately, no translation of the Holy Book was ever recorded in Dee’s surviving journals. We know only what the Angels claimed is in the text, and a few precious words translated here and there. In many ways, modern scholars have to approach the Book of *Loagaeth* as archaeologists once approached Egyptian hieroglyphics. We can examine the words and make a lot of educated guesses about linguistic patterns, but without an Angelical “Rosetta Stone” we are ultimately flying blind.

Perhaps this Rosetta Stone already exists in the Forty-Eight Angelical Keys. The Keys represent a much smaller sample of the Language- totaling only 1070 words, and much fewer if we exclude words that repeat. However, unlike the Holy Book, the text of the Angelical Keys came with English translations. This grants us a wonderful opportunity to analyze the Angelical words closely- looking for syntax and grammar, root words, compounds, affixes, etc. (Then, with any luck, we can apply what we learn to the text of *Loagaeth*- beginning with the First Table.)¹

When comparing the Holy Book with the Forty-Eight Keys, it can be easy to assume one is reading two different languages.² However, my own analysis of the text of *Loagaeth* leads me to believe that its language is one and the same with that of the Keys. I have found several words from the Keys within *Loagaeth* as well- some of them intact and some of them in modified forms. I have also found the names of several Angelical Letters in the text, and a couple of direct references to *Heptarchic* Angels.³ While the words of the 49 Tables do seem alien to those familiar with the Keys, I think this is merely because *Loagaeth* represents a much larger sample of the Language.

Having said the above, I will also concede that the Language used in the Keys does seem to have a slightly different “feel” and flow than the text in the Holy Book. (Laycock illustrates this adequately in the introduction to his *Complete Enochian Dictionary*.) Remember in chapter two of volume one, where Raphael said of the 49 parts of *Loagaeth*:

Every Element hath 49 manner of understandings. Therein is comprehended so many languages. They are all spoken at once, and severally, by themselves, by distinction may be spoken. [-*Five Books of Mystery*, p 297]

I assume that the “Elements” of *Loagaeth* are the 49 individual Tables. If each of these Tables contain 49 interpretations and languages (or, perhaps, *dialects* of Angelical), it makes for a total of 2401 interpretations/dialects. It is probable that the language of the 48 Keys represents a sample of one of these Angelical dialects.

Angelical “English Senses” and Fluid Definitions

The Angels throughout Dee’s journals, when translating Angelical words, referred to the English as “senses” or “significations” rather than definitions or translations. This was because the given English elaborations are filled with glosses, poetic license and implied adjectives. The Angelical words merely “signify a concept”, and we are somewhat free to apply any English words that properly (and poetically) illustrate the concept. (If you refer to the third and fourth columns of the *Angelical Cross-Reference*, you will see how the “essential concepts” of the Angelical words differ from the English elaborations given by Nalvage.)

As an example, we can look at the various interpretations of the word *Malpurg* (Fiery Darts):

Malpurg (Fiery Darts)

Malprg (Through-Thrusting Fire)

Malpirgi (Fires of Life and Increase)

An even better example of fluid definition is found in the word *Cocasb* (Time):

Acocasb (Time)

“*Cacocasb*” (Another While)

Cocasb (Time)

Cocasg (Times)

Qcocasb (Contents of Time)

Furthermore, *Cocasb* likely shares a root with:

Cacacom (Florish)

Cacrg (Until)

Casasam (Abiding)

Capimali (Successively)

“*Capimao*” (While)

Capimaon (Number of Time)

Capmiali (Successively)

Angelical shares this trait of “fluid definitions” with ancient human languages such as Sumerian, Egyptian or Hebrew. Modern English tends to possess more specific definitions, which are necessary in order to create and utilize our sophisticated technology. However, in previous ages, it was possible to use a single word to represent any number of related concepts. (For instance, consider the ancient Egyptian word *Khepher*- which might indicate creation, formation, transformation, mutation, etc.) The precise meaning intended by the author was indicated by context.

Root-Words

Several Angelical words with dissimilar spellings turned out to have similar definitions- revealing many previously unknown root words. Compare the following words:

Londoh (Kingdom)

Adohi (Kingdom)

Both of these words translate as “Kingdom”- but they would not have appeared near one another in a simple alphabetical listing. We can see, however, that they share the letters “doh” – and this is likely an Angelical root word.

Conversely, I found that many words with similar spellings had *dissimilar* definitions. This often highlighted relationships between concepts within the Language that were not apparent at first glance. For instance, compare the spelling similarities between these words:

Ors (Darkness)

Orsba (Drunken)
Orscor (Dryness)
Orscatbl (Buildings)

All of these seem to share a common linguistic root, (*Or* or *Ors*) but they have definitions that are considered unrelated in English. By contemplating how these concepts might relate to one another, it can tell us something about how Angels “think.”

These root words also support the idea that Angelical works similar to ancient languages such as Hebrew. Such early tongues are based upon a series of simple root words- usually of two or three letters, each of which may or may not stand on its own as a proper word. Affixes can then be added to the roots to alter inflection or tense.

For example, consider the Angelical word *I* (Is) - which is the likely root of the word *Ip* (Not). By adding affixes, we obtain:

Ipam (Is Not)
Ipamis (Can Not Be)

An even more important root is *Ia* – which does not stand as a word on its own in the Keys.⁴ However, it is possibly the root of several existing words- just a few of which are listed here as an example:

<i>Iad</i> (God)	<i>Iaida</i> (the Highest)
<i>Iaiadix</i> (Honor)	<i>Iaidon</i> (All Powerful)

Further, the first word in the above list, *Iad* (God), appears to be the root element of several additional words:

<i>Geiad</i> (Lord and Master)	<i>Ioiad</i> (Him the Liveth Forever)
<i>Iadnah</i> (Knowledge)	<i>Laiad</i> (Secrets of Truth)
<i>Iadpil</i> (To Him)	

At the front of the *Lexicon*, I have included a list of all of the root words (or letter combinations) that I have discovered to date. (The list includes mostly those root words that do not already stand as words on their own.)

