PLURILINGUISME ET LANGAGES SPECIALISES

METHODS FOR SPEECH CONTACT ANALYSIS: THE CASE OF THE 'UBIQUITY OF RHETORIC'. PROOFING THE CONCEPTUAL CONSISTENCY OF SPEECH AS LINGUISTIC MACRO-SETTING

Dr. Fee-Alexandra HAASE
University of Nizwa, Oman
F.A.Haase@gmx.de

Abstract:
In this article we will apply a method of proof for conceptual consistency in a long historical range taking the example of rhetoric and persuasion. We will analyze the evidentially present linguistic features of this concept within three linguistic areas: The Indo-European languages, the Semitic languages, and the Afro-Asiatic languages. We have chosen the case of the concept 'rhetoric' / 'persuasion' as a paradigm for this study. With the phenomenon of 'linguistic dispersion' we can explain the development of language as undirected, but with linguistic consistency across the borders of language families. We will prove that the Semitic and Indo-European languages are related. As a consequence, the strict differentiation between the Semitic and the Indo-European language families is outdated following the research positions of Starostin. In contrast to this, we will propose a theory of cultural exchange between the two language families.

Key words:
Conceptual coherence, rhetorics, persuasion, linguistical dispersion, cultural exchange.

1. Introduction: The Concepts of 'Rhetoric' and 'Persuasion'

Persuasion is the process of convincing someone of one's own position or standpoint. Traditionally, in Western culture, persuasion is placed within the area of rhetoric. Its history can be traced back to ancient Greek rhetoric. But, of course, persuasion has always and in all cultures been used for the aim of making sure that someone adopts the standpoint of someone who intends to do so. While rhetoric is the artificial way of

BDD-A4025 © 2012 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:47 UTC)

persuasion, there are also *ad hoc* created and never codified ways of persuasion. Persuasion can be applied to all issues. The term 'ubiquity of rhetoric' expresses this statement and the omnipresence of rhetoric. The state it arises from is the option to choose deliberately. Persuasion is assumed to be practiced by using the spoken or written word, but this is just the most commonly considered way of persuasion; the image and the various media, and actually all demonstrating processes aiming at taking over a standpoint, have always functioned as tools of persuasion. Persuasion is a ubiquitous phenomenon for rhetoricians. The main aim of this discipline is the use of the human faculty to teach; though also a natural, unlearned faculty of the use of persuasion is inherent in the human species. The 'art of rhetoric' has developed in Greek antiquity a nomenclature for the description of rhetorical phenomena and areas of reach; its general approach is that rhetoric is ubiquitous. So it also transcends the medium of the human voice and can be found in media and image. We are interested in the concept of rhetoric / persuasion and its linguistic representations. A concept is the carrier of knowledge in a representative form for the inherent meaning. This knowledge will never be released as a real issue or object. It stays as an imaginative representation in the sphere of the mind and is applicable to the issues of the real world. Quintilian described this mental function in his *Institutio Oratoria.* The conceptualization as the state of mind of the rhetorical proof by the artificial proof of the *epicheirema* is recognized by classical rhetoric. Quintilian, in his *Institutio Oratoria*, describes the artificial proof by the conceived argument, which is identical with the *res* as *epicheirema.* Quintilian writes: "Celsus autem iudicat, non nostrum administrationem, sed ipsam rem, quam aggredimur, id est, argumentum, quo aliquid probaturi, sumus, etiamsi nondum explanatum, iam tamen mente conceptum, epicherema dici." (Quintilian. *Institutio Oratoria*. V, 10, 4) For example, we can add and detract items or count them using the rules of mathematical concepts. Concepts can be 'created', they can be traced via means that serve as their applications, and they can be learned through the applications. We can also say that concepts are applied unconsciously or consciously. Also the awareness of a concept within a society or the non-existence of a concept depends on the state of the awareness regarding the concept. The concept of 'concept' is present in scholarly writings and its existence was in use in the early sciences such as

BDD-A4025 © 2012 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:47 UTC)

rhetoric. Here we are in the area of questioning the relation between knowledge and the awareness of knowledge. Relying on Quintilian's discourse on the concept and its 'unreal' appearance in the human mind, we should mention that the concept as a mental state is to be classified as state of the mind of unconsciousness; we can be aware or cannot be aware that a concept is 'working' in the background, when we perform certain actions, which are the linguistic applications of the concept or actions resulting from them.

2. Research

2.1. Introduction: 'Language Contacts' and 'Speech Contacts'

Mendenhall (2006: 17) discussed the problematic differentiations of the Semitic languages in the research and the 19th century theory of a common Semitic or *Ursemitisch* delivered in waves from Arabia to other areas. Standard theories see Arabic as one of the South Semitic languages; Mendenhall here appeals to scholars critically re-consider alternatives. Zack (2012) has made recently a contribution to the state of Arabic as a diachronic and synchronic linguistic phenomenon. Afro-Asiatic languages are contemporary Berber languages, Chadic languages, Cushitic languages, and Semitic languages. Vernet (2011) states, in *Semitic Root Incompatibilities and Historical Linguistics*, with regard to root incompatibilities in Proto-Semitic for historical root reconstruction, that "these rules can only be applied to verbal roots, not to derivative forms and affixed forms. The importance of these structural incompatibilities consists, then, in the fact that they reduce the possible number of combinations of the triconsonantal bases. Excluding onomatopoeic roots and loan words, these laws of incompatibility are fully regular in the verbal roots (but not in the nominal ones) and, therefore, do not have exceptions, as in all phonological laws. The structure of the Semitic verbal roots is, then, absolutely conditioned by these restrictions of incompatibility. These rules are universal in character and apply also to the different families of the Afro-Asiatic and Indo-European languages. The restrictions of incompatibility are a tool of great importance in the historical reconstruction of the roots (especially, of the verbal roots in Semitic)." (Vernet) Agmon writes in *Materials and Language: Pre-Semitic Root Structure Change. Concomitant with Transition to Agriculture*: "Materials and language have evolved together. Thus the archaeological dating of materials possibly also dates the

BDD-A4025 © 2012 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:47 UTC)

words which name them. Analysis of Proto-Semitic (PS) material terms reveals that materials discovered during the Neolithic are uniquely triconsonantal (3c) whereas biconsonantal (2c) names were utilized for materials of the Old Stone-Age. This establishes a major transition in pre-Semitic language structure, concomitant with the transition to agriculture. Associations of material names with other words in the PS lexicon reveal the original context of material utilization. In particular, monosyllabic 2c names are associated with a pre-Natufian cultural background, more than 16,500 years ago. Various augments introduced during the Natufian, and perhaps even more intensively during the Early Neolithic, were absorbed into the roots, tilting the equilibrium from 2c toward 3c roots, and culminating in an agricultural society with strictly triconsonantal language morphology." (Agmon) When we look at the ancient Egyptian language, we can say that it is extensively build upon words with two radicals. Hallen writes in *A Description of the Afro-Asiatic (Hamito-Semitic) Language Family:* "In contrast to the Indo-European Language Family, about which much research has been done over the past two centuries, relatively little is known about the former Hamito-Semitic Language Family, now known as the Afro-Asiatic Family. (While much research has been accomplished with the Semitic Languages because of Arabic and Hebraic religious ties, little has been done with the Afro-Asiatic family as a whole.)" (Hallen) Proto-Semitic is the hypothetical proto-language for historical Semitic languages of the Middle East. Potential locations are Mesopotamia, the Arabian Peninsula, and the Levant. Proto-Sinaitic is an existing script from the Middle Bronze Age attested in rock inscriptions at *Serabit el-Khadim* in the Sinai with syllabic representations representing signs for an alphabet assumed to be the origin of the north-western Semitic alphabets with 22 signs, which was developed around 1700 BC. The ancient Egyptian language is *de facto* among the Afro-Asiatic languages an early and a recorded language. It shows that – at least partly – it contains linguistic elements which are similar to the other Semitic languages. Also, here a differentiation is hard to be sustained without considering the Semitic languages as a part of the Afro-Asiatic languages, thus extending the area of the Afro-Asiatic language family. The Proto-Indo-European language is the reconstructed common ancestor of the Indo-European languages. The reconstruction of this language is an ongoing field of research. According to

