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Abstract
This work starts with the premise that the Albanian language is one of most ancient languages in the world and stands in the root of the common trunk of the Indo-European languages. The common pre-Indo-European origin is preserved in the present Albanian language almost in the same conditions that this language was spoken 2-3 thousand years ago. Further in the work arguments are set forth regarding Albanian language priorities as a synthetic-analytic type language and the role of the Albanian language as the key in analyzing the Indo-European language system is presented.

Regardless the tendencies toward analytic features the Albanian language, at the same time, preserves also useful elements from the synthetic features. Continuing, the Albanian language geopolitical positioning is presented from the point of view of the Indo-European languages differentiation and concentration in the EU context and Euro-Atlantic countries integration, supposing the conditions of each language in relation to the specific way of thinking in that language.

Closing, some concrete examples are presented about where and how the different ways of thinking may be applied and harmonized, either with the synthetic or analytic domination, and a concrete example is analyzed about how Albanian language can be invested in the improvement of the Indo-European linguistic system, drawing some conclusions in this direction.
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Introduction
This work aims at presenting the importance of the Albanian language as the key of analyzing the Indo-European languages in their common base, meaning not simply the analyze of some words and terms with common roots or ancient origin, but also meaning the specific ways of thinking that may have been differentiated during the historic evolution of these words and terms according to the specific languages. In this context, it is evaluated that the geopolitical dimension of thinking in the Albanian language supports the Euro-Atlantic integration.

The method of study used is the comparison and confrontation of some facts and knowledge among the three main aspects of the theme regarding: Albanian language
origin in the roots of the Indo-European languages trunk, Albanian language and nation positioning in the European region where this name stems from together with the first gods and legends, and an Albanian viewpoint for a conversion between cultures where the analytic or synthetic ways of thinking have priority.

Common pre-Indo-European origin through the Albanian language

Some authors argue that the Albanian language has a very ancient origin, if not the most ancient language in the world\(^1\), which derives from the language with which communicated the white human race since its very beginning. According to the French linguist D’Angely, “Pelasgian language or Albanian language is as ancient as the white human race...”\(^2\). In the same line of thought is also Mathieu Aref when he refers to the Man who thinks that the Albanian language originated from Japheth, son of Noah. In this context, Aref refers also to Parsons and Xhons\(^3\).

Another Albanian author, Elena Kocaqi, in her study emphasizes that the white human race derives entirely from one Pelasgian-Illyrian ‘ethnic layer’ and that there is no other historic fact to contradict the facts presented in her study. Therefore, according to the author, automatically results that the Pelasgian-Illyrian language is the base from where originated all the other languages called Indo-European languages. So, the Albanian language is the one called pre-Indo-European language, while the Albanian language is Japhethic language (Japheth is the father of the white human race from which the Europeans derived, according to the Old Testament), writes Kocaqi.\(^4\)

More concretely, according to Aref, “ancient Pelasgian language, from which the present Albanian language derives, was an origin language spoken in Europe, Aegean, and Asia Minor since at least year 6500 BC.” Aref reaches this conclusion based on Meje reasoning about the existence of an idiom or a unique language in the old time and origination from it of the other languages (or dialects of the same language, like Hirt and Shrader, which “…among other modern authors put forward the hypothesis of the existence of one unique “European” language spoken from the Atlantics to Caucasus and Asia Minor.”\(^5\)


So, the above resources, but others also, support the idea that the white human race had its origin in speaking one common language, regardless the dialects that might have been subsequently differentiated to separate languages. According to Aref, the “Indo-European” language notion is “only one neologism” developed by some XIX-th century philologists’ and linguists’ guessing, imagining or envisioning. Based on present language resemblances and correspondences between some European languages and approximately Asiatic languages that were subsequently classified in branches and sub-branches according to the proximity level, when everything makes you believe that the pre-Indo-European element is distinguishable in the languages that have derived from the ancient Pelasgian in which the relationship with the Danubian population are numerous. In this context, Aref emphasizes, “…I can state that the Pelasgians are direct descendants of the first populations that inhabited in Europe, Asia Minor, and almost in the Mediterranean area.”

Not very far from this point of view is the official standpoint published in the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Albania, although too restrained. According to the Academic Shaban Demiraj, “Albanian language is part of the Indo-European languages, i.e. in that family of languages with common resource, which since the early pre-historic times are spoken in the areas from India to Europe. …The deeper we go in the past, the more obvious are the similarities and joint-correspondences between these languages…” So, if one would “dare” to go even deeper, then would not be excluded that the conclusion would be the same with the above authors.

Much carefully, Demiraj implies that old Albanian (from which the present Albanian language has derived) is extended along several centuries (more or less, in the same historic period with the ancient Greek and ancient Latin based on one or some dialects of the “Southern Illyrian” or authentic Illyrian. In this way, the Albanian language is developed through the gradual evolution of its “mother language” precisely in the Eastern coast of the Adriatic and Ionian between the VIIth – VIIIth centuries of the New Era.