Compounds

Also akin to early (and, of course, many modern) languages, Angelical roots/words may be compounded in order to convey more sophisticated concepts. For instance, the three words *Zir* (Am), *Enay* (Lord) and *Iad* (God) are combined to form *Zirenaiad* (I am the Lord Your God).

I have found that, most often, compounds are made between nouns or verbs and the words that modify or indicate them. The following examples are an extremely small sample of such modifier-compounds found throughout the Forty-Eight Keys. (Note that I have placed the modifiers within each word in bold.) There are possessive adjective (*his, her*) compounds:

*Busdir**tilb*** (Glory (of) Her)

*Elzapt**ilb*** (Her Course)

*Lonsh**itox*** (His Power)

Demonstrative and relative pronoun (*which/that, this, those*) compounds:

Arcoazior (That Increase)

*Ds**abramg*** (Which Prepared)

Artabas (That Govern)

*Ds**chis*** (Which Are)

*Un**alchis*** (These Are)

*Ds**i*** (Which Is)

*Ois**alman*** (This House)

*Ds**om*** (That Understand)

Conjunction (*and, or, but, as*) compounds are very common:

*Cor**sta*** (Such As)

*Od**chis*** (And Are)

*Cr**pl*** (But One)

*Od**miam*** (And Continuance)

*Tab**lior*** (As Comforters)

*Od**zamran*** (And Appear)

*Tav**iv*** (As the Second)

*Q**mospleh*** (Or the Horns)

Plus, compounds are regularly created from forms of the verb “to be” (*is, are, were*):

*Chis**holq*** (Are Measured)

*Page**ip*** (Rest Not)

*Un**alchis*** (These are)

*Od**ipuran*** (And Shall Not See)

*Ino**as*** (Are Become)

*Zire**naiad*** (I Am the Lord God)

Idlugam (Is Given)

Gchisge (Are Not)

There are fewer (though no less significant) examples of nouns compounded with adjectives or verbs other than "to be."

I have also found that compounding Angelical words often results in changes to their spelling. For example, the word *Dsonf* (Which Reign) is a combination of *Ds* (Which) and *Sonf* (Reign). However, notice that there is only one "S" found in *Dsonf*. That is because Angelical combines duplicate letters when forming compounds. Therefore, the final "S" of *Ds* and the first "S" of *Sonf* combine into one "S" in *Dsonf*.

Another example is the word *Gmicalzoma* (Power of Understanding). This is a combination of *Gmicalzo* (Power) and *Oma* (Understanding). However, we can see that the final "O" of *Gmicalzo* and the first "O" of *Oma* have been combined into a single letter in the compound.

There are also several examples of completely inexplicable spelling changes when compounds are formed. For instance, the word for "Day" in Angelical is *Basgim*, while the compound word for "the First Midday" is *Bazemlo* ("Bazem" + "Lo"). The change of the "S" to a "Z" is not surprising, because these letters represent a similar sound. However, note how the "GI" of *Basgim* has disappeared entirely from the compound *Bazemlo*. Therefore, we can guess that "Bas/Baz" is an Angelical root indicating "daytime." However, we cannot guess what rules apply to the spelling change between *Basgim* and the "Bazem" element in *Bazemlo*.

It might be helpful to provide another example, so we will look at the word *Soba* (Whose). In the compound *Sobhaath* (Whose Works), the spelling has altered to "Sobha." In the compound *Sobolzar* (Whose Courses), the spelling becomes "Sobo." Even more inexplicable, in the compound *Solamian* (Whose Continuence), the spelling is altered to "Sola."

Conjugation

Further spelling changes may come from conjugation instead of compounding. These changes appear so random, even professional linguists can find no rhyme or reason behind them.⁵ Several examples follow:

Goho (Sayeth)

Naoln (May Be)

Zir or *Zirdo* (Am)

<i>Gohia</i> (We Say)	<i>Noan</i> (To Become)	<i>Zirom</i> (Were)
<i>Gohol</i> (Saying)	<i>Noar</i> (Is Become)	<i>Zirop</i> (Was)
<i>Gohon</i> (Have Spoken)	<i>Noas</i> (Are Become)	
<i>Gohus</i> (I Say)	<i>Noasmi</i> (Let Become)	
<i>Gohulim</i> (Is Said)		

Unfortunately, I cannot report that I have discovered anything useful in this regard. Given the apparently haphazard manner in which the spellings are altered, I can't even state with surety that conjugations, as we would recognize them, even exist in Angelical. Many Angelical words (verbs and nouns) alter their spelling even when they do not conjugate or compound with other words. Just a few examples are:

<i>Aai, Aao</i> (Amongst)
<i>Acocasb, Cocasb</i> (Time)
<i>Butmon, Butmona</i> (Mouth)
<i>Efafafe, Ofafafe</i> (Vials)
<i>Netaab, Netaaib</i> (Government)

Affixes

Having learned somewhat about Angelical roots and compounds, I was able to isolate what *appear* to be several Angelical affixes. For example, there are some instances where the addition of “-o” to a word seems to add the connotation “of”:

<i>Caosg</i> (Earth)	-	<i>Caosgo</i> (of the Earth)
<i>Vonph</i> (Wrath)	-	<i>Vonpho</i> (of Wrath)
<i>Iad</i> (God)	-	<i>Oiad</i> (of God)

However, this does not appear to be a set rule. First, the word “of” is *extremely* rare in the Angelical. (Usually, it is simply implied by context.) Secondly, some words appear with additional “-o” affixes without gaining the connotation “of.” Examples are:

<i>Zol</i> (Hands)	-	<i>Ozol</i> (Hands)
<i>Zien</i> (Hands)	-	<i>Ozien</i> (“my own” Hand)
<i>Micalz</i> (Mighty)	-	<i>Micalzo</i> (Mighty/Power)

