

# Ummite, A Functional Language?

---

Translated by Jeff Demmers

This white paper disseminates the integral development of the Ummo language, structure and pronunciation. Translated from an unknown author, the meaning and message is kept original as possible with a few exceptions for corrections and clarity. Reference to the original Ummo letters and are designated as "DXX" or "AXX.XX" or "Ref XXX", etc. - JD

---

## Reminder

Jean Pollion (in the sequel, "JP ") published in 2002 a book entitled "Ummo, real extraterrestrials" in which he exposes in particular his work on the Ummite language, and the discovery of its structure:

"All modes of expression of the Ummites (vocabulary or telepathic) are built on a basic "vocal" language presented in the documents. (expressions of "first level"). In this language without earthly equivalent, each phoneme emitted (elementary sound like those that are emitted by pronouncing A, S, T, W, O, I, etc...) expresses an idea, an abstraction. I called this sound expression that evokes a concept: a "soncept" [sound + concept], which gives this language an ideophonemic structure, a word invented by analogy with "ideographic".

There is no grammar or syntax. There is no noun, adjective, verbs, but only relational ideas and three assembly conventions including the doubling of a sound, which adds the idea of equality, balance and permanence to the idea conveyed by sound.

Earth languages refer to an object by a word and there are as many words as there are objects or ideas, requiring dictionaries that serve as a repository of meaning and grammar systems. It is very quickly noticed that the language the Ummite supposes is a "functional" form of thought, in which objects do not exist, but are defined by their functions, contributions or functional components. No dictionary is necessary, the "words" being themselves explicit." - Explanatory Summary of the Ideophonemic Language System (<http://www.umno-sciences.org/index.htm>)

For further explanation, I can only refer to his book.

## The Ummite Alphabet

There are 24 letters in the Ummite documents, which are those of the Roman alphabet except the J and the P. It should be noted that these letters correspond only to an approximate phonetic transcription of their language: **"The words noted in this document are an approximate graphic expressions of their actual voice"** -D21.

Jean Pollion retains only 17, each corresponding to a "soncept":

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>A</b> = effectivity,</p> <p><b>B</b> = contribution,</p> <p><b>D</b> = form, manifestation,</p> <p><b>E</b> = mental image, perception, idea</p>                                      | <p><b>N</b> = flow, transfer</p> <p><b>O</b> = dimensional reality, being, creature</p> <p><b>R</b> = imitation</p> <p><b>S</b> = cycle, alternation</p> |
| <p><b>G</b> = organization</p> <p><b>I</b> = difference, otherness</p> <p><b>K</b> = mixing, approximation</p> <p><b>L</b> = equivalence, correspondence</p> <p><b>M</b> = relationship</p> | <p><b>T</b> = evolution</p> <p><b>U</b> = dependency</p> <p><b>W</b> = modification, information</p> <p><b>Y</b> = set, package, group</p>               |

The letters C, F, H, Q, V, X and Z, which are found in the Ummo letters, are not retained by J. Pollion either for reasons of homophony in Spanish (V for B, C and Q for K), or for "obvious" transcription errors (case of H and Z). All these letters are indeed very rare (frequency less than 0.2%), with the notable exception of the X. A curious case because it is related by Jean Pollion to GS: however, the Spanish pronunciation "normal" assimilates it rather to CS (or KS to take up the soncepts), or even simply to S, which is also explicitly found in the D32:

*"We use the phoneme XI or SI (it is difficult to find the appropriate letters) which means CYCLE ROTATION or REVOLUTION which has a double acceptance. That is, it is what you call a homophone word. With the word "XI" or "CSI" nous express both the rotation of UMMO on its axis (one day) and that for example of a wheel".*

The X is also replaced by a simple S in some letters (2 common examples: SAABI – XAABI, and SANMOO – XANMOO). In addition, it is stated in D-69.3 that "the G is pronounced as an aspirated H", which does not fit at all with the assimilation S = GS. Finally, the letter X is much more common than the G, the S or even the K (not to mention the C); in fact, it is even the most frequent consonant. It is therefore difficult to see why relegate the X to the rank of a combination that is not phonetically correct and goes against the practice of Ummite letters.

It should also be noted that on the remaining letters, the K, the R and the T are very infrequent (barely 1% for all three). Keeping the X, there are therefore only 15 truly frequent letters, which total nearly 99% of the letters used.

In addition, the 5 AEIOU vowels represent just over 70% of the letters used, including 53% for AIO alone, and just over 60% of the words begin with A, I, O or U. More than 95% of words also end with a vowel. If we add that the I and the Y are interchangeable by homophony (see below) as well as the U and the W, the frequency of the "vowels" increases to more than 77%.

Note that this concentration of frequencies is higher than Spanish, where it is necessary to use 9 letters (in descending order EAOLSNDRU) to arrive at 77%, the first three reaching only 37% (against 53% for Ummite).

Of course, these frequency considerations must be taken with great reservations given the small sample we have, and in particular by the absence or almost absence of sentences.

The consonants are only very rarely doubled, with the exception of the M and the N: AMIE, AMMIE or OEMI, OEMMI for example (the case of the W is different because it is related to a vowel, U). More generally, the succession of 2 consonants is very rare: words are normally composed of a series of 2 to 4 syllables, themselves constituted with a consonant + a vowel (possibly doubled), or several vowels.

## Synonyms Always Homophone

Any reader of Ummite documents will have immediately noticed the similarity of many words (synonyms), inside the same letter, translated identically or very closely. The vast majority of these "synonyms" are homophone (same pronunciation, same meaning) for a Spanish reader, and this homophony almost always resides either in the long 'a' of a vowel, or in the substitution of a letter (Y by I, U by W when it precedes a vowel, S by X, V by B). These synonyms are extremely widespread: of the 1205 terms I have identified (excluding proper names and excluding the letters NR), nearly 42% are only variants of the same word.

JP argues that the various spellings of the same word are way for the Ummites to illuminate this or that characteristic: the definition of a word being functional, we can actually consider that depending on the context, one of its functions is put forward, as if we were somehow varying the view. However, if this were the case, this approach would have to be purely functional, i.e. one would have to find relatively different spellings of the same "word". This is unfortunately not the case: as we have seen, synonyms are only built on the basis of homophony. In the case of a frequent word, one even has the impression that synonyms only exhaust all possible combinations, or almost, of the same pronunciation:

| <b>BUAWE</b> | <b>IBOZOO</b> | <b>OYAGAA</b> |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| BUAAWEE      | • IBOOSOO     | • AYAGAA      |
| BUAUE        | • IBOOZO      | • OIAGAA      |
| BUAUEE       | • IBOOZSOO    | • OIIAGAA     |
| BUAUIE       | • IBOSO       | • OOYAAGA     |
| BUAUUEE      | • IBOSOOUU    | • OUYAGA      |
| BUAUUEE      | • IBOSZOO     | • OUYAGAA     |
| BUAWEE       | • IBOTZOO     | • ORIAGGA     |
| BUAWEI       | • IBOZOOUU    | • OYAAAGAA    |
| BUAWWEE      | • IBOZSOO     | • OYAAGA      |
| BUUAUE       | • IVOOSO      | • OYAAGAA     |
| BUUAUEE      | • IVOSZOO     | • OYAGA       |
| BUUAUWEE     |               | • OYAGAAA     |
| BUUAWEE      |               | • OYOGAA      |
|              |               | • YOAGAA      |

It should be noted, however, that some homonyms are approximate in terms of pronunciation (the R of ORIAGGA is not quite homophone with the Y, although it is similar in Spanish), while others seem to result from transcription errors (for example, two letters inverted as YOAAGAA for OYAAGAA).

In addition, it should be noted that Ummites attribute to the doubling of vowels to a very specific role: according to them, it represents the graphic translation of the lengthening of a sound ("*The number of letters written means that in our phonetics we stretch sessions*" D357-2), which is also rendered by a circumflex accent in the letters "French".

I therefore consider that it is necessary to "reprocess" the terms by eliminating the synonyms, which reduces the number of terms from 1205 to 659.

I specify, however, that even this explanation (lengthening of sounds) is not satisfactory in view of the number of synonyms that we meet: for example, for OYAGAA, the 4 syllables can be elongated (O in OO, Y or I in II, A in AA, GA in GAA), including in combination. The question that arises is, of course: what is the purpose of this lengthening? It could be the equivalent of a tonic accent, or of a tone, which modify the meaning of a word or marks a flexion for example. But this is obviously not the case since the meaning is always exactly the same (and conversely, some words have NEVER been altered, for example GAA, which is nevertheless constitutive of OYAGAA = OYAA + GAA = planet / cold star + square). There are many rare exceptions (for example, IEN which means both 2 and even or third) but there does not seem to be a link between these variations in the meaning of the same word and its spelling variations. It is difficult to conclude in the absence of complete sentences, but I admit that there is a point here that remains obscure.

I note in passing that some indications on the pronunciation Ummite seem rather incompatible with the concepts: for example, the D21 says "*We are from a Planet whose phonetic verbal expression could be written as follows: UM-MO (the "U" very closed and guttural, the M could be interpreted as a B)*". By the way, if this is the case, why transcribe this sound with an "M"? This mystery aside, if the M sounds like a B (which itself sounds like a V in Spanish, at least in Spain), what about the respective concepts? Same problem for the A and the E if we believe the D357-2: "*The Collective Soul or BUAUE BIAEII (the "e" is pronounced as a synthesis of A and E):*" what happens to the 2 concepts?

## Phonetic Limitation of Soncept Combinations

A major disadvantage of a functional language as described by JP is that very many combinations of concepts are unpronounceable and must therefore be excluded on the sole basis of phonetics. Imagine, for example, that we want to express "the cyclical evolution of an organization", which would reflect the rotation of an assembly, or the turnover of staff in a company, or the turnover of teams in a factory. In a translation essay, we find ourselves in front of the " word " TSG, which is unpronounceable.

However, it is very easy to remedy this:

- add for example an O and we get TSOG: cyclic evolution, the alternation of organized creatures (since it is the rotation of people);
- we can also add a U (TSUG: cyclical evolution, the alternation of a dependent organization - since

- the members of an organization depend on one another);
- or an A (TSAG: the cyclical evolution, the effective alternation of an organization – since it is indeed a real change, the number of members who are substituted by others, and not a simple reorganization by permutation of the members between them);
  - or an I (TSIG: cyclical evolution, the alternation of a different organization, not identical –always insisting on the fact that the organization is perpetuated while being different, which is the idea of the circle or the wave: we go through different points while maintaining the structure).

What we find is that it is extremely easy to add one of the concepts "vowels" to a word without affecting its general meaning. You will tell me, it is good since it allows to remedy the previous pronunciation problem, but on the one hand it is not very economical, and above all, it raises the question of the relevance of these vowel concepts: if they are also "boiler-go" and do not alter or little the meaning of the words, do they really have a intrinsic function?