BDD-A4025 © 2012 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:47 UTC)

the most popular assumption about its origin, the *Kurgan hypothesis* is to be mentioned as claiming the origin in the Pontic-Caspian steppe of Eastern Europe and Western Asia. Mainstream linguistic estimates of the time between Proto-Indo-European and the earliest attested texts, the *Kültepe Texts* from 1900 BC in contemporary Turkey, range from 1500 to 2500 years. These texts contain Hittite loanwords and names in an Assyrian document.

2.2. Migration Around 3700 BC

The synchronic approach to the comparative linguistics of different languages can be traced back to the discipline of 'comparative grammar' in the 19th century. At the level of word semantics, similarities between the Arabic and the Afro-Asiatic languages were known. The state of the research in the diachronic perspective must be described from a cultural perspective, taking into account the language contact situations within a long historical perspective. The diachronic approach starts actually in prehistoric times; its speculative character is best expressed in the assumption of Proto-Semitic and Proto-Indo-European languages. During the Chalcolithic (Copper Age), around 3700 BC cuneiform writing appears in Sumer. Mesopotamian writing was a tool for records, independent from the spoken language used. The Egyptian hieroglyphs also developed around that time. In Mesopotamia, as center of development, we note the *Uruk Period* (ca. 4400–3100 BC), the *Jemdet Nasr Period* (ca. 3100–2900 BC). As for the Early Bronze Age civilizations, the *Early Dynastic Period* (ca. 2900–2350 BC), the *Akkadian Empire* (ca. 2350–2100 BC), the *Ur III Period* (2112–2004 BC), and the *Early Assyrian Kingdom* (24th to 18th century BC) dominated the area. Mesopotamia, as part of the Fertile Crescent, might have had a strong influence on migration and communication. Archaeological findings in Mesopotamia, Bahrain, and Oman show that products with an origin in the Indus Valley civilization are known and trade was done in ports of the Persian Gulf. James writes in his *Prehistoric Religion. A Study in Prehistoric Archaeology*: "Although the transition from food/gathering to food/ production was a very gradual process localized in certain regions, notably in the Fertile Crescent in the Ancient Middle East, where it became an accomplished fact it had a marked effect upon the disposal of the dead in more elaborate tombs and with a more complex mortuary ritual." (James) The main question for the comparison of Semitic and Indo-European roots is, if an influence between

BDD-A4025 © 2012 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:47 UTC)

the Indo-European languages and the Semitic languages exists and if the answer is 'yes', another question opens: 'At which time was an exchange between them happening?' The Indian languages, categorized as part of the Indo-Germanic languages, e.g. Sanskrit, have, according to today's knowledge, no influence on the Semitic languages at an earlier state and time of language exchange. So we have no indication that the Semitic languages might have been influenced by the Indo-European languages on the Indian subcontinent, at an earlier stage during the time of proto-language configuration and existence of the languages now considered to be part of the Indo-European languages. It is a speculative approach to assume that a linguistic exchange between the languages of the territory now related to the Semitic languages and the languages of India and the mainland of Europe existed, in which the Semitic territories of the Arabian Peninsula and the Levant were touched and contacted by the linguistic material of the Indo-European languages. But this would provide an explanation why the lexical and semantic material of both language families is so similar, as can be seen from the following analysis of the concept 'rhetoric / persuasion'.

2.3. The Problems of the Theory of 'Language Contacts' and its Assumptions.

A History of Research in Contrastive Linguistics

Sankoff writes in his *Linguistic Outcomes of Language Contact* that "language contacts have, historically, taken place in large part under conditions of social inequality resulting from wars, conquests, colonialism, slavery, and migrations – forced and otherwise." (Sankoff) Sankoff notes that "this schema neatly brings together the macro level of the language and the micro level of the individual speaker. Its tacit assumptions are that (a) individual speakers can be characterized in terms of native and second languages, and (b) that groups or communities, as collectivities of such individual speakers, are relatively homogeneous in this regard – or at least, that one can abstract away from differences internal to the speech community." (Sankoff) While we can speak about the phenomenon of language contacts in clearly distinguishable settings of languages, we have no testimony of the earliest languages in this regard, with the exception of the Egyptian language. Theoretically, semantically and morphologically similar elements of the thesaurus of three languages can be shared between the three languages, which have different grammars and are distinguishable

BDD-A4025 © 2012 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:47 UTC)

as three independent languages. But is such an assumption applicable to the scenario of the third millennium BC? Is the distinction between languages as separate units at that point the suitable assumption? We doubt its suitability. But we know that the ancient Egyptian language, which considered itself as the 'speech of the country Egypt', without any mentioning of the concept language, possessed words to distinguish the Egyptian language from other foreign contemporary languages; it was a pejorative expression, similar to the connotation of describing other non-Greek languages as 'barbarian'. But even when the awareness of the 'otherness' of speakers of other languages existed, we cannot conclude that it was *de facto* another language, in the contemporary definition of a rule-based, separable linguistic macro-unit.

The assumption of language exchange between the Indo-European languages and the Semitic languages is discussed here in order to find an implementing solution to the question and phenomenon researched, which would show that Indo-European and Semitic languages are related. This kind of research is found in Western research since the second half of the 19th century; this line of research is argumentatively and evidentially supported by the use of the comparative method of 'comparative grammar', which was later continued within the field of 'comparative linguistics'. Brunner (1969) published *Gemeinsamen Wurzeln des semitischen und indogermanischen Wortschatzes. Versuch einer Etymologie*, advancing an etymological claim of the relationship between Indo-Germanic and Semitic languages. Fellman (1978: 51-53) discussed Semitic and Indo-European languages, in an approach based on comparative and historical grammar. Dundes (1992: 257-312) compared the Indo-European and Semitic worldviews. Daube (2000: 15-17) made a contrastive linguistic study of word-formation in Indo-European and Semitic. Bomhard (2011) discussed in *Indo-European and the Nostratic Hypothesis* the idea of the Nostratic language family. Levin, in such works as *The Indo-European and Semitic Languages* (1971), *Studies in Comparative Grammar: III. "Snow", an Early Indo-European Loan-word in Semitic* (1994: 77-84), *Studies in Comparative Grammar: II. The Prehistory of the Indo-European Thematic Declension, in View of the Semitic Cognates* (1992: 111-144), *Semitic Evidence on Some Problems of Indo-European Prehistory* (1992: 249-265), and *Comparative Grammar of Indo-European and Semitic: Is this the Right*

