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*According to Professor Aldo Neppi-Modona, one of Italy’s leading authorities on the Etruscans, and co-editor of the review Studi Etruschi, the coming publication of the Semerano theories “is going to revolutionise our views of language – I’m convinced of that”.*

ON THE THRESHOLD OF A NEW HISTORY
OF EUROPE. OUR CULTURAL ORIGINS:
THE SEARCH FOR AN AGE-OLD IDENTITY

The most serious ills from which several of the large civilized communities of Europe suffer are caused by a painful wrench, which distances man ever further from his cultural origins. The belief of genetic superiority has been among these ills, although the egoism that troubles the relationships within large communities cannot always be blamed on this. Words, which have greater permanency than any metal, since they spring from the immortal essence of the soul, are authoritative proof of Man’s ancient unity. For the first time, this unity more convincingly brings in the peoples of the Near East, where the greatest and most ancient civilizations flourished.

The end of this millennium is destined to bring a reshuffle to the fortunes of the different races. On the threshold of a new order in Europe, it is impossible to ignore the importance of extensive new problems which will occupy those in power.

Just as in imperial Roman times new races threatened the borders and the stability of the Empire, so today other races on the fringes of Europe look to it as a means of escaping misery and poverty. Meanwhile, on the no longer viable cultural level, glaring pedantry triumphs, and philosophical sham, the false problems of man, and the works which engender words, burn smoky incense to obscure any glimmer of truth which could regenerate the world.

These volumes are the result of many years of research into original sources, which hold the distant roots of man’s origins. The research was illuminated by the vision of a wider cultural bridge linking the dawn of civilization to the people who created values, and who, from the Fertile Crescent, return here reintegrated in the creativity of the Mediterranean peoples. The Western world owes these people a debt that has never been acknowledged for their inestimable heritage, including writing, the alphabet, and as shall be seen
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and proved in the text, the origins of the majority of languages and thus also of their sound systems.

History has demonstrated that ingratitude leads to bloody holocausts, which can only be avoided by reorganizing the fabric of an enlightened knowledge of history.

Following the rich and ever more persuasive finds of the great civilizations that paved the way for the Greeks and Romans, and with better knowledge of what makes up the fabric of our institutionalized erudition, how is it possible to continue, in the face of future generations, to develop our theories, thus perpetuating the bric-à-brac of an improbable Ursprache, lost in the search for traces of peoples evoked by romantic imagination, spectral shadows in the subjects of many academies, people still fleeing from an unknown Heimat? How is it possible to defraud the people who reaffirm their presence on the threshold of our history, of their due recognition?

Furthermore, since the future has an ancient heart, striking up a new cultural relationship with the remote past creates a new spiritual unity between us and bygone races, which, like burnt-out stars, continue to irradiate the shining message down to us. These people have been denied the due recognition of having been, in the beginning, influential in shaping our destiny.

The desire for new happiness among populations stirs up closed egoisms in the hope that the word, once again creative as at the dawn of civilization, will penetrate and transform the scream of recurrent bestiality into harmonious dialogue.

Once the general significance of the title of this work has been understood, culture as civilization reborn, a more involved section provides the title for the ‘Great Assizes’: ‘The Apocalypse Can Wait’. But what of the spirit, what of the future of the destiny of Europe? This is a subject that can no longer be left imprudently to political theorists alone.

It is perhaps salutary to recall that if the centre of the world has moved from the Mediterranean to the shores of the Pacific, and if Galileo’s ‘Accademia del Cimento’ has its antipodes in Silicon Valley, where research and technology are continually advanced, it does not logically follow that man’s spirit has been enriched and enlarged, nor that the beauty of the world has reached new heights, nor that there is new hope for the starving and dying in the world. It may be useful for man today to return and fortify himself with some ancient virtue and to digest, in the clarity of the symbol, the meaning of the fall of the giants.
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Although the progress and results of methods employed in large socio-political groups cannot be ignored, the style and role of citizens have fallen to those of consumers, whose point of intersection is a common market of men, ‘fruges consumere nati’, or as Leonardo expressed it, digestive tubes.

The legitimacy in some European countries of young protesters holding violent demonstrations against the cultural impoverishment of the day, should be read as a sign of the exasperated consumer civilization, which will produce more bankers and accountants while exiling humanity and reason. To quote Wittgenstein, ‘No religious confession has abused metaphysical expression so much as Mathematics’. However, language hardened to signs and numbers is nothing new, since even much of current linguistics formalizes the voice to algebraic diagrams and examines the training of animals, who are only lacking speech.

Man today is privileged by his understanding that at times science is unwittingly cruel and that few scientists like Leonardo, and currently Ettore Maiorana and Rita Levi Montalcini, know how to step off the fame bandwagon and show their anxiety for man: because it is not always easy to convert dynamite or the atom in the liberating and beneficial light of genius.

Let us therefore honour the word for its creative ability to affirm an ever wider humanity, and remember that there are no privileges of race but only common social duties and that no one can succeed alone.
INTRODUCTION

The discovery of the great civilizations of the Near East: Sumer, Akkad and Ebla, has opened up a far reaching historical reference point, a gateway to the origins of Western civilization. The ancient Akkadian language, from which both Assyrian and Babylonian derive, with its impressive lexical wealth, provides firm historical bases on which to document the development of Indo-European languages. The hypothetical reconstruction of an original language, Indo-European, which has been attempted in the past, today seems like a heroic attempt entirely unsupported by any historical evidence. The morphological components, which compete to structure the enunciative forms of our languages, refine their values and their sense of purpose in their origins. It was via Mesopotamia that in the eighth century B.C. India received a form of Semitic writing, the most famous adaptation of which was to become Brāhmī.

TOWARDS THE RECOVERY OF ANCIENT CULTURAL VALUES

Within a short time the ethnic groups, religions and languages of Europe will be reshuffled and subjected to the stormy dynamics of progressive integration. It is precisely this forecast which prompts the desire to provide documentation of our past and to record the distant echoes of the voices of the peoples who shaped the destiny of our civilization, the sum of the supreme affirmations with which humanity has propagated itself down the centuries.

The values picked up and recouped on the distant horizons of the word, as it appears at the dawn of our history, can become like an antidote to the abolition of the living sense, the dissolution of man, who threatens to rail against all the latitudes in which anti-humanism unknowingly raises its head.

In ancient India, the brahmins, who had lost the original meanings of the sacred formulae, rediscovered in the words of the Upaniṣad, the desire to uncover the secrets of arcane values, 'Word and thought had left to look
for the bráhman, but they returned without having found him’. Today, once more, those who pore over the papers of Indians sages, cannot refine it without listening to the echoes of the ancient Eden again, beyond illusory mirages. Neither is it possible for the other divine figurations, Atman and Viṣṇu, to reveal themselves, for their names are also sealed in the cuneiforms that build up the languages of the Near East, from where, in the eighth century B.C., writing was introduced into India.

Contrary to what the poet felt as ‘the bondage of words’ and comparable the airy freedom of his ghosts, the use of the voice is once more considered a richness, holding the enunciative tool which liberates man from the darkness of silence and the inarticulate rage of the scream: only the humanity of the word competes to uphold the ripening of a vigilant thought.

It is futile to cry over the void in permanent values or the invisible chasm into which daily life is inexorably sinking today, more insidious than the dark asteroid that has returned to threaten the earth. The only thing to save our continent will be a new and wider cultural movement. This will be possible only if culture can identify itself with the creative energy which unveils the needs of change in times of crisis, and provide an informed conscience to those who are most prepared.

In order to cure the moral and material failings of the world, which we are forced by fate to inhabit, the mass media work to spur on the intellectuals denouncing their complicit silence. The term intellectual is, however, out of date and ill suited to uphold such an arduous undertaking. In order to enrich the substance of their possible discussion, those who can must themselves provide the objective proof of the need for well directed intervention, so as to avoid contentions of words with the air of doing battle with the winds of old mills.

Only those peoples who acquire a clear understanding of their past are in a position to construct a future proportioned to their needs, since they are free of the errors which burdened the ancient path. The others, entangled in the mechanisms of a soulless world, act out each day a life that is not fed by secrets, healthy roots. However despite all this manoeuvring and jousting, in these pages there will still be those who in alluding to speaking men and languages will talk of race; as there will also be those who consider Indo-Germanic to be the true ‘Ursprache’. It is not surprising that this is still the case, as if nothing had come to pass. It is the sign of the absurd which explodes in the space that cannot be filled between the invocation of man and the obtuse indifference of the world.

From June 25th to 27th, 1987, three years after the publication of the first part of Origini della Cultura Europea (The Origins of European Culture),
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Werner Maihofer, President of the European University Institute in Florence, used almost the same title for a meeting between renowned orientalists to discuss the 'Middle Eastern Origins of European Culture'. Giovanni Pettinato made many interesting and intelligent observations regarding the various papers.

This new contribution to the history of the origins of man is published in Florence at a time when the echo of the Laurentian celebrations, honouring the climax of an unparalleled quality of life, is still resounding. Here Pico della Mirandola drew the prophet 'Abd Allāh's sense of man's dignity from Arab texts and revealed the Chaldean and Egyptian mysteries. Here Western culture felt the constant call back to the doctrines of the East, and in the great reconciliation of the faiths of East and West, sky and earth were invoked to compose a single harmony. Filippo Mazzei, a fighter for the freedom of the United States of America came from this land, which named the New Continent. As J. F. Kennedy remarked, the principle of equal rights, set out in the American Constitution, is inspired by the writings of this famous Tuscan. The publishing house Leo S. Olschki, a dynamic centre for the promotion of humanistic culture in the world, is based in Florence. It is the hope of the author that this work does not dishonour Florence's ancient humanism and harmonizes with the fervour of a new rebirth, particularly after the brutal massacre has inflicted a burning wound to the city's composed beauty, without succeeding in extinguishing her soul.

The founder of Federal Germany, Theodor Heuss, declared that without politics it is possible to make culture, without culture it is impossible to make politics. If it was still the practice to place one's work under the benevolent auspices of a patron, I would not hesitate, in the refuge of the past, to place my work before the greatest and most illumined of monarchs from the thirteenth century onwards: Frederick II, Emperor of Germany, King of Sicily and Puglia, in whose Palermo court Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Arab, Germanic and French culture existed together harmoniously. On a par with, or perhaps more than the country of his fathers, he held this Mediterranean island dear and reorganized it, humiliating the preemption barons.

The 'baptized Sultan' opens the horizons of knowledge to the spell of Eastern culture. The contentions he aspired to were engaged in with the Sultan of Egypt and Tunisia and science and learning were given full rein. The terms of his wisdom reached people in every latitude. The Greek Jew Teodoro and Michele Scoto became members of his court, as did ranks of melodious poets. The great Jews Yēḥūdāh Ben Shēlōmōh Kohen and
Ya'cőb Anatoli worked here together with Arab thinkers. The presentation of the Liber quadratorum of Leonardo da Pisa reached Frederick here. Barbarossa’s grand son who would have unified the ‘garden of the Empire’ and who after the victory at Cortenuova sent the ‘Carroccio’ to Rome, thus remains the great symbol of illumined sovereignty which with lucid daring confronts its contention against the darkness of time.

THE GREAT CULTURAL IRRADIATION FROM THE FERTILE CRESCENT

Following the discovery of Ebla and the new finds concerning the great civilizations of the Near East, research has been forwarded by the return to a vast historical reference point. This is constituted in the main by the written Semitic language, which spread with the great conquerors of Akkad, Sargon and Naram-Sin, over the shores of the Mediterranean and flowed back through Babylonian and Assyrian. Cuneiform writing, from which it benefits, is the inheritance of the Sumerian civilization, which was more culturally important in antiquity. Sumerian words unnoticed survive in our languages.

In the past the complex system of microasian ethnography has been one of the principal themes of oriental studies. What is now most pressing is not to dwell on the infinite mixings of languages and peoples ‘born to fall like leaves’, but to underline the language, or rather the voice which dominated the chorus of speakers and which today reappears on the shipwreck of time.

When examined, the Tablets of Kül-Tepe, ‘the hill of ashes’ in ancient Cappadocia (later to become the land of Wulfila), were found to use Assyrian of the third millennium B.C., thereby testifying to the vast Assyrian colony and its cultural influence over large areas of Asia Minor. Palaeo-Assyrian culture overwhelmed Proto-Hatti civilization, with the consequence that cuneiform script became the means of linguistic communication before the discovery of the alphabet.

The Boğazköy Tablets demonstrate how the Akkadian language predominated over the cultural parasitism of the Hittites. The language used by the statue of Ibbit-Lim in Ebla appeared to be Akkadian. The propulsive, vital force of the Aramaic language was subsequently to provide the means of communication between the Assyrians and Jews and was used as the administrative language of the Persian empire, up until the seventh satrapy and India.

Our history of language therefore starts with the substrata of written symbols. It is salutary to note how in cases of catastrophe, when traditional
frameworks collapse, writing protects language from the corruption which is otherwise inevitable in the fragile medium of the spoken word.

Derrida rightly celebrates the fascination of absolute legibility, the guarantee that a written text may be read ad infinitum in a variety of countless different contexts: ‘Even in the absence of all possible readers, after the death of all intelligible beings, writing, with a heroic abstraction, keeps alive the possibility of something being re-read... Writing, by cancelling the living references of the spoken word, promises its semantic content salvation, even beyond the day when all those capable of speaking and hearing fall victim to the holocaust’. This dispenses with the need to dwell upon possible new, non-existant words and hypothetical references to enunciative elements of which no trace remains in time or history.

THE PRESUMED DISPERAL OF LANGUAGES: AN OFFENCE TO THE BIBLICAL TEXT.

The Contribution of the Akkadian Language

The Bible tells of the building in Babylon of a great tower, the ziggurat, and of how it was held to be an obscure symbol of power, which offended and challenged God, whilst for the Babylonians it was a temple of prayer. So God declared, ‘Let us go down and there confound their language’ (Genesis, 11, 7).

The Vulgate interpretation, that God scattered the languages, is contradicted by the Hagiographa itself, when in the tenth pericope it refers to this dispersal using the appropriate Hebrew term lāšōn ‘tongue’. However, in the original language of our ziggurat, ‘mingle their tongues’ actually means ‘cause discord’, ‘trouble and upset the unity of intent’, the surest way of bringing about the downfall of a people. Here the term lāšōn surrenders its place to the word sāfā ‘lip’.

Similar expressions are common throughout the chronicles of the deeds of Assyrian–Babylonian kings. Thus, in the chronicles regarding the great Sargon, founder of the dynasty of Akkad, it is said that ‘In the tenth year his hand reached the borders of the western lands, making one its word and erecting effigies of himself in the west’. ‘Made one its word’ has the opposite meaning of ‘mingle their tongues’; it denotes a unitary politico-religious centralization, imposed by the conqueror on the lands which had fallen under his dominion. Recourse to the language of the great civilization of Akkad and Sumer will free us from the crucial doubt, which prevents us from solving the mystery of countless words, and which will act as
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a table of reference in our new approach to historical etymological research. By turning to the original great language we dispense with the need to examine traces of other related languages in detail, comforted by the certainty the demanding scholar Giovanni Garbini expresses when he states that, 'Given its ancient documentation, Akkadian unquestionably furnishes us with precious elements for the reconstruction of the physiognomy of the Semitic languages as they were actually spoken around, let us say, the fourth millennium B.C.‘.

The body of facts and linguistic evidence which was examined in this work could be described with a subtitle from Vendryes: *Introduction linguistique à l’histoire*.

It will become ever clearer that the linguistic act of translating the various contents of consciousness is linked to the polyvalence of meanings which a word, on its own, is destined to gather throughout the historical process: a plurality of semantic values stemming from a single reality, the pertinence of one original meaning. The compact nucleus of a word is thus able to pass unscathed through the magical and ritualistic languages of primitive races and apotropaic or evocative formulae, to emerge in the formulaic expression of faith in prayer. The insolent, formalizing verbosity of so-called new linguistics, which so often overshadows common sense, is of no help in the opening today of a new dialogue. ‘The profound linguistic reality’ in the end reveals only profound consternation on observing how low the formulaic level lies, almost as deep as the void into which Dante peered: ‘tanto che, per ficcar lo viso a fondo, io non vi discernea alcuna cosa’.

**The New Foundations of Historical Linguistics**

The advent of the great Sargon, founder of the dynasty of Akkad (which around the middle of the third millennium B.C. loosed its weaponry on the Mediterranean, thrusting onto the island of Crete), brings with it the transparency of a great symbol: the contribution made to Western civilization by the greatest civilizations in the history of the Near East. Evidence can be found in the ziggurat unearthed on Mount Accoddi in Sardinia, another trace of Mesopotamian religion and culture. Noteworthy too are the reports issued by the mass media, backed up by well-informed and well-documented archaeologists, which relate to this discovery and are reminders of the frequent voyages undertaken off Italian shores in ancient times by peoples from Mesopotamia. So it is that the recovery of the lan-
guages and traces of the great civilizations of the Near East may enable the historical linguist to follow a new seam in the exploration of the origins of our words which, in turn, hold the secrets of the origins of our civilization. It is this examination of their history that urges the European conscience to question and redefine itself, in the hope of rediscovering the meaning of our destiny.

A few decades ago nobody would have entertained the possibility of a reality which does away with all Eurocentric conceit and restores due recognition to the inexhaustible matrix of the Near East, including the linguistic plane.

**The Name**

Name, the genetic codex of a living being’s individuality, foreshadows the ‘nomen–omen’ identity: name as a projection of destiny, a real and specific identity. However, in the tablet of destiny a name, the divine word, had true worth only when written.

The creative function of a name is already celebrated in the Biblical text dedicated to the Creation. In Genesis (I, 5-11), it is said that «’Elōhîm called the light ‘Day’, and the darkness he called ‘Night’; ’Elōhîm called the firmament ‘Heaven’, then the dry land ‘Earth’ and the gathering together of the waters ‘Seas’». Thus the elements of the universe emerge from chaos thanks to the names which mould them into specific features of the Creation.

The motif of the creative name is already present in the ancient Babylonian and Assyrian poem Enûma eliš, a celebration of the deeds of the god Marduk. An *ouverture solennelle* provides the opening lines: ‘When the heavens above had no name, the earth below had none..., when none of the gods had (yet) been created and they did not (yet) have names..., Laḫmu and Laḫamu were created and given names’.

Diogenes Laertius (II, 5, 15) offers the opening passage of the work of Anaxagoras, in which the philosopher places the intellect, the voûç, at the origins of things, responsible for organizing the elements. ‘All was confused, then came intellect and put it in order’.

The origins of voûç were sought in vain; all that could be discerned was that its stem was *voF*-: in that digamma, an original -b-, nobody made out that in Latin etymology it was necessary to postulate ‘nomen’ and in Greek ὄνομα. The Akkadian is *nabûm* ‘to give name’; b, m, w alternate: in Akkadian the name *awilu* ‘man’ is also found written as *amûlu* and *abîlu*.
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For the ancients the magical essence of all beings was enclosed in their name and to know it was to have power over them. A relevant formulation of modern thought with regard to names is represented by the Philosophy of Names (Filosòfija imen), which Aleksandr Fëdorovič Losev held to be central and fundamental to metaphysics. He reflected on the assumed eidetic structure of reality, embracing the dynamic and constructive features of eido-logy and Platonic antinomies.

All this constitutes a system of symbolic realism: the universe, to differing degrees of verbalization, is a construction of names.

In this work, however, the far-off, enunciative meaning of name is used. The various names which, in different languages, denote a similar reality, are drawn from the distant horizons of history so that they may reveal the different ways in which the mind reacts to the reality of the cosmos.

The cultural phase in which we now find ourselves is characterized by a profusion of disciplines, producing in turn a quantity of terminology which cannot always be said to bring cognitive enrichment. Old ideas are often hidden under new guises which serve only to clutter the frontiers of the various fields of institutionalized knowledge. Despite this, there is not one particle of our cultural universe which cannot find its point of reference in a lemma of a remote and organic symbolic codex. Thus the history of words (as far back into the nebula of their origins as the observer’s eye can see), bears witness to the dignified survival of the humanistic anthropology, which Foucault believed to be dissipated in the light of his structuralism.

For many years the methodological impossibility of following the hazy paths of Indo-European research was aggravated by the fallacy that the present, contrary to the views of Heraclitus, was the only dimension of reality. Structuralism does not set a premium on the dynamic matrix of words as seen from a historical, evolutionary point of view, ignoring as it does the inexhaustible wealth words provide, capable as they are of spreading through every strand and topic of communication, owing to their ductile nature and vitality.

Historical linguistics has long been conditioned by schools of thought which have confused the realms of competence and application of different fields of study, such as the anthropological structuralism of Lévi-Strauss, a by-product of the linguistic structuralism of Jakobson and Trubetzkoy. The outcome of this is to be found in the paralogisms of those who assign the task of renewing the social sciences to the new school of phonology, solely because it will not consider the terms used as independent entities.
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INTRODUCTION

The new historical perspective, enriched by recent acquisitions and new, hard-won conquests, makes it necessary to reconsider and re-evaluate past experience.

CENTUM AND SATEM

Great importance is traditionally given to the dichotomy which divides the two groups of Indo-European languages: those languages which are known as centum (pronounced kentum) and those defined satem. However, a prehistoric frame of reference taking into consideration the notion of the number cento (hundred) would presuppose a degree of cultural development incompatible with that of the Indo-European origins. Leaving this consideration to one side, the origins of the word ‘centum’, the Italian cento, Greek ἐκατόν, Sanskrit śatām, Old Gaelic cēt, Gothic hund, Tocharian A känt, B känte have never been clear. It was erroneously hypothesized to stem from the base *dekmīt ‘ten’, but ‘centum’, ἐκατόν, displays the same base as the components of -κοντα, -ɡinta’, that is to say the tens of Greek and Roman numerals. These components, with the final -a, represent a dual of the base word, meaning ‘hand’, the number 5 graphically symbolized by the Latin V, which, when counting on one’s fingers, depicts the hand with all its fingers. Thus the Gothic hund, ‘hundred’, provides the base for Hand, Gothic handus and Anglo-Saxon hand, and for which no extra-Germanic associations are known. ‘Hand’ doubtless derives from the same base as the Greek χανδό-άνω, I hold: in the hand (Od., 17, 344), Latin prae-hendo’, Aoristic ἔχαδον (cf. the Latin praeda < *prai-heda). The unknown base, hypothesized in *ghend-, corresponds historically to the Akkadian qātum: qā-ātum ‘hand’. This also provides the base (the initial occlusive unvoiced, instead of χ- from q-) for the verb κτάομαι, ‘I take’, originally ‘I place my hand on’. It is thus from the Akkadian qātum ‘hand’ that the history emerges of the Sanskrit sātām (with initial palatal sibilant) and of ‘centum’, ἐ-κατόν, of which the initial ἐ- may be likened to εἰκοσι: *Fixati twenty (the Akkadian e-ṣrā) and which denotes a multiplier that will multiply ‘five’, a hand, by twenty.