---

8 Ibid, pp 264, 278.
9 Ibid, pp 245, 279.
The Academic Demiraj places the passage from the Illyrian to the Albanian (regardless that the late is one unique language) at the same level with the passage from the Latin to each specific Roman language, or with the passage from the old common Germanic to each of the specific Germanic languages, from the old common Cyrillic to each of the specific Cyrillic languages, from the old Greek to the new Greek (even this one a unique language like the Albanian and Armenian ones), etc.

Demiraj accepts that “according to the dominating opinion, Pelasgians were a different people from the Greeks and their language belonged to the Indo-European languages family.” But the name Pelasgian “… that appears since Homer’s, was used by the old Greek authors to name the ancient population of pre-Greece” apparently, without distinguishing or specifically expressing if the other part spoke one or several separate languages different from the Greek one.

But the linguists of the XIXth century have cut it short, thinking of a heterogeneity of languages. While, according to Aref, in the beginning it was the question of differently called tribes – not essentially different tribes – who used the same linguistic fund in different dialects. So, for instance, Aref continues, “…in the Mediterranean sea or specifically in the Aegean see, numerous populations were met: Pelasgian, Leleg, Carian, Lisian, Teukrean, Ligurian, Liburn or Illyrian, mentioning here only the most distinguished ones. It seems that this has confused the specialists (linguists, ethnologists, archeologists, pre-historians or historians). They have thought of different populations, while it meant one population with different denominations and numerous dialects!”

The same viewpoint is defended also by the researcher Elena Kocaqi. According to her, “…all white race nations spoke one common language. Data show that this common language was unique in the Bronze Age, about 2500-1000 BC. This language continued to be unique, perhaps dialectal, even after Iron Age up to Antiquity.”

---

10 I recall that the terms "Illyrian" and "Albanian" are used here in their general meaning, as the Illyrian may be divided into Northern Illyrian and Southern Illyrian, while the Albanian is a direct derivation of Southern Illyrian through a several centuries transition of the old Albanian from the Southern Illyrian to the new Albanian.

11 In fact, the accurately written term would be "specific", but in my evaluation the term "specific" is used by the author meaning "unique". In the Albanian connotation, "specific" may be misunderstood as if it has no origin or neighborhood relation with any other language.

12 See the above note in relation to "unique" or "specific".


14 For more details see Demiraj: Epirus…, 2008, 34v.


this language’s system and roots are all present in the Indo-European languages that hum in Europe and they may be explained only from the Albanian language standpoint.

According to Kocaqi, Albanian language may be the only language in the world where most of the two or three letter syllables (over 850 such) are meaningful, which is not evidenced in any other language. But syllable words are the first human stammering and as such they also are the most ancient. The most important syllable words of the Albanian language formed over 80% of the present Latin, English and more vocabulary. Thus, the Albanian language includes in its system the entire Indo-European system of the common words. All word roots above which this system is raised are found in the present Albanian. As the conclusion, the Albanian language is the only key that may explain the true meaning of the Indo-European languages vocabulary, the author highlights.\footnote{Ibid, pp 30, 234}

But, does Europe ask about ‘Albanian language key’? I hope it has strong reasons to do that, because the more are the languages differentiated from the origin system, the more are diversified the specific ways of thinking, based on the specific languages that the separate nations speak and write. “Backwardness”, or the Albanian language closeness with the origin system, may time after time be rediscovered as an advantage even for the most advanced, by serving it as the mirror of the history duskiness, in order to re-find what used to join, why were we separated, and how may we converge. In this context will the following issues be handled.

**Geopolitical spirit of the Albanian language in the harmony of the Indo-European languages**

Albanian language potential in the synthetic-analytic thinking – the case when the ‘backwardness’ in origin may be discovered as an advantage

As it was mentioned above, the Albanian language is a syllable system that includes a big number of words and synonyms. Base words are one syllable words and presently, the Albanian language expresses the basic everyday life actions with one syllable. Most of the syllables with 2 or 3 letters are meaningful and with this system, the Albanian language may form an infinite of words, even entire language systems, according to the researcher Kocaqi.\footnote{Kocaqi, E. *Shqipja çelësi i gjuhëve indoevropiane*. (Albanian language, the key to the Indo-European languages.) ISBN: 978-9956-22-29-9. Sh. butuese ‘GEER’; shtypi ‘Rozafa’. (pp 28, 30) Tirana, 2008.}

As the syllable words are the first human stammering, as such they are the most ancient words. Syllabifying is a feature of primitive or first languages. If the Albanian language has 2-letters words, Latin has 5-letters words. These syllable words make the base from which entire word systems are formed in several languages. While the
foreign etymologists have worked for over 200 years in order to define the 25 base words of the Indo-European system, all these words are found in the present Albanian language and are explained only through it.20