Another likely affix is “-ax”, which may be an indicator of action similar to our own suffix “-ing”, which can turn verbs into active participles (i.e.- "The running water is very deep.") or present progressives (i.e.- "He is running very fast."):

<i>Blior</i> (Comfort)	-	<i>Bliorax</i> (Shalt Comfort)
<i>Om</i> (Know)	-	<i>Omax</i> (Knowest)

There are other verbs that end with the “-ax” suffix, but we have no examples of the same words without the affix: *Camliax* (Spake), *Tastax* (Going Before). We might possibly add *Gizyax* (Earthquakes) and *Coraxo* (Thunders of Judgement and Wrath) to this list- they may be nouns by English standards, but they still indicate violently active forces. Meanwhile, there are some “-ing clause” verbs in the Keys that do not appear with the “-ax” suffix- such as *Dluga* (Giving Unto) or *Panpir* (Raining Down).

Rarities: Pronouns, Prepositions, Adjectives, Articles, Case

There are several aspects of grammar that are extremely rare or even non-existent, in the angelic Tongue. For instance, personal pronouns are used very infrequently in the Keys- and it is difficult to say why they are used in the places we find them. The existing personal pronouns are:

<i>Ol</i> (I)	<i>Yls</i> (Thou- sing.)
<i>Tox</i> (Him/His)	<i>“Pi”</i> (She)
<i>Nonca</i> (You- plural.)	<i>“Ip”</i> (Her)
<i>“T”</i> (It)	<i>Par</i> (Them)
<i>Tiobl</i> (Her)	

Relative pronouns like the following seem to be a bit more common, as they are not as easily implied by context:

<i>Sobam</i> (Whom)	<i>“Smnad”</i> (Another)
<i>Casarm, Casarma</i> (Whom)	<i>Asymp, Symp</i> (Another)
<i>“Da”</i> (There)	<i>Ds, Dst</i> (That, Which)
<i>“Irgil”</i> (Many)	<i>Priaz</i> (Those)
<i>Unal</i> (These)	<i>Vomsarg</i> (Every One / All)

Plus, we find these possessive adjectives:

Tilb (Her)

Tox (His/Him)

Aqlo (Thy)

Soba, Sobca, Sobra (Whose)

However, they are used sparingly, and- as we saw previously- they are often found in compound with their nouns. In such cases, I note that they often follow the noun- such as in *Lonshitox* (His Power) and *Elzaptilb* (Her Course).

Non-possessive adjectives are even more uncommon in the Angelical text of the Keys. When they *are* used, they typically follow the rule of English- falling immediately before the noun they indicate, and not usually compounded with it. Some examples are *Vohim Gizyax* (Mighty Earthquakes) and *Adphaht Damploz* (Unspeakable Variety).

On the other hand, most of the poetic adjectives we see in the English translations are not implied in the essential definitions of the Angelical words. Such as *Orri* (Barren Stone), *Grosb* (Bitter Sting) or *Sapah* (Mighty Sounds) – all of which are nouns that show no linguistic indication of their adjectives. It would appear that adjectives in such cases are left entirely up to the author, or reader, of the text.

Another rarity in Angelical is the use of prepositions (at, on, in, for). We already know that there *may* be an affix to indicate “of” (“-o”). There is also one instance of the word *De* (of) that stands alone in the Keys. Plus the following prepositions are found here and there throughout the Keys:

Aai, Aaf, Aaiom, Aao (Amongst)

Aspt (Before)

“*Azia*” (Like Unto)

Oq (Except/But)

Bagle (For)⁶

Mirc (Upon)

Nothoa (Amidst)

Oroch (Under)

Pambt (Unto)

Tia (Unto)

De (Of)*Zomdux* (Amidst)*Pugo* (As Unto)*Zylna* (Within)*Vors, Vorsg* (Over)

All of this indicates that prepositions exist to some extent in Angelical, but they are not often used unless context makes them unavoidable.

Meanwhile, I have discovered that articles (a, an, the) are not used in the Angelical at all. As in most cases with pronouns and prepositions, articles are implied entirely by the context of the sentence. This trait is also common to historical languages- such as Latin. Adjectives, prepositions, articles etc are more prevalent in later, more complex idioms.

I have also found that grammatical case does not often apply to Angelical. In modern English, the “case” of a noun or pronoun can be subjective (he), objective (him) or possessive (his). In the Angelical, much as with conjugation, there do *appear* to be some examples of spelling changes from one case to another. (See the list of pronouns above.) However, there is no indication these changes have anything at all to do with case.

Meanwhile, there are several examples of *vocative* case in the Angelical tongue. A noun takes the vocative case when it indicates someone being *addressed*. For example, in the phrase “Open the door, John”, the word “John” is vocative. The sentence does not need the addition of “John” in order to be complete, but we include it to specify that John is being addressed. Of course, there is no vocative *case* in English – so we do not see any spelling change to the word “John” when used vocatively.

However, older languages such as Latin do utilize a vocative case. The most famous example comes from Shakespeare’s play *Julius Caesar*- during the scene where Caesar’s best friend Brutus stabs him in the back. After the assault, Caesar turns to Brutus and says, “*Et tu, Brute?*” The Latin word *Brute* (broo-tay) is the vocative case of

the name *Brutus*.

The first example of the vocative case in Angelical is found within the First Table of *Loagaeth*, where we find the word *Befas*.⁸ It would appear this word aroused the curiosity of Dee and/or Kelley, because it is similar to the name of a *Heptarchic* Angel the men had already met: *Befafes*- the angelic Prince of Tuesday. In the margin, Dee makes the following notation:

Befes the vocative case of Befafes. [-The Five Books of Mystery, p. 310]

Therefore, we know that someone in the text of the First Table of *Loagaeth* (presumably the Creator) is directly addressing *Befafes* for some reason- and the vocative case alters *Befafes* to *Befes*.

