

Re: Kris Hirst's page on Why Don't We Call Them Cro-Magnon Anymore? updated

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2008-02/msg00472.html>

- *From:* Doug Weller <dweller@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 19 Feb 2008 09:03:39 +0000
-

On Mon, 18 Feb 2008 16:27:19 -0800 (PST), in sci.archaeology, J.LyonLayden wrote:

On Feb 14, 5:03 pm, Doug Weller <dwel...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Thu, 14 Feb 2008 13:18:05 -0800 (PST), in sci.archaeology, J.LyonLayden wrote:

On Feb 14, 11:16 am, Tom McDonald <kilt...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

J.LyonLayden wrote:

On Feb 13, 8:04 pm, Tom McDonald <kilt...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

<snip>

Why
Basque?

Because I believe they are
the oldest surviving

indigenous culture in Europe, and many of their words may be unchanged since the ice-age. They may be the last people to have seen cro-magnons and neanderthals.

Cro-Magnon appears to be the first H.s.s. in Europe. If Basques are indeed the, or one of the, oldest surviving indigenous populations in Europe, they are most likely *descended* from Cro-Magnon stock. IOW, they would not have *seen* Cro-Magnon folk, they would have *been* Cro-Magnon folk (in the loose terminology that Hirst argues against, but seems to have used, in the past anyway.) I'd be interested in the DNA evidence wrt Basques.

But with that caveat, I am not unhappy with the idea that the ancestors of the Basques could have seen, and possibly interacted with, Neandertals.

However, in your story, you appear to want your shorty grain harvesters to use Basque words. By this I take it that the shorties are intended to be descendants of Cro-Magnon, in my construction of their ancestry (see above). If you grant that, then who are the giants? A relic h/g population also descended from C-M?

The giants are really big cro-magnons and the farmers are proto-

Re: Kris Hirst's page on Why Don't We Call Them Cro-Magnon Anymore? updated

natufians.

My reasoning for using Basque words is that it's a language isolate that may be akin to Jomon and Moor...

Or Elvish? What are you talking about? No one knows anything about the language the Jomon spoke – is 'Moor' a type?

Scratch Moor– I misquoted or misremembered or something.

But I am only assuming here that the Ainu of Japan are the descendants of the Jomon, and that since Ainu is a language isolate that it is a derivative of the Jomon's language. Are the Ainu no longer candidates for the descendants of the original inhabitants of Japan?

Funny thing, I've written to Kris Hirst about that.

<http://www.springerlink.com/content/1623061n3013666w/>

In order to investigate the phylogenetic status of the Okhotsk people that were distributed in northern and eastern Hokkaido as well as southern Sakhalin during the fifth to the thirteenth centuries, DNA was carefully extracted from human bone and tooth remains excavated from archaeological sites. The hypervariable region 1 sequences of the mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) control region were successfully amplified and 16 mtDNA haplotypes were identified from 37 individuals of the Okhotsk people. Of the 16 haplotypes found, 6 were unique to the Okhotsk people, whereas the other 10 were shared by northeastern Asian people that are currently distributed around Sakhalin and downstream of the Amur River. The phylogenetic relationships inferred from mtDNA sequences showed that the Okhotsk people were more closely related to the Nivkhi and Ulchi people among populations of northeastern Asia. In addition, the Okhotsk people had a relatively closer genetic affinity with the Ainu people of Hokkaido, and were likely intermediates of gene flow from the northeastern Asian people to the Ainu people. These findings support the hypothesis that the Okhotsk culture joined the Satsumon culture (direct descendants of the Jomon people) resulting in the Ainu culture, as suggested by previous archaeological and anthropological studies.

http://www.jstage.jst.go.jp/article/ase/112/2/112_161/article

Morphological affinities between Jomon and Ainu: reassessment based on nonmetric cranial traits
(received July 30, 2003)

Abstract This study reevaluates the relationship between the prehistoric Jomon and modern Ainu based on 18 nonmetric cranial traits. Although the two Ainu series from the northeast coast and

Re: Kris Hirst's page on Why Don't We Call Them Cro-Magnon Anymore? updated

central/southern regions of Hokkaido Island are always associated with Jomon, significant differences between the Ainu and Jomon were detected in the frequencies of seven traits: metopism, supraorbital foramen, ovale?spinosum confluence, hypoglossal canal bridging, jugular foramen bridging, biasterionic suture vestige, and occipitomastoid bone. Regarding these traits, the Ainu series are more similar to the Okhotsk than to the Jomon series. A broad comparison among pan-Pacific populations confirms the maintenance of distinctive morphologies in the remote regions of group ranges, as represented by the Jomon and to a lesser extent the recent Hokkaido Ainu. The Ainu occupies an intermediate position between Jomon and Northeast Asians on the one hand, and between Jomon and the Native Americans on the other. The pattern of temporal change between Jomon and Ainu, together with clinal variation among the three Ainu series from Sakhalin Island, the northeast Hokkaido coast, and central/south Hokkaido shown in the present study, indicate possible admixture between the ancestors of recent Ainu and northern groups such as the Okhotsk people in the post-Jomon periods.

Which means the source of the Ainu language may not be the Jomon language, right?

Doug
[SNIP]

Doug Weller ---

A Director and Moderator of The Hall of Ma'at <http://www.hallofmaat.com>

Doug's Archaeology Site: <http://www.ramtops.co.uk>

Amun - co-owner/co-moderator <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/Amun/>

.