In other words, according to researcher Kocaqi, the Albanian language is consolidated as a language in the form it is today since at least 3000 years. While the common language that the white human race spoke was unique in the Bronze Area, about 2500-1000 BC, continuing as such, and perhaps in dialect form, even during the Iron Area up to the Antiquity.21

Aref shares the same point of view: “The only descendants of Pelasgians in Europe are present Albanians, whose language (intending, excluding the borrowed words or foreign neologisms) is spoken today the same way it was spoken since more than 3000 years ago!”22

This way, Albanian language serves today as a living mirror for all the Indo-European languages that were spoken 2-3 thousand years ago. On the other side, the Albanian language evolution toward synthetic-analytic type presents a quite specific development, because in addition to benefiting the analytic forms, it, in most cases, has at the same time preserved the previous synthetic elements. Besides, its syllable character gives to the Albanian language a functioning agility in any type of context, either synthetic or analytic.

But what do we understand by synthetic or analytic language? In order to answer this question we may begin with the meaning of terms. Language syntheticity has to do with the joining of several morphemes of different types in order to create new words or with the joining of some root-words that connect the morphemes to show grammar functions. While language analyticity has to do with the opposite tendency, where the morphemes are ordered as separate words in sentences, avoiding even the need of inflection.25

As Prof. Demiraj writes, the Albanian language has also developed some analytic features being gradually transformed in a synthetic-analytic language. Of synthesizing features we may mention: 1) Vitality of grammar forms built by multi-meaning grammar

---

21 Ibid, pp 194.
indicators and their full or partial self-sufficiency during their use in the sentences. 2) Partial preservation of the sentence parts old time free order.26

While of the analyzing elements we may mention: 1) Development of some analytic grammar forms that partially preserves elements of synthesizing; 2) Partial loss of some grammar forms capability to be self-sufficient as sentence parts; 3) Order fixing for some parts in sentence.27

In this context, may be evaluated as Albanian language innovations the combination of the partial preservation of the sentence parts old time free order with the fixed order of some sentence parts, thus combining the best of synthetic and analytic types. Similarly, the other innovation through the development of analytic grammar forms preserving partially elements of synthesizing.

Nevertheless, evaluation of usefulness in the synthetic-analytic ratio remains relative, because if in the synthetic form the suffixes give the word some type of predefined destination, in the analytic form handling the word with prefixes may take the same word to any position (specifically when the suffixes fall or the word is not inflicted).

Another relativity element may be connected to the analytic feature of fixing the order of some parts in the sentence. If some “fixing” are definitely done, then there’s no reason why these are called analytic, but rather synthetic, because all the words are congealed within the same structure. The same stands with the definition of terms. We may define one term by using several sentences, but the term remains one unique word that may be called synthetic. The combination of this word with other analytic type words, gives that word a new context.

I have the impression that in the above situations, the Albanian language may work better. However, I think they remain an issue for the experts of the area. While the main advantage of the Albanian language I believe stands to about 850 words, root words, which may be combined to create an infinite of words and meanings. Also, they may serve to the contextualization of the meaning for many other Indo-European words that are formed based on these Pelasgian-Illyrian words.

In this context we may put up some questions: How and when were the populations differentiated (from the same trunk)? What happened to linguistic spacing (from the same trunk) and how were the different ways of thinking differentiated (that have a common essence)? Otherwise, how far have they gone and where or when may become closer? Maybe in the answers to these questions may be hidden the key to the European United States or the support where its unified geopolitics may be based.

27 Ibid
However, it is logical to think that the biggest differences (in languages and ways of thinking) be found in the earliest in time and furthest in extension differentiations, or in the most isolated ones in life spaces where the populations are developed (starting from the origin). So, if we clarify the “differences” between the Roman languages on one side and those Germanic and Baltic-Slavic on the other (which generally, both the first and the second ones, belong to synthetic type languages\(^{28}\), together with the Greek and Armenian languages\(^{29}\)), then, I believe, we will be able to also find the common “essence” of a way of thinking from where would stem another type of unity for the European Union. To this intent may serve a deepening of comparative studies with the Albanian language.

**Geopolitical positioning of the Albanian language from the standpoint of differentiation and concentration of the Indo-European languages in the European Union context**

In the context of the EU geopolitics, it is worthwhile to bring into attention the fact that the Roman languages are spoken in Italy, France, Spain, Portugal, Romania, etc.; the Germanic languages are spoken in Germany, England, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, etc.; Slavic languages are spoken in Poland, Croatia, Slovenia, Bulgaria, Check Republic, Slovakia, etc.;\(^{30}\) Baltic languages are spoken in Lithuania and Latvia, etc.\(^{31}\) Traditionally, Roman languages countries, in majority, were focused mostly in Mediterranean or maritime geopolitics, while Germanic languages countries and Baltic-Slavic languages countries were focused mainly in the continental geopolitics.

