



# International Journal of Sanskrit Research

अनन्ता

ISSN: 2394-7519

IJSR 2017; 3(3): 36-45

© 2017 IJSR

www.anantaajournal.com

Received: 12-03-2017

Accepted: 13-04-2017

Milorad Ivankovic

Omladinski trg 6/4, SRB-26300

Vrsac, Serbia

## The Vedic God Mitra the Mitrani and MAP the Inviolable Guardian of the Sacred Vedic Lore

**Milorad Ivankovic**

### Abstract

For more than a century the whole academic community has been fooled by a very few of the so called “Learned Sanskritists” in the West through their Flagrant Misuse and Misinterpretations of the Sanskrit grammar and language. Under such circumstances, it is absolutely inadmissible and unacceptable the absence of adequate reaction by the prominent Academics, Professors, and Experts (acronymically: Apes) from the (in)famous centers of learning: Harvard, Yale, UCLA, Austin TX, Oxford, Cambridge, SOAS London, Tübingen, Bonn, Berlin, etc. which actually reveals and testifies of their Incompetence, Dilettantism, and Charlatanism, viz. just their *aping* a really competent scholarship. We are greatly indebted to our Noble Vedic ancestors for the sacred lore inherited through the Vedic oral tradition and is our duty to denounce all those deceptive, false and fake non-authentic modern theories that have been promoted by incompetent “Learned Sanskritists”. And we bow to the unrivaled and unsurpassed grand Vedic thinkers. (See Note 1).

**Key Words:** Meillet, Thieme, Bolero, Skepticism, Reflexive Participle, Mitrani

### Introduction

The article “Le dieu indo-iranien Mitra” by Antoine Meillet (1866-1936) historically viewed, was the beginning of a new perilously deviant trend in Indo-Iranian studies in the West, characterized by loading the authentic Vedic words with arbitrarily “invented” meanings in an arrogant, shortsighted and narrowviewing attempt by the Western scholars (who were intellectually incapable of grasping the higher knowledge expounded in the Vedic texts) to teach IN RETROSPECT the unsurpassed Vedic seers how they should have had to conceive their gods and their religion, thus despising the profound genuine insights attained by the ancient Vedans, in order to promote their own insatiable vanity.

### Meillet

In 1907 the Frenchman Antoine Meillet came with his fixed idea that the Old Iranian (Avestan) god Mithra in fact represented and literally meant “Contract”, thus actually deprecating the capacity for logical thinking of the ancients who like powerful Romans, firmly believed in Mithras Deus Sol Invictus, viz. God Mithra the Unconquered Sun !

His fictitious “invention” was particularly admired by a Hitlerjugend guy named Paul Thieme who became Meillet’s most prominent epigone and his most loud spokesman. It is irrelevant whether was Thieme a formal member of Hitlerjugend or not, since he had been maturing psychologically, intellectually and scholarly during the Hitler’s rule, and was inevitably, at least subconsciously, indoctrinated by Hitler’s ideology.

Thieme first expressed his admiration for Meillet’s idea in 1938 at the peak of Hitler’s power in his article

titled: *Der Fremdling im Rigveda* and became Meillet’s most devout follower, zealously trying to prove that the Rigvedic Mitra also means nothing but “Contract”. His insistence on sticking to only one unchangeable meaning of the Vedic terms reveals his personal adherence to iron rule and dictatorship, and his sophomoric ignorance of the Vedic language which is polyvalent and polysemic in accord with the motto formulated by the grand Vedic seers, Aitareya Mahidāsa: *paro’kṣapriyā iva hi devāh* viz. “Gods are indeed fond of cryptography” (Aitareya Brahmana, 3.33) and Yājñavalkya Vājasaneyā: *paro’kṣakāmā hi devās* viz. “Gods are indeed desirous of cryptography” (Śatapatha Brahmana, 6.1.1.2).

**Correspondence**

Milorad Ivankovic

Omladinski trg 6/4, SRB-26300

Vrsac, Serbia

### “Bolero“ Maurice

Thieme obviously developed inferiority complex towards his senior French scholars and artists for he at the beginning of his monograph on Mitra (1957) <sup>[27]</sup> cited Maurice Ravel’s motto, viz.

“...great art is simply a supreme form of pretense“ in order to establish firm foundations of his interpretations of Vedic Mitra. As for Ravel and his (in)famous “Bolero“, it is an uninventive, monotonous and dull composition, like a military march. It’s not surprising that Ravel’s work was so appealing to Thieme, because “Bolero“ was quite compatible with Hitler’s dictatorial iron rule and the marching of his SS (Schutzstaffel, viz. “security echelon“) paramilitary death squadron and personal bodyguard of the Fuhrer himself. Of course, the youthful members of Hitlerjugend too often used enthusiastically to display themselves marching before the happy smiling face of their beloved Fuhrer, shouting in (a state near) trance: Heil Hitler! Sieg Heil!

(see Note 2).

We do not blame him for that, but for a much serious crime, viz. a criminal act of falsifying the rules of the Sanskrit grammar, an unprecedented linguistic crime of which he was caught *in flagrante delicto*.

As regards Thieme’s perverted view of Vedic poetry as a form of Pretense it should be said for the truth sake, that Vedic poetry was NOT composed for PRETENSE or for Poetry’s sake viz. as l’art pour l’artisme, but was REAL down to Earth, and non-pretending at all.

(see Note 3).

Veda is primarily NATURAL and Exact SCIENCE, and not Poetry for Poetry’s sake.

As for Ravel, it might be observed that he could have found much better use as shoeshine boy to the truly grandeur figures in Music Art such as Chopin, Liszt, Debussy, etc.

As Germain Bazin profoundly detected the essence of Hindu concept of man, god and the universe, from analyzing Hindu art, especially “Descent of the Ganges“ a monumental relief carved in a living rock: “the flux of life runs through all Hindu art, One and Indivisible ...sculptured forms were not detached from the rock face...but they draw their life from the block of which they are still a part, the Hindus conceiving nothing as distinct from its surroundings, but seeing everything in every thing“ in his masterpiece:

“A History of Art from Prehistory to the Present“ he came at most profound insights into the Hindu worldview from art perspective (first published in 1953, but it seems that Thieme never heard of it).

