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Abstract

The given work addresses the problem of the origin of speech and Pre-Nostratic language, which the linguists regard unsolved to this day. Here our studies of the following issues are presented:
1. How the early men began to speak and on which basis they gave relevant names to the objects and the phenomena;
2. How did they manage to express their views?
3. What proof and the data of Pre-Nostratic language has been preserved by the Kartvelian language.

We pursue the aim of the reconstruction of the lexis of the Pre-Nostratic language, for which reason it has become necessary to study the basic words consisting of word sounds and harmonious sound complexes proved in the Kartvelian language, in other words consonants and neutral vowel O[ǝ], as well as harmonious sound complexes and a neutral vowel.

The work includes the Pre-Nostratic language vocabulary, as well as the method of restoration of the archetypes of the Pre-Nostratic words through the reconstruction of the Kartvelian words; these archetypes represented the word sounds and sound harmonious complexes prompted by the nature, which, for the expression of certain idea, formed on its part non-grammatical sentences. Here are presented the examples of forming modern words, as a result of uniting the archetypes forming part of the non-grammatical sentences and the following phonetic changes.

Keywords: Word sound, harmonious sound complex, Pre-Nostratic language, Kartvelian language.
Introduction

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men. (John 1:1-4)

It is widely known that aforetime there was one uniform, single language (Genesis 11:1). However its reconstruction is considered to be impossible by the scholars, as its trace and the linguistic data are believed to be lost for the mankind beyond recall. Although, it is a well known fact that nothing is lost in the nature and it only changes. That is why the denial of the possibility to recover, reclaim something that had existed aforetime is the same as to concede to one’s own failure.

From the archaeological discoveries it is clear that a man used to be a wild creature. We may suppose that at the time, a man only possessed the survival instinct and could produce inarticulate sounds but not the words that expressed any particular notions. Nevertheless, being in possession of the sensory organs, exceptional memory and the capability of development we may assume that the humans eventually developed the skill to perceive the sounds of the nature and their imitation. Probably, initially the man perceived only the simple (non compound) sounds expressed only by one consonant, while eventually he mastered more complex sounds. For instance, the sound that is emitted by hitting a stone on the stone kǝǝ, or a sound we hear when snowflakes fall on our head or shoulders thǝ which a man may have perceived earlier than a sound deer makes āramǝǝǝ, the sound made by a hoopoe āpǝpǝpǝ. Therefore, the man, imitating the nature’s realities, eventually gave relevant names to these realities, which is also confirmed by the Biblical traditions: “And out of the ground the LORD God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof.” (Genesis 2.19).

It becomes clear that the primitive man started to talk imitating the sounds of nature and the phenomena and gave them relevant names. It gives us grounds to assume that the language of the primitive men was a language of the nature. While the linguistic differences within the nature’s language used to be determined by the diversity of nature on the world territories, which apparently caused the differences between the speech sounds – quantitative difference of phonemes in various languages throughout the world.

Possibly due to the abovesaid dialectic differences of the nature’s language occurred at the various territories of the earth, although, the nature’s language, i.e. “Adam’s language” had mostly to be uniform throughout the territory of the entire world. The hypothesis is proved by the existence of relevant natural sounds and words in multiple, different languages, (Bomhard, 2018), which in our opinion derive from one, basic language, the language of the nature.
The Megrelian, i.e. Iberian language, referred today as Kartvelian language assisted us greatly in solving the given task, as it keeps quite an impressive data on Pre-Nostratic or “Adam’s Language”.

After the comparative analysis of corresponding Georgian Megrelian words it becomes clear that the Georgian language sprung from the maternal body of the Iberian language and grew upon it (in Megrelian, ardili/k\textsuperscript{h}ardili. Ethnic name k\textsuperscript{h}art\textsuperscript{h}i (← k\textsuperscript{h}ardi derived from it.

\textsuperscript{h}abali, mentioned in Assyrian sources, t\textsuperscript{h}ibari and t\textsuperscript{h}ibere, in Greek and Latin sources, t\textsuperscript{h}obeli, in Greek Bible, t\textsuperscript{h}obeli - in Hebrew, t\textsuperscript{h}uvali in Georgian (N. Khazaradze, 1967) confirm that they have undergone different phonetic changes in different languages, despite being allomorphs derived from the common basic form \textsuperscript{h}abara. While the basic mom-grammarized sentence \textsuperscript{h}a \textsubscript{b}a \textsubscript{r}a means [The Suopreme] Existing with supreme the light-. From here derives ethnic name iberi (←t\textsuperscript{h}iberi), and ethnic name from iberi - megreli (iberi → igeri → egeri → egri → megri → megreli).