But, from the linguistic viewpoint, it looks like the Albanian language is the apex where are these two big linguistic families, Roman languages and Germanic and Baltic-Slavic languages, are interfaced or approximated up to the common trunk. Something similar results also according to Václav Blažek,\(^{32}\) based on the studies from Sergei Starostin, in 2004,\(^{33}\) qualifying the classification of the latter as absolute with the margin or error up to 5% of the millennium, from 14% according to Swadesh.

According to Starostin\(^{34}\) classification, from the same common origin of Indo-European languages (or language), the ancient languages that were differentiated the earliest, at the same period of time, are Albanian, Greek, and Armenian (-3020 – 2590 BC). Almost

---


\(^{29}\) Ibid


\(^{33}\) Starostin, Sergei. 2004. In "Workshop on the chronology in linguistics, Santa Fe 2004". Cited according to Blažek, as above.

\(^{34}\) Starostin, Sergei. 2004. In "Workshop on the chronology in linguistics, Santa Fe 2004". Cited according to Blažek, as above.
at the same time (up to one century after), continued to happen the differentiation of
the Italic and Germanic languages (-3020 – 2500 BC). Certainly, time of differentiation
is symbolized by signing of detachment, but the ferment of differentiation and identity
crystallization worked gradually even earlier during several centuries (-3020 – 2500
BC).

Starting from the above classification, it looks like that with the Albanian language
compete, based on the old age, only the Armenian and the Greek ones. This means
that the three of these languages are daughters of the same one, while their origin
derived from the same population, more or less with the same unique features.
Therefore, lets stop for a little at the origin of the two sister nations, Armenian and
Greek ones, from the Albanian nation standpoint.

**Armenia**

According to Mathieu Aref, about 610 BC, a Thracian-Illyrian tribe was settled in Uratre
region in the King Medes Siaksar area. This tribe was called Haikan, according to the
tribe leader Haik, founder of the kingdom that later was called Armenia and a symbol
of Armenian people. While Caucasian language was part of the Pelasgian influence
domain, specifically part of the speaking of one of their mostly known tribes, Phrygian,
who, among other Caucasian regions, colonized also Armenia.\(^{35}\)

Ilir Cenollari, in his study “The prophecies of Tomorri’s god”, talks about Thesprots
who were displaced from Epirus to Thessaly before 2000 BC and that later emigrated
to Armenia bringing with the their old names of the origin. The numerous Armenian-
Albanian linguistic coincidences seem that originate from this displacement, highlights
Cenollari.\(^ {36}\)

**Greece**

According to Aref, before the arrival of Greeks, Greece was populated by Pelasgians
from whom Ionians and Athenians originated who converted into Greeks after their
Hellenic transformation. Greeks are fruit of a fine mixing between autochthonous
Pelasgians and the first Semite-Egyptian conquerors (Danaos, Kadmos, Pelops... all
foreign heroes’ eponyms). The descendants of Egyptian Danaos are Dorians. Ionian-
Dorian controversy is encountered in the entire Greek history where everything

---

\(^{35}\) Aref, M. *Shqipëria (historia dhe gjuha) ose Odiseja e pabesueshme e një populli parahele*. (Albania (history and language) or

\(^{36}\) Cenollari, I. *Prefeçitë e Zotit të Tomorrit. Studim historik*. (The prophecies of Tomorri’s god. Historic study.) Shtëpia botuese
separates them: Ionians derive from autochthonous Pelasgians and Dorians are Semite-Egyptians.\footnote{Aref, M. Shqipëria (historia dhe gjuha) ose Odiseja e pabesueshme e një populli paraheleen. (Albania (history and language) or The unbelievable odyssey of a pre-Hellenic people) ISBN: 978-99943-903-9-7. PLEJAD. (pp 13, 14, 33, 37) Tiranë, 2007.}

Another interesting approach regarding Greek nation is offered by the researcher Cenollari who is based on a number of sources. Summarizing, Arcadia\footnote{Arcadians: first inhabitants of this regions (6000-3000 BC) who inhabited Dardania, Macedonia, Albania, Epirus, Thessaly. [Cenollari, 181]} gave birth to the devine Pelasgia a long time before Proselinois, where Selloi is the same word as Helloi with the replacement of the first letter. Selloi inhabited the region around Dodona and Ahelou where, according Aristotle, previously they were called Grai and now Hellenic. While, according to Virgil, Grai territory was identified by Epirus territory.\footnote{Ibid, pp 117-123.}