The second example of vocative case appears in *A True and Faithful Relation...*, while Dee and Kelley are having a conversation with the *Heptarchic* Angel *Madimi*. The Angel suddenly halts the discussion to say:

Carma geta, Barman. [-*A True and Faithful Relation...*, p. 32]

When Dee asked *Madimi* what this phrase meant, she translated it as “Come out of there, Barma.” *Barma* turned out to be the name of a spirit inhabiting Kelley, which *Madimi* proceeded to exorcise. The form *Barman*, then, is a vocative case of *Barma*.

Finally, there *may* be a third example of vocative case- also found in the First Table of *Loagaeth*- in the word *Bobogelzod*. This word certainly appears to have some relationship with the *Heptarchic* King of Sunday *Bobogel*- and could very well represent a vocative case of his name.

Thus, we know that Angelical makes use of the vocative case. We do not know, however, what rules govern the spelling changes.

Phonetic Glosses

Note: Throughout the remainder of this chapter, I will illustrate some pronunciations according to a key found at the beginning of the *Lexicon* or the *Angelical Psalter*.

It is vital to remember that Dee was not recording the words in Angelical characters. Kelley spoke the language fluently while in his trance-state, and Dee merely wrote what he heard in English letters. I have no doubt that many of the words recorded by Dee are exact in their Angelical spelling- meaning we could take the English letters and transliterate them directly into Angelical. However, there are many examples of words that have “phonetic glosses.” This is what I call spelling “peculiarities” that appear in different instances of the same word- which are apparently intended to give us pronunciation cues.

Take, for example, the word *Crip* (But), which appears without the “I” in the compound *Crpl* (But One). Therefore, the “I” should not likely represent an Angelical character in this word- leaving only “*Crp*” (But). The shortest and most radical⁹ version of the word should be the “correct” spelling. What we have in *Crip* is a phonetic gloss- letting us know that “*Crp*” is pronounced “krip” rather than “kurp”

There is also the element “*Purg*” (Flames) - appearing in such words as *Ialpurg* (Burning Flames) and *Malpurg* (Fiery Darts). Yet, these same words appear elsewhere as *Ialprg* (Burning Flame) and *Malprg* (Through-thrusting Fire). Therefore, “*Prg*” and “*Purg*” are likely the same word with the same Angelical spelling. The extra “U” is merely a phonetic gloss, telling us where to place the vowel sound. Elsewhere, we can even see the word *Prge* (Fire)- yet another phonetic gloss, adding the “E” to tell us the “G” is a soft “juh” sound. All of these clues suggest the true pronunciation of the Angelical word “*Prg*” is identical to our word “Purge.” However, the word is probably spelled “*Prg*” (*Mals, Don, Ged*).

Compounds are not the only places we can look for phonetic glosses. Several words that stand alone in the Keys appear more than once with different spellings. For example, consider the word *Abramig* (Prepared). This word appears only once in this form. Meanwhile, it appears in three other places in the Keys in the form of *Abramg*- twice standing alone and once in a compound. Therefore, we might suspect that *Abramg* (*Un, Pa, Un, Tal, Ged*) is the radical spelling of this word. The extra “I” in *Abramig* merely tells us where to place the vowel sound (“ay-bray-mig” rather than “ay-bram-jee”).

Another good example is the word *NA* – which appears in the *Five Books*... and the Book of *Loagaeth* as a name of God. We might assume this word is pronounced

“nah” or “nay.” However, in the Keys we can find the same word written phonetically as *Enay* (Lord). Thus, we know the proper pronunciation of *NA* is “en-ay,” and it should be spelled with only two letters.

As further examples, we can compare the following words:

<i>F</i> (Visit)	-	<i>Ef</i> (Visit)
<i>L</i> (First)	-	<i>El</i> (First)
<i>S</i> (Fourth)	-	“ <i>Es</i> ” (Fourth)

The added “E” in each case is apparently a phonetic gloss- once again showing us where to place the vowel sound in the pronunciation of the words.

Further phonetic glosses seem to be associated with the Angelical digraphs- though the subject is fairly uncertain. In ancient languages (at least, those which possessed an alphabet), digraphs are usually indicated by a single letter. For example, the Hebrew letter *Peh* represents the sounds of both “P” and “Ph.” The letter *Tau* represents both “T” and “Th.” Likewise, there are several examples of this in Angelical:

Cnoqod is pronounced “see-noh-kwod” (Q = Qu)

(Also see: *Cnoquod*)

Cormp is pronounced “kormf” (P = Ph)

(Also see: *Cormf*)

Lonsa is pronounced “lon-sha” (S = Sh)

(Also see: *Lansh*)

Noncp is pronounced “non-sef” (P = Ph)

(Also see: *Noncf*)

Sapa is pronounced “say-fa” (P = Ph)

Telocvovim is pronounced “tee-loch-voh-vee-im” (C = Ch)

(Also see: *Teloch*)

“*Vonpo*” is pronounced “von-foh” (P = Ph)

(Also see: *Vonpho*)

The above is fairly convincing evidence that Angelical digraphs are indeed represented by single letters. That would mean that the secondary letters in these

digraphs (the “h” in “Ph” and “Ch”; the “u” in “Qu”, etc) are merely phonetic glosses, and should not be included when the words are spelled in Angelical characters.

However, there also exist *counter*-examples in Dee's journals. The very first word of the Holy Book of *Loagaeth* (Table One, Side A) was originally recorded by Dee as “Zuresk.” Later, Raphael corrected this by telling Dee the word must contain seven letters- *Zuresch*. (The “Ch” taking its hard sound, as in our words “ache” or “chrome.”) Because of this correction, we know the “Ch” digraph is- in this case- actually written with two letters instead of just one.

If we continue to look through the first few lines of *Loagaeth* (which Raphael spelled out Angelical character by character)¹⁰, we find several further examples of two-letter digraphs as well.