The existence of many corresponding words having derived from the common base has been proved in Georgian, Megrelian (same Iberian), Lazi – Chanian and Svan languages. (H. Fenrich, Z. Sarjveladze 2000), which is a proof that they resulted due to the divergence of common basic language. However, as only Iberian language explains the etymology of the national origin lexis in the language, named common literary Georgian, whereas other Kartvelian languages fail to do so, the Iberian language, possessing unparalleled quantity of grammatical possibilities and accordingly the richest lexical fund in the world has no alternative. (M. Dzadzmiaaad others...2007), It points to the fact that the so called scheme of interrelationship Kartvelian Languages by Kurdiani and Chikobava is incorrect as well as the term “Kartvelian”, as the languages implied under the term, are detached from Iberian language and not Georgian. The antecedence of the Iberian language is confirmed by the article of Acad.Takaishvili “When the state of Ibers became the Kartvelian State”(Takaishvili, 1948) and a Megrelian inscription ‘k\textsuperscript{h}iana mi?orc~ – “I love the Universe”, performed by the 3000 year old ligature in Asomtavruli and Mkheidruli script, discovered on Grakliani Hill. (Pipia K. 2017). Besides, as only the Iberian language allows to reach the depth of “Adam’s language” and no other language, possessing such possibilities has been identified so far, the scheme of interrelationship between the “Adam’s language”, Iberian and Nostratic languages, complied with Bomhard’s scheme we believe to be the following:

The Megrelian, i.e. Iberian language, referred today as Kartvelian language assisted us greatly in solving the given task, as it keeps quite an impressive data on Pre-Nostratic or “Adam’s Language”.

After the comparative analysis of corresponding Georgian Megrelian words it becomes clear that the Georgian language sprung from the maternal body of the Iberian language and grew upon it (in Megrelian, ardili/k\textsuperscript{h}ardili. Ethnic name k\textsuperscript{h}art\textsuperscript{h}i (← k\textsuperscript{h}ardi derived from it.

\textsuperscript{h}abali, mentioned in Assyrian sources, t\textsuperscript{h}ibari and t\textsuperscript{h}ibere, in Greek and Latin sources, t\textsuperscript{h}obeli, in Greek Bible, t\textsuperscript{h}obeli - in Hebrew, t\textsuperscript{h}uvali in Georgian (N. Khazaradze, 1967) confirm that they have undergone different phonetic changes in different languages, despite being allomorphs derived from the common basic form \textsuperscript{h}abara. While the basic mom-grammarized sentence \textsuperscript{h}a \textsubscript{b}a \textsubscript{r}a means [The Suopreme] Existing with supreme the light-. From here derives ethnic name iberi (←t\textsuperscript{h}iberi), and ethnic name from iberi - megreli (iberi → igeri → egeri → egri → megri → megreli).

The existence of many corresponding words having derived from the common base has been proved in Georgian, Megrelian (same Iberian), Lazi – Chanian and Svan languages. (H. Fenrich, Z. Sarjveladze 2000), which is a proof that they resulted due to the divergence of common basic language. However, as only Iberian language explains the etymology of the national origin lexis in the language, named common literary Georgian, whereas other Kartvelian languages fail to do so, the Iberian language, possessing unparalleled quantity of grammatical possibilities and accordingly the richest lexical fund in the world has no alternative. (M. Dzadzmiaaad others...2007), It points to the fact that the so called scheme of interrelationship Kartvelian Languages by Kurdiani and Chikobava is incorrect as well as the term “Kartvelian”, as the languages implied under the term, are detached from Iberian language and not Georgian. The antecedence of the Iberian language is confirmed by the article of Acad.Takaishvili “When the state of Ibers became the Kartvelian State”(Takaishvili, 1948) and a Megrelian inscription ‘k\textsuperscript{h}iana mi?orc~ – “I love the Universe”, performed by the 3000 year old ligature in Asomtavruli and Mkheidruli script, discovered on Grakliani Hill. (Pipia K. 2017). Besides, as only the Iberian language allows to reach the depth of “Adam’s language” and no other language, possessing such possibilities has been identified so far, the scheme of interrelationship between the “Adam’s language”, Iberian and Nostratic languages, complied with Bomhard’s scheme we believe to be the following:
I. Linguistic Data and scientific achievements

As we have noted above, the scholars believed the trace and data of the language and speech origin to be lost beyond recall (G. Nebieridze, 1981, p. 50) and the interest to the language and speech studies has dwindled since 1866, but on the basis of the logic that the problem never arises if there is no way to solve it, the given interest has not been extinguished completely and our study is not conducted on empty ground.

In regards with the study of the given issue, it is important to consider the views expressed by Gamkrelidze-Machavariani: “as in early common Kartvelian vowel ǝ had to be present by the side of the consonant, the number of syllables was determined by the number of vowels. In the common Kartvelian of the period there were no specific sonant phonemes, as the units opposed particularly to consonants and vowels as the element c was accompanied by the element ǝ” (T. Gamkrelidze, G. Machavariani, 1963, p. 370). The view expressed by the renowned linguists is a truth and it has to be pointed out that the consonant sound, pronounced separately and independently in the form of a phoneme does not exist in the nature. The consonant pronounced independently is always accompanied by the neutral vowel ǝ, attached to it in a natural way. Therefore not a single representative of
any nation could pronounce the consonant sound without it, being accompanied by the ǝ vowel. That is why the consonant sounds pronounced independently in Iberian language have the meanings of a complete word. That is why they are called word sounds. The same logic extends over the word harmonious complexes, which neither exist in the nature without the accompaniment of the neutral sound ǝ and it gives them the importance, without which, they have no meanings, as the particular phonemes extracted from the word.

Today, in various languages there exist sound harmonious complexes, some originated in the nature and others were established within the Socius. The establishment of the latter in the socius had to be based on eliding of the ǝ vowel in a more complex words derived through the merge of archetypes forming part of primeval non-grammarized sentences. Such phonetic phenomenon had to occur in certain places due to the weakness of a stress on ǝ vowel. Gamkrelidze and Machavariani explain the reason of eliding of the vowel (Sincoping) in a word, in the following way: “One of the reasons for the vowel sincope may have been the presumption of the mobile dynamic stress at the early stage of the development of the common Kartvelian, through the influence of which weakening and loss of the vowels without a stress occurred.” (T. Gamkrelidze. G, Machavariani, 1965, p. 370). As a result, instead of the form ǝǝcǝ, sound harmonious complex ǝcǝ was achieved.

