

text of "Indoeuropei o no", speech at "MYTHOSLOGOS" Lerici July 2017

by [ilcommissarioborachia](#)

 FACEBOOK

... due to its intrinsic nature, the semiotics ... of a language ... is to be qualified instead as an institutionally open: in identifying the sociostatistic norms of use and realization of the infinite semiotic potential of language it finds not a limit, but an order, not closures, but directions of investigation. Following one or the other involves a choice: unlike other language disciplines locked in the limbo of neutrality, the semiotics of lexical noemes, ... semantics, must necessarily take part within the divisions that run through human societies.

(Tullio De Mauro: *Introduction to semantics* , Bari 1971 ², pp. 280-281)

"When I use a word," said Humpty Dumpty haughtily, "it means exactly what I have decided it to mean - no more, no less."

"But the problem," Alice said, "is figuring out if you can make words mean different things."

"The problem is," said Humpty Dumpty, "who's in charge, that's all!"

(Lewis Carroll, *Alice in Wonderland* , quoted by De Mauro in *op.cit.* , P.184).

Indo-European or not (with an appendix on the work of Giovanni Semerano)

speech prepared by Paolo Bertini for MythosLogos on 27 July 2017, at the Pontile di Lerici bar

1

In the year 3153 AD, the tischio Franzisko Smid Wo was in the ancient city of Genua, as counselors available to the ambassade in Rome of the Nipponian state. Smid Wo had already served in a similar role shortly before in Portokalo, a town whose language he knew perfectly well. Passionate - in a far from artisanal way - of historical linguistics, he discovered in the attic of the ancient house of a Genuese friend (whom he frequented often) a printed edition, without phonized digital supports, of the comedies of the well-known Jylberto Kovi.

The SW noticed from the first reading striking linguistic similarities between Portuguese and Genuese. To limit ourselves for reasons of time to the most obvious:

vo è e - vuscià to mean you / her

the endings in -au / ou of the verbs in the past tense (cf. the passage of the well-known genuese song *inve ġe tì m'a preparou a meneštrina co i òvi* : *instead you made me the soup with the egg*)

working on his idea of a genuese matrix that through the movements of the Ligurian people would have expanded its influence towards Portokalo, avoiding with direct navigation the bend of the Franza, the SW intelligently thought of applying the theory of the lateral areas , and given the propensity of two peoples chose the Iowa (in Genuese called “Greeks”) as the eastern counterpart of the Genuese expansion.

The analysis confirmed the correctness of his way of proceeding; we will limit ourselves only to the most obvious examples:

GENUESE	IOWA
bü rse bag	Βύρση stock exchange
Acatàe (spezzino catàe) to buy	Κτάομάι to buy
Camalàe carrying weights with difficulty	Κάμάτος fatigue κάμήλος camel κάμνω I suffer, I tire
Send him a handkerchief	Μάνδύλλιον shawl, cloth

Polèo foal	Foal Πωλος
Reìza effectiveness, yield	Πέζω I do all the way

*There were difficulties: SW was very surprised that the name with which the Iowa (Greeks), like many European languages and even some Ligurian dialects designate the fruit of the orange, that is **portokali** (fruit of Portokalo) was completely absent both in the genuese that in Portokalese, which present respectively e **četròn** and **laranja** , and it remained uncertain whether to attribute these results to the strong presence of **substrates** or the fact that Iowa was a peripheral area of the great Genoese expansion. But the theory was now born; and later it was strengthened by linguistic and non-linguistic studies: the similarities between Portuguese - Italic - and Spanish; the confirmation of the real existence of Christopher Columbus - not by chance Genuese - and of his navigation, the colonization of Sudamerika, up to the sensational discovery that in a district of Bones AYIràs, called del Boca, a perfect Genuese was spoken.*

*The various scholars who continued SW's work called his theory - no longer just theory - **PORTOGRECOGENESE** , and no linguist worthy of the name can ignore it.*

What you have just heard is the introduction of a book of mine - which of course I will never write - on Portogrecogenese.

As for the traditional, initial, "canonical" theory (what I call "fundamentalist") of the **Indo-European**, it went exactly like this:

William Jones ([London](#) , [28 September 1746](#) - [Calcutta](#) , [27 April 1794](#)) was a [British philologist](#) , [orientalist](#) and [magistrate](#) (.....), One of the first scholars of [the Sanskrit language](#) and precursor of [Indo-European studies](#) .

The affinity and original unity of the languages i., Already glimpsed by grammarians and scholars of the early eighteenth century, and became certain in the second half of the century, with W. Jones, was then confirmed by the investigations of the Schlegel brothers, the Grimms, [W. von Humboldt](#) and [F. Bopp](#) , who in 1833 published a comparative grammar of languages i. then known (Sanskrit, Iranian, Greek, Latin, Lithuanian, Gothic and German; in the second edition of 1857 it also included Armenian and Old Slavic). In the 19th century, [the work](#) of reconstruction of the protolanguage (Ursprache) carried out by the European linguistic culture led [Schleicherto](#) interpret the different historical languages i. as a natural differentiation and articulation, according to fixed laws, of a

perfect and unitary archetypal language, the i. common, which would have split into two sections, eastern and western, then branched in turn (tree theory). (enc. Treccani, sv)

Of course, what struck and attracted most scholars initially was the presence of the affinities of **Sanskrit** (used in a part of *central* -north-west India , according to scholars between 1500 BC and the first centuries AD), with Greek, Latin, Germanic. We will have to return to this point several times.

Thanks to the work of the aforementioned scholars, at least five things happened: the first two I will say immediately and they are beautiful; the other three later, and they are - obviously in my opinion - very ugly and very unscientific.

The two beautiful are these:

1. **Comparative linguistics** was born
2. it was clearly seen that apparently different phonologies could be compared through it if there were reinforcements and confirmations

eg .: Latin sequor - Greek hepomai (see Latin quis - Osco-Umbrian PIS)

before commenting on "my" Portogrecogenese hypothesis, it must be said immediately that people like Varro (1st century BC) and above all Seneca (1st century AD) were aware of these phenomena (see famous chapter 8 of *Ad Elviam matrem* , not surprisingly quoted very often by Semerano), but they did not seem to give it much importance.

