

The “Babel Language”: Roots of a Globalised Communication

Abstract. In order to better understand homo loquens, a careful attention should be given to the postulate according to which both cosmic and human universe rely on recessive dualities such as chaos and cosmos, dark and light, silence and talking, nature and culture. For it is not always easy to explain the complex way a certain reality changes into its opposite. For example, we still look into the matter: How was it possible for a divine, pure spiritual essence to change into cosmic matter? How was it possible for the holy word of divine origin to later change into profane word of human origin? Anchored in such an explanatory context, this paper aims to study the processes in which a certain communicative unity of human being – under the conditions of passing from nature to culture – changed into this diversity of languages that paradoxically help human beings to communicate and understand each other. The roots of a global communication, semiotically assumed, in other words....

Keywords: unity, verbal language, explanatory hypothesis, the power of word, communicative dispersion.

1. Preamble concerning the “power of the word”: a hermeneutic approach

Our paper proposes to answer this last question using the well-known story of “Babel’s Tower” as a reference point. In terms of mythological analyses, we may say that the myth of Babel itself offers a dual explanation about the relationship between Divinity and Man, where the language is the mediator. Such an explanation is found again in the double etymology of the word “Babel”, i.e.:

- a positive acceptance, where Babel means “the God’s gate / the holy town of God”, which permits us to realize the

construction of the tower (ziggurat) aspects paid to Divinity¹;

- a negative acceptance, where Babel means a scene of confusion, which is connected to a penalty imposed by God for an excessive human being vanity.

Apart from the hermeneutic assumptions, the story of the Babel’s tower clearly suggests² three hypotheses to the modern researchers of the language as:

¹ This alternative is previous to the Bible’s scenario of the tower of Babel’s construction and it is found in the most known Summerian myth of the III-d millenium B. C. The myth shows that the tower was built by people as a place for Gods, being a token of their humbleness before Divinity. The confusion of tongues represents a consequence of the feud between Gods (Enki and Enlil), which resulted in the dispersion and discord of the human race.

² From different perspectives, a series of interpretations are capable of association with “the

* Universitatea „Al. I. Cuza”, Iași

(1) *The people who lived in proto-archaic times had a unique language.* Let's recalled the fact that according to the Biblical history, after the Flood: "There was only one language and the same words on the Earth"³ [Genesis 11:1]. Such an idea is deeply implied in the human being subconscious, which activated it through:

X its archetypal myths, that is "the whole Universe, people in concord worshiped Enlil in a single language", it is written in the Summerian myth of Creation (Enuma Elish), for example;

X the traditional philosophical and linguistic arguments: let's reaffirm, here and now, the historical unsolved feud between the linguistic naturalism and conventionalism occurring in the confrontation between the Chinese school of "names" and the Confucian school of "conventions", between the Indian school of "mimamsa" and the "nyaya" logic, between the Greeks' "phusis" and "the-sei" conception, between medieval "realism" and "nominalism", etc.;

X the nowadays scientists research: the hypothesis backed up by the genetic studies stating that the languages of the world derived from a common nucleus

Babel myth" [cf. Manea, 2001: 218-224], which is regarded as: a deconstruction of the sense, a way of geographical-territorial dispersion of people and an emblem of the human creative action, that is a first metaphor of the human stability / upright position, etc.

³ The choices through which this first idea is translated into various alternatives of the Bible can be suggestive for interpreting the myth. This is why we thought it useful to quote some of them here: "At that time, there existed a single language and a single tongue for all" [cf. *The Missionary and Bible Institute of the Romanian Orthodox Church*, Bucharest, 1988]; "All around the world there was a single language and the same words" [The Bible Society, *Romanian Bible*]; and: "There was a tongue and a voice for all the people on the Earth [Rose, 2001: 171] etc.

specific to a generating human type (spotted in Africa 2,5 millions years ago), which spread gradually all over the world [Sforza-Cavalli, 1992: 6-13];