Despite the work presented by the renowned scholar T. Gamkrelidze and G. Machavariani (“System of sonants and ablaut in Kartvelian languages~”), phenomenon of Megrelian language has not been thoroughly studied to this day..

Iberian language has preserved the interjection, pronounced to show extremely negative emotion, characteristic of various animals, of specific sound, before the beginning of speech by the humans, dating back to the wild life, expressing despondency and horror – ǝǝǝǝǝvǝ-ǝvǝ interjection (by women) and vo-va, va-va (by men), still used to express something negative by the word sound ǝ (➔va/ve). Academician Niko Marr stated on the basis of the study of these or similar archaic words: “The Japetian language group allows us to reach the
border lines between the Human language and animal speech, through the comparative studies. (Niko Mar, 1923, p. 42).

Views of M. and Ts. Dzadzamia on the sounds, word origin and the speech have to be pointed out: „Megrelian consonant words are presented, as such, with only one certain condition, when they are accompanied by a half vowel ǝ. Without it, single consonant sounds and consonant harmonious complexes present no notion, no meaning.” (Dzadzamia M., Dzadzamia Ts., 1997, p. 58); “speech sounds represent phonetic (sound) units segmented by the man, imitating the multiple inarticulate sound complexes existing in the nature, briefly – the phonemes, that are historically determined by the meanings (defined)”, ... Initial or primitive speech was actually imitation of the sounds produced by the nature, i.e. sounds expressed by the objects and the natural phenomena. In brief it was a speech in the nature’s language.~ (Dzadzamia M., Dzadzamia Ts., 1997, pp. 204-205); “Primitive speech was a speech with the imitated basic consonant forms, namely single consonants, consonant sounds harmonious complexes and their attachments (if present) with the accompaniment of emphatic semi-vowel ǝ sound” (Dzadzamia M., Dzadzamia Ts., 2007, p. 93). i.e. When at the time no grammar existed, the men expressed their views through the combination of word sounds and sound harmonious complexes. However, the authors of the given reality presented the problem in a general form, hypothetically.

They present little or insufficient concrete examples. Nevertheless when the Dzadzamia authors (Father and son) made such conclusions they relied upon the word sounds and sound harmonious complexes preserved in the Iberian language to this day and multiple basic forms existing as their attachment. For instance, in Iberian language expressions preserved from the consonant speech era: k’ǝ čǝ _ `Fed acorn; šǝ dixa skʰǝrǝ _ `Moist earth is drying up ~; č’q’ǝnt’ǝ ŋvali č’q’ǝrt’ǝ _ `Fresh (young) cheese is being squashed ~ etc. However did there exist in Iberian language, preserved and intensively used ten single consonant word sounds (gǝ, k’ǝ, lǝ, t’ǝ, šǝ, čǝ, ca, ʒǝ, c’ǝ and č’ǝ) apart from word sounds with the homonyms presented by 20 consonants out of 30, how the word sounds and sound harmonious complexes came to existence; which particular realities emitted these sounds; Besides “speech sounds are phonetic units, segmented from the multiple inarticulate sound complexes existing in the nature, in short phonemes, which are historically determined by
certain notions, meanings (specified).” (M. Dzadzamia, Ts. Dzadzamia 1997, p. 204), if in word sounds achieved by the imitation of concrete realities existing in the nature, presenting neutral vowels separately or the result of possible reconstruction of word sounds into phonemes, has not ever been studied before us.

On the basis of the fact that separate sound (phoneme) extracted from the word composition has no notion, linguistics considers the words with the notion as the unity of meaningless sound units displayed in a certain sequence: "….by the arrangement of minor units" (or with meaning K.P.). with no notion, the speaker can create the units of more complex meaning, by merging them – the words, connecting the words, he can form a sentence. Therefore on the one hand we have the sound expression units, while on the other hand - rules for the combining of the given units, the so called grammar.~ (T. Gamkrelidze and others, 2003. p. 28).

The conventionality theory of language origination was apparently formed on such erroneous views, which the majority of the scholars share to this day with the following dominant opinion; “the language mostly consists of the words that denote conventional meanings of the objects and phenomena. I.e. the principles of conventionality are applied instead of iconicity principle.” (G. Nebieridze, 1991, p. 17). That means that word meanings were adopted not on the basis of natural realities, but men gave un-motivated conventional names to the objects and the phenomena according their own will. In such case, errors are unavoidable and on the basis of these errors, the scholars, wishfully trying to present their language as the basic language, namely Gematrians, created an illusion of the divine, naturally ciphered origin of their language, through the selection of the words of different sound composition and artificially getting the required summed up number of characters in them. But we, along with the entire scientific world, do not share the given opinion, as big units of complex meaning – the words, were not created from smaller units void of meaning – sounds (phonemes), but by the combination of comparatively smaller units prompted by the nature, bearing the meaning – and word sounds and sound harmonious complexes, which after turning determining neutral vowel ǝ into a complete vowel are present today in the words as syllables.
II. Establishing the origin of sound harmonious complexes