Some other sources used by Cenollari prove more or less the same thing as above, but form another approach. Summarizing, Hellada comes from Hellenes son of Deucalion who was displaced from Epirus, Dryopes toward Thessaly. Deucalion and his wife Pyrrha are two important mythological names because they are related to the name of Dodona oracle and with the name of Epirus, Piraeus, Pyrrhus. Probably, the name ‘Graie’ is higher that “Hellan” because it is related to a spiritual state where woman possesses man and life in general. So this ethnonym is so ancient that it goes back to matriarchy area. Grai is Zeus’s son with his first wife, Pandora, while Hellenes is son of Pyrrha, Pandora’s daughter. A VII\textsuperscript{th}-VI\textsuperscript{th} BC centuries poet says: “Graies”, Hellenics’ mothers.”\footnote{Ibid, pp 117, 118, 119}

Europe

According to researcher Cenollari, the ancient legends testify that Europe’s myth is closely connected with the Arcadia, Epirus, Dodona, and Toskeria region. Europe, the Arcadian nymph, is Zeus’s wife. Europe’s myth is entirely developed in Arcadia. Zeus took Europe away to Crete. Europe’s brothers were Cadmus (Kadmu) and Chillicus (Kiliki), both very famous. Cadmus was Illyr’s father, ethnonym for Illyrian. In another legend, Europe is identified by Trebeshina mountain in Albania, which in antiquity was called “Aeropus” (Europe).\footnote{Cenollari, I. Profecitë e Zatit të Tomorrit. Studim historik. (The prophecies of Tomorri’s god. Historic study.) Shtëpia botuese ‘Jonalda’. (pp 117, 118, 119) Tiranë 2009.} But, almost all legends are related to the same above mentioned places. Therefore we may feel proud if the name ‘Europe’ was firstly used in the Albanian regions by our ancestors.
Idolatry and religion origins

Aref thinks that the Pelasgians inherited to Greeks a good part of their cults and gods. Zeus is Pelasgian and Dodonian, while Dodona is located in Epirus, cult capital of Pelasgians.\textsuperscript{42} Researcher Cenollari shares the same viewpoint according to which the origin of religion stems from the Pelasgians and Dodona’s divinity. According to this author, Dodona’s oracle was born in the period of time Arcadia mythology was conceived, Zeus’s cult and titan divinities of the first generation epos were created. Dodona’s oracle is as ancient as Zeus’s cult.\textsuperscript{43}

Regarding Dodona, Cenollari makes the following synthetic summary: Dodona is Zeus’s chapel... Zeus is creator if the good and right laws, thus of the divine and practice code, that his will is expressed in the oak tree, etc. ... Zeus was born in Toshëri (Albania – B.A.) by titan couple Rhea and Cronus, Akrokeraune mountain (Mountain of Lighting) has its name, that the head divinity is defined “Pelasgian Zeus”, Dodonian Zeus, Ceranous Zeus, “Zeus Pater” i.e. father Zeus as Tomorri mountain is called, mountain – father, Tomor father. Inaku, Jason, Heracles, Achilles, Pyrrhus, Neoptolemeus, Odysseus (Ulysses), Aeneas, Alexander Molosi, Pyrrhus of Epirus, etc. all prayed, worshiped, and consulted in Dodonian Zeus chapel.\textsuperscript{44}

So, based on all these data results that the history of European civilization goes deep in the dusk of history centuries and millenniums further before the Greek and Roman civilizations and any other later civilization is built on the “shoulders” of their predecessors originating since the birth of the white race in the European territory. We all have the right to be proud of our predecessors’ history and that cannot be undone.

Therefore, again, we have our roots here in our beautiful Europe. And, if we would refer to the researcher Elena Kocaqi,\textsuperscript{45} our same pre-Indo-European origin that we have like all the other European people, would be presented as follows:

Italy, in the most ancient times, was inhabited by Pelasgian-Illyrian tribes in its entire territory: in South were Japyges, Mesap and Daun; in North were Ret, the natives; in the center were Romans who derived from Ene Dardanian while Etruscans, or Tosks were Pelasgians. The same thing can be said for Gaul and Iberia.

\textsuperscript{44} Ibid, pp 45, 163, 164.
German-Scandinavian race originated from Illyria. Ancient Scandinavians pretend Trojan-Thracian origin. Teutones tribes were all originated from North Illyria. From the Nors who were an Illyrian tribe in present Austria, originated Austrians. While Normans, Vandals, and Franks, who formed German nation, were from Illyria’s Panonia. Goths originated from Mysians. Mysians had an Illyrian-Thracian origin.

Old Englishman derived from Dardanian Troy tribe, which is proved by the ancient and medieval writings. Anglo-Saxons were from Illyria’s Panonia, while Piks and Skiths called themselves Albans and spoke the same language as Daks which is presently translated from the Albanian.

Other Hellenic tribes had Pelasgian-Illyrian origin. Thus, Ionians were Pelasgian and Doriains were Illyrian. Arvanits are Ioninas’ descendants in Athens and Doriains’ descendants in Peloponnesus. Armenians also originated from Pelasgian-Illyrian tribes. They were those Armenians who populated present Iran’s region from where Persian language and Avestan language originated. The Alban Skith populated North India between Ind river and Gang river, where originated the old India language and the Sanscrit.

