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Abstract

It has been demonstrated indisputably (cf. “Veda vs. Tetragrammaton” IJSR, 3(1), 2017), the genetic relationship between Biblical Hebrew and Vedic Sanskrit and other so-called Indo-European languages, inclusively of ancient Egyptian and Chinese as well. This newly recognized reality requires a completely new classification of world languages, especially the languages of the ancient world. Unlike modern currently adopted linguistic theories which are based on Arbitrary Reconstructions and Fictitious Inventions of the self-styled Proto-Indo-Europeanist scholars, the present paper provides a new classification on the Vedic Model formulated by the incomparable, unequalled, unparalleled, unrivaled, unsurpassable, superior Vedic Etymologists, Grammarians and Phoneticians.
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Introduction

In Vedic classifications (whether linguistic, religious or philosophical) the main distinction between phenomena appears to be perceived and formulated in the form of Binary Algorithm (e.g. bright-dark, celestial-terrestrial, divine-humane, etc.) reflecting Reality as the Unity of opposite but complementary principles.

The Four Main Classes of Distinction: A) Vyásas vs. Anásas

In the Rig-Veda, there is a clear and strict distinction between the Aryan speakers and the non-Aryan speaking tribes, the latter being called anásas. The term is derived from Sanskrit ās (akin to Latin os, and Slavic usta “mouth”) with negative prefix an-, meaning “voiceless, speechless, dumbs” (see Note 1). The famous seers Atri and Vasistha (Rig-Veda V 29.10 and VII 6.3) particularly emphasized the Pani-tribe as “crudely-speaking” (mrdhavācās) “dumbs” (anásas). The Panis were an ancient Iranian tribe known to the Greek historian Strabo as Parnoi. Note that the Vedic retroflex “n” in Panis is pronounced as “rn” in English words burn, turn, learn, which gave the analogous plural form Parnoi in Greek. In the Vedic auxiliary texts (see Note 2) there are some more elaborated comments on Panis, e.g. “Pani calls himself pumān (viz. a man)”. But Pani is not a man, because he does not speak like a man. Analogously, Germans call themselves Deutsch viz. “people” (derived from Gothic theud “people, race, nation”) and is further related to the Hittite tuzzi “army”, Slavic tudji(n) meaning “foreign(er)” (depending on different dialect it is pronounced either tuvi or tudži).

But as Hillebrandt correctly noticed, all Slavic nations to this day use the term “Dumbs” (or Němci in Slavic to denote ethnic Germans, the term being derived from Old Slavic němu “speechless, mute, dumb” semantically identical with Vedic anásas). Thus, from the previous exposition it is absolutely clear that both Iranians and Germans were considered by ancient Vedans and Slavs as “dumbs” and not Aryans at all. This is another proof that Germans and Iranians have never belonged to the Aryan family proper. Incidentally, Germanic black Nazi svastika (depicted on red butcher’s cloth-like flag) is not Aryan at all, since authentic svastika being symbolic of the beneficient power of the Sun, must have been “arya hiranya svastika” viz. Noble Golden Svastika. Whatsmore, this ancient terminology has been applied not only to Germans proper, but also to the ethnic name “Anglians or Angles” (viz. Englishmen) which is of the same semantic origin, being derived from *ŋ-gels or *ŋ-gols (from Slavic *ne-gols via metathesis *ne-glas)
meaning “no-voice, no-speech, speech-less”, hence “dumbs or mutes”. There is still an ancient district in the German province Schleswig called “Angeln”. In medieval times 9 – 12 c. CE. the province and the whole northern part of the present-day Germany was populated by the Slavic people wherefrom came the name “Angeln” viz. „Dumbs” (cf. Helmoldi Chronica Slavorum, 1167). The word “dumb” itself is Slavic in origin meaning “oak-tree” and is connected with the ancient Slavic saying “He keeps silent like the tree” (said of somebody who is unskilled in conversation). Such person knowing not what appropriately to say, usually just swallows his saliva and keeps silent, and that swallowing, viz. the act of gulping, and the word gulp itself in Slavic (via metathesis viz. glup) came to denote “a stupid person”!