For this, let's go back to JP's functional language principle.

## A Functional Language?

First of all, it should be noted that the term "functional language" as used by JP does not correspond to a linguistic definition. There was indeed a school of functionalism in linguistics, whose head of file was the French André Martinet (*Elements of General Linguistics* – 1960), but this does not have much to do (it was also part of the current of structuralism of the Prague circle, from the Saussurian tradition, that is to say of Aristotelian essence: rigorous but reductionist).

It should also be noted that Ummites do not describe their everyday language as being especially different from ours. For example, in the D77 which describes their different types of language, *the one in question here "The first, DU-OI-OIYOO (it can be translated as connecting language) uses ideograms in their graphic expression and groups of vocables (ndt: Voz plural voces: voice, noise, cry, word, vocable) linked or connectés that represent concepts, values and concrete objects and even ordered complex ideas. It is a vehicle that serves to converse routine issues (domestic language, technical, vulgarized macrosocial)".* What they describe (without much detail unfortunately) as truly revolutionary and different are their other languages, especially this coded language based on phoneme repetitions that fits into everyday language as a second train of simultaneous thoughts.

JP defines Ummite as functional as opposed to the word-object relationship (or word-idea):

*"Earth languages refer to an object by a word and there are as many words as there are objects or ideas, requiring sayings that serve as a repository of meaning and grammar systems. It is very quickly noticed that the Ummite language supposes a form of "functional" thought, in which objects do not exist, but are defined by their functions, contributions or functional components".*

It will be noted in passing that this characterization of "earthly languages" is quite caricatural and far from unanimous: it was indeed, simplifying a lot, that of Saussure and structuralism, but linguistics has progressed enormously over the past 50 years. A language does not contain only word-objects, far from it (verbs, adjectives, pronouns, articles, etc.), and there is also not a word for each object or idea, fortunately!

JP further introduced the notion of concept, which would be the smallest significant unit of the Ummite language.

In a functional language, each concept should be able to express itself as a function. But what is a function? It bothers me that it can be reduced to two fundamental characteristics: that of relationship, and that of transformation. A function always establishes a relationship (or link) between its object and its result, and this result differs from the initial object by a transformation (or operation). In mathematics, it is thus represented by  $f(x) = y$ . The problem with a purely functional language is that it never has an object to apply to: each concept (function) applies only to another concept, and has insistently immediately.

But this reading does not exactly fit, I believe, with JP's theory of this functional language. For him, the function (the concept) does not apply to other functions, but describes an attribute of the object (which is, readily, never defined). This is the function(s) of the object itself, not a function of language. Let's take the simplest example, that of an object: the object itself is never named (no word-object), it can only be inferred from the different attributes that are described. In an even more limited way, it is not its attributes but only its functions that are described. Thus, we do not describe what the object IS, but what it DOES (and we find here the fixation of Ummites against the verb to be and the subject-predicate relationship, which only takes up the theses of Russel and Whitehead that of the general semantics of A. Korzybski, or that of the E-prime movement founded by Bourland, all these very worth dating from the first half of the twentieth century).

We should therefore logically end up with verbs instead of nouns: a bird would become, for example, "that which lives, which flies and which sings". One of the problems of this type of Construction is that the more precise you want to be, the longer the list of functions must lengthen since "naming" is then "framing" the name without ever reaching it: "who lives" can be any animal or plant, "who flies" can be an airplane, "who lives and flies" can be a bat. If you want to refer to a stork or ostrich, things get complicated!

In addition, each function must "maximize" its power of discrimination in relation to the others, in order to minimize the number of functions (of concepts) to be used. Finally, the functions themselves can be "reduced": "who flies" is a subset of "who moves". In the end, we can represent a word by the intersection of a certain number of sets, of which we will try to reduce to a minimum the number and /or the "size".

## **Functions or Simply Attributes?**

But Ummite language and concepts don't work this way either. First of all, curiously, JP defines ALL concepts (functions) not by verbs, but by nouns. Certainly, they can always be expressed in the form of verbs more or less disguised: the being is what is, he form is what manifests, evolution is what evolves, dependence is what depends, etc. But by analyzing the "translations" of Ummite words by JP, we can only note that many concepts no longer have anything of a function: X (GS) often becomes a wave, Y is a group, E is a perception or an idea, O is a creature, etc. It is therefore no longer a question of functions, but simply of attributes, purely descriptive.

## **Number of Discrimination of Concepts**

Much more serious, and in my opinion this is where one of the fundamental weaknesses of the system lies, concepts are not discriminating; on the contrary, they are for the most part extremely general and

therefore vague, while often overlapping. In fact, they can often (but not always) apply to just about anything. Let's see why these vowel concepts are so malleable, taking up the definition of the most common as proposed by JP in his book, classified in descending order of their frequency:

|                 |   |   |
|-----------------|---|---|
| <p><b>A</b></p> | <p>Concept <b>A</b> expresses an idea common to <b>action</b> and <b>truth</b> or <b>reality</b> through the <b>action or activity observed, effectiveness</b>. The action is in itself true, since objectively stable. The action is also sometimes the fact of the number. Depending on the context, concept <b>A</b> is transcribed as:</p> <p><b>truth, truthfulness, action, activation, effectiveness, reality, active confirmation, etc.</b></p>   | <p>It can be said of any object or idea that it is true or real, of any action that it is effective. In addition, JP sometimes simply translates this concept as "effectively", which only reinforces the meaning of the rest without modifying it. Take a little test: take any sentence in a book, and sprinkle with "effectively". You will see, it usually goes very well but it does not change anything in the meaning of the text...</p> |
| <p><b>O</b></p> | <p>This concept <b>O</b> evokes the idea of "dimensional reality". That is to say, that of being. As the language is essentially "functional description", it is not necessary for it to further define what has an "existence decryptable by equations", however complicated they may be. Therefore, this concept will be transcribed, depending on the context, by:</p> <p><b>"entity, existence, being, creature"</b>. If it is human creations, I propose the equivalent of our expressions <b>"thing, thing, thing"</b> and other <b>"widget, device, object, constituent"</b> or any other equivalent word. It is a question of naming any "dimensional <b>reality</b>", material or immaterial. Including the <b>"dimensions"</b> themselves, ultimate constituents of the models.</p> | <p>Here we find a one-size-all formulation for "what is", however restricted to the realm of the concrete ("what exists" would probably be a better translation). Concept can therefore be applied to anything that is not an idea or concept (abstraction). The translation proposed by JP of thing, thing, thing, shows well the little precision of the concept.</p>   |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|



|                 |   |   |
|-----------------|---|---|
| <p><b>I</b></p> | <p>Sound <b>I</b> carries a common concept to the major idea of difference. We would say <b>non-identity</b>. All the transcriptions below are only formulations, according to our system of nuances, of this central idea. I transcribe the sound <b>I</b> according to the contexts, by:</p> <p><b>"different, other, distinct, separate, varied, diverse, difference, opposite, independent...</b> and all the nouns attached to it: difference, otherness, separation, variety, diversity, independence, and much more rarely opposition.</p> | <p>Anything can be defined as "the other" of what he is not. Choose an idea or object, and think of everything it(he) is different from. By definition, it's anything but the object/idea in question, which inevitably is not at all accurate.</p>   |
| <p><b>U</b></p> | <p>It is the one that evokes the concept of <b>dependence</b> or <b>influence</b>, depending on the point of view, and naturally the most common form of dependence that is the <b>condition</b>.</p>   | <p>Anything being dependent on what surrounds it, and having an influence on it, we can apply this concept to anything we want. It is also sometimes replaced by O by "homophony", which is not really a problem.</p>   |
| <p><b>E</b></p> | <p>This sound carries a concept that I transcribe, according to the contexts, by:</p> <p><b>"perception, mental representation, mental result image of stimuli transmitted by the sense organs, sensation(s), etc. "</b></p>  | <p>As JP himself says: "<i>An Ummite does not, in fact, directly designate an object or an idea. He often begins by expressing that it is the mental image that one has of... This is why there are quite many terms that begin with "mental image".</i></p> <p>Indeed, we only know the world through the representation we have of it, and from there, anything can be adorned with this concept, whether it is an object (indirectly known via the representation that our brain makes of it) or an idea (directly produced by our brain).</p> |
| <p><b>X</b></p> | <p><b>The X</b> is not a concept, but the transcription of the couple <b>G-S</b>. We will therefore find, in equivalence of this transcription, all the combinations involving <b>G</b> for organization, arrangement, and <b>S</b> for round, circle, turn, cycle, periodicity, repetition in wave contexts: everything that characterizes the waves is expressible by organized periodicities, in social contexts with the notion of permutation which is also an organization of alternation, etc...</p>                                       | <p>Note the redundancy with the concept N which also applies to everything that is wave train, radiation, etc.</p>  |

|                 |  |   |
|-----------------|--|---|
| <p><b>W</b></p> | <p>The concept <b>W</b> expresses, depending on the context:</p> <p><b>"variation, change, novelty, event, information, ... "</b></p>  | <p>It's hard to find something that doesn't change... This concept is often interchangeable by homophony with the U, which is quite easy: by cause and effect link, any dependence or influence affects both parties and thus causes a change, an alteration.</p>   |
| <p><b>N</b></p> | <p>This <b>N</b> concept conveys the main idea of "flow", of "displacement", not in the sense of transport that one notions such as that of flow. The flux can be immaterial, although real, as a stream of particles, waves, radiation. This main idea will be rendered, depending on the context, by:</p> <p><b>"flux, transfer, flow, migration, radiation ... "</b></p>  | <p>We find the notion of movement no longer internal (change, concept W) but object by the movement or its absence is not very precise (few things are immobile) and quite primary or. For example, in the newborn, the type of movement (continuous or not, trajectory) is one of the ways to distinguish between living beings and objects, and also between "friends" and "enemies".</p> |
| <p><b>D</b></p> | <p>The Spanish <b>D</b> sound, conveys a concept that I transcribe, according to the contexts, by:</p> <p><b>"appearance, appearance, manifestation, appearance, form"</b></p>   | <p>Everything has a shape, an appearance. Look for something that doesn't have one, only to find out.</p>   |
| <p><b>Y</b></p> | <p>The <b>Y</b> concept conveys our ideas of:</p> <p><b>"volume and grouping</b> that I propose to render by our notions of <b>"package", "group", "together"</b>. The idea is both quantitative and volume, we will see. The idea of grouping is underlying, as is of <b>gathering</b>. Extending the <b>mathematical notion of set</b>, we will find this concept in the constituent groups of networks, which we could qualify as subsets. As such, this concept has a privileged place in the Ummite culture, since all the conception and expression of the collectivity are built on the notion of group or network.</p> | <p>Concept close to the following: grouping is a form of organization</p>   |
| <p><b>G</b></p> | <p>Concept <b>G</b> evokes an idea common to all of the following formulations:</p> <p><b>"arrangement, organization, positioning, structure, presentation</b> (in the sense that it is a witness to an ad hoc organization), etc.."</p>   | <p>Here again, JP specifies: <i>"Particles, atoms, and even individuals, in societies (networks) are the object of an <b>organization</b> that translates, in part, their degrees of freedom."</i> In other words, almost everything is part of a network, everything is organized, everything has an order.</p>  |

|                 |  |  |
|-----------------|--|--|
| <p><b>M</b></p> | <p>This concept <b>M</b> conveys the main idea of "connecting". It will be rendered, depending on the context, by:</p> <p><b>"association, juxtaposition, union, meeting, coupling, relationship".</b></p>   | <p>It's hard to find something that doesn't have to do with anything else...</p> |
| <p><b>B</b></p> | <p>The Spanish <b>B</b> sound is an intermediate sound between the <b>V</b> and the <b>B</b> in French. These two transcriptions carry the idea of contribution as "the action of an external agent to a reality aimed at increasing any constituent level of that reality". I propose to transcribe it, according to the contexts, by:</p> <p><b>"contribution, assistance (such as lending sound ..), apport (immaterial), participation, cause"</b></p> | <p>Everything contributes to something, by the simple fact of existing.</p>      |

