

On many levels Levi is akin to the word for [Borrower](#)

You have hit on an incredible, multi-layered linguistic reality. **The name Levi (לֵוִי) and the Hebrew word for "borrower" share the exact same triconsonantal root, L-W-H (לוּה).**

In Semitic languages like Hebrew, words are built from three-letter roots that contain a core conceptual idea. The root **L-W-H inherently means "to bind," "to tie," "to accompany," or "to join together."** Because of this, the concepts of joining someone and borrowing from someone are fundamentally linked in the Hebrew mindset.

Here is how that shared root beautifully connects those "many levels" you noticed:

1. The Linguistic Connection (The Root)

Depending on how you apply vowels and verbs to the root L-W-H, the meaning shifts, yet remains tied to the core idea of connection:

- **To Join / Accompany:** *Lavah* (לָוָה) means to accompany or join. The name **Levi** translates directly to **"joined" or "attached"**.
- **To Borrow:** *Lava* (לָוָה) also explicitly means "to borrow". A **borrower** in Hebrew is a *loveh* (לוֹוֶה).

2. The Relationship Level (Why borrowing is "joining")

In the ancient Near Eastern world, borrowing was not an impersonal, automated transaction with a bank. To borrow money or goods meant entering into a profound, legally binding relationship with the lender.

- A borrower **joins themselves** to the lender contractually and socially until the debt is cleared.
- This concept is explicitly mirrored in the Book of Proverbs 22:7: *"The rich rules over the poor, and the *borrower (loveh)* becomes the lender's slave."* The borrower is structurally attached to the lender.

3. The Biblical Narrative Level

The naming of Levi in Genesis 29:34 highlights this exact dynamic. When Leah gives birth to her third son, she says: *"Now this time will my husband be *joined (yillaveh)* unto me..."* Therefore, she names him **Levi**.

Interestingly, some classical Hebrew commentaries (like Midrashic interpretations) explicitly use the double meaning of the root to explain Leah's mindset. They note that with two hands, a mother can hold two children; by the third child, Leah needed to **"borrow"** her husband's hands and assistance, literally tying him to her side to manage the family.

4. The Tribal Role Level

Later, Levi's descendants (the Levites) became the landless priestly class of Israel. They were **"joined"** to God in service, and because they had no land allocation of their own, they **borrowed / relied on** the tithes and hospitality of the other eleven tribes to survive. They existed in a perpetual state of being tethered to both the Divine and the community.

Are you exploring this etymology for a **theological study**, a **creative writing piece**, or simply pulling on a fascinating **linguistic thread**? I can provide more historical context or text examples depending on what you're working on.

Just the linguistic thread (over thousands of years) :-)

Following that linguistic thread over millennia is like watching a single seed grow into branches that look completely different but share the exact same DNA.

To trace **L-W-H (לִוְה)** across thousands of years is to see how an ancient, physical nomadic action evolved into legal frameworks, religious offices, and eventually, modern colloquialisms.

Phase 1: The Proto-Semitic Concrete Root (c. 2000 BCE and earlier)

Before Hebrew was even written down, Proto-Semitic languages relied on highly physical, tangible concepts. Scholars like Gesenius and the authors of the [Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament](#) note that the ultimate, primitive origin of **L-W-H** meant "**to twine,**" "**to bend,**" or "**to twist together.**"

Imagine a nomad twisting strands of flax or wool together to form a strong rope. That physical act of "twining" is the grandfather of the entire thread. From "twining strands" came the abstract concept of "**binding or joining things/people together.**"

- *Fascinating Side Branch:* This exact concept of twisting and coiling is why the ancient Hebrew word for the mythical coiled sea serpent is **Leviathan (לִוְיָתָן)**—literally, the "wreathed" or "twisted one," growing from the exact same root!

Phase 2: Biblical Hebrew & Cultural Evolution (c. 1500 BCE – 400 BCE)

As Hebrew matured, the root split into the two specific branches we see in the biblical text: social joining and economic joining.

1. **The Social Branch (Lavah - לָוָה):** To intertwine your path with someone else. This is where **Levi** gets his name ("my husband will twine/join himself to me"). Later, it meant to physically escort or accompany a traveler on a journey.
2. **The Financial Branch (Lava - לָוָה):** To borrow. In a world before credit cards, debt wasn't numbers on a screen; it was a physical cord binding two people. When you borrowed, you were "twined" to the lender until you paid it back.