ETYMOLOGY

Having abandoned, thanks to Schuchardt, the old antithesis between phonetic etymology and semantic research, scientific linguistics was able to rid itself of the old empiricism and pursue the historical individuality of
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words, as far as possible within the given limits. Etymological research benefitted little from the linguistic structuralism of Jakobson and Trubetzkoy extolled by Lévi-Strauss, because the advent of phonology not only altered the linguistic perspective, but also furnished the social sciences with the same degree of renewal which ‘nuclear physics, for example, brought to the category of the exact sciences’. However, the value of renewal esteemed by the philosopher, has little to do with the historical science of etymological research. Phonetics, a comparatively recent discipline, was developed by the fascinating and careful analysis of Indian grammarians. The real progress in historical linguistics came about in the field of Romance languages only because the starting point for comparative studies, on a historical plane, was easily found in the parent language, Latin.

The in substantial, futile attempts to attack the hypothetical proto-Indo-European, proto-Germanic and proto-Slav areas inspired by Schleicher, already begin to dissolve with F. Diez.

Foucault, theorist of the death of man, disappearing ‘like a face of sand’ in the anonymous practices of knowledge and power, hints in his closing pages at the need to resuscitate his subject and reaffirm it on the plane of historical practices, so he can operate once more within the coordinates of individuality. The problematics of subjectivity, which came to the fore late in Foucault’s work, mark the shift in structuralism towards history.

Having reached the scientific stage in etymology, we are now faced with certain elements capable of obscuring the horizon, in particular the etymological dictionaries of Ernout-Meillet and Walde-Hofmann for Latin and of Chantreine for Greek. Max Vasmer’s work opens up a rich field of research for Russian, as Mayrhofer’s does for Sanskrit. The researcher, whilst consulting the volumes that provide the background to the essential Greek and Latin words studied in this work, is assailed by problems of doubt and contradiction, especially when faced with the lemmata of Greek and Latin etymological dictionaries.

In the Romantic era comparative etymology drew from as far afield as ancient Indian and Persian; it distanced every historico-philosophical apriorism, and methodically pursued the history of words in the circumscribed field of similar languages.

The Indian language and culture, celebrated by F. Schlegel, strengthens the links on the guidance of morphological similarities. Etymologically, Mutter in German was placed with Latin ‘mater’ and Ancient Indian mātār. There are countless other obvious affinities. It could be said, with Biblical sadness, ‘You multiplied the numbers of men, not their happiness’. In
order to avoid both past and more recent etymological disagreements, re-
searchers abandoned etymology, though without expressly saying so.

Based on the Indo-European hypothesis and lacking a wider range of
reference, lexical research was hampered, etymology was left in the hands
of the grammarians and caught up in the intricacies of comparative gram-
mar. So-called historical linguistics had a geographically limited view of hi-
story. Many of the elements which make up words: case modifiers, affixes,
prefixes, are seen by linguists as being etymologically irrelevant, empty
parts; they did not realise that, although morphological aspects may be tem-
porary elements, added to the core of a word, just as clothes and ornaments
are used to dress the human body, changing with fashion, they do, none-
theless, have a history of their own.

For the Indo-European languages, these elements were present over a
relatively short period of time. Grimm’s Laws regarding shifts in explosive
consonants in Germanic languages have thus a limited area of application.
The initial part of zwei corresponds to a d- in other Indo-European langua-
ges. But the origin of zwei (and also the origin of Latin ‘duo’ etc.) was un-
known. It is only thanks to our wider table of reference that due, Gothic ’t-
wai etc., leaves the Indo-European confines, where it is placed as root *de-,
and recovers in a more distant word a base with initial t-, indicating the na-
tural meaning of ‘twin’. The same is true for thousands upon thousands of
words, showing that the horizon of Indo-European origins was lit up by
the sun of the Near East.

*What is the truth?*

Scientific etymology, advanced in the etymological dictionaries of clas-
sical languages, is of no use in explaining the origin of Latin ‘verus’; vir-
tually nothing was known. Only comparisons with a few other words (not
all of which are pertinent) and the absurd connection to ‘verbum’ are offe-
red. ‘Verum’, ‘truth’, from ‘verus’, Old High German ‘wär’, corresponds to
Akkadian bârum ‘to become certain, proved, certified’ and may be asso-
ciated to the sacred bârum ‘the diviner’: from barûm ‘to look upon, to
inspect exta, to observe omens’, similar to autopsy.

Whilst the truth of the Romans is an appropriate term for the future
compilers of new legislation governing the rights of different peoples, the
truth of the Greeks, à-λῆθεια, begins with a negative, à-, and is based on
λαθεîn in the sense of ‘being hidden’. The constantly changing thought pro-
cess thus becomes part of a never-ending alternation between light and
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dark, depriving coverings of all truth, just as, when a rotating planet turns and shows its hidden side, which is also lit up. No reference is made to the evident connections between the Greek word and other terms belonging to the same spheres of cultural origins. Akkadian lātum, Hebrew līt ‘to cover, to hide’, lāt ‘secrecy’. Unveiling the meaning of ἀλήθεια brings to mind the work of the hermeneut, of the ἐρμηνεύς ‘interpreter’. The only information given for this term was that it was a ‘terme technique sans étymologie’ (Ernout-Meillet). We shall return to this matter below. U. Galamberti, in Linguaggio e civiltà wrote perspicaciously about etymological suggestions in the philosophy of Heidegger and of Jaspers.

The treatments sketched by etymologists often end with the terms ‘obscure’, ‘inconnue’, ‘unbekannt’. In other cases heroic attempts lead to banal errors. The etymon of Latin ‘culina’, for example, illustrates this perfectly.

The Italian exhibition Il Vetro dei Cesari was regarded as a spearhead for the Italian cultural offensive in Britain. More than 160 glass exhibits from the Roman Empire were displayed in London. On such occasions no opportunity is lost to draw retrospective panoramas and build hastily constructed bridges into the past. In this particular case, the public was told that the origins of the art of the magical Augustan glassmakers were extremely remote, dating from the Bronze Age. This age-old industry was born in Mesopotamia where it developed and expanded towards Egypt. After a period of decline, it blossomed again with the Assyrian-Babylonian Empire in the seventh century B.C. It later came to the West and triumphed in Rome where people were fascinated with techniques belonging to bygone ages. This appears clear; however enthusiasm wanes when we trace the beginnings of our Western culture on the basis of equally concrete evidence.

The word ‘etymology’ has a parallel destiny to that of mystery, mystērion: a mystery that does not know its own self. In Greek, the term etymologia is of relatively recent date. It is from the Hellenistic period. It was connected to the Stoics (cf. V. Pisani, L’etimologia, Paideia Editrice, Brescia, 1967, p. 14, n. 3) and was present in a work by Crisippus. It is known to the geographer Strabo, the rhetor Dionysius of Halicarnassus and to Apollonius (Dyskolos) but unknown to Plato who, in Cratylus leads etymologies into the dizzy whirls of a reeling dance where he is influenced by little more than the sounds made by words. Etymologia is therefore related to Greek étymos ‘true’, étymon ‘the true element in what is said’. This word is however in turn traced to etesos, ‘true, authentic’, of unknown origin. Our much older table of reference provides us with the certainty of the origins of etymologia and confirms its meaning, ‘discourse about the truth of a word’, that is, about the truth promised by the word itself.
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INTRODUCTION

Plato’s etymologies in Cratylus are fairly similar to those expressed by Homer when, for example, he places the name Odysseus next to odysso- noς ‘angry’. When considering classical writers, it is difficult to draw the line between a play on words and etymology. Plato’s inaccurate etymologies cannot be explained solely by his desire to prevent analysis being shifted from things to names.

The most striking of Plato’s etymologies include that of θεοί, the gods, originally conceived as unfixed stars. The name is said to come from the verb θέω ‘I run’; ἄηηο ‘air’ was given the meaning of ἄει ἰει ‘constantly moving’. The elements of language perceived as phonic representation of the real tend to become constitutive glottoconics. For example the letter ὅ expresses mobility while λ expresses lightness etc.

Of the various etymologies contained in Cratylus, philologists today tend to accept that of σελήνη, ‘selene’ (the moon) deriving from ‘sela’ (splendour). Etymologists, however, pronounce this word to be ‘obscure’.

The etymologies of the ancients frequently respond to an enunciative or exegetic need. The Biblical etymology of Babylon is thought to be similar to Homer’s etymological treatment of Odysseus, that is Bābēl, explained on the basis of Hebrew bālāl ‘to intrigue’. It is however Babylonian bābili ‘god’s gate’, Sumerian kā-din-gir(ra). Unexpected derivations attempt to explain the names of the patriarchs. In the Pentateuch, place names and names of people led to etymological myths. In the first part of Genesis the origin of the terrible bārā remains a painful mystery for Bible philologists. It expresses the big bang of ‘Elōhīm for which we have blindly accepted the translation of ‘created’. The seventy epiōsen are worse, ektisen in Aquila’s version, better. The word bārā, which is repeated 47 times in the Bible, is a solemn term. Like eden, it is drawn from a language of remote and venerable cultural traditions. It is Sumerian bāra ‘to spread’, (‘weit öffnen’): it is heaven and earth rushing to take up their designated places in the creation. For as long as science still retains the pyrotechnics and the big bang of the Beginning, bāra will be a better rendering of the original act.

It is not essential here to dwell upon the long history of empirical etymology, which first developed with the Sophists. From language as a product of nature (physei) in Plato’s terms, we pass onto the Alexandrians’ concept of language as ‘convention’ (thesei). With the Alexandrians the study of primitive words (archai) is followed by morphological and phonetic research.

In De lingua latina Varro continues the excellent philological work of Aelius Stilo; however the etymologies he postulates in this work have been defined as puerile: ‘amnis’ is related to ‘ambitus’, ‘ager’ to ‘ago’ (leading to
the ridiculous modern interpretation ‘taking to pasture’; ‘palus’ marsh was related to ‘paululum’, that is a small quantity of water etc. The etymologies of Pompeius Festus and Nonius Marcellus did not do much to improve the situation.

The etymologiae of Isidorus of Seville (sixth century A.D.) are useful for the archaic terms he attempts to explain, but are also thoroughly bizarre.

Πάντα δὲ αὐτὸν ἐγένετο.
Johannes (I, 3)

* * *

Plato, Varro and Isidorus try to recreate the discernible universe by analysing the simple or majestic words connected to its origins. It is ‘name’ that, by the will of ’Elōhîm, first draws the elements from chaos. This becomes lógos in the Gospel of St. John: ‘everything was created through this’. No one realised that if the base of lógos ‘reason, word’, was sought in the stem of the Greek légo, ‘collect, enumerate’, which had no etymology, then this would not provide the values that can, be obtained from our more ancient table of reference, where the almost identical leqû, apart from the meaning of ‘take’, also signifies ‘understand’. It is from this that the Hebrew word meaning ‘knowledge’ derives. Thanks to our table of reference, the Greek noûs ‘intellect’, the organizer of the universe according to Anaxagoras, can be identified with the verb meaning ‘to name’.

In the search for the very ancient knowledge of the Italics, the recognition of the etymological value of ancient Latin words, provoked Vico’s philosophical questioning; he attempted to accord the rhythm of ideas with the flow of historical facts. Although he failed in this, his aims and recognition of an illuminating presentment were worthwhile. As in all recent and modern research, he did not have any historical reference to a real, alive world, to the distant millennia.

An achievement forever.

The historically based structure of Vico’s thought leads us to produce evidence capable of expanding the limits of etymological research beyond the boundaries imposed by the Romantic school’s historical grammar.

In his masterpiece Môrêh nebûkîm, ‘Guide for the perplexed’ Maimonides aimed to console those souls troubled by the contradiction between the
traditional teachings of the faith and rational thought; he attempted to show that there was no contradiction, but rather a widening of horizons, a richer vision of ancient cultural connotations.

There are words which streak like lightning flashes across boundless skies and prove how created (and at the same time creative) words have the speed and propagation of sound. We stumble across one of these at the Eastern limit of the Indo-Germanic world and it confirms the opinion that mathematical proof offers the guarantee of practical precision: the ancient Indian mánah, ‘intelligence, spirit, thought’, mánuh, ‘man’, as in a thinking being, like the Greek μένος spirit and thus, with semantic meanings more similar to those of the original, μήν month, that is the calculation of time measured by the moon: μῆνι, and thus again the Latin ‘mens’ mind, the Gothic man ‘to think’ and Lithuanian mēnas ‘to remember’ etc., find their radial centre in a word from the most ancient tradition: Akkadian manû ‘to calculate, to count, to consider’. The noun manītu ‘number, that which is calculated’ is a distant source of the Latin ‘moneta’ (see ‘moneo’), which through abject calculation and thought risks deification as ‘Juno Monēta’. However, historically Akkadian manû, at the origins, after spreading to India, continued its journey even further to be associated not only with brahman of ancient India, but also in the magical power of the mana of the Melanesian peoples, energy or dynamic essence, μένος which animates objects or people, like the manitu of the Algonquins, which confirms P. Rivet’s discovery of the relationship between Austronesian languages and those of the American Indians.

A grammarian of the past, who did not have the recent discoveries in the Near East in perspective, would not have been able to brave the flying jump from the Akkadian manû to the Melanesian mana and perhaps he would not even do so today, in order to remain faithful to his limitations, like the scholars of Salamanca who whistle up storms and stay at home.

Etymologies: under the veil of Isis.

In Sais, the ancient statue of Isis bore an inscription: ‘I am all that has been, that is, and that will be: no mortal has ever lifted my peplos’. Thus many etymological mysteries have remained concealed.

Here at the threshold one must guard against the surprise discovery that the most common words in our languages have no real history or etymology. Whoever looks for the origin of the Latin ‘aqua’ water will read in authoritative texts that ‘ce mot ne se retrouve pas ailleurs’ (Ernout-Meillet). There is, however, no mystery about a Germanic word, the Gothic ahwa
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‘river’, the German Aue and the component of the toponym Scandinavia, which is something completely different. We are far from connecting at its origins the word ‘aqua’ to a reference table which is no longer conjectural but historical, offered by the first great civilizations of the past, whose languages we have managed to recover in the last two centuries: this reference table is Akkadian with its great dialectic treasures, Assyrian and Babylonian. Therefore we observe that the Latin ‘aqua’ corresponds to the Akkadian aga’u, agiu, agû, accusative agâ, ‘current, wave, flow of water’. This base also goes back to the origins in the name of the Aegean Sea, ‘Aegaeum’. As in Køben-havn, the component -avia of Scandinavia and the German Aue echo the old term with the meaning pond, marsh which are residue of rivers: Akkadian ḥawu, ḥawwu (ḥammu), ḥabbu, ammu (āwu: ‘swamp’) from which the hydronyms Bret Avon and Italic Ema (Ima) derive.

The origin of the Latin ‘unda’, ‘wave’ is unknown, as is that of Greek ὄδωρ, ὄδος, and Slav voda, which call to mind Akkadian adû, Sumerian adē-a, ‘wave’: -q in ὄδωρ shows that it means running water: Akkadian arû ‘to go, to advance’. As far as the original sound a- is concerned, it is known that already in the II millenium B.C. in north-west Semitic a and u were interchangeable: sumum / šamum, ‘name’.

In Homer, a word for bread surfaces from the most ancient substratum: ἄχολος (Od., 17, 222); its origin is unknown. The reference to Sanskrit aṣnāti ‘eats’ in its turn awaits illumination, while Akkadian comes faithfully to the rescue with akalu ‘bread’.

Unknown too is the origin of the name of the archetypal Greek divinity, Apollo, the highest symbol of light and harmony coexisting in divine fullness, for Apollo used rays of sunlight to make the strings of his lyre, and of his silver bow. The etymology of the name Απόλλων is given with the melancholy refrain ‘inconnue’.

If one strays from the Thessalian Ἀπλοῦν (which rhymes with Akkadian aplum ‘son’ and justifies the meaning of Latona, Λητώ ‘mother’), like the Semitic denomination of the ‘(unbearable) face of God’, Hebrew penû-’El, Ἀπόλλων (see anthroponym Ἀπελλὼν), in his solar hypostasis signifies shining face: Akkadian appu, Siriac appē ‘face’ (‘Gesicht’) and allu, ellanum ‘luminous, holy’ (‘hell, heilig; von Göttern’).

Even the adjective which best expresses one of the components of Greek spirit, καλός, beautiful, has never been blessed with a history stretching back into the remote past. All that is known for certain about καλός is: ‘etymologie est ignorée’. No-one had the slightest suspicion that words like the English holy and German heilig ‘sacred, holy’ could have their root in the same thousand-year-old stock as καλός, whose original meaning is
‘whole, perfect, healthy’. The Greek reveals beauty in its origins with the
colours of health, integrity, like a reflection of the intangible divine perfec-
tion. The evidence is presented by the well known meanings of the Ger-
man heil ‘whole, healthy’, English whole, Anglosaxon hal which have the
same origin as holy and καλός.

Sappho calls the moon beautiful, κάλαν, when it radiates light in its
fullness (πλήθοςωα) and the stars pale in comparison; καλός, ‘perfect, whole,
beautiful’ is Akkadian kalûm, western Semitic kull ‘whole, all’: perfect is
the creature of the holocaust to be offered to the divinity. Analogical con-
firmation is to be found in Akkadian texts where the adjective meaning
‘fattened’ (Akkadian marû), used of animals destined for sacrifice, is some-
times linked to another adjective with the meaning ‘pure’ (Akkadian
ebbu).

We cannot continue to claim that the Greek word ἀγρός and the Latin
‘ager’, derive from the verb ἀγω with the meaning ‘the place where animals
are led to graze’: ‘ager’, ἀγρός is ‘cultivated field’ and no farmer worth his
salt would lead the goats to graze the shoots, because ἀγρός has a thousand
year-old ancestor in the Sumerian a-gâr ‘field’ and in Akkadian ugûru.
The Latin ‘sons’ guilty cannot be fobbed off as a present participle of the
verb ‘esse’ instead of discovering there the base of σύνομαι ‘I do wrong
harm’, whose origin, it is true, is unknown, but which is a denominative
of Semitic origin: from Akkadian šûnum ‘criminality’, šênu ‘wicked’: ša-šêni
‘criminal’: English sin comes from the same base.

This is the reality upon which, as in the disciplined practices of scientifi-
c research, anyone may propose solutions or evidence.

How may the analysis of words (at times even the most common and
closest to everyday use), or etymological research be accepted when to
explain the Latin ‘culina’ ‘kitchen’ it resorts to the banal compromise of
‘culus’, instead of singling out the synonymic root of ‘coquina’ ‘kitchen’,
from ‘coquo’, that is, the root which for ‘culina’ can only be that of ‘caleo’,
Akkadian qâlû, with its form qûllû ‘to burn’? Even the etymon ‘repud-
dium’ is an outrage to Rome.

And how can it be acceptable, in order to illustrate the origins, for
example, of the archaic Latin ‘prosapia’ ‘kin, progeny’, to suggest ‘pro-’,
which obviously calls us back to the past, and also a term dredged up from
the Sanskrit area, which touches on the gratuitous obscenity of sâpah, ‘pê-
nis’, instead of discovering a word with the meaning of ‘gens’, to be precise
Akkadian sâbu ‘people’?

In a few, still topical, pages Giorgio Pasquali (G. Pasquali, Preistoria nella
poesia romana, ed. S. Timpanaro, Sansoni, 1981, p. 65 and following), once
again with Debrunner, evoked Greek words deriving from the pre-Indo-European background, words, among many others, such as θάλασσα sea, εἰρήνη peace, ἐμπιστεύς interpreter, πρέσβυς old, πρεσβευτής ambassador, he moreover included nautical, commercial, religious, and state terms, as well as toponyms, and plant and animal words. Thus: δοῦλος slave, λαὸς people, πόλις city, terms for the sovereign: ἄναξ, βασιλεὺς, τύραννος; and lastly, words like βραβεύς referee, and the names of the great Greek heroes: Achilles, Ulysses etc. Similarly, he listed all the names of musical instruments. The etymology can be traced here, in the etymological dictionary. As far as Latin is concerned, while devoting much attention to immigrant Indo-European words, Pasquali observed that in its lexicon there are many words which it is not possible to etymologise with complete certainty, and he turned back to terms of presumed Etruscan origin such as ‘person’. Therefore Meillet’s argument is picked up again, on that ‘part d’inconnu: cette part est large...’. The Indo-European faith is, however, even larger.

The problem which concerns such a construction today, following the discoveries of the past century, puts us in the position of affirming that the Indo-European system runs the risk of seeming a ruined castle. It is the common words themselves which confirm their historical ancestors, not in Indo-European roots but in words which bear witness to their right to belong to the Mediterranean, genetically traceable to the great civilizations of Sumer, Akkad, Babylon, Ebla, Ugarit, Tyre and Sidon. In order to express concisely this remote derivation it is the Akkadian language, the most ancient and richly documented, which in the main comes to our rescue.

Indo-European does not even manage to explain the ‘inconnue’ origin of καί, originally ‘as, like’ (‘également, et’, Chantraine), which in Cypriot and in Arcadian of Mantinea keeps in its original Semitic pure form: ka, comparative particle, of similarity or proportion, ‘as, like; at, after’, Arabic kai, Akkadian ki.

Indo-European does not even assure the etymology of οὐ, ‘not’; of οὐξ, οὐκι, οὐχί: ‘l’étymologie de οὐ reste obscure’. Instead οὐ, which bears out the rule of the dropping of –l-, the original intermediary or at the end of the word, corresponds to Akkadian ul ‘not’: therefore οὐξι, with –κι (Akkadian ki, ‘like’) gives the original meaning ‘not like’.