Another good counter-example is the word *Hoath* at the end of the First Angelical Key. I included the transmission of this word in volume one, chapter three (section, “Dee Suspected of Cryptography?”), where Nalvage was still associating numbers with each letter of the words. There, we can see undeniably, Nalvate transmitted both a “T” and an “H” for *Hoath*, and gave a number to each letter. Therefore, once again, we can see an Angelical digraph represented with two letters as in modern English.

Thus, we are left with several examples of one-letter digraphs and several examples of two-letter digraphs. That leaves us with a large number of two-letter digraphs in Dee's records that give no clue to their proper Angelical-character spelling. Was Dee writing these words in transliteration (letter for letter) or phonetically? Where no such clues exist, I have recorded the digraphs in the *Lexicon* in Angelical characters just as Dee recorded them in English. Yet, there remains some room for debate on the issue.

As a final entry in this section, I would like to mention a short phonetic note that Dee recorded in his journal for a word in the Book of *Loagaeth*. For Table One, Side A, Line 23, Dee recorded the word *Au*. In the margin, he noted “*au* sounds *af*.” It might seem that Dee was indicating that the “U” could sound like an “F.” However, it is more likely that he was indicating a “V” sound for this word- so that *Au* is actually *Av*. In the English of Dee's time, “U” and “V” were essentially the same letter. So Dee would have

had to utilize the “F” as a kind of phonetic gloss, to approximate the phonetic sound of “V.”

Early-modern English and Angelical

Before we continue discussing the pronunciation of Angelical, we must first consider a few points about the English used by Dee to record the words. As mentioned previously, Kelley spoke the Angelical words aloud while Dee recorded them in English characters. (He also added marginal notes with phonetic pronunciation clues.) These words and notes are all recorded in- and represent sounds familiar to- Elizabethan English. A little study into this vernacular will make sense of many of Dee’s seemingly inexplicable phonetic notes.

Dee lived from 1527 – 1608 CE, making him contemporary with folks like King James (1537 – 1640 CE) and William Shakespeare (1564 – 1616 CE). These men all spoke “Elizabethan” English (with different regional dialects). As any Enochian scholar can tell you, reading Dee’s journals is an ordeal similar to reading Shakespeare’s plays or James’ authorized Bible. (Remember that the quotes you have read throughout this book have been modernized.) Therefore, a study of Shakespeare’s English is necessary if one wishes to estimate the sound of the angelic language recorded by Dee.

Contrary to popular belief, the English spoken by Dee and Shakespeare was *not* Old or Middle English. It was, in fact, a form of modern English called “early-modern English.” This idiom existed roughly between the late 1400s and the late 1600s.¹¹ In other words, it was the standard language of the European Renaissance era. It was *not* the “Queen’s English” accent we currently associate with the British upper class and royalty. Nor was it the cockney dialect we associate with east-end London peasants.¹² These accents did not originate (as we know them) until the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Those who study Shakespearean phonetics commonly suggest that early-modern English sounded more like the “hillbilly” accent found in the Appalachian regions of eastern America. That is because the Appalachian people migrated from Europe while early-modern English was prevalent, and then settled into isolated communities. Therefore, their language remained unchanged for hundreds of years, and it currently contains the most similarities with early-modern English. Of course, I am not suggesting that we read the Angelical Keys in the voice of Jed Clampett. However, it is important to

place the phonetic sounds we are going to explore in their proper context.

Early-modern English is a transitional dialect between Middle English and what we speak today (present-day English). It retained some of the spelling conventions of Middle English, but had shifted to a pronunciation more familiar to the present-day version. That, in fact, is why it so often confuses modern students. We can listen to plays by Shakespeare and- for the most part- understand what we are hearing. There may be puns or catch-phrases we don't recognize, and there are a few words that have changed in meaning, but the words still sound basically like present-day English.

However, when we try to *read* the same material, there are some glaring departures from what we learned about English in school. These departures are partially thanks to the Middle English spelling conventions that had not yet passed out of the system by the time of Shakespeare and Dee.

Further departures and confusion arise from the fact that English had not been standardized during the early-modern English phase.¹³ The “educated” languages such as Latin had reached a standard- but English was still the vulgar tongue. Just as the definitions of the words were somewhat fluid, so were the spellings. Most words were spelled according to how they sounded to the author (a factor that could vary widely from region to region), or according to how the author believed they “should” be spelled. The rules were so fluid that the same word might be spelled in different ways within the *same text*. (Of course, we have already discovered this within Dee's record of the Forty-Eight Keys.)

Thankfully, there is a brighter side to early-modern English as well. *Most* of the grammatical rules you learned in school- and take for granted to this very day- apply to Dee's English. (That's why the language sounds similar to our own when spoken.)

For the most part, the consonants in early-modern English sounded pretty much the way we use them today. A “G” before an “E” or “I” generally had the soft “juh” sound (as in: general, budge, giant,), but otherwise took the hard sound (as in: grand, glad, haggard). The letter “R” probably sounded longer and more drawn out than present-day English. For example, the name “Henry” has three syllables in early-modern English. So does the word “angry.”¹⁴ The letter “Z”¹⁵ was new, but was used by Dee and Kelley as we use it today (as in: zest, zip, sizzle). The letter “X” took the sound of “ks” in the middle or at the end of a word (as in: excite, taxes, fox), but the sound of “z” or “tz” at the beginning (as in: xylophone, xenophobe).

Most of the digraphs are familiar: “Th” (as in: this, that), “Sh” (as in: sheet, dish), “Ph” (as in: phantasm, phone), etc. The digraph “Ch” also existed- sometimes representing the “tch” sound (as in: church, chain), and other times a guttural “kh” sound (as in: ache, chrome, chronicle). “Kn” had finally developed the “nh” sound we know today (as in: knight, knife). Early-modern English also recognized the more archaic “Gn” digraph as a throaty “nh” sound (as in: gnat, gnaw, gnarl).

Therefore, if you are a native English speaker, you can read the Angelical Keys pretty much as they appear. You can most often go with your gut reaction on how the letter-combinations of the words should sound.