Russians were named from an Illyrian tribe from Panonia that had emigrated to Scandinavia where was enlarged and further reached the present Russia territory. Slavs are a mix of Asiatic race with the European race. Precisely authentic Slavs are the Southern Slavs, as the Russians and Western Slavs are in most of them an autochthonous population that became Slavic. In Asia, India was populated in North by a white race called Indo-Skith, as they derived from Alban Skith of the Black Sea.

So, in this context, I think that all the above facts and hypothesis are important, as they give to the Albanian language a geopolitical sense of origin, at least compared to the Roman and Germanic flows (with their respective ways of thinking and acting). The Albanian language is a synthetic-analytic type language against the languages in the other Indo-European flows where generally the synthetic type dominates.

There is only one intersection point where it seems as the “extremities” converge. This intersection has to do with the analytic element (along with the synthetic one) of an ancient language (perhaps “mother language”) from where the Albanian has remained (Albanian language), and with the synthetic element (without much synthetic content, regardless the recent evolutions) of a “granddaughter” language or “grand-granddaughter” language like the English one.

In this context, I believe would help us understand how the way of thinking in English works, if we would answer the question that what happened with the evolution of the new analytical way of thinking after the linguistic refraction from synthetic to analytic when the populations with the Roman or German origin were differentiated and made distant into English-speaking ones.
Similar questions may be formulated regarding closer differentiations between and within Roman, Germanic or Baltic-Slavic languages, including the most recent differentiations when two separate languages or dialects were differentiated and qualitatively detaching from their common mother language. The correct answers may help in the right approximation toward one language and one joint way of thinking.

While in the inner aspect of any country, the dialects may be left in free social use as a suitable territory for the researchers, but in a way that would support the unified standard of each mother language.

**Conversion spaces between the analytic and synthetic culture of thinking**

Talking about two different cultures of thinking, analytic or synthetic, they in fact are not considered as detached from each other processes, but as unique method where dominates one or the other tendency.

Against the fact that the English is considered a daughter language, a granddaughter language of the Germanic family, being conceived in a close relation with the Roman family languages (specifically with the French), it is evaluated as an analytic language, even though the origin families languages from where it derived are mostly evaluated as synthetic languages.

The Albanian language that is classified as a synthetic-analytic language is an exclusion. For this reason, but also due to its base vocabulary in the Indo-European languages system, the Albanian language may operate as a key to identify the distinctions in the roots of (no matter how few) words and meanings between Roman-Germanic on one side and those Anglo-Saxon on the other, but perhaps even more between the languages where the two “daughters” have present contact or direct connection with their mother language.

**Analytic way of thinking and synthetic way of thinking – two different ways of illumination that can converge**

So, what may have “corrected” the English-speaking people with their analytic way of thinking? In order to answer this question maybe the best way would be the historic and comparative inspection of the two types of laws, Roman law on one side and Anglo-Saxon law on the other: resolution of the issues starting from the formulation of the penal acts generalized concepts – in the first, and resolution of the issues starting from the penal case or precedent – in the second.

So, the Roman law creates a generalization on the bases of some cases and then from that generalization resolves the other cases, while the Anglo-Saxon law does not “give much consideration” as it respects and follows the previous resolutions. The latter,
only after is convinced that the interest is strongly calling, only then creates a new precedent. It of course has refined a technique of its own progressing in this direction, saying from the bottom – up, by preparing the place or setting the brick and then the foot.

Similarly, the Roman law or mentality has its own way of illumination, by firstly throwing “the rope or the crook”, if we would figuratively be expressed, and then be “ascended or descended” as the case would be. I think they are both, and separately, similarly limited, for the elevation of the building is defined by the base of its foundation in the time when it was built, while the new foundation for a higher building is defined by the new idea for the new base of the foundation that, sometime, should be built from the beginning. So, while the limitations are reciprocal, the intention remains the same and for that reason they can accord.

Analytic way of thinking and synthetic way of thinking – two different ways of leading that can become harmonized

I think that another comparative aspect between the two laws may refer to accusatorial system in the Anglo-Saxon law and inquisitorial system in the Roman law, which culture dominates mainly in the continental Europe countries. In the accusatorial system, the penal investigation and proceeding starts with the initiative of the damaged party that bears the evidence. While in the inquisitorial system⁴⁶, penal investigation and proceeding⁴⁷ starts with the initiative of the judge or public prosecutor, i.e. with the state initiative, where the latter bears the evidence. I think that the first culture has encouraged in the administrative level the principle of pushing from below, while the second culture encourages the principle of orientation or direction from above.