Even the etymology of the Latin ‘et’ is unknown, which means company, together, with: Hebrew et, Akkadian itti ‘with’, which returns in Greek ἔτι.

Also unknown is the etymology of the Latin ‘cum’ with, which denotes union: from the base of Akkadian kamû, ‘to bind’, that of Greek σύν, from σύν, which derives from Akkadian kussûm ‘to bind, to tie’. The etymo-
logy of the very common ‘res’: which gives Akkadian ṭēš (ṭēšu), ‘object, piece, item’ in the sense of ‘caput’ in numbering. For the phenomenon of original –l– dropping, in Greek, two examples are noteworthy: ὁδός, ‘safe and sound’, Latin ‘salvus’: the origins of these words were unknown. Since Indo-European is unable to link ὁδός healthy and Latin ‘salvus’ with the Semitic: Akkadian (read šalāwu) šalāmu ‘to be in good condition, intact’, šalāwu: šalāmu ‘health’, šalmu ‘sound, whole’: *šawu (with the dropping of –l– in Greek; m in Akkadian is read as w, especially between two vowels). Thus Akkadian šalmūtu, *šalvātu is Latin ‘salus, salutis’. Thus σῶμα body corresponds to Akkadian šalmu > *šamu ‘bodily shape’; the stem σῶμα– and the meaning of cadaver bring to mind a distant crossing with the base of Akkadian šalamtu ‘corpse’ (‘Leiche’), plural šal-mātu > σῶματα.

A few more examples, in addition to the thousands which are shown in the pages of the etymological dictionaries, following, are useful in illustrating how Indo-European disregards the most common words. The domestic fireplace, Attic ἔστια, Doric ἐστία, is obscured by fumes of doubt: over the presence or not of an initial F–. There is even a risk of failing to link the Latin ‘Vesta’: Akkadian has ešātu, išātu, ‘fire’, which has no need of words to be accredited. Indo-European does not even know the etymology of the Greek δῶμα, δῶματα, which is the plural, used in the sense of ‘houses, buildings and families living in them’. This word calls to mind Akkadian dadmu, plural, with a base reduplication reminiscent of one of the Sumerian ways of expressing a group, the plural. This also brings to mind the difficulty of finding the origins of the alpine term bai’ta ‘hut’, reproduced faithfully in the Hebrew bajit, ‘little dwelling’, Akkadian bētu.

Let us take the history of the word uomo ‘man’: Latin ‘homo/hominis’. We cannot go back to Latin ‘humus’ earth which would give the animals the privilege of claiming less humble origins, not from the earth. The Oscan humuns ‘man’ does not assure us of the origin of the most ancient language, of the Ziggurat: the Sumerian umun, ‘man’, gives dignity back to the word for man, ‘hōmo’, whereas ‘human’, Latin ‘hūmanus’, does not derive as dabbler might think from ‘hōmo’, which would not explain the different quantity of short ō’s and long ū’s, but goes back to the Ziggurat language: Akkadian ūmānu, ‘wise, competent, artist, craftsman’: ūmānu was the monarch’s counsellor. We can better explain thus the ‘humanae litterae’.

The obscurity of Indo-European obviously also extends to verbs meaning ‘to see’: ὁγῶ ‘I see’ has no etymology, which is instead guaranteed by the existence of a digamma initial F–: it corresponds to Akkadian barū ‘to
look upon, to observe, to watch over’ and the digamma, $\phi$-, gives the original $\beta$-. However, not even $\theta$εδομαι, ‘I watch’, has an etymology: ‘pas d’érnyme’ (Chantraine). We now know that initial $\theta$- corresponds to initial $\text{t}\text{'}$ of the Ugaritic $\text{t}\text{'}\text{j} ‘to see’, to $\text{s}$- of Akkadian $\text{s}e\text{'u} ‘to see, seek with the eyes’, Hebrew $\text{s}a\text{‘a} ‘to gaze at, to behold’, German $\text{s}ehen$. The presence of the original Semitic laryngeal thus also explains the origin of Latin ‘sagio’ and German $\text{s}uchen$.

The meanings of cosmos and earth.

There are enunciative domains where imagination and art share their creative capacity with the primordial word: ‘Beautiful is your mantle, Oh divine sky, and beautiful are you, dewy earth’. The origin of the Greek $\chi\omega\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\zeta$, which had the original meaning of ‘mantle, adornment, cover’, as attested by lines of the $\text{Iliad}$, was unknown and in Frisk’s index it is condemned to obscurity, because centuries of research have had no happy result.

In a famous sequence from Homer, Hera, before meeting Zeus, surrounds herself with an irresistible aura of perfume and wraps all her ornaments around her body (II., 14, 187, and following). Elsewhere the ornament is ivory, dyed purple by a Carian or Meonian woman, to make a pillow for a horse (II., 4, 145). With Pythagoras, Parmenides and Plato, the semantic broadening of $\chi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\zeta$ reaches the splendour and calmness of the order of the universe. The etymology of the Greek word is reached with the help of an elementary notion of consonantic phenomena, in particular the mute $-\tau$- before $-\mu$- which gives the group $-\mu\nu\nu\nu$-. As the root of $\chi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron$ ‘ornament, covering’ corresponds to Akkadian $\text{katmu(m)} (\star\text{kasmu})$ which means ‘clothed, covered’, the verbal adjective of $\text{kat\text{\-a}mum} ‘to cover with garments, to veil’, $\text{kuttumu} ‘to provide with clothing’, is applied to give ‘a woman in the harem’.

Placed in the category of beauty of an order which encircles it with incredible harmony, the harmony of the heavens, the cosmos of the great Greek thinkers could not exclude the earth. This is nothing new: at the roots of the thought which contemplates the universe, the Sumerians placed, as we know, the binomial $\text{an-ki}$, that is ‘heaven-earth’. I do not think, however, that anyone has explored the hitherto unknown origin of $\chi\theta\omicron\omicron\nu$ ‘earth’: this term remains in the span of the identical base: Akkadian $k(a)\text{t\text{\-}awum} ‘to cover’ > *$\text{kt\text{\-}awum} > *$\text{kt\text{\-}aun}$: the adjective $\chi\theta\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\omicron$, referring to the god Hermes (cf.), guider of souls, makes him a god who is an expert in walking in the dark kingdom under the earth: his name Hermes repeats the corresponding base to Akkadian $\text{her\text{\-}emu} ‘to cover’. Thus in its
origins the Latin ‘mundus’, in the sense of ‘adornment’ backs up the semantic meaning of the Greek term: ‘mundus’ finds distant ancestors in Akkadian mudû ‘a garment’, which recurs in Ugaritic and echoes the Sumerian mu-du-m.

Stemming from the vision of a clear and geometric order, modern science has worshipped the original trigger of creation thundering with the great fireworks of the big bang: the deafening hypothesis of these origins almost mirrors the furious civilization of noise, which exhausts and depresses the soul. Such a hypothesis is remedied by the possibility offered to this ephemeral being, called man, of contemplating a part of the great Whole: this nullity, seeing more than the eyes of the stars, is a nullity which pursues the flight of the galaxies, a prodigy even greater than creation itself.

The nature of modern science does not lend itself to the contemplation of the universe, because the indifference to the atom, which at the beginning of the century characterised scientists, is counterbalanced by the event that took place in Rome, in the “scuola di Via Panisperna”. In 1926 the era of nuclear physics exploded: in Copenhagen, Otto R. Frisch, translated the pages of “Ricerca Scientifica” to colleagues anxious to know the latest results. The scientist examined the regularity of details rather than the cosmos or the fundamental laws: he worried away at wearisome problems, like the covering of chemical atoms, around the chemical properties of matter, revealed through the mathematical formula of quantum theory, and was still trying to throw light on the darkness overshadowing the relationship between quantum theory and theory of relativity: It is still man, who strives to steal fragments from the universe of endless secrets, and triumphantly call them discoveries.

It is possible that one day, when a sharper vision of the world which surrounds it has been reached, science will rearrange the great cosmos in its supreme order climbing up from the triumphant miracle of the infinitely small, and leaving behind the world of leptons, mesotrons, and try to link together the great galaxies moving in an inconceivable direction. Elliptical, spiral, irregular galaxies, finally joined, like the quarks stuck down by gluons. Perhaps the scientist will be struck by the suspicion that the cosmos may be assumed into the vital order, organically structured by the great stellar agglomerates, of the great Universe, and the rhythm that moves it all, from the electron to the great astral masses, will then be the breath and vital pulsation of the Cosmos, diastole and systole of the great heart. However, floating in the guts of the great Organism, the inhabited stars no longer permit the open vision of the Whole, which cannot have senses inferior to those conceded to the ephemereal beings. And today, when on earth life is
prostrated at the mercy of the crowd which can eliminate it by pressing a button or poisoning the atmosphere, and many are the deaths threatened and foretold, perhaps in this dreadful suicide we will feel the hostility of the cosmos, which feels within the organic life inhabiting it, the virus which oppresses it. What force can stand against the mysterious adversity of the universe if not the love which binds us? There was a poet who lived through this anxiety in the transparency of an image, but the broom flower of his last poem remained helpless and defenceless, on the slopes of a volcano.

It is possible that long before the sun dispels the last reserve of hydrogen, on the almost deserted earth, man will wander about in search of man, no longer an enemy, and the colour of the face being unimportant, the light of another’s gaze will momentarily relieve their sorrow.

The origin of the noun ‘titulus’.

Yet we can at times go back to the origins of etymologies which seem to be pure eccentricity. In the first grammatical treatise of Icelandic, which is preserved in the Codex Wormianus of Copenhagen University, the Latin word ‘titulus’ is given as deriving from Titan, the sun. The etymology, given by Remigius of Auxerre, can be found in the commentary of Ars minor by Donatus and plays on the analogy between Titan, the sun which illuminates the creation, and ‘titulus’, the gleam which illuminates text. The Codex Einsidlensis 172 is also enriched by this etymology, which recurs in the commentary to Theodulus’ Ecloga, by Bernardus of Utrecht. Here in the Latin etymological dictionary, the etymology of ‘titulus’ is given, which in Ernout–Meillet’s volume is unjustifiably traced back to Etruscan. ‘Titulus’ however is originally the brief ‘note’, the distinguishing mark affixed with chalk, ‘albo lapillo’, ‘creta an carbone’, Horace would say: it is chalk, and the base ‘tit-’ corresponds to Akkadian tittu, titu, Hebrew tit ‘chalk’, from which the Greek titanος, ‘chalk’ confused with Titan, the ‘Titan’ also derives.

The Secrets of Modern Words

Until relatively recently the word ‘race’ recurred frequently in linguistic works. Much of historical linguistics is still unintentionally coloured by racial typologies, despite the enormous contribution to linguistic analysis provided by the discovery of the languages and cultures of the Near East.
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The origin of the German term ‘Sippe’ ‘people’, ‘stock’.

The overwhelming egocentricity of the Indo-European school is revealed in the etymology proposed for the German term ‘Sippe’. With no justification whatsoever, it is said to be derived from the third person pronoun! Deprived of its original noble quarter, this term was already present three thousand years ago. It is Akkadian sabu, better preserved in the Latin ‘pro-sapia’, Ugaritic šb’, Mari and Ancient Babylonian sabûm meaning ‘people’ (‘Leute’). Hebrew stresses its meaning as ‘army’.

The origin of the noun ‘race’.

There is now no doubt that the origin of the word ‘race’, French race, is to be sought in Old French haraz ‘breed of horses’. The term haraz is itself however of unknown origin.

As is the case for many Semitic terms circulated from Arabic, haraz, haras recalls a Neo-Assyria term Ḥaršā ‘gentilic referring to a breed of horses’, Assyr. Dict. 6, 115: it is originally an adjective from the name of a town: Ḥaršu, Ḥarša. An older form haršitu, known in Ancient Akkadian and Ur. III*, denotes ‘gentilic referring to a breed of sheep’, ibid., 113. Ḥaršā, referring to a breed of horses, solves the mystery of the origin of English ‘horse’. Scholars had been unable to find the etymology of this term. It also explains the German Ross, which reappears in the Italian word rozza ‘an old, run-down horse’.

The origin of German ‘Seele’, English ‘Soul’.

Mystery has surrounded the origin of English soul, German Seele. The words were thought to stem from sea, see, of unknown origin. In reality soul recalls the netherworld, which in Hebrew is šēōl ‘abyss, nether world’, while Seele shows the influence of the Akkadian base šillu ‘shadow’.

The origin of German ‘Leib’ body.

The proposition of Indo-European as the original source language is put in jeopardy by Germanic. When seeking the origin of Leib ‘body’, or life the scholar is directed to a remote Greek root λίπος ‘fat’. However, the most authoritative and oldest base is the Semitic Akkadian libbu meaning Leib itself ‘abdomen, parts of the body, inside’. This term is also the origin
of the word Liebe ‘love’ since libbu, Hebrew libbā, Semitic lubb denotes
the internal organs of the body but also signifies ‘heart, mind, wish, desire,
preference’. It is clearly the origin of Latin ‘libet’, ‘lubet’ (cf. Semitic lubb)
‘likes’ and of Old High German lōben ‘to praise’. The Germanic root leib-
meaning ‘to remain’, with which the English life has erroneously been con-
ected, is hence misleading. As far as the suggested root *leip- ‘to oil, to
stick’, is concerned, this derives from Akkadian lepu, lipu ‘fat, sallow’,
Greek λίπος.

A few more examples.

In order to evaluate the conditions in which etymology operates on the
symbolic codes of roots in the modern world, which has remote bases, it is
sufficient to examine the treatment of common terms such as English ware
(‘to look’), German wahren ‘to keep’ etc., which were referred to the root
*wer ‘to perceive, to look after’. Ware, German wahren, for which the same
base *wer- was proposed, however, call for a more distant starting point,
such as Akkadian barūm ‘to look upon, to watch over, to observe’ from
which we have bārū ‘diviner’. Similarly, for English walk and German wal-
ken ‘to tread’ etc., Sanskrit valgati ‘jump, dance’ was chosen! The root
*wel- ‘to roll’ is not pertinent. Walk corresponds to Semitic hlk, Akkadian
(h)alāku ‘to walk about, to go, to move’: the initial w- is the result of a la-
ryngeal fricative.

Similarly, English to burn, German brennen are said to stem from a root
*gʷer-. This becomes irrelevant if Semitic languages are considered: He-
brew bā‘ar ‘to burn’, Akkadian barāru ‘to blaze’. So it is with English
burn in the sense ‘brook’, and German Brunnen ‘well’, which were thought
to be related to the base of brew, in the sense of making beer. Clearly burn
has Semitic roots: Akkadian būrum ‘well, pool, hole’.

For English to spring, the season spring and German springen ‘to come
up’, a root was hypothesized on the basis of a Sanskrit verb meaning ‘to de-
sire’. The season spring, however, points to a base meaning ‘a shoot’, since
the initial s- is not etymological and the base corresponds to Akkadian pi-
rhu, perhru ‘sprout, blossom’, with the verb parāhu ‘to sprout’. The mo-
 bile initial s- stems from the original Akkadian definite pronoun ša, šu.

It is interesting to consider some further modern-day examples. When
Max Pfister presented his Lessico Etimologico Italiano at the Amsterdam Con-
ference, he was asked to speak on the theme Language and culture in Europe.
He chose the word ‘apex’ as a paradigmatic example and related several
Lombard terms to it, such as awas ‘underground water’, avis, aves ‘under-
ground waters’, for which terms Hubschmid had correctly suggested a pre-Latin *apis/o. Max Pfister was however aware that ‘apex’ ‘olive sprig on the top of the flamen’s cap’ was not etymological. It has now been ascertained that it is compounded from Semitic bases, the oldest being Akkadian appu ‘tip, edge’, and išu ‘tree, wood’. The Lombard terms mentioned, meaning ‘waters’ are obviously totally different since awas, awis can be identified with the hydronym common in the forms Apsa, Avesa, Ausa: Akkadian apsû ‘deep water, subterranean water’, Sumerian ab-zu.

When the English term birch, German Birke and Sanskrit bhuṛja were first grouped together as a paradigm of Proto-Indo-European unity, in order to reconstruct a hypothetical base, Indo-European *bherg, a historical link capable of illustrating the true meaning was missing. This proved to be similar to that of the Latin ‘betulla’ (also unknown), which as Plinius wrote also expresses virginal whiteness, and originally meant ‘virgin’ as in Hebrew bêtulâ ‘chaste maiden, virgin’. Proof of this meaning is to be found in the origin of English birch (*bherg). It has ancient roots in Akkadian perḫu, perḫu ‘sprout’ (“Spross”), that is Latin ‘virgo’ and ‘virga’ a sprig that has not yet produced fruit.

Among the most august and profaned sacred words is the term freedom. Free, German frei, Anglo-Saxon freo etc. are said to stem from a root *pri- meaning ‘to love’, and from the Sanskrit priyâḥ ‘dear’. The relationships become more confused when the Latin term līber ‘free’ and līberi ‘sons’ are mixed. In reality ‘free’ etc. originally had an élitist sense. It is from the base of German Frau, the ‘chosen’ and therefore ‘beloved’: from Akkadian bērum, bērum ‘choice’, Hebrew bêhir ‘elect’: from Akkadian bērum, Hebrew bēhar ‘to select, to choose, to like, to love’.

The origins of rain and the German verb regen were unknown. For Gothic régna and Anglo-Saxon reg, the Latin term rigo ‘irrigate’ was suggested; this however was ‘sans étymologie’ (Ernout–Meillet). Regen is Akkadian rēhû, rēhû ‘to pour itself’ (‘sich ergiessen’), Aramaic rhê (Papyri), and recalls Akkadian raḥasu, Arabic raḥada, Hebrew raḥas ‘to wash’, Semitic raḥd.

The English verb try, meaning, following Onions, ‘examine and determine’, is related to Old French trier ‘to distinguish’ and to Catalan triar. It has also been said to stem from a Gallic–Roman verb of unknown origin. Its base is, however, fully documented in Semitic scripts. In Hebrew it is tūr ‘to explore, to investigate, to go about as a spy or scout; to search’. The verb has filtered along the same lines as haras ‘race’, the source of English horse and German Ross. Hebrew tūr harks back to Akkadian tāru, Assyrian tuārum ‘to turn, to turn around, to approach’.
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WHO ARE THE ARYANS?

In the past the term *Aryan* meant Indo-European, and it is still used by some English linguists in this sense.

The Sanskrit term *āryaḥ*, in Ancient Persian *arya*, recalls the Sanskrit *arīḥ* ‘foreigner’.

Thieme proposes relating this term to the Greek accretive prefix ἀρι and also hypothesizes the base ἐρις ‘contest’; this is, however, untenable.

The Sanskrit terms *arīḥ*, *āryaḥ* denote the nomadic invaders, the foreigners who invaded the Punjab area and subjected the inhabitants. The original base of the Sanskrit terms is that of Akkadian *āru* ‘to go, to advance against, to attack’. There is also the connecting term in Aramaic and Hebrew *aḥer* ‘foreign’, which, by way of contrast, reveals the real meaning of the Sanskrit term used for the native population subjected by the Aryans: *dāṣāḥ*, meaning ‘barbarian, slave, adversary, devil’, *dāṣyuh* ‘barbarian, cruel’. These terms, which had no etymology, in fact stem from the base of Akkadian *dāṣum* (to treat with injustice, to treat with disrespect), Hebrew *dūš* ‘to tread down’.

The *Aryan* society of the Brāhamana, *Kṣatriya* and *Vaiśya*.

The names of the Indian castes, for example *brāhmaṇaḥ* the brahmin, belonging to the class of priests, are not of Indian origin. As has been mentioned above, the name *bṛāhmaṇeṣ*, presupposes roots like Sumerian *bara*, Akkadian *parakku* ‘temple’, Hebrew *baraḥ* ‘worship god, pray’. This was the caste that claimed spiritual dominance and developed currents of thought and of faith that were far removed from the cultural and moral level normally attributed to the Aryan invaders.

Similarly *Kṣatriyāḥ* ‘master’ (‘Herr’), a member of the second caste, in Avestan *hābryō* ‘holder of power, master’, was related to Sanskrit *ksatrām* denoting ‘power, might, rule’: Ancient Persian *hšām* ‘rule, kingdom’, however the origin was unknown.

The base corresponds to Akkadian *kaššu* ‘mighty, strong’, Ancient Assyrian *kaššu* ‘a high official in Anatolia’: *kiššūtu* is ‘power, might, totality’. The component -*niya* of *kṣatriya* corresponds to the Semitic base *r*, Akkadian *rūa*, Ancient Aramaic *r*, Hebrew *re* ‘associate’.

The name *vaiśya*, member of the third caste, is connected to the Sanskrit base *vīt* > *vīṣ*- ‘dwelling place of a family, race, tribe’. However *vīt*
corresponds to Akkadian bitu ‘dwelling place, house, encampment: of nomads, family, household, aggregate of property’.

The ruling gods of the Indo-Europeans.

The treaty between the Hittite king Šuppiluliuma I and the deposed king of Mitanni, Mattiú(z)za (or Kurtiu(a)z)za or Šat-ti-ú-a (z)-za as his name is written today) was compiled in the Akkadian language in about 1380 B.C. Several copies are extant.

Among the Babylonian gods invoked by the Mitanni king to bear witness to his loyalty to the Hittite king, we find Mi-it-ra-aš-il and U-ru-ya-na-aš-ši-il (variant A-ru-na-aš-ši-il) and In-dar (variant In-da-ra) and the Na-ša-at-ti-ia-an-na. Dumézil’s choice of title concerning the ruling Indo-European gods is an utter misrepresentation of history. The title is The Indian Gods of the Indo-Europeans. It should read The Mitanni gods of the Indians.

The names of the Mitanni gods were rediscovered in the Rg-Veda and the final -šil was thought to be ‘a Hurrian approximation’ aiming to express a trait peculiar to Sanskrit, the double dual of Mitra-Várûṇa (Dumézil). This characteristic, the dvanda, is not peculiar to Sanskrit. It is present in Greek, in Osco-Umbrian and even in The Chronicles of Nestor. What is important is to seek the origins of the names of these gods and ascertain if, originally, they were really part of the Ancient Indian paradise.