Let's go back to our **Portokalogenese** .

What I would like you to be struck by is that - **apart of course the little story I invented and its conclusions** - everything I have told you jokingly is true:

- it is true that Genoese and Portuguese are similar, but no history of Genoa speaks of Portugal more than Spain, France, the Greeks and the Latins

- it is true that in the Boca district they speak Genoese
- it is true that Columbus discovered America and that the Portuguese colonized Brazil
- the Genoese - ancient Greek comparisons that I have proposed to you are VERY TRUE, and I have specially chosen them: one, phonetically convincing, very wrong; one

questionable; three scientifically correct

- the story of the orange is true

but the Portuguese-Genovese theory is not true

We know that things did not go that way, and that Genoese and Portuguese are similar as **neo**-Latin, and the Genoese and the Greek first of all for the great commercial activities of the ancient Greek navigators, and then - let's say so for now - because BEFORE the expansion of Latin and the neo-Latin phenomenon, they were **Indo-European**. At this point a faithful Indo-Europeanist would say: "see? You said it! As there is, well proven, the **neo**-Latin phenomenon, there has been, *mutatis mutandis* the same, the Indo-European one: the Latins have conquered the world and transformed the languages of a lot of people! ".

Too bad it didn't go exactly like this:

Rome in 500 BC was a **polis**, created on purpose, probably by several **ethnic groups (etnia)** (the concept of **peoples** as we understand today - we will see it later - it did not exist): the major ones were: Latino, Sabino, Etrusco. At that time, 300 years before the Punic wars and two hundred and fifty after its foundation, it was already scary, in fact it concluded treaties of non-belligerence with Carthage, a Phoenician city, that is, Semitic. In Rome they spoke Latin, Sabine, and Etruscan; Greek was also spoken by the ignorant at the vegetable market, a bit like me when I speak English "Speak-Up" when I go out and about with my wife abroad. Very little was written in Rome, often in strange languages and from right to left. The Latin component was for wealth and superior number. The Latin of that time up to about 200 BC, the years of that genius who was Plautus, was very different from what is studied at school, that no one ever spoke (it is known that Augustus did not speak it except in the senate or speaking and writing to the Roman people). We remember one of the oldest "Latin" attestations

Manios med fehfaked Noumesioi which in Latin 200 BC - 500 AD would be

Manius me fecit Numerio, that is, **Manius made me for Numerio**. Note the past tense of *doing* with the Greek doubling, which the following Latin **never did again**.

The Romans, not the Latins, conquered the world; they **never** imposed their language except in the censuses, but exported after the first century BC. C. their literature. The world spoke Greek, or rather Hellenic, as a lingua franca, and a whole other series of intelligent *lingua franca* (*lingua*

franca.....); in the meantime the Romans had destroyed the Latins: they destroyed their religion by adopting a certain version of the Hellenic one, they changed their language by preparing an official one, **Roman** , 90% attributable to the Latin one.

As happens in our language of men, over the centuries children studied or traveled or made a career more than parents and grandparents and ancestors; in the meantime **Christianity** arrives which is written in the original Greek in the Gospel of John and is translated from Hebrew into Greek from 200 AD (... Alexandria.....) and is of Hebrew derivation. In the second half of the 4th century AD, St. Jerome, a great scholar of Latin classics, retired to the desert, studied Hebrew and Aramaic alone, and translated the entire Bible into classical Latin (= *Vulgate*); his contemporary and friend / enemy Sant'Agostino knows how to speak and write Latin to be the envy of Cicero, and probably preach Latin in church. Nobody speaks Latin at home, but everyone understands it and speaks it a little. The children continue to study and progress. The barbarian invasions arrive. After about three centuries of "passage" (300-600 AD) the church protects its parishioners, collaborates with the new masters, makes religious services an obligatory meeting point (as was the Roman religion, Cicero tells us, for the *Romans of Rome*), took possession of culture. When the world moves towards the “historical” Middle Ages, the languages are **neo-Latin** . Meanwhile, Cicero's Latin had never been spoken by anyone.

If this is Indo-European, you are facing the humblest, most devoted, insufficient and convinced student of Indo-European studies imaginable.

But from 1800 to a few decades ago, Indo-European was not this: we read it above from Treccani. On which documents were based to say that it was that **Ur** from which almost twenty languages would have branched out, we will see shortly, passing on to the three very ugly things that I think Indo-European has done.

First let's take a look at these maps (the speaker projects and comments on the following maps):

About 70 years ago an archaeologist Dorothy Annie Elizabeth Garrod, in Israel, on Mount Carmel, discovered tombs and artifacts that belonged to a still unknown population that she called NATUFIANI, for the name of the place. Based on the analysis of the bones it was found that they lived in a period ranging from about 10,000 to 9,000 years ago. The surprising broom was that of an instrument never seen before: a tool composed of a bone handle that housed sharp flint splinters. Among those splinters were the remains of an

ancient species of wheat. That found object was a sickle! In practice, the Natufians had designed a tool that was to cut the grass.

2

Before going on to this second part I would like to provoke you with another game, albeit less dishonest than the previous one:

[the speaker asks how many of the participants are local, how many know the neighboring chief scientist from La Spezia, how many know via Napoli, and what is in front of the well-known restaurant "Osteria della Corte": his intention is to get to see how many know there depicted Madonnina, know what is written in the frieze above her, and above all what this inscription means and where the small marble group comes from. The group is located on a door on the side of a large church, so it is natural to think it has always been there; in reality it was "saved" by a church located in the area now occupied, since 1869, by the military arsenal. The area was partly cultivated with olive trees; the intersections of the channels of pure water (.....) were marked by churches and chapels, probably "heirs" of previous pagan temples; the construction of the Arsenal canceled, confused or destroyed all these testimonies.]

Now it is legitimate to ask: Wasn't Christianity in La Spezia before? Was it there and was it infinitely different? Can Cavour's Piemontesi be considered the "Indo-Europeans" of the occasion? How much does the story told so far have to do with the dialect of La Spezia? And with Christianity in general?