## Grouping of Soncepts

We realize by analyzing the definitions that JP gives to soncepts that they are grouped roughly in three major categories that I have baptized of temporal, spatial and relational:

| Category   | Definition  | Soncepts                  |
|------------|---|---------------------------|
| Time       | Characterizes change, evolution over time, which can be internal (change) or external (movement).   | N, W, S, T                |
| Space      | Translates the organization, the arrangement in space, the state (including simple existence). Space must not be reduced here to physical space, to the concrete: "spatial" can be applied in this definition to an idea. It is a question of describing a state in an absolute (and not relative) way. | G, D, O, A, S, K          |
| Relational | Defines the type of relationship to the rest of the world, to "other" means the relative state. This relationship can be "passive" (position of one object relative to another for example) or "active" (action of one object on another).  | M, E, U, I, Y, B, L, K, R |

JD: The S can take on a spatial (circular) or temporal (repetition) sense, while the K is both spatial (mixing) and relational (rapprochement).

## The "world tour in 17 soncepts"

To tell the truth, it was predictable that the 17 soncepts were quite vague. Indeed, in this functional language, everything must be able to be reduced to a combination of 17 fundamental bricks. In other words, the Ummite dictionary does exist but it has only 17 entries. Without going too far, I don't see how to express any idea and designate any object from such a limited number of concepts, even disregarding the length of the words. Here we find a mathematical inspiration of a formalism pushed to the extreme, where 17 soncepts would represent in a way the basic axioms of language.

I have no doubt that we can construct a representation of the world from 17 concepts, but this world will either be extremely poor and very structured (the universe of programs of a very simple programming language with 17 operators for example), or extremely "blurred" and very rich. In other words, such a functional language is either too specialized (it only says a small part of reality) or too general (it describes a very vast but poorly defined universe). We have examples of the first case (specialized languages, which is often similar to codes: for example, all the road signs constituting the rules of the road, or all the rules of the game of chess), but not the second it seems to me (except maybe in the animal world, but it is very speculative).

Our terrestrial languages represent a compromise between these two extremes: general enough to adapt to all situations, but specialized enough to be usable (memorization, learning, pronunciation, etc.).

## Context Dependence

Another critical problem of JP's functional language, related to the previous one, is its permanent reference to context. For each concept, JP establishes a list of "senses" approached, specifying each time: "according to the context". But what is this context? In letters, Ummite words are almost always isolated (there are only half a dozen sentences for more than a thousand words), and most of the time translated. Since we have both the context and better still, the translation, it is not very difficult to "choose" for each concept, in the list of definitions proposed by JP, those that will fit best (it is all the easier as the definitions, as we have seen, are extremely flexible).

But let's imagine for a moment a veritable Ummite phrase. The context is that of the other words themselves- also Ummites. How can we know what is meant by "the actual *differences of what is distinct*" (IAI)? Without context, I challenge anyone who does not already know the translation to find a precise meaning to this expression (if this is your case, do not turn the page right away and look for a moment!).

IAI means "perfume, smell" and JP explains that "The *olfactory signature is fundamental for Ummite. For him, perfumes, smells are the objective signs of what is "other", external, foreign*". But this is just as true of sounds, images, and more generally, of any distinctive attribute of something or someone who is not himself or herself. My grandfather's beret is a sign that actually distinguishes him from me! In addition, the concepts used are not discriminating: I do not see how perfume or smells are particularly characterized by this notion of "effective differences of the distinct". Would it not be more logical a priori to associate perception (E) or mixture (K) for example? Note that in his search for concepts, JP himself relied on perfume as a perception to characterize concept E, from the word bathroom (E-XAABI) that only the E differentiates from XAABI ("room, room, house"): gold, the Ummite bathroom (unlike our bathroom). ! is mainly characterized by perfume baths, from which JP deduces that E stands for "perception".

One would be tempted to say that IAI is a common combination, and that Ummites immediately recognize the equivalent of "perfume, smell". But then, we are no longer in a logic of functional language, except in the banal and very earthly logic of our "word-objects"!

One could also retort that this sense of "perfume, smell" is driven by the context. Certainly, but the context itself is never more than a set of words (the sentence) each of which will pose the same problem of definition: if in the sentence X Y Z (where X Y Z are words, cad combinations of concepts), the meaning of X can only be established by knowing those of Y and Z, it is the same for Y (function of X and Z) and Z (function of X and Y). In other words, either we go around in circles, or we come back to the word object.

Some may say that in French, as in all terrestrial languages, it is sometimes essential to know the context to grasp the meaning of a word (polysemy). For example, the rooster can be the animal or the cook; the etymology of the 2 words has nothing to do with it, the first coming from the onomatopoeic imitation of the song of gallinaceous (coco coco, attested in imperial Latin in Petronius) and the second from the Dutch kok (cook), which we find in cook in English and master in French (both from the Latin coquus). It is obviously much worse in the spoken language, because of the homonyms: the "chan" of the rooster can refer as well to the cook pushing the song, as to the field where the gallinaceous is! One can obviously have fun finding other examples, but they remain rare, and since they affect very few words, the context is clear and the correct meaning is easily deduced, which is not the case of the Ummite language as described by JP.

Unfortunately or fortunately ,there is to my knowledge only one true example of Ummite expression that is neither explicit nor placed in context:

" in an in transcendent chatter like UAEXOOE IANNO IAUAMII IE OEMII + UAMII XOA AALOA " - D77 (note 4)

Certainly, we find the common word OEMII (man, human) as well as UAMII which means "food, food", but for the rest, it is the unknown. So let's see the translation that JP offers us:

| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>UAEXOOE IANNO IAUAMII IE<br/>OEMII</b></p>   | <p style="text-align: center;"><b>UAMII XOA AALOA</b></p>   |
|--|---|
| <p>The idea of permutation necessary for the equality of creatures (<b>UAEXOOE</b>)<br/>the effective variety of reciprocal transfers, exchanges between creatures (<b>IANNO</b>)<br/>the effective variety of foods (<b>IAUAMII</b>)<br/>emotions (<b>IE</b>) creature with perceptions in relation to its confinement [to its planet] [human being] (<b>OEMII</b>)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• food or food or meals (needs in relation to isolation) (<b>UAMII</b>)</li> <li>• Cyclic Organization and Creature Efficiency (<b>XOA</b>)</li> <li>• equivalent effective balance and creature efficiency (<b>AALOA</b>).</li> </ul> |
| <p>This gives:</p> <p><b>The idea of permutation necessary for the equality of creatures, the effective variety of exchanges between creatures, the effective variety of food are [sources of] emotions for men.</b></p>   | <p>This gives:</p> <p><b>"the cyclic organization of the diet is equivalent to the stability of the efficiency of the creatures" or "the regularity of the diet is an equivalent of the continuity of the efficiency of the creatures".</b></p>                               |

The least we can say is that it remains very obscure ,and very far from the idea that we can have of an "in transcending chat" (the chit-chat of the English, the conversa fiada of the Portuguese or our tasty French expressions: chatting, carving a bib).

To illustrate the practical impossibility of communicating with such a functional language without knowing the context, I imagined a small "game" that I will describe directly on the list.

### **Do Soncepts Help with Understanding?**

Notwithstanding their validity, it is interesting to wonder if this tool proposed by JP helps us to better understand the letters. Knowing that all Ummite words with a handful of exceptions come with a translation in the letters, the question is to know what more the JP method brings. It is out of the question, of course, to examine here one by one all the translations proposed by JP in the dictionary that accompanies his book. However, the exercise is extremely precise for those who want to judge the real usefulness of this method.

For my part, my general feeling is that JP translations using concepts do not help with understanding, or often make it more difficult. These translations are usually very obscure and vague, and one constantly has the impression of not knowing what one is referring to until one has the original translation of the Ummites. In fact, rather than providing assistance to the existing translation, one gets the impression that it is the inverse that occurs in the process: JP first gives a concept translation by concept, but already choosing some meanings rather than others for each of them. The result is often incomprehensible taken in isolation. Then, sometimes in several stages, he gathers this "sonceptual" translation to extract a global translation of the word, much more intelligible in general (although...), and which applies roughly to the original Ummite translation. All along, one frankly has the impression that one is only trying to return to the starting point (translation), after having taken an obscure detour on this sonceptual path. Translation by concepts only corroborates normal translation at best, but it almost never holds by itself: in other words, we understand translation by concepts only if we already know the meaning of the word. Which is exactly how a code works: it only hides the original meaning, without bringing anything to it.