The Mitanni Empire was centred on the left bank of the Euphrates, south of Taurus. It included the northern part of Mesopotamia and, from about the fifteenth century B.C., also the western part of Assyria. Kurtiu(a)z)za had surely no need to invoke the gods of other peoples. In the Akkadian text the names of the gods invoked gain significance from the very language in which they are written. Mi-it-ra-aš-ši-il denotes gods favouring fairness (regarding the treaty) and reveals the bases of Akkadian mithāru, mithāra: ‘fair, equal’ (‘einander entsprechen, gleich’). It includes the preposition ašša, aššum, aššumi ‘related to, concerning’ (‘wegen’), and i’lu, e’lu ‘written agreement’ (‘Vertrag’) from e’elu ‘to bind’. Similarly, U-ru-ya-na-aš-ši-el (the variant A-ru-na-aš-ši-il shows evidence of the different cultural setting in which the Akkadian text was transcribed) denotes the sky, or rather the vault of heaven, and can be analysed as Akkadian urû (‘Dach’), (W)anu, Anu (‘Himmelsgott’) and ašši-e-’l- ‘for, in favour of, the treaty’. The other god invoked is In-dar (variant In-dara) and means ‘for eternity’: Akkadian in- or ina ‘in, an’ (‘zeitlich’) and dāru ‘eternity’ (‘Ewigkeit’). The spirits concealed in the Na-ša-at-ti-ia-an-na, invoked by the Mitanni king, are “my benevolent ones”, “my entities showing fa-
vour”: we should bear in mind the plural of Akkadian nāṣū (“Träger’) and annu ‘consent, benevolence’. If these gods are to be identified with the Indian gods Mitraḥ, Vāruṇa, Indra and the Nāsatya, the hypothesis of the presence of Para-Indians on the Euphrates is unfounded: the origin of the names of the great gods reveals the Mesopotamian matrix and the transition from the Near East to India. Indian Mitraḥ is the same as Sanskrit mitraḥ which means ‘favouring understanding, friend’ (neuter mitrām ‘agreement, understanding, contract’). As has been seen, mitrāh stems from a base corresponding to Akkadian mīṭārū ‘fair’, an adjective from the Akkadian word maḥārū ‘to please, to be equal’, mīṭhūrū ‘to agree with each other’. In Sanskrit however a tumult of almost homophonic bases merge together and enrich the original range of meaning of the bases. In terms of strict chronology, in the Rg-Veda one does not perceive a definite difference between Mitraḥ and Vāruṇa. Similarly, in the Atharva Veda, Vedic prose literature, the two gods are conceived as being interchangeable.

The name Vāruṇa was unexplained. Its origins, however, are very different from the name of the god invoked in the Mitanni king’s treaty. One must imagine a supreme god, a heavenly hypostasis enveloping and protecting everything, from the whole world to the village. The bases of its name are found in Sanskrit váraḥ ‘turn, circumference, place, environment’, which corresponds to Akkadian wārum ‘to turn’, with the ending -una where -u- reveals the presence of a partly concealed -a- in the Mesopotamian name of ‘heaven’, of Sumerian origin: Akkadian Anu deified ‘Heaven’: a two-faced Janus guarding the confines of the earth. The -u- of Vāruṇa is analogous to Sanskrit udān ‘water’, where u- stands for the original a- of Akkadian adûm (edûm), Latin ‘unda’.

It is consequently clear why, originally, the functions of the two divinities Vāruṇa and Mitraḥ were incorporated within one supreme power.

Researchers failed to notice that the Akkadian base of Mitraḥ is the same as that of a Slavic term: Russian mir ‘peace, border, agreement’: Akkadian mihru ‘correspondence’ from maḥārū ‘to please’. However, this is consonant with the base of Akkadian miṣru ‘border, border line, territory’: bel miṣri is the ‘neighbour’, literally ‘the lord of the border, of the land’.

Many theories can be objectively confirmed only when the history of key words is fully examined. Thus the “new, comparative mythology”, as Americans called Dumézil’s research, may fall at the starting post since it presupposes a divine triad dominating the Indo-European Pantheon, including that of Rome. To make up the triad, ‘Quirinus’ is given a place alongside Jupiter and Mars. ‘Quirinus’, however, is originally an adjective used as an attribute with the name of a god: It does not only stand for Ro-
mulus. The name ‘Romulus’ means ‘the one of the foundations’ and derives from the base of Akkadian ramû ‘to lay the foundations’ (‘Fundament anlegen lassen’), ‘to position the dwelling’ (‘Wohnung aufschlagen’). It is evident that the adjective ‘quirinus’ can be applied to Romulus but it can also be used for ‘Mars’, called according to Servius ‘Quirinus’ when he is ‘tranquillus’; that is, when he is not out fighting. The origin of the adjective ‘quirinus’ and that of ‘quiris’ – literally ‘belonging to the village, the town’ is now certain. It is from a Semitic base: Akkadian kirḥu, Hebrew qîr ‘wall: of a house or town’, qirjä: Aramaic qirjä ‘city’.

Brāhma.

The semantic value first assigned to brāhma was ‘form, formation, representation, creation’ (‘Formung, Gestaltung’). In this sense, the term finds no antecedent in Indo-European; but, as a late Vedic personification, it reveals Aramaic influences. The Hebrew term bārā, meaning ‘to form, to create, to make’, and Sanskrit brahmān, meaning ‘the one who reveals, who creates: the poet, the priest who officiates at sacrifice’ have remote links with Akkadian bārûm ‘diviner’, (‘Opferschaupriester’), connections with barāum ‘to be variegated, speckled’ and barmum ‘speckled’.

The name of the divinity Brahman-, personification of the neuter brahman, shows other influences, such as Akkadian barāḫu ‘to shine’, an allotropic form of parāqu ‘to flash’, and Hebrew bārah ‘to bless, to praise, to ask blessing’ and paramālu ‘sanctuary, temple’ (‘Heiligtum, Hochsitz’), Syrian praḳkah ‘altar’.

Ātmā ‘breath, soul’, Old High German ātum, German Atem ‘breath’, was wrongly related to Greek ἤτοι (see above). The original meaning is ‘flatus vocis’. The holy Sanskrit word corresponds to Akkadian atmû ‘speech’.

Visṇuh is a beneficent god who attains moments of glory in the Rg-Veda, and together with Śiva has an important position in Hinduism. The term means that Visnuh drives away evil and enmity. Obviously, of its essence, ‘nicht sicher erklärt’ (Mayrhofer). It derives from Sanskrit vi- with its meaning of ‘off, apart’ (‘weg’), corresponding to Semitic -b-: Ugaritic b- (which has the meaning of Hebrew min: ‘apart, away from’). The component -ṣnuh derives from a Semitic base: Akkadian śīnu, šīnu, ‘wicked’ (cf. οὐνομάω and Latin ‘sons’), Hebrew śinā ‘enmity’. Connections with the Sanskrit term sānu, the origin of which was unknown, were erroneously proposed.
Suryaḥ.

The etymologies proposed for Suryaḥ, the Sun, are inconsistent. The hypothesized roots and the proposed connection to *āFελ are clearly biased. It derives from the base of Akkadian šarāru, Sumerian sur ‘to flash: of shooting stars’, šārīru ‘a star’.

Śivāḥ.

The name Śivāḥ, meaning ‘kind, friendly’, is of Semitic origin. It recalls Aramaic and Hebrew siwān, Babylonian siwānu (simānu), the third month of the Babylonian calendar, corresponding to June–July. From the same base we have Akkadian siwanu (simānu) ‘season, proper time’, noun from asāmu ‘to be suitable, fitting’. Its attribute of rudrā- ‘shining’ is easily understood, referring as it does to the force of the summer sunlight in the month of the reaping of crops and of ripe fruits. Rudrā- was said to relate to Latin ‘rudis’, the origin of which was unknown. It recalls the name of refined bronze, ‘rudis’, of Sumerian origin: Akkadian urudā ‘copper’ (‘Kupfer’).

The lingam was a symbol of the fecundity and authority ‘sign’ (‘Merkmal’) of Śivāḥ-Rudrā-. Originally it may have been a branch, an offshoot, a stick, symbolising the phallus (Mayrhofer). Etymologically, it is close to Akkadian ligiwūm (ligimūm), Sumerian li-gi-n ‘offshoot, offspring’.

Agni.

The name Agni, hypostasis of fire, derives from Semitic bases: Egyptian ’ikn. Hittite aganni draws upon Semitic roots, as does the Latin term ‘ignis’ (see above).

Vāsuḥ.

Vāsuḥ means ‘excellent’. It is confused with vāsu ‘possession, property’. Its origin was completely unknown. The Greek term ἐὖς was considered, as was Hittite aššu ‘good’. The meaning of ‘excellent, high’ leads us to the Akkadian term wāšū ‘high-rising’, from wašū ‘to rise: said of the sun’, while the Sanskrit term vāsu ‘possession, property’ corresponds to Akkadian bišu (‘Habe, Besitz’), in Ancient Assyrian bāšū ‘available’.
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So it is for devāḥ ‘heavenly, divine’, Latin ‘deus’, ‘dīvus’, Gallic Dévo, Ancient Germanic teiw-, Old High German Zio ‘god’. The Indo-European d- (like the d- of δόο) stems from an original t-: Akkadian tebû ‘to rise’ (‘aufstehen’), tebūm, tūbum ‘a rise’ (‘Erhebung’). One is reminded of Latin ‘sub divo’. Neo-Persian dēv ‘demon’, Avestan daēvō, ancient divinity and devil, shares the semantic value of Akkadian tebû ‘to rise, to rebel’ (‘aufstehen’). Confirmation of the fact that d- derives from t- is to be found in Sanskrit devā: ‘brother of the husband’: Akkadian taʾʾumu ‘twin’ (‘zwillings’).

The lexical plane of Ancient Indian.

The search for a historical identity in Ancient Indian poses the same problems which led to a reconsideration of the real nature of the Greek and Latin terms which, together with many from the modern ages, were still suffering from a state of age-long doubt and contradiction.

The questions which remained unanswered for a great number of terms, both in Sanskrit and in our own cultural spheres, are proof of the heroic, but often futile, efforts undertaken by numerous scholars. Simple words, such as Ancient Indian āpah, said to be related to the Latin word ‘opus’ lacked any historical basis. The relation between the two was still coloured by Biblical sadness: “You multiplied the numbers of men but not their happiness”. Āpah and ‘opus’ come from the base of Assyrian epāšu, Akkadian epēšu, but cf. also Hebrew ‘ābad, ‘to work, to labour’: Akkadian epēšu ša dulli is the ‘work’ (‘Arbeit’) of a fatigue party whereas (as the past has a truly old heart) ‘ābad leads as far as the German word Amt, by way of Celtic ‘ambactus’.

Thus, for Ancient Indian āpah (apsv of the Rg-Veda IV, 7), which returns in Messapic Mεσ-απία and in Old Prussian ape ‘river’, an Indo-European dialectal variant was dreamt up: *ap- of ‘water’ whereas it in fact derives from Akkadian apsû ‘deep water, subterranean water’. The birth of etymology must have been influenced by a brilliant Indian grammarian, Gārgya, who questioned the origins of words forcedly devised on the grammatical principle that nouns are derived from verbs: for example, the etymology of aṣva ‘horse’ from aṣ ‘to travel’.

The universality of that principle, Čākaṭāyana, of the noun being derived from the verb, seems to have been treated by grammarians with the same respect accorded to the laws governing the universe. Pāṇini accepted Gārgya’s reservations and gave up trying to obtain the etymology of words like aṣva ‘horse’, go ‘cow’, punuṣa ‘man’ that seemed to be of obscure origin
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and hence of uncertain meaning. In order to be identified with Latin ‘equus’, the term ḥaṣa must be traced to Babylonian eqbum, Semitic ‘aqib, Hebrew ‘aqeb ‘hoof’: of a horse, of a quadruped. Greek ἑπποξ derives from the assimilation of ḥb > pp. There is base interference as from Hebrew ḏakaf ‘to drive on’, Akkadian ekēwu (ekēnu). The term eqbum comes up again in Venetic ekvon (Este, 71: cf. G. B. Pellegrini–A. L. Prosdocimi). Gilardini found there ‘bits of horses’ hoofs’. Space restricts us to only a few explorative attempts in the Ancient Indian lexical plane; but such analysis can be extended to almost all Sanskrit terms.

A- ‘this’, Avestan, Ancient Persian a-, demonstrative pronoun, is Aramaic, Neo-Babylonian a-, aga ‘this’, ‘that’. Áva, ‘down from, from’ is an adverbial form from Akkadian appu in the sense of ‘tip’. Ándhāh ‘dark’: Akkadian antalu ‘solar eclipse’.

Another of the many paradigms, which define the direction of the irradiation, is that of the Ancient Indian noun máḍhu. It expresses ‘that which is sweet: drink, food, honey’ and comes up again in Osset. digor mud ‘honey’; in Greek μεθύ, ‘sweetened wine’, in Old High German metu ‘hydromel’, in μέλι ‘honey’, in Finnish mete-, in Hungarian méz-, Chinese mjēt > mi, in Sino-Korean mil, in Japanese mitsu. The Turkish and Mongolian term bal ‘honey’ derives from *maddu-. It returns in Tokharian mot ‘aphrodisiac drink’, in Old Slavonic *medu-. The oldest record of Semitic mtq, mtq remains Ancient Babylonian matāqu ‘to become sweet’, matqu ‘sweet’. Arabic mádī did much to extend the range of influence of this term.


Kāmaḥ originally meant ‘point, that which juts out’, hence ‘ear’. The proposed references are untenable. It corresponds to Akkadian qāru ‘horn’ in the sense of ‘protruding part’, especially as referred to the moon (‘horn, cusp of the moon’).

Ṭālu ‘palate’, that is high part (cf. Latin ‘palatus’, Etruscan *phalato ‘heaven’) is Semitic in origin. It recalls Hebrew tālāl ‘high, to heighten’.

The initial v- corresponds to the effect of the rough Greek breathing on ḡ: vṛādh ‘to be pleased’: Akkadian rāšu, Hebrew rāā ‘to be pleased’, is influenced by Akkadian rādiu, rēdum ‘official, administrator, member of the police’ (‘Verwalter, einfacher Polizei–Soldat etc’).

Viṣa(-an) ‘strong, procreative, virile’ is Akkadian raṣānu, Arabic raṣuna ‘to be strong, firm’ (‘stark sein, fest sein’).
Vṝhāti ‘tears, pulls off’. The base brh was erroneously refused (Mayrhofer). It is Akkadian pARĀHU ‘to cut off’ (‘abschneiden’).

Vṛścāti ‘cuts, breaks’ is from a base related to Akkadian PARĀSU (‘entschneiden, abtrennen’). In Sanscrit it is a denominative.

The word vānrā ‘colour, race, caste’ has been related to the base vr- ‘cover’. A Scythian term *varna ‘defence, cover, cloak’ is postulated. It is necessary to start from Sanskrit vārman- ‘defence’ (‘Schutzewheer’). This is from the base of Akkadian ḥarāmu (ārāmu: ‘to cover the body or a part of the body’). We are reminded of Hermes, the underworld god in his role as guider of souls (cf. the etymology of Greek χθόν). The adverb vṝtā ‘at will, at pleasure’ recalls Akkadian rūtum, Hebrew re‘ūt ‘delight, desire’. Pūrusā ‘man’, in Pāli purisa ‘man, servant’ establishes a link with Ancient Babylonian purśuwu (puršumu: ‘elderly person’, ‘Greis’) and with Neo-Assyrian parśūmu ‘old slave’ (‘alter Diener’).

Aṣurā ‘powerful, lord’, Avestic ahūrō is derived from AŠurū ‘Assyrian’ in the sense of ‘dominator’.

Sām ‘together, united’ stems from Akkadian samīhu (samāhu) ‘joined together’ (‘miteinander verbunden’). Ancient Indian samāḥ ‘equal’, with the original meaning ‘that goes together’: Hebrew šavā ‘to be like, equal’, derives from the same base.

Sāmā ‘season’ and Avestic ham- ‘summer’ etc., recall Akkadian šamaš (Šawaš) ‘sun’, which returns in Ancient Indian svāh ‘sun’, ‘heaven’, and accords with Akkadian šamū (šawū) ‘heaven’. For Indra, the meaning ‘strong’, the basis of the name, confirmed by the derivative indriyām ‘strength’, attests to the original component, with the sense of Latin ‘durus’ ‘lasting’: Akkadian darū ‘(dauern)’, dūrū ‘(Dauer)’.

How can one explain tāmah ‘darkness’, Vedic tāmas-i, Tokharian B tamaše ‘dark’ etc., if one does not start from Akkadian dāmu ‘dark’ (‘dunkel’)?

Vāsā ‘possession, property’ is from the Akkadian base bašū ‘to be available’: būšu ‘property, goods’, bašitu ‘possessions’. V- corresponds to an original m (pronounced w-): vanōti ‘likes’ is from the base of Akkadian manu (wanu ‘to love’).

The Sanskrit word yavanāh, denoting the Greeks, the Ionians, is Semitic: Hebrew yāvān ‘Ionia, Greece’.

Rāma- ‘lovable’ (‘lieblich’) is from the base of Akkadian rāmu, Arabic ra’ima ‘to love’ (‘lieben’).

For svāhā ‘health’, one should consider Latin ‘salus’. For virāh ‘man’, Latin ‘vir’. Śīrah ‘point’ is Akkadian šīru ‘protruding, jutting out’.
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The origin of *Nāsatya*, the name used for the *Āśvin*, the heavenly horsesriders, was unknown. The hypothesized meaning was ‘saviours, healers’ from *nāsate*. In actual fact it is derived from the Akkadian base *našš* ‘to lead, guide the horses’ (‘trügen: Pferde’). They are the horses of the rising sun (*Sūryah*): Akkadian *našū* (‘Träger’), *našū* (‘tragen: Glanz’). The base merges with that of Akkadian *nēšum, naʾāšum* ‘to heal’ (‘genesen’).

Sanskrit *dhārmāḥ* indicates lasting order; it denotes all that is fixed for a long time and stems from Akkadian *dārum* ‘everlasting, perpetual’.

In the *Rg-Veda*, *kárma* is the ceremony of adoration of the gods. It retains the meaning of its Akkadian base: *karābu* ‘to make the gesture of adoration or greeting, to pronounce formulas of praise, adoration, homage etc’, *karābu* ‘prayer, blessing’.

*Uṣāḥ* ‘dawn’, Greek *ēwς*, Aeolian *ōwς*, corresponds to Akkadian *usāʿu* ‘to rise: said of the sun’. On a similar semantic plane, Sanskrit *āhar* ‘day’, erroneously related to the base of German *Tag*, derives from Akkadian *waḥar* (*mahrū*) denoting the first part of the day: *mahrū* ‘earlier’ (‘früherer’). It is the Etruscan *Ucer* who, together with his four steeds, accompanies the rising sun in the Tuscania mirror.

*Sōmah*, the plant with inebriating juice, is the subject of much literature (CAD, 17, 315 and following). Its praises are sung throughout the ninth book of the *Rg-Veda* and it is deified as the haoma of the Avestā. It is Akkadian *šāmmu* ‘the plant of the heart’, which the god “Śamaš brought down from the mountain”. As a heavenly god, its name recalls Akkadian *šamū* ‘heaven’. Its inebriating effect is stressed in the Hebrew term *šāmām* ‘to be stupefied, astonished’.

*māyā* ‘power, strength’ could be related to *mā* ‘to measure’ etc. It comes down by way of Aramaic; the original base is Semitic. There are even echoes in Hebrew *māʾōz* ‘fortress’, *meʾōd* ‘power, strength’: cf. Akkadian *mašāhu* ‘to measure’.

There are few words within the realm of Ancient Indian that can not be related to ancient Semitic sources after a close analysis of the lexical heritage. Thousands are found on the same plane of reference. How can one etymologize Sanskrit *ṭiśe* ‘has’: *ṭiṭa* ‘possessor’ without referring essentially to Akkadian *išū* ‘to have’ (‘haben’)? Or *ṭiṭ* ‘small’ without referring to Akkadian *išu* ‘small, little quantity’ (‘gering, wenig’), *išūtu* ‘littleness’ (‘Wenigkeit’)? Similarly, Sanskrit *iśā* ‘post, pole’ is the counterpart of Akkadian *išu, iššu* ‘pole, stick’ (‘Pfahl, Waffe, Holz’). This is also the base of *ṭišū* ‘arrow, weapon to be thrown’ (‘Pfeil’). Sanskrit *ivā, evā* and *vām* ‘so’ correspond to the base of Akkadian *ewūm* (*Ś*: ‘gleichmachen’). Sanskrit *ruśan* ‘shining’ is Akkadian *ruššūm* ‘reddening: of the sun’ (‘rot: v. Sonne’).
INTRODUCTION

Thousands of words from Ancient Indian must thus be returned to the civilization whose language the Mitanni and Hittite kings adopted when compiling their treaty. When considering mahām ‘gift’, it is not possible to close one’s eyes to Ugaritic mgn, Hebrew māgan, miggen ‘to give’, Aramaic maggan, Arabic magğan ‘gift’ (‘Geschenk’). The Sanskrit pronoun amū- ‘that’ is said to be connected to the base of a- ‘this’, which is the same as the Aramaic and Neo-Babylonian demonstrative ā, a ‘that’. It corresponds, in actual fact, to the Ancient Assyrian pronoun ammû, ammiu ‘that’. Sanskrit ānu ‘according to’, Greek āvō, corresponds to Akkadian ana ‘to’. It is possible to continue in this vein; however the problem is of enormous proportions and cannot be dealt with in full here. Sumerian and Akkadian hymnology should also be compared to the Vedic creations: veda ‘knowledge’ is Akkadian wadû (edû: ‘to know’).

The glorification of Indian culture was celebrated by Friedrich Schlegel; but scholars were not yet ready to burn even one grain of incense for the older and more extensive culture of Mesopotamia. In the eighth century B.C., one type of Semitic script came to north-western India from Mesopotamia. The most remote Indian adaptation is that seen on coins and inscriptions in the third century B.C. It is referred to as brāhmi or Brahma script. Evidence of its reading from right to left as in Semitic script, are still extant. These are the real origins of all other Indian writings. Yet, if we consult the etymological dictionary of Manfred Mayrhofer, to find the origin of Ancient Indian nāraḥ ‘running water’, there is only a reference to Greek ναός ‘running water’; there is no possibility of finding any reference to its real origins, that is, Aramaic, as can be expected for Indian terms. To date, the fact that countless numbers of Ancient Indian words had clear Semitic origins was concealed or ignored by ‘Indo-Europeans’. Akkadian naru might have upset the whole accepted system. This system, however, has no historical basis.