BDD-A4025 © 2012 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:47 UTC)

Time? (1990: 152-164) also contributed to the contrastive linguistic studies on the Indo-Germanic and the Semitic languages. Rundgren (2003: 585-599) research was published in *Semitic and Indoeuropean: A Linguistic Study in Comparative Aspectology*. Vennemann's (2003) claims, presented in *Europa Vasconica, Europa Semitica* were refuted by the scholarly community. The hypothesis of the pre-historical Semitic influence on the Indo-European language is connected to the distribution of Semitic vocabulary into the languages of the Indo-European language family. This hypothesis is not accepted as a standard assumption in linguistics. Vennemann argues that in Europe, after the Ice Ages, 'Semitidic' and 'Atlantic' people had settled that imported the Semitic heritage to Europe. This *Vasconic hypothesis* has been rejected by the absolute majority of linguists, historians, and archaeologists. On the other hand, we have evidence that at least one Semitic language in Europe existed, which is now extinct. So, Indo-European languages could also have entered the territory of the traditional Semitic languages. Also, the proto-language reconstruction is a hypothetical construct of one language per language family. This research conception still relies on the assumption that languages and not speech is the macro-unit of the linguistic exchange at that time. For the time of the prehistoric ages within cultures until the beginning of the historic time there are no criteria of evidence as to the existence of languages in the modern / postmodern sense. For example, in ancient Egypt the concept 'language' did not exist, 'speech' was used as the concept for linguistic communication. The dispersion, a phenomenon we describe later below, between the contemporarily assumed Indo-European and the Semitic languages or their ancestors, should not be considered as an event, when 'one language meets another language'. Speech contact was, besides upcoming images as means of documentation, the only communication tool. Speech contact was not recorded and not literally fixed; it developed as 'word of mouth' from one generation to another, more or less equally shared among the participating persons.

2.4. The Theory of the 'Urheimat' of the Indo-Europeans vs. 'Dispersion for Equity'

Elst observes in *Linguistic Aspects of the Indo-European Urheimat Question* that "when evidence from archaeology and Sanskrit text studies seems to contradict the theory of the entry of the Indo-Aryan branch of the

BDD-A4025 © 2012 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:47 UTC)

Indo-European (IE) language family in India through the so-called 'Aryan Invasion' (*Aryan Invasion Theory*, AIT), we are usually reassured that 'there is of course the linguistic evidence' for this invasion, or at least for the non-Indian origin of the IE family." (Elst) In *Linguistic Aspects of the Indo-European Urheimat Question*, the author notes that "in the 18th century, when comparative IE linguistics started, the majority opinion was that the original homeland (or Urheimat) of the IE language family had to be India. This had an ideological reason, viz. that Enlightenment philosophers such as Voltaire were eager to replace Biblical tradition with a more distant Oriental source of inspiration for European culture. China was a popular candidate, but India had the advantage of being linguistically and even racially more akin to Europe; making it the homeland of the European languages or even of the European peoples, would be helpful in the dethronement of Biblical authority, but by no means far-fetched." (Elst) Recently, the Black Sea Area was considered to be the 'Urheimat' of the Proto-Indo-European language. Elst writes in *Linguistic Aspects of the Indo-European Urheimat Question* that "the contact between Tokharic and Chinese adds little to our knowledge of the Urheimat but merely confirms that the Tokharic people lived that far east. The adoption of almost the whole range of domesticated cattle-names from Tokharic into Chinese also emphasizes a fact insufficiently realized, viz. how innovative the cattle-breeding culture of the early IE tribes really was. They ranked as powerful and capable, and their prestige helped them to assimilate large populations culturally and linguistically. But for Urheimat-related trails, we must look elsewhere." (Elst) For us, the question of the *Urheimat* is not so important, since the framing question of our study is how the speech contacts between the speakers of languages related to those we classify as Semitic languages and the speakers of languages now classified as Indo-European languages existed. The border between Semitic Afro-Asiatic languages and Indo-European languages is a construct. We can replace this construct by arguing that the speech units in the area of the Semitic and Indo-European languages described languages existing in permanent exchange with each other. At the time, the examples discussed below came from linguistic material which was not distinguishable as part of a language family. In our proposed theory of 'dispersion for equity', within the use of linguistic tools for the sharing of speech and making communication possible among

BDD-A4025 © 2012 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:47 UTC)

participating entities, the aim of linguistic communication via speech was to communicate. The grammatical features of distinct languages are a linguistic feature, which came up with the existence of power and the centralized domination of territories. Grammatical features are a criterion of the macro unit 'language', which is a linguistic macro unit coming up later, after the macro unit 'speech'.

2.5. Research of Language Contacts of the Prehistoric Past

Contemporary Hindu and Urdu are languages that show the difference between an Indo-European language and a language highly marked by Semitic influences, through the medium of Arabic. Sahala remarks in *On the Sumero-Indo-European Language Contacts*: "Albeit the genetic affinity of the Sumerian language is still lacking consensus, some vocabulary related to Sumerian may be found from various language families including Indo-European, Kartvelian, Semitic, Dravidian and Uralic. Where the Semitic contacts are well attested, contacts to other families have often been regarded as controversial." (Sahala) According to Sahala, the "Sumerian language was spoken in ancient Mesopotamia from the 4th millennium BC to the Old Babylonian period (1900 BC), during which the Sumerians were gradually assimilated into Akkadian speaking Babylonians. By the end of the 17th century BC Sumerian was no longer spoken as a first language but it was still studied by Akkadian scholars as a classical language and its literary tradition continued for almost two millennia." (Sahala) So the Sumerian language might have been in contact with the old Indo-European language on the Indian subcontinent and the territories of Central Asia northwards. However, as Sahala states, "regardless of numerous attempts to connect Sumerian with Caucasian, Semitic, Ural-Altaic, (Elamo-) Dravidian, Basque and Indo-European languages, by the vast majority of scholars it is still regarded as a language isolate with no known relatives". (Sahala) Sahala observes that "where the Proto-Indo-European sound system is completely based on reconstruction and thus reflects the pronunciation on an abstract level, also, the exact quality of the Sumerian phonemic inventory is uncertain." (Sahala) Studying the Proto-languages for the Semitic and the Indo-Germanic language branches, we can soon conclude that there are similarities of the branches representing the concept 'speech'. Nevertheless, they will be presented here as a case study of the material for the Proto-Semitic and the

BDD-A4025 © 2012 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:47 UTC)