Bazin was capable of attaining higher knowledge of the authentic Hindu worldview by inferring it from Hindu Art, since art is the form of expressing one’s subconscious self, viz. one’s sincerity free from interference of the thinking brain, viz. non deliberately, unintentionally, without any definite exercise of one’s will, spontaneously, instinctively, than all those modern so called “Learned Sanskritist“ together, by their worthless guess-work based on superficial textual analysis of the ancient texts.

It is worthy to remember that “From greatest Sincerity comes greatest Achievement“ as said by the ancient Chinese philosopher Confucius.

Modern man alienated from Mother Nature is hardly capable of thinking in Vedic categories and to see things with the eyes of the Vedic seers.

Vedic view is essentially the one of Integral Dualism viz. holistic, conceiving Reality as the unity of opposite but complementary principles expressed in the form of binary algorithm viz. natural-social, abstract-concrete, divine-humane, celestial-terrestrial, etc.

Apparently, Thieme was inclined to follow the worst examples possible, viz. Meillet, Ravel, and Zarathustra !

### Thieme

It is a thing to regret that Paul Thieme throughout his long life (1905-2001) remained completely unaware of his errors, mistakes and misinterpretations of the sacred Vedic texts, grammar and language, which sprung undoubtedly from his youthful indoctrination by Hitler’s erroneous ideas and theories about pure Aryan race. Being innately merciful, compassionate and empathic, we cannot but feel sorry for Thieme’s incapacity for overcoming his vanity and attaining proper insights into the sacred Vedic lore. Thieme was obsessed with sin and guilt, and accordingly he used to load Vedic terms with it (e.g. *Aditi* with “Non-Guilt, Guiltlessness“ vs. *Diti* “Guilt“), which is not surprising, after all those innumerable atrocities, genocide and an attempt at total holocaust of the Jews, Gypsies, and Slavs, committed by the Fuhrer himself and his most zealous followers.

And although we agree with the late Chinese (Taiwanese) Professor Cheng Man-ch’ing, the Master of Five Excellences (viz. calligraphy, painting, poetry, t’ai chi boxing, and Chinese traditional medicine), that “We must be KIND to BLIND men“, we are greatly indebted to our most Noble Vedic ancestors, the Vedans, hence it is our duty (and Thieme also spoke of duty, see Note 4) to denounce Thieme’s errors, rooted in his intellectual blindness, narrowness and limitedness, for the sake of the Truth expounded by the Eternal Vedas.

### Thieme’s Grave Offence to the Vedans

Thieme seriously offended our Most Noble Aryan ancestors, the Vedans by his remark that the Vedic society was an “undeveloped society“ (cf. Thieme, 1957, p.61) <sup>[27]</sup>! In comparison with the Iron Rule and Dictatorship of the Third Reich, in which every individual was “disciplined“ like a robot or zombie under vigilant surveillance of the Gestapo and SS death squadrons, while every family drove VW (Volkswagen), Vedic society might look “undeveloped“ to some extent.

But Thieme overlooked the fact that the advanced car industry was in fact based on the Vedic indispensable invention of “Wheel“ modeled after *Pūṣṇas cakra* the Eternal Indestructible vehicle of the God (cf. Rig-Veda, VI 54.3). Apart from technological advancement, modern society is in every aspect inferior to the Perfect social structure of the ancient Free Vedic society constituted of Four “Colors“ or Varnas: Priests, Kingly and Warrior Class, Agriculturists, and Working Class (servants, hired workers).

### Luders

German scholar Heinrich Luders (1917) <sup>[15]</sup> after accepting Meillet’s theory on Mitra he underwent an interesting investigation in his paper on Contract-breach among the ancient Aryans, and found that there existed a belief that a man who breaks a contract would bring death upon male relatives of his kinsfolk.

NB. Incidentally, this belief proved itself absolutely true, e.g. his beloved Fuhrer after breaking the Contract pledged with

Stalin, the head of USSR, brought an unprecedented calamity onto Nazi Wehrmacht soldiers during the dreadful Russian wintertime in WW II.

But this does NOT prove that god Mitra means “Contract” himself!

Following Meillet Luders applied the same methodology for the explanation of the Vedic god Varuna. In his opinion the term Varuna designated the concept of “Eid”, viz. “Oath”, from the root *vr̥* “to close in”, thus Varuna being “ein Eidgott”, viz. God of Oath, moreover the Oath Personified himself!

Thieme firstly conceived Varuna as an appellative noun meaning “protection or protective treaty” (1941) but he abandoned this view after reading Luders’ treatise on Varuna (1951) [16].

Meillet earlier (1907) [19] brought into relationship Varuna with “*vrata*” viz. “vow”, and conjectured that its appellative meaning must have been “Loi, Ordre” viz. “Law, Order”.

In order to reconcile both views Thieme proposed the phrase (syntagm) “True Speech” for Varuna, which in fact is not a translation but rather a description of the term. Thus, evidently all their trials were nothing but insecure guess-work and problematic conjectures.

### The Epigones

Ilya Gershevitch adopted Meillet’s view on Avestan Mithra, and added that Mithra besides being the god of contract is also the god of the Early Morning Light, though he was not able to explain how and why it was so. Moreover, he expressed openly his skepticism as to the correctness of Meillet’s theory altogether, e.g.:

“The question now to consider is whether the Avestan Mithra’s association with the contract is a secondary development due to fortuitous identity of his name with a word for ‘contract’ or represents a, or the primary function of the god...Theoretically, the first position alternative is quite possible...”

Walking in the footsteps of Meillet and Thieme, J.P.Brereton just modified their rendering of Mitra as to mean not exactly “contract” but “alliance” instead.

Another of Meillet’s and Thieme’s loud spokesmen Hanns Peter Schmidt, advocating for Brereton’s view on Mithra as representing “alliance” rather than “contract”.

Recently, Thomas Oberlies (1998) [20] repeating Thieme’s standpoint concludes that “Mitra ist ein klassischer Funktionsgott”. This is a Nonsense for it is not specifically Mitra’s characteristic to have a function, but of every divinity, otherwise it would become a dysfunctional one, and hence unnecessary to exist at all.

This is how and why the oldest Dyaus lost its status in favor to Parjanya “Thunder(er)” (akin to Slavic Perūnu) and Indra-bhaga “Strong-deal(er)” (Slavic Jako-bogu), another name of Thunder(er). Religion too has always been subordinate to the laws of market economy.