The opposite Vedic term of the anāsas is vyāsas (derived from vi-ās) literally “dia-lectician, viz. skilled in debate or conversation, hence eloquent one”! In this connection the legendary compiler of the Vedic texts called Veda Vyāsa (to whom is ascribed the authorship of Mahabharata Epic, Bhagavad Gita, and also Bhagavata Purana, the texts composed within the span of time of at least two thousand years) actually does not represent one particular person but rather authentically denoted “a whole class of ancient eloquent individuals who had Sanskrit language under their complete command” comparable to the ancient Greek Homer who was just one in the long lineage of blind poets (Homer is supposedly author of Iliad and Odyssey, delineating the Trojan war which happened five centuries before his birth). Analogously, it is absolutely impossible for one man to be the author of the texts composed within the span of 2000 years as credited to Veda Vyas. In Slavic tradition the same distinction is made the same way as the Vedans did, though the ancient Slavs did not simply borrow or plagiarize Vedic terms Vyāsas and Anāsas, but they used their own creativity and inventiveness and created the ethnic name Slověni to designate themselves meaning “those who have slovo, viz. word” in contrast to the Germans who did not know how to speak properly, hence being designated Němci viz. “Dumbs”!

However, the distinction between Vyāsas vs. Anāsas does not cover all distinctive differences between languages, e.g. Iranian and Germanic languages differ distinctly by their habits of pronunciation especially of authentic Aryan Voiced consonants, viz. with respect of Voicing and de-Voicing of consonants. Therefore additional distinctive classifications are needed to cover all such varieties among various groups of languages.

B) Sanskrit vs. Prākrit
The ancient Aryan grammarians made a strict distinction between normatively highly certified Sanskrit and all those non-certified vernaculars that sprung from it in Vedic times, hence called Prakrits viz. “vulgar or natural dialects” comparable to the well-known distinction between Classical Latin and Vulgar Latin. Among the Prakrit tongues of utmost importance for further classification of distinctiveness between various groups of ancient languages is the one called Paśači.

C) Aryan vs. Paśači-tongues
The Paśači-group of languages is named after an ancient Aryan classification of Indian vernaculars or vulgar tongues, known as Prakrit, of which Paśači shares the main common phonetical features with Sumerian, Altaic, Etruscan, Anatolian, Germanic, ancient Egyptian, Chinese, Cretan, Mycenaean, but also common Greek in some instances.

1) The Problem of Correct Voicing
All the languages in this group as a rule used to substitute the Aryan VOICED phonemes (especially plosives) by their de-voiced (unvoiced, voiceless) counterparts, then the Aryan Unvoiced Plosives by their Unvoiced but Aspirated counterparts, and the Aryan Unvoiced Plosives by Unvoiced FRICATIVE substitutes, thus giving a weird acoustic impression to the audience hearing it as of listening to the freaky voices of the Pīśācas or “demons”.

Such phonetic mutations require specific systems for the representation of proper phonological distinctions between phonemes. Basically, there are two different systems for representation of the Paśači-tongue phonemes in script:

a) Abstract Phoenemic Representation or APR, in which the distinction between phonemes is made on an abstract level as they are distinguished in the mind of the speakers, using the whole spectrum of alphabetic signs, regardless of actual pronunciation, including the signs for non-existent VOICED phonemes, the exemplary model being ancient Sumerian system, and analogous modern Pinyin Romanization for transcription of Chinese, and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APR</th>
<th>vs.</th>
<th>RPR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sumerian</td>
<td>Dongo</td>
<td>“Heaven, god”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>egal</td>
<td>“palace”</td>
<td>Akkadian ekallu (g vs. k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unedog</td>
<td>“letter”</td>
<td>unetukku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Pinyin</td>
<td>“Heaven, god”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tian</td>
<td>“Heaven, day”</td>
<td>Tien (T vs. T̄)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Real Phoenetic Representation or RPR, in which the distinction between phonemes is made on Phonetic level as they are actually pronounced, viz. between Unvoiced Non- Aspirated vs. Unvoiced Aspirated phonemes, the exemplary model being ancient Akkadian system for transcription of Sumerian, and analogous Wade Romanization for transcription of Chinese, e.g.

2) Phonetic Mutations
Even the languages with correct Aryan VOICING, like Hebrew, Celtic, Iranian, and surprisingly Latin all display various f-types of phonetic mutations, e.g. the f-type of phonetic mutation featuring the f-phoneme (derived from p common to Paisaci- tongues, for example Sanskrit pardate vs. German farzen and English fart, etc. In Latin it derived from Aspirated Plosives only, viz. from ph, bh, dl, ghv ) which is non-existent in proper Aryan languages such as Sanskrit and Slavic, and Baltic tongues either (otherwise Latin shows no other types of mutations and is most close to Sanskrit and Slavic, and along with them belongs to the SU-family of languages, see section D below).

3) Roughing and Smoothing
Despite their correct Voicing, Baltic tongues are exaggerated by vowel-roughing or over-diphthongization, in contrast to Vedic and Slavic vowel-smoothing or monophthongization, e.g. Vedic sacred syllable Om, akin to Old Slavic ुम > modern Slavic um “reason, intellect, mind, brain, common sense”, but Lithuanian has aumuo “ibid.”. Hence, Baltic
tongues too cannot be considered the members of the Aryan languages proper.