Proto-(Indo-) Germanic language, available in the research database *Tower of Babel* initiated by Starostin. Levin (1995) mentions several examples for etymological relationships between Indo-European and Semitic languages. Levin notes that "long prehistoric experience, in IE and in Semitic, must likewise have weeded out many erstwhile collocations of consonants, and left either language group (or its individual languages) with certain patterns that were readily compatible with the verb-inflections." (Levin 1995: 167) Levin observes that in the Indo-European family the Greek *χρά/ή* is related to the Semitic Hebrew *qar'* for 'call'. The Semitic Arabic *isman* is related to the Indo-European Slavic *im* for 'name' and the Avestan *nām* for 'name'. The Indo-European *(-)λε/0χ-* refers to the Semitic Hebrew *-leg-* for 'lie'. (Levin) Etymological relations do exist; examples are the *musara* 'inscription' related to the Indo-Iranian **mudra* for 'seal', and *igi* 'eye' is related to the Proto-Indo-European **h3ekw-* for 'eye' (Sahala). Jagodziński mentions, in *Indo-European and Semitic Languages*, several equivalent forms within the etymology of Indo-European and Semitic languages. The Arabic *lisān* 'tongue' and 'language' is related to *laḥwasa* 'lick', the Hebrew *lāšōn* 'tongue' and 'language' to *lāqaq* 'lick', the English *tongue*, the Gothic *tungo*, the Latin *lingua*, the Old Latin *dingua*, the Sanskrit *juhū-*, *jihvā-*, the Avestan *hizū, hizvā*, the Polish *język*, the Prussian *insuwis*, the Lithuanian *liežùvis*, the Greek *glõtta, glõssa, glátta*, and maybe also the Latin *gingīva* 'gum of a tooth', the Greek *gamphēlaí* 'muzzle' and 'mouth'; the Polish *lizać* 'lick', the Lithuanian *liẽžti*, the Greek *leíkhō*, the Latin *lingō*, and the English *lick*. The Arabic *qāla* 'speak', the English *call* from the Nordic *kalla*, the Briton *galw* and the Polish *głos* 'voice' are related. (Jagodziński) Jagodziński argues that it is language exchange, or, more precisely, speech exchange, rather than a common ancestor language that lies at the origin of the similarities between Indo-European and Semitic languages. Jagodziński remarks in *Indo-European and Semitic Languages*: "There was a time in the science when it was thought quite seriously that the first proto-language – or the language from which all the others originated – was Hebrew. A specific reminiscence of that view is the opinion that a special close genetic relation exists between Indo-European (IE) and Semitic languages. Such a view can still be found in some works. Newer investigations suggest very strongly that such a view is not correct and that the previously demonstrated similarities of both language families

BDD-A4025 © 2012 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:47 UTC)

are the result of the connections between them during thousands of years rather than of their common origin. Nevertheless, those similarities are odd, and the circumstances of their development are not clear in all respects." (Jagodziński) The circumstances of the development of the similarities between the Semitic and Indo-European languages, which, according to Jagodziński, are not clear in research, can be illustrated by our examples. The examples given demonstrate that at the time of the prehistoric age, in the third millennium BC, the semantic and lexical configurations of words from one concept were extremely similar; the configurations were so similar that they bring into discussion the form of the macro-unit of the linguistic representation. On the basis of our examples, we can identify the lexical, morphological, and semantic similarities. But we cannot make statements about the syntactical features of grammatical descriptions of linguistic rules.

2.6. Research of the Theory of the Common Ancestor of the Indo-European and Semitic Languages and the Question of its Chronology

Description of the Speech Contact Situation of the Proto-Language State

We are still evaluating the relations between the Semitic Afro-Asiatic and Indo-European languages. Jagodziński writes in *Indo-European and Semitic Languages* that "if the Indo-European and Semitic languages had a common ancestor, it was only in the very distant past. The IE protolanguage surely existed ca. 4,000 BC. It is supposed that the Nostratic commonwealth must have existed, 11,000–15,000 BP. At the same time, the common ancestor of, among others, the Indo-European and Semitic languages should have existed ca. 25,000 BP. It is not strange that traces which have remained of that distant ancestor until today are very scarce, and the prevailing part of the similarities of both groups should be explained with the parallel development and mutual interactions." (Jagodziński) Jagodziński points out that "it is interesting that in the Semitic languages we can find not only almost all counterparts of the IE ablaut, but also the function of particular alternations seems to be similar in some cases. Qualitative alternations (originally in the shape *a : i : u*) and quantitative alternations (reduction and lengthening) are so frequent in this group of languages that only the consonantal skeleton of words is

BDD-A4025 © 2012 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:47 UTC)

considered to be the root (it consists of 3 consonants as a rule)." (Jagodziński) Armitage and colleagues write in *Pre-historic Arabia Crossroads for Early Humans (and Neanderthal Hybrids?). The Southern Route "Out of Africa": Evidence for an Early Expansion of Modern Humans into Arabia*: "The timing of the dispersal of anatomically modern humans (AMH) out of Africa is a fundamental question in human evolutionary studies. Existing data suggest a rapid coastal exodus via the Indian Ocean rim around 60,000 years ago." (Armitage; Jasim; Marks; Parker; Usik; Uerpmann 2011: 454) Armitage and colleagues mention that "Arabia and its fierce deserts have long been seen more as obstacles than conduits to human migration and most archaeology here has focused on historical times. Recent studies, however, show wetter periods such as the one that began around 130,000 years ago." (Armitage; Jasim; Marks; Parker; Usik; Uerpmann 2011: 455) We must not forget that the oral language was the tool used to communicate by spoken intercourse in prehistoric times; the faculty of speech was not recorded, but shared and communicated from person to person; language(s) was/were not fixed or coded; the language had to serve as a tool for communication. Language as the faculty of speech extended at any point and to any person in prehistoric times. So it is amazing that it stayed stable within a time continuum. The grammatical aspects, as structural elements of language, could only arise at a point when this structural changing of its material, the word which refers to a concept, was applicable to a set of words in a language as a linguistic macro-unit. The language dispersion at that time was different from contemporary language contact situations. In Europe, Maltese is the only contemporary Semitic language spoken. It has been assumed (Toth 2007) that Reatic is a Semitic language now extinct, which had been spoken in Central Europe. No Semitic languages are known on the Indian subcontinent. The Nostratic family tree is a recently built family tree, which consists of the family tree of the Indo-European languages, the Semitic languages, and the Afro—Asiatic languages. The Sanskrit language is an old Indo-European language, which had speech contact situations in contacts with both the Arabic peninsula and the continental area reaching up to northern Europe. Both the maritime route to the Arabic peninsula and the continental route to Europe were open for language contacts, which blurs the line of a strict separation between the Semitic Arabic language and

BDD-A4025 © 2012 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:47 UTC)

Indo-European languages. An impact of the lexicon of Sanskrit on Semitic languages existed during the language states of prehistoric time.

3. Research Methodology

In this article we discuss the concept 'rhetoric / persuasion', on the basis of the scientific history of the comparative and contrastive studies between Indo-European, Afro-Asiatic and Semitic languages, in the specific case of the earliest language levels. We will argue that, besides the separation of the language families, there also existed an exchange between these language families. While this study discusses topics ascribed to the field of 'historical linguistics' and 'language contact studies', we argue that the correct terms for such studies should be linguistic communication studies in speech contacts; the impact of one language on another can only be studied within speech situations. We focus on the semantic aspect and the historical linguistic perspective of language comparison. The language contact study on Indo-European, Afro-Asiatic, and Semitic languages will be conducted within the comparison of the Proto-language levels and ancient Egyptian as a recorded language of the 3rd millennium BC. While we can clearly state that the modern Indo-European and Afro-Asiatic languages belong to different language families, this article focuses on examples of semantic and lexical similarities which allow us to bring into discussion the linguistic communication and language contact situation(s) between the earliest states of these language branches, now differentiated. We can use the term 'concept' in its common use as the mental representation of knowledge in a unit and also in a very specific context. We suggest the use of the term 'concept' as a linguistic term in a linguistic context for the description of the basic unit of a word in order to describe its meaning. For example, we find that the root *B(/BH)-L-Q* as the synthesis between the Indo-European root and the Semitic root has the meanings or concepts REACH, GET, ARRIVE, COME etc. from the Semitic side (see below), plus the meanings from the Indo-European side as its complete meaning-bearing and thus knowledge-bearing unit representing the concept implemented. In the long etymological range, all the entries under one word in an etymological wordbook can also serve as the realizations of a concept. The difference between the approaches to linguistic concepts representing units is that in the research area concerned with the Indo-European

BDD-A4025 © 2012 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:47 UTC)

languages, the differentiation between the ten forms of the verb finds its equivalent in the Indo-European roots, but any approaches to systematizing the forms are lacking in research. For instance, Pokorny offers in his list of etyma roots examples that show similarities to be grouped. How the concept as a 'macro-unit' and the concept as the 'linguistically represented unit' refer to each other is the topic of the research. It is placed within the framework of material relating to the concept of 'rhetoric'/'persuasion' since prehistoric times.