Since the main consumers of religious rites (viz. sacrifices) who bore the expenses of the religious performances were the members of the ruling kingly and warrior class, the Thunder-god as the archetype of a Divine Warrior occupied the highest position in a religious system in antiquity, especially among nomadic communities. After the change from nomadic to continual sedentary life-style took place even the Thunder-god was doomed to lose his high position as it was the case with Indra. There is a fabulous story how the Thunder-god was humbled by Vishnu disguised as a brahmin boy who

revealed that every ant was once an Indra the king of gods by virtue of pious deeds, but returned again into ant due to its bad karma (Brahmavaivarta Purana, Krisna-janma Khanda 47.50-161, cf. Zimmer, 1990) [33].

Among Thieme’s imitators there are some American Sanskritists, viz. Stephanie W. Jamison and Joel P. Brereton (2014) [13], as well as German born Michael Witzel (2007) [32], who brazenly undertook the task of translating the whole Rig-Veda anewly in English and German, respectively, with fairly disastrous results.

Nonetheless, all Thieme’s fellow “Learned Sanskritist” overlooked completely like Ignorant Analphabets would do it, his misinterpretation of the rules of Sanskrit grammar in their “learned exegetical analysis”.

### German Skepticism

Even Thieme’s fellow German scholars have been highly skeptic as to the correctness of his interpretations of the Vedic Gods, e.g.

Herman Lommel argued (1962) [14] “Diese Gotter waren fur ihre Verehrer lebendige Wesen, nicht abstrakte Begriffe, nicht Deifikation einer Idee (Vertrag, Bundnis) ...sondern Personen, die man kannte”. Consequently, he argued that the identity of Mithra with the sun already existed in the Avesta.

Hanns-Peter Schmidt following J.P. Brereton, challenged Meillet’s and Thieme’s translation of Mithra as ‘contract’ quoting examples from the Avesta and the Rig-Veda:

“Yasht 10.116-17 gives a list of the degrees of sanctity of different *Mithra*: between friends is 20-fold, ...40-fold between partners, 50-fold between Husband and Wife...80-fold between father-in-law and son-in-law...1,000-fold between two countries...The inclusion of natural relationship make it impossible to take *Mithra* in the sense of “contract”. The sense of “alliance” is the more encompassing sense..... the fact that in later Sanskrit *mitra* means “friend” and in New Persian *mehr* means “love, friendship” has led some scholars to reject Meillet’s thesis. E.Herzfeld assumed the virtual identity of *mithra* with the later Sanskrit and New Persian meanings...W.Lentz argued that a more general definition like “piety” would also do justice to the religious aspect. J.Gonda insisted on Vedic *mitra* “friend, friendship” and not “contract, contract-partner”...

(In the Rig- Veda) among gods and men Mitra created Rain ...The connection of Mitra and *mitra* ‘ally or mediator’ with Peace is rather frequent...As *mitra* ‘ally’ Agni (the Fire) mediates between gods and men...Agni makes Husband and Wife unanimous like a *mitra* viz. well-established ‘ally or mediator’...Savitar the god Impeller, dwells together with the rays of the Sun, encompasses the night from both sides, and becomes Mitra...

The Bridegroom is called *mitra* (cf. Rig-Veda V 52.14, X 27.12)...etc.”

Recently, Georg von Simson (1997) allied with the skeptics, but he also failed to notice Thieme’s grammatical errors. In his view Avestan Mithra represented both the morning and the evening star Venus, while Mitra and Varuna in the Veda represented the morning and the evening manifestations of the planet Venus, respectively.

Their Low German kinsmen (from the Netherlands), viz. two well-known Dutch scholars, Jan Gonda and Franciscus B.J. Kuiper (both followers of the French Sanskritist Abel Bergaigne), they too opposed to Thieme’s views taking Mitra to mean “friend, friendship”. However, they both failed to notice Thieme’s misuse of the rules of Sanskrit grammar (see

Note 5). C. Anghelina (2013) <sup>[1]</sup> argued similarly “What I question and reject here is that these gods are the personifications of such concepts. In fact, to make a comparison, arguing that Mitra or Varuna represent the Contract/Alliance itself would be the same with saying that the Old Testament Yahweh is the embodiment of the Ten Commandments, i.e. the Ten Commandments themselves.” However, she also overlooked Thieme’s flagrant misinterpretations of the Sanskrit grammatical rules, displaying like her colleagues linguistic incompetence and ignorance of the crucial principles of the Sanskrit grammar. Incidentally, she argued that Vedic religion was fundamentally astral, and that Varuna, Mitra, Aryaman (as well as other main Vedic gods) represented stars and constellations, viz. Aquarius, Aldebaran (main star in Taurus, indicating spring equinox), Regulus (main star in Leo, announcing Summer solstice), respectively (2013), but later she revised her guessing and identified Mitra with Pisces/Fish, and Aryaman with Aries/Ram (2014).

### Mitra vs. Brereton’s Alliance

Joel P. Brereton, another among the army of Thieme’s epigones, only seemingly on the surface worked his own variations on the translation of the Vedic terms *Mitra*, *Varuna* and *Aryaman*, but actually he has added nothing essentially different and enlightening save stylistic nuances along the line: “it is not Black but rather Dark, or, it is not Liquid but rather Fluid, etc.”

Brereton too displays just the same degree of incompetence and ignorance of the Sanskrit grammatical rules as all those so-called “Learned Sanskritists” mentioned above.

Americans (laymen and scholars alike) being heavily indoctrinated and brain-washed subconsciously by the biased CIA and Pentagon’s military propaganda, view their North Atlantic Treaty Organization (acronymically NATO Alliance), as divine institution, additionally empowered by American government authority (viz. commandments, see Note 6), founded on American customs (viz. American values).