(2) *The archetypal language of the human being is loaded by an active special power of the word.* The uniqueness of the language enabled people to warm themselves up in the first common big action: "And they said to one another: Come on! Let's make bricks and burn them well into the fire!" [...]. "And then, they said: Come on! Let's built a fortress and a tower to reach the sky and then let's make ourselves a name so as not to be spread throughout the world [Genesis, 11: 1, 4]⁴. Getting down to see their deeds, God said: "Look, they are a single people and they all have the same language; and look what they've started: Nothing could stop them now from doing what they planned to do" [Genesis, 11: 6]. The use of the power of the word by man in a similar way to the one of Divine creation is suggested in this context by some semantic shades:

X *to say = to do* ("And God said: 'Let there be light' and there was light" [Genesis, 1:3]: the verb 'to say' becomes the archetype of any Divine creation and it will be repeated each time God adds something to the reality of the world;

X *to do = to name* (and vice-versa): the erection of the Tower was equal in value to getting a name by those known to have built it;

⁴ As far as this statement is concerned, the alternative of the Biblical text used by Serafim Rose suggests that people had already known the prophesy about their spreading out all over the Earth (according with the text: "Come to built the new fortress...and to create a name before we are spread out throughout the world". This is why the construction of the Tower could be defined as the last try of people to become famous [Rose, 2000: 172].

X the similar use (by consensus / resonance) of words constituted an effect of the power⁵ and nothing could have stopped it, except for Divinity.

(3) *The uniqueness and power of the word have gradually disappeared as a consequence of the differentiation of the language.* Seeing the profane effect of the “power of the word” (belonging to a “perfect language”) over the human race spiritual evolution, God decided by means of His own word: “Let’s come down to confuse the language down there in order for the people not to be able to understand one another [Genesis, 11: 7]. Here, the “confusion of the language” is suggested to have been a prophylactic necessary action, to prevent some possible catastrophes known by God only. This conversion of senses of languages resulted in a beneficial effects, that is the appearance of a human culture represented and shaded by countless images faces.

All in all, placing the symbol of the Divine intervention in the brackets, we have to ask now: what objective causes and mechanisms generated the uniqueness and human language ontological power of the human language? How was it possible for it to pass from its unity to its diversity, from its natural “intrinsic power” to its “conventional power” later on? These are the questions we propose to answer on the basis of three determined stages regarding the genesis and evolution of the

human language using the archetype of the Bible’s story:

a) *the phase of “pre-Babel language”*, generated by man’s resonance with:

X the “cosmic language”, activated by the presence of celestial phenomena and processes;

X the “living beings’ language” which became manifest in the human, animal and vegetal kingdoms, on the other hand;

b) *the phase of the “Babel language”*, used by all human beings in three genetic hypostases with the view to making man became manifest through:

X the “wordless language” (inside), where the human being’s symbolic semiotic function becomes manifest; this was the first significant function of the human being to be able to generate representation signs of the reality through a volitional control, that is the possibility of transmitting these signs through an intra-mental way (probably the telepathic type signals / signs);

X the “nonverbal language”, which is specific to the first external manifestation of the symbolic / semiotic function, that is the competence for generating signs of musical, plastic, gesture types, etc.;

X “verbal language” is typical of man who can generate external verbal signals, sonorous complexes articulated with “intrinsic power” (fully motivated / iconic in relation with denominated reference);

c) *the phase of “post-Babel language”*, concerning the modern language specific to the human being already differentiated culturally and characterized by specific ethnical-linguistic features.

⁵ The imperative “*Let us*” used by both God and man, can represent a good example of “magic words”, having a strong power of stimulation. The hypothesis of the genesis of some linguistic structure is met there as a result of correlating the human efforts in the process of common action by using some articulate sonorous complexes of the type “heigh-ho”.

The three phases (and their sub-chapters, respectively) are connected through an ontogenetic determination, the inferior level being a premise for the superior level manifestation. The research of these stages constitutes the object of a large work, which makes us limit only to the analysis of the hypotheses that tried explaining the unique genesis and the natural power of the proto-archaic language, i.e. to reestablish the ways through the unique language metamorphosed in time, and it was replaced by the diversity and conventionality of the modern language.