Leading in the first case (Anglo-Saxon culture) is certainly less dangerous than leading in the second case (Roman culture), but with the condition that leading in the first case is apt to and calmly “float” on the pushing wave coming from below. While leading in the second case means to demonstrate a deep vision and open broad perspectives where people may follow you as the orchestra follows the director, but with the condition that the fantasy be oriented in the right direction or it should stop before the “dam brakes of the overflow”.

I believe that both cultures have their pluses and minuses and it seems that they are converging toward each other. In the first culture, I percept (with what I can from the Internet sources) that the technical staffs and the analysis-synthesis structures are

reinforced, more or less independent, in support of the higher governmental officials. But the officials select what they are looking for following their perceptions, while the answer coming from the other side may beautify the “underground currents” image, until they suit the leaders’ perceptions. (In this context, sometime a threshold may be created that the “pushing” from below takes the leaders’ perceptions out of reality.)

While in the second culture (Roman culture), I believe, always more is starting to open the terrain to the pushing requisites and signals from below, but perhaps without giving the necessary importance to the supporting technical staffs in order to reflect and pass in the appropriate way the findings and impulses coming from those “signals”. Thus, if in the Anglo-Saxon culture the “underground currents” image beautifying may happen according to the leader’s preference, in the Roman culture passing these currents “rawly” (as the result of the preliminary steps toward coming closer to the Anglo-Saxon spirit) may take the leaders to rushed decisions. But the identification of the distinctions makes their flattening possible and creates the possibility for their harmonization.

Synthetic-analytic meaning in the Albanian thinking and some problems in leadership

My perception in the context of the Albanian reality reinforces my belief that our leaders are too marveled with the culture of leading through pushing from below. Perhaps as they think that, meanwhile, they can take care of anything but leading, even by exercising any type of “pressure” from above. (Sometimes one may even feel remorse for such a category of leaders, when you see their sincere wonder about why this leadership technique is not working automatically.)

This phenomena I believe, is reinforced when it is the case when the two problematic sides of both cultures (as above mentioned) are integrated in one, exactly like a synthetic-analytic way of thinking, like the one that belongs to us, Albanians, may pass. I think that the result would be the image of a fully volunteerist leadership descending from above, with the technical mediocre staffs, that pass like a conveyer the selected wishes of the leadership. But on the other side, i.e. in the movement from below – up, the staffs would hold a double attitude: they would respond to the leadership aptly to its desired illusion, while would block, reverse or divert any type of pressure signal coming because of the pressure from below.

I don’t think there should be excluded that demonstrations of this nature, like in the Albanian case, somewhere more and somewhere less, may come across as well in other continental Europe countries, as they also are included in the movement of gaining from the best of the Anglo-Saxon model of leading. This phenomenon may be mostly observed in the exchanges and approximations between the two types of laws. But what may seem good at one, this one may have start abandoning, while he
may prefer any “good” of ours, that may damage him too, if he does not understand in advance what is the essence of distinction.

There is the possibility that, in the “analytic” culture of leading, (if we would accept this definition), the selection (from above) continues to remain too analytic, when the evaluation (form below) is becoming always more synthetic. While in the “synthetic” culture of leading, the selection (from above) continues to pass synthetic elements, but the evaluation (form below) still is not detached from the domination of the analytic features.

Therefore the problem is to get off the synthesis of the problematic sides of both cultures (at least in the Albanian context), getting closer to the synthesis of the best qualities that both cultures hold: in the internal level – respecting the pressure from below and responsibility of leading from above; in the external level – respecting the balances in conformity with the vision; and, in the integration level – respecting the macro-balances, conditioning leadership responsibility, factorization and respect of pressure from below.

Linguistic analysis of a few words may explain in embryo the distinctions between the two ways of thinking, the synthetic and analytic ones. An English-Albanian illustration: power and influence.

I think that the synthesis of the best qualities that both cultures hold cannot be attained without being returned to the origin, at that time when the differentiation and birth of the English language happened as an analytic language, that, at the same time, reflected a new dimension and the substrata in the synthetic languages foundation from where it has derived.

In this flow, the emphasis of the analytic feature in the Anglo-Saxon way of thinking is nothing but the refraction (lets say in the “stone” reality) of the Germanic languages prolongation on one side, with the confrontation form the prolongation of the Roman languages on the other side, etc., in the conditions of those people and of that concrete environment with which they have interacted. There is no separation: two branches, coming out of the same trunk, that profuse again somewhere on the top because they are defined, refracted, reflected, materialized, conceived or converged by the people and place that joined them.

I think that the problem resolved by the English-speaking people has to do exactly with the “comminution” of the long word-forming constructions into more simple and concrete particles, in order to use them “meaningfully” during the exchange, resolving the problems as realistically as possible. So, if the synthetic languages of the origin are translated into an analytic language, this means that the new natives wanted to change something, something that did not suit to the concrete reality.
In this context, I believe that would be only a limited number of words or verbs, specifically between those that are related to the passage from the thought to the action, that would call for a comparative study during their refraction from the close synthetic origin to the analytic one, or from the re-actualization of the old analytic paradigm, but now in a new context in order to find where are the roots of the two different ways of thinking.