4. The Concept of Rhetoric in Indo-European, Semitic, and Asian-Sino-Asiatic Languages

4.1. Case 1: The Linguistic Concept Linguistically Represented in *L-U(/O)-GH(Q)*

This concept can also be found in the Afro-Asiatic language Ancient Egyptian, represented in the verb *rui* for 'to go out' and 'to depart'(Wallis Budge: 420). *L* and *r* are identical in ancient Egyptian. The relationship between this verb and later Semitic forms needs further investigation. The Arabic Proto-Semitic root finds a linguistic representation in the contemporary Arabic noun *lugha* for 'language'. The term *loqui* for 'to say' is the root for the term *eloquentia* ('eloquence'). The etymological history is dubious in the Indo-European languages. The Latin *loqui* comprises 'to speak', 'to say', 'to name' and is traced back to the Indo-European root **tolkᵘ̯-* for 'to say' (Pokorny etymon 1088). This derivation is doubtful (Koebler 2005). Pokorny's etymon 1088 *tolkᵘ̯-* has the meaning 'to speak'. In Semitic languages, the Proto-Semitic **lVɣ-* within the Afro-Asiatic etymology has the meanings of 'to stammer', 'to speak incoherently', 'to speak', 'to chat', 'to chatter' and 'to speak briskly'. Related to it are the Hebrew *lʕʕ*, the Arabic *lɣw*, and the Tigre *laʕleʕä*. The noun لغـــة has the semantic field of 'language', 'tongue', 'speech', and 'talk'. Also لســان for 'tongue' and 'language' exists.

4.2. Case 2: The Linguistic Concept Linguistically Represented in *R-A(/E)-I*

Pokorny's etymon 859-60 of the Indo-European Proto-language *rei-*, *rē(i)-* with the Indo-European root *reibh-* has the meanings of 'to cry', 'to scream', 'to bellow' and the related expressions. Koebler (2006: 926) lists the Indo-Germanic root **rē-* for 'to calculate' and 'to count' with reference

BDD-A4025 © 2012 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:47 UTC)

to the Pokorny etymon 853 *rē-*, *rə-*, extended *rē-dh* for 'to count', 'to compute'. Pokorny's etymon 860 *rēi-* and *rī-* has the meanings 'to count' and 'to arrange'. The root **rēi*, with the meanings 'to fit', 'to count', 'to arrange', refers to Pokorny's etymon 860 and also has in its linguistic applications meanings such as 'to narrate'. The Arabic root *r-a-I* is used for 'to say'. Its basic meanings are 'to see', 'to behold', 'to descry', 'to perceive', 'to notice', 'to think', 'to have the opinion', 'to express one's opinion'. The noun *rai* is used for 'opinion', 'view', 'idea', 'notion', 'concept', 'conception', 'advice', 'suggestion', and 'proposal'. The noun رأي comprises in present-day Arabic the meanings 'opinion', 'view', 'to say', 'judgment' and 'persuasion'. In Hebrew רָאָה (*raʔah*) means 'to see', 'to look', 'to inspect', 'to consider', and 'to perceive'. The Arabic root ىرأ *also* refers to the concept 'to see', with the semantic meanings 'to see', 'to look', 'to cast one's gaze on', 'to perceive', and 'to comprehend' (*Semitic Root Repository*). This concept can also be found in the Afro-Asiatic language Ancient Egyptian, represented in the noun *ra* for 'sun' and 'day' and *re* with the meaning 'mouth'. (Wallis Budge: 417)

4.3. Case 3: The Linguistic Concept of 'Rhetoric'/'Persuasion' Linguistically Represented in *B(/BH)-L-Q*

Ancient Egyptian *per* means 'to go outside', 'to proceed', 'to grow up (plants), 'to pass a limit', 'to arise' (Wallis Budge: 218). The sign for the sounds *'l'* and *'r'* was identical. The root *b-l-q* (بلـــــغ) in Arabic refers 'to reach', 'to get', 'to arrive', 'to come', 'to come to age', and 'to reach a high degree' in the first form I, while form III stands for 'to exaggerate', and form IV *ab-l-q* is used for 'to report'. The noun *balagh* means 'communication', *balagha* (بلاغـــــة) means 'eloquence', and rhetoric is the *ilm al-balagha* (Wehr 1976: 73-74). Pokorny's etymon 125-26 *bhelĝh-* has the meanings 'to swell', 'to bulge', 'to billow'. The etymon 155 *bhlegu̯-* has the meanings 'to swell' and 'to become bloated'. The etymon 123-24 *bhel-* has the meanings 'to speak', 'to bell', 'to bellow', and 'to resound'. The etymon 124 *bh(e)lāg-* means 'weak', 'silly', and 'ridiculous'. The etymon 122-23 *bhel-*, *bheləĝ-*, *bhelə-n-ĝ-*, *bheleĝ-*, and *bhl̥k̂-* means 'to balk', 'to beam', and 'to rafter'. The root **bha* (Koebler 2006: 94) has the meaning 'to speak' and refers to Pokorny's etymon 105. The root **bhel-* has the meanings 'to blow up' and 'to swell' and refers to Pokorny's

BDD-A4025 © 2012 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:47 UTC)

etymon 120 (199/32). (Koebler 2006: 115) The root **bhel-* has the meanings 'to bloom' and 'to grow' and is identified as Pokorny'a etymon 122 (200/33). (Koebler 2006: 119) The root **bhel-* refers to Pokorny's etymon 122 (201/34). (Koebler 2006: 120) The root **bhelegh-* also refers to Pokorny's etymon 122. (Koebler 2006: 122) The root **bhelgh-* refers to Pokorny's etymon 125 (207/40). (Koebler 2006: 123) Pokorny's root 120-22 *bhel-*, *bhlē-* refers to 'to grow', 'to spread', 'to swell', and 'to inflate'. Pokorny's root 122 *bhel-*, *bhlē-*, *bhlō-*, and *bhlə-* refers to 'leaf', 'foil', 'blade', and 'bloom'. Pokorny's root 122-23 *bhel-*, chiefly with suffixes as *bheləĝ-*, *bhelə-n-ĝ-*, *bheleĝ-*, and *bhl̥k̂-* refers to the meanings 'to balk', 'to beam', and 'to rafter'. Pokorny's root 123-24 *bhel-* refers to the meanings 'to speak', 'to bell', 'to bellow', and 'to resound'.