4) Over-fricativization
Additionally, Old Iranian, as well as Celtic and Germanic languages too, have developed a full range of FRICATIVE interdental and velar harsh phonemes non-existent either in Vedic or Slavic (represented in transliteration by the Greek letters: th-eta, d-elta, g-amma, kh-i, etc.) the process termed succinctly and precisely by one word as over-fricativization, viz. substituting the authentic Aryan Voiced and Unvoiced Plosive Aspirate sounds, beside a set of truly weird Vowel phonemes and Diphthongs non-Aryan in origin.

5) ʃ-Type Phonetic Mutation
Ancient Egyptian and Anatolian Hittite display ʃ-type phonetic mutation derived from authentic t-phoneme, while Biblical Hebrew as well as German display the ʃ-type mutation that sprung from s-phoneme. The most illustrative example of ʃ-type phonetic mutation can be observed within the various forms of symbolically very important Number SEVEN presented below:

One of the special features of the Hebrew scriptures is the symbolism of number Seven. The Hebrew word șiba’ h viz. “seven (masculine cardinal number)” > ʃabṭa’ t viz. “seventh (masculine ordinal number)” is phonetically closest to the Germanic/Gothic sibun > German sieben, and Hittite šipta “seven” (featuring both “ș” and “b”)! The word for number seven is actually derived from the reflexive pronoun “se” (self), but first it is necessary to explain the evolution of the term denoting number “seven”. In ancient times man used his fingers of both hands to present visually to his partners or associates what number he actually meant. This conclusion can be deduced from the term used to denote number “eight” which is represented by the dual form astau in Sanskrit, related to the Old Iranian ašti meaning “the width of four fingers”. Thus astau undoubtedly means “two times four fingers”, viz. four fingers of one hand plus four fingers of the other hand (except the thumbs, which are distinguished from other fingers). However, when man wished to indicate number “seven” with his fingers to onlookers, then he had to detract one of his fingers so that only seven remained. He did that by retracting one of the fingers (usually the little finger on one hand) into his palm, thus hiding it from the view of onlookers. In other words, he used to “spare or save” one of the eight fingers for himself, by bending one of them inwardly into his palm so that only seven fingers were visible outwardly. Thus, actually number seven was defined as one “spared or saved for one’s self” as can be deducted from the Greek variants hebdos and hebdemos, as well as Slavic sedmi from the authentic *seb-dimi, all containing the reflexive pronoun sebh- as the first member of these compound terms.

This authentic meaning of the term denoting number seven, viz. “spared/saved for oneself” is well preserved in the Hebrew Bible. Whatsmore, the author of the Book of Genesis, chapter 2, played paronomastically on this authentic meaning of the word, claiming that God rested from all his work on the seventh day which he had taken exclusively for himself, as an Holy day. The term denoting “seventh day” viz. šabbāṯ morphologically is close to the Slavic soba viz. “room, authentically a separate space devoted for one person, i.e. for one’s own self” related to o-soba (variant o-seba) “person, self” derived from the reflexive pronoun se, sebe. In Akkadian sebe alone denoted number “seven”!

Phonetically the Hebrew term (with doubled voiced consonants “b”) matches exactly the Sanskrit sabhā “a place, viz. room, chamber or hall for public meeting, authentically a space set apart per se, for a special purpose, a place allocated for a particular use”, the term of the same origin as Slavic and Hebrew terms mentioned previously. Note that the doubling of Hebrew voiced plosive consonants “BB” corresponds to the Sanskrit aspirated voiced plosive “BH” (analogously as the Hebrew šadday with doubled “DD” corresponds to the Sanskrit “DH” in sādhaya, for which refer to “Veda vs. Tetagrammaton”).

It is further related to the German ethnic term Schwaben which means literally: “those being or living on their own terms, viz. free people” and the Slavic svoboda (with the variant slobođa in South Slavic) “freedom, liberty, RELEASE”, all derived from the reflexive pronoun self (se, sebhe, svobho). And again German form matches the Hebrew, both displaying ʃ-type phonetic mutation. The etymological connection between all these words is evident from the Deuteronomy, chapter 15.

“At the end of every SEVEN years you shall make a RELEASE.” (It is referred to human beings and land (soil, ground) equally!), etc.