But I realize that these reviews may seem very free or even peeled so I will take some examples, to add to those mentioned above (IEN, IAI, etc.). I chose some because they were short (and short words are generally the most difficult to translate because of the few concepts used), others because they were on the contrary particularly long (with many repetitions of the same concepts that end up losing all meaning by dint of redundancy), others still because I found the translation particularly hard ("forcing" the concepts to arrive at fall back on the translation), and others finally because I found them funny! All of these examples are taken from JP's book.

| JP Definition  | Comments   |
|--|--|
| <p>-“<b>UO</b>” This term appears twice, in A84.12 "Thus <i>XOODIUMMO UO</i> with an average density of <i>16.22 grams/cm<sup>2</sup></i>" and in A124.15: "... which we call <i>IAGIAIAAOO UO</i> because it was the first detected,..". According to the diagram published by Ribera p43, the core of the planet XOODIUMMO <b>UO</b> is designated by the number 0". We note the shift of the counts "cardinal" and "ordinal", because the zero is counted first (see Civilization of the Ummites, vol 1).</p> <p>The raw reading of the vocable gives its meaning: "dependence (<b>U</b>) of entities, beings, existences, creatures, dimensional realities (<b>O</b>)", that is to say "that <b>on which</b> dimensional realities <b>depend</b>" or "[factor of] <b>dependence on dimensional realities</b>". We can express it as "<b>first, origin, initiator, and naturally zero</b>".</p> | <p>" Dependence, influence, condition " + " dimensional reality, entity, existence, being, creature", thing, thing, thing, widget, device, object, constituent "</p> <p>It can just as well be read the condition of existence, the influence of things, the dependence on reality, etc. It is curious that the zero, which marks the absence, the void, is characterized by the concept of dimensional existence...</p> |

-“**IEAAYA**” This term appears only once, in A27.99 “... *open your eyes to see her and eat and drink the AAYA IEAAYA (feces and urine) of the mistress of UMMO*”. We recognize the **AAYA** segment (see the term) which expresses “an action of balancing effect if of the whole”. The **IE** segment expresses “emotions” (see the term). The term **IEAAYA** designates “an action for a **set in effective balance of emotions**” or “an action for a **set in effective equilibrium** [of origin] **emotional**”. The description gives a very coherent solution. In our logic and language model, feces are one thing and urine another, different from the previous one by many characteristics: the ways of elaboration, the ways and modes of elimination and the physical characteristics of consistency, respectively solid and liquid. The Ummite language is a vehicle of feature descriptors, and as such, truly independent of any external logic. A masterful prevue is given to us here: we have seen that the **AAYA** feces (see this term) are actually called “confirmation package, validation of the balance” or “balancing action of the whole “and share this segment descriptor with the photons, which are also in their own way a by-product of the return to the energy equilibrium of electrons. Urine also evokes this function of confirming the balance of the individual, but under different conditions, those associated with emotions. Aren't fear, joy or laughter, for us too, privileged “triggers” of urination? We will note in passing the difficulty we have in expressing with simplicity this concept of “difference in mental perception” to designate our emotions, proof that it is not part of our consciousness expressible on a daily basis. The Ummite language constitutes, as such, a truly original whole: who could still claim that it is the expression of an earthly thought?

Passions on the scatological side and ask- we really if what distinguishes urine from feces is.... emotions?! I admit that the expression piss with laughter applies perfectly to what I felt when reading this translation! More seriously, it is clear that emotions have nothing to do with this story: urinating under the effect of a strong emotion is rare and anecdotal compared to the frequency of the natural need to empty the bladder, and these strong emotions can also apply to defecation. Personally, I would have rather leaned for “liquid feces” for example.

-“**NOOXOEOOYAA**” This term appears only once, in Ribp65, note 4 “greenish planet” that I deduced from the context, by elimination. Confirmed by the extract from the Aguirre file in A13.131. We recognize the **OYAA** segment which corresponds to a shape for “planet”, “cold star”. The **OOXO** segment must be read **OOGSO** [**GS** = **X** void phonetic] i.e. “entity with organized cycles” in the equilibrium of its constituents (see **NOOSOEE**). That is to say, the mercury is here clearly designated for the exploitation of its physical characteristics (see also **OOXEE**). The concept **N** expresses “flux, transfer, radiation”. Soncept **E** expresses “mental image, perception, sensation”. The **NOOXOE** segment evokes

You may not quite understand the why of the reference to mercury, so let's go to **NOOSOEE**.



|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>"the perception of the radiation of the entity with cycles organized in the equilibrium of its constituents", or "the perception of mercury radiation". The full term refers to <b>"a perceived planet [with] the radiation of mercury"</b> [green or greenish color, see NOOSOEE].</p>  |  |
| <p>-<b>"NOOSOEE"</b> This term appears only once, in a document translated by the Gesto in D357.15, I quote color <b>NOOSOEE</b> (green)", later than the Moya catalog and the Aguirre compilation.</p> <p>The <b>OOS</b> segment expresses "entity, existence, being, creature, dimensional reality, constituent (<b>O</b>) in symmetry, equality, equilibrium, equity, reciprocity (<b>O</b>) round, circle, turn, cycle, alternation (<b>S</b>)" i.e. "alternation in the equilibrium of constituents". Soncept <b>O</b> expresses "entity, existence, being, creature, dimensional reality, constituent".</p> <p>The <b>OOSO</b> segment evokes "the entity with alternation in the balance of constituents". The equilibrium of constituents (<b>OO</b>) is a major element of the state of matter (see <b>GOO</b>). Mercury is the only metal that is liquid at ordinary temperature and evaporates easily. It is thus characterized by alternations of stability of its atoms (liquid or gas).</p> <p>The <b>EE</b> segment expresses the "codification, modeling, recording"(see common combinations). The soncept <b>N</b> extreme "flow, transfer".</p> <p>The full term refers to "[the color of] the codification of the flows <b>of the entity</b> with alternation <b>in the equilibrium of the constituents</b>". The codification of fluxes, or the recording of radiation, is what we call the emission spectrum. Indeed, a flow is emitted and the recording, the mathematical formatting, as well as the attached measures are the expression of a modeling.</p> <p>This term can also be rendered by "[the color of] <b>the mercury emission spectrum</b>". In offend the emission spectrum [radiation coding] of mercury consists of four visible lines, all in the green!</p> | <p>If you are still not convinced that "codification of the fluxes of the entity with alternation in the equilibrium of the constituents" = mercury emission spectrum = green, go read to <b>OOXEE</b></p> |

-“**OOXEE**” This term appears only once, in Ref-171 in the expression "YAA **OOXEE** (mercury reservoir)". And quoted by Moya in Ref 390 "Mercury deposition". It is part of a missing page in the Aguirre compilation in my possession. We are here in front of a typical case of shift in thought. The associated indication of "secure tank" makes us identify the term "mercury" and YAA reservoir.

But the Ummite language is not identifying objects, it is "designating by function" (see preamble to this volume). In the same way that TAXEE describes programmed cycles of consistency change, **OOXEE** refers to programmed state changes: vaporization cycles, condensation. The additional indication says that it is mercury, but the term designates the cycles (S) [**GS=X**] programmed, piloted (**EE**) of organization (G) of the entity in equilibrium, stable (**OO**). The reformulation gives "**stable entity for the organization of programmed cycles**".

Finally, we find here the explicit reference to mercury, which JP has taken up in previous translations to arrive at the green color. But curiously, and although he himself suggests in **NOOXOE00YAA** to refer to **OOXEE**, here fuses here to translate it as mercury!

-“**SOOIOIBOZOO**” This term appears only once, in A17.176 "for us a *LIVING BEING* is the **SOCIOIBOZOO NETWORK** capable of enriching its content "relative to its mass" of *INFORMATION*, structuring itself throughout time with greater complexity. The transcription of **C** has never been encountered, especially since it has a specific pronunciation in Spanish before the vowels e and i. This is certainly a copy error for an **O**, on carbon for example. We recognize the **IBOZOO** segment which evokes "a point of cyclic or alternative manifestations in an equilibrium of components" (see this term).

The segment **IO** expresses "difference, other, distinct, separate, varied (**I**) entity, being, existence, creature, dimensional reality, constituents (**O**)", i.e. "a difference for the creature". The **SOO** segment expresses "round, circle, turn, cycle, periodicity (**S**) entity, existence, being, creature, dimensional reality, constituent (**O**) in symmetry, equilibrium, equality, equity, reciprocity (**O**)", i.e. "cyclicality in the equilibrium of constituents" [standing gravitational waves? and informative?].

The term complete refers to the living being as "[a network of] points of repetitive **manifestations of balance of components with differences in the creature by cyclicality in the balance of constituents**".

Incredibly, while we are clearly facing an "earth stirs" (**SOCIO**, radical very terrestrial, associated with **IBOZOO**, one of the most common Ummite words), easily understandable in the context, JP prefers to invoke an unverifiable shell and embark on the translation of **SOOIO**!

-**“UAXOO”** This term appears more than twenty-five times in documents. The associated indications are varied. I have retained in A16.156 "and a **UAXOO (RECEIVER)**", in A16.157 "**UAXOO atoms (SENSORS or RECEIVERS)**", in A22.36 "*.. of an AAXOO-UAXOO equipment (EMETTEUR-RECEIVER)*", in A45.80 "For our part we have Sensitive devices **UAXOO IBOAYAA (RADIATION DETECTORS)**", A136-2.118 "*.. up to a series of UAXOO (DETECTORS) located in..*", A136-2.119 "**UAXOO (DETECTORS OR RECEIVERS)**", A136-3.128 "*or UAXOO (TRANSDUCERS) are disturbed*".

This term is quoted three times by Moya in Ref 273 "Receiver", in ref 275 in the expression **UAXOO IAS** "Receiver number 1", and in Ref 276 in the expression **UAXOO IEN** "Receptor number 2".

We recognize the **UA** segment which expresses the dependence of the effectivity or the action under condition. And the **XOO** segment, **GSOO** transcription that expresses gravitational waves.

The reformulation gives "[device] **whose activation of gravitational waves is dependent** [on what is to be detected]". The device is both specialized detector and transducer. Which is correctly rendered y "**gravitational transmission detectors**".

The word in itself has nothing to do with gravitation, it simply means receiver, sensor. The D69-3 is extremely precise on this point:

*"On the entire surface of XOODINAA is an extensive series of UAXOO. They are detector or sensory organs activated by various stimuli of a physical, chemical or biological nature. (By example: electromagnetic frequencies, elastic voltages, magnetic and gravitational fields, electrostatic gradients, static and dynamic pressures, molecular presence of gas, existence of mold and virus, etc.). Electronics technicians and Earth systems engineers will say that these are transducers capable of transforming the excitatory energy function into an equivalent function of a nature: "Optics, gravitational or nuclear resonance".*

In the D41-5, we are also told about AAXOO-UAXOO (TRANSMITTER - RECEIVER) ultrasonic devices to direct their semi-domestic "dolphins" (GIIDII). We also find this meaning in NIIUAXOO ("receiver channel or data transmitter" - D69.3 Note 3) and in UULUAXOO ("*The range of transducers sensitive to the magneto-electric spectrum that extends from 2,638.1014 to 5.32.1016 cycles /seconds*", which corresponds roughly to the spectrum of the visible (hence the root UUL), or in UAXOOEXY ("*Physiological control equipment has been equipped with transducing probes that check almost all organic functions, without the need to introduce UAXOOEXY inside organic tissues*")

UAXOO actually makes the pair with AAXOO which means transmitter (and we also find NIIAXOO: effector channel, transmitter of orders or series of pulses). Interesting if we think of the couple WAAM – UWAAM...