Most of the differences between early modern and present-day English appear where vowel-sounds are concerned. Of course, most of the grammatical rules are still the same as we know them. For instance, an “E” following a consonant at the end of a word will become silent, and make the preceding vowel long (as in: bake, precede, pipe, hope, duke).

However, as we shall see, early-modern English used many peculiar letter-combinations to represent the vowel sounds - many of them left over from the more archaic spellings of Middle English. I would like to highlight a couple of points that most often result in confusion for students:

First, early-modern English used the letters “I”, “Y” and “J” interchangeably. The basic rule was that “I/Y” represented the vowel sounds, while “J” (actually an elongated “I”) represented the consonant sound.

“I/Y” could be used at the beginning or end of a word- making the sounds of “yuh” at the beginning (as in: yard, your, yellow) and “ee” at the end (as in: lady, windy). Sometimes, an “I/Y” at the end of a word could have the long “eye” sound (as in sty, ply, sky). If it follows an “A”, it makes that vowel long (as in: day, stay, dais). In the middle of a word, “I” possessed its typical short sounds (as in: bit, sit, whither) or long sounds (as in: bite, kite, blight, sight).

Meanwhile, either the letter “I” *or* its elongated “J” version could appear in a word with the consonant “juh” sound.¹⁶ It might appear at the start of a word (as in: justice, jump, John)¹⁷ or in the middle (as in: adjust, object, majestic). Finally, as if to confuse matters further, the “juh” sound could also be represented by a “G” (as in: danger, sage, range).

The next common point of confusion, for modern students, is between the letters

“U” and “V.” These letters were also interchangeable in early-modern English, and might indicate either a vowel or a consonant sound.

If the letter was used at the beginning of a word, it was always written as “V.” It might take the consonant “vuh” sound if preceding a vowel (as in: very, visit, vast). Or, it might take the vowel sound if preceding a consonant; either the long “yew” sound (as in: vtopia, vtilize, vseful),¹⁸ or the short “uh” sound (as in: vp, vtmost, vsher).¹⁹

The “U” form of the letter could be used anywhere else in the word. Whether it took the vowel or consonant sound was the same as above. It could take the consonant sound if it preceded a vowel (as in sauage, saue, Daud).²⁰ Or, it could take the vowel sound if it preceded a consonant (as in: mud, scrub, button.)²¹

I should also point out that the letter “W” was fairly rare. It was more often written like a literal double “U” (or “V”) - “uu” or “vv.” Linguists refer to this as a "slide", where two vowel sounds are combined to form a new sound.

On the following pages, you will find reference charts for early-modern English phonetics, which can be applied to Angelical words as well as the pronunciation notes Dee left in his records. It is not an ultimate guide to proper Angelical pronunciation (as we shall see later, there are also several Middle English influences upon Angelical), but it gives us a much clearer picture than systems based upon Hebrew or other phonologies.

Therefore, when you encounter an Angelical word with an obscure spelling- *or* one of Dee’s seemingly inexplicable phonetic notes- simply look for that word’s letter-combinations in the right-hand column of the charts below. The left-hand column will indicate the sound likely made by those letters in Angelical (and early-modern English):

Early-Modern English Phonetics Chart²² (for Angelical Pronunciation)

Consonant Sounds:

<i>Phonetic Sound (as in)</i>	<i>Letter Combinations in early-Modern English</i>
B (<i>boat, clobber</i>)	b, bb
D (<i>dive, ladder</i>)	d, dd
F (<i>fan, rough, phone</i>)	f, ff, gh, ph
G (<i>guard, giggle</i>)	g, gg
H (<i>house, hover, who</i>)	h, wh
J (<i>budge, jump, adjust, magic</i>)	dg, dge, j, i, d, di, dj, g
K (<i>cake, back, chrome</i>)	k, kk, c, cc, ck, ch
L (<i>land, spill, will</i>)	l, ll
M (<i>metal, mammal</i>)	m, mm
N (<i>name, manner, knight, gnome</i>)	n, nn, kn, gn
P (<i>pine, speck, puppet</i>)	p, pp
R (<i>road, serrate, write</i>)	r, rr, wr
S (<i>save, bless, cereal</i>)	s, ss, c
T (<i>table, little, lottery</i>)	t, tt
W (<i>water, work, what</i>)	uu, vv, w, wh
X (<i>except, flax, excite</i>)	x
Y (<i>yes, yellow, your</i>)	y, i
Z (<i>zoo, haze, blizzard, xylophone</i>)	s, z, zz, (very rarely: x)

Vowel Sounds:

<i>Phonetic Sound (as in)</i>	<i>Letter Combinations in early-Modern English</i>
A – long. (<i>date, day, eight, whey</i>)	a, aa, ai, ay, ei, ey, (maybe: eh)
A – short. (<i>bat, cat, apple</i>)	a, æ ²³
E – long. (<i>beet, heat, believe, only</i>)	e, ee, ea, ie, y, æ ²⁴
E – short. (<i>fed, bed, head, dead</i>)	e, ea
E – silent. (<i>taste, hope, wage</i>)	e
I – long. (<i>I, bite, blight, style, height</i>)	i, igh, ai, y, ei, ye
I – short. (<i>bit, cliff, miss, pen</i>)	i, j, e
O – long. (<i>oar, bone, though</i>)	o, oo, ou, ov, ow, oa, ough, ovgh
O – short. (<i>hot, tall, father, auburn</i>)	o, a, au, av, aw, augh, avgh, ough, ovgh
U – long. (<i>root, through, brute</i>)	o, u, v, ou, ov, oo, ough, ovgh, eu, ew
U – short. (<i>cup, of</i>)	u, v, o

Digraphs:

<i>Phonetic Sound (as in)</i>	<i>Letter Combinations in early-Modern English</i>
“Kwuh” (<i>queen, quick</i>)	qu
“Ow” (<i>out, drought, house, town</i>)	ou, ov, ow, ough, ovgh
“Oy” (<i>oil, boy</i>)	oi, oy
“Shuh” (<i>shine, shower, wish</i>)	sh
“Tch” (<i>chase, church, witch</i>)	ch, t, c, cch, tch
“Thuh” (<i>that, whither, thorn</i>)	th, (very rarely: y) ²⁵

Take note that several of the above letter-combinations appear more than once. For example, the combination “ough” appears under four different headings, because it might indicate any of the following sounds:

Long “o” (as in: though, dough)

Short “o” (as in: thought, cough)

Long “u” (as in: enough, rough, tough)

digraph “ow” (as in: drought, bough)

This means that- just as with early-modern English itself- there will always be some ambiguity in the pronunciation of Angelical words. However, at the very least, the above information will allow us to make educated guesses rather than engaging in blind speculation based upon present-day English, Hebrew or other languages.

Middle English and Angelical

Having said the above about early-Modern English, I feel it is necessary to add a few words about Middle English and its influence on Dee’s Angelical language.

Dee may have been writing his notes in his own contemporary English- however, we must keep in mind that he was receiving a sacred magickal language from the Angels, which they claimed to be an ancient proto-tongue. This is not uncommon for magickal languages- most of which are archaic in some form. For example, the priests of ancient Babylon made use of the older Sumerian language in their rites. In Dee’s time, the dead languages like Latin and Hebrew were the standard mystery languages. Therefore, it is no surprise that Angelical would have also had an archaic sound to the ears of Dee and Kelley. That is where Middle English comes into the picture.

Middle English was the language used by Chaucer to write his *Canterbury Tales*. One of the best-known traits of Middle English was the manner in which it tended to pronounce most of the letters in each word- so the vowels were clearly pronounced. As the English language drifted toward its Early-modern phase, the syllables began to blend together into the sounds we are familiar with today.

By taking Dee’s phonetic clues into account, I have discovered a general "Middle English" trait throughout Angelical. This is especially applicable to vowels or groups of consonants. For example, all the vowels in the word *Aai* are sounded (“ay-ay-ii”). In the

word *Balye*, the “A”, “Y” and “E” are all sounded distinctly (“bay-lee-ee”). The word *Momao* follows the same rule- with the “A” and both “O”s sounded distinctly (“moh-may-oh”).

For consonants, we can look at the final “M” in *Mapm*, which sounds alone (“map-em”). Or the initial “L” in *Lring*, which also makes its own sound (“el-ring”). Another example is the word *Zlida*, where the initial “Z” stands alone (“zohd-lida”).

I could give dozens of examples of this convention, but I think the above should suffice as an illustration. This in no way means that *every* letter in every Angelical word should be pronounced! However, the convention appears often enough to give the language a slightly “Middle English” flavor. In this way, the Angelical tongue would have sounded “archaic” to Dee and Kelley - thus fulfilling the requirement for a magickal language.

General Notes on Angelical Phonology

This section is where I have gathered all of my notes on the phonology of the Angelical language. They are taken from everything we have seen in this chapter so far, as well as Dee’s own pronunciation notes. (See the *Lexicon* for more on Dee’s notes.) What you see below can be applied directly to the Angelical words, as Dee recorded them, and which you will find in the *Lexicon*.

Vowels

Pronouncing the vowels in the Angelical tongue does not present much of a problem. As we shall see in the *Lexicon*, a vowel will usually take its short sound when it is followed by a consonant in its syllable. For some examples, see *Lap*, *Iad* and *Zir*. However, when a vowel is attached to the *preceding* consonant (i.e.- it stands at the end of its syllable), or when it stands alone in a syllable, it takes its long sound. For examples of this, see *Momao*, *Napeai* and *Paradial*. Dee’s phonetic notes- which we shall see in the *Lexicon*- usually divide the words by syllables, thus indicating to which consonant (if any) each vowel is attached.

Consonants

Of course, it is the consonants that cause most students (and adepts!) to stumble

with Angelical pronunciation. While they generally make the sounds we are familiar with, there are several words that contain peculiar groupings of consonants that make little to no sense to modern English readers. There are certain grammatical rules one must learn to make sense of it all:

When two consonants are placed together, they can:

1) Make a digraph as they would in present-day English (Ph, Ch, Th, Qu, etc), as in *Dorpha*, *Ethamz*, *Chis*, *Teloch*, *Norquasahi*, etc. Or they can:

2) Make a new consonant sound as they would in present-day English (Gr, Tr, Gn, etc), as in *Grosb*, *Trian*, *Gnay*, etc.

However, if neither of the above apply (as in *Nazpsad*, *Farzm*, *Zchis*), then:

3) The “peculiar” consonant letter is pronounced as a syllable unto itself, after the manner of Middle English. By “peculiar”, I mean the consonant in the cluster that stands as the “odd man out.” For instance, in the cluster “GSP” we find that the letters “SP” naturally form a sound together (as in spot or speak). Meanwhile, the letters “GS” do not make a natural sound in English. Therefore, that “G” is the peculiar one in the group- and it is pronounced by itself, in its own syllable.

In Angelical, a letter standing alone in a syllable is not pronounced phonetically. To continue our above "GSP" example, the “G” would take neither its hard sound (“guh”- as in game or good) or its soft sound (“juh”- as in giant or huge). Instead, one would actually pronounce the letter’s *name*- sounding like “jee.”

Let’s take a look at some examples in Angelical: The word *Nazpsad* is pronounced "nayz-pee-sad." The central "P" stands out in this case as the peculiar consonant, and is therefore pronounced as "pee." The word *Farzm* is pronounced "farz-em." The final "ZM" do not combine naturally in English, and the "M" is pronounced by itself as "em." As a final example, the word *Zchis* is pronounced "zohd-kiis." The initial letters "ZCh" do not combine, therefore the “Z” is pronounced as “zohd.” In each case, the peculiar consonant stands alone as its own syllable.