2. Metamorphoses of the language: interdisciplinary assumptions

Semiotically speaking, to follow the avatars of the human language genesis is equivalent to studying the structural-functional schema named by us: *the semiotic graph of human language genesis* [Stanciulescu, 1995]. From an integrative perspective, this graph presents the genetic stages of the (non)verbal competence / performance of human communication. Each of these stages is characterized by specific sign codes, being to a certain extent a "virtual" or a "real" language. The distinction between "virtual" and "real" sign (language) characterizes the distinction between Nature and Culture: the potential "language of the Nature", without "subject of knowledge" (Popper), becomes the "language of the living", first, the real "language of the Culture", second, through the *significant act* of the human being.

The appearance of the semiotic function represents the decisive step of passing from non-human to human, defining the first human communication semantic

manifestation at the same time, that is "Babel language". There are two proto-archaic communication forms:

- *Wordless communication* ("the interior language") is achieved by intra-mental resonance through the transfer of some cerebral holograms from "brain to brain" supported by a presumptive "energy-informational field" of the human community. This type of communication, which is a somehow ignored by the conventional rigid science, refers to the ability of the human being to "come into resonance" with her/his fellow at the distance through mechanisms of a telepathic type. A characteristic specific to every energetic-substantial structure of the world is involved in this process: *the feature of getting into resonance*. For example, the mental image of a tree or forest in flames, transmitted by a certain transmitter will be associated by the receiver with the relation: "*fire = danger = run !*". This process of cerebral transmission of holograms, emotions, etc. – which is apparently appreciated by present scientific research – perhaps represents that "ideal language" potency with which human beings could have efficiently communicated so as to erect the "tower" towards the sky.

- *The external communication* is realized by the secondary symbolic codes: *nonverbal* (gestures, plastic, musical) or *verbal* (words / sonorous signs expressed by "articulating resonance"). This type of communication made it possible for the "*power of the spoken word*", to become manifest for the first time by means of transforming the social group into a "harmonic vibrator" permanently involved in refining the linguistic sign. It characterizes the moment of *real linguistic performance* of the human subject hypothesized by Babel-Tower story.

2.1. The unity of language: causal determinations

Studying the phases which define the appearance of the human language, we were implicitly permitted to realize the main causes justifying the hypothesis of “Babel language” as a common language for all of the people. Among the causal factors – referring to both, the constitution of the internal (“wordless”) language and external one (verbal, sonorous) of the human being – we can mention now:

1) The *cosmic-geographical factors*, which refer to:

- the existence of the same basic cosmic phenomena, which confronted the people of the Earth: the alternation “day and night”, seasons, the dualities: sky-ground, dark-light, hot-cold, water-fire, so on, that can be found in the languages of the world’s peoples;
- the existence of almost the same basic shapes of relief (mountains, hills, fields, waters, etc.) and fauna (land animals, fish, birds, etc.) or flora (trees, flowers, etc.) submitted to denomination;
- linguistic representation of temporality, in an apriori sense / inborn postulation by Kant and Chomsky (as a successive causal relation between natural phenomena submitted to a regular determinism) and of specialty (as a relation between up-down, left-right etc.).

2) The *morpho-physiological factors specific to the human being*, which refer to:

- the appearance of the genome / unique human type gradually spread all over the world; this unique “genetic language” (a biologic expression of “Babel language”) is preserved by all the races of the world [Sforza-Cavalli, 1992: 6-13] only that it is a little different from one race to another;
- bio-morphological qualities specific to human beings only: functionally

autonomous cerebral hemispheres, verbal apparatus, the ability of articulating a certain number of sounds, etc.;

- the structure and identical functionality of the human body: morphological symmetry, identical positioning and motioning of the body, etc.;

- similar bio-physical manifestation, regarding actions connected to basic instincts: reproduction, feeding, self-defense and aggressiveness.