6) f-Type Phonetic Mutation
The most significant example is the common word for “offspring” viz. Hebrew nefëš, German Neffe, Old English nefa, > modern nephew, etc. And though Hebrew and Germanic share the same f-type and ʃ-type phonetic mutations, Hebrew in contrast with German displays the correct Aryan Voicing of consonants, being much closer to the authentic Aryan pronunciation than Germanic languages. From the evidence collected and expounded previously it is absolutely clear that German tongue and Germanic tongues generally, contrary to the accepted views of Adolf Hitler and most of German Sanskritists and Orientalists, have never been a part of the Aryan family proper, but the members of the “demonic” Paiśācī-group of languages!!!

7) The mutations of r-phoneme
Another feature of the authentic Paiśācī resembles Chinese for its analogously substituting the Aryan vibrant continuant liquid r-phoneme (considered by ancient Vedic Aryans and Slavs as the mark of manly or adult talk) by the non-vibrant lateral liquid l-phoneme (considered the mark of infant or baby talk). Sometimes the r-phoneme is substituted in Chinese by the vocalic glide “y” which is also a mark of infant talk. Note that as a rule all polysyllabic Aryan words are downsized to monosyllables in order to conform to the monosyllabic structure of the Chinese language by way of apheresis, syncopation, contraction, elision and metathesis. Thus, for example, the word America is shortened by apheresis, “r” is substituted by “y” to form a diphthong, and the adjectival termination –ka is dropped since it resembles Chinese word guo (pronounced kwo) for “land/state”, giving the form (a)me(y)i > Mei + guo meaning “Beautiful land”.

NB. Among the Slavic people small infants use to pronounce the word Amerika almost identically as adults Chinese do, viz. as Mei(y)i, featuring r > y change!

8) The Origin of the Terms “Piśācas” and “Paiśācī”
The Sanskrit term Piśācas, judging from Phonetical point of view is most likely related to the Slavic words pisak (undoubtedly of imitative onomatopoeic origin) denoting “a strident, harsh, screechy, shrieky, shrilling sound, or whistle
9) The Distinction between Aryan vs. Paisācī-tongues in Practice
The distinctive differences between Aryan vs. Paisācī-tongues can be observable most plainly and conspicuously by tracking the development of the greatly diverse and multifarious forms of the oldest common word for “Heaven, Sky” with the explanations found in the Vedic texts concerning its evolution.

The term Veda has twofold meaning: as a verb it means “I know/he, she, it knows” and is semantically equivalent to the Latin “scio”, whereas as a noun it means “science” and is equivalent to the Latin term “scientia” (viz. science). In spite of its somewhat metaphorical language, Veda is essentially Natural Science, and is objective, attestable and verifiable as natural science should be. Vedic texts are indispensable for the hermeneutics of these ancient linguistic forms, since they have preserved the initial stage of evolution of the common term for „Heaven, Sky“. In the oldest Vedic philosophical text, viz. Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, V 113. it is written: “evaṁ daivī vāg anuvādati stanayitmur Da Da Da iti...” viz. “The Heavenly Voice of Thunder repeats the same: Duh, Duh, Duh,...” From the above passage it becomes perfectly clear that the sound “D” was selected by the ancients on its resembling acoustic properties as the signifier of Thunder(ing Heaven)! The short vowel “a” is considered by Sanskrit grammarians as an inherent part of every consonant, so only the plosive consonant “D” is to be counted as bearing the distinctive feature of the sound of Thunder.

Man has five senses: three short-range (touch, smell, taste) and two long-range ones (sight and hearing), the latter two providing long-distance perception, hence they are most important in perceiving the world around. The perception of sound (especially low and loud) has the most dramatic psychological impact on man because it exerts powerful effects not only to the sense of hearing proper (viz. ear) but onto entire body (viz. abdomen and inner organs) of living beings. Long before the invention of cannons and explosives the thunder of Heaven was almost the only natural source of explosions (and rarely earthquakes and volcanoes) so that ancients developed quite a dramatic perception of its manifestations. From the natural association of thunder with light(ning) sprung a primitive erroneous Geocentric notion of Thunder-god as the creator of Light and Day independently and prior to the existence of the Sun, as is delineated in the Book of Genesis, 1.1-16. “In the beginning God created heaven and earth. The earth was formless and void and darkness covered the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God hovered upon the water. And God said, Let there be light...and God divided the light from the darkness...and God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night...” (on the first day, then he made the firmament on the second day) and only just on the fourth day “God made the two great lights: the larger light (viz. the Sun) to rule the day and the smaller light (viz. the Moon) to rule the night.”