After this premise, let's move on to the three attitudes in my opinion unscientific and harmful to research, which many Indo-Europeanists have practiced extensively:

1. Look for a people with certainty, in the sense that we now understand it (a concept that is frantically formed from 600 BC to the European Romantic 1800) and a land of origin of the Indo-European (*Urheimat*); when the Indo-Europeanists themselves abandon this research, speak of "stock" and "civilization": frankly I have never understood what the difference is, why a civilization either refers to a people, or to a series of very related and close peoples , who transmit it or impose it on others, or it is not a civilization. In any case, the attitude links with confidence - and not as a hypothesis given by parallel surveys - to an analysable communication tool (a language), human realities that can no longer be analyzed *while they were using this tool*.. It would be as if we now attribute to certain

South Americans from less well-off areas the mentality, the way of life, the religion and the tools of Spain today.

This people, or this civilization are imagined as alive, dynamic, before the eyes, while they are hypotheses that span 2000 years

2. Producing as a duty, a *must* , the inclusion in every dictionary of an "Indo-European" language, the etymology from Indo-European, accepting other entries only in the case of isolated and full-blown loans

3. Refuse any active and strong mixture, any contact between linguistic groups and their speakers other than the hypothesized "families"

We will see in a moment how they think about this, scholars devoted to Indo-European since the mid-1900s. First, however, an annotation is necessary:

What I tried to describe in 1. had never happened before, and will never happen again after: the great historical and ethnographic drawings (Herodotus, Thucydides, the Bible, contemporary historiography) usually have a premise (that where more where less is tinged with mythological or is set in an openly secular or openly moral / religious way) on **man** in general, on the human creature and on **human civilization** , then they move on to deal with a series of circumscribed events, and usually with **a**people (most of the time, but not always, the one to which the author who writes belongs). Only for the "Indo-European" between 1800 and the first half of 1900 we want to link a hypothetical linguistic study (moreover, I have already recognized it, very productive and convincing) to the **direct** description of a civilization, its *institutions and beliefs* .

Well, let's proceed:

the professor. Tristano Bolelli (.....) Issued in Pisa the lecture notes (.....) Of his basic course in glottology in 1970. Here is what we find (pp. 122 et seq.):

In any case, on the data of the comparison, in the last century the so-called linguistic paleontology was built based on the principle that the language community provides the richest data on the peoples who speak it and their prehistory

at this point Bolelli cites (pp. 124 - 128) a whole series of scholars and works (the most daring and convinced was perhaps that of Max Müller), dated between 1845 and 1938, with continuations up to 1962, which they supported this effort; it is good to first see how Bolelli concludes on p. 129 note this: the efforts of the second half of the twentieth century to describe an Indo-European civilization (Dumézil, Benveniste, etc.) are nothing more than a re-edition of this attitude, felt as a duty

after the Freudian explosion on the one hand, various archaeological finds from another, and avant-garde cultural anthropology from yet another, in addition to the successful spread of structural synchronic linguistics; and in fact, in these works these tools and fields are confused with each other without warning,

Here is how Bolelli concludes:

All these concordances, taken as a whole, strike and lead us to believe that they are due to commonality of civil development, to closer contacts (in my opinion, this word is very important: contacts) between speakers (and just as important is this: speakers) of these languages; but neither anthropology nor prehistory say anything about it.

Before reading another important scholar let me quote another passage from Bolelli's handouts (p.155):

Max Müller had placed the Rg Veda in the middle of the 2nd millennium av. Cr .. Of course, this date must also be moved lower

This idea is fundamental; because the most widespread Indo-Europeanism, the one we find in four pages, or in two lines, at the beginning of the Greek literatures of the classical high school, or in the history books of the first and second grade secondary school before talking about the "Greeks", but even in works for university students he never tells what documents we have or don't have, which are inscriptions coève to the speakers we are talking about, and which papyri, codices (.....); which are fragments and which words in abundance.

Now the *Rg Veda* are 1028 religious hymns; by deduction experts date a great many of them to historical epochs, and much less to very ancient dates. But **everything** that has come down to us, as matter that we touch with our hands, belongs to writings dating from 300 **AD** onwards. These writings are written in the **Brahmi** alphabet . Do you know what technical derivation the Brahmi alphabet has? (... ..) Semitic, like most of the alphabets then and still in use on earth.

Nothing prevents us from thinking that a non-Indo-European wisdom and history, almost certainly oral transmission, have been translated into a new language and written in a new alphabet, all after the world conquest of Alexander the Great (300 BC) and above all the Greco-Latin commercial expansion over the whole earth. I do not think this, for various reasons that are highly unsafe (... ..), but nothing prevents us from thinking it: with the "Bible of the 70" in Greek it happened exactly like this, and it is only a lucky case if there are still Jews, Judaism, Bibles in Hebrew-Aramaic-Greek (II book of Maccabees). Note, "in passing" that thanks to the discoveries of Qumran (... ..) we

know that the translation of the "Seventy" is more reliable than in the more ancient biblical phases than a good part of the Masoretic tradition ...

Let's move on to another scholar: in 1987 André Martinet - nothing less than the good definition of the "double articulation of language" (.....) - edited for Laterza in Italian translation *Indo-European, languages, peoples and cultures* ; bad choice of translator / editor for the title: the original title in French is: *Des steppes océans, L'indo-européen et les "Indoeuropéens"* , that is something like *The oceanic steppes: the Indo-European and the "Indo-Europeans"* . The hyphens and the quotes and the bad translation say a lot.

This book (which no longer mentions anyone, because it is very elaborate and complete, and for the most part useful, but it said nothing fundamental) is in my opinion important: the French edition is only one year earlier, and in practice it deals with the coherent and organized reorganization of the university lectures that Martinet gave to his students, not so much for his theories, but in order not to leave them deprived of all the updated information on such a fundamental subject.

On page 4 (the second writing) we find:

The noun "Indo-European", derived from the adjective, mostly designates the language not attested in itself...

a little further down:

But from the practice of this new discipline it was soon understood that there could be no identity between Sanskrit and the mother tongue, which was believed to have existed in a very distant past. (note the thought , the concept itself and the use of the imperfect).

On page 3 we find:

The case of the careful study of a phenomenon is different, because then it becomes essential to define precisely what it will be about

on page 15 (underlines mine)

Since we cannot isolate on the temporal axis a point capable of reconstructing a state of language, a community that makes use of it and a corresponding culture , our vision of the Indo-European phenomenon will necessarily be dynamic.