3) *The human beings’ bio-psycho-social common elements regarding:*

- *affectionate states* (joy, pain, fear, anger, etc.) revealed in relationships and exposed ambivalent (laughter-cry, joy-sadness, etc.), etc.;

- *volitional states* taken out of natural gestures (the satiated infant’s head B shaking in front of his/her mother’s breast) in denial or from conventional gesture (for example, the same gestures means acceptance for the Bulgarian people;

- *unique logical grammatical structure* determines, by linguistic universality and fixable grammatical, categories (syntactic categories such as subject–predicate) reflecting general principles of the human thinking;

- *social life systems*, assuming human co-existence relationships, within the group through direct contacts among the members of the group or through indirect relations interceded by various types of social establishments;

- *aspects of the cultural universe* involving certain common aspects of the material life (food, shelter, clothes, etc) and the spiritual ones (religious manifestations, expressions of the artistic language, etc.).

The above mentioned causes (among which we can find Noam Chomsky’s “hard nucleus” of the linguistic competence) can be held responsible for generating the “common language” postulated

by the Bible scenario. The syntagm “common language” must be diversely accepted in accordance with the kinds of signs referred to:

(a) *mental images* (visual-holographic type) through which most of telepathic messages seem to be transmitted, are quasi-identical for every human subject when they refer to the same referring;

(b) *verbal representations* are identical at the level of the signified, but they can differ more or less at the level of the “significant” always maintaining a commonly phonetic root: those shown by the comparative linguistic research on Indo-European language, for example the transition from the interior (mental) language to the external one (verbal) has constituted a scientific “taboo” for the human language researchers.

It is only now that it has started to be risen by the synergy of conventional or non-conventional intra-disciplinary explanations.

2.2. (Non)conventional hypotheses regarding the genesis of the verbal language

Two categories of explanations have been historically associated with the attempt to understanding the appearance of the verbal language:

- the *naturalistic* one (*phusei*) sustains that it was due to motivation that the word appeared through its con-substantiality with the denominated reality and the conventionalist (*thesei*) postulating the arbitrariness of the name compared to the referential. Both of them constitute the object of the notorious feud between Cratylus and Hermogenes, the two characters of Platon’s best known dialogue, sustained with ontological and ethimological arguments.

2.2.1. The appearance of the word under the “mimesis umbrella”

All in all, we can say that the appearance and usage of the verbal (oral) word must be bound to the naturalistic explanation (in a first phase of man’s becoming manifest through the word) and to conventional explanation in a “modern” subsequent phase of the human history. To sustain this viewpoint in another context [Stanciulescu, 1995] we can reconsider the assembly of explanatory hypotheses, which have been formed up to now from some complementary, merely “intuitive” disciplines, such as linguistics, philosophy, language psycho-sociology, so on the “logical” ones (phonology, phonetics, semiotics, etc.). In this perspective, five categories of scientific explanations regarding the genesis of the verbal language could be grouped under the “mimesis’s / iconism’s umbrella” [Eco, 1982], the iconism representing – as Thomas A. Sebeok considered – the “core of any semiosis” [cf. Danesi, 1998: 21]. They refer to:

(1) *The hypotheses of primary (ontological) mimesis* are spotlighting the quality of the sound to be the “passive” support of reproduction of some particular objective processes or phenomena based on similarity. This category includes the appearance of the words by sonorous imitation of certain sounds or onomatopoeic-generated sounds beginning with the material ones (Cock-a-doodle doo!, “bow-bow!”, “kew-mew”, etc.) up to the artificial ones: Thud! Thump! Slap! Pop! Bang! (“*bow-wow*” theory).

(2) *The phonetic (secondary) mimesis* uses the “active” valences of the articulated sounds to convey the adequate correspondences with a certain reference by:

- *phonetic mimesis* of some sequences, suggesting the essence of some objects, phenomena, processes and building nouns such as: flickering, murmur, so on through symbolic mimicry or adequate verbs (to shout, to blow like the wind, etc.);

- *articulates mimesis* motivating the existence of some identical to all the people sonorous reactions of an emotional sensory nature, which are capable of expressing [cf. Danesi, 1998: 50]:

- some interjections, such as: Why! Ah! Hey! Alas! Ha!, which suggest, by sounds, certain psycho-affecting situations: pain, astonishment, anger (*"pooh-pooh" theory*);
- instinctual sonorous manifestations like babbling and grumbling at the specific stimuli, like the breathing of a mother reaching her infant (*"ding-dong" theory*);
- sonorous expressions generated by the need to coordinate activities within certain processes of work (*"yo-be-ho" theory*);
- sonorous complexes generated by the need to respond to affectionate states such as: love, play, etc. (*"la-la" theory*);
- *distinctive features" mimesis*, establishing the existence of the following elements in the language:
- sonorous couples / oppositions (special states of the acoustical energy such as: vocal / nonvocal, consonant-nonconsonant, compact-diffuse, tensed – relaxed, sonorous-deaf, etc, through which words are articulated in with reference accordance [Jakobson, Halle, 1977, cf. Ionescu, 1992: 131-135];
- objective relations such as: little-big, sad-gay, hot-cold [cf. Kerbrath-Orecchioni, 1977: 31-32] or by

some bright/dark vowels or soft-liquid, plateful-aggressive" consonants, etc. [Fonagy, 1970];

(3) *The hypotheses of the "conventional mimesis"* suggest (as noticed by the reader in the juxtaposition of the two antinomy concepts) the passing from the genesis of the motivated language (natural) to the non-motivated type one (conventional), by means of the following generative mechanisms:

- *semantic transfer*, which is capable of expressing certain elements of the non-verbal language (motivated) in terms of a verbal language (half motivated) by a reflection of grade three of reality; for example, "figure five" stands for the word "hand" as a consequence of translating the symbolic gesture of hand-raising within the articulated sonorous complex [Brunschvig, 1929: 11];

- *the symbolic motivation* (relative), that presupposes to name the reference through reporting it only to certain qualities (attributes), which impress the one who gives the names such as: "ghiocel" which comes from the Romanian "ghioc" = a special form of helical shell, from the Russian "podznejnic" = under-snow or French "perce-neige" = to pierce / penetrate / break through the snow, from the German "schnee gl ckhen" = "snow-bell" or from the English "snowdrop" = drop of snow, etc.;

- *etymology by vicinity* that characterizes the genesis of some substitutive rhetorical figures [Augustin, 1991: 152] such as *synecdoche* (mortal = man), *metonymy* (to drink / have a glass = to drink its content), *automasia* (cancer = death) covering the relations between the content and the recipient, the whole and the component, a cause and its effects, etc.;

- the mechanism of *generating words by grammatical-semantic combination* such as achieving some words through association

(sun-flowers, edible-oil) or by adding prefixes or suffixes ("in"-dispensable or symbol-"izing", etc.).

(4) *The semi-partial conventionalism* refers to the genesis of the word by semi-arbitrary denomination of a certain real / or unreal referential, either at the level of the significant (as in "quark" case), suggesting – by its significant – something frisky (playful), or at the level of the signified (as in the word "tele-vision", motivated at the level of the signified only).

(5) *The hypotheses of the integral conventionalism*, developed on the channel of the saussurienne arbitrariness, sustain the fact that a (great) part of the linguistic signs have been born through cultural convention, by a social arrangement at the level of the linguistic groups, words being unmotivated at the levels of the signifier or the signified (as in some concrete words like "bureau", for instance, or in some abstract words like "satisfaction").

*

The panel of the above categories of explanations allows us to elaborate some conclusions of a semantic nature such as:

- Their succession spotlights as clearly as possible the process of passing from the linguistic unity to the diversity one postulated by the Babel's myth from the natural genesis of the words (a "pre-Babel phase") to the conventional one (a "post-Babel" phase).

- The "gradual continuum" [Eco, 1982: 273] possibilities of an iconic expression of the word employ all the levels of the word's power starting with the energetic resonance of the sonorous significant with the named thing up to the informational resonance of the signified. Each of the above attempts of explanations distinctly mentions a hypothetical

generating mechanism, specific to a certain type of words. Consequently, we can say that it is the complementary of the registered hypotheses that can draw an integrative imagine upon the way in which the multitude of kinds of words of the human being language was created.

-The explanations proposed are preponderantly built out of the perspectives of the social-human disciplines which do not act with instruments of excessive formalism or scientific experiment.