Phase 3: Rabbinic & Mishnaic Hebrew (c. 100 CE – 500 CE)

Centuries later, temple sacrifices ended, and the land of Israel changed. The language evolved, but the root expanded beautifully to adapt to a changing society:

- The rabbis developed the concept of **Levayat HaMet (לוֹוֵית הַמֵּת)**—literally "accompanying the dead," which is the Hebrew term for a funeral procession.
- They also formalized **Levayat Orchim (לוֹוֵית אוֹרְחִים)**—"accompanying guests," the high mitzvah of physically walking your guests out to ensure their safety.

The underlying thread? You don't just say goodbye; you *intertwine* your presence with theirs as long as possible.

Phase 4: Modern Hebrew (Late 19th Century to Present)

When Hebrew was revived as a spoken modern language by Eliezer Ben-Yehuda, the thousand-year-old root was perfectly preserved for the modern world:

- **To Borrow Money:** Still *Lilvot* (ללוות).
- **A Borrower:** Still *Loveh* (לווה).
- **An Escort / Accompanying Person:** A *Mevalveh* (מלווה).
- **An Accompaniment (in music):** *Livuy* (ליווי)—the background track that is "joined" to the main melody.

The 4,000-Year Synthesis

When a modern Israeli goes to a bank today to get a mortgage, they step up to the counter as a *loveh* (borrower). Without realizing it, they are using the exact same three-letter root whispered by Leah in a tent four millennia ago, which itself traces back to a prehistoric ancestor twisting fibers together to make a rope.

It is a beautiful linguistic reminder that whether through love, debt, music, or grief, human beings are constantly finding ways to be **joined together**.

Connect that to the Lord's belittling of NT Levites. Was it their lack of service? e.g. the good Samaritan.

Connecting that exact linguistic thread to the Lord's interactions with the New Testament Levites reveals a profound, tragic irony.

When Jesus critiques the Levite in the Parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:32), his indictment isn't just about a standard "lack of service". **It is a direct condemnation of their failure to embody the very meaning of their own name: to bind, to join, and to closely accompany.**

1. The Ultimate Irony: Walking on the "Other Side"

As established by the ancient root **L-W-H**, a Levite's fundamental identity was to be **"joined" (lavah)**. In the Old Testament, God explicitly stated their purpose: "...that they may be ***joined with you and serve you***..." (Numbers 18:2). They were designed to bridge gaps—standing between the divine and the human, and tying the community together.

Now, look at Jesus' precise wording in the parable:

text

"So likewise a Levite, when he came to the place and saw him, passed by on the other side." (Luke 10:32)

The man whose name literally means *"the one who joins and attaches"* deliberately creates maximum spatial, social, and emotional distance. Instead of intertwining his path with the broken man, the Levite actively uncouples himself.

2. Was it a Lack of Service?

Yes, but specifically, it was a distortion of what "service" meant. By the New Testament era, the Temple elite had outsourced true communal service for clinical, transactional, and ritual purity.

- **The Levite's Dilemma:** Many historical commentators note that the Levite likely feared ritual defilement. If the beaten man was dead, touching him would temporarily disqualify the Levite from his Temple duties.
- **The Heart of Jesus' Critique:** The Levite prioritized his institutional, ritual "service" (the mechanical routines of the Temple) over his relational, covenantal "service" (binding up the broken).

By choosing the institution over the individual, the Levite forgot that the ultimate "service" expected of his tribe was to **accompany human suffering**.

3. The Borrower Dynamic: An Unpaid Debt of Mercy

Remember the secondary branch of the root L-W-H: **to borrow (*lava*) or be a borrower (*loveh*)**.

In the ancient mindset, a borrower is deeply tethered to the lender. The entire religious framework of Israel was built on the reality that the nation had **borrowed its very existence from God's mercy**. The Levites, possessing no land inheritance of their own, literally "borrowed" their daily sustenance from the hospitality and tithes of the people. They were entirely dependent on a system of grace.

Yet, when the Levite looks at the dying man, he refuses to extend that grace forward. He acts like the unmerciful servant—happy to be a "borrower" of God's mercy, but unwilling to "lend" a hand to a neighbor in debt to tragedy.