For the reconstruction of the real picture of Pre-Nostratic, or “Adam’s Language” speech it has become necessary to set whether the harmonious complex under the study is a sound harmonious complex existing in the nature or result of later, phonetic changes, characteristic for the socius, as it is known that the harmonious complex $c_1c_2ǝ$, existing in the nature, doesn’t break into separate $c_1$ and $c_2$ word sounds. As it was possible to pronounce $c_1c_2$ forms in a reversed way $c_2c_1$ and later (after the merging of the word sounds) due to the weakness of a stress on $ǝ$ vowel between the two consonants, eliding of the given vowel may have occurred. We also have reversed forms of the consonant sound harmonious complexes $c_1c_2$ and $c_2c_1$, for example bro-li (crystal) and rbi -li (soft), rkh (horn) and krho-mi (chrome) etc. Similar reversed sound harmonious complexes do not exist in the world. Therefore, there do not exist t'q'ǝ, ǯya, čxa and etc. Reversed forms of natural harmonious complexes q't'a, ǯya, xča and etc. Neither there exist amalgamated attachments of word sounds and sound harmonious complexes, which give us certain meaning. For example cǝcǝ and ccǝcǝ forms. Such merging used to occur at the stage following the primeval speech of a man. I.e. if there exists the reversed form of $c_1c_2 - c_2c_1$, it means that $ǝ$ vowel with $c_1$, or $c_2$ has elided. Despite the fact that initially it originated in the form of $c_1ǝc_2$ or $c_2ǝc_1$.

It is possible that from the beginning to this day, throughout the millennia, under the influence of turbulent past and cataclysms, not all initially existing natures prompted word sounds and all speech sounds (phonemes) have been preserved, but on the basis of the linguistic data preserved in Megrelian (same Iberian) language, it becomes possible to reconstruct the main lexical fund of the Pre-Nostratic language, or the first common or “Adam’s Language”. This lexical fund was possibly limited to the word sounds formed by 30 (or more) consonants existing in Megrelian (if there existed over 30 consonants), homonyms and sound harmonious complexes. Until that we find it necessary to present several examples of the formation of the latter.
III. Origination of word sounds and sound harmonious complexes

We have prepared all the assumed examples of the presumed origin of word sounds and sound harmonious complexes for the book soon to be published titled "The first alphabet of the mankind." Here we present only several examples:

1. If we quickly stretch a springy (solid) rope or a tightly stretched string between the two points, after pulling the rope we shall hear word sound \( \text{bǝǝǝ} \). In the first place tying, connection took place, while in the other case the \( \text{tying, connection} \) silence, peace was broken, during which the given realities issued and we heard a sound complex \( \text{bǝǝǝ} \). That is why the sound complex \( \text{bǝ/bǝǝǝ} \) assumed the neanning of \( \text{tying, connection..} \).

2. If we are in a cozy, comfortable environment and snow flakes fall on our head and shoulders we shall periodically hear the sound complex \( \text{tʰǝ - tʰǝ - tʰǝ ...} \) if we pronounce determinant sound of the sound \( \text{tʰ} \) with bigger ephasy, with the prolonged \( \text{tʰǝǝǝ} \) form, in the shape of snow, water, or the phenomenon of \( \text{light} \) standard, with the aim to deliver information to someone, this information becomes more persuasive. Therefore the word sound \( \text{tʰǝ/tʰǝǝǝ} \), after pronouncing \( \text{tʰoua} \rightarrow \text{tʰova} \) (snowing), figuratively assumes the meaning of arriving light. Word sound \( \text{tʰǝ} \) in Iberian language is 3rd person verb. And expresses the finished event, the snow flake, fallen once will not fall again. Therefore in Iberian language it will be \( \text{ga-tʰǝǝǝ} \) (finished), denoting ending of a certain task.
3. *rǝrǝrǝrǝrǝ*... prolonged sound complex we shall hear during the movement of the invisible reality, around us at a high speed. It should be pointed out that all the rest 29 (consonant) word sounds are emitted by the visible realities. Apparently, due to the fact of being different and special the word sound *ra*, after pronouncing *re* (is) was given the function of confirming the presence of other realities.

4. Overripe fruit, being left on the branch in an inapproachable place, with its appetizing smell, seems to be whole and palatable from the distance, but with a slight shake of the branch it will drop to the ground and squashing will produce the sound harmonious complex *t'q'ǝǝ*, that’s the reason why the sound harmonious complex *t'q'ǝǝ* assumed the meaning of false, imaginary. Meaning of Lying, deceitful false. From it Iberian word *t'q'ura* (lie has come to existence): t'q'ore → t'q'ure → t'q'ura and the Georgian t'q'uili (a lie): t'q'ǝore → t'q'uire → t'q'uile → t'q'uili.

5. If we squeeze a fat chicken, live or plucked and cleaned, we shall hear the sound harmonious complex *ʒɣǝ*, which can’t be said on a lean chicken. The chicken that does not produce such sound harmonious complex is not considered to be edible. In Iberian language it is said: dir-*ʒɣǝ*, to which Georgian ga-*ʒɣa* corresponds, in English saturated.

As for the origin of the sounds (phonemes), as a result of the reconstruction of word sound consonants and neutral vowel, it is easier to present them as separate, units without the meaning, than their segmentation from inarticulate sound complexes”.