The symbol of the course of the sun and of fertility: the swastika.

The Sanskrit form svastih is analysed on the basis of āsti ‘is’ (cf. Ancient Indian as ‘to be’). The result is a substantivated verbal form used as a noun: svasti- ‘health, well-being’ (Ṛg-Veda - Šāmhitā). Hence svastika-, an auspicious figure. Other linguists analyse āsu- ‘existence’ etc.

The characteristic form of the swastika, a cross with four equal arms bent back at right-angles towards the left, symbolises the movement of the sun. It does not come from India: the symbol was known in Mesopotamia and already recorded in Helam in early Bronze Age pottery. It was used in
Egypt, Cyprus, Crete. In Europe it was used as a decoration in the early Iron Age. In Greece, in Bocotia, was found on clay statuettes mounted on fibulae and on vases of geometric design. It spread to India, Tibet, China. Svastaih is from Sanskrit svāh ‘sun’ which is of Semitic origin.

Careful linguistic analysis reveals once more how much Ancient Indian culture owes to the civilizations of Mesopotamia.

On the Christian tombs of believers awaiting resurrection, the sun-symbol came to denote the promise of everlasting return. The symbol tells us that the sun is near: svastih is derived from Akkadian Šawaš (šamaš ‘sun’). There is the sense of tīhu ‘nearness’, from the verb ṭeḥû ‘to approach’. From the darkness the voice of the Idumean watchman in the arcane oracle of Isaiah is still heard: “A voice was heard from Seir: Sentry, how long will the night last?” In the past, the sun-symbol was made into an obscure, threatening sign; however today the history of the Near East can sweep aside this misinterpretation.

THE ANCIENT TOponymic UNITY OF OUR CONTINENT

The first volume of this study developed a wide range of research into the toponymy of the European world, giving new insights into this field through successive approximations to previously unknown, age-old facts, since the truth, which carried no weight in the research into the antiquity of our Continent, is that the most ancient names of regions, cities, lakes, rivers and mountains take no account of the passage and presence of Indo-European peoples.

The ancient heart of the future: the origins of the name York.

One of the ancient names with very clear origins is ‘Eburācum’, which became the great English town York, the Celtic Caer Ebrauc. This is certainly the pre-Latin word used in the American New York. The primitive settlement was in the middle of the Vale of York depression, at the confluence of the rivers Foss and Ouse: its slight elevation marked the easiest crossing point. Etymologically it derives from two words of Semitic origin meaning ‘over the water’ and ‘crossing the water’: the Akkadian ebberu ‘travelling across’, ebar ‘beyond’, ebēru ‘to cross: water’, and the word meaning ‘water’, ‘river’: the Akkadian agū ‘current, flow of water, wave’. Before defining the term shire, as in Yorkshire, which reappears meaning district in Old English and is found again in Sher-field, Shir-land etc., it must
be stated that nothing was known about it, since the Old High German *scira*, which is found in two glosses meaning *charge*, cannot be traced back to Latin ‘cura’. A remote starting point, known to Latin, meaning ‘division, department’ harks back to the Semitic word *skr* to Akkadian *sekeru, sakaru* ‘to dam up, to close’. The noun is *sikru* ‘seclusion, cloistering, weir, dam’. This starting point gives the Latin ‘sacer’, originally meaning ‘protected from the profane’, of which nothing was known; thus ‘sacarium’ etc. This brings us to the origins of ‘Britannia’: the Akkadian *beritu, biritu*, ‘terrain surrounded by water, island’.

It is necessary to free English toponymy from wild etymologies: for example in compound words including the Old English *catt*: this was understood as ‘cat in the sense of wild cat’, as in Ekwall’s work (Oxford, at the Clarendon Press). As the Old English *tun*, Celtic *dunum* and even the various ancient *Tunis* of North Africa, spring from Akkadian *dunum, dunnum* ‘fort, fortified house and area’, (CAD, 3, 184), so *catt* can be traced to the Babylonian *kadum* ‘fortified outpost’. Many place-names, such as *Musbury, Musgrave* were wrongly supposed to derive from ‘mice’; even *Muston*, Old English *Mus-tun* was interpreted as a ‘mouse infested tun’ (Ekwall). Later it was suggested that *must* could be a ‘muddy stream or place’. *Mosa, Mosella* and *Moskva* attest to the presence in Europe of the word corresponding to Akkadian *mushum, musium, musa’u* ‘outflow of water, land irrigated’: from Akkadian *asu, wasu* ‘to go away, to move out’, *asitu* ‘exit, drainage canal’.

Thus Albion, the old name for Great Britain, in the Romantic era was again linked with Latin ‘albus’ and passed for ‘white island’. Here the Old Ligurian world is helpful with ‘Albium Ingaunum’ *Albenga*, ‘Albium Intimilium’ *Ventimiglia*, which with the river ‘Albis’ reveal that *Albion* is the *Land of the Channel*: it is the ancient Akkadian *halpium*, Sumerian *halbia*, *halbi* ‘a kind of well’. Proof can be found in ‘Belgium’, facing the Channel, which harks back to Semitic: Hebrew *peleg* ‘river, brook, stream’, Akkadian *palgum*.

Elsewhere I have recounted how Queen Elizabeth II, upon a visit to Italy, in reply to President Pertini’s remark about the War years against a traditional ally, stated that two millennia of history united the countries and that nothing could erase the signs. In particular, the fact that ancient names closely link the Ligurians and Lepontians to the ancient Britons has already been emphasised: the ancient name of Richborough, ‘Routoupia’ of Ptolemy, ‘Rutubi portus’ recalls the name of the Ligurian river ‘Rutuba’, the Roia, which comes from afar, from the Mediterranean: ‘Rutubis’ is a port of Mauritia Tingitana. The word is from a Semitic base, Akkadian,
clearly a hydronym: ruṭṭubu, raṭbu ‘wet’ (‘durchfeuchtet’), ruṭṭubu ‘to wet’ (‘befeuichten’). Richborough evokes ancient Rich-, recalls the Akkadian riḫû ‘to pour’, Hebrew rî ‘river’ and Akkadian bûru, bûrtu ‘hole, well, waterhole, source’; it is Old High German furt ‘ford’ confused with the Latin base ‘portare’. Thus we have the English and Italian hydronym Amber (Ambre), Tuscan Ambra, German Amper, which derive from the Sanskrit āmbhah: the Sanskrit term, like abhrám goes back to the Akkadian abārum, appārum, Sumerian ambar ‘lagoon’.

The cardinal points.

For an old inhabitant of Kentucky, the borders of the United States were marked to the North by the northern lights, to the East by the rising sun, to the South by the precession of the equinoxes and to the West by the Judgment Day.

It is not only the common speaker who is far from realising the origins of the words North, South, East, and West. Scholars have also found it difficult to trace east to the Greek ἐως, Homerian ἱός daun and Asia. East derives from the base of Akkadian āsitu ‘exit’: from the verb (w)āṣû ‘to rise: said of the sun’. West from the root i.e. *wes in the sense west, exit of the sun from the horizon, disappearance, is from the same base as east: wa-šātu ‘moving out’ (‘Auszug’). The etymology of North was also unknown. The base nor- is found in Norway (North way), accessible from the South via various straits. Nor- is from the German base Nehrungen (see Näringer) the typical land strips on the Baltic coast; the same base of narrow, Anglo-Saxon nearu, and Old Saxon naru. Nor- reappears in Old Nordic Njorvasund (see Kluge ‘straits of Gibraltar’).

The etymology is given by the Semitic nahr, Akkadian nāru, nartu ‘canal, river’; nor- returns in ‘Noricum’ the region between the Danube and Inn rivers. Njord is the ancient Swedish and Norwegian divinity of fertile waters. ‘Belgium’ is also, as has been stated, the land facing the Channel. In an analogous manner, ‘boreal’, that is ‘northern’, from Greek Borēas, the Thracian wind which appeared to come from the swamps and the Hellespont stretch of water, is from the base of Akkadian bûrum ‘stretch of water’. Baltic is also from a hydronym base with the original meaning ‘lagoon, swamp’: Akkadian balītītu ‘pond’. It is known that ambra, which emerged from the glaucous sediment of the sea, at the mouths of the rivers opening into the Baltic, is the very ancient Sumerian ambar, ‘lagoon’. South, Old Frisian sūth etc. had no etymology. It is Akkadian šūtu ‘south’, Aramaic šūta, ‘south, south wind’ (‘Süden, Südwind’).
Queen's word.

The discovery of Ebla has widened the horizons of ancient history to reveal a vast cultural unity, reaching from the Persian Gulf to the shores of the Mediterranean and Europe. Gelb's theory of a cultural koiné in the third millennium B.C. in the Syro-Mesopotamian area, centering on Kiš, is interesting although it needs further definition.

Leibniz intuitively knew that the ancient names of rivers, mountains and passes used by the Germanic peoples hid the secret of a living past.

Today we can clearly state that names such as Bonn, the ancient 'Bonna', Banbury, Banwell, Banningham, as well as the ancient name of Vienna, 'Vindobona', go back to Semitic: Akkadian banû, and Hebrew bânâh 'to build'. This is the root which in English turns Bonhunt ('Banhunt'), into Bonnington, and into 'Bononia' in Italy and on the Danube. Narbona ('Narbo') is the 'construction, the city on the river'. The component Nar-, as in Narborough, was explained in Narford as nearu 'narrow'. However, the fact that it goes back to the Akkadian root närum 'river', Semitic nahr and also has the sense narrow, strait is ignored. The Italic Nera ('Nar') confirms the sense of river and thus the Narenta ('Naro').

In the same way the component Vind-, of the ancient name for Vienna, also denotes 'river', as indeed the Italic hydronym 'Vindupala' and the English 'Windsor' go back to the Akkadian base (w)id 'river' and the Semitic wd 'to go out'. The component -sor of Windsor ('Windlesora') denotes the turning of the river: it is the Akkadian sârû 'to circle, to whirl'.

Vindo- reappears in the form 'Venta': besides the candour which history takes away from 'Vindobona' and the various 'Venta' of Winchester etc., the darkness which was wished upon the Thames ('Tamesis'), Thame and Tame also dissolves. For Thames the Sanskrit Tamasâ, an affluent of the Ganges and tamasa ('dark') were recalled, but this Sanskrit word repeats the Akkadian base da’mu, dāmu- 'dark' and is no use in making the English rivers clear. The name Thames 'Tamesis' originally denoted the 'river of great loops, since, over all the other bases, the Akkadian word tamû 'to turn', tawûm, Semitic ṭwi 'to turn' with the component ašû 'to go out, to go away', ašîtu 'canal, exit' prevailed. Confirmation is to be found in the name 'Londinium', which originally meant 'the small fort, the fortified place on the loop of the river'. It derives from the unknown base of English land-, originally 'surroundings, territory', Italian landa, archaic English laund: from the base *lam > *lan of the Akkadian lamû, lawûm 'to circle a region', lâmû > *lām- > *lān- 'walking round'. The component -dinium of 'Lon-dinium' seems at origin to be a diminutive of the common
Celtic base -dūnum (‘Welsh -din: fort’) of which nothing was known, but which corresponds to the Akkadian dūnum, dunnūm ‘fort, fortified area: strength’, Hebrew dūn ‘to rule’ (see Greek δύναμις). Thus in Celtic toponyms -durum, Bret -dor: English Dor, it is the Akkadian dūrum ‘city wall, wall, house’, Hebrew dōr ‘dwelling’. Dorchester, Bret Doric, place on a Roman road: “D. is on a Roman road: Doric is derived from the root derk-, in Bret derch, Welsh drych, ‘aspect’ etc.” following Ekwall.

However the base *drk-, to be found in Dorking (Dork) is refound in -terg- in ‘Opitergium’, ‘on the high road from Aquileia to Verona’ and corresponds to the Semitic Hebrew derk ‘road, path, way’, the Akkadian daraggu.

The meaning attributed to Kent ‘band, circle’ and thus ‘hem, margin, border’ is strengthened by the etymology of Kent: Caesar’s ‘Cantium’, Diodorus and Strabo’s Kántion, Ptolemy’s Kántion ákron, Beda’s ‘Cantia’. The origins go back to a verified historical base which has entered the language of the Mediterranean: the Old Spanish ‘canthus’ rim of a wheel, the Greek kanthós ‘the corner of the eye’ (Arist. Hist. anim., 491 b 23 etc.), ‘eye’. To these the mountainous belt of Cantabri must be added. The base corresponds to an original plural form: the Akkadian kannātu of kannu ‘belt, band’, from kanānu ‘to coil’; the Hebrew kenā‘a ‘bundle’.

Dover (‘portus Dubris’) is a hydronym: it comes from the root ‘Dub-’, the French river Doubs: the Akkadian tūbbū ‘irrigated’, Sumerian dub ‘to pour’. The second part of ‘Dub-ris’ goes back to the Akkadian rēšu ‘high sea, source’, ‘caput fluminis’, the Aramaic rēšā ‘top, head’.

It is clear that the component magos in Celtic names, for example ‘Rotomagus’ (Rouen), ‘Noviomagus’ (Noyon), derives from the same origin as Sardinian Macomer: from Semitic. It is the Hebrew māqōm ‘stand, abode, dwelling place’. The component Roto- of ‘Rotomagus’, Rouen, on the Seine, is the Akkadian Semitic rātum, Hebrew Aramaic rahat ‘stream’. Furthermore, ‘Raetia’ denotes the region on the borders of the great rivers.

As to the puzzling names of mountains, for example the Cévennes, in Latin ‘Cebenna’, which characterize the Massive Centrale with deep river erosions, the original base is the Akkadian kāpu, Aramaic and Hebrew kēp ‘cliff, rock’, accompanied by the Akkadian ēnu, Semitic ‘ain ‘fountain, spring’, which is the Etruscan -enna, found in many toponyms, such as Ravenna, Cittàfenna, etc. These are also the origins of Capena, the name of the Faliscan city: -ena is also a hydronym.

Pyrenees derives from the name Pyrēnē, according to Herodotus (2, 33) a city at the foot of the mountains from which the Danube springs, Istros.
However, Pyrénè is a hydronym, the name of the famous spring of Corinth: Pyrene recalls the Neo-Assyrian burāni ‘springs’, the plural of the Akkadian būru ‘hole, well’, while Istrōs is the old name of the Danube at its mouth on the shores of the Black Sea, where Assyrians were settled in the third millennium B.C.. Istrōs corresponds to the Akkadian root āšītu ‘exit’, from the Akkadian āsu, Hebrew ḫṣ ‘to gush out’. The ancient Danubian civilizations developed until the third millennium B.C. on the shores of the Danube, on account of the peoples of the Near East following the river backwards from mouth to source. The presence in Hungary of elements of Sumerian culture are proof of this dissemination.

THE IDENTITY OF OUR ANCIENT GODS: JUP(piter) AND JAHVE

Let us bring together our ancient gods so that at the origins of the confusion of the world we are not faced with the variance *Juppiter-Jahvé. It is known that their names are their very being and that our ancient gods were not wiling to reveal their names in their essence, so as not to be ensnared in the language of mortals. Jahvé has Moses say, “I am that which I am”. However the terrible tetragram Jhwh evokes remote syllables Jo-, Ju-, not abbreviations of the name, but components which recall Hebrew Jōm, Arabic jaum, Akkadian ūwu (ūmu) ‘day, storm’ (‘Tag, Sturm’). Jau-, Jaum appear in Akkadian inscriptions of the twentieth century B.C. The remainder of the tetragram, hwh, has the sense of ‘he is’, that is the basis of Semitic: Western hu ‘he’ and Hebrew ḫaja ‘to exist’. As Jupiter Pluvius who speaks with thunderbolts, and as Zeus who amasses clouds, Jahvé accompanies the flight of the Israelites as a cloud by day and as light by night. ‘And the Lord said unto Moses, Lo I come unto thee in a thick cloud’ (Exodus, XIX, 9). Jahvé appears on Mount Sinai in the morning in a storm of thunder and lightning, ‘A thick cloud upon the mount... And mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire: and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly’ (Exodus, XIX, 16-18). The Great God of our people was originally the Lord of storms and light. Jwv – of *Juv-piter, ‘Jupiter’ also enters the history of the tetragram and can be identified with the Akkadian ūwi (ūmi) ‘day, storm’ (‘Tag, Sturm’), in the plural with the sense of ‘time, days’ (‘Tage, Zeit’). The Akkadian ūwu (ūmu) crossed with Akkadian ūwu (ummu) ‘fire’ (‘Hitze’) is the fire of the great furnace in the sky. Nobody suspected that the D- of Sanskrit Divāuḥ, the god of the day and sky and therefore day itself, and Δ- of the Greek genitive Δλός etc., was an
original pronominal component, with a determinative function. The importance of Aramaic, not only through the Persian which reached India, becomes clear. The Aramaic di- (zi-, dê, Ugaritic dê, ancient Akkadian šu, *tu) reveals the sense of Di-yaūh: originally ‘he (that is god) of the day’. -Yâuh and the eternal Semitic jaum, Hebrew jôm can be placed besides Akkadian ūwu: ‘Juv-(piter)’, Jovis, Oscar Jūveis and ΔιόνΥσi. Those who are familiar with these prodigious languages can understand the task of Zeûς invoked νεφεληγείτα amasser of clouds. Zeûνον údɔr the water of Zeus, rain reveals a base traced to the Semitic base of Akkadian zāmath ‘rain’, zanânu ‘to rain’, zinnu ‘rain’. Thus the Homeric Ζηνός, Ζηνί, Ζηνα, whereas the correspondents to Cretan Τηνός, Τηνί, Τηνα play on Etruscan Tin, Tinia ‘Jove’.

The name of the divinity, with the meaning ‘day, storm’, once again leads back to Akkadian šawû (šamû: ‘himmel’), šawâu, Ugaritic šawu: Italic ‘Semo (Sancus)’ sky and Akkadian sawû (šamû: rain, ‘Regen’); the -e- of Zeûς recalls the -e- of ‘Semo’, as the Z- harks back to the outcome of Akkadian šu, Aramaic z-.

Proof that the dominant Indo-European gods were armed with deterrent thunderbolts, Zeus, such as ‘Juppiter’, can be found in the supreme being of the Baltic peoples, who also had the same attributes: Perkun-, Latinized Perkūnuas. In Lithuanian perkūnas denotes lightning itself; perkūn in Latvian and percnuts in Old Prussian signify ‘thunder’, that is Akkadian ber-quin, Semitic barq ‘lightning, bolt, thunderbolt’. In the past Perkūnas was thought to be derived from the Latin base ‘quercus’.

HOW DOES ETRUSCAN FIT IN?

People may well ask, ‘How does Etruscan fit into this new, historically based system?’. In order to defend themselves from the will and insidious, vain ambition of many discoverers, Etruscan scholars must, since Etruscology is a strict discipline, pose their problems in a historical perspective at all levels, particularly as far as hermeneutics is concerned. In this way a bilingual inscription will not suffice to prove that clan means ‘son’, for it must also be brought back to a concrete, historically based linguistic reference, thus dissipating the idea of Etruscan as a language removed from all other linguistic structures.

The unexpected survival of Etruscan ‘clan’.

The revitalisation of the existence of the Etruscan word clan, in the sense of the Greek παῖς and Latin ‘puer’ child, son, inferior, servant, is helped
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by the Latin word ‘cliens’ client, that is he who is a step lower than the ‘patronus’. To remain in the sphere of Latin, which holds many secrets of the Etruscan language, it becomes clear that clan can be identified with the term ‘calone(m)’ (that is ‘calo, calonis’) boy, a military orderly. In the past the word ‘calo’ was considered by Pompeius Festus, Porphyrius (Hor., Ep. 1, 14, 42), Nonius and Servius, similar to ‘cala’. It is not therefore surprising that in Isidorus’s Etymologiae it gratuitously takes on the meaning of ‘boat: for wood’. Etruscan clan corresponds to Greek κλών, branch, shoot: a line in Sophocles’ Antigone (713) rules out that it derives from κλαω I break. To use an image of a chain, it can be said that at the head there is the ancient Akkadian qālum, qallum ‘young, small’, followed by the Latin ‘calone(m)’ boy, inferior, and further on even Neapolitan guaglione, Irish caile ‘girl’ (diminutive cailin), English colleen, and even the German Klein ‘small’, English clean as in pure, everything that is still young. However, in this case the base with the meaning ‘young’ has collided with that of Akkadian qa-lūm (refined, said of silver), qalūm (to burn, to refine), which gives the Latin ‘calor’, previously of unknown origin.

The place of Etruscan among ancient languages.

‘For when she saw men pourtrayed upon the wall, the images of the Chaldeans pourtrayed with vermillion, girded with girdles upon their loins, exceeding in dyed attire upon their heads, all of them princes to look to, after the manner of the Babylonians of Chaldea, the land of their nativity’.

Ezekiel, 23, 14-15.