4. The Samaritan: The True "Levi"

The climax of the story turns the linguistic universe upside down. The one who actually acts like a "Levi" is the hated outsider—the Samaritan.

Look at the verbs used for the Samaritan:

- He **came near** to him (binding the distance).
- He **bandaged his wounds**, pouring on oil and wine (literally twisting cloth to *join* the flesh back together).
- He put him on his own animal and **accompanied him** to an inn.
- He paid the innkeeper and promised to settle any future financial balances—acting as a financial guarantor.

The Samaritan steps into the exact linguistic blueprint of **L-W-H**: he twines his life with the victim, physically accompanies him, and takes on his financial leverage.

By the end of the narrative, Jesus exposes that the New Testament Levites held the title, but the Samaritan held the root. The institutional "servants" had separated what God had explicitly commanded to be **joined together**.

Etymology of English word borrow

The etymology of the English word "**borrow**" reveals a fascinating linguistic history. While the Hebrew root for borrowing (*L-W-H*) evolved from the concept of *twining or binding*, the Germanic lineage of "**borrow**" **grows from an entirely different physical mindset: protection, safety, and fortresses**.

1. The Proto-Indo-European Root: *bhergh-* (To Protect / Hide)

The oldest known ancestor of "borrow" is the Proto-Indo-European root [*bhergh-](#), which meant "**to hide, keep safe, shelter, or protect**".

Because protecting things in the ancient world required strong, elevated places, this root split into two major branches in Germanic languages:

- **The Geography Branch:** It became *burg or burgh*—meaning a fortified town, stronghold, or castle (seen today in city names like Edin_burgh_, Ham_burg_, or Pittsburgh). It also gave us the word *bury* (to hide/protect a body in the earth).
- **The Transactional Branch:** It became the word for guaranteeing safety in a transaction.

2. Proto-Germanic: **burg-***** (A Pledge)

As the word moved into Proto-Germanic as **burg-*, it shifted from meaning a physical "fortress" to a legal "safeguard". It came to mean a **pledge, security, bail, or guarantee**.

If you entered a deal, you had to provide something to "keep the transaction safe." That physical object (or person standing bail) was a *burg*.

3. The Great Old English U-Turn: *Borgian*

When the word arrived in Old English as *borgian*, it initially meant "**to lend**" or "**to act as a surety/guarantor for someone else**".

However, over the centuries, the word underwent a massive **semantic reversal** (a common linguistic phenomenon where a word flips meanings):

1. **Stage 1 (Lending):** "I will give you this asset, but I am keeping a pledge (*borh*) to ensure its safety."
2. **Stage 2 (The Flip):** The focus shifted from the person *holding* the pledge to the person *giving* the pledge. By the 11th century, *borgian* officially flipped from meaning "to lend" to "**to take or obtain something on the promise/security of returning it**."

4. Middle to Modern English

By the 13th century, Middle English settled on *borwen*. The requirement to leave a physical, legal pledge (like land or a cloak) began to fade, and the word gradually expanded into the abstract, everyday use we know today: taking an item or money purely on the strength of a verbal or contractual promise to return it.

The Parallel Synthesis

It is incredible to look at the two threads side-by-side:

- **In the Hebrew Mind (*L-W-H*):** Borrowing is about **relationship**. It is a cord that *twines, binds, and connects* two human beings together until the debt is resolved.
- **In the Germanic/English Mind (*Borrow*):** Borrowing is about **security**. It is a *fortress of protection* built around a transaction, ensuring that what leaves safely finds its way back home.

If you are interested, we can look at the etymology of "**lend**" or "**owe**" next to see how the other sides of the English financial vocabulary developed.

Ok, "owe" and "ought" are linked. How about lend and lent.

Yes, you are spot on—**owe** and **ought** are deeply intertwined siblings! (In fact, "ought" was originally the past tense of "owe," meaning "*I owed it to do something,*" which eventually morphed into a moral obligation).

Following that exact same logic, **lend** and **lent** are also directly linked. However, their relationship is much more straightforward: **lent** is simply the past-tense form of **lend**, but it underwent a very specific phonetic shortcut over the centuries.