4.4. Case 4: The Linguistic Concept of 'Rhetoric'/'Persuasion' Linguistically Represented in *S-U-A-D*

The basic meaning of the Proto-Indo-European root *su̯ād-* is 'sweet'. Pokorny lists under the etymon 1039-40 *su̯ād-* the meanings 'sweet' and 'to enjoy something'. The root **suadys* referring to Pokorny's etymon 1039 has the meaning 'sweet'. (Koebler 2006: 1221) The *Tower of Babel* lists under its entry of the Indo-European root **swād-* , which is related to the Greek *hw-*, the meanings 'sweet' and 'to persuade'. Related to it are the Tokharian A *swār* and B *swāre* for 'sweet'. Old Indian *svādú-* has the meanings 'sweet', 'pleasant', and 'agreeable'; *svádate* and *svádati* mean 'to taste well', 'to enjoy', and 'to like'. The Avestan *xʷāsta-* means 'made ready by cooking'; *xʷanda-kara-* is 'pleasant', and Pashto *xwand* is a 'nice taste' and 'pleasure'. Related are also the Old Greek *hā̆dú-* and *wadü-s* for 'sweet' and 'good tasting', 'pleasant', and 'delightful'. *Hā́domai̯* means 'to enjoy' and 'to delight'. Related are the Baltic **sū̂d-ī̂-*, the Germanic **swōt-u-*, **swōt-i-*, and **sut-i-*, the Latin *suāvis* for 'sweet', 'delightful', and *suādeō*, *suāsī*, *suāsum*, *suādēre* for 'to give advice'. In the Altaic language family, the Altaic **čị́átu* has the meaning 'sweet'. Related is also the Kartvelian **ṣatx-*. (*Tower of Babel*) The Greek form *hw-* with the meanings 'sweet' and 'to persuade' is the form that links the Indo-European languages and the Semitic languages. The Proto-Semitic **ḥVlaw-* and **ḥVlaw-* in the Afroasiatic etymology have the meaning 'to be sweet'. Related is the Arabic *ḥlw [-a-]*, which is based on the biconsonantal **ḥal-*.

BDD-A4025 © 2012 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:47 UTC)

The Proto-Afro-Asiatic **ḥal-* has the meaning 'be sweet'. Related are the Egyptian *haire*, Semitic **ḥVlaw-* and **ḥVlaw-* for 'to be sweet'. The Western Chadic **ḥall-* means 'sweet juice sucked from the abdomen of a hornet' and the Central Chadic **hal-* means 'sweet'. The contemporary Arabic حلـــو means 'sweet'. Ancient Egyptian is covered as an early Afro-Asiatic language in this concept.

4.5. Case 5: The Linguistic Concept of 'Rhetoric'/'Persuasion' Linguistically Represented in *B-H-TH*

The Proto-Indo-European root **bheidh-* has the meanings 'to persuade' and 'to agree'. The root **bheidh* refers to Pokorny's root 117 (194/27), with the meanings 'to force', 'to advise', 'to confide', 'to encourage'. (Koebler 2006: 106) Related are the Old Greek *péi̯thomai̯* for 'to trust', 'to be persuaded', and 'to obey'; *pístis* means 'trust' and *pêi̯sma* is 'persuasion' and 'confidence'. Related are the Slavic **po-bēdĭtī* and **ū-bēdĭtī* and the Germanic **bīd-a-*. The Latin *fīdō* means 'trust. Related is the Albanian *bint* for 'to persuade' and 'to agree'. The Arabic *bahatha* (بحـــث) means 'to search', 'to investigate' in form I. In form VI it means 'to discuss'. The noun *bahth* (بحـــث) means 'discussion'. The nouns مناقشـــــــة stand for 'discussion', 'debate', 'talk', 'dispute', 'argumentation', بحـــث for 'search', 'consideration', 'discussion', 'study', 'seeking', and 'investigation', حـــــوار for 'dialogue', 'discussion', and 'interlocutor', محادثـــــــة for 'conversation', 'talk', 'dialogue', 'discussion', 'discourse', 'parley', and منـــــــاظرة for 'debate', 'discussion', 'controversy', 'dispute', and 'disputation'. The Ancient Egyptian *peht* has the meanings 'strenghth', 'might', 'power', 'bravery', and 'renown'. (Wallis Budge: 218) The sound '*p*' is the equivalent to '*bh*'.

5. The Analysis of the Concepts

5.1. Theoretical Framework and Knowledge

As we could see in other studies about the extension of linguistic contents, the extension of a concept in its linguistic application through dispersion goes across the traditional separation of language families as established in the Christian tradition; Semitic and Indo-European linguistic material is partly identical as shown by Levin (1995); this identity concerns structural, morphological and semantic parallels. So the process we call

BDD-A4025 © 2012 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:47 UTC)

'dispersion' must have happened in a prehistoric time. Its extension can only be considered as subject of studies as far as the linguistic documentation is evident. But we have reason to assume (at least for a part of the linguistic thesaurus) that the Indo-European and the Semitic words evincing similarities derived from a common ancestor language, since the linguistic root was equally modified in both languages ('*Common Ancestor Theory'*) or both had a common language between them, which is now not known ('*Blank Language Theory*') or served as dialects of one undifferentiated language ('*Theory of one Language – Many Dialects*').

5.2. Discussion of Findings, Contemporary Theories of Language Families

Based on Proto-Language States and Development of Language, and the Speech/Language Distinction

The Nostratic family is proposed to be a super-family with Eurasian Indo-European, Uralic and Altaic and Kartvelian languages and the Afro-Asiatic languages of North Africa, the Horn of Africa, the Arabian Peninsula and the Near East, plus the Dravidian languages of the Indian Subcontinent. Starostin divides Borean languages into the Nostratic and Dene–Daic families. This theory is supported by our findings, even though only for two language families. The *Proto-Human Language Theory* assumes the existence of a common language shared among all humans. Thus, no language was independent and originated on its own. The term 'language contact studies' the most recent used in the field for contacts between languages. But this term implies some problematic assumptions. It implies that languages were in contact with each other; but the term 'languages' is irritating: it implies that languages always existed; it excludes other forms of communicative networks building linguistic systems and ignores the fact that the concept 'language' wasn't consciously known or practiced. On the contrary, speech as the human ability to communicate orally in established, repetitively and redundantly performed speech contents must have existed.

Chomsky is a representative proponent of the '*Discontinuity theory*' of human language, claiming that language developed *ex nihilo* without any previous steps or forms of development. We would agree, since the stability of the linguistic material for the concept 'rhetoric' supports the

BDD-A4025 © 2012 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:47 UTC)

reconfiguration of contents of speech at any time. The meaning-bearing units of speech itself show, taking our example, continuity from the assumed time of around 3600 BC to contemporary use that can be an argument for the 'self-establishment' of speech. The issue linguists investigate in the lexical thesaurus, the syntax, the morphology, and the semantics, refers to languages as macro-systematic units for speech performance at specific synchronic and topological positions. But speech as the faculty of oral performance is an expression of the human and as such a faculty similar to hearing, walking, etc. Languages as we find them as linguistic 'macro-units' in our scholarly studies are 'conditionalized frameworks' for the performance of human speech. They are learned and the human individual is supposed to enter these 'conditionalized frameworks' of speech. Speech is thus form and content at the same time in our differentiation, while language is the established framework of ruled applications of speech. But since our linguistic material is much earlier than the beginnings of speech / human language are supposed to be, we are not discussing origins here. Our material indicates that at a specific time in the history of humans the phonetic similarity of speech / human language spoken in Northern Africa, the Arabic peninsula, and Europe was so high, that we can consider them to have a common linguistic 'macro-unit', which was spoken. Why it is problematic to speak about language / languages in this regard will be discussed below. Similarly to Chomsky's assumption that language is an innate faculty of the human, we assume that not language, but the faculty of speech is the innate faculty of human beings, determining all human linguistic communication and other tools of communication, as well as the formation of languages as macro units of human linguistic communication.