It seems indeed that the ancient Aryan seers were capable of foreseeing into the future, for if Brereton’s rendering of Mitra/Mithra as “alliance” is correct, then obviously NATO Alliance is the quintessential form of the god Mithra armored with *vazra* (Vedic *vajra*), taking into consideration the role of NATO in modern international affairs and its being equipped with nuclear “firecrackers” (see: “Mithra and Vazra” below). It’s not surprising, therefore, that Brereton subconsciously has used to project his own, sc. American divinized concepts of NATO Alliance, Authority / Commandments, and Customs / Civility (viz. American Values) into the Vedic threesome, viz. Mitra, Varuna, and Aryaman, as the divine representatives of those American-like social institutions. In his narrowness Brereton has not realized that Vedic Mitra is a much more greater power than any earthly, viz. social alliance. He apparently lives under impression that Americans can walk the Moon (and undoubtedly the Sun very soon too). Allegedly the Twelve Magnificent American Space-Apostles, viz. Planetonauts (they were not Astronauts since the Moon is not a star) walked the earthly satellite or planet He-Moon (note that the Moon in Sanskrit and Slavic is male, viz. He-Moon, while in English it has been “transvestitized” into a feamale !) most likely first looking for Jesus and the (his) heavenly Father Yahweh for the origin of which see “Veda vs. Tetragrammaton: Decrypting the Greatest Enigma in History” IJSR, Vol. 3, Issue 1, 2017, p.21-25) but found

nothing, not even Communists were there, so having no one to exploit, American imperialists have lost their interest in it. Incidentally, there are so many proofs that they never landed there, and that only “faked” the performance of landing.

One sure evidence that they were never able to perform it is this: the NASA staff still use the term “the Eclipse of the Sun” which is an absolute Nonsense, since the Sun is the only primary source of Light in our Universe, and hence it cannot go into eclipse (in Slavic the Sun is usually neuter in gender, and becomes male only in curses): if they really walked the Moon then they would witness by their own eyes a phenomenon the Eclipse of the Earth (erroneously called the Eclipse of the Sun) when the body of the Moon interferes into the pathway of Light between the Sun and Mother Earth. Thus, Americans transfer their interest onto the Red planet Mars, hoping for a more lucrative Spoil from there, since Mars, being Red, must have something to do with Communists and the Working Class ready for unscrupulous exploitation by the American capitalists. If they do not succeed according to their expectations, they most likely intend to perform even more amazing feat, viz. to Walk the Sun !!! (since the communists’ USSR did not succeed to perform it).

Then and then only the Americans would experience the real power of Mitra, face to face !!! For his information, he should have to know this, viz. Vedic God Mitra is considered “Bull”, whereas NATO seems to be just a barking dog. NATO is hardly impressive to countries like North Korea (leave it alone China, Russia, India) and even aggressive Islamic jihadists everyday challenge its authority. Mitra is considered “most beloved one” while NATO is hated even by all those American families whose sons lost their lives fighting for the cause of American imperialism throughout the world, not to mention Islamic countries like Iran, where NATO is viewed as the embodiment of Satan himself. Mitra is definitely NOT the divine representative of such concept of Alliance. And what is Mitra in Reality?

### The Real Mitra

But what actually was the real Mitra?

1. Mitra is considered *vṛṣabha* viz. the Bull (Rig-Veda V 63.3), being symbolic for Fire (both Celestial and Terrestrial, viz. the Sun and Ritual Fire) and NOT for “contract”!
2. Mitra is considered *priyatama*, viz. “most beloved, dearest one”. It is highly improbable that any person may consider an abstract “Contract” to be the “most beloved one”, viz. loved more than one’s mom, dad, sister, brother, spouse, sweetheart and relatives.

There is an old saying “If were not for the Poor, even the Sun would NOT shine”! Naturally, therefore, the Sun shines free of charge for all the Poor of the world. This is the Supreme and Ultimate “Divine” ethics ! (see Note 7) And the attribute *priyatama* viz. “the most dear, beloved, lovable” ONLY makes sense if the god Mitra is (equated with) the Sun (and with Fire being consubstantial with the Sun, especially during ice ages when the effects of the Sun’s activity on earth diminishes greatly, and man’s life depends on Fire). Because the Sun is the *ātmā jagatas tasthuśāś ca* viz. ‘soul of all the moving (living beings) and all that having stood (immovable)’ as formulated by the seer Kutsa Āngirasa (Rig-Veda I 115.1). It should also be noted that since times immemorial the word for ‘Sun’ is used as the most frequent hypocoristic term for calling one’s beloved (besides proper “love, dear, darling” e.g. every mother calls her child ‘my Sun’ (since it is so dear

to her as the life-giving Sun) and lovers use the same, or 'honey' instead. As for the 'honey' in the Rig-Veda the term *madhu* 'honey' is used frequently as a metaphor for 'Light' (sc. Sunlight, since without the Sun there can be no permanent light and no life at all).

However, Mitra as every other Vedic divinity has Two forms or aspects, viz. Divine vs. Humane, Celestial vs. Terrestrial, Natural vs. Social. Therefore, the term "mitra" naturally denotes its social aspect apart from being identified with the Sun, fire or daylight (see further below).

3. The Latin word *contractus* (from which derive French *contrat* and English *contract*) is a compound consisting of the prefix *con* + past participle of the verb *trahere*, viz. *tractus*.

There is an analogous term in Sanskrit, viz. *sam* + *gir* > *samgir* having the same meaning, viz. "con-tract, co-venant, con-vention"; and Mitra is a guardian of it, (cf. Rig-Veda X 89.9, both *Mitra* and *samgir* mentioned in the same verse), but Mitra is NOT *samgir* himself !!!

4. Avesta cannot be and is NOT reference for the Veda, but only vice versa is true, since the Veda is at least One Thousand Years OLDER than Avesta (which is just a gravely Distorted Version of the Veda)! Almost all Avestan terms were re-loaded by the meanings of secondary development in comparison with the Vedic ones, viz. they are not authentic ones.

5. Even in the Avesta, Mitra does NOT mean "Contract" either, e.g. in the Avestan Yasht No.10 Verses 116 (A) and 117 (B), respectively, devoted to Mithra, it is mentioned: **A)** *Mithrō antare...huyāghna*, viz. "Mithra between husband and wife (or rather between bride and bridegroom, or fiance and fiancee, viz. boy-friend and girl-friend, since the word *hu-yāghna* actually denotes "one of good faith, viz. fidel, faithful, trustful)". There is an exact "twin" analogy in English tradition of using the term "friend", but as is quite obvious and natural, no one in this world dates or mates with girl-*contract* or boy-*contract*, but ONLY with girl-*friend* and boy-*friend* !!!

Whatsmore, in the Rig-Veda it is said explicitly that a young maiden *yosana* invites *mitra* "bridegroom or fiance/boy-friend" (V 52.14) and that she finds *svayam* "her own" *mitra* "bridegroom, fiance, boy-friend" among men (X 27.12). And Agni the sacred Fire is said that he makes like *mitra* the Lord and the Lady of the House (viz. Husband and Wife) unanimous (Rig-Veda V 3.2).