**IV. Pre-Nostratic or ”Adam’s Language” vocabulary**

We believe that there does not exist a complete vocabulary and it just can not exist, as in a short amount of time a new word may come to existence. It is also possible a word to lose its meaning and be dropped out of use, in time. Thus, it is only natural that the linguistic fund of ”Adam’s language”, consisting of the old basic forms (word sounds and sound harmonious complexes) may not be complete, but it offers us approximate picture of the speech of the period.
As mentioned above, the primitive speech was a speech that involved imitation with single consonant forms, i.e. word sounds, while expressing deeper views with their attachments is a more subsequent phenomenon.

In our view the primitive language lexis had to be similar to the one below;

a) word sounds:

1. `tied ~; Cxou bǝ, (čxou bo) _ `the cow is tied ~;
2. `is hung ~; guda jas muko-bǝ, (guda ǯas muk'o - bo) _ `leather bag is hanging on a tree ~;
3. `was hanging ~; Citiq kuCxiT qimki-bǝ, (čit'ikʰ k'čxitʰ kʰimk'i -bo) _ `bird hang from the branch with its foot ~; here all three words (tied, hanging and was hanging) express tying, connection in general;
4. `poured out ~; gegna-bǝ, (gegna-bo) _ `poured out, poured down ~;
5. `poured”; qigni-bǝ, (kʰigni - bo) _ `poured on ~. Poured, pouring in general.
6. 1. woodcock;
2. `looks like ~; squa mumas gǝ, (skʰua mumas gǝ) _ `son looks like father ~;
3. `built ~; giorgiq ŭude a-gǝ, (Giorgiqʰ ŭude a-gǝ) _ `Giorgi built a house ~;
4. `won ~; petreq laʔafı mi-gǝ, (P'etrekʰ laʔapʰi mi-gǝ) _ `Petre won a game ~;
5. `won from ~; petreq laʔafı mu-gǝ, (P'etrekʰ laʔapʰi mu-gǝ) _ “Petre won the game from sb ~;
6. `to sheath ~; yama orCxes qala-gǝ, (q'ama orčxes kʰala-gǝ) _ `Sheathed a sword ~;
7. `return grace ~; mardi gina-gǝ, (mardi gina-gǝ) _ `returned grace ~;
8. `repaid ~; vali gini-gǝ, (vali gini-gǝ) _ `repaid debt ~;
9. `put on, (-irgo) ~; xeSTaTmani qimi-gǝ, (xeštʰatʰmani kʰimi-gǝ) _ `put on gloves (fitted on) ~;
10. `hit ~; keti qimio-gǝ, (k'etʰi kʰimio-gǝ) _ `hit sb., with a bat ~;
11. `find way out ~; uryi tyaSe ZiuT gSa-gǝ, (urqʰi tqaše ʒiutʰ gaša-gǝ) _ `hardly found the way out from a dense forest”~
12. ʻEarth~; ga/ge/gi (ga/ge/gi) _ ʻplanet earth~.
   do. 1. ʻ-placed~; Wirqa tabakis qigla-d, (č'irkʰa taβak'is kʰigla-dœ) _ ʻplaced glass on
   the table ~;
   2. ʻ“put on” qimi-d, (č'apʰula kʰimi-dœ) _ ʻput on shoes”;
   3. ʻleft~; ase i-dœ (ase i-dœ) _ ʻjust left ~.
   va. 1. ʻva/va/va~ _ interjection expression of show sorrow, mourning, unpleasant
   experience. ʻva̱va̱va̱va - va̱va~ KKeening of Iberian women; ʻvo-væ, va-væ~ _ men;
   2. ʻva/ve~; va-re (va re) _ ʻis not ~; ve-laɣafu (ve - laʔapʰu) _ ʻdid not play~.
   za. 1. ʻkneaded~; comi z, (comi zœ) _ ʻKneaded dough ~;
   2. ʻis burning, is on~; daCx ri z, (daCxari zœ) _ ʻFire is on~;
   3. ʻ-reconciled~; maCxuperi boSefi ga-zœ (maCxup'eri boʃepʰi ga-zœ) _ ʻreconciled the
   fighting children ~.
   ha. Word sound h, (hœ) conveys the name of the material mass, which we breath, smell
   and to which we listen, without which no living creature can survive for more then two
   minutes. And the one that is not pronounced, it is breathed out.
   thœ. 1. ʻsnowfall~; Tœ do Tœ,... do sumi dRadoserc uWyvaduo T_ndaœ (thœ do thœ, ...
   do sumi dyadoserc uč'q'vaduo thœndaœ) _ ʻsnowing and snowing,... it snowed three days
   without a stop. ~;
   2. ʻfamily~; ibdaT Cqimi Ti-Sa (ibdatʰ čkʰimi thʰi-šä) _ ʻlet's go ti my family~.
   3. ʻ-ended, finished ~; giorgiq saqvari ga-Tœ (Giorgikʰ sakʰvari ga-tʰœ) _ ʻGiorgi
   finished work /ended it ~.
   k’œ. 1. acorn_oaknut;
   2. ʻ-kept to himself~; beso dixa mi-kœ (Besoʰ dixa mi-k’œœ) _ ʻBeso occupied the
   land~;
3. `tempered~; petreq yama jgiro gargo-k'vera, (P'et'rekʰ q'amá ʒgiro gargo-k'vera) _ `Petre tempered the sword well ~.

la. 1. `falls down~; qua dixas la, (kʰua dixas la) _ `stone falls down ~. Falling. in general.
2. `walked ~; iq mTeli qiana mi-l, (ikʰ mtʰeli kʰiana mi-la) _ `he walked around the world~;
3. `studied, investigated ~; giorgiq i akani jgiro gi-l, (Giorgikʰ i ak'ani ʒgiro gi-la) _ `giorgi investigated the area, studied the area well~.