The inscription on the Tomb of Augurs, which accompanies the representation of a religiously fervent, praying figure, is in itself enough to place Etruscan among the ancient languages. The words are an invocation: apas tanasar. Etruscan apa is documented as meaning ‘father’, which can be identified with the Pan-Semitic ab: Akkadian abu ‘father’, accusative aba. The prayer is addressed to the tomb so that it protect the remains of the father. It is apa– because Etruscan does not have the voiced bilabial occlusive of aba; and tanasar, like the second person singular, a form of the Akkadian verb našāru (Semitic nvr) ‘to protect, to take care of, to safeguard’: in the form handed down, for example, šar māt Ḥatti [bēlka u māt Ḥatti] ta-na-aš-sar ‘you, RN, will protect the king of Ḥatti, your lord, and the land Ḥatti’ (CAD, see našāru, p. 41 b); in Neo-Babylonian texts the name of a divinity and ta-na-šar appear (von Soden, Akkad. Handwörterbuch, p. 755 b). ‘Protect my father ...’: Foscolo’s prophetic Cassandra prays that palm
trees and cypresses protect the tombs of Ilion. Here a son in tears prays in vain that the tomb keep his father and protect him more than ‘from the insults of the clouds’ and ‘from the profane foot of the common people’, from the greedy hands of desacralizers. There should be no doubt that the Etruscan word for the divinity, aesar, anchored to the solid proof of Suetonius, corresponds to the name of the greatest Assyrian god, Aššur, in Western Semitic Ašar, whereas the Etruscan aiś (Latin ‘deus’), has the original meaning of ‘what is on high, celestial’: Akkadian āšû ‘high, rising’. It is therefore obvious that the ethnic Tuρονοῦ, used by the Greeks to denote the Etruscans, is of Assyrian origin: Herodotus holds that it derives from Prince Tyrsenós of Lydia, who led the Tyrrhenian colony in Italy. This name is, by the assimilation of the second –t-, from the Assyrian turtenu, the highest dignitary after the king: it is a well-known Hebrew term, tar-tān ‘title of an Assyrian dignitary, general’. Tyrannos ‘tyrant’ comes from the same origin as turtenu, in the form turtān̄u, through the phenomenon of apologetics. Their true ethnic, Rasenna, confirms the meaning of Tyrsenoi, since it derives from a Semitic base: Akkadian rāsûm ‘leader, prince, chief’. In the names of rivers, for example, Rassina a tributary of the Arno, has the base rāṣ- meaning (as in the Latin ‘caput [fluminis]’ and Akkadian rēš-ēni) ‘spring’. The Etruscan element –ina, as also –emna, exactly renders the Akkadian –ēnu, ēnu ‘spring’ (‘Quelle’). The adjective ‘tuscus’ denotes an ‘inhabitant’ of Etruria: the base tus- confirms the heritage of the Akkadian and Assyrian cultural world, also the depositary of the ‘Sumerian culture’, to which we owe umun ‘man’, Latin ‘homo/hominis’; Italic ner, in ‘Nero/Neronis’, ‘prince’; agār; Greek ἀγάρ etc.: Sumerian tuš ‘to live’; Etruscan tuš- ‘dwelling place’.

The Latin word ‘persona’, according to Terentius, refers to the part given to an actor. Linguists often assume it derives from the Etruscan Phersu, the name given to the figure painted on the Tarquinia Tomb of Augurs. Phersu is understood as ‘mask’ (‘Skutsch’). Phersu is, what is more, likened to the Greek πρόσωπων, meaning ‘face, forehead’, whereas the meaning of ‘mask’ is relatively recent and does not accord with the ancient Phersu of the Sixth century B.C. It is not fitting here to ask ourselves whether the Etruscans staged theatrical productions at this early date. It is, however, known that the most ancient use of the mask was in sacred functions. Phersu should thus represent a terrible and threatening divinity, whose attribute is a dog, as in the Daunia stele: Cerberus, Avernus’ dog.

The linking of Etruscan Phersu with Greek πρόσωπον ‘face’ presents us with hard facts: we do not know the origins of the Greek word, although clearly they are not Indo-European. Homer gives a plural πρω-
σῶπατα (Od., 18, 192) and a dative προσώπατα (Il., 7, 212). This plural has escaped the attention of scholars, as indeed did Manzoni’s don Abbondio, ‘to whom nobody paid any attention’. Besides the preposition προσ-, the component -ωπον corresponds to Akkadian appum > āpun ‘upper part of face, profile, nose’: Hebrew af ‘snout, nose’, that is Syrian appē ‘face’; the plural of the Akkadian appum is appātu (> āpata) -ωπατα. Thus Phersu, with his fearful dog, is the person armed with a club and evokes an episode in Homer: Heracles, who was sent to take away the dog of Hades (Il., 8, 367 and following). In the other scene in which Phersu appears, he does not dance but flees and has lost his dog, set against the figure armed with a club.

Phersu corresponds to Akkadian paršu, which in the plural denotes the powers of a divinity, Hades, but it can be traced to peršu ‘abyss’. ‘Persona’ on the other hand, is the original noun adjective in ‘-ona’ (see ‘matr-ona’) which derives from a base of the Akkadian persu ‘part’, from the same base as the Latin ‘pars’, which was considered of unknown origin. It however corresponds to Akkadian parsu ‘part, portion’: the verb adjective of the verb parāsu ‘to part, to divide’. This is the ancient ‘persona’ with his part to be represented on the stage or in the comedy of life.

In the primitive ordering of the Roman calendar, the year began with the month corresponding to Etruscan March, which, according to the Liber glossarium, was called velc-itanus. We must presume that this season, as for many peoples of the Near East, was originally the first month of the Etruscan year. For the Babylonians, at the time of Hammurabi, it was thus for the month Nisānu ‘March-April’, and also for the Canaanites with the month Abib. In comparison with the Semitic and Hebrew rōš ha-sānāh ‘the first day of the year’, the etymology of the Etruscan velc-itanus reveals that it also signifies ‘New Year’s Day’. Velc- corresponds to the Semitic word for ‘head’: the initial v- represents the reading w- of Akkadian (read walku), malku, Hebrew melek ‘king, prince’ etc. The –itanus component corresponds to the Semitic, Aramaic ‘iddan, Syriac ‘eddān ‘time’, Akkadian adānu, edānu ‘a period of time’. This word was still extant in Gothic: athn ‘year’, which was considered antiquated in respect to the common Germanic term for year: Gothic jer, which corresponds to Akkadian jeru, ajaru: Aramaic Ijjar ‘name of the second month’. Athn was linked to the Sanskrit atati ‘turn’ and let us hope that this is true. It is on these bases that the Etruscan language should be traced, historicizing its age-old problem and not minding the common question, ‘Where did the Etruscans come from?’ and why not also, ‘Where did the Italics come from?’. We will keep to the historic facts of the words, which also created the facts of the ancient world.

~ LIII ~
INTRODUCTION

Some German language etymological dictionaries explain Dragoman ‘interpreter’ as being of Assyrian origin: the reason for the diffusion is simplistically given to Aramean nomads. The only truth in this is that Dragoman, like the Italian ‘turcimanno’, has preceding Akkadian targumanna, turgumanna, in Aramaic targmana, turgmana, in Arabian targuman. In the Etruscan Tuscania mirror, besides the young woman Pavatarchies, who is holding a haruspex liver, is the bearded Tarchunus, wrapped in a cloak. The figures are intent on listening to voices which appear to be emanating from the depths of the earth, while a winged genie, who resembles Tages, is in the process of lifting the earth in order to emerge. Tarchunus, more than a proper name, appears to denote the interpreter, the haruspex who will transfer to texts what Cicero will read in Libris Etruscorum. Thus Tarchunus appears to be from the same base as Targumanna, like the Aramaic targem, meaning ‘to translate’.

Paul Kretschmer emphasized the importance of Mesopotamian civilization to the ancient inhabitants of Lydia. Trade with Northern Mesopotamia, of Sumerian-Akkadian civilization, passed through Lydia. Kretschmer set out to prove that the influence of that civilization had reached countries on the Aegean via Lydia and ebbed back to the West. However, the comparison between Greek Lydia, after seven centuries and Etruscan culture is antihistorical.

The names in the Herodotan tradition of the Lydians, who set out for what would become Etruria, are Semitic. Besides Tyrsonos, there is Manes, the first king of Meonia, which is Assyrian mansû ‘leader’ and by assimilation massû, Neo-Babylonian maššû and Hebrew Mōšēh. Atys denotes a member of a fraternity: ancient Babylonian athû ‘partners in a relationship’.

The disquisitions of Dionysius of Halicarnassus on the Pelasgians and Tyrrenrians, called Pelasgians, are not consistent. His history, opus rhetoriciun, separates them into two ethnic groups, and departs from Thucydides, who speaks of the Pelasgians of Acte, descendants of the Tyrrhenians (IV, 109). It attempts to justify Sophocles’ poetry, when Inachos, who ruled the lands of Argos, the hills of Hera and the Pelasgian Tyrrhenians, sings. We cannot blame Dionysius for not knowing that the name Pelasgian (referring to the people who abandoned Thessaly and scattered all around, and who in Italy prayed to the natives to treat them as friends), originally meant ‘settler’: Πελαγοῖ, even though the word immediately conjures up πέλαγος, it originally had the meaning of the Akkadian word bēl(u) iššakku ‘settler’ (another word [palag]iššakku) rather than sea people. With this information we can better understand the statement in Herodotus’ famous excursus
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(I, 56) on the Hellenes and Pelasgians, that although the latter were of Ionic origin, the progenitors of the Attic people and were famed for never leaving their lands, they spoke a foreign, barbarous language, and mingling with the Hellenes, accepted their language. The Pelasgians in Attica are the most ancient and remote landowners.

The ancients used the useful expedient of deducing the names of ethnic groups from supposed eponyms. Xanthus is a good example: ‘The Lydians came from Lydus, the Torebians from Torebus’; Xanthus does not have any trace of the Assyrian name of Lydia. As far as Rasenna is concerned, Dionysius does not diverge from this useful system. The Etruscans took their name from one of their leaders, Rasenna (I, 30), whereas the Romans called them Etruscans as they inhabited the region of Etruria, ‘Ετρούσσια. The base of this name ἔτω- crops up in Etruscan toponyms: Velatnī, Volterra, Velirnī, Velletri. It is Semitic: Aramaic atrā, Ugaritic atr, Akkadian ašru ‘region’: see Oln-ωτρία the name for Brutium, the land facing the canal at the straits of Messina: ‘Bruttium’ is Akkadian būrtum ‘hollow, sheet of water’: German Furt. In the past Oln- in Olnωτρία was thought to hark back to wine, but it is Akkadian īnu (i > o̞), Semitic ‘ain ‘water course’: the Straits.

The fact that Etruscan, like Akkadian, has no o vowel merits attention. The number twelve was important in some Etruscan institutions. Twelve was the symbolic number which at the origins led the destiny of Rome: the twelve vultures seen by Romulus. The number attests to the sexagesimal system of Babylon and was important in the Near East: the twelve cities of Ionia, the twelve tribes of Israel, the twelve patriarchs, and the twelve apostles of Jesus.

The Tagetetic books were the depositaries of Etruscan discipline and thought to be based on the teaching of the mythic Tagetes, the old-looking child, born from the ploughed fields of Tarquinia, outside the influence of an arcane authority, in which some tried to explain these texts. The books state that originally the name Tages / Tagetis meant book, written to establish precepts and maxims and to guide the people who had founded their law on religion and in their rites. Tages / Tagetis corresponds to the late Babylonian tahhittu, tahhīsu, Nuzia tahhītu ‘annotation, note, protocol, announcement’ (‘Aufzeichnung, Erinnerung, Niederschrift, Promemoria’) (‘Protokoll-] Notiz’). The word is derived from the base of the Akkadian verb ḥasasu ‘to remember’, ‘to meditate’ (‘sich erinnern, gedenken’).

Lucumon, according to Servius, means king, and brings to mind Horace’s ‘Maecenas atavis edite regibus’. In luchum, lauchum, Latin ‘lucumo / lucumonis’, the base luch- meaning ‘to order, to be powerful’ was put for-
ward. Thus in the Etruscan verb *lucair*, the meaning ‘to exercise power’ was
discerned. In actual fact *luch-*., *lauch-* corresponds to the component -λευ- of
βασιλέως: Akkadian *le’um* (*lehum*), Middle Assyrian *la’a’um* (*laha’u*)
to be powerful, to be able’ (‘vermögen’); in βασιλεύς, βασι- recalls a form
of the verb ‘to be’: Akkadian *bašū: ibaššī* ‘it is’ and the adjective *lē’um*
capable: Latin ‘potens’ ‘potens regni’ ‘he who has dominion’: ancient
Babylonian *šarrum* (king) – *le-ú-m* (vS, 547). Guided by the Latin ‘luc-
mon’ ‘-is’ etc. of oblique cases it is obvious to discern the corresponding
Akkadian *ummūnu*, ‘people’, ‘armed people’, Hebrew ‘am ‘people’
(‘Volk’) in the component ‘-umon-’. Lucumon is thus ‘potens gentium’.

Further observations on language.

In the days of Gellius, an archaic Latin word spoken by a famous law-
yer to highlight his speech, could provoke laughter, as if he had spoken in
Etruscan or Gallic (‘quasi nescio quid Tusce aut Gallice dixisset universi ri-
serunt’, 11, 7, 4). Etruscan was not either a pleasant sounding or easily gra-
sped language for the Romans: it was not very different from Phoenician
spoken by the Carthaginian in Plautus’ play.

The Etruscans also benefitted from the linguistic treasure of the Near
East, inherited from the Indo-European languages. Besides *clan* ‘son’, the
meaning of *apa* ‘father’ is also certain, as has been stated above (Gothic uses
*aba* meaning ‘husband’).

The Etruscan word *ati* ‘mother’ brought to mind Gothic ‘aihe’, which
is thought to be ‘baby language’. *Ati* however is the shortening of the
Akkadian base *awwata* ‘mother’ (*ammatu*: ‘a name for a mother’, CAD),
with an Etruscan ending -i. As far as the Gothic *ai*– for *a*– is concerned, by
analogy one can also compare Germanic *ai*, a-, Anglo-Saxon ā (see Ger-
man *Eid* ‘oath’): Akkadian (*w)adum* (‘Eid’, ‘agreement’), Latin ‘vadimo-
nium’. One has to acknowledge in Etruscan *sa*– (not *śa* ‘six’: Akkadian *šeš-
šet*) the correspondent of the Latin demonstrative ‘sum, sam’, which was
well known to Ennius: it can be identified with the Akkadian demonstra-
tive *šū* he (see TLE, 880, 882). Therefore the meaning of *lautn*, *lautum*,
which brought to mind ‘family, freedman’, is confirmed by Neo-Babylon-
nian *la’utānu*, *latānu* ‘servant, a type of serve’. *Lautn-eteri* presupposes
the meaning ‘freedman’ in *eteri*: Akkadian *etēru* ‘to rescue, to take out, to save,
to take away’.

*aiś, ais* god (plural *aiser*: *eis* (plural *eiser*), noun adjectives *aisna, eisna*:
not to be confused with *aesar* (see the great divinity), attested by Svetonius,
and therefore to be accepted. The form *aiś* expresses a concept similar to
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Latin ‘deus’, of unknown etymology. ‘Deus’, ancient deivos, feminine deiva, dēva, originally meant ‘high’, ‘he who rises’, and thus celestial. It derives from the Akkadian base tēbū ‘he who rises’ (‘aufsteigend’): the names of the mountains Tifate, Tabor, as d- was originally t-: see ‘duo’. In a similar manner aṣ derives from the Akkadian base āṣū (‘high-rising; a high-rising mountain peak’): see Latin ‘altare’, which even for the worshippers of Baal, was a rising, a mountain (cf. βουμός).

cesi, in relation to the dead (see hupni) should be understood ‘is hidden’: literally ‘is covered’: Akkadian kašū ‘to cover’.

hupni (-š), hupnina etc.: derives from the Akkadian base ḫuppu ‘hole’.

hus/huš ‘boy’: derives with obscured timbre from Akkadian wīṣu ‘small, little’: cf. eššu meaning vēoç ‘new’.

maru, high magistrate, Latin ‘maro’, Umbrian maron- is a Semitic word corresponding to Hebrew mārōm ‘height, high rank, excellence’.

meṭhλum ‘power, authority, dominion’: is late Babylonian meṭelū ‘power, lordship’.

malena ‘mirror’: is from the base corresponding to Akkadian mašālu ‘to be similar’: the Akkadian noun is mašālu, mušālu, mešēlu ‘mirror’.

ni ‘succession: in time’, ‘course of years’, ‘years’. Formation as in avēl ‘years’, acil, vacil, suthil etc. where -l- has the sense of pronoun, anaphoric (with the function of -s in Latin and Greek in the nominative), corresponding to Latin ‘ille’; -s to Akkadian šu, Latin ‘sum’ ‘this’. The r- base of ni, traced to the Akkadian base riddu ‘succession’ (‘Verfolgung’), is originally ēqa, Latin ‘ver’, the first season of the Etruscan year: Akkadian ajjaru, Aramaic Ljjar ‘the second month of the year’, German Jahr. For aphaeresis see zal.

suti, suthi, suthu etc. ‘tomb’, ‘ditch’ is Akkadian šūtu, šuttu, šuttātu ‘ditch’ (‘Grube’).

Thefarie, Thefarie, of the Pyrgi laminas, derives from a Semitic noun: Hebrew tifārā, ṭiferet ‘magnificence, honour, glory, boast’. It is thus an attribute of Veliunas, who is ‘the favourite of Juni’. Velianas ‘the favourite of the sky’, see ‘Janus’: Akkadian Anu: the Sky god. Vel is Akkadian bēlu ‘lord’.

verse ‘fire’. Akkadian biรสu ‘sparkle’ denoting the original production of the spark to start a fire.

zal-, zal-, esal etc. ‘two’ cf. Latin II, which represents the sign of I place besides another I. Semitic: Hebrew ḫēṣel (preposition: ‘at the side of, near, close to’, aššil ‘joint’: cf. ‘duo’, ‘twin’.

vacil, ‘distribution’, Hebrew bāqā ‘to cleft, to split’, Ugaritic bqē, Aramaic beqa‘. It would be possible to continue this process for hundreds of other terms, but there is no further space here.

~ LVII ~
The Concrete Historical Reality of Linguistics
and the Scientific Status to which it Aspires

The great orientalist, Sabatino Moscati has directed a rigorously methodological warning to those investigating Phoenician origins. His remarks settle the accounts with old and new research into possible Indo-Germanic origins; he has stated that the question, ‘is not one of researching debatable origins, but is rather the determination of a historical reality’. Our history begins with written records, which nullify hypothetical reconstructions and ensure historical linguistics can avoid continuing to lay down roots. We can defend ourselves with equal firmness against the scientific findings of DNA’s ability to reveal facts, which we cannot expect to shed light on the characteristics of Indo-European linguistic structures.

John Lyons has underlined how some linguists have dedicated much effort to affirming the scientific status of linguistics, whereas biologists, chemists and physicists have no need of proving the scientific character of their disciplines. Articles propounding the scientific credentials of linguists give rise to feelings of justified diffidence. The conclusions lead to paralogisms: the reason for dispute often ends by assuming a methodological indetermination, which extends to touching subjects close to the pseudo-sciences of glottochoric research, Chomsky’s innatist generativism, and the mentality that flourished in the shadow of Port-Royal and Descartes. This is undoubtedly a reaction to behavioural materialism, but it is destined to deviate linguists from the rigorous study of original semantic values. The answers to the problems associated with the acquisition of language and cognitive processes by human beings are still not available. The questions should be left to interdisciplinary and empirical research, to the scientists experimenting on primates and to neurophysiologists.

Science is not to be confused with immobile and dogmatic scientism, mental laziness, for true science is constant research, never content with any apparent certainty. During the renowned Viennese symposium, Popper, with Poincaré’s Science and Hypothesis in his hands, stated, ‘In science, even in the best and most certain science, we are always dealing with hypothetical knowledge. The most important thing in science is a critical attitude’.

It is certainly understandable why in education ‘normal science’ is taught (Kuhn would say its paradigm), as an explicative model to be defended. Avant garde trends are held at bay. It is moreover understandable how the traditional word ‘science’ holds an aura of invisible authority. The aggressive impetuosity of revolt springs from this: Feyerabend in his ‘extra
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scientiam nulla salus’ warning, stated, ‘Nothing more than a convenient fable’. ‘Extraordinary science’ is different, it springs from the anomalies that in the end explode, without refuge. Fortunately for the linguist, it is a case of returning to historical research, using the new methods available following the finds from Near Eastern cultures. A linguist is a historian of signs. Referring to an invaluable volume by Giovanni Nencioni, Benedetto Croce once strongly advocated the work of linguists, stating, ‘What else can the linguist or glottologist studying these signs do but research their genesis, that is the varying communication needs for which they were invented, and for which they served or serve, continually being re-adapted, changed, refreshed or put aside? ... Linguists and glottologists must lay aside their ambition to be scientists, which fired them in the era of positivism. “We scientists...” he said, looking with compassion at the men of letters who distinguished the beautiful from the ugly, an archive transcriber, a text researcher or an archaeologist, making the useful work of the philologist awkward and helping the historian with this denomination. Linguists must, for their part, resign themselves to being historians’.

The most important piece of teaching, for which we must thank the neo-grammarians, was expressed, once again, by H. Paul, and has the solemn ring of a simple warning, ‘It was thought that language could be considered scientifically, in a different way to historical study. I must refute this’.

When, in the second half of the Nineteenth century, historical linguistics reached the full knowledge of its potential, if not of its limits, it was ready to speak the reconstructed original language. The fable of the sheep, which began, ‘avis akvasas ka’, was invented and narrated by the great compatriot August Schleicher in 1868. The language in the fable changed from the time *owis replaced avis, and later *owis was replaced by H₃ ewis. Thus in the place of varna ‘wool’, in the fable text, there was wⁿa and today *wⁿH₂neH₂’ is preferred. These virtuoso games multiplied in the name of progress and historical linguistics entered a tunnel of perverse labyrinths of hypothetical echoes and sounds, without Indo-European becoming a real language, but rather a bed of Procrustes. It has never been established, but it would be helpful to know, what originally gave the Greek word ðiç (ll. 24, 125), the English ram (with the feminine ñe), the Sanskrit āvi-, Latin ovis, and Lithuanian avis. This is one more question amongst the multitude of uncertainties surrounding the origins of language.
EX ORIENTE LUX

When I began examining words linked more to history than any series of conjectural roots, I was guided by Akkadian, the most ancient language. I started, in the place of the hypothetically reconstructed symbols of Indoeuropean words, to draw up a historical reference table, which at times appeared remote, although it was supported by age-old tradition.

Akkadian words, more often than not, have echoes of similar languages, such as Aramaic, Ugaritic, Hebrew. The importance of Aramaic in Persian culture from the Eighth century B.C. to the seventh satrapy and the peoples of India and Bactriana, is well known.