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>Note that there seems to be confusion in the ideograms of the D33 3rd note UAXOO and AAXOO. Another curiosity: the word UAXOO appears several times in the D47-1 to designate the "sport, game", instead of OXUO...</p>  |
| <p>-<b>“UULWA”</b> This term appears only once, in A23.43 <i>"... the UULWA AGIADAA EEWEE (1) a kind of tight overalls, whose colors in this case, yellow circles on a purple background, constitute a complex code of colors and chromatic geometric shapes that represent the different professional specialties of our world..."</i>.</p> <p>Quoted by Moya, in Ref 326 in the same expression "Kind of blue work, very showy". We recognize <b>UUL</b> which expresses "optical". The <b>WA</b> segment expresses "changes, variation, novelties, information (<b>W</b>) truth, action, effectiveness (<b>A</b>)", that is, "the truth of changes". The full term refers to <b>"the truth of change through optics"</b>.</p> | <p>Absolute counter-sense! UULWA is followed by AGIADAA which designates the profession of man (Ummite) whose day is described, and EEWWEE means clothing (see below). We are told in passing that the colors of these clothes are associated with each profession, in this case yellow circles on a purple background for the man in question. The word therefore has nothing to do with its color – unlike the "work blue" or "white collar" in French, the Ummites do not have the exclusivity of uniforms colored by profession! It is only (word for word) an equipment inspector's garment from UULWAAGIADAA.</p> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>-“<b>UULWAAGIADAA</b>” This term appears only once, in A21.22 <i>"THEGEE (EPOUX) Is currently inspector of a UULWAAGIADAA equipment (Species of viewfinder similar to terrestrial X-ray devices used in Radiometallography). His job is to check and control the recordings made to periodically compare the condition of the soil and the grounds around the large underground pipes. With this equipment one can not only check the structure of the geological layers but their rock composition, their percentage of sand, clay and gravel or organic substances. Any observed change that could damage the pipes or pipes, is calculated, codified and handed over to the Network of Computers, which governs the organization of UMMO (XANMOO AYUBAA). The citation by Moya in Ref 325 in the expression UULWA AGIADAA "Kind of viewfinder device used in radiometallography" is both a copying error and a serious error in reading the text which leads to a misdirection! This term is an excellent example, double on two levels, of the "rule" of multiple attribute (see semantics). Example of power in simplicity. The repetition of segment AA invites reading according to (UULW and AGIAD)-AA. In the AGIAD segment, the repetition of soncept A invites reading according to A-(GI and D). The group (GI and A) expresses "arrangement (G) different (I) and manifestation (D)". Soncept A expresses "truth, effectiveness". The group (GI and)- A, or AGIAD expresses "the effectiveness of manifestations of different ageing". The UULW group expresses "optical (UUL) variations (W)", i.e. "optical variations". The group (UULW and AGIAD) evokes "the effectiveness of manifestations of different arrangement by optical variations". Segment AA refers to "effective continuity", i.e. "without disruption". The complete term designates "[a device for] <b>the effectiveness of manifestations of different arrangement by optical variations without disturbance</b>". That one can reformulate by "[a device for] <b>the verification [effectiveness] of displacement symptoms or disorders [manifestations of different arrangement] by optical variations without disturbance</b>".</i></p> | <p>Description of the husband's work. Note that the root UUL refers to the apparatus, while in the previous expression, JP attributes it to the garment...</p> <p>For more details, see AGIADAA below.</p> |
| <p>-“<b>AGIADAA</b>” This term appears only once, in A23.43 <i>"It is in the particular case that we are commenting, the UULWA AGIADAA EEWEE (1) a kind of very fitted overalls, whose colors in this case, yellow circles on a purple background, constitute a complex code of colors and chromatic geometric</i></p>  | <p>Although the letter D41-6 explicitly says that <i>"The name of the garment is associated with the name of the profession"</i>, JP sees a serious counter-meaning!</p>                                   |

*shapes that represent the different professional specialties of our world (1) The name of the clothing is located associated with the name of the profession". Quoted by Moya in Ref 325 in the expression UULWA AGIADAA "Kind of viewfinder device used in radiometallography". The translation conveyed in this quotation is truncated and induces a serious misunderstanding. And there is no question of radiometallography. Moya mixed with another passage of the same document, in which the allusion to radiometallography is only similar: A21.22 "THEGEE (EPOUX) Is currently inspector of equipment of UULWAAGIADAA (Kind of viewfinder similar to terrestrial X-ray devices used in Radiometallography). His job is to check and control the recordings made to periodically compare the condition of the soil and the grounds around the large underground pipes. With this equipment one can not only check the structure of the geological layers but their rock composition, their percentage of sand, clay and gravel or organic substances".*

The repetition of the isolated concept **A** invites to the reading in multiple attribute (see semantics) of the term according to **A-(GI and DAA)**. The **GI** segment expresses "organization, arrangement (**G**) difference, other, distinct, separate, varied (**I**)", i.e. "different arrangements" or "layout differences". The **DAA** segment expire "manifestations, forms (**D**) effective equilibrium, substantive equality, continuity, stability (**AA**)[see common combinations]", i.e. "stable manifestations". The group (**GI and DAA**) evokes "the stable manifestations of differences in layout". Soncept **A** expresses "truth, action, effectivity". The complete term designates a "[apparatus for] **the effectiveness of stable manifestations of differences in arrangement**". The context is there to help us understand the expression and its construction. Dans the didactic approach that I recognize to the Ummites. The underground pipes are buried, as we do, in a complex of sand, gravel, rocks intended to facilitate laying and ensure the stability of the ground under and around the pipe. The device in question here is an optical tool (viewfinder) intended to detect changes in the condition of the soil around the pipes. Control to which we almost never indulge.

More fun, he now has to translate separately each term, which gives:

**UULWA: the truth of change through optics**

**AGIADAA:[apparatus for] the effectiveness of stable manifestations of differences in arrangement**

**EEWEE: mental image by coded information or informative code for perception**

JP tells us that "The context is there to help us understand the expression and its construction": fortunately! Moreover, it is not the context that is given to us, but the detailed definition of the word!

We can compare with the previous translation of UULWAAGIADAA in a single word, which implies different readings because of the multiple attribute reading rule: thus, JP reads **A-(GI and DAA)** in one case and **AGIAD)- AA** in the other.

-**“EEWEANIXOO”** This word appears four times. I have retained, in A136-1.112 "In advance also, our brothers travelers have put on the **EEWEANIXOO**

No need to complicate your life: EEWEE (and its EEWE variants, EEUEE, etc.) means clothing, and

(*HERMETIC PROTECTIVE CLOTHING*) (*SEE NOTE 6 of the APPENDIX*), in A136-2.114 "The members of the crew, can then move freely inside the long annular corridor, after having got rid of part of our **EEWEANIXOO**", and in A136-5.152 "The **EEWEANIXOO** constitutes what you would call "DIVING SUIT or COSTUME". Quoted by Moya in Ref 94 "Protective space outfit, hermetic". This is the special garment coated to withstand accelerations in the "frost", a kind of diving suit, in short. This term is interesting in more ways than one and contributes fully to the coherence of the language with the texts.

We recognize **EEWE** who evokes the garment, observing that it is so designated in "non-social" conditions (for the "shower" at home or here "in the jelly"). The **ANI** segment expresses "truth, action, effectivity (**A**) flow, transfer (**N**) difference, other, distinct, separate, varied (**I**)", that is, "the activation of differentiated flows". The segment **XOO**, which must be read **GSOO** [**GS=X**, see phonetics], expresses "organization, arrangement (**G**) round, circle, turn, cycle, wave (**S**) entity, being, existence, creature, constituent (**O**) in symmetry, equality, in equilibrium, in equity, in reciprocity (**O**)", that is to say "the organization of cycles of equilibrium of the constituents".

The rest of the complete term designates "a **garment with activation of differentiated flows for the organization of the equilibrium cycles of the constituents**". This garment completely isolates the traveler, and for lasting periods, it seems. This led to control the "psychobiological" state of travelers under this garment. To this end, the garment is equipped with a wide series of gravitational wave sensors and effectors intended to provide information on the passenger's condition and to elicit reactions back to normal (see **BIEWIGUU AGOIEE**).

This is the justification for the name of this diving suit. It can therefore be seen, with regard to this term, that the name given to the garment absolutely corresponds to the description of the conditions of use. As the "translation" that is given does not mention these elements at all, they are not the object of an induction by the text. The coherence is therefore complete, and the probabilities of dealing with a terrestrial "invention" from scratch are close to zero. The reality of the garment and the conditions of its use are "self-confirmed" by the coherence of the text.

**ANIXOO** refers to gravity (see **AINNAOXOO**). On the model of French, we simply have an anti-G combination.

Moreover, in his definition of **UAXOOEXY**, JP explains that "**According** to the context, these are probes that "equip" the acceleration combination (**EEWEEANIXOO OOE**) and that inform the computer responsible for managing the balance and comfort parameters of the traveler".

There is also another example of specialized clothing: **EEWEEGOO** (see this word).