ma. 1. `m/ma~ (m/ma) _ personal pronoun _ `I~;
2. `m/mi/min~ (m/mi/min) _ Interrogative pronoun _ `who~;
3. `m/mu (m/mu) _ Interrogative pronoun _ `what~.

na. 1. `n/na (n/na) _ `water~; in fugurative sense _ `The source of life~, or, `God creator~;
2. `hurt~; baRanas Tofurq e-n, (bayanas tʰopʰurkʰ e-na) _ `Honey hurt the baby ~.

pʰa. 1. `lips~; pʰp/pipu (pʰpʰ/pʰpʰu) _ `lips~;
2. `made~; ma RoronTiq pʰ, (ma ɣorontʰikʰ pʰ) _ `God made me ~ (created).

ʒa. 1. `above~; J/ʒi (ʒa/ʒi); dixas ʒi ca re (dixas ʒi ca re) _ `Sky is above the earth ~;

rʰa. `r/re~ (r/re) _ `Is~.

sa. `Urinate~; in general, to urinate. figurally: relief, facilitation pleasure, bliss.

tʰa. 1. udder;
2. `left~; iliaq naTeli kvali di-tʰ, (Yliakʰ naʰeli kʰvali di-tʰ) _ `Ilia left a luminous mark~;
3. `forgiveness~; RoronTiq coda miu-tʰ, (ɣorontʰikʰ coda miu-tʰ) _ `God forgave him, any sin~.
4. `breath last breath~; lexiq Suri go-tʰ, (lexi kʰuri go-tʰ) _ `The sick breathed last breath ~;
5. ´freed (set free)-; baRanaq Citi gou-t, (bayanakb ċit’i gou-ta) _ `Child freed a bird ~ (set free);

pʰa. 1. `layer-; f/fa (pʰa/pʰa); žəri pʰa _ `two layers ~;
2. `boiled-; wyarq qo-f, (c’q’arkb kʰo-pʰa) _ `water boiled ~.

kʰa. 1. `ground-; petreq qobali do-q, (P`et`rekh kʰo-bali do-kʰa) _ `Petre grounded wheat ~;
2. `Do ~; zvambaq i-q,; es saqme (Zvambakʰ i-kʰə) _ `Zvamba did it ~.

yə. 1. `owl- _ night bird; R_/Ru (yə/yu) In Iberian language the bird was given a name according the sound complexes it produces R_/R_/R_~_, (yə-yəə-yəəəəə) immitating:

2. `took~; qeTiq wigni mide-R, (Kʰetʰ;kʰ c’igni mid-yə) _ `Keti took the book~;
3. `brought~; gogiq oRali qimi-R, (Gogikʰ oyali kʰimi -yə) _ `Gogi brought the load here ~.

q’a. `shoutediyvira~; aWou do y, (ač’ou do q’əə) _ `It hurt and he shouted~.

šə. 1. `Wet~; S, diax (šə diax) _ `Wet earth~;
2. `remembers~; is ifreli S, (is ipʰreli šə) _ `he remembers everything ~. In a general form, remembrance, memory;

3. `walked~/vlida-; Cqaras mi-S, (čkʰaras mi-šə) _ `walked fast/walked~;
4. `drank~; Tamadaq breli Rvini S_/Su (tʰamadakʰ breli γvini ras šə/su) _ `Toastmaster drank much wine ~;

5. `knitting~; beboq xeSiTaTmanefi S, (bebokʰ xešitʰatʰmanepʰi šə) _ `Granny knitted mittens ~.

čə. 1. `Fed~; oWkumali C, (očk’umali čə) _ `Fed sb. ~. In general alimentated;
2. `gave away~; sikeTe go-C, (sik’etʰ go-ča) _ `shared kindness~;
3. `kept~; sabuTefi ģjiro do-C, (sabuʰepʰi ʒgiro do-ča) _ `kept the documents safely ~.

cə. 1. `elm~ _ tree specie;
2. `beat up~; ketiT c, (k’et’iθ cə) _ `beat up with a bat ~;
3. `paid~; pativi c, (p’at’i ci) _ `Paid respect~.
1. lies~ (devs); ja dixas Z, (ʒa gixas ʒa) _ `a tree lies on the ground~;
2. `graze~; cxenq ndolo Z,, (cxenkb ndolo ʒao) _ `horse grazes in the field~.

C'ao 1. `this year~; w, jgiri mosavali iguafu (c'ao ʒgiri mosavali iʔuapʰu) _ `harvest is good this year~;
2. `graze~; cxenq ndolo Z, (cxenq ndolo ʒǝǝ) _ `horse grazes in the field~.
3. `c'ǝ. ~

C'ao 1. `intestine~;
2. `c'ǝ. ~

Qʰo 1. handful;
2. `overthrew (knocked down) ~; dugigime Ā/Āu (dugigime qʰ/qʰu) _ `is overthrown ~;
3. `dismantled ~; kare do-Ā,, (k'are do-č'əə) _ `dismantled a tent ~.