Martinet got off to a good start: he knows perfectly well what Indo-European has become, and what was to remain after the beginnings of great linguists like Bopp and Grimm: the construction of some (possibly safe) radicals of varied but certainly connectable meanings (such as *smoke* , *breath*, *soul* ...) that appear in languages more similar than others. This is what the vocabularies quote with * or

with PIE (Proto Indo European); it is what my teacher had taught me in mathematics: the greatest common divisor (p. 4: *a sort of algebraic quantity*). That it can exist or not, it doesn't matter ...

After these positive beginnings, let me quote you a few sentences from Martinet's book:

Where an Indo-European language prevails, the population will be predominantly mestizo (p.23)

Burials of the same type as Kurgan, with immolated victims, punctuated the advance of the Indo-Europeans across Europe (p.43)

Then, on the level of meaning, the value of "parent" was replaced by the head of the great patriarchal family while on p. 32 says: *the reconstructed form of "father" is pātēr, which does not exactly mean "parent", but rather "head of the clan"*

and we could continue ...

In short, even informed and up-to-date people live immersed in a vulgate they cannot get rid of.

We have heard "in passing" mention of the Kurgan (....), Strange that the book does not speak of the Natufians : Martinet dedicates an entire chapter to them describing their expansion from 4200 to 2800 BC, that is, periods in which writing basically **did not exist** ; how did the kurgan speak? Obviously Indo-European. Which territory and series of discoveries more delicious to almost identify the *Urheimat* that continues to fascinate us?

What actually happened? Martinet knows the success of the studies of Marija Gimbutas (... ..) and knows that alongside the success of these Horses Sforza (... ..) has studied the DNA of the Kurgan and has deduced that they are a component of future Europeans (the III I think): as a linguist, he cannot remain silent on such phenomena. But we will never know how Kurgan spoke, how many languages they used, where they got them and if they taught them to others. What if those languages were "Indo-European".

As for the DNA discourse, I notice that this fascinates a lot (speaking with science colleagues, those very few who talk for five minutes with interest on these things) I always ask myself: *but why don't you also base yourself on DNA studies?!?*

Let me propose yet another naughty game: take, addressing politely, two South American girls of ours here in La Spezia. If possible, go to a tall one, rather dark, long-limbed but sturdy; and another less slender one, with wide hips and light coffee-milk skin. Record them both speaking in Spanish. Ask them as kindly and painlessly as possible for some DNA, and... good luck!

But that's not all: close the recording and analysis of DNA in a tomb at Boschetti (*the municipal cemetery of La Spezia*), and then wait for a scholar to say about it in more than 6000 years ...

In *concluding* this part I would like to *anticipate* an objection (*here male cogitat peccat sed non fallitur*) : that my way of acting would be in a backward sense far from the bulwark of contemporary anthropology (the one, to understand, of *linguists and anthropologists*) that makes the language of the communities studied one of the foundations of anthropological study.

Well, I grew up, and indirectly I try to continue growing in my small way, on the studies of Maurizio Bettini who led the anthropological line, which I almost *fully* approve in Latin research in Italy (... ...), I have married since 32 years the third graduate of Bettini, who graduated with a thesis on the *mater in the Roman world* cited in various publications. What does it mean to do anthropology with linguistics? It does not mean playing with meanings and "relationships"; basically means two things:

1. identify **within an established and certified community** lexical systems that show social systems and above all systems of attitudes (and with prudence and inventory benefit)
 2. compare the different social application of identical terms in two different communities, for example *phrater* in Latin or Greek, and think about it
- It cannot, and scientifically must not, mean anything else ...

3

Philology, in the Italian and perhaps world schools in general, is very little practiced; this is a grave fault and the reasons are varied and we are not here to talk about it.

But philology is almost nullified in the popular level - sometimes even high and appreciable - of fundamental arguments. The unconscious reason here is very clear: the knowledge of the dating of the documents that give us news, the general doubts about their status, their *transmission and tradition* prevent us from fantasizing and proposing interpretations concerning human subjects who can no longer answer us.

It is good to know that there are no documents attesting to the phases studied as being older than the "Indo-European" languages other than Greek and Latin prior to 300 AD. Each of you can draw the deductions that you want.

Another serious shortcoming of the Italian and European school (a shortcoming which - apart from praiseworthy exceptions - also extends to university studies) concerns an appropriate knowledge of the importance of the so - called *lingua franca* :

lingua franca The language used for many centuries in the Mediterranean basin in trade relations between Europeans, Arabs and Turks (and still, here and there, living), consisting of a predominantly Italian and Spanish lexicon (like our Italian now) with few Arabic voices, and an extremely simplified grammar system. All those types of mixed languages are widely called *lingua franca*, which arose out of practical communication needs in areas or environments where very different linguistic groups come into contact (Treccani encyclopedia)

pity that when I proposed to our very kind Angelo Tonelli to include in this beautiful initiative, so that it preceded my speech, an exceptional lesson, which I have already heard, on the *lingua franca* in the strict sense by the expert and passionate Admiral Giorio, the program and the spaces here in Lerici were all already defined and occupied: you would have touched the importance and extent of these phenomena, even in the theater and in reading literature ...

All that we have of the ancient world **of linguistics**, if it is not a *lingua franca*, is hyper-specialized literary, elite religious, or juridical in the strictest sense of the term. In short: we will never know how people spoke at a given point, in a given period. Never. Neither what language in general, nor in what way.

But, and this is complementary and more important, we will never know if those texts are translations of knowledge already existing in another language; they are religious or library possessions of foreign texts; they can, in theory, be anything.

It is also well known that **Hellenic** ("Greek") is a dynamic language of formation and variation, with five very different dialects that the speakers of the poleis lived as real languages (as now in Spain). Probably, if we had discovered the fragments of the lesbian Sappho after Jones' notes, the Aeolian would now be considered an "Indo-European language" (... ...)