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>-<b>“EEWEEGOO”</b> This term appears twice, in A35.22 "A NEW <i>PLASTIC EPIDERMIS</i>: The individual is endowed with a new plastic epidermis that allows perspiration while at the same time preventing infiltration through its pores by chemical and biological agents ....Operational mechanism: Beforehand we have, near the natural orifices, a series of devices with functions adapted to the needs of each Organ.... This is the <b>EEWEEGOO</b>" and in A36.38 "..., our brothers had to cover themselves with <b>EEWEEGOO</b> (Clothing), their outer aspect was that of classic blue earth work very tight".</p> <p>The detailed analysis of the details of these two passages designates the <b>EEWEEGOO</b> first as a system of equipment intended to give the autonomy of man in an environment that conquer, even hostile, the final "film" (what we could call the "garment" being only an accessory of external presentation).</p> <p>The <b>EEWEE</b> segment expresses "an equalized, constant perception of programmed changes" (see <b>EEWEEANIXOO</b>). The confrontation of an unknown environment, potentially hostile, involves events, novelties (<b>W</b>) which are wanted, programmed (<b>EE</b>). The explorer must however keep intact (constant, equal to itself) its perceptual capacity (<b>EE</b>). The <b>GOO</b> segment expresses "arrangement, organization (<b>G</b>) entity, being, existence, creature, constituent (<b>O</b>) in symmetry, equality, equilibrium, equity, reciprocity (<b>O</b>)", i.e. "organization of constituents in equilibrium".</p> <p>The term complete refers to "an <b>organization of constituents in equilibrium for constant perceptions with programmed events</b>".</p> | <p>Consisting of <b>EEWEE</b> (garment)+ <b>GOO</b> (shape, state, structure). An extremely interesting term because we find <b>GOO</b> in the description of the states of matter:</p> <p><b>DOLGAA GOO</b> (" <i>Physics of the structure of matter</i> ")</p> <p><b>GOOINUU</b>: solid state ("provided with mass"); see <b>UAMIIGOOINUU</b> (solid foods)</p> <p><b>GOODAA</b>: liquid ("<i>liquid state of matter</i>"), see <b>UAMIIGOODAA</b> (liquid foods, beverages, soups)</p> <p><b>GOONIOADOO</b>: plasma ("<i>special state of matter that is not solid, liquid, nor gas</i> ", " <i>state of Gaz in which at a very high temperature the atoms remain in the form of NIOADOO (IONS)</i>")</p> <p>Curious note about the <b>EEWEEGOO</b>: "<i>new plastic epidermis (...) it is a thin film that has been sprayed by means of a sprinkler hole on the epidermis of the chest, back, arms and legs</i>" - D57.5. Hence the term plastic, because it fits the shape of the body (tight suit). However, plastic comes from the Greek "malleable", which is used to model, specific to modeling, relative to modeling", just like... plasma!!! An even clearer rapprochement for our Spanish friends, by the way, because there is the common term "plasmado"(captured)...</p> |
| <p>-<b>“XIIXIA”</b> This word appears only once, in A13.114 "To <i>LOVE SEXUALLY</i> we have an expression that differentiates it from the other: it is <b>XIIXIA</b>". Quoted by Moya in Ref 380 "Loving sexually". This aspect of the life of the Ummites is addressed in the documents under the same descriptive conditions as the other subjects. By avoiding, in this field as much as in others, details that could give too much credibility to the origin of the authors. The repetition of the sound <b>X</b>, which must be read <b>GS</b> [<b>GS=X</b>, see phonetics]invites the reading of common qualifier (see semantics) according to <b>GS-(II and IA)</b>. Segment <b>II</b> expresses "isolation, limit, boundary, envelope, containment [here I think "hidden"]".</p>   | <p><b>"Repeated, isolated and effectively distinct [two]organizations" out of "organized, isolated and effectively distinct cycles"</b>= sex?!</p> <p>I really appreciated the precision of JP (completely arbitrary) "to two": no parities in Ummites?!</p> <p>Note that <b>XIIXIA KEAIA</b> (art, sex technique) means prostitution.</p>   |



|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>The <b>segment IA</b> expresses "difference, other, distinct, separate, varied (<b>I</b>) truth, action, effectivity (<b>A</b>)", i.e. "effectively distinct". The group (<b>II</b> and <b>IA</b>) expresses "isolated and effectively distinct " The <b>GS</b> segment expresses "arrangement organization (<b>G</b>) round, circle, turn, cycle, repetition (<b>S</b>)", i.e. "repeated organization ". The full term refers to "repeated, <b>isolated and effectively</b> distinct [two]-person organizations" or "<b>organized, isolated, and effectively</b> distinct cycles."</p>  |   |
| <p>-<b>"XIIIXIOUIA"</b> This term appears only once, in A25.83 <i>"All unmarried boys had the right to cohabit periodically with these unfortunate boys (a number both depending on the amount of solicitations of this kind and the number of women available for XIIIXIOUIA). With the particularity that there were also GEEs (GARCONS) controlled for this sad end, conceding to the YIE alone the same privilege"</i>. We recognize the <b>XIIIXI</b> segment which expresses "repeated, isolated and distinct organizations" (see <b>XIIIXIA</b>).</p> <p>The yes segment expresses "entity, being, existence, creature (<b>O</b>) dependence (<b>U</b>) difference, other, distinct, separate, varied (<b>I</b>)[with <b>UI</b> = particular, specific (see common combinations )]", i.e. "peculiarities of creatures". The final soncept <b>A</b> expresses "truth, action, effectivity". The term refers to "the <b>effectiveness of the peculiarities of creatures in relation to repeated, isolated and effectively distinct organizations</b>".</p> | <p>This word and the next one (which are found in the same paragraph of D41-12) are perfectly synonymous and relatively clear: XIIIXIA means sex and OUIA "leader, responsible" (this word is also present in the previous sentence). As the Ummites themselves Tellus, so these are the "women <i>and men who regulated this trafficking</i>", or in good French the pimps.</p> <p>I let you compare with the intelligibility of " the <b>effectiveness of the peculiarities of creatures in relation to repeated, isolated and effectively distinct organizations</b> "</p> |
| <p>-<b>"XIIIXIOUIAA"</b> This term appears only once, in A25.83 <i>"Large families regulated the number of their offspring of both sexes. Those who exceeded this figure were devolved to the XIIIXIOUIAA (women and men who regulated this trafficking) [this is prostitution, Ed].</i></p> <p><i>All unmarried boys had the right to cohabit periodically with these unfortunate boys (a number depending on both the amount of solicitations of this kind and the number of women available for XIIIXIOUIA). With the particularity that there were also GEEs (GARCONS) controlled for this sad end, conceding to the YIE alone the same privilege"</i>. We recognize the <b>XIIIXI</b> segment which expresses "distinct and hidden cyclic organization" (see <b>XIIIXIA</b>). Segment <b>AA</b> expresses "truth, action, effectivity (<b>A</b>) in symmetry, equality equilibrium, equitably, reciprocity (<b>A</b>)", i.e. "effective equity" or</p>   | <p>JP is making a mistake by omitting "[the people in charge of]" his translation; as we have seen, the term OUIA refers precisely to these people.</p>   |

"real equilibrium" in the sense of "no waves".

The **yes** segment expresses "entity, being, existence, creature (**O**) dependence (**U**) difference, other, distinct, separate, varied (**I**) [with **UI** = particular, specific (see common combinations )]", i.e. "peculiarities of creatures ". The term refers to "[the people in charge of] the **effective balance in the peculiarities of creatures about cyclic, distinct and hidden organizations**".

If the Ummite language was functional in the sense given to it by JP, we should also note other phenomena that are absent from the letters. Admittedly, absence of proof is not proof of absence according to the consecrated and worn formula, but it is that it is even a good clue.

## One Word, Several Objects

IF, therefore, the Ummite language was functional, one should encounter the same Ummite word to designate different "things" but of similar functions. In French, this phenomenon exists within certain limits:

- **For classes of objects (more or less general):** for example, car, bus, motorcycle, truck, bicycle, boat and plane can be grouped under the common name of vehicles. If we add the metro, the train, the rollerblades and the skate, then we have means of transport. If one Talk about the car fleet, we only include cars, motorcycles, buses and trucks. Speaking of 2-wheelers, we limit ourselves to motorcycles and bicycles, etc.
- **A car itself can change its name according to one or more of its characteristics (shape, function, etc.):** a station wagon, a coupe, a convertible, a sedan, a monospace, a 4x4, a pick-up, a diesel, a utility, a taxi, a marshmallow, a car, a Formula 1, etc. In other words, the function of an "object" can sometimes be specified thanks to a different name ("synonym"), without being obliged to attach another word to it (such as race car, car without a license, etc.).
- **Finally, it should be noted that the etymology of the word itself can indicate its function:** auto-mobile (which moves by itself), tractor, bicycle (2 wheels), etc.

I have found very few examples of such functional synonyms in Ummite. The same word generally always designates the same thing, or they are classes of objects (comparable in this to the terrestrial use illustrated above), or the attic, different objects/ideas but also different functions (while it is the identity of their functions that should justify the use of the same term).

A good example of this paradox is the word IAS, which means both quantity 1 and rank second (the subtlety being that Ummites count from 0). However, these are 2 very distinct functions: counting on the one hand (cardinal), ordaining on the other hand (ordinal). In French (as in English, in Spanish, and probably other languages – to be checked), we distinguish BETWEEN ONE and PREMIER (and even second when there is no third);ditto in English (ONE and FIRST) and Spanish (UNO and PRIMERO).

The derivatives are equally clear: for example, unity is not synonymous with primacy. This goes even further in Ummite since for IEN (2), we find as well the meaning of 2, that of third and also that of pair, which is nevertheless very different (the pair implies the quantity 2 exclusively – we can not add or subtract element, does not imply order, and insists on the notion of complementarity, of dependency). We can therefore see exactly the opposite of what we have been aiming for: in this case there is a single term for several "objects /ideas" but they do not have the same function at all!

## One Object, Several Terms

In addition to the previous point, the same object should also have different "names" depending on its essential function (or the one that is highlighted). Again, I did not find an example: all the "objects" (or ideas) mentioned more than once in the letters have one and the same name, regardless of the context and/or their function. For example, the on-board computer of their spaceship, that of their kitchen, that of the camera and that of the planetary network of Ummo have very distinct functions. Of course, their basic function is "computer", under the criterion of discrimination and economics of functional language, shouldn't each one be named differently (the word computer –XANMOO- being reserved for the generic designation of computers in general)? It is not at all so, bien on the contrary: like our good old earthly languages, each word is built on the XANMOO basis:

- **XANMO+UULAYA for camera ( computer + photo)**
- **UAMII+XANMOO for the kitchen (food + computer)**
- **XANMO for other computers (possibly followed by AYUBA when it comes to a network, whether it is that of the spaceship or Ummo).**

In French, we have the digital camera, the household robot, the on-board computer (or even the automatic pilot), the central computer, and others (laptop, calculating machine, personal computer, microcomputer, electronic diary ...). Each time, we find a word = an object or an attribute (or even a function), with a principal word that is specified by a second: laptop combines computer (quite large class of objects) with the portability function, which allows to specify the meaning.