And while the authors of the Bible ceased to evolve from this erroneous geocentric notion, the Vedic seers were well aware of the error in the earliest layers of the Vedic texts, so they developed a superior Meno-Helio-centric system of the universe in which the Moon and the Sun were considered the creators of Heaven and Earth (e.g. Rig Veda II 40, etc.). The other vocalic constituents of the term for “Heaven” had been selected on the ground of their acoustic properties, viz. the vowel “i” (spelled as the English “ee”) displaying acoustically highest frequency formants among vowels (as high front close vowel), being phonetically associative with Light and Height (viz. with Heaven from which thunders and lightnings come down). Therefore, the rootword di in Sanskrit verbal forms came to mean “to shine, be bright” (viz. dīleit “he shines” etc.). However, the same rootword di is preserved in Slavic compound duž-dí in its authentic sense, viz. “Heaven, Sky”, whereas the prefix duž denotes “altered, non-authentic state of something, (derived from the word du “two, secondary, not original one”), hence meaning “bad, worsened”, being semantically analogous to English prefix mis- “wrong, bad erroneous” derived from Proto-Germanic *missa “divergent, astray” or literally “in an altered or changed manner”. The compound as a whole appears to “rain (sc. rainy sky)”, in its modern variants spelled variously as e.g. dužd, duž’d, desezh, desž, des’t, duž’d etc. with final short reduced unaccented vowel “i” of the authentic rootword di (authentically mid central unrounded, non-labialized vowel) now pronounced as mid-central vowel “s”, but is omitted in writing, whereas the accented reduced short vowel “u” of the prefix duž- (authentically mid central rounded viz. labialized vowel) mutated and is now spelled either as the short vowel “a” or “e”). Since the thundering Heaven, represented phonetically by the rootword di, brings rain down to earth it acquired the meaning “life” in Sumerian, with obligatory de-voicing of the initial voiced plosive into ti (as by all Paisaci-tongues).

The earliest recorded derivative from the rootword di denoting “Heaven/God” extended by the nasal ending –n is Sumerian compound term din.gir literally “moving (gir) across Heaven (din), hence God“ (as opposed to kin.gir “moving upon earth, viz. men”, derived from ki “earth, land”, akin to classical Greek ge, Doric ga, Mycaean Greek Ma ka “Mother Earth”, showing genetic connection between Earth and Man as her offspring; the same concept is observable in Doric Da-mater, and common Greek De-meter “Earth-mother” from which derived demos “people”, see Note 3).

Its cognates found widespread among Altaic languages, e.g. Beltir Tingir, Mongol Tengri, Buryat Tengeri, Tatar Tanger, Yakut Tangara, etc. displaying de-voiced initial consonant as by all Paisaci-tongues, are the proofs that Sumerian Dingir was also pronounced with de-voiced initial (authentically voiced plosive in Vedic Sanskrit as the signifier of thundering Heaven)! It is also found in Etruscan Tin “Jupiter” and Greek dialectal variant forms of Zeus, viz. Cretan Tin, Tan, Ten (with de-voiced initial as by all Paisaci-tongues), as well as Doric Zan and Zen, pronounced Dzan/Tsan and Dzen/Tsen < *Dian/Tian and Dien/Tien, of which cognate is the Chinese Tian (pronounced Tien, with de-voiced aspirated initial, a hallmark of Paisaci-tongues) meaning “day, sky, heaven” (see Note 4). NB. The distinction between nominative and accusative of the Greek nasal ending forms was made by accent, viz. the acute in the nominative vs. the circumflex in the accusative. There can be no doubt that the forms with nasal ending are older than Dyau, Dyava, Dyavi, as well as Zeus, Iove, Yahweh etc. since they are found in Sumerian, Etruscan and Altaic tongues which apparently lost their close ties with the advanced Vedans and ceased to evolve.

As for Chinese terms, Kong Ying Da, a noted scholar from the Tang dynasty, 7th c. CE., clarified their meanings as follows: “Di (< *Tigs), Tian ye, Tian shen, Tian di.”
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viz. “Di and Tian (Heaven) are the same. Heaven is Spirit, Heaven is Divinity”. Sky or Heaven is like a natural giant screen on which all the changes during the course of time become clearly visible, day into twilight into night into dusk etc. As Jesus said in Matthew, chapter 16.1-3:

“In the evening you say, It will be fair weather because the sky is red. In the morning you say, It will be foul weather today because the sky is red and lowering. You can forecast weather by Judging the appearance of the sky.” Hence the same term for “Heaven” came to denote “day” too, e.g. Sanskrit dina, Old Slavic dini > modern variants dan, den, dzien, etc., Latin nun-dinae (ninith day) etc. However, the ancient Vedans became aware that Heaven besides its Bright Diurnal aspect also has Dark Nocturnal aspect. Moreover, Heaven or Sky changes even throughout the day, and though usually it is Sunlit, Bright and Blue during the day, it may turn Dark, Murky, Gloomy, Cloudy and Rainy when atmospheric pressure is down low. Conversely, if atmospheric pressure is high, Sky or Heaven may appear Clear, Moonlit, and Starry by night when it is usually Dark, so it may appear as the Slavs use to say that “Moonlight shines like the Day”!