Now, returning to the discourse of philology and documentation, there are two cases in which, in the "Indo-European" area, we have reliable and durable and non-literary documents of the languages used: Greek written in Linear B in the tablets of Crete, and the tablets Hittite of Hattushaş (present day Bogaž-Koi, approximately in the center - south - west of present day Turkey), the capital of the "B Hittites" (.....); in both cases, fortunately, the words concern lists of royal warehouses: objects, kings, officials, numbers. And in both cases the dating is in the middle of the millennium 2000 - 1000 BC.

We do not have, in a Greek quite similar to the one being studied, as a language and as a structure and writing, a sure attestation of popular and at the same time literary use, prior to the "Nestor's Cup".

And this is usually dated to the 7th century, it was found in Ischia (.....) in 1955 and in a certain sense it quotes a passage from Homer.

Instead, we have a wealth of tombstones, inscriptions *and the like* in the same millennium and beyond as regards the "Semitic" languages in general and especially **Aramaic** (... ...) in an area that goes from India almost excluded to

Cappadocia, that is it touches the Hellenic area and almost intersects the Hittite one. The Hittites, however, are mentioned from the very first pages of the Bible, even if today we are not univocal in identifying who the text refers to.

It is good to tell the truth about the Hittite: it is practically a "slightly Semitized Greek":

for example *man* used to say *ANTHUSHAŠ*, where *anth-* is identical to the idea applied to the Greek *anthroopos* ("the one who holds his face up, forward, in front of you"), and *-ush*, although obviously no one says so, is the way in which the first pages of the bible and the Hebrew still call the human person:

ISH - ISHAH (... ..)

on the "brake" that has been placed on research on this linguistic phenomenon (ie the denomination of *male - female* in *homo sapiens*) by the trivializing ideologies applied to linguistics, and by the etymological hypotheses exercised not on maps structured by human communities (the language was a product *to use*, and particularly agile and in a certain sense intelligent languages won) I prepared two structured cards that seem pretty to me: now we skip them for reasons of time and "thread of speech"; if there is more time we look at them, otherwise those who are interested will read them online...ⁱ

Before drawing a conclusion, let's say the most important thing:

a concept of **homeland** similar to ours did not exist until about 600 BC. I have tried to explain and document this well (which, moreover, all scholars know) in a work of mine for the philosophical journal GLAUX (.....); of **people** least of all: it would be necessary to explain well to the students what this word means in the well-known SPQR (.....). The concept of people as we understand it today is formed frantically and not always honestly by Charlemagne, Luther, and above all by Romanticism and the European Risorgimento. As the great German and English archaeologists threw on Pylos, Knossos, Troy, the idea of palace and kingdom of their times and / or of the Renaissance courts, giving a hard time to their more scientific successors, so in the school, and often also at the next level, it happens for these things: the people, the language, the civilization, the "culture".

What existed then, behind the foundation and impressive multiplication of the Greek poleis, which belongs to that golden age of 600 BC?

There were **families**. These families made alliances with each other. These alliances were sometimes made even for very distant territories (Hellenic concept of **XENIA and PHRATRia**): Herodotus stupendously attests us that the **ACHAI MENIDI**, that is the great and extended "people" of the great Persians (we are in 530 BC), were of made a *phratria* (.....).

These families (or, if you like, small organized peoples) sometimes gathered in associations for the purpose of conquest (often it would be better to call it predation): this is the case of the so - called *peoples of the sea*, and - something absolutely

too little clarified by the school to the children) of the assailants of Troy, under the very little heeded orders of poor Agamemnon, who bring together (but here Homer is probably literary - anthropological in the same way Ariosto will be) a philosopher trader like Odysseus and a "man of honor" old-fashioned like Achilles.

Let's proceed: we are sure, absolutely sure, that **Aramaic (.....)** was a lingua franca in the territory described above, excluding the Hellenic one and further west, from before 1000 BC and beyond. In certain periods it was adopted by the chancelleries of strong states, such as the Persian one (people who host a version of the "Indo-European"!), In historical times. Even these things, serious scholars all know, but they say too little (see the entry ARAMEI in Treccani, elaborated by a scholar of truly remarkable caliber such as **Giorgio Levi Della Vida**).

As to how hellenic the Hellenic was in the same period, I hope no one has any doubts. The main strength of the ancient Hellenes was the trade associated with shipping.

It is very probable, in my opinion, that the idea of identifying well-defined and not very changeable languages linked to identifiable and not very "liquid" communities consciously belongs to the period 250-BC - 100 AD, as confirmed by the attitude of the sovereigns and Hellenistic experts in general, the Qumran discoveries, and the Rosetta Stone. Probably, in previous periods, and especially before the "golden age", that is 600 BC, there was an idea of the relationship between languages and people and communication, at least in part different: what will be the translation and knowledge of languages, on the other hand, was a practice - like ours (clumsy and effective) of English *speak up* - of free languages, of mixed languages, of more agile and famous languages for various and not necessarily uniform reasons. This may have formed also what for 150 years some have continued to call *Indo-European* . This, which I propose to you, is a trivial idea and in my opinion it can be approved, but it does not seem appropriate to me to make it a theory to affirm and defend ...

A final note: we treat the ancient Greeks as "sons of Homer" for a whole series of Romanticism responsibilities; certainly if we think that it was learned by heart in the Athenian schools of 400 BC, the accounts add up. But our boys also study (studied) Dante thoroughly and obligatorily (.....). The Greeks themselves, however, highly esteemed Hesiod, invented little stories in which the two compete in riddles (Hesiod wins) and the like. Hesiod is from Boeotia, and Thebes is a city colonized by the Phoenicians (even the most orthodox of the Indo-Europeanists bow to the seals of the amphorae found); his works often allude to Homeric formulas, they use the gods and heroes of Homer extensively; but they speak little of war, and

often in a negative way. They talk about work, land, and religion. *Magnificat* attributed by the NT to Mary of Nazareth.

But Hesiod was a genuine Greek, to all intents and purposes: he was neither Semitic nor Christian (there is no doubt about the second thing!).

At this point, before making a humble and small proposal, we can line up what I think are the responsibility of a part of the "Indo-Europeanists", and of the supporters of the "Greek miracle" referring to the figure of a "people" as we understand it us today:

- “Blocks” etymologies and interesting cultural comparisons
- it is not racist or veterinarian, but it offers many possibilities to those who are
- he considers written versions that are elitist, “national”, sometimes of dubious dating, as absolute historical linguistics
- he uses mixing them together with scant methodology: society, anthropology, mentality, language, literature

The time has come to ask ourselves: without that vulgar huge tube that was the starting booster, and its meticulously studied direction, where would the Gemini and LEM have come?