It is useful to evaluate the reasons for such guidelines in the light of new research. The discovery in 1968 of the statue of Ibbit-Lim, king of Ebla, in Tell Mardikh in Syria by the Italian archaeological expedition led by Paolo Mathiae, which had been excavating for five years, was important in dispelling any doubt that the distant culture was beyond reach. The cuneiform inscription on the statue appeared to be Akkadian, that is belonging to the Eastern Semitic group, albeit with new dialectic details. In his volume, Ebla, An Empire Engraved in Clay, Giovanni Pettinato, referred to the scepticism of many academics in identifying Tell Mardikh with Ebla. Astour rejected the idea, ‘more or less outright’; the Germans, D. O. Edzard and G. Farber were more cautious in their rejection. Pettinato went on to state, ‘It had to be admitted that all the previous historical reconstructions were wrong, the geographical maps of the Near East that had been so painstakingly reconstructed had to be thrown out. We know how disposed to admitting error human beings are’. The human beings in question here were the famous scientists and academics of the past. It should be added that, following a sad tradition, the great Sargon contributed to the destruction of Ebla. The king, who is known through a famous stele, the son of a priestess (like Romulus and Remus), did not know his father and was saved by a character not unlike the humble Italic ‘Faustulus’. The scientists scepticism for the finds from Tell Mardikh extended to the royal archives of Ebla, presumably because shadow was preferred over light.

Nineteenth-century historico-comparative linguistics was already in muddy water by the end of the century. The invincible aporias in the pages of de Saussure’s best linguistic experiments are also inevitably present in his Mémorie, the volume dealing with the primitive vowel system in Indoeuropean languages. Osthoff’s strong criticism, which also involved the young H. Möller, hurt the Geneva linguist, particularly by the definition of his
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work as ‘a failed attempt’ (‘misslingene’). The volume was the linguist’s last foray into the origins. He did not plan revenge but directed subdued insults towards German obtuseness. From that time onwards it appears that he found writing difficult. The notes from his courses were forgotten; his followers were overly faithful and bold, not always the greatest sign of love. Faced with some reconstructed Indo-European form, it is now possible to see that de Saussure moved with the trembling of a paralytic and that he could not mask his troubles. In the paragraph dealing with linguistic palaeontology, he refers to the transience of the results of those, like Adalbert Kuhn, examining the stock of words to reveal the mythology of the Indo-Europeans, or like Pictet, who studied tools, weapons, domestic animals, flora and fauna, domestic and social life, to fix their place, or like J. Schmidt, Hermann and Hirt, who examined tree names. De Saussure assumed it was the difficult etymology which caused uncertainty and asserted that there were few words, ‘with a well established origin’. After wisely refusing to acknowledge the same origin for the Latin ‘servus’ and ‘servare’, he fell into the trap of ‘dominus’ from ‘domus’, supporting this with haudo-
naz (the head of ĥeudo), Gothic ĥiudans from ĥiuda (see Dizionario s.v. deutsch).

As linguistic rules, A. Meillet and R. Gauthiot have upheld that Indo-European only had a final -n-, since -m- was excluded. They could not have been aware of the absolute relevance of this fact, which points to Indo-European being on the receiving end from the reference point, Akkadian. Better de Saussure’s: ‘In the final position -m- is changed to -n-’. The precedence of the final -n- over -m- cannot be upheld: from the most ancient historical languages, it is possible to document the phenomenon of the -m- developing nunation, that is the final -n- in Aramaic and Arab. We know that in Akkadian all nouns end in -m- in the masculine singular, and in the feminine singular and plural. In the North-West of the Semitic area -m- appears in the majority of proper names, as indeed it is found in Egyptian transcriptions. Traces of the phenomenon appear in the Tell Amarna glosses: Ugaritic has a final -m- in the dual and masculine plural. Signs are also apparent in Hebrew, in words such as dārōm ‘South’, ħartōm ‘scribe, of Egyptian hieroglyphics’, in proper names such as Milkōm. De Saussure’s assertions concerning words of phono-symbolic origin, are among his most important. They re-evaluate in part Vico’s statement in Scienza Nuova Seconda, ‘A language based on onomatopoeia likewise began to develop; the same language used by young children to make themselves understood’. In his Cours, de Saussure wrote of onomatopoeia, ‘There are many fewer than one would imagine’ (p. 101). This does not exclude, as De Mauro noted,
that particularly in poetry some linguistic signs hold phono-symbolic values. However, whether voluntary or involuntary, this effect refers to the pleasure and art of using phonic symbols and does not lie at the origins of the words themselves.

Historical linguistics did not benefit fully from some of the observations by Neo-grammarians. One was treated by de Saussure in the following way, ‘Strengthened by their principle, the Neo-grammarians declared that roots, stems and suffixes are also abstractions of our spirit and are only used for expository convenience’. This is true since we do not speak with roots: historical legitimacies only have words. If we succeed in historically establishing their origins, even suffixes emerge from the abstraction to which we had banished them and historically clarify their operative function.

The great lacuna in de Sausurre’s Cours, admitted by his own transcribers, is the absence of a word linguistics. He promised this during the third course, and it was to have held an important role, yet it never came into being.

De Saussure lingered over a law, which starting as ever from Indo-European, attempted to demonstrate that the voiced aspirates i.e. become unvoiced aspirates in Greek. However, thýmós which is used as an example, is derived from the hypothetical *dhūmos (see θυμός in the Dictionary).

In his fundamental work, Undersøgelse om det gamle Nordiske eller Islandske Sprogs Oprindelse, Rasmus K. Rask wrote, ‘However mixed a language may be, it belongs to the same linguistic branch as another if it shares the bases of language, the most important, material, indispensable and primitive words’. Original affinity is only evident if, ‘Similarities in the structure and language system correspond’. Rask was fortunate to be unaware of Sanskrit at the time he wrote the work, which drew up the comparative grammar of Indo-European languages, he therefore did not fall into the same trap as Bopp. The latter was ensnared by the belief that Sanskrit was the mother of all European languages, as his letter of August 1814 to Windischmann proves. It was Honorée Joseph Chavée who laid this prejudice to rest in 1867. The identical morphology of Greek and Latin with Sanskrit is so evident, and infinitely more abundant than of Latin with the Romance languages, that it leads to the assumption that such similarity of form is a relatively recent phenomenon. It is interesting to consider the presence of the Latin ‘denarius’ in Sanskrit. The similarity of exterior form brings to mind the Indian Buddhas that took on the features of Apollo, following Alexander the Great’s conquests.

~ LXII ~
THE BIRTH OF PHILOLOGY

It should be remembered that philology, in its original meaning of *love of words*, was born in the Near East. Sages used the writings they found to diffuse the benefits of a noble understanding: not only were sapiential, juridical and poetic texts transcribed, but also dictionaries of the language in use and an ancient tongue, Sumerian, were compiled. Akkadians and Eblans cultivated this discipline, which gave interpreters the key to drawing near peoples who had entered the sphere of the most ancient empires in history.

Thousands of years later, Indo-European linguistics has privileged morphology, which continues to reflect classic, in particular Greco-Latin, forms. The definitions in descriptive grammars still hold sway after twenty-two centuries, although, as Jespersen remarked in *The Philosophy of Grammar* (p. 58), they ‘are very far from having attained the degree of exactitude found in Euclidean geometry’. L. Hjelmslev thought that the idiosyncratic nature of Greco-Latin grammar, obstructs its being used in a general system.

It is now clear that Indo-European is only a linguistic, and not an ethnic or racial, notion. The quest for the original cultural heritage can only be entrusted to lexical enquiry, pushed forward as far as possible on the historical level. As it is a matter of defining a phase, which can be considered relatively pre-inflectional, at the threshold of our origins, it is important to repeat that morphological components belonging to the recent era when grammarians employed taxonomic systems, are of no use.

The work of our greatest glottologist, Grazziadio Isaia Ascoli, should be underlined. He researched the Ario-Semitic link and surprised the public with a ‘fraternal embrace between two races’, in a quasi mythic prehistory (*Studi critici*, II, p. 23). Ascoli, at that time, had faith in being able to reconstruct ‘the prehistoric phases of the Aryan and Semitic languages’, in order to point out ‘the same morphological fabric and a sufficient number of phonetic similarities’. He used Sanskrit grammar as a model to find ‘the history of the original inflections of the Aryans’. To reach the analysis of the inflection of a word, he began with the Sanskrit pronominal declension (the oldest and most basic). However, when faced with *-am* in Sanskrit pronouns, he could not at that time point out the distinctive Akkadian particle, with the Latin meaning *-met*, which is added to emphasise Akkadian pronouns: *-m, -ma* (e.g. *attāma* ‘thou’).

For some time Sanskrit has ceased to wear the halo of ancient sacrality, which the Romantic period attributed to it.
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THE LAW OF PHONETIC SHIFTING (‘LAUTVERSCHEIBUNG’)  

Enormous methodological importance was given to the phonetic law of shifting by one degree, which differentiates the consonantism of Germanic languages from other language groups in the Indo-European family. It is useful to consider what practical advantages it brings when inserted in this new methodology, which suppresses all reference to hypothetical Indo-European.

The unvoiced occlusive k was assumed for Indo-European. From the Greek ἐκατόν ‘hundred’, Latin ‘centum’, the consonantal rotation became a spirant h in Germanic languages, which have German hund (-ert), English hund (-red) etc., from the same base as Hand, hand, derived, as has been reported, from a base meaning counting: Akkadian qātum ‘hand’, which provides the base for centum, a respectable number that cannot be considered a product of primitive Indo-Germans. Thus, originally the phonetic evolution started not from an unvoiced occlusive k- to become a spirant h-, but from the uvular occlusive q- of qātum.

The rotation law also takes in the evolution of Greek φ: φράτω (bh of the old Indian bhrāṭā: ‘brother’), Latin f- of ‘frater’, Gothic b- of broþar, English brother. The etymology of φράτω is unknown, but it is certainly from the Semitic base of Akkadian ibrū, Ugaritic ḫbr, Aramaic ḥabrā ‘member of a community’, ‘colleague, associate, fellow’, Assyrian ebbātu ‘alliance’ (‘collegium’), which confirms the original semantic value of φράτω and ‘frater’, member of a society and not consanguineous. It follows that instead of the hypothetical Indo-European bh- of old Indian, the Semitic bilabial b- must be placed at the origins.

In the same way, the Greek θυγάτηρ daughter, Gothic daúhtar, English daughter, German Tochter, recalls the Sanskrit duhitā ‘daughter’, Avestan duvā, Lithuanian dukštė. However, the Sanskrit -tā ending is based on the Semitic morphological feminine form ā(a)īt, Akkadian ātu. The original base is the Akkadian daqqu, ‘small: child’: on the whole Indo-European languages have kept the original Semitic d-.

However, the change from the spirant Latin h- of ‘hostis’ to the Gothic g- of gasts, German Gast, cannot be attributed to an Indo-European paternity. ‘Hostis’ foreigner, that is he who is ‘foris’, from without the city walls, owes its initial h- to the bilabial semivowel w- of the Akkadian wasūm ‘to go out’, waṣītu ‘exit; come out: of a city’ (but see Dizion. p. 428).
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HAND AND MIND

The hand, defined by Kant as ‘man’s external brain’, has developed, through gesture, the original philogenetics of language.

In his Dizionario di psicologia, Umberto Galimberti examines the kinesics of gesture and honours W. Wundt, who studied the connection between biological and cultural factors.

As has been seen, in the Etruscan tomb, a figure is represented in an attitude of intense religiosity: he prays with upraised hands that the sepulchre keep and protect his Father’s remains: apas tanasar. It is known that apa-corresponds to Akkadian aba, the accusative of abu ‘father’, and that tanasar in Akkadian is the second person of a verb form, which here has a deprecatory function: Akkadian naṣāru ‘to protect, to keep safe, to watch’. He raises his arms and prays: from the Mesopotamians to Egypt to the Hebrew world, raising the hand is the most solemn word of the appealing spirit. The Latin verb ‘dico’ I say and the Greek δεῖκνυμι I signal, to the Old High German zeigōn (‘zeigen’), recall the similar Ionic verb δέκομαι I lift, also in reference to the person who raises the new-born child, as in the Odyssey (19,335). Reference to ancient times is easy since the Akkadian dekû meaning lifting up, in particular ‘to raise, to lift up, to call up soldiers’, with the word meaning ‘hands’ signifies ‘to pray’ (qāṭē dekû: ‘to lift one’s hands in supplication’). The diphthong of the Greek and the long –i– of the Latin indicate that they are denominative verbs, derived from the Akkadian noun dekû: dikû, which has the same meaning as the Akkadian kallûm ‘messenger, official responsible for summoning people’. Some reference to kallûm can be seen in the Latin ‘calator’ herald, as the other Akkadian noun dekû; dikû ‘call to gathering’, religious ‘ceremony’, and also dikûtu ‘corvée work, performed upon summons, marching into battle’ are at the base of the Latin ‘dictator’. It should be added that the Greek δάκτυλος finger, whose origins, like the Latin ‘digitus’ (prehensile organ which ‘takes up’, and also ‘index’), can be traced to dekû, dakû. This is proved by the English ‘finger’, German Finger, certainly derived from the base ‘fangan’. Academics wrote ‘of uncertain origin’: the Indo-Germanic school was blind, ignoring the sign ‘Don’t step on the flowers’.

The Old High German fang meaning ‘to hold in the hand’ derives from the ancient Assyrian base pahā’um, Akkadian pehûm ‘to close, to lock’.

Verification of pehûm ‘to hold, to lock’ can be seen by analogy: χανῶ-άνω I take, Latin ‘praehendo’, ancient Nordic geta ‘to obtain’, English for-
get: originally ‘to let go: from one’s hand’: derive from the un-nasalized Akkadian base qātu ‘hand’, which gives hand, Hand and Gothic handus.

Jacques Derrida examined Heidegger’s thesis concerning the creative value of the hand, ‘The hand traces signs, it probably demonstrates because man himself is a sign (Die Hand zeichnet vermutlich weil der Mensc h ein Zeichen ist).’ Derrida wrote, ‘The play and theatre of hands merit an entire seminar’. Heidegger emphasises the monstrosity of hands that are unique to men, ‘Monkeys do not have hands, they have prehensile organs’ (Greiforgane besitz z.B. der Affe). He clarifies his point by discussing university teaching and stating that the fact that the sciences belong to the essence of technique depends upon this. ‘This is why we attempt to learn and think here’ (Daran versuchen wir hier, das Denken zu lernen). Derrida queries, ‘But to learn what? The answer cannot be wholly explained, it passes through a very subtle craftsman-like work of hand and pen’. Heidegger reaches the end of his thesis with perhaps the most profound statement of the entire work.

‘In any case, thought (das Denken) is manual work (es ist jedenfalls ein Hand-Werk)’. It does not appear that Derrida has accepted the axiomatic essence of this profound discussion, as he speaks of ‘the essence of technique as protest, an act of resistance masked with difficulty, against... the professionalization of university study...’. Heidegger’s intuition unknowingly opens up an illuminating view of the past.

He would have found proof in support of this far-sightedness, if it had been necessary, in the history of an ancient Italic word, in a language that he would not have used as a touchstone for his often arbitrary etymological forays. As has been mentioned above, the Latin word ‘manus’ was never given an etymology, but the meaning of the Akkadian manû ‘to calculate’ and the natural counting system using the fingers, started up pertinent discussions.

The Latin supports the identity of hand, calculating tool, reason and man, that is the German Mann, Mensch ‘man’, as a thinking being. With the Old High German mannisco, all the German words from this base can be traced back to the stem *men, which is none other than the Akkadian manû ‘to calculate’.

Heidegger could not have foreseen the resurrection of the ancient manû, with the Latin ‘manus’ hand, which rises to nemesis of that great refusal of the dead language, ‘cut from its living roots’. Derrida knew well that a German such as Fichte when speaking of humanity would never say Humanität, of Latin origin, but Menschlichkeit, which should denote the vast community of men, furbished with the dignity of thought, that is with Latin ‘mens’, rather than Greek μένος.
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All this would not have been able to give the origin of the German word *Hand* ‘hand’.

If Fichte thought that for the Romans ‘humanitas’ had become the symbol (‘Sinnbild’) of an over-sensitive idea, and that the introduction of foreign Latin words into the German languages would have risked lowering the moral level of their way of thinking (‘ihre sittliche Denkart...’), how could he have replied to the historical necessity of recuperating the original values of his words, at the base of a vast cultural Semitic world, which has risen from the ashes like the Arabian phoenix? How could Fichte have laid aside the word *Denkart*, similar to Latin ‘tongeo’ ‘I know’, and Oscar *tanginom* ‘sententiam’, which are also of Mediterranean origin?

**Writing**

The origins of the Greek verb *γράφω*, *I write*, the Latin ‘scribo’, and the corresponding Indo-European verbs such as Persian *ni-pištam* ‘written’, Slavic *pišati* ‘to write’, Old Prussian *peisāi* and old English *writan*, are unknown. This is remarkable, when one considers that the history of man begins with writing.

Let us consider the wide organic system of graphic communication, since we cannot speak of the attempts at ideographs in the Ice Age after the little Karl Weule or Obermeier had to say about Pasiega’ signs; nothing of the Mas d’Azil pots, in which Édouard Piette thought he could discern the prototypes of the alphabet, in mesolite!

In the famous passage of the Platonic *Phaedrus* concerning the superiority of logos over writing, many were unknowingly taken in by Socrates’ enchantment. Plato’s myth of the Egyptian god Theuth would have earned the sympathy of the priest Sais. He said to Solon, who was trying to recall the years of the ancient myths of Phoroneus and Niob, ‘Oh Solon, Solon, you Greeks are always children: you have no ancient thought springing from ancient tradition’. The myth of the god Theuth, which sets out to induce King Thamus to teach the people writing, the drug which aids memory, was derided by the king as being a tool of corruption and a dampe ner of memory. The myth has engendered lengthy discussion, from Comenius, Rousseau and Fichte to Dewey, and has brought us to Derrida’s statements concerning Western logocentrism.

Many have not noticed how in *Phaedrus* Socrates praises madness, the liberating and beneficial mania, from the prophesying kind of Apollo to the Dionysian variety, from the poetic to the aphrodisiacal, and to Eros, hereby
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anticipating Erasmus' Ἐγκώμιον μωρίας. At the spring in the sanctuary of the Nymphs, in the panic aura of a tranquil recess, Socrates acts like a madman, first repeating the verse to the logographer Lysias and then re-singing the love palinode with inspired effusion. According to Socrates, the terrible quality of writing lies in its similarity to painting, where the figures stand before you as if alive, yet if you ask them questions they do not answer. The references to cicadas singing and thereby enchanting the lazy in the sultry heat, the mention of Isocrates, and the insistent exaltation of the dialectic logos eventually reveal Plato's secret intention of defending the effective creativity of his paideia, in respect to the logography school, which proposes written forms of eloquence, excellent material for mental laziness. Plato places himself on the polemical level of Alcidamas, from the school of Gorgias, the master in the art of improvisation (αὐτοσχεδιάζειν). It was an Egyptian scribe in the Fifth dynasty (2563-2423 B.C.) who questioned the verisimilitude of Plato’s myth concerning the Egyptian Thamus, who refused the divine gift of writing. The writings of the scribe, together with another similar Sumerian figuration, remain the most ancient examples of a very ancient art, which honourably flourished in the shadow of temples and kings. The intense concentrated expressions in the representations of scribes remain a constant in art, enforced by the teaching from around 1970 B.C. of the Egyptian Khety, ‘See a scribe who is listening; whosoever listens becomes an able person’. Khety did not tire of repeating himself, ‘You see, there is no profession where one does not receive orders, except that of the scribe’; and again, ‘If you know how to write, this will bring you more advantages than all other skills’. Egyptian hieroglyphics, from the end of the prehistoric era, at the time of Menes, the founder of the first dynasty, remain the most noble expression of civilization, characterizing, along with the pyramids, the cultural life of Egypt.

It is to be deprecated that the ignorance of the Greeks prevented Plato from reading in hieroglyphics the song of the blind Harpist, the Teachings of the genius Imhotep, who was writing almost at the beginning of the third millennium B.C.; or to read in cuneiform the myth of the Marriage of Emil and Sud, in which the god, who dominates the Sumerian pantheon, gives the bride the art of writing, the tablets decorated with writing, the stylus, the surface of the tablet. The Elogy to the art of writing by the Sumerian scribe (‘The art of writing is the Mother of orators, the father of masters..., whosoever has learnt it has the world in his hand’), would have been useful in contesting the supremacy of Plato’s oral tradition. Lastly the message of the legendary king of Uruk, Enmerkar, whose deeds are narrated in the Sumerian poem edited by Kramer, ‘The messenger had a heavy tongue, he could not repeat
it...; the master of Kullab mixed the clay and engraved the words on it as on a tablet; no-one had engraved words in clay before...: the master of Kullab engraved the words... and they were visible'. Giovanni Pettinato’s comments in his work I Sumeri are interesting, ‘We do not here intend to penetrate the difficult subject of the relationship between writing and oral tradition. However, a written message, although more restricted than its oral counterpart, certainly provides greater guarantees of accuracy than any other means of communication, since it requires fewer checks and can be carefully scrutinised in peace at any time that this is considered necessary’.

*Ancient words meaning ‘writing’.*

Despite its stylization, cuneiform writing, which followed on from the pictographic phase, kept something of the magic and of the possession of living reality, that was fixed in the rock of the caves at Lascaux or Altamira by prehistoric man. However, with the series of definitives and graphic signs, which helped the reading of ideograms and heightened their semantic value, writing developed constant dialectics, through which thought re-found its roots in lived reality. The Akkadians called the constellations *writing in the sky*, and thus before Galileo read the universe in the geometric forms set out by God, they had projected the signs of their daily communication in the great book of the cosmos.

The pubic triangle, which in cuneiform writing is the symbol for woman, denoted the door to life. The Greek δελφύς womb, the female reproductive organ, is the word which coarsely imitates δελφίς dolphin, the ancient Akkadian word *daltu*, Hebrew *delet* (door), which is the name of the consonant *delta*.

The Sankrit word meaning ‘writing’, ‘alphabet’, was *lépiḥ*, a term which through ancient Persian and influenced by Aramaic, had Sumerian origins. Achemenid Persian bears witness to the form *dipi*—‘written’, which is Sumerian *dub* ‘written: clay tablet, written document’ (‘*Tontafel, Urkunde, Brief’*), Akkadian *típpum*, which in Helamitic becomes *tuppi* and later *tippi*.