In view of the above, Thieme's clam that "Mitra is a god of men and ONLY a god of men" is absurd (Thieme, 1978, p. 503). **B)** *antare dahyu...Mithrō*, viz. "Mithra between countries (nations)". There have never been in use the term *contract*-countries anywhere in the world. And again, in English tradition, there is an exact "twin" analogy, viz. *ally*-countries, or friendly nations. And "ally" is synonymous with "friend" and NOT with "contract" !

6. The only daughter of Sultan Suleyman the Magnificent (or Muhteshem Suleyman, 1494-1566) and his legal wife Hurrem Sultan was named *Mihrimah* < Persian *Mihr-i-Mah* viz. "Sun-and-Moon", derived from Avestan *Mithra* + *Māh*.

7. In ancient Roman mysteries, the god Mithra(s) is depicted as killing the White "Albino" Bull, being symbolic of the Cold White Light of the He-Moon (in Vedic the Moon is Male), which becomes killed (viz. saturated) in the Morning by the appearance of the Sun's Heated (Burning) Light in the Eastern Window on the horizon. Exactly because of it Mitra is identified (in both Rig-Veda and in Avesta) with the Daylight (viz. Morning Light), which is Consubstantial with the Sun

(and Fire of course) since without the Sun there can be no Daylight.

NB. Only the ancient and contemporary so-called "Monotheists" believe that god within their primitive Geocentric system of the Universe made first the Day/Light, then the firmament, but he created the Sun not earlier than the Fourth Day of creation, just three days after he created the Day, with Daylight already in existence before the appearance of the Sun (as is claimed by Moses in the first chapter of the Bible, called Genesis, which was borrowed by Muhammad, who braggingly added 7 firmaments instead of the initial Moses' one, apparently influenced by the 7 spheres of Ptolemy's astronomy, in order to impress his contemporaries, boasting how magnificent knowledge he obtained from God, but to no avail, since even Ptolemaic system is equally Geocentric as is Biblical). It was deadly dangerous to think rationally and logically during the Dark Middle Ages in Europe, e.g. the grand Renaissance thinker Giordano Bruno was burned alive, by order of the Pope and his Secret Police called the Inquisition, because he boldly disavowed this Geocentric nonsensical concept of the universe.

By way of comparison, the Vedic sages were aware of this error and developed highly advanced and superior Meno-Heliocentric system of the universe (cf, Rig-Veda II 40, etc.)

#### MAP or RAP

Thieme in his paper on Mitra and Aryaman (1957) <sup>[27]</sup> commented Geldner's translation of Rig Vedic Hymn to Mitra: "Geldner translates *Mitro...bruvānah* 'He who names himself Mitra'...the rendering is, in fact, grammatically unimpeachable...*bruvāna* can of course mean "being named" as well as "naming himself" !

But the fact is that by any means it CANNOT mean "being named" since it is not passive Voice, but Medial-Active or Reflexive-Active Participle (abbreviated acronymically as MAP or RAP)!

This error sprung from the assumption of modern Proto-Indo-Europeanists based on the fact that in Classical Greek Reflexive-Active (also called Medial) and Passive verbs used identical forms in both types of verbs. On the same grounds Proto-Indo-Europeanists postulated the identity of meaning and hence are described as mediopassive Verbs when discussing Greek or Proto-Indo-European. This is an obvious error because of the following reasons:

1. Greek is Not Sanskrit, but an inferior mainly Paisacitongue (cf. "A New Language Classification on the Vedic Model", IJSR, 3(2), 2017) which developed NO distinction between Medial (viz. Reflexive) vs. Passive verbal forms.

2. Proto-Indo-European is an "invented" fictitious category, and not a real language, since language is a living entity and subject to permanent change. Therefore, such theoretically postulated but Never Spoken Language, is inferior in every aspect to highly advanced Sanskrit.

3. In Sanskrit the two forms viz. Reflexive-Active vs. Passive are STRICTLY Distinguished in Form and in Meaning and CANNOT be substituted, and they are not reversible or mutually interchangeable.

#### MAP as the Matter of Life and Death

The Question of Distinction between Reflexive-Active vs. Passive forms in the Vedic era was the matter of Life and Death in the literal and STRICT Sense of the Words. How so ?

Viewed from the perspective of market economy, the most important institute of the Vedic times (when Vedism was a living force in society) was that one of *Yajamāna* viz. “individual who bore the expenses of the sacrifice, viz. sacrificing for his own self/his own benefit”.

The term itself is a Medial-Active viz. Reflexive-Active form of the Present Participle (MAP or RAP) of the verb *yaj* “to sacrifice”. However, by Thieme’s logic, it can be translated in passive voice “being sacrificed” which in other words means that the one who orders a sacrificial act to be performed on his behalf (viz. for his own benefit) actually would become the Victim of the sacrifice Himself!

But the fact is that Medial-Active or Reflexive-Active Participle CANNOT mean that, being strictly distinguished from the Passive Participle form of the verbs, like that of the verb *yaj*, “to sacrifice” > viz. *Yajyamāna* which alone means “being sacrificed”, featuring the Passive INFIX *-ya-*, and therefore it cannot be used as the substitute for *Yajamāna* !

### 1) The construction of MAP or RAP

Present MAP or RAP is constructed by adding the suffix *-māna* (or *-āna* for the 2<sup>nd</sup> class verbs).

The suffix *-māna* apparently derived from the pronoun *aham* “I” in the oblique cases *mām*, *me*, etc. in the same sense as the English *mine* (*myself*) < *I*, and Old Latin *-mina* (cf. *femina*), and accordingly denotes the Reflexive action of an agent, in which the result of an action goes back to the one who acts, viz. *mine* or *myself*, *thine* or *thysself*, *himsself*, *hersself*, *itsself*, *ourselves*, *yourselves*, *themselves*, *oneself*, *one’s own*, etc.

On the same model the ancient Vedans made the Reflexive suffix from the pronoun first person singular *aham/māna* viz. “I/mine”.

In case of the suffix *-ana* it came obviously as the result of false division *aham + āna* (of the above expression *aham + māna*) on the wrong assumption that the Reflexive adjective should begin with *a-* (viz. *āna*) since it derived from the Personal Pronoun *aham* (comparable to non-existent English form “ine < I” instead of the correct “mine < I”) beginning with “a”!

NB. In Slavic the Reflexive Pronoun *se/svoj* “self/own” is used to express any person and number.

