

## **Zoom Presentation Errata**

More details on the subjects of the errata can be found in the PowerPoint, voices and obviously the book.

1) Though we clearly stated that vernacular Canaanite was named “Aramaic”, then “Syriac”, just as nowadays it is named “Arabic”, we perhaps missed clearly stating that Lebanese vernacular (as well as vernaculars of the surrounding) remains of Canaanite language in its evolved form for various linguistic as well as social and genetic reasons all converging together.

2) At one moment, we stated that all of what is Aramaic in the Koran is Canaanite: we should have added “for words that existed between ~ 590 BC and AD ~ 400”. After AD ~ 400, all what is Aramaic is Syriac, with, in lack of formal evidence, big possibility of Canaanite origin. This issue of Aramaic linguistics being Canaanite also applies to what figures linguistically outside the Koran, and even more so to non - linguistic but other cultural issues. Of note, many references erroneously use the date 700 or 900 BC instead of 590 BC, and therefore specifically state that Aramaic was the spoken and literary language of the Assyrian empire, though said language was still Sumero - Akkadian. Finally, Aramaic - proper applies to back then inhabitants of Aram proper (Golan / Horan / Zabadani in Syria, and their language, the latter before 590 BC, which, if scrutinized enough, may end being considered a Canaanite variety).

3) We stated that the Koran uses “Arab” / “Arabic” for the Arabic language, but not for the People / ethnicity / sociological entity (of note, it uses this term once as an adjective to Muhammad bin Abdullah). We did not clarify that the Koran refers to the Arabs (i.e. the Bedouins of the “Saudi / Jordanian / Syrian / Iraqi / Gulf desert, as per sociological sciences) as Aarabs (A`rabs, A3rabs, أعراب), translated into “Bedouins” in Western languages, Islam jurisprudence stating later that Arabs are “previous A3rabs” who have now settled. Thus, the Koran practically never mentions Arabs as it defines them, “settlers in cities”: indeed, Islam also and controversially states from a doctrinal point of view that any person who speaks Arabic is an Arab [and refutes that Arabism be an ethnicity] (we state that, yet regardless of the current erroneous consideration of all “Arab world” vernaculars as Arabic). Also of note, said settled previously Bedouins considered Arabs by Islam are not considered Arabs by sociological sciences, according to which they were, at the dawn of Islam, mainly Tanukhids and Hejazites. “Hejazites”, as per the name of the geographical region, included Hebrews, Nazarenes and Sabians as well as the local Peoples (Thamudics, Qedarites and Dadaniyans / Lehyranites) of Christian religion now imbued by Nabateism, a fusion of predominant Canaanism and secondary Arabism. Of note, Tanukhidism was a fusion of predominant Arabism and secondary Canaanism. Indeed, Hejazites were not Arabs; the latter were to its east.

4) We did not have the opportunity to clarify that Syriac language having emerged in a long - time Assyrian region, and despite other reasons as well, it is mostly nowadays considered as having branched off Sumero - Akkadian (we shall not discuss the Mesopotamian original languages here), yet \_and what matters to us\_, having been well Canaanized in the eastern section of the Syriac

stronghold, and heavily Canaanized in its western section (of course, as for several other issues within these errata, please refer for details pertaining to this surprising statement). Said Canaanization is the root of Eastern and Western Syriac varieties (sometimes called Aramaic or Aramaic - Syriac). A good example is the predominance of the vowel “o” relative to the “a” in the Western variety.

5) At one point, we mentioned (current) Dubai as a place Canaanite trade had reached, to ease the recognition of said region, when in fact the Canaanite inscription was in fact found in current Sharjah.

6) Perhaps we did not clearly emphasize that Druzes often mention having arrived to an empty Shuf region, but we did mention the Abbasid incursions 150 years earlier to evacuate the area from its Christian inhabitants before withdrawing, leaving a void.

7) When we emphasized that Christians were well established in their homes and did not always live in caves, since it is often said “they used to live in caves” \_as if all the time, it may have seemed that we trivialized the period between 1305 and 1392 when indeed they did so and that was the most remarkable moment, even the crucial one, of their resistance for freedom against Muslim occupation since the Muslim conquest.

8) When we mentioned that “back then” (1547 - 1841) Christian feudals were subjugated to Muslim feudals, themselves subjugated to the Muslim (unless exceptionally Christian) Emir of Mount Lebanon, and himself subjugated to the Ottoman prime minister, we did not clarify that the aim was to show that no matter if they seemed semi - gods to their subjects, we know now how inferior they were in the hierarchy, not to mention that one rank lower meant much humiliation.

9) We did not have time to clarify what the Muslim concession should be in the “Canaanite to Muslim” message in the end, in order to allow for the existence of the current state of Lebanon in a peaceful manner, but we leave that to readers when they are through with the PowerPoints!