Xo 1. `hand~; x/xe qimeTx, (xo/xe kʰimethxa) _ `took his hand ~;
2. `sits~; mafa taxtis x/xe (mapʰa t'axt'is xo/xe) _ `King sits on the throne;
3. `gave birth~; Txaq qacari x, (tʰxakʰ kʰacari xo) _ `a goat gave birth ~.
4. `tree~; xumla j/ja gedg, (xumla ʒa/ja gedgə) _ `a dead tree stands ~;
2. `burnt ~; din-j, (din-ʒə) _ `burnt~.

Qəo `created, made~; ifreli RoronTiq ɣ,(iʔreli yorontʰikʰ Qə) _ `God created everything ~.

b) Sound harmonious complexes existed in the nature:

T'q'əo `liar~; ty, re (t'qʰə re) _ `is a liar~;
čxǝ. `hot~; Cxǝ/Cxe re (čxǝ/čxe re) _ `it’s hot ~;
3ỳǝ. Sound harmonious complexes expressing something fat, well-fed (gam-3ỳa-riš);
č’q’ǝ/č’q’ǝǝ. 1. `screethed~; Citiq Wyǝ (čitikʰ č’q’ǝǝ) _ `bird screethed ~;
2. `cursed~; RoronTiq Wyǝ (ɣorontʰikʰ č’q’ǝǝ) _ `cursed by God~;
ỳǝ/ỳǝǝ. `wailed~; yvarus oCiq jRǝ (q’varus očikʰ ỳǝǝ) _ `Billy goat waved when castrated~.

Besides there do exist sound harmonious complexes sc’ǝ, pʰxǝ, p’q’ǝ, cxǝ da c’q’ǝ, which seem to be of natural origin, but we haven’t sought out the realities emitting such complexes. Complexes confirmed in Georgian language cxǝ and c’q’ǝ of natural origin have to be equivalent forms of čxǝ da i’q’ǝ complexes confirmed in Iberian language.

V. Method of the restoration of archetypes and sentences of Pre-Nostratic language through the reconstruction of Kartvelian words.

It is noteworthy that in Megrelian (Iberian) language 86 homonymms are presented in total through 30 wordsounds constructed on 30 existing consonants. Among them 15 – nouns, 63 3rd person verbs, 1 – interjection, 1 – particle, 3 – pronouns, 2 adverbs and 1 adjective. i.e. signs of grammatization were initially involved in the wordsounds and sound harmonious complexes. Therefore, although rarely, we encounter in Pre-Nostratic language well grammatized and slightly grammatized archaic sentences as well.

In order to reconstruct archetypes and sentences of the Pre-Nostratic or Nature’s language we have to set whether the words under the study are of relatively later formations or have been conceived in the era of the functioning of Pre-Nostratic language. For which reason we should replace all the vowels of the studied word with the neutral ǝ vowel and we may get three types of archaic sentences:

a) when the archaic sentence includes only the archetypes presented by wordsounds.;
b) when the archaic sentence includes one or more word sounds and sound harmonious complex existing in the nature;
c) when archaic sentence includes one or more wordsound and sound harmonious complex born in an archaic era, which is a result of syncopy of the neutral ǝ vowel between
the two consonants, having come to existence due to the merging of archetypes presented by wordsounds in the same sentence.

After the reconstruction of the sound harmonious complexes, dated back to when they were conceived, archaic sentence represented in point “a” is received.

The given method only allows to determine etymology and meaning of the words that came into existence during the functioning of Pre-Nostratic language. I.e. it would allow to restore the non-grammarized sentences built by archetypes, through the restoration of the words that are in use to this day (but have originated in the archaic period). If it turns out that the notion of the latter received through the grammarization at the modern level accurately determines the meaning of the word under the study, it will prove that it has been conceived in the era of the functioning of Pre-Nostratic language and the archetypes and the sentence are restored (reconstructed) correctly.

For the reconstruction of true archetype of the studied words of the conception period it is always necessary to take into consideration the possible phenomenon of ablaut.

VI. Restoration of the speech forms of Pre-Nostratic language

In order to clarify the abovesaid, we should consider several examples:

a) From the vocabulary of Nostratic (Latin nostratos – our) languages:

In Megrelian rxuala – boring, piercing.

Here, the the equivalence of the bases of rxu and ryu is important, the initial form of which has to be ra xa, which, at the level of modern speech could be imagined in the following way: is (rə) birth (xa), or there is a [new desired reality] birth. And indeed through drilling/boring, a new and desired, more complete reality is born.

The base of the mention corresponding words has to be bəbə, double bə, which directly means binding, link, connection, biological connection is implied, continuity: Son - father - grandfather. Georgian ba-ʋshi and bi-ϲ’i, Megrel. ba-ɣanaDand bo-ʃi, Laz. be-re denote biological connection, son.

3. In Aramaic language there is kerüm (bark, leather) equivalent to Georgian kʰerkʰi, in Sahara Berberic Tuareg there is a-urum (a bark); Muab Chad language group has kuro (shell, bark); Latin and old Russian k’ora; In Old Mongolian körü - süm (skin); In Japanese k’ara _ shell, bark (Dolgopol’sky Долгопольский, 1971-1972, p. 117).