Therefore, they added the darkest of the vowels, viz. vowel “u” (spelled as the English “oo”) (displaying acoustically the lowest frequency formants among vowels, as low back rounded vowel) in order to indicate the Dark appearances of Heaven, thus created the term reflecting Reality as the unity of two opposite but complementary principles (viz. White-Black, viz. Bright-Dark, and Diurnal-Nocturnal, in Sanskrit termed sakla-kṣyna, or in its older form sakra-kṣyna from which the Chinese terms yang-yin evolved, see Note 5), in other words the concept of Integral Dualism (which is fundamental to Vedism), as can be observed in the Sanskrit root form for Heaven, viz. *dīu > pronounced div or du (depending on the place of accent).

That the Vedans were fully aware of Heaven’s dual (Bright/Dark) aspect is clearly evident from the Rig Veda X 68.11 whereby the Dark Nocturnal aspect of Dyaus is pictured as a Black Steed, viz. śyāva “dark-colored” aśva “horse” kṣanebbih “adorned with pearls”, in contrast to its Diurnal Bright aspect pictured as a red Bull viz. uṣirya vṛṣabha (cf. Rig Veda V 36.5 and V 58.6).

This Vedic concept of “Heaven, Sky” disavows the commonly adopted erroneous view widespread among modern contemporary self-styled Proto-Indo-Europeanists, according to which the PIE form of the word for “Heaven” denoted likely “the Daylight Sky” (and that only in their futile Constructions and fictitious Inventions), proving indisputably that the original designation of the term denoting Heaven in fact covered both Diurnal and Nocturnal, as well as Bright and Dark (viz. White and Black) aspects of Heaven.

The same forms are observable in Latin dium “open sky”, Old Slavic divu “an ominous bird symbolic of the dark inauspicious aspect of Heaven”, Hittite šē < *Tiu (“Sun”-god), ancient Egyptian Šyw (pronounced Šyu < *Tyu “the god of atmosphere”), Old English Tig (modern Tues-day or the day of Heaven, again with de-voiced plosive initial as by all Paisaci tongues, etymologically related not to the day of Latin god Mars (the god of war), but to Italian Giove-di < Latin love-dies “the day of love, viz. Jupiter”! The old form *Tiwaz or thundering Heaven was substituted by Thorr, a specifically Germanic god of thunder, from which derived English Thurs-day), Old High German Ziu or Zio (pronounced Tsiu/Tsio from Proto-Germanic *Tiwaz).

The ancients undoubtedly perceived the thunder of Heaven as yelling, viz. commanding and threatening supernatural voice of Heaven personified. Hence, Mandarin Chinese term Di (Pinyin Romanization), or Ti (Wade Romanization, as it is actually pronounced), derived from Old Chinese *Tig(s) matching exactly the Anglo-Saxon Tig (or Tew, genitive Tives > Tues-day), acquired the meaning “emperor” besides authentic “Heaven, god, supreme ruler” (see Note 6), (both Chinese and Old English being the closest cognates of the Anatolian forms, e.g. Palaic Tiyav; Lydian Tiv, Luvian Tiwāt “Sun-(god)” but with semantic shift in meaning from “Heaven” in favor of the “Sun-(god)”; and also Hittite šiwat “day”, see Note 7). The thundering Heaven as a rule was often associated or even identified with the light of the Sun itself, e.g. Greek Zeus, Hebrew Yahweh, Baltic Perkunas, Slavic Jako-bogu, and his Vedic cognate Indra-bhaga as the successor of Dyaus. There is also Old Norse Tivar “gods (plural)” matching the Luvian Tiwart(iya) “pertaining to Sun”, which confirms Germanic genetic ties with Near East languages (naturally, including Hebrew).