Finally, it should be considered that there are inscriptions in Aramaic and Hittite "b" in the respective "crossed" territories of the two languages.

In short, in my opinion the "Indo-European" would be Hellenic, which, like Latin in the way studied above, would divide the world (sometimes even in a peaceful and collaborative way) with Aramaic and a few other Frankish languages continuously expansion. Expansion given by trade, sometimes by conquests, but above all by providing the *language tool* (.....), and then in both cases the *modern phonetic alphabet tool* for politics, finance, literature. (see Map 2)

from here on, with or without Semerano, we will take care of supporting this idea

4

We have said that one of the responsibilities of exclusive and excessive Indo-Europeanism is to “block” scholars in etymologies or comparisons with “non-Indo-European” languages. We will shortly talk about the position and the books of Giovanni Semerano. First I will show you some of my autonomous researches that I carried out especially for this meeting in scarce two

months, thanks to the fabulous dictionaries made available by Inet (.....); they are almost all starting from present-day Hebrew, both to facilitate research (.....), and because, it is known, present-day Hebrew is faithful to its own ancient language and culture, but also contains many influences given by the history of the Jews; this goes in the direction that I feel I can support: on the one hand, "peoples" and languages have always mixed much, much more than was previously believed, with phases ranging from two million years ago to today, and at least in three ways:

ADOPTION OF AGILE AND PRACTICAL LANGUAGES

EXPANSION OF STRONGER PEOPLES AND ACCEPTANCE OF THEIR LANGUAGE, MIXTURES (the only phenomenon accepted by "fundamentalist" Indo-Europeanists; example given verbally by the Romanians, who in any case never spoke Latin)

OVERLAPS AND CONTINUOUS, UNKNOWN AND UNCONTROLLABLE MIXING;

on the other hand, the winning languages were not those of a "people" who imposed them, but those created in a more practical and intelligent way, or more literary, or imposed for trade or lived by extended religiosity, or more than one of these aspects put together;

before leaving, however, let's take a look at what the *Etymology Dictionary online* (a tool that regularly and necessarily uses PIE) says about the term *wine* :

Old English win “wine,” from Proto-Germanic * winam (source also of Old Saxon, Old Frisian, Old High German win, Old Norse vin, Dutch wijn, German Wein), an early borrowing from Latin vinum “wine,” from PIE * woin-o-, related to words for “wine” in Greek (oinos), Armenian, Hittite, and non-Indo-European Georgian and West Semitic (Arabic wain, Hebrew yayin), probably from a lost Mediterranean language word * win - / * woin- "wine." (*imagine the arrows ...*).

let's continue:

hittite *adanna* food, Latin *ivy* to eat = Greek ἐδομαι; ancient Indian food *adanam* , Armenian *utem* ; in Arabic we have Transliteration ghḏḥa' Pronunciation ɣi'd̥aːʔ; nourish: a't'am / 'it'am

on the other hand in Hebrew *s'd* sa ad (the initial s-should not cause difficulties: it is the "Indo-Europeanists" themselves, for example, who refer to the Greek κνέω I *am pregnant, carried in the womb of the* ancient Indian *svaiati*, in which obviously the comparison concerns - *Go-*,

according to the frequent matches in ie *-kw- -ku- -v-*) and *eat* it *indigence subsidy* (cf.. lat. *satis* , Italian *full, sated* , Engl. *satisfaction = satisfaction*), Armenian շատ (= *šat*)

SAPERE *y ' d hje da* (edò) εἰ δὲ οἱ δα (let's reflect on this: the Sanskrit translations of *knowing, wise, seeing, knowing* correspond to this root, but in a less immediate way and within other phonetic correspondences very different) ¹ ; furthermore in Hebrew we have: מודעות : knowledge, awareness, conscience: Transliteration **mwd'wṭ (moodhut)** which could remember μαθεόμαι ...

It should also be borne in mind that among the most commonly used morphemes in both Hebrew and Arabic for the meaning of "see" appear *ray, rad, rey and mar mir* referring to ὁράω, *radium, radius* and *mirror* ...

LOVE *leehov* (see the Israeli documentary film: *Eykh hifsaqti lefaḥed velamadeti leehov et Ariq Sharon* (1997, *How I learned to overcome my fears and love Arik Sharon*, video) by the Israeli Avi Mograb read this etymology of the well-known English term *love* from the [Online Etymology Dictionary](#) :

Old English *lufu* “feeling of love; romantic sexual attraction; affection; friendliness; the love of God; Love as an abstraction or personification, "from Proto-Germanic **lubo* (source also of Old High German *liubi* "joy, "German *Liebe* "love; "Old Norse, Old Frisian, Dutch *lof*; German *Lob* "praise; "Old Saxon *liof*, Old Frisian *liaf*, Dutch *lief*, Old High German *liob*, German *lieb*, Gothic *liufs* “dear, beloved”). The Germanic words are from PIE root **leubh-* "to care, desire, love."

cf. the very Indo-European Latin *libet*

Did the Israelis Adopt English? Maybe; in fact, the fact is that in Hebrew *heart* is said to be *lev* ; the fact is that ...

LOVE: today a boy would say to a girl (or vice versa) *ani ohev* I (you) love; in ancient Hebrew he would have said *ahavah* ... how not to think of αγαπάω, which in the lexicons has no "Indo-European" comparison, but is attested by Penelope for Ulysses in Od. 23, 214? In my opinion, also the cf. with lt. *aveo*.

In the ancient Hebrew of the Bible love is also said *chesed* , which is any type of love (except that exclusively of bodily pleasure) *olam chesed ibané* : *the world from love is built*, corresponding to the Greek όλα (↔ κόσμι = *all together* ! ") (See current Hebrew *kol*) χαίρει ἔβην," all by grace-love came "(in fact βαίνω in Aristotle and elsewhere is also used to indicate the construction of geometric figures, as well as giving rise to βήμα, which like all the Greek scholars know it means "solid base"; it may seem risky and perhaps it is, but consider that in Hebrew / ba'na / and bnyyh mean to *build* , while b ' , ba *come*). (for the alternation -s - / - r- see, in addition to the well-known example *Lases / Lares* , LRPalmer, *La lingua latina* , ed. it. Turin 1977. We also reason on phenomena such as our *coherent / cohesive ; adherent / sticker* : from what are languages really formed?).