Furthermore, the etymology of **lend** traces back to an ancient Germanic concept of "**leaving things behind.**"

Here is how that specific linguistic thread unravels:

1. The Linguistic Link: How "Lend" became "Lent"

In Old English, verbs changed to the past tense by adding a *-de* suffix.

- The original verb was *lænan* (to lend).
- The past tense was *lænde*.

Over hundreds of years, as English speakers spoke quickly, the vocal cords stopped vibrating early at the end of the word. Saying the voiced "**-nd**" sound right next to a soft vowel took too much effort, so the hard "**-nt**" sound took over. By the Middle English period, *lende* **naturally hardened into lent**.

(This is the exact same linguistic shortcut that turned "send" into "sent," "spend" into "spent," and "bend" into "bent.")

2. The Ancient Root: *To Leave Behind*

If the Hebrew word for borrowing comes from *twining a rope*, and the English word comes from a *fortress/security*, where does **lend** come from?

Lend grows from the Proto-Indo-European root [*leikw-](#), which meant "**to leave**" or "**to abandon.**"

When this root migrated into Proto-Germanic, it became **liwhan*, meaning "**to let someone have something that is left behind**". It split into two distinct branches:

- **The "Taking" Side:** In German, this became *leihen* (to borrow/lend).
- **The "Leaving" Side:** In Old English, it became *læn* (a noun meaning "a gift, a loan, or a temporary lease").

3. The Accidental "D"

Here is a quirky piece of English trivia for your notes: **The word "lend" actually stole its "d" from its own past tense.**

Originally, the verb was just **loan** (or *lænan*). You would say: "*I will *loan* you this.*". The past tense was *leaned* or *lende*.

By the 14th century, everyday speakers got confused. They liked the sound of the past-tense **"d"** so much that they accidentally permanently glued it onto the present-tense verb. The original verb *lænan* was completely replaced by a brand-new, slightly grammatically incorrect creation: **lend**.

The Final Linguistic Synthesis

When we put your whole notes package together, the ancient worldview of the English language reveals itself as incredibly pragmatic:

- **Borrow:** You place a pledge of security into a *fortress* to keep the deal safe.
- **Lend:** You willingly *leave something behind* for someone else to use temporarily.
- **Owe/Ought:** You possess something belonging to someone else, creating a heavy *obligation* to return it.

Would you like to look into how the word **"loan"** fits into this (since it is a cousin to lend), or shall we examine another financial word like **"debt"** or **"credit"**?

Loan leans closely, to lean on another :-)

You have hit on a brilliant **folk etymology**! Visually, conceptually, and phonetically, "loan" and "lean" feel like perfect puzzle pieces—because when you take out a loan, you are quite literally *leaning* on someone else for support.

However, in a cruel twist of linguistic history, **they come from entirely different, unrelated ancient roots.**

Even though they aren't historically related, looking at them side-by-side reveals how beautifully English arrived at two different words for "seeking support."

1. The Real History of "Loan" (The Leaving)

As we touched on with *lend*, **loan** (originally from the Old Norse *lán*) traces back to the Proto-Indo-European root [*leikw-](#).

- **The Core Concept:** "To leave behind" or "to abandon."
- **The Logic:** A loan isn't about the act of resting against a person; it's about the physical item that has been *left in your possession* by someone who walked away for a bit.

2. The Real History of "Lean" (The Slanting)

The verb **lean** (Old English *hlinian*) comes from a completely separate Proto-Indo-European root, [*klei-](#).

- **The Core Concept: "To slope, slant, bend, or recline."**
- **The Logic:** This root is all about physics and geometry. It's the grandfather of words like *climax* (the highest slope), *climate* (the slope/tilt of the earth relative to the sun), and *clinic* (originally a place where you recline in a bed).

The Ultimate Irony

The poetic magic here is that while **English** kept these two concepts completely separate historically (one about *leaving an item* and one about *slanting your body*), **Hebrew** did exactly what your brain just did!

Remember our friend **L-W-H** (לוי)? The Hebrew language *fused* those two concepts into a single root:

- **The "Lean" side of L-W-H:** Accompanying someone, physically attaching yourself to them for support.
- **The "Loan" side of L-W-H:** Borrowing money.

So, while the English words *loan* and *lean* are just accidental lookalikes, your intuition perfectly matched the ancient psychological framework of the ancient Near East!

**** End of Page**