In Ummite, a language that would be completely different from all those existing on Earth because functional, we find exactly the same construction scheme: not from concepts but from simple words, joined to each other to create more complicated or more precise words. We do not define the super food processor Ummite by its function (automatic preparation of food) but by the association of the words food (UAMII) and computer (XANMOO), exactly as in France we associate robot (or electric) and household (or culinary or kitchen) to specify its function. We are even more precise since we call these robots "multifunction" to differentiate them from a simple juicer, vegetable pass, blender mixer, electric rake, chopper, etc. The names of the brands and models themselves evoke their function:

- **Moulinex (evoking both the mill, the company originally called Le Moulin-Légume, and modernism with the extermination for express)**
- **Kitchenaid (the kitchen helper, an American appliance)**
- **Magimix (the magic blender), the Powermix (the then mixer, which has the power in France!), etc.**

In fact, in addition to the above example of XANMOO and its derivatives, many Ummite words are constructed according to this not particularly functional principle of association, from a radical to which other words are associated:

- **An Ummo home (XAABI): living area / fireplace (XAABI-UANNAA), living room (IA-XAABI), dining room / kitchen (UAMII-XAABI), bedroom (WOIWOI-XAABI), bathroom (E-XAABI), projection room (UULODA-XAABI)**
- **On light, optical (UUL): photography (UUL-AYA), photo lens (UUL-AXAA), contact lenses (UUL-AX-BOIYU), light sensor (UUL-UAXO), optical fiber (UUL-NII), camera or camera (UUL-ODOO), projection room (UUL-ODA-XAABI), flying optical reconnaissance machine (UUL-UEWAA), light sensor (UUL-UAXOO), optical recording system of stars at great distances (spectrometer) (UUL-XOODII OEMM), etc.**

We also note that the "rules" of this association seem neither very strict nor very precise:

- **Some words are sometimes separated, others are not (e.g. IBOZOO UU and IBOZOOUU)**
- **The word order is not always respected (we find both UI ONAWO and ONAWO UI for university)**
- **The order does not seem to have clear functions: the XY association usually translates to X of Y (XOODI-UMMO = stratum, geological layer of Ummo, XANMO-UULAYA = the computer of the camera, etc.), which is most common in Spanish and French, but we also find the opposite, as in English, i.e. Y of X (UMMO-WOA = the "god" of Ummo, OANNEA-OIYOYOO = telepathic language ,UUL-UAXOO = light sensor, etc.)**

## **Alien Language?**

One of the essential characteristics of the Ummite language according to JP, and which would distinguish it from all terrestrial languages, would be not to be agglutinating. Let's make a parenthesis beforehand to clarify this notion of agglutination within the framework of the typology of languages. The typology of languages is method of classifying languages according to several criteria such as:

- **The relationship between the syllable and the morpheme**
- **The relationship between form and function**
- **The use of classifiers**
- **Marginal grammatical traits.**

The categories of languages are not closed and to say that a language is of the inflectional type does not mean that it belongs only to this type: such a language can be just as much very synthetic, a little inflectional and sometimes isolating. Traditionally, the main categories are:

- **Insulating Type**
- **Flexional Type**
- **Agglutinating Type**

Analytical languages (insulating) and synthetic languages (inflectional and agglutinating) are generally grouped and opposed. We added the **Polysynthetic Type**. The presentation below is mainly based on the following 2 sites:

- [http://encyclopedie.sytes.net/encyclopedia.php?title=Typologie\\_des\\_langues](http://encyclopedie.sytes.net/encyclopedia.php?title=Typologie_des_langues)
- <http://www.mediom.qc.ca/~extrudex/articles/lp-typo.html>

## Insulating Type

An isolating language is a language in which words are or tend to be invariable and where one cannot, therefore, distinguish between the radical and the grammatical elements. Such languages express the various grammatical relationships by isolated words and signs. They show a certain one-for-one relationship between form and meaning: each "word" (as long as it has a meaning) constitutes, on its own, a single minimum unit of meaning. In other words, any (or almost) unit with a meaning, in an insulating language, is indecomposable into smaller significant units. Therefore, these languages show a very undeveloped morphology, apart from the derivation processes.

Mandarin Chinese is often cited as an example of the most perfect insulating language we know (because we do not really attest to the existence of fully insulating languages), and this is why Chinese "words" are not complex (decomposable) units on the formal level, and that they do not accept any flexion (see the so-called inflectional languages, below). By this, the grammatical or syntactic value of the units of the insulating language is often a function of their location in the sentence, or of certain prosodic facts in the spoken chain.

It is salient to also present English when it comes to insulating languages. Admittedly, English has not exploited this phenomenon as fully as in Mandarin Chinese, but its morphological poverty (verbal or nominal) makes it an excellent candidate for the title of insulating language: the preterit marked by the typically Germanic dental consonant (marked in writing by *-ed*), the mark of the plural, as well as the verbal desinence of the third person of the singular of the present (cf. *I see* and *he sees*) are about the only survivors of a much more developed morphology that is attested in the ancient states of this language.

Isolating languages are traditionally opposed to agglutinating languages, inflectional languages and synthetic languages; by the way, they are also called analytic. This set differs on the one hand from agglutinating languages by the fact that syntactic relations between the elements of a sentence are expressed by distinct modes, and, on the other hand, highly polysynthetic languages, because grammatical values (number, gender, etc.) are not necessarily always expressed by inflections (elements with high polysynthetic potential), many languages having recourse, to do this, to a plethora of clitic particles. There are therefore no, or to better render the thing, there are therefore less, affixes juxtaposed with radicals in the analytic languages. This also significantly reduces the length of words (except for compounds, c.f. the German *Sehnenscheidenentzündung* "tendonitis"), but increases the number in the sentence.

French is an analytical language. The emergence of compound tenses (*I took*, *I would have taken*, *I would have taken*, *I will take*) is an excellent proof of this, as is the myriad of conjunctive locutions (because, *after that*, *from the moment when*, *while*, *at the same time as*), and the profusion of prepositions since the fall of the Latin declensions. Although the language remains inflectional in some respects (for example, verbal conjugations), a sentence such as *Why he had spoken to a*

*friend, after Peter had eaten* shows in its constituent elements a much more complete analysis than its Latin equivalent, where the (poly)synthesis is very strong: *Itaque amico dicerat, Petro edente*.

## Flexional Type

Inflectional language is a language in which words change shape according to their grammatical relationship to other words. In these languages, not all words are "invariable" (which is the case in an insulating language): some change their pronunciation. It is said of them that they undergo the play of flexion and that the set of different forms of the same word flexed form its paradigm. Each form of a paradigm can convey one or more types of grammatical traits (gender, shadow, function, nature, number, etc.) can oppose (singular against plural, masculine against neuter, first person singular against first person plural, etc.). We speak of *conjugations* when it comes to verbal flexions, and of *declinations* when it comes to nominal (or pronominal) flexions. The terms of the same paradigm, however, do not change their meaning: only grammatical traits are opposed. Note that the flexions *must* absolutely belong to a *paradigm* to memorize this denomination. The word flexed is ipso *facto* identifiable by this so-called paradigm. If there were only one desinence, in a given language, expressing the subject function for all nouns, it would not be a flexion, and it would probably be more likely a simple agglutinating language than a real inflectional language. Let be the classical Greek language. The nominative singular of the noun meaning "man" is  $\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha$ ; its accusative sound of the same kind, i.e. masculine, etc..  $\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha$ , genitive  $\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha$ , and so on. These desinences (- $\alpha\alpha$ ,- $\alpha\alpha$ ,- $\alpha\alpha$ ) cause the noun to belong to a certain formal group called the second declension, because they oppose, among other things, the distances of the first position decline: the nominative singular  $\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha$  " trial " becomes  $\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha$  to the accusative,  $\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha$  to the genitive, etc.

There are several possibilities of modifications of the signifier (sensitive form, most often auditory) of a word according to its grammatical relationship to other words of the statement, that is to say several types of flexion. The radical does not usually exist in its inflectional affix, but there may be a zero desinence that should not be neglected. This means that the absence of flexions is sometimes just as distinctive as its presence (for example, some words of the third Latin declension, such as *consul* in the nominative which is declined *consul-em*, *consul-is*, *consul-o*, etc.). Internal flexion is called the modification of the vocalism of a word rather than the addition of a desinence (cf. English I sing "I *sing* ", *I sang* " I sang ").

The more inflectional a language is, the more flexible its syntax is: the word order, in Latin, Greek or Sanskrit, has, so to speak, only a stylistic value; that one writes *Petrum Paulus vertebrate*. *Paulus Petrum vertebrate* or *vertebrate Paulus Petrum*, etc., the statement keeps an identical overall meaning: "Paul strikes Peter".

## Agglutinating Type

The term agglutinant language was introduced in 1836 by the German linguist Wilhelm von Humboldt. It is formed from the Latin verb agglutinate, meaning "to stick together". Indeed, it is a language in which words are formed by "sticking" to the radical of the affixes in such a way that the boundaries between the morphemes remain clear and that each morpheme corresponds to a single semantic or functional trait. Each "word" of these languages is, most often, a compound of several phonemes, so much so that an entire sentence in French can be the complete equivalent. Affixes (suffixes, prefixes, infixes) juxtaposed (or inserted, in the case of the famous

infixes) to radicals will express the syntactic relationships between the elements of the sentence. Turkish exemplifies this in a beautiful and simple way. Or the Turkish word *ev* "house". *Evler* means "the houses", *evlerim* "my houses", *evlerimde* "in my houses", and so on. Then let's mention, for our curiosity, an artificial agglutinating language: the language of the Klingon race from the Star Trek series, invented by Mark Okrand, is of this type! Derivation as a morphological process (e.g. French *say* > *say* again, *slow* > *slow*, *large* > *grow*) is a beginning of agglutination, but, generally not expressing syntactic relationships, these affixes remain marginal phenomena in the establishment of a typology of languages.

## Polysynthetic Type

The so-called polysynthetic languages are strictly opposed to agglutinating languages because they present a syncretism pushed in their minimal significant elements: a single form, indecomposable, applies to several semantic elements (or, if some prefer, grammatical) identifiable. Inflectional languages like Latin or Classical Greek are highly polysynthetic. German provides an example of contemporary languages. In *Der Mann ist mein Lehrer* "the man and my teacher", the article *der* indicates both the definite (opposing the indefinite article), the singular, the masculine, and the nominative.

What can be said about Ummite in the light of this classification? Within the limits imposed by the sample we have (see the next point), the exercise is delicate. The analysis shows that Ummite words are very often composed in juxtaposing existing words, which generally designate "objects /ideas" and more rarely attributes or even functions. These are in the vast majority of nouns, and sometimes verbs it seems. We find no trace of desinence, conjugation, gender or number marks, nor adjectives, pronouns, nor articles (the latter do not exist according to the D41). Of course, in the absence of a representative sample of the Ummite language, it is difficult to pronounce, but in any case, there is no trace or clue (JP considers for its part that the Ummite is completely free, and the D104 seems to go in this direction: "*The autonomous paragraphs indicated in quotation marks are a literal transcription, taken as faithfully as possible from the original report. This precision of the language version that is yours familiar, get along with the grammatical and semantic additions that make it intelligible, since our texts are extremely synthetic, devoid of the syntactic morphology that is familiar to you, which makes it very complicated to decode them without a prior addition of verbal forms, adjectives, etc.*"). We can therefore clearly exclude the lexicon f type, and probably the agglutinating type. Ummite would therefore essentially be an insulating, analytical language.

It should be noted that agglutination is not in itself a "defect", quite the contrary. Unlike isolating languages (analytic), agglutinating languages are much more organized and simpler to analyze. Esperanto, an artificial language with a universal vocation, is consciously agglutinating. Agglutination introduces both great flexibility and an economy of means (fewer pages in the dictionary!), as opposed to insulating languages (Chinese, an insulating language par excellence, stands out for its difficulty). Inflectional languages are even more economical and extremely structured, almost "mathematically mathematical"; it is their strength (coherence, organization) and their weakness (you have to think about a lot of things before saying a word correctly!). Isolating languages are in this sense more rudimentary and less structured than others, I would say baroque in some ways: no sophisticated system for grammar, extended sentences, a multitude of words, etc. As JP rightly said, these are in a way lazy tongues: if we are satisfied with a weak vocabularies, and basic rules that are simple, the insulating language is easy to use, at least in a "food" mode. But this apparent ease is misleading: mastering such a language is much more difficult because it is

intrinsically richer, it offers more scope for maneuver because of its vocabulary and the "vagueness" of its grammar. At the risk of caricaturing, German lends itself well to philosophy, while French lends itself better to poetry! I would therefore find it astonishing that the Ummites, so keen on order and exact sciences and so reluctant to fantasy and art, have created a completely isolating language.