Therefore, they can be correct from the intuitive viewpoint, but, scientifically speaking, they are not sustained and substantiated enough. The necessity of integrating the most recent results of the sciences of the complex systems (neuro-cybernetics, cognitive psychology, the theory of information, the technology of computing and holography, etc.) requires a new vision upon logogenesis capable of enlightening the "black box" in which words were born and sprang out. This perspective constitutes our goal and we intend to use it in order to elaborate a genuine vision and, consequently, a less conventional one regarding the genesis of the "words of power": *biophotonics vision*.

2.2.2. Biophotonics' hypotheses concerning the nature of the language

As a very recent scientific discipline, *biophotonics* tries to unify *biology*, as a science of living, with *photonics*, as a theory and technology of lasers. One of the main interest of this new discipline – which we have originally developed as "biological lasers" theory [Stacniulescu, Manu, 2001] – is to scientifically explain the emission of bioluminescence specific to any living organism, a bio-electromagnetic emission which was experimentally observed and studied as a "mitogenetic radiation" (Gurvich), as a "Life-field" (Burr), as a

“ultraweak emission of radiation” (Popp), etc.

*

Semiotically speaking, an unconventional biophotonic scenario of language genesis [Stanciulescu, 1995; 2004] allowed us to find the following similarities:

- the signified (the informational content of the word) corresponds to the mental figurative representation of the referential;
- the signifier (the energetic support of the word) has a double correspondence:
 - an interior one, at the level of the neuronal (phonetic) representation (of the photonic nature);
 - an exterior one, at the level of the associate articulated expression (of sonorous nature).

Based on these correspondences, we can elaborate a general law of complex systems, the “law of circular metamorphose”, using the following judgement:

- *if any semiotic system (reflecting something) can be described by the structural duality signifier-signified;*
- *if any system is a subsystem in relation to an integrative hierarchy;*
- *then, what is the signified in the subjacent system became the signified in the superjacent system.*

At the level of the neuro-linguistic system, the causal chain representation – phonem – sound constitutes the frame of the process of the mimetic motivation of the sonorous word. This circuit explains the hypothesis sustained by some specialists and adopted by our study: “Any word had a sonorous motivated form at its origin. We don’t speak here about the period of the origin of the language. We referred to every historical period when the words were created in order to name things, attributes, actions etc. in connection with certain char-

acteristics of those. The parallelism of the sonorous shape and sense is included in the etymologic sense of the word and the secondary meanings. The metaphors are motivated in relation with the initial meaning. Words have both integral and motivated sonorous forms in accordance with the meaning [Graur, Wald, 1961: 90].

Proving that any word holds a force that is not derived from convention or authority, but out of its sonorous structure [Allott, WEB] is able to scientifically explain a series of obscure aspects ignored or simply rejected from the history of “the word of power”. It’s enough to bring into discussion in this context only the possibility of direct and immediate understanding of the content of a word. The power of telling your own name, mantras, the therapeutic power of some incantations (verbal chorus or spells) or the force of onomatopoeic exclamations to generate consonants with some certain centers of energy and information of the organism, the tradition of alchemy, to do research into the name of the thing (object) firstly, and secondly in the proper object and so on, become comprehensible as sonorous resonance phenomena.

This intrinsic (physical) participation of the word in the human and natural environmental reality confirms the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis: the form of the language reflects the world outlook of the group using it. We could add another (less conventional) hypothesis to this one: *the phonetic structure of a language implicitly determines the psycho-behavioral physiognomy of a particular person or of a group of individuals.*

3. The “post-babel language”: from unity to diversity

Towards the end, following the scenarios of the biblical story, we ask again, taking into serious account the probable

(plausible) implication of Divinity in the mixture of the languages, what objective mechanisms could make the initial unity of the human language disappear in time and be replaced by the great variety of present dialects. The answer to this question confront us with this paradox: the same categories of general causes ensuring the unity origin of the human language are held responsible for its differentiation. The differentiation in which man, as a bio-psycho-social complex, resonated to the particular aspects of the cosmic-geographical space and the historical time, as well.