The ancients also noticed that between those two sharply opposed aspects of Heaven there is a transitional phase neither bright nor dark (in English called appropriately “twilight”, viz. two lights, a blend of both), hence they selected vowel “a” (as neutral one between bright and high “i” and dark and low “u”) to designate that aspect of Heaven. Therefore, the vowel “a” had to be inserted in between di and u, thus forming the diphthong stem of the word, viz. *Di + a + u > Dyau (the medial “i” had to change into glide between consonant and following vowel), which became authentically Dyaus(s). On the other side, the ancient Greek form for Heaven, viz. Zeus(s) < *Diu(s), displays the flagrant Greek change from authentic “a” into “the bleating e-vowel” of the sheep and goats (just in the same way as the vowel “a” is pronounced in Modern English, see Note 8). This bleating of the Greeks permeated all aspects of life in ancient Hellad, as it were the goat their tribal totem in antiquity (cf. Sanskrit mātar, Latin/Slavic mater/mati, Chinese ma, Sumerian a-ma for “mother”, but the common Greek mē(tēr) like the “me” cry of the sheep and goats, though Doric Greek had (Dā)-mā(tēr), and Mycanaean Greek ma, and NOT me! They even conceived the All-God Pan (related to Vedic Pusan) as having hindquarters, legs and horns of a goat (due to their erroneous interpretation of the Vedic symbolic designation of god Pusan as one “having Goats instead of Horses yoked to his chariot”, namely, the goat symbolically represented the god Agni or the sacred Fire), so their speech seemed to reflect such an erroneous attitude (subsequently, the unwise medieval Christians even equated the Greek god Pan superstensively and nonsensically with biblical Satan). Ancient Greeks had much difficulties in grasping commonly inherited Vedic ideas and concepts because of their inferior intellectual capacity, which they tried to overcome by superstition and inflated imagination. This was actually responsible for developing a notion of Zeus as primarily “daytime (daylight) Sky” (opposed to his spouse Hera who impersonated “night-time” and Dark feminine or yin principle) which eventually led the self-styled Proto-Indo-Europeanists to the Erroneous Conclusion (mentioned previously above) that it must have been the original authentic Proto-Indo-European concept of the God of Heaven/Sky. The final –s termination in the nominative case was intended to indicate closing of the day in the evening naturally with sleep, svapna in Sanskrit, hypnos in Greek, which spread from that onto other nouns and words as the common nominative termination. In Sanskrit the final –s alternate with –h analogously to human breathing during sleep, viz. so (for inhaling or breathing in) versus ham (for
exhaling or breathing out). Throughout the declension of the root/stem *Dhau* various terminations are added to, causing the medial (viz. intervocalic) “u” to change into glide, viz. “v” between vowels analogously as the vowel “i” changed into “y” previously), viz. *Dhia-a* > *Dyava*, etc. To sum up, the sounds of speech used to designate the word for Heaven were not selected accidentally or arbitrarily but every sound reflected specific natural aspect of Heaven:

D (thundering Heaven) + *iy* (Bright Heaven) + a (twilight) + u/v (Dark Heaven) = *Dyava*, from which derived Sanskrit *Dyava*, Latin *Iove* Pater, as well as Hebrew *Yava* and *Yave* (viz. *Yah-weh!*) The two “h” letters are just matres lectionis, used only as the guidance for proper spelling, like in English, e.g. the instruction for spelling of the word *manipulation* is given as *māh-nip-yuh-leh-shun*, written with three non-existent “h” sounds! As is the sound of thunder temporary and impermanent, so its linguistic counterpart the plosive sound “D” too is subject to elision, hence it is missing in Latin, Hebrew and Greek as explained previously. The Hebrew and Latin forms (Yahweh and Love) are further evidence that the authentic constituent vowels of the term for Heaven were *i-a-u* (and not *i-e-u* as in Greek!) The utilization of the acoustic properties of the same vowels (usually written “ee” and “oo”) for the distinction High-Low, Small-Large, Bright-Dark is well observable also in English, e.g. English words “tweet and twitter”, denoting “light, chirping, high-frequency bird-like talk”, and “tweeteer”, viz. a small high-frequency loudspeaker, in contrast with “woofeer”, denoting a large and massive loudspeaker for the reproduction of low-frequency sounds.