LUCE 'wr (w) or οράω (... ..)

SEE ra'ah (cs idea of the "ray")

BLUE 'kahol lt. coelum, caelum (... ..)

SE (in the sense of *if*) 'n Greek αν

PUMPKIN FOR THE HEAD, DOME OF THE HEAD, Arabic HEADDRESS

kiprà, Arabic kephià Greek κέφα κεφαλή German *kopf, haupt*, Neapolitan 'n *cup* English *head* from *habid caput* etc, Latin and ancient Indian *caput*

COUPLE IN THE SENSE OF PAIR zwg Greek zog ζευγος yoke

WEDDING COUPLE M / F nisuìn lat. *nexus*

PEOPLES OF THE SEA gwyym (goim), CHRISTIANS goim ("gentiles": see Paul who calls non-Jewish Christians' Ελληνες, and Saint Jerome who translates *gentiles*)

Greek πελάς γοι (..... !!!) current Armenian *Kzohvi*

TERRA 'erez ingl. *heart* (do we want to see the hypothesized "Indo-European" etymologies?)

SCURO (controversy over the *name* "Europe"...) Greek ereb έρεβος

WALKING ON FOOT hlk halak (e) ingl. *Walk*

COURSE OR WATER CHICKEN wadi Greek ύδατος ingl. *Water*

CHILD-CHILDREN yelad - yeladihm ingl. c *hild - children* (... ..)

THE NAME OF THE *LIME tilia* the name is identical to the Latin name, and any

Italian dictionary offers a wealth of comparisons

"Indo-Europeans", but ... not for the Greek (ασβέστης,

however not attested in ancient Greek; English:

lime; the German : *Linde*... What can I say, since every

“noble” treatment of the Indo-European part

from the common name of birch or beech? In

actually *linden* should come precisely from the Greek

ancient *πίλιον*: “*light pen*” for the shape

of the leaves, but we are not at all sure. The Hellenic

"International" therefore, not the "genetic"

Indo-European would seem to be responsible for the-

the denomination

now look at this system:

from the ease with which the infant begins to pronounce, *ma pa* expressions are formed which

are addressed by human cultures to *mother* and *father* . In Hebrew we have (*a*) *bà* and *ym* (*à*)

so much so that in some Italian regions *father* is preferred . *Son* in Hebrew it is said *well* ,

following the above structure we should have something in the West like *pe-*: and in fact the

Greek *παῖς* evolves (but probably it was already pronounced like this) into *pe-* (cf. *pedophile*);

"On the sidelines" also consider Lat. *puer*, *puella* , French *petitto* say small, etc. Italian *bamb*
(ino).

and we come to the biggest provocation: ARIYA, ARIANI = tall, noble - Ahraràt = high

mountain, ARAMEI = noble, or the families of the *plateau* ; proper name HARA'M which is
still given now = *noble* (with all due respect to whom are you thinking ...)

Moving on a cultural and non-linguistic level in the strict sense, I believe you are all familiar

with the myth of Adonis (.....), of Babylonian origin (.....); it seems that Sappho in her

love hymns ended up invoking him, and for this reason the meter she invented is called *adonius*

. Well everyone knows that the most observant Jews tend not to pronounce the names of God (... .. + God's sound language), replacing them with an A., which means ADONAI, and that this derives from Adonis they know and recognize all:

Shamà Israel, Adonai eloh enu (cf. Xenophanes: ... *but only one is God*)

what a nice "cultural tour" we've been on since before 600 BC, huh? These are things that everyone knows. But that's not all: for Catholics the *whole* Bible is the word of God, and St. Jerome translates "God" *Deus* , the term of which indicated the Latin gods, the θεός of the Greeks, and all this happened in less than a thousand years (600 BC - 350 AD): imagine what may have happened between 3000 and 600 BC)

the numbers SIX and SEVEN: Hebrew שש שֵׁשׁ, שבעה shi'va (six and seven are the two numbers that are most similar between different languages)

I inform you that I could continue, both with other lexical comparisons, and with grammatical analyzes between Hebrew and languages such as our ancient or today's European ones ...

5

Giovanni Maria Semerano ([Ostuni](#) , [21 February 1911](#) - [Florence](#) , [20 July 2005](#)) was a [librarian](#) , [philologist](#) and [linguist Italian](#) scholar of ancient [European languages](#) and [Mesopotamian](#) . Author of large etymological dictionaries of Greek and Latin in which he proposed his innovative theory of the origins of European culture, on the basis of which European languages would thus appear to be of Mediterranean and basically Semitic origin .

The first point therefore is: Semerno adopts the same perspective as the "fundamentalist Indo-Europeanists", simply reverses it in favor of the Semitic languages, making it clear in his latest book that he thinks mainly of the Akkadian of the first Sargon, whose empire (c.2334-2279 BC), according to inscriptions placed by himself, would have reached the Mediterranean ...

The origins of European culture : four autonomous volumes between 1984 and 1994

- The first two volumes (*Dictionary of the Latin language and modern voices* and *Dictionary of the Greek language*) in which he investigates 7,300 terms and plans to find them in the ancient Semitic languages (subtitle: " *Semitic bases of European languages* ").

- The other two volumes are both subtitled: *Revelations of historical linguistics - in appendix The Etruscan message* , on this "message" returns in *The people who defeated death* .
- The most provocative work is *The Infinite, a millennial misunderstanding* , together with the last one from 2005, *The Tale of the Indo-European*.

In his work, Semerano thus compares thousands of terms of the ancient European languages, attested, with the Semitic languages.

Let us see, after the *Dictionary* , very briefly the works one by one.