For example, based on a comparative study between the terms power and influence, in the English language context and based on some encyclopedia dictionaries, power can be described as: “power is referred to the concept of energy transformation that realizes the action by realizing a ‘pressure’ or producing a ‘suppression’, regardless the result on the object where it acts on.”\(^{48}\) While “influence is not focused on the power of pressure or suppression in itself, but on its result on the influenced subject, even on that type of result that is to the benefit of the one that exercises the power.”\(^{49}\)

From the Albanian language viewpoint, I think that here a “split” is noted, as in order to measure the power one should pass on the other side of the “river” to percept the impact. But it does not include the mass of power for the aimed impact without passing on the other side. According to FESH,\(^{50}\) power presupposes its capacity (capacity to work, move, act) but also the scale and consequence of that capacity; while the influence is described as consequence, as result, but also as action and as power (action over somebody or something).

According to the English concept of power, exercise of the “pressure” principle (from below) during the leadership process, where ‘pressure’ or ‘suppress’ are a power with an undetermined mass, gives meaning to the expression that “any people deserves the government it has”. While the influence is more an element of leadership as a result “to the benefit of the one that exercises power”, thus supports the exercise or the pull principle (lead, leadership).

Meanwhile, according to the Albanian concept of power, but also of the influence, they both are powers, but while the first is stronger or direct, the other is softer or indirect. Analyzed in Albanian (perhaps in the European also) this means: “If you do not learn by good manners, you will suffer the bad ones”. But the concept of power in Albanian (perhaps in the other synthetic type languages also) presupposes the mass of power as well, likewise the influence may be the mass itself. So, in a synthetic meaning, who has the power should also take care of mass, either when serves according to the pressure principle, but even more when it serves according to the pull principle.

---


\(^{49}\) Ibid, pp 7-8.

\(^{50}\) *Fjalori Elektronik Shpjegues i Gjuhës Shqipe*. (Albanian Language Electronic Thesaurus Dictionary.)
Concluding, I think that the Albanian language may be of help in such approaches (because it is perhaps the direct descendant of the mother language). But being myself not a linguistic specialist (and taking care of my way to stay as “superficial” to the things as possible), I believe that the interests of the authentic linguistic specialists, in cooperation with the security and power specialists, but also with philosophers, sociologists, etc. together with the interests of the states that should support them, would be many times more powerful should it interest to them to move into this direction.

Now a couple of words more, not only as Albanian, but also as European, I do not think that the reinforcement of the analytic way of thinking has more advantages than the reinforcement of the synthetic way of thinking (even have they no meaning without the help of each other), but knowing the first better, the synthetic way of thinking may re-rise and pass ahead again, and, perhaps, this way and vice-versa.

Some conclusions

In the context of this work it is evaluated that the Albanian language takes a key position in the system of the Indo-European languages and has a lot to offer. The main conclusions regarding the issues presented in this material may be outlined as follows:

- The more the languages are differentiated from the origin system, the more the specific ways of thinking are diversified, according to the specific languages that the specific nations speak and write. For this reason, there is the need for “movement” in the opposite direction so that the national standard of a language may induce the approximation with the national standard of the other language.

- Albanian language today is a living mirror for all the Indo-European languages that are spoken 2-3 thousand years ago. Its evolution toward the synthetic-analytic type is specific because it develops the analytic forms of the language preserving at the same time the synthetic forms. While the syllable character supports the action in any type of context, synthetic or analytic.

- If we would “clarify” the meaning differences in the roots between Roman languages on one side and the Germanic and Baltic-Slavic ones on the other, then we would be able to find the common “essence” of one way of thinking from where would stem also another type of EU unity. To this intent may serve the deepening of the comparative studies with the Albanian language.

- Positioning of the Albanian language somewhere near the apex of a possible common language for all the Indo-European languages, give to the Albanian language a geopolitical sense of origin, at least compared to the Roman and Germanic flows and with their respective ways of thinking and acting.
- Clarification of the causes that define the differences of the language types from synthetic to analytic and vice-versa may be a good base to distinguish the characteristics in the way of thinking according to the specific languages.

- As the languages are differentiated through the dialects, they may be left in a free social use as a suitable territory for the researchers, but with the condition that they support the unified standard of the mother language they belong to.

- The Albanian language may serve as a key to identify the distinctions in the roots of (no matter how few) words and meanings between the big language families, but also between the new languages at the level where they are detaching from their mother language.

- The Albanian language may be of assistance in analyzing the meaning of some specific key-words in different languages that may have been much detached from the context of word-formation origin up to the creation of the opposite meanings. But for this, the involvement of the area specialists would be required.

- The synthetic and analytic ways of thinking are complementary to each other and each should understand the other by finding the solutions that fit reciprocally.
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