### 2) Intransitivity vs. Transitivity

Reflexive form of the Present Participle (depending on applying of the verb transitively or intransitively) may convey different nuances in meaning accordingly, e.g.

a) Present Reflexive-Active Participle of the verb *pac* “to cook”, viz. *pacamāna* means “cooking for one’s self” when the verb is applied Intransitively, but it may mean “cooking oneself” when applied Transitively, though in the latter case, since it indicates “an action Impossible to perform” its meaning is to be understood only figuratively and metaphorically and by no means literally.

There is an exact analogy in Slavic languages, viz. regarding the usage of the Reflexive verbs, e.g. the verb *kuhati* “to cook” in its Reflexive form viz. *kuhati se* (with Reflexive Pronoun *se* added after the verb), literally “to cook one’s own self”, but is actually understood as “to sweat because of excessive heat that one feels inside the body as if cooking one’s self”!

Accordingly the term *Yajamāna* means “Sacrificing for his own behalf, (viz. for himself)” when applied Intransitively, but literally means “sacrificing himself” when applied Transitively, but it is to be understood metaphorically in the

sense “sacrificing something of his own property, viz. money, or equivalent to money such as goods or cows, in order to pay expenses for performing the sacrificial rites”.

But it could NEVER mean “being sacrificed” because it is NOT Passive Voice of the verb!!!

In the same way the Rig-Vedic line *Mitro...bruvāṇah*, the verb *bru* “to say, speak” in its Reflexive form may mean “Speaking for himself” when applied Intransitively. But it is to be understood metaphorically when applied Transitively, and semantically it means exactly as the same verb in Slavic, viz. *kazati* “to say, speak” > Reflexive form *kazati se*, conveying the meaning “to show up, reveal, indicate” and NOT to speak at all!

b) Since the Reflexive-Active forms are NOT preserved in Latin (except for a very few Reflexive-Active Participles turned into adjectives, such as *femina* < *\*dhoi + mina* literally “milking herself, in order to feed her suckling, viz. nursing one, hence woman” and is related to the Slavic verb *dojiti* “to nurse, suckle” and the agent noun *dojilja* “nurse”, akin to Sanskrit *dhayati* “she milks, suckles, nurses”, *dhenu* < *dhainu* “nurse, viz. the female of any species”), the same effect is accomplished in Latin by applying various prefixes to the verbs, e.g. : Latin *dico* “to say, speak” > but *in-dico* “to indicate, show, point out, reveal”!!!

Exactly the same meaning is conveyed by the Sanskrit Reflexive-Active Participle *bruvāṇa* (in Epic Sanskrit it is used rather the regular form *bruvamāna* with the suffix *-māna* instead) viz. Mitra “reveals, indicates, shows himself up”, naturally in the Eastern Window on the horizon in the Morning, (this is a depiction of the rising Sun in the East early in the morning) and thus causes people to associate (see below the Rig-Vedic hymn to Mitra III 59.1 ), after they were confined in their homes through the Night by god Varuna (cf. Atharva Veda IX 3.18).

This verse actually corroborates the notion of Mithras Deus Sol Invictus the ancient Romans worshipped throughout their empire.

That is the Real Meaning of this verse in the Hymn to Mitra in the Rig-Veda (see below). And there exists Not even an allusion to “making contracts” or so in this verse.

### Mitra in Archaic Sense

Here below is the verse in question from the Vedic Hymn to Mitra III 59.1 the author of which is the grand seer Viśvamitra meaning “the *mitra* of everyone” who wrote: *Mitro janān yātayati bruvāṇo* which means “Mitra (Friend) causes people to flock, by revealing (announcing, showing up, pointing out, exposing, or indicating) himself “ ! (viz. Early in the morning, Mitra the Sun, revealing/announcing himself on the eastern window of the horizon, he causes people to associate, the causative verb *yātayati* is related to the Slavic *jatiti se* “to flock“ < *jato* “bevy, flock, gathering“).

Mitra is above an ACTIVE Animate Living Entity who is capable of performing an action onto Himself and by Himself from within, hence it is used Reflexive-Active Participle!

On the other side, the appellative ‘contract’ (or pact, alliance, treaty, covenant or so) is a PASSIVE inanimate fictitious abstract concept incapable of performing an action onto itself and by itself, but require an outside agent/viz. (non-existent) third party to perform it. Hence, Thieme, and his epigones, desperately needed to impose the Greek grammatical rules into Sanskrit thus violating Sanskrit grammar in order to justify their false grammatical construction with aim to



conform it to the Avestan concept of *mithra* as 'contract' (see Note 8).

This same verse, in accordance with the Vedic fundamental concept of Integral Dualism which include opposite but complementary principles, viz. divine vs. humane, celestial vs. terrestrial, Natural vs. Social, is to be understood twofoldly, first as the Sun (see above) viz. Natural, and then as Friend, viz. Social !

However, it is of utmost importance to understand first what was the authentic meaning of the word "Friend". This same word has quite different meaning in modern society than it had in antiquity. Nowadays the word friend means just "an acquaintance or comrade", but the ancients took it more seriously.

Among the Slavic peoples even today the analogous term has a very specific meaning, Slavic *prijan*, *prika* or *prijatelj* viz. "He-Friend" still actually means "kin(sman)-in-law" and primarily designates "Father-in-law", while the term *prija* "She-Friend" designates "Mother-in-law", (the terms is akin to Sanskrit *priya* meaning "friend, love(r), (be)love(d), dear"). Whatmore, all the male kinsmen on both sides (of the bride and of the bridegroom) are called "He-Friends" and all the female kinsmen on both sides are called "She-Friends". Even more importantly the same term is related to the famous divine couple of gods from the Germanic religious mythical tradition known as *Freyr* the god of Sun and Rain, as well as a god of Peace but also conceived as warrior and is one "whom no man hates" (which in other words means that he was "Loved by all" just like Vedic Mitra, see Note 9) and his sister of the same name viz. *Freyja* the goddess of Love and Fertility (from the same origin evolved the Old English adjective *freo* "free, not in bondage, because being loved one", verb *freogan* "to love, think of lovingly, hence to free", nouns *freod* "affection, friendship, peace", *Friga* "Love" derived from *Friya*, goddess of Married Love (in Old English "g" stands for vocalic glide "y", cf. *Frigedaeg* "Friday, viz. Friya's day"), *freo* "wife, viz. beloved", *frithu* "Peace", *freond* "one attached to another by feelings of love and personal regard", *freondscipe* "Friendship, mutual liking and regard", but also "conjugal Love"; and Old Norse *frithr* "Peace, Love, Friendship" !