Once again, we realize the fact that the language surely represents the model of the word representation by a certain human group that is in a closer or farther correspondence with Nature in accordance with the stoic principle: the order of the things. In other words, the language appears to be a copy of thinking which in its term is a copy / reflection of the visualized reality. The way in which this copy was historically created couldn't be explained by a single cause / hypothesis / theory due to its complexity.

It is the assemble of the complementary causes mentioned above as well as their explanatory associated hypotheses that can explain the process of the appearance of the world's languages system as a post-Babel state of the human communication.

All in all, we can say that the dispersion / crumbling of the language took place by means of some essential mechanisms involved in the processes such as:

a) Bringing to perfection by individual repetition of resources (verbal-kinesthetic mechanism) dependent on the saying of the first words and doubled by the process of social-symbolic interaction taking place in this stage generated the modification original form of words (the signifier), by transforming them at the

level of the groups and, also, through learning and using them more or less united on the community scale. The last sonorous form of the verbal code will thus represent the result of a never-ending collective processing series of actions.

b) At the level of "the signified" we witness a process of re-signifying the words, varying with the individual attitude towards their referential. The origin and explanation of the connoting nature of archaic symbolic language is found within this process of semantic amplification. The psycho-social mechanism of co-noting will gradually transform the initiating full of "power of reality" natural language into a conventional language, loaded only by the power of the human mind.

c) The extension of the verbal type communication on the scale of some ever larger human groups within ever larger geographic areas in parallel to its rising in efficacy (the increase in the human being's communicative performance) by a direct contamination (process of mimicking, interfering, synthesizing, conquering or cooperating etc.) among ever more individuals and groups of people increases gradually.

d) Apart from the normal alternative of direct inter-human contacts, the spiritual hypotheses of the indirect contact among people at the level of an "Trans-subjective Ego" (Fichte) of a "language metaphysical communication" (Karl Vossler) or of the eastern "Akashique document" identified with "mankind's etheric library" have been proposed through the platonic channel of the so-called world of ideas and kantian apriorism. In a modern alternative, we meet again these concepts in the non-conventional hypothesis of "morphogenetic fields" [Shaldrake, 1981]. Under the circumstances of modern scientific cognition, the human being's psycho-social

fields generated by life together becomes explicable by the analytic tools of psycho(socio)photonics, that is the "photonic fields theory of the information-energy" [Constantinescu, Stanciulescu, 1993].

This theory makes it possible for us to scientifically understand the transfer of information from bio(psycho)individual field towards the "collective field" of the human collectivity and vice-versa by means of a double resource mechanism for energo-information transfer:

- from the stimulant object to the human bio-sensor (mediated by analyzers);

- the transfer of information from the non (stationary) field of an inanimate object to the human being stationary field of the human aura (human bio-field vibrators, to the substantial vibrators of the brain, of the membranous liquid crystals, firstly); of pineal-pituitary ("the third eye", a reminiscence of the archaic brain), respectively, which is extremely sensitive to light (electromagnetic radiation).

The normal tendency within an interval evolution of any ethnic language by simplifying or grammatical nuance, by lexical enrichment through various means etc. justifies a paradoxical feature of the ethnic language already noticed by Saussure, that is to be essentially unchangeable as a consequence of the individual's change of place toward the social, i.e. his susceptibility to modification (in the virtue of his arbitrariness). At the same time, understanding the above processes justifies the natural continuity of the two generative mechanisms which are held responsible for the appearance and evolution of the human language:

- the *naturalism*, which explains the immemorable dimension of the singleness of the language of Babel Type (internal or / and external clearly apparent) and the *conventionalism*, which explains the multipli-

cation of the World's languages (spoken or/and written) that is the appearance of the post-Babel language;

- the *innatism* – which was developed by Noam Chomsky postulating the inborn nature of a "hard nucleus" of the linguistic competence – and the *constructivism* sustained by Jean Piaget, who declares the construction of the linguistic performance by reporting it to the socio-cultural environment in which the human being evolves.