The utterly inconvenient theoretical frame of the science is that languages always existed; and this premise brings into play the implication that enclosed, bordered territories of languages framed against each other have always existed. Even historical linguists speak about Proto-languages. But it would be wiser to consider other forms of 'macro-units', better matching the nature of speech and the spoken character of the early performance of human communication; of course we know from Saussure that language is also a human faculty; but in the early stages of human development it was not a stable one. For example, sound shifting and the

BDD-A4025 © 2012 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:47 UTC)

non-connotation of vowels as flexible elements in spoken languages are to be found in the ancient Egyptian language. The phenomenon of sound-shifting is also known in the Indo-European languages. In this language family the change of vowels was also used as an indicator for grammatical changes like in the Semitic and the Afro-Asiatic languages.

We can be sure that, in pre-historic times, language was not experienced as a social phenomenon, with diverse languages. Language was experienced as binding and connecting, as well as a given of birth. The option of recording it was not taken into account; at least we have no documents dating from prehistoric time. So the concept 'language' is, in its contemporary sophistication, hardly employable to the human communication via speech at that time. Taking the example of the Ancient Egyptian language, we can see that the documentation of words entailed symbols and images. The ancient Egyptians used for their own language the expressions *metu m r n Kemet* (Wallis Budge: 335) and *r n Kemet* (Wallis Budge: 416), which means 'words in the mouth of Egypt' and 'speech of Egypt'; thus, the concept 'language' was lacking here, and the concept 'speech' was used instead for the communicative action of the land itself in a cognitive metaphorical setting. Language can only be defined here as the human individual's ability to speak. Neither in the Proto-languages do we have any evidence for the concept 'language' as represented in roots. Grammatical and modern/postmodern linguistic features of the speech content of the linguistic 'macro-unit' might have been quite different at the time this material was taken as representative linguistic material. But it is useless to enquire about the separation of features and the characteristics of a language in the modern/postmodern sense in the case of the 'macro-unit' of that time. We can demonstrate the coherence of the smallest units of language, words, across a wide topographical area, but we cannot derive the conclusion that a language / languages existed.

Our material demonstrates that the morphological structure of the roots for the concept 'rhetoric / rhetoric' are similar in the authentically documented ancient Egyptian language and the two hypothetical Proto-languages, Proto-Semitic and Proto-Indo-European. The meanings of the examined roots are identical to or prototypical of generalized meanings from which the concept arose in later languages. Derived words in later languages preserved the concept. Since both the hypothetical languages and

BDD-A4025 © 2012 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:47 UTC)

ancient Egyptian fall into the same timeframe of development, around 3600 BC plus/minus 1000 years, we conclude that the synchronic identity of these languages supposed to be spoken in Egypt, the Arabian peninsula and Europe lies within the same lexical inventory equipped when we generalize our findings of the concept 'rhetoric'. We cannot determine if it was one or several languages, dialects, or other linguistic forms, but we can assume that the lexical linguistic inventory was similar. In terms of language contact, or rather better said, speech contact, we conclude that between Europe, Arabia, Africa, and the Indian subcontinent, speech contact existed, with a linguistic inventory of morphologically and semantically slightly different inventory. As mentioned above, we cannot say anything about the linguistic configuration (language or dialects), but at the level of the smallest sense-carrying unit, the word, the unity and similarity of the linguistic material is obvious.

5.3. 'Dispersion' of Physical Communication and the Exchange Process of Languages and Mental Concepts

The dispersion of the linguistic carriers of concepts in concrete languages is undirected. We cannot predict how a concept develops or is realized in the form of its linguistic applications. For instance, a language will spread locally. But we can say that concepts spread across linguistic barriers like different languages; languages permanently work in exchange with each other. In the cases we looked at, the similarities between the Proto-Indo-European and the Semitic language Arabic show that the differentiation between Semitic and Indo-European languages is not needed, and it merely results from the induction of the former hypothetical approach to the distinction between language families, since – at least in the case of the concept 'rhetoric' – this concept finds in both these traditional language branches similar linguistic representations with equal meanings. Historical linguistic studies investigate into this issue using case studies like this one. Surely, physical exchange (e.g. movements of people, trade) enforces dispersion. Dispersion means that a linguistic unit with a conceptual meaning (e.g. a word with semantic representational meaning) extends by any means through reduplication. But language is a conservative means; it rather prefers to modify the old than create the new. We can assume that there is a relation between physical movements of words and

BDD-A4025 © 2012 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:47 UTC)

movements of mental conceptions. A concept can be carried in the form of applications across barriers of time and space. Even though dispersion is undirected for us as observing researchers and can only punctually be followed in all of the cases, when an actually existing linguistic representative form is available, it concerns only the grammatical features of a language. On the basis of our findings in the two traditional language families, we can say that similarity between them exists at a conceptual level ignoring grammatical configurations within languages. Limitations are established through linguistic barriers like dialects, languages, and features like synchronic and diachronic change. The dispersion of realized entities in languages still containing the concepts is undirected. Persuasion, in a historical linguistic perspective, is a concept we can use to demonstrate that traditional assumptions about the linguistic barriers of languages cannot be upheld. We can demonstrate that barriers for concepts of rhetoric were, in their linguistic representations, already commonly ready and identical within the Indo-European and the Semitic language family. As examples of this phenomenon we have taken linguistic representations of the concept 'rhetoric' in the Arabic and Indo-European language family.

Works Cited

AGMON, Noam, 2010, „Materials and Language: Pre-Semitic Root Structure Change. Concomitant with Transition to Agriculture.", in: *Brill's Annual of Afroasiatic Languages and Linguistics* 2, pp. 23-79.

ARMITAGE, Simon J.; JASIM, Sabah A.; MARKS, Anthony E.; PARKER, Adrian G.; USIK, Vitaly I., UERPMANN, Hans-Peter, 2011, „Pre-historic Arabia Crossroads for Early Humans (and Neanderthal Hybrids?). The Southern Route „Out of Africa": Evidence for an Early Expansion of Modern Humans into Arabia.", in: *Science,* January 28; 331.6016, pp. 453-456.

BRUNNER, Linus, 1969, *Gemeinsamen Wurzeln des semitischen und indogermanischen Wortschatzes. Versuch einer Etymologie.* Bern, München: Francke.

Contemporary writings of Arabic words were derived from: *Google Translation Tool*. Google. August 23, 2012. <Http://www.google/translate.com>.

BDD-A4025 © 2012 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:47 UTC)

DATABASES, 2011, *The Tower of Babel Project*. Initiated by Sergei Starostin. Starling. June 23. <http://starling.rinet.ru/cgi-bin/main.cgi?flags=eygtnnl>.