Compare New Persian identical meaning of *mithra* > *mīhr* viz.: "Love, Friendship", cf. also Slavic cognates *miru* "peace, silence, tranquility", but also "world" synonymous with *svetu* "Light", hence (visible) world, people", and *vse-miru* "whole-world, viz. cosmos, universe"). Apparently the ancients conceived peace (viz. contract of peace) as a result of Love, Kindness, Friendliness, and not vice versa.

Contract may be considered just as By-product of Peace that sprung from Love. NO contract can make one to Love somebody !!!

The Germanic parallels reveals clearly the connection between Peace and Love (liking, kindness) and the Buddhist *māitrī* (derived from *mītra*) viz. one of the *catur brahma-vihāras* or "Four sublime (spiritual/mental) states" conveys the meaning "Loving kindness" (not 'contractual kindness') towards all living beings. Thus, the Vedic concept of Mitra authentically meant "love, viz. dearly beloved one(s)" of which the syllable *mi* is an unmistakable sign. It is of the same origin as Latin *a-mi-(cus)* 'beloved, viz. friend' (cf. *amor* 'Love'),

except that the latter displaying prothetic *a*-vowel (analogously as the Sumerian has *a-ma* vs. Mycaean *ma*, Chinese *ma* English *mom* etc. all of which mean the same viz.

'mother'). And the initial bi-labial nasal *m*- represents not only symbolically but (F)actually the KISS(ing), hence Liking, Love! Etymologically, the suffix *-tra* in Mitra is added to indicate 'transmitter or means' e.g. *man-tra* literally "transmitter of thought(s)/thinking, viz. word" (Thieme, 1957, incorrectly rendered *mantra* as "thought", cf. p.38).

Thus *mi-tra* denotes "means of getting together/uniting/ viz. becoming dear one(s)" (cf. Slavic *mi* < Old Slavic *my* < \**mei* "we", German *mit* "together, with") viz. "means of kissing" and that certainly cannot be contract, but love, friendliness, affection, passion, respect, regard, reverence, esteem.

And as an old saying reminds us: "Love and Marriage go together like a horse and carriage, you can't have the one without the other" ! And it reveals how the Avestan term *mithra* came to be generalized into "contract or alliance" from the initial "kinship-in-law (obtained by marriage)" .

This same concept is verified by Herodotus in his *Historia* relating that the Persians worshipped Aphrodite the goddess of LOVE under the name *Mitra* (see Note 10).

NB. This does not mean that Mitra is Aphrodite, viz. Roman Venus or Freyja after whom is named Dies Veneris of Friday in English, but that he rather authentically combined the functions of both Freyr and Freyja (see above).

Through the Progeny of the bride and bridegroom both sides become connected "by Blood", and as an old saying teaches us "Blood is NOT Water"! Therefore, the "kin-in-law" is regarded by the Slavs as *svojta* viz. "own-kin" or "self-kin" (derived from the Reflexive pronoun *svoj* "self/own", related to the Sanskrit *svayam* "self"), in other words "kin-by-love" (viz. by marriage), and that is the real meaning of the ethnic term *Mitrāni* !

(see below "Mitra and the Mitrāni"). On the account that "Friend, viz. Own-kin" is connected by Blood, he is considered just as one's own "the dearest or most beloved" viz. *priyatama* in Sanskrit !

Thus, when He-Friend comes (viz. presents, shows up himself) into the house of his Kin-in-law, announcing himself (or herself) that "He-Friend (or She-Friend) is here", all the members of the house gather (flock) around (him or her), leaving their other activities, in order to pay respect to him or her.

Then, the best of food and drink are being served for him or her (or for both, if they come together). Thus, by coming to visit his kin-in-law He-Friend pays his respect to them, while his Hosting counterpart expresses esteem to He-Friend by generous and hospitable treatment of his guest. And the Host and all the members of his house are happy since they too can enjoy the best of food and drink (preserved for such special occasions only, otherwise unserved for ordinary occasions and everyday consummation) with their dear guests.

Both functions, viz. paying respect to a host and expressing esteem to a guest, constitute the Vedic divine concept of god *Aryaman* viz. "Feasting (involving both hosting and guesting)" of which the Vedic god *Agni* (Sacred Fire) is the representative, being simultaneously both *gr̥hapati* "Host, Lord of the house" and *atithi* "Guest of every house" ! In the same way the functions of gods Mitra and Agni came to be interconnected socially, viz. Agni the holy Fire is *mītra* par excellence since Fire was the member of every Home, of every House viz. of every Family, hence he was considered "kin-in-law, viz. one's own-kin" !

Analogously, the Sun too is *mītra* "one's own kin, kin-in-law (viz. kin-by-love)" because he visits every home, every house, every family while shining impartially on every living being with no discrimination.

Viewing psychologically, Love implies “Warmth/Heat (Passion)“ viz. Fire, consubstantial with and heat-radiating entity like the Sun. Thence, naturally Agni or the sacred Fire not only symbolically but concretely (physiologically and physically) represents *Mitra* “love, viz. friendship“ that radiates warmth between those who love each other, especially between wife and husband (as mentioned previously cf. Rig-Veda V 3.2) !

This is the true meaning of the Sanskrit term *Mitra*, and is corroborated and attested by the *Mi-ta-an-ni*, the Aryan tribe who became kin-in-law with the Hurrians of Asia Minor.

### Mithra and Vazra

In the Avestan Hymn to Mithra (Yasht No. 10. 95-96), it is said that Mithra goes over the earth after the setting of the Sun surveying everything between heaven and earth and is depicted as holding the *vazra* viz. “thunderbolt“ in his hands (related to the Vedic *vajra* “ibid.“) the weapon exclusively attributed to the Vedic thunder-god Indra.

How it came that Mithra was conceived as warrior bearing fiery thunderbolt ?

The Vedic text elucidate this mystery, for the Thunder-god Indra is directly called the Sun *Sūrya* (Rig-Veda X 98.2), in one hymn Indra himself asserts that he was once *Sūrya* (IV 26.1), and the seer Yajnavalkya in the Satapatha Brahmana I 6.4.18, equates Indra with the Sun.