*(the meeting continues with the summary of the works, with the traits that according to the speaker are more interesting, more convincing, or less; with the substance entrusted to each book; we dwell a little on the immediate opposition of Salvatore Settis; yes the most well-known and important linguistic discussions * are reported: only one is discussed below; the difference between Semerano's position and that of the speaker himself is underlined)*

manu (and Etruscan numbers), Atàlu, afar - eperu, -atr- (see *-add-* greek - *τρον* * "*place where you ...*": *θεάτρον; λούτρον* , **etc.**

[the speaker - time permitting - proposes the reading of the first words of the Cortona tables with counterparts of Semitic languages populated by Semerano in The people who defeated death , and with his notes on how some of the terms also recall known Latin or Greek formants]

NAC REST MC CENU: *here the first next to it is the tomb*

xy = P. Bertini

xy = Semerano

(Semitic area): laqash Latin: lego, λέγω / λόγος... *lt. loquor (to speak)*

[nb: both choose and read

gere than to speak]

tok (Hebrew index) δείκνυμι (show, indicate) lt. I say = to say

appwndice on the names of the months for use and consumption of the reader

CURRENT ITALIAN	CURRENT BASQUE	CURRENT SANSKRIT	HUNGARIAN	PRESENT JEW
January	urtarril (year, season)	janavarī	január (but also <i>zuzoros = month of frost</i>)	januaκ
February	otsail (of wolves?)	pharavarī	február (but also <i>enyheges</i>)	febβuaκ
March	martxo	We don't have straight translations	március	meκts
April	apiril	āṅglavarṣasya caturthamāsaḥ	április (but also <i>nyilonos = to open up</i>)	apκil
May	maiatz	vaiśākhajyēṣṭham	május	maj
June	ekain	jūna	június (but also <i>termenes = harvest</i>)	juni
July	uztail	julāṭ	július (but also <i>halászonos = suitable for fishing? , cf. Greek ἀλιεύω</i>)	juli
August	Abuztu	agastamāsa	augusztus (but	ogust

	BUT IN BABYLON / HEBREW July / August is <u>abhu</u> / <u>'abh</u>		also hévenes = probably <i>strong, cf. ingl. heavy</i>)	
September	irail	bhādrapadāśvinarī	szeptember (but also gyümölcsönös <i>month of must,</i> <i>see Latin mulceo</i>)	september
October	urri	aktūbara	október (but also mustonos = cs with synonym)	oktober
November	azaro	navambara	november (but also gémberes)	november

December	abendū (advent)	disambara	december	detsember	
----------	---------------------------	------------------	-----------------	-----------	--

N.	Before exile	After the exile	Period
1st	<i>abīb</i>	<i>nissān</i>	March April
2nd	<i>ziv</i>	<i>iyār</i>	April May
3rd		<i>sivān</i>	May June
4th		<i>tamus</i>	June July
5th		<i>av</i>	July August
6th		<i>elùl</i>	August September

7th	<i>ethanìm</i>	<i>tishri</i>	September October
8th	<i>bul</i>	<i>cheshvan</i>	October - November
9th		<i>kislèv</i>	November December
10 °		<i>tevèt</i>	December January
11 °		<i>shvat</i>	January February
12 °		<i>adàr</i>	February March
*		<i>veadàr</i>	

1 जानाति know Transliteration jānāt ; **विवेक** wisdom wisdom Transliteration vivēka (the phoneme D is missing!) ; **पश्यति** see Transliteration paśyati ; वेत्ति {verb} वेत्ति see Transliteration vētt ; **know विद्या** knowledge science, Transliteration vidyā (which comes third in the lemma)

i If instead of asking ourselves the meaning of a term in itself, or of comparing *femina* with the organ of breastfeeding θηλη , relying on the Indo-European correspondence **f - θ** (... ...), and then continue all this perhaps in social discourses or even ideological, if we looked at maps like the ones below, perhaps we would understand that man has called the human person and then, being of two sexes, he has "marked", as Trubečkoj would say, the element that is a human person as much as the other , but it is simply also different (... ... on this you can also see a study of mine on "family grammar" from many years ago):

ha **wah** (Eve) ish (human creature) gn (birth, generation, existence)

wo man ishah ("female" human creature) γυνή
gna (a.indian)

wei b + **man, men, min** she queen

(it should be borne in mind, among peren- is genus thesis, that *min* in Hebrew is one of the

hu manus various idioms for *sex* , and includes Japanese **jīn** (persona)

also the significant *species*

ho minis fujin (lady)

(as in the structural model of the first column)

fe mina

among other things, we consider that relying on linguistics to make ideology does a disservice to ideology itself, the serious and sincere one: it is based on the explicit affirmations and actions of the adversary that his machismo, feminism, patri- or matriarchy (... ...), not taking words formed with patience and technique by the human

animal and playing on them (example of the biblical episodes of Tamar or Susanna and the elders, and *how they* are narrated, respectively 2Sam 13: 1- 33 and Daniel 13).

Think of the fact that *donna* (*domina*) means *mistress*: were companies attentive to women that created this designation?

And how was a free woman treated in the "democratic" Athens of 400 BC? There is no ideology, or sociology in grand style, with words. Instead, I would say micro-sociology”: for example, in Rome, as far as heritage is concerned, women had a better position than in other states. Then there is a micro-history of attitudes: for example, in a society that is not at all tender with daughters, such as the ancient Roman one or the Florentine one of the 14th century, one seeks the “mistress of the heart”...; but if we had not received and studied all these things with patience, what message would we receive, interpreting it immediately and superficially, between *queen* ("generatrix") and *domina* ("mistress")?

GAMES ON NUMBER **ONE**

“Indo-European” languages Sanskrit isolated languages, Finno-Ugric languages

Greek *év eka* (m) Japanese *ichi* / noun

latin *unus* finnish *yksi*

ingl. *one* hungarian *egy*

ted. *Ein*

 **Uncategorized**

 PREVIOUS

FOLLOWING 
interlude

LATEST ARTICLES



1 WEEK AGO

ministerium deficiens, 7

THREE WEEKS AGO

ministerium deficiens, 6

4 WEEKS AGO

ministerium deficiens, 5

1 MONTH AGO

ministerium deficiens, 4

2 MONTHS AGO

ministerium deficiens, 3

[Open a site and earn with Altvista](#) - [Disclaimer](#) - [Report abuse](#) - [Privacy Policy](#) - [Customize advertising tracking](#)