The Sanskrit *lipi-kara*—‘scribe’ gives the Akkadian word for scribe *tupšarru* ‘the king of the tablet’, Sumerian *dub-sar*, Hebrew, Judean-Aramaic *típšār* (Schreiber). The Greek γράφω, took the un-Greek stem *gerbh*—with e vocalism, in Anglo-Saxon *ceorfan* ‘to cut, to engrave’, Old High German *kerben*. There was no doubt that the Latin ‘s-cribo’, γράφω and σ-κα-γιφάσθαν to smooth, to dig, were from the same base; Akkadian *ḥarābu* ‘to cut’, which recalls the Akkadian *qarābu* ‘to penetrate’ also in the sexual
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sense, which satisfies Derrida’s phallography, ‘to approach: sexually’. The supposed *gerbh*—recalls the Akkadian nominal bases qerbu, qirbu, qarbu ‘inside, inner part; mind, meaning’, before which s-, σ- is the original definitive pronoun: ‘that of penetrating, acting on the inner part’, which denotes the ancient act of engraving, penetrating clay, ‘writing’. The Slavic and Russian pissät—recalls synonymous bases: Akkadian pa’āšu, Hebrew pāša ‘to cut’. The Akkadian verbal adjective pāšu, the feminine of which is pa’ī-išt-tu (vS, 840), reveals an original definitive in the Slavic verb. Slavic kniga ‘book’ corresponds to Akkadian kanīku ‘sealed document’, an etymology that has already been put forward, but which was considered unprecedented. When I reproposed this in a wider context in a talk held at the Florence European University Institute, a colleague remarked that the meaning was slightly different. I asked him if he thought ‘libro’ was nearer Latin ‘liber’ bark, or book to Latin ‘fagus’. How is it possible, in these conditions, to start a fruitful discussion? The German schreiben repeats the Latin ‘scribo’, whereas the English write, German reissen ‘to tear’, Greek ἀρᾶσσω, Old Saxon writan ‘to split’ can be traced back to the Akkadian base ̣harāšu (‘to cut down’).

The three great bloodless revolutions with which civilization exploded are memorable: the inventions of writing, the Phoenician alphabet and printing, which gave everyone the means of acquiring and spreading knowledge. Whatever the mnemonic-technique behind the recital of poets or ancient singers, such as the singer of the Babylonian poem Enūma eliš performed on the fourth of the Nisanu month, it is probable that even the recital of the Rg-Veda was based on a written text similar to that which has survived. Thus actors and singers today do not show either the score or the written text.

Today, whatever the destiny of the book, about which Derrida appears to prophesy obscurely, writing will remain the dynamic model on which for over five millennia man has constructed his cognitive universe.

Hermeneutics has the Task of Distancing the Concealing Veil

The origin of the Greek verb hermēneuō, ἔμνευω, is unknown. It is useful at this point to speak briefly of hermeneutics, also by way of gratitude to Hans Georg Gadamer. His studies underline the aims of hermeneutics, a discipline aimed at examining the meaning of research: ‘how is it possible to understand?’ (wie ist verstehen möglich?).

Hermeneutics succeeds in making knowledge ‘the original character of
life itself. If, for thinking man, existence was always interpretation, Gada-
mer must be merited with marking the modern era as the season of herme-
neutics, organized as an autonomous discipline.

However, how can polysemy, a term which has become enmeshed
along its way, reveal its specific identity at the origins? It was thought that
the etymology of hermēneia, ἐρμηνεία, was similar to Latin ‘sermo’ and
pointed at the origins to ‘the efficacy of linguistic expression’ (Kerényi, Her-
meneia und Hermeneutiké etc., Zürich, 1964). The possibility of interference
with the name of the god Hermes, Zeus’ messenger, and an intermediary
between the gods and man, was evaluated. This possibility was discarded as
the result of an a posteriori reconstruction, as no linguistic-semantic link
with Hermes, besides superficial assonance, was found. Nevertheless, Hei-
degger (Unterwegs zur Sprache) insists upon a supposed original meaning of
hermēneuein, that is ‘bringing a message, announcement’. However, a strict
etymological approach was not even attempted in the past on these bases,
not only on account of the thin thematic substance thrown up by the her-
meneutics in the ancient cultural world, from Plato to Aristotle. Friedrich
Schleiermacher, whose generic identification of hermeneutics by way of in-
terpretation, as the comprehension of any text of not immediate meaning, is
no further forward than Saint Thomas with his interpretation clarifying the
hidden meanings of texts.

Etymologists stated that hermēneus, ἐρμηνεύς foreign language interpreter,
he who explains was a ‘terme technique sans étymologie. On a supposé un
emprunt d’Asie Mineure’ (Chantraine). The recall of Hermes, the interme-
diary between Zeus and man, is abandoned in favour of Hermes chthonios,
underground, dark. What, however, is the path that leads us to fill the se-
manic blank? At the origins hermēneuō meant I uncover that which is covered: it
derives from bases corresponding to Akkadian ermu ‘that which hides, co-
ver, sheath’, erēmu ‘to cover’: it confirms Hermes chthonios. The base of
the component -neuō, νεῦω fold corresponds to Akkadian nē’u, ne’û ‘to
turn away, to loose’ (‘unwenden’).

Confirmation can be found in the etymology of chthonios, underground,
said of Hermes: we have seen in this attribute a base synonymous with
erēmu ‘to cover’: Akkadian katāmu ‘to cover, to cover with earth’, He-
brew hātam ‘to hide’: this base is the same as chthon: earth, understood at the
origins as ‘that which covers’. It is thus that this, as Hermes, the guider of
souls, also lays aside the invincible vanity of heroes in the darkness of
Hades.
SPECIMENS
OF THE DICTIONARIES
il gen. greco e latino; la flessione στοιχείος richiama la base del plur. accord. τἐμετέρι. Le abbreviazioni delle finali di šām, šu sono normali per i pronomi: anākū > anāku (io), attā > atta (tu); τέμενι è ebr. τάάμ (‘judgment, royal decree’).

θεμωσ trascino, sospingo. Venne derivato, a torto, dalla base di τίθημι (v.), ma θεμωσε, che fu glossato come θάγκασε, θάκαστο (Od., 9, 486, 542), significa prese con violenza, costringe a. Accad. tamāhu, aram., ebr. tənāh (afferrare, smuovere, ‘ergregiarsi’, ‘to take’).


θεόντων gen. pl.: ‘che saltano alla vista’ (Hes.), v. θεόντων.

θεωράσσει che manifesta il pensiero diverso: epitetto di ολοκληρωτής (II., 13, 70) ma anche sostantivo; θεωρία, θεωράλο, θεωροποιών, rendendo un oracolo (II.): πρότος fu rinviato a (θέος o) προτευς (v.).

θεός, -είον dio, divinità. Mic. te-ö, arm. di-ke (dei); furono accostati anche lat. ‘fériae’ (v.), ‘féstus’ (v.) e persino ‘fénium’ (v.). L’i. dhëšiyka-e è di incerto significato (Frisk). Forma postulata per l’armeno è i.e. *dhë-es; per θεός *dhë-os; ma v. θέ-στις, θεόκες θεόκες. Si ipotizzò *θεος, lit. divas (spirito), ma di un digramma non esiste alcuna traccia metrica e una concezione spiritualistica per i Greci è anacronistica, perché troppo corposi sono i loro dei originari. I Greci della Jonia, come negli agglomeramenti di città nel numero di 12, tipico delle città cananee, ebree e etrusche, hanno in comune con le religioni cananee-fenicie la credenza che la divinità si identifichi con l’oggetto di culto e sia presente nel luogo ove si veneri, un pilastro o un cippo (massēbā, ḫammān). Per la etimologia di θεός, non si può, dunque, prescindere dal primitivo concetto della divinità fra gli antichi popoli che stanziarono in territori poi occupati dai Greci. Non si può dimenticare la pietra che Rea in Creta porge a Cronos e che egli divora credendo di inglutire il piccolo Zeus; l’omfalo di Delfi, ipostasi della divinità, è una pietra conica a punta ovoidale; una pietra conica era il simulacro di Afrodisia a Pafo, non dissimile la pietra nera di Esmes; un acciottolato, una pietra nera rappresentava Cibele, come la pietra nera venerata dagli Arabi (al-bagiar al-aswad) alla Mecca. Il betilo, “casa del dio”, il culto della pietra aniconica o appena sbocciata, è comune all’Oriente semitico; le pietre sacre dei Cananei è noto che furono adorate persino dai figli di Israele e ci preme notare che i Greci antichi praticano largamente lo stesso culto, come attestata Pausania descrivendo i santuari greci. Per i Romani stessi il «lapis silex» era la pietra sacra di Giove Feretrio e il giuramento veniva sancito per «Iovem lapidem». Il cret., beot., cipr. θεός scopre la corrispondenza con accad. diu (dû, du’u: cripta, stele di una statua di divinità in una cripta, ‘platform: in a cella, a solid brick platform that takes up a large section of cella’; ‘Kultsockel; Postament der Götterstatue’) confuso con tâ, tu’u (‘nische’); ebr. tân. Accad. di’u si sovrappose o esclude una voce antica corrispondente ai nomi sumeri dir, dimir, dimir, digir (dio, ‘Gott’).

θεραπεύω curo, guarisco: v. θεραπεύω; il verbo greco, che alle origini ha il senso di servo come θεραπεύω, mostra di aver subito successivamente l’incrocio con basi corrispondenti ad accad. rap₁u, cananeo rp’ (guarire, ‘heilen’), ebr. ṭāfā (‘to cure, to heal, to bind a wound, to restore’), rifut’ (‘medicine’): the- è un determinativo: accad. *tu, aram. de (‘das’), cfr. ebr. rif’u (‘a healing’) etc.

θεραπεύων, -οντος (col. -οντος secondo Choe-rob.: An. Oxon., 2, 242) in Omero è chi assiste il grande guerriero, attendente: Patroclo, Automedonte, Alcimo rispetto ad Achille; poeticamente assistenti, therapontes di Ares, sono i guerrieri più validi, therapōn delle Muse si dirà poi il poeta; in eteron-attico θεραπεύων, servo, schiavo, femm. θεραπεύων; θεραπεύον, in Omero, servo, assisto, seguo un guerriero; poi servo il dio; assisto, curo, guario, θεραπεύων, servizio, cura. Di θεραπεύω si ignoro l’origine: ma il suo significato richiama il lat. ‘comes’, anzi χι χι χι: al capo, chi accorre accanto, chi lo soccorre, lo assiste; le basi semitiche sono corrispondenti ad accad.  тебû (andare, venire proprio vicino, ‘to come near’, ‘ganz nah herankommen, herantreten’); che è poi il greco θέω, coro, accorso), тебû, тебû (vicinanza, ‘Nähe’); la componente -πάτων corrisponde ad accad. rabûm, *rapûm (capo, ‘great’), rabûnu (capo, ‘president’),
Bürgermeister’); θερμηκός, curo, guarisco, mostra nella seconda componente l’interferenza di base come accad. rapānum, ant. bab. rapām (curare, guarire, fasciare, ‘to heal, to cure, to mend, to comfort’). La voce θεράπτης, dimora, abitazione alta, dor. θεράπτης, la<space>c. σεράπτης ha altra origine: la base iniziale, interferenza semantica della base semitica corrispondente a ebr. tā (‘stanza’, ‘room, chamber’; accad. tāt), richiama una voce come accad. terru (costruzione, ‘ein Bauteil’), e la base δαιμίνη richiama voci come accad. appum (parte superiore, ‘Oberseite’), appannu (parte superiore di costruzione, ‘ein Gebäudeteil’) voce in uso particolarmente fra gli Urtiti.

Θερμος lupino, θερμωνς, di lupino etc. Lo si fece derivare da θερμος caldo, « avec déplacement de l’accent, comme le est d’usage » (Chantraine) etc. Ma era già vivo in medio babilonese tarmus, aram. turmus, arab. turmus, lat. ‘termis’.


Θεσπελος, ‘on che conquista lo sguardo’, spettacolare; poi prodigioso. Dalla base θες- di θακ visa, confusa poi con quella di θες; l’altra componente: da sem.: accad. sakālu (conquistare, ‘to acquire, to annex’), ebr. śākēl (‘to behold’).

Θεμης, -ου istituzione. Dor. τεμος, lac., arc., locr. θεμως. Il lac., arc. locator. θεμως ci guida ad accad. dammī (stanziamiento umano, cittadini e abitazioni, ‘settlements and inhabitants’): per δ + μ > σμ, è in θεμος la corrispondenza di -ά- ad accad. d (ma v. Fidus, unbr. Fish); in θεμωφόρος, attributo di Demetra, si scopre l’incrocio con la base corrispondente ad accad. disūm (ebbr. dešē: ‘spring, grass, spring pasture, cereal’), dešūm (‘abundant’), dāsūm (trebare i cereali, ‘to thresh’).

Θεσπις, -ις ispirato, meraviglioso, divino. θεσπις, meraviglioso, straordinario, divino, lucente, detto anche di πλος, χαλκός; dalla base di θες (v.) incrociatosi con quella di θας; l’altra componente è dalla base di σφας (v.): σφας; θεσπισ (Hom.) che arde lucente.

Θεσσαλία Tessaglia (vedi basi di θεσπις): i Tessali stessi, Θεσσαλος, si dicevano, ben a ragione, Πετραλος, petraico Πετραλος (Swbury 90 A.1e 483): Πετραλος conferma il significato di Αμφιλος (accad. ḥammu (stagnno, ‘swamp’) di ‘terra irrigata’): accad. bet-dālī ‘territory irrigated by drawing water: from a well’. Per- mostra l’incrocio della base corrispondente ad accad. pat- (pattu), ugar. piêt (territorio, ‘fines’) e di bētu (casa, patria, territorio).

Θερματος, -on vaticauido, uscito dalle labbra divine. La voce greca è stata ricalcata su σφης (v.) ma le componenti originarie erano ben altre, poiché non è ipotizzabile una base θες-. Dalla base di θας (v.) unita alla base corrispondente ad accad. šap at (st. c. di šaptu, pl. šaptā, duale šaptān: labbra, ‘lip’), con influvio di δις-σφης (v.) e della base di accad. šēp (‘to proclaim the fame or greatness of a god’), forma di accad. apū.

Θέω accorso, corro, θαξω, mi affetto; a.e. dāvatī (corre). Accad. tehū (accorrere, avvicinarsi, ‘sich nähern, herantreten’).

Θεωρός chi è inviato a consultare un oracolo, ad assistere a una festa religiosa; quindi spettatore. θεωρος epitetto di Apollo che reca luce; θεωρος significò ‘chi si accosta a vedere’, ‘chi va come spettatore’: si pensò a θες ‘spectacle’, a θες; in realtà la prima componente deve essere indicato in dale origini movimento verso un luogo dove si deve osservare e tale componente corrisponde ad accad. tehū (andare, accostarsi, ‘bittend, fordern herantreten’) e la base di *Fōrōς ‘osservatore’ corrisponde ad accad. barū (vedere, osservare, ‘schaun, sehen’, bārū osservatore dei riti religiosi, ‘Opfer- schauer’); θεωρας è alle origini un ‘accostarsi a osservare, assistere’.

Θῆβαι, Θήβη Tebe: capitale della Beozia e
paragauda (paragaudis), -ae orlatura d’oro o di seta dorata, veste ornata con tale bordo; persiano (Hübischmann). Alle origini ha il significato di "ornamento floreale in rosso": cfr. ebr. pərah (far fiorire, ‘to blossom’), perah (ornamento florale, ‘blossom, blossom-shaped ornament’) e ädöm (rosso, ‘red colour’), ädêm (essere rosso, ‘to be red’).

paragraphus, -i paragraphus, v. παράγραφος.

Parca, -ae Parca, divinità incaricata di filare il destino dei mortali. Il nome è da Varrone connesso con *pariō* (Gell., 3, 16, 9 sqq.): etimologia ammessa dai moderni. Deriva da accad. pārak šimmāṭi (sala dei destini, cioè cripta del santuario dove si ascoltavano i responsi, ‘Schicksalskammer’): la voce è parāka, nom. parāku (cripta, stanza del dio, santuario); ma v. parāku, parāq, ebr. pāraq (troncare, ‘to tear’); eufemisticamente (v. ἱμηδής), sentita come la vergine, la fanciulla: aram. ḫarāḥ, ebr. ṣerah, accad. ṣerēḫ (rampollo, ‘sprout, blossom’), v. lat. virgin, virgo.


parcus, -a, -um limitato, economico, moderato, parco, esguio, letteral., che trattenne, v. parco.

parduis -i, v. παρδος.

parēns, -entis padre o madre, pl. ‘parentès’ i genitori, gr. οἶκον, v. pariō.

pāreō, -ės, -ui, -itum, -ēre appaiò, mi faccio vedere, sembro; imper. paret è chiaro, è evidente. ‘Pas d’étymologie sûre’ (Ernout-Meillet, s.v.); ma è certo corrispondente a accad. bārum, ant. ac- cad., ant. ass. buārum (farsi vedere, emergere, ‘in Erscheinung treten, auftauchen’); l’imper. paret, è chiaro, corrisponde al significato di bāru (essere certo, ‘to become certain, proved, certified, CAD, 2, 125): v. *vērus*, ant. a. ted. wahr.


pāriēs, -ītis m.: origin. ‘elemento divisorio, intermedio’, muro, parete del tempo ‘quando paries lento vimine textus erat’ (Ovid. Fast., 6, 262). Una flessione *pāreis, ἱτις* è attestata dalle lingue romanze; insostenibili: lit. tveirrī, tvērti (abbracciare) etc. Ant. accad. barītu, accad. berītu, berītu, bertu: che rendono il sum. murū (limite, divisorio, confine,
corrispondente ad accad. zakāru, saqāru (parlare, dichiarare, 'to declare, to speak'); v. zeigen.

calgia [ital.] v. scale.

scale [ingl.] piatto della bilancia, strumento per pesare, ted. Schale: piatto di bilancia, ant. a. ted. scala (coppa, scodella), ol. schaal, ant. nore. skal (piatto della bilancia), sved., dan. skål etc.: si ipotizzò il grado allungato -ē- della rad. i.e. *ěk- (spacare), ma v. οξύλλω, θύλλω; altro sostantivo in -ō- dal grado -ō- è scorto in anglos. scale (guscio, conchiglia), ant. a. ted. scala (guscio) > ted. Schale (buccia); anglos. scie (⇒ ingl. shell: conchiglia, guscio), got. skalja (tegola), ital. scala e anche scoglio (dantesco scoglio "crosta": «correte al monte a spogliarvi lo scoglio ch'esser non lascia a voi Dio manifesto», Purg., 2, 122 ss.), ant. fr. escalier, franc. échelle. Da base con significato di coppa, crosta, conchiglia: accad. kalū (ciotola, coppa, conchiglia, 'bowl, crown of the human skull, shell of the turtle'); ebr. keli (vaso, 'vessel'); la voce italiana scoglio (genovese scogliu) richiama il ricalco su voce semitica corrispondente ad ebr. sāqāl (coprire con pietre, 'to cover with stones'); mentre, tenuto conto del significato strumento per pesare, ricorre un ricalco su base come accad. šaqālu, ebr. šeqel (pesare, 'to weigh, to poise, to estimate'), šeqel (peso, 'weight, shekel').

schkenken [ted.] offrire, ant. a. ted. skenenken, m. n. ted. schenken, anglos. scencan. Il significato di dare è successivo a quello documentato anche dall'antico inglese dialettale skine (mesedere, versare, dare a bere); cfr. Vestefal. schenken (allattare). A torto ricondotto alla base di ted. Schenkel (v. shank). Da base corrispondente ad accad. šaqûm, sem. śqi, ebr. šaqa Hi (dare, offrire da bere, 'to give to drink, to water').


schlissen [ted.] chiudere, v. ηθέλεω.

schneiden [ted.] sminuzzare, fare a pezzi, ant. a. ted. sniadan, ant. sass. snithan etc. cfr. ccc. snḗti (ramo), ir. snḗd (minuto, piccolo); cfr. ted. schnei zen (intagliare). Accad. sandu < samdu (triturato, macinato, 'gemahlen'), samādu, semḗdu (triturare, macinare, 'mahlen'); sinūdu (macinato, farina, 'Mehl').

schnitzen [ted.] incidere, v. schneiden.


schön [ted.] bello, originariamente da fare attenzione, da guardare; m. a. ted. schone, ant. a. ted., ant. sass., skônı, m. ol. schoon, sved. skön; cfr. finn. kaunis (bello). Viene connesso con la base di schauen (v.) e viene postulata una rad. *ske-, *(s)keu- "guardare a", "mirare a"; v. see.

schreien [ted.] v. scream.

schreiten [ted.] camminare, ant. a. ted. scritan, ant. sass. skiran, anglos. scridan (muoversi). Viene ricondotto a una rad. i.e. *sker- (voltare, piegare, 'drehen, biegen'). Accad. sahrā, sēbrū (volgersi, andare, piegarsi verso, 'sich drehen, sich wenden, wiederkommen').

schwarz [ted.] nero, v. lat. sordes.

Schwester [ted.] sorella, v. sister.

sciaccallo [ital.]. La voce turca risale alla base corrispondente ad accad. ákílu: ša-akalī: akalū (divorare, distruggere, 'to eat, to ravage', CAD, s.v.: lo sciaccalo è infatti chiamato il "divoratore" nei testi accadici: ákílu: 'Beiname des Schakals' Vs, 29 a).

scoglia [ital.] scoglio, v. scale.

scorch [ingl.] ardere, scaldare. Di ignota origine, ma in relazione con base antica, corrispondente ad accad. šarāhu (‘to heat, to scorch’).

scrape [ingl.] raschiare, ted. schrappen, della stessa base di lat. « scribo », gr. γράφω (v.).


sea [ingl.] mare, ted. See femm.: mare; masch.: lago, got. saius (lago, palude), ant. a. ted. sēo (mare, lago), ol. zee (mare), sved. sjö (lago; mare) di cui si ignorò l'origine: v. soul.

seal [ingl.] foca, v. soul.

see [ingl.] vedere, anglos. sēon, ant. fris. sēa, ant. a. ted. sehan, ted. sehen, got. saihvān: la base