I admit it seems odd that Angelical consonants should sound like the *names* of

English letters. (After all, they have their own Angelical names!) However, notice that long vowels also sound like their English names (long “A” = “ay”, long “E” = “ee”, long “O” = “oh”, etc)- and any Angelical vowel that stands alone in a syllable takes the long sound. It would appear, then, that the same principal is applied to Angelical consonants when they stand alone. That is to say, Angelical recognizes “long consonants.” Just as a long *Un* (A) sounds like “ay”, so a long (or extended) *Tal* (M) sounds like “em.”

While we are still on the subject of “long consonants”, I should mention that the letter *Ceph* (Z) sometimes takes its long sound for no apparent reason. For example, when the Angel Nalvage transmitted the *Corpus Omnium* to Dee and Kelley, he informed them that the word *Moz* could be pronounced “moz” or “moz-ohd.” The shorter pronunciation indicates “Joy”, while the pronunciation with the extended “Z” (“zohd”) indicates “Joy of God.”

As we can see, there is no grammatical reason why the “Z” in *Moz* should be extended. The same is true for the word *Zacar* (zay-kayr) - which appears in the 48 Keys several times with the extended “Z” (zohd-ay-kayr). My best guess is that this is not based upon a grammatical rule at all. Perhaps, instead, it is merely a poetic (or lyrical) gloss- after the manner in which a singer will elongate or add syllables to a word in a song to fill metre or emphasize emotion. This is suggested by the difference between “moz” as “Joy” and “moz-ohd” as “Joy of God.”

Special Cases

Another quirk of the letter *Ceph* (Z), is that it is sometimes interchangeable with *Pal* (X). This is perhaps because “Z” was somewhat new in the Elizabethan era, and “X” more usually served for the “Z” sound (as in xenophile or xylophone). We see evidence of this in the Book of *Loagaeth*, where the Angelical letter-name *Drux* (N) is given the alternate spelling of *Druz* in the margin.²⁶

The letter *Don* (R) is another Angelical character of interest. When the letter “R” becomes the peculiar consonant in a cluster, it is neither pronounced “ar” (the long consonant sound) nor given its own syllable. Instead, it is merely pronounced “ur” (as in our words turn or spur)- so that it combines with the consonant before it. For example, see *Prdzar* (“purd-zar”), *Prge* (“purj”), *Dialprt* (“dii-al-purt”), etc.

There is one final special case I want to record here. In his journals, Dee established that the word *Battle* was pronounced “bal-tayl” (rhyming with ball and tail).²⁷ I found the pronunciation of the three-consonant cluster in the second syllable- “TLE”- very odd. I decided to investigate further by searching for other words ending in “LE”, and found *Bagle* and *Cicle*. As you can see in the *Lexicon*, Dee’s notes on these words are less than helpful. I find it likely that each of these words should end with the sound of “ayl” (as in our words bail or tail). In fact, I suspect that any time we see “LE” as the final two letters of a three-consonant cluster, they will have the “ayl” sound.

- ¹ The Archangel Raphael says of the First Table: “Let this lesson instruct thee to read all that shall be gathered out of this book hereafter. [...] It shall be sufficient to instruct thee.” [*Five Books of Mystery*, p. 291]
- ² See the introduction to Laycock’s *The Complete Enochian Dictionary*.
- ³ All of these are included in the *Lexicon*.
- ⁴ It does, however, appear in *Loagaeth*- though without definition. I note it is very similar to the Hebrew word *Iah* or *Yah* (God).
- ⁵ See the introduction to Laycock’s *The Complete Enochian Dictionary*.
- ⁶ *Bagle* appears elsewhere as a form of “because.”
- ⁷ “And you, Brutus?”
- ⁸ Table One, Side A, Line 21.
- ⁹ Radical, used in this sense, means “root” or “smallest unit.”
- ¹⁰ See *John Dee’s Five Books of Mystery*, p. 288 – 295.
- ¹¹ After what linguists refer to as “the great vowel shift.” The main difference between Middle English and Modern English is the pronunciation of the vowels.
- ¹² Think of Eliza Doolittle in the play *My Fair Lady*: “The rine in spine styas minely on th’ pline!”
- ¹³ The first English dictionary was not published in London until 1604 CE.
- ¹⁴ Based on Shakespearean phonetics.
- ¹⁵ Called *Zed*, *Ezod*, *Zod* and sometimes *Izzard*.
- ¹⁶ Present-day English entirely dropped the use of “I” for the consonant sound.
- ¹⁷ Or: iustice, iump, Iohann.
- ¹⁸ All of which we write today: utopia, utilize, useful.
- ¹⁹ That is: up, utmost, usher.
- ²⁰ That is: savage, save, David.
- ²¹ In the *Lexicon*, I have sometimes modernized the usage of “U” and “V” in order to make the words more comprehensible to the modern eye. For instance, the word *Zomdux* (Amidst) appears in Dee’s journals as *Zomdvx*.
- ²² Do not confuse this chart with my own phonetic Angelical pronunciation guide and notes found in the *Lexicon* and *Angelical Psalter*
- ²³ This character- which appears as a combination of “A” and “E” (or “Æ”)- is called an “ash.” Sometimes it has the short “A” sound (as in: ash, apple, ask), and sometimes it has a long “E” sound (ether, eon, eros, etc)
- ²⁴ See previous footnote.
- ²⁵ In Old and Middle English, the letter “Y” could often indicate the “Th” digraph. This is where we get words like “ye” that are pronounced “thee.” This convention was formally dropped from early-modern English, though some authors in Shakespeare’s time still used it. I doubt, however, that it applies to any Angelical words, as Dee seems to have regularly used “Y” to indicate the “yuh” sound.
- ²⁶ See the *Five Books of Mystery*, p. 291, footnote 136. *Loagaeth*, Table 1, Side A, Line 1.
- ²⁷ See the entry for *Baltle* in the *Lexicon*.