However, on the basis of a sample both limited in size and representativeness (see below), one cannot really pronounce on the nature of the Ummite language, and to say that it is totally free of agglutination and from there, justifying an "extraterrestrial" origin, seems to me to be risky to say the least.

## Is Ummite a Language?

Based on the letters, it is indeed difficult to speak of an Ummite language. All we have is a lexicon, a set of words, the vast majority of which are given to us in isolation. We actually have a list of words, no more, from which we have extracted an alphabet (more precisely its approximate phonetic transcription). In other words, we do not and cannot deduce a grammar from, which is essential to constitute a language. Try to learn a language only from a dictionary, and you won't get very far!

In addition, these words never seem to vary (absence of flexion, even verbal, and absence of agglutination), and as we have noticed that we find only nouns, arises a serious problem: if Ummite is an insulating language, where the hell have passed all the particles, these "little words" essential to structure the sentence? Problem all the more serious as the order of the words seems quite free in Ummite, while this characteristic is rather typical of inflectional languages (they compensate for the freedom in the order of the words by the rigor of their flexions). If Ummite does not use particles or word order to articulate and make sense of the lexicon we have, it is clearly not a language. In the absence of sentences, a real sample of texts, I think it is impossible to conclude as to the Ummite itself; on the other hand, the JP method does not support this analysis either since it is unable to generate a grammar. But a "language" without grammar is like a body without bones, without nerves and without blood vessels: a porridge of words, unable to function. And the main function of language, dear to functionalists precisely, is that of communicating.

## Conclusion

All the previous analysis does not call into question the existence of a hypothetical Ummite language; what I dispute is both that it is functional and composed of concepts, and that it is possible, on the sole basis of the letters available to us, to pronounce on its existence. And of course, as a result it is possible to conclude anything about its origin (terrestrial or not).

JP's mistake, it seems to me, is to have looked for a meaning where there was not necessarily one, or in any case, where there were not sufficient conditions to find one. Its analysis thus looks much more like decryption than linguistic analysis, based on the assumption that there is some kind of code. After all, if it is a question of translating Ummite, the work is already done since the vast majority of Ummite words are translated into the letters themselves by their authors.

But JP seems not to have been satisfied with these translations, and looked for a code, a hidden meaning. This code could only reside in the letters themselves, since the other linguistic elements were either already explained (the words) or absent (the sentences). However, it turns out



that the words are few, that these letters are in limited number and above all, that very few of them constitute the essence of the words. Provided that a sufficiently vague meaning was given to each of these letters, it became possible to create this code based on concepts and to "decipher" the words they constitute (in reality, to try to find from this code the already known meaning of the words). I think that at the cost of some effort, it must be possible to do the same with any combination of a limited number of words consisting of a reduced alphabet with a very high frequency of a few letters. I don't think it would work, however, with randomly composed words, but Ummite words, whatever their origin and despite the little we know, follow at least some phonetic rules (for example, the non-repetition of consonants with rare exceptions). For my part, I believe that the concepts are a construction of JP and not of the Ummites themselves.

**Note 1:** (about André Martinet and functionalism) A. Martinet proposes a general theory of language, known as functionalism, a structural approach which does not neglect the historical dimension and which analyses the facts of language in the light of the function - considered central - of communication. Starting from the achievements of phonology - which he helped to improve, in particular with regard to the theory of archiphoneme and neutralization - A. Martinet elaborates the notion of double articulation, posing that the language is segmented, on the one hand, into modes (linguistic units having both a form and a meaning, which he will classify from the way of which they mark their function) and, on the other hand, in phonemes (linguistic units having only one form and no meaning); this vision allows him to show how a few dozen phonemes make it possible to form thousands of modes which, in turn, assemble in linguistic statements.

([http://fr.encyclopedia.yahoo.com/articles/sy/sy\\_269\\_p0.html](http://fr.encyclopedia.yahoo.com/articles/sy/sy_269_p0.html))

Read also for a good introduction to functionalism (zipped file to download):

<http://perso.wanadoo.fr/michel.santacroce/fichiers/div/Fonctionn.hqx>

**Note 2:** (about the title of the section "around the world in 17 concepts") A nod to the "Tour of the Day in 80 Worlds" by Julio Cortázar, a great lover of literary games and fascinated by time, himself referring to the initiatory journey of the "Tour du monde in 80 days" by Jules Verne, another lover of word games (see in particular the double reading of most of the proper names of his novels) obsessed with time and space!

**Note 3:** (about polysemy, after the example of the "rooster") A very rich example is that of the "court" sound: not only with homophones like court, court, court, run, etc. but also with true polysemic forms, absolutely undecidable without the context. Thus, the student and the river follow the course, but they are not the same! Another classic is bucket, jump, fool, seal.

**Note 4:** (following the translation table of UAEXOOE IANNO IAUAMII IE OEMII etc.) I note in passing that the 2nd part of XOA (OA: the efficiency of creatures) is noted to the trap (we only find it via AALOA), and that the L of AALOA which marks the equivalence no longer refers to stability (AA) but to the 2 previous words.

**Note 5:** (at the beginning of the table of examples of translations, after IEN, IAI, etc.) I also refer you to the archives of the list of the month of February 04 for the analysis and debate on the terms OANA and OANMAA, which I translate as 7 and 8 respectively.

**Note 6:** (in the example table, about UAXOO) Note that there is an error: this NIIUAXOO channel must be only receiver because the transmitter channel is designated later by NIIAXOO. This is not the only time there is confusion, moreover between, the two words.

**Note 7:** (about "I found very few examples of such functional synonyms in Ummite" in the 5th paragraph of the section "One word, several objects"). We note mainly the polysemy of XI on which they themselves insist: "we use the phoneme XI or SI (it is difficult to find the appropriate letters) which means (CYCLE, ROTATION or REVOLUTION) and which has a double meaning. That is, it is what you call a HOMOPHONE word. With the word "XI" or "CSI" we express both the rotation of UMMO on its axis (ONE DAY) and the revolution for example of a WHEEL". However, there is a downside: in use, XI NEVER designates anything other than the Ummite day in the letters. It should also be noted that the same thing exists in French, and moreover for the same word "cycle" depending on whether we are talking about the cycle of the moon, the food cycle, the cycle of the woman, a bicycle, a tricycle, a moped, etc. Ditto for "revolution" or for "parable" (the curve, and the figure of style). And since we evoke the day, again, polysemy in French: the period of time (The Day of the Year), and clarity (it is daylight). In short, really not enough to rave about the originality of the Ummite language from this point of view.

**Note 8:** (about the ex termination in Moulinex) That we find in other brands of the time: solex, pyrex, spontex, bultex, etc.

**Note 9:** (about the word UUL with its examples of compounds) Although this word alone does not appear in the letters.

**Note 10:** (2nd paragraph of the section "Is Ummite a language?", about the sentence "Problem all the more serious as the order of the words seems quite free in Ummite") For example, in the D59-2: the IBOZO UU IEN AIOOYAA (from IBOZOO UU the pair exists), while IIAS IBOZOO UU AIOOYEDOO (a single IBOZOO UU does not exist / does not make sense).

**Note 11:** (last paragraph before the "Conclusion" section, about the sentence "In the absence of sentences, a real sample of texts, I think it is impossible to conclude as to the Ummite itself") These remarks seem to join those made by the experts of the University of Seville in Spain, judging by the few extracts that JP reports in his book (I unfortunately do not have the minutes of this meeting).

**Note 12:** (in the Post Scriptum, before reading literary examples) Period craze not only in fiction literature, but also in philosophy and practice: Esperanto was created at the end of the nineteenth century by Ludwig Lazare Zamenhof and Volapük invented by Johann Martin Schleyer in 1879.

## Post Scriptum:

As a postscript, for those interested in artificial language construction, I can only recommend this extraordinary site called The Language Construction Kit:

<http://www.zompist.com/kitlong.html#natural>

Finally, for some contemporary examples of the first Ummite letters of creation of artificial languages in literature, a non-exhaustive list that shows the craze of the time for this subject:

Borges, Jorge Luis. "Tlön, Uqbar, Orbis Tertius". *Ficciones*. 1956.  
Short story. <http://www.its.caltech.edu/~boozier/etexts/tlon.html>

Burgess, Anthony. *A Clockwork Orange*. 1962.

*Novel. Features extensive use of a future teenage argot called Nadsat, essentially English heavily influenced by Russian.*

Delany, Samuel R. Babel-17. 1966.

*A science fiction novel. A constructed language is central to the plot, but is not actually described in any detail. This is not surprising - given what is described, the language Babel-17 is almost certainly impossible. Learning it gives you incredible mental powers, and simultaneously programs you to do the bidding of the language's creators, through strong Whorfian effects. It's entirely implausible, but I'd still recommend the book.*

Havel, Vaclav. The Memorandum. 1966.

*Play - presumably originally in Czech, but a translation is available. I haven't seen or read it. Features a Newspeak-like conlang called Ptydepe supposed to maximize productivity.*

Heinlein, Robert A. "Gulf". Assignment In Eternity. 1949.

*The short story featuring the conlang Speedtalk, which is impossible, albeit less so than Babel-17.*

Nabokov, Vladimir. Pale Fire. 1962.

*I know very little of this book - it contains a conlang called Zemblan, of which the lexicon is reproduced in the earliest surviving archive of the conlang mailing list:*

<http://www.ri.xu.org/conlang/conl91.txt>

Orwell, George. Nineteen Eighty-Four. 1948.

*Novel. Orwell's dystopia of a totalitarian future is widely considered one of the greatest works of English literature in the 20th century, so it's worth reading anyway (assuming you haven't already). Newspeak may not be a particularly inventive conlang - basically a reform of English -but it's well known, an important part of the story, and the principles are described in some detail, so I'd include this. Newspeak was in part a satire on Basic English, for which see the comments on Speedtalk in the \_Langage Construction Kit\_: <http://www.zompist.com/kitlong.html#lexicon>*

Vance, Jack. The Languages of Pao. 1957.

*Science fiction novel. I haven't read it. I'm not sure how fully the languages are realized, but certainly there's some description - see the mention of the verbless language in the LCK. Language planning and the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis are central to the plot, as I have heard it described.*