In our opinion, the word kʰerkʰi and its equivalent forms in various languages have been derived from the basic form kʰə rə kʰə → kʰerkʰi, where kʰə means making rə – is. Then kʰə rə kʰə // kʰerkʰi means creator(maker) is Creator. Thus, truly the bark is the creator of wood without which the growth of the wood and its development and creation are impossible.

b) From Russian:

In Russian we have the word lečenie _ treatment (medical). If the word was conceived in the era of uniform speech, it had to be conceived in a form lə čə nə. The basic form denoted by the similar connected form does not exist in the nature. In Megrelian we have separate word sounds lə _ falling down, falling; čə _ fed to, alimentate; nə _ Water, Water Source of Life. Thus if in the era of uniform speech they used to pronounce jointly the words falling + feeding + source of life it means that they wanted to say: feeding the fallen with the source of life. Even on the level of the contemporary speech Feeding the fallen, or a sick person with the source of life may only mean treatment.

2. k’niga _ a book. Its basic form had to be k’ə na ga, where k’ə in Megrelian means tempering, na _ water (directly meaning), figuratively source of wisdom, ga _ build,
General form, building, therefore the sentence consisting of these words is of the following essence: source built by [mind] tempering [of wisdom] is nothing else but a book.

c) From Hebrew:

1. In Hebrew we have a word daluti _ beggar. Its basic form had to be da lə t’ə, where da is the 3rd person verb and means put, in a general form placement (put). lə, as we have mentioned means falling, t’ə is also 3rd person verb and means give birth, general form, birth. Then dalut’i ← da lə t’ə means placement (put) _ born to be fallen, i.e. for inactive falling, doomed to be a beggar.

2. Jewish Cabalists write that the language initially was called thanaxa. Thora and sacred scriptures were written in this language, but they fail to explain convincingly the etymology of the given word. The word thanaxa is written in Hebrew only with consonant sounds thnx where th in their opinion means thora, Pentateuch, n – nevim (Prophets), and x, means k’t’uvim (Scriptures). (I apologize to the readers for being unable to explain what is the connection of the sound x with the word k’t’uvim).

In Iberian language thə in the word thanaxa means light (Supreme is implied, the divine wisdom, nə _ is water, source of life, figuratively God - creator. xə-is also a 3rd person verb and means giving birth, in a general form, birth. Therefore the basic form of the language thanaxa - thə na xə // (light- God - Birth) means language born of God’s light wisdom(lucid). And indeed the first common (uniform) language of the physical manifestation of the Supreme Creator – language suggested by the nature (its wisdom).

d) From Georgian (same New Iberian):

Snow in absolute darkness is so clearly visible that it may be considered the etalon of visibility, light. Therefore if they wanted to say: the most visible reality has befell upon the environ~, they expressed the given reality in the following way: na thə ra (water-snow-is). So the contemporary word came to existence natblesi (natbəra → natbəre → natbere → natbele → natblesi).
I.e. water befallen as visible snow, as the fresh water is invisible in the dark of the night, i.e. it is dark (Georg. – bnele). Thus, the given reality used to be expressed in the following way bα nα rα (pouring _ water _ is). bα nα rα → bαnα rε → bne re → bnele → bneli; If they wanted to say “a lie” they used to say: <<t’q’o ra>> (is a liar). From here Megr. t’q’ura and Georgian t’q’uili; The essence of the notions “New” and “old” can not be determined by the rapid wearing of the newly made object or preservance of the quality of centuries old object, therefore if they wanted to say <<axali>> (new), they used to sai: <<a xa ra>> (was born – is) and if they wanted to say the word `zveli~ (old), they used to say `zəa ra~ (is placed is) (zəa rα → zue re → zuεle → zueli → zveli and etc.

Now let us have a look at the situation between the words having derived from the basic words (k’ethili da sa-k’uthari) (in the word k’ethili sound I is a result of the relaxation, or softening of the sound.

Word sound k’ə in the word k’e tə ili (←k’ə tə rα) means tempering, in the word _ k’ut hari (←k’ə tə rα) _ it denotes keeping (for oneself), while word sound th in the word k’et’ili means light, divine wisdom, in a word _ k’ut’ari it denotes a head. The word k’et’ili, means literally: tempering of light wisdom is and indeed the best deed in the human behavior, tempering of light and wisdom. The rest, in comparison, are nothing but rendering disservice; Word _ k’ut’ari literally means kept to self is. Personal is nothing else but reality kept for self; Iberian word k’it’i (← k’ə tə=kept to self), finger in Georgian, a part for keeping something for self.

As we have seen, it is clear from the analyzed words there is a live link between the lexis of Pre-Nostratic and contemporary Iberian language.

Conclusion
Proceeding from the abovesaid we may conclude that if a word has corresponding words in various languages, it means that their common basic form was conceived in the era of functioning of the primary uniform (common) language and their meanings could be determined by the meanings of the word sounds and sound harmonious complexes, existing in the Iberian language. If the word has no corresponding forms in other languages (or they
may not be studied yet) but if the method we have elaborated and the application of the word
sounds, existing in Iberian language as well as use of word sound meanings, existing in the
Iberian language to determine its precise etymology, it points to the fact that it was conceived
in the era of the first common language and has been formed through the further connection
and linking of the lexis of the period.
Therefore the given method allows to determine the basic forms of all corresponding words
that are included into the vocabulary of Nostratic languages, the basis of obtaining their
meanings, i.e. the lexis used in the era of common speech and accordingly reconstruct Pre-
Nostratic language, same as the first primary, common language of the mankind.

Besides, the humble work is noteworthy for paving the way to the solution of the
problem, regarded unsolvable in Linguistics, namely the reconstruction of the Primary,
common language of the mankind, which in our view is a further important step towards the
perception of the unsolved mystery and accordingly further spiritual-moral development of
the mankind.
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