DAUBE, David, 2000, „Word-formation in Indo-European and Semitic", in: *Lex et Romanitas: Essays for Alan Watson,*Ed. Michael H. Hoeflich, Berkeley, Calif.: The Robbins Collection, pp.15-17.

DOI: 10.1126/science.1199113

DUNDES, Alan, 1992, „Wet and Dry, the Evil Eye: An Essay in Indo-European and Semitic Worldview", in: Dundes, Alan, *The Evil Eye: A Casebook,* Madison, Wis.: Univ. of Wisconsin Pr. pp. 257-312.

ELST, Koenraad, 2012, „Linguistic Aspects of the Indo-European Urheimat Question.", in: *Bharatvani. Website Koenraad Elst,* February 23. <http://koenraadelst.bharatvani.org/articles/aid/urheimat.html>.

FELLMAN, Jack, 1978, „Semitic Linguistics and Indo-European Comparative and Historical Grammar.", in: *Linguistics,* 206, pp. 51-53.

HALLEN, Cynthia L., 2011, „A Description of the Afro-Asiatic (Hamito-Semitic) Language Family", Brigham Young University, June 23. <http://linguistics.byu.edu/classes/ling450ch/reports/afro-asiatic.html>.

JAGODZIŃSKI, Grzegorz, 2012, *Indo-European and Semitic Languages.* Grzegorz Jagodziński, February 23. <http://grzegorj.w.interia.pl/lingwen/iesem1.html>.

JAMES, E.O., 2012, *Prehistoric Religion. A Study in Prehistoric Archaeology*. New York: Barnea and Noble, 1962. US Petabox. August 23. <http://www30.us.archive.org/stream/prehistoricrelig00jame/prehistoricrelig00jame_djvu.txt>.

KÖBLER, Gerhard, 2012, *Indogermanisches Wörterbuch.* 3rd ed. 2006. Homepage Gerhard Köbler, August 23. <http://www.koeblergerhard.de/idgwbhin.html>.

KÖBLER, Gerhard, 2012, *Lateinisches Abkunfts- und Wirkungswörterbuch.* 2005. Homepage Gerhard Köbler. August 23. <http://www.koeblergerhard.de/Latein/LateinischesWB.pdf>.

KONINKLIJKE, Brill N.V., 2010, *Leiden,*. June 23, 2011. http://www.fh.huji.ac.il/~agmon/Fullpaper/AALL_002_online_23-79.pdf>.

LEVIN, Saul, 1971, *The Indo-European and Semitic Languages.* Albany (N. Y.): State University of New York Press.

LEVIN, Saul, 1992, „Semitic Evidence on Some Problems of Indo-European Prehistory.", in: *Word* 43.2, pp. 249-265.

BDD-A4025 © 2012 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:47 UTC)

LEVIN, Saul, 1992, „Studies in Comparative Grammar: II. The Prehistory of the Indo-European Thematic Declension, in View of the Semitic Cognates.", in: *General Linguistics* 32.2-3, pp. 111-144.

LEVIN, Saul, 1994 „Studies in Comparative Grammar: III. "Snow". An Early Indo-European Loan-word in Semitic", in: *General Linguistics*, 34.2, pp. 77-84.

LEVIN, Saul, 1995, *Semitic and Indo-European. Its Principal Etymologies. With Observations on Afro-Asiatic.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins,.

MENDENHALL, George E., 2006, „Arabic in Semitic Linguistic History.", in: Journal of the American Oriental Society 126, 1, pp. 17-26. American Oriental Society. August 23, 2012. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20064451>.

POKORNY, Julius, 2012, *Indo-European Lexicon. Pokorny Master PIE Etyma.* Linguistics Research Center of the University of Texas at Austin, University of Texas at Austin. August 23. <http://www.utexas.edu/cola/centers/lrc/ielex/PokornyMaster-X.html>.

QUINTILIAN, Marcus Fabius, 2012, *Institutio Oratoria.* The Latin Library. August 23. <Http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/quintilian/quintilian.institutio5.shtml>.

RUNDGREN, Frithiof, 2003, „Semitic and Indoeuropean: A Linguistic Study in Comparative Aspectology". In: Semitic and Assyriological Studies presented to Pelio Fronzaroli by Pupils and Colleagues. Ed. Paolo Marrassini. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, pp. 585-599.

SAHALA, Aleksi, 2012, „On the Sumero-Indo-European Language Contacts". University of Helsinki. February 23. <http://www.ling.helsinki.fi/~asahala/asahala_sumerian_and_pie.pdf>.

SANKOFF, Gillian, 2001, „Linguistic Outcomes of Language Contact". in: Peter Trudgill, J. Chambers & N. Schilling-Estes (eds.): *Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, pp. 638-668. University of Pennsylvania. February 23, 2012. <http://www.ling.upenn.edu/~gillian/Interlang.doc.pdf>.

Semitic Root Repository. August 23, 2012. <http://www.semiticroots.net/index.php?r=word/view&id=232>.

TOTH, Alfred; BRUNNER, Linus, 2007, „Raetic. An extinct Semitic Language in Central Europe.", The Hague, Holland: Mikes

BDD-A4025 © 2012 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:47 UTC)

International,. Hungarian Federation in the Neatherlands. August 23, 2012. <http://www.federatio.org/mi_bibl/Toth_Brunner_Raetic.pdf>.

VENNEMANN, Theo, 2003, *Europa Vasconica, Europa Semitica*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

VERNET, Eulàlia, 2011, „Semitic Root Incompatibilities and Historical Linguistics.", in: *Journal of Semitic Studies* 56.1, pp. 1-18.

WALLIS Budge, ERNST Alfred, 1920, *Egyptian Hieroglyphic Dictionary*, London: Murray.

WEHR, Hans, 1976, *A Dictionary of Written Arabic*. Ithaka, New York: Spoken Languages Services, Inc., pp. 73-74.

ZACK, Liesbeth, 2012, *Middle Arabic and Mixed Arabic: Diachrony and Synchrony,* Leiden: Brill.

Rezumat:

Metode de analiză a contactelor de limbă: cazul „ubicuităţii retoricului". Analiza comparativă a coerenţei conceptuale a vorbirii ca macro-cadru

În acest studiu se aplică o metodă comparativ-diacronică în analiza coerenţei conceptuale dintre termeni referitori la retorică şi persuasiune. Sunt vizate trăsăturile lingvistice legate de acest concept în cadrul a trei arii lingvistice: limbile indo-europene, limbile semitice şi limbile afro-asiatice. Am ales cazul conceptului de 'retorică'/'persuasiune' ca paradigmă pentru acest studiu. Prin fenomenul de 'dispersare lingvistică' putem explica dezvoltarea limbii ca fiind nedirecţionată, dar cu coerenţe lingvistice dincolo de graniţele familiilor de limbi. Scopul a fost să dovedim că limbile semitice şi indo-europene sunt înrudite. În consecinţă, diferenţierea strictă dintre familiile de limbi semitice şi indo-europene devine desuetă ca urmare a postulatelor cercetării lui Starostin. Prin contrast cu aceasta, propunem o teorie a schimbului cultural dintre cele două familii lingvistice.

Cuvinte cheie:

Coerență conceptuală, retorică, persuasiune, dispersare lingvistică, schimb cultural.

BDD-A4025 © 2012 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române

Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:09:47 UTC)