**D) SU-family vs. HU-family of Languages**

Another important distinction is made between SU- vs. HU-family of languages. The SU and HU-family of languages are named after the Aryan word meaning “well, good”, pronounced *su* in Sanskrit, Slavic, Latin and Old Irish, but spelled *hu* in Greek, Iranian, Celtic (except for Old Irish and its derivatives Gaelic and Goidelic), Chinese and even North-American native tongues, viz. Siouan (spoken by Sioux people), Omaha and Tetons, e.g. Sanskrit *su-mnha* vs. Greek *hu-mnos* both meaning “hymn”! The forms *su* and *hu* represent the Zero Grade of the word. In Chinese and native North-American tongues the word is preserved in its extended Full Grade, being a phrase or Greetings in its own right, e.g. Chinese *Ni hao*! And North-American Red Indian (viz. Siouan/Omaha/Tetons’) simple greetings *Hao* (being slightly Americanized and represented in script as *How*)! However, in Sanskrit and Greek it functions mainly as prefix in compounds, e.g. Sanskrit *sau-bhaga* “well-fare, good luck”, *sva-dhiita* (with inverted vowel sequence *sua*) “well-placed, solid, firm” (besides usual simple Zero Grade form *sudhita*), etc. Greek compound words are composed with irregular prefix *eu-* (instead of the proper form *euhe*), e.g. *eu-logia*, *eu-sebia*, *eu-angelion*, etc. NB. In Classical Greek the initial laryngeal *h* was unstable and subject to elision, cf. e.g. Herodotus’ rendering *Arakhotos* and *Indos* of the original Iranian names of the rivers *Harakhaiti* and *Hindu*, whence comes the incorrect form *India* for the Land of the Bharatas, instead of the more correct form *Hindia* (note that the language spoken there is called *Hindi* or in its earliest medieval proper form *Hindvi*!) Here below are given the examples in comparison with Chinese Mandarin vs. Aryan and other so-called Indo-European languages:

1a) *hao* “good, well” (departing tone, viz *3*<sup>rd</sup> Mandarin tone), related to Avestan *hu*-, Greek *hu-*, *heu* > *eu*, Sanskrit and Slavic, *su*- *sau*— Old Irish *so-scell(a)e* “good-news, viz.

translated from Latin *eu-angelium* < Greek *eu-aggelion*; *suthain* “eternal, or literally very-old, or of good-age, i.e. very-aged”.

1b) *hao* “to love, like” (entering tone, viz. *4*<sup>th</sup> Mandarin tone), related to Cymric (Welsh) *hy-gar* “loveable, like-able, amiable, literally love-worthy, i.e. worthy of love”. Naturally, there are many words distinguished by simple *S* vs. *H* like the following terms: Sanskrit *sapta* vs. Iranian *hepta* Latin *septem* vs. Greek *hepta* all denoting “seven”, but there are other examples involving Chinese Mandarin words too:

2) *huang* “brilliant, shining”, *Avestan* *huvuaro* (Late Avestan *hu, huro*) Gen. *huvon* “Sun”, Cymric *hul* (Breton *huel*); Old Cornish *hual*; Vedic *suvar* and *suvr*, Latin *sol*, Old Slavic *shinice* (modern *sunc* “Sun”, Old Irish *sail* “eye”)

3) *Xi Hao* (or *He*) “Sun-Goddess (solar charioteer)” reconstructed as *hral* (or *hngral*) gool (by Zheng Zhang, 1987, 2003), related to *hueghuel* < PIE *sueghuel* “the Sun” (Pokorny/Starostin, 2016). NB. Zhoub Ji Xu (2003) reconstructed it erroneously as *xral* *guaal*, with initial “s”, but this is wrong because Chinese is one of the *Hu*-tongues as demonstrated above.

**Conclusion**

The above classifications A,B,C,D cover all the varieties of distinctive properties of different languages needed for making most precise distinctions between various groups and families of ancient languages as well as between their modern derivatives.

**Dedication**

This paper is DEDICATED to the Loving Memory of my Dear Mother Nada Tesla who passed away on February 18, 2016. just 40 days before her 85th Birthday (born on March 29, 1931).

**Notes**

1. The term *anāsas* was erroneously and nonsensically taken by Griffith, Walker, Eliade, etc. to mean “noseless”, despite the fact known to everyone that there have never existed either humans or even *pithecanthropi* without noses.


3. Sumerian *gir* akin to Latin *gerere* “to wear, carry (on)”, Italian *giro* “race”, Slavic *greti* “to go”, even Japanese *geri* “kick”, all indicating the movements of hands and feet!

4. In Chinese as in English, both Paisaci-tongues, the Unvoiced plosive initials *t*, *p*, *k*, are additionally *aspirated*, viz. followed by a sharp audible puff of breath, known by its Latin term *spiritus asper*.

5. Chinese *yang* “bright” < Old Chinese *lang* < downsized from Sanskrit *sakalam*, by apheresis, Chinese *yin* “dark” < Old Chinese *klyim*, downsized from Sanskrit *kri(y)a*m), by elision, syncopation and contraction.

6. The Mandarin Chinese *Di*, pronounced *Ti* < *Tig*(s), with de-voiced initial, erroneously reconstructed by most historical phonologists either as *tikh* (Lee), *tigh* (Schuessler) *teegs* (Zhangzheng), *teks* (Baxter-Sagart), or *tees* (Zhou).

7. Chinese *Tig*(s), Anglo-Saxon *Tig*, and Palaic *Tiyaz*, display the “g” and “y” respectively, as substitutes for labial vocalic glide “v/w”!
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