Let us close the "hermeneutic circle" noticing that the language of our proto-parents, Adam and Eva, adapted to the terrestrial reality, hadn't been able to get lost until the Flood passed, according to the Bible. Noah was chosen by God to preserve the uniqueness of the human language and, on the other hand, God wanted Noah's descendants Sem, Ham, Iafet to give birth to the first ethnic groups of the World. As we have all seen, the last process required the explicit presence of God who came down to confuse the tongues of the human beings purposely.

In semio-linguistic terms, we could consider the history of such a mixture of human languages as the one describing the historical process of man's passing from the proto- archaic language – to be much poorer from lexical and semantic points of view – but united and loaded by the "natural power" of the reflected referential. In fact, this process describes the passing from "the language of nature" and the "language of the living" to the language of the "machine culture", much nuanced, but arbitrary (conventional) and, consequently, wanting "the power of its right correspondence to the named thing".

Let's admit, however, that it is this process that enabled man to show his/her dignity of creation derived from the qual-

ity of being "an image and resemblance of Divinity" we can say that through this stimulant metamorphosis God cleared the way to free will to be used by man in putting the language itself to work.

As a conclusion of all the proposed explanations, we could observe that the same causes which assured at the beginning the unity of the language, determined its diversity in other contexts. That is why the Babel-Town story is considered to be a symbolic description of the *evolutionary process of passing from the protoarchaic language*

(poor vocabulary, but unitary and carrying the "natural power" of the referential) *to the language of the modern culture* (much more refined, but short of its ontogenetic power).

Finally, having as a conceptual support all the above considerations, the possibility to detect and analyze the semiotic parameters of the actual globalized communication becomes available, for sustaining a strategy to make the human common existence more efficiently and harmoniously.

References

- Allott, Robin (1998), "The motor theory of language: origin and function" (Cortona, 1988), <http://www.percep.demon.co.uk/motorthy.htm>
- Augustin (1991), *De dialectica*, Editura Humanitas, Bucuresti.
- Brunschvig, Leon (1929), *La philosophie mathématique*, Felix Alcan, Paris.
- Constantinescu, Paul, Stănculescu, Traian D., *Resonance as a Principle of Universal Creativity. Photonic (Quantical) Hypothesis of Information-Energy*, in: "Revista de Inventică", Iași, nr. 12, 1993.
- Danesi, Marcel (1998), *The Body in the Sign: Thomas A. Sebeok and Semiotics*, Monograph Series, vol. 1, "Legas" Publishing House, New York, Otawa, Toronto.
- Fonagy, I. (1970), "Les bases pulsionnelles de la phonation", dans: *Revue française de psychanalyse*, Janvier, XXXIV.
- Eco, Umberto (1982), *Tratat de semiotica generala*, Editura Stiintifica si Enciclopedica, Bucuresti.
- Graur, Al., Wald, Lucia (1961), *Scurta istorie a lingvisticii*, Editura Stiintifica, Bucuresti.
- Ionescu, Emil (1992), *Manual de lingvistica generala*, Editura All, Bucuresti.
- Jackendoff, R. (1987), "On Beyond Zebra: The relation of linguistic and visual information", *Cognition*.
- Kerbrat-Orecchioni, Catherine (1977), *La connotation*, Presses Universitaires de Lyon.
- Lorenz, Konrad (1975), *L'enver du miroir (une histoire naturelle de la connaissance)*, Flammarion.
- Pracontal, Michel de (1992), *La science et les races: interview avec L.L. Cavalli-Sforza*, dans: "Le Nouvel Observateur", Nr. 1420 / 2329 juin.
- Rose, Serafim (2001), *The Book of Creation, The creation of the World and Man of beginnings, trad. Rom.*, Sophia Bookmaker, București.
- Shaldrake, Rupert (1985), *A New Science of Life*, Terrytown, New York.
- Stănculescu, Traian D. (1995), *Miturile creatiei: lecturi semiotice*, Editura Performantica, Iasi.
- Stănculescu, Traian D. (2004), *Semiotics of light. An integrative approach to human archetypal roots*, second edition, Cristal-Concept, Iasi-Geneva.
- Stănculescu, Traian D., Manu, Daniela M. (2001), *Light's metamorphoses: An introduction into the "biological lasers" theory*, Editura Performantica, Iasi.