Indra and Agni the Fire are considered twins (Rig-Veda VI 59.2) for the thunderbolt is of fiery nature. Since Fire is consubstantial with the Sun thus quite naturally Indra is equated with the Sun. The phenomenon called thunderbolt is produced (viz. ignited) by the collision of cold (negative or *yin*) vs. hot (positive or *yang*) masses of air (atmosphere), the latter being conditioned by the activity of the Sun. The ancient Vedans (viz. scientists, for the term “Veda“ as an abstract noun means “Science“) were very well aware that *vajra* the thunderbolt (consubstantial with thunder-god) is not an entity per se, but it depends on the effects of Sun’s activity on the conditions in the atmosphere, and quite fittingly explained this as Indra’s personal asserting that he “was once *Surya*“ (viz. the Sun, as mentioned above, Rig-Veda IV 26.1).

And at last but not least, Indra is identified with Savitar (Rig-Veda II 30.1) just like *Mitra* is (Rig-Veda V 81.4), which makes them both consubstantial, viz. identical with the Sun. Thus there can be no doubt that the ancient Aryans conceived *Mitra* as the Sun, Fire, and hence naturally as Morning Light viz. Daylight.

### Mitra and the Mitrani

The ethnic term *Mi-ta-an-ni* undoubtedly authentically spelled *Mitrāni* with their king bearing the Aryan name *Šattivaza/Mativaza* are the proofs that an Aryan clan came into the “kin-in-law” relationship with the Hurrians and established a mixed-blood Aryan-Hurrite dynasty hence they appropriately called themselves *Mitrāni* viz. “kin(smen)-in-law”.

Therefore they invoke *Mitra* as the first god in the treaty between *Mitrāni* king *Šattivaza* and the Hittite king *Šuppiluliuma* (around 1400 BCE). This could not have been possible by making merely a contract, but there was an absolute necessity as always been, to establish the “kinship-in-law” by mixing blood of both families/parties.

Note that in the cuneiform syllabary there is no syllabic character for representing consonant cluster such as *-tra-* (e.g. *Mitra* was written *Mi-ta-ra*) hence in order to present the

ethnic *Mitrani* phonetically correctly with respect to accent and authentic number of syllables it was recorded as *Mi-ta-an-ni* in which the double “a” stands for Sanskrit long vowel. Otherwise, the form *Mi-ta-ra-an-ni* (if utilized) would violate syllabic and rhythmic structure of the word. For this reason the consonant cluster, viz. “r” was to be avoided.

However, it is more likely that the liquid “r” was elided in the Mitanni vernacular prior to its recording in the Hittite-Mitanni treaty, since as many other Vedic Prakrits (the one of which doubtlessly was the Mitanni, see Note 11) used to drop it, especially in consonant clusters e.g. Sanskrit *dharma*, *śramana*, *gharma*, and even *ṛṣṇa* (with vocalic viz. syllabic “r”) vs. Prakrit forms *dhamma*, *samana*, *khamma* and *tanha* etc.

### Mitrāni vs. Vṛtrāni (see Note 12)

There is an opposition between the ethnics *Mitrāni* versus *Vṛtrāni* the followers of *Vṛtra* from *vṛ* + *tra* “means of binding, viz. bond” (the archenemy of the thunder-god Indra, hence naturally of *Mitra* too) denoting those who like *Vṛtra* made a bond or pact in hiding under cover of the night/darkness (ruled by the Moon represented by *Vṛtra*, who is identified with *pāpman* viz. “sin, evil, crime, wickedness, evil demon, devil” in the Śatapatha Brahmana XI 1.5.7), viz. those who sworn a plot, conspiracy, perfidy, viz. “plotters, conspirators” comparable to NATO pact which aims secretly (perfidiously) at the destruction (not only of the USSR formerly but even today) of Russia and China as well.

### Conclusion

To deny the authentic innate connection of *Mitra* with Sun is not only absurd but it is a sign of the lack of logical intelligent thinking viz. making correlations between various natural and social phenomena.

### Notes

1. This complies with the great works of the three English Charlies, viz. first by Charles Darwin’s theory on the ape origin of the Westerners, supported by Charles Dawson’s discovery of the Piltdown man, and practically attested by the works of the greatest filmmaker of all times Charles Spencer Chaplin, alias Charlie Chaplin, who was surrounded by negative publicity in the USA about his films criticizing capitalism, and was eventually accused of being a communist, so he fled the USA in 1952, and settled in Switzerland permanently in January 1953 (when the author of this treatise was born). Incidentally, there is nothing worthy of praise created in American Cinematography after Sir Charles Spencer Chaplin’s work. He was so advanced and ahead of his time, that even Bruce Lee in his 1973 Hollywood success “Enter the Dragon“ actually plagiarized Chaplin’s right back slapping kick to opponent’s face while grasping him around the neck with left hand and pulling his head downward (from the 1915 movie “By the Sea“) as well as other boxing and fighting techniques, often using acrobatics, that Charlie displayed with spectacular virtuosity in many silent movies.
2. Actually the SS is to be spelled properly “eSH eSH“ since both initial letters in the compound “Schutz-staffel“ are pronounced in German as the English “sh“ sound ! Similarly the Nazi Secret State Police or “Geheime Staatspolizei“ abbreviated from the initial syllables of each individual word into GeStaPo, but pronounced in German “Geshtapo“ !



3. Thieme (1957, p. 23) [27] came with a silly explanation “(the ancient Vedans) PRETEND that the abstract ‘contract’ is a Person ‘Contract’ ... a real, living God”.
4. Thieme wrote: “I feel it is my duty to warn especially Latinists, who cannot be expected to judge on the merits of Dumezil’s indological arguments...Vedic Sanskrit bristles with elementary problems, unknown to Latinists, that must be solved by grammarians before it be possible for sociologists to apply their theories. Latinists may not realize how often an ingenious explanation of an alleged idea is, in reality, nothing but an ill-advised justification of a simple mistranslation.”  
We completely agree with the above his remark, but the problem is that Thieme himself had done exactly the opposite of what he intended to advocate against ! For he flagrantly misused the rules of the Sanskrit grammar !!!
5. In a private correspondence (leavesfall 1989 – spring 1990), Kuiper behaving arrogantly like an Aga (viz. acronymically Arrogant Germanic Assholiness, to use the terminology of the American Urban Dictionary) criticized my relating Chinese and Greek (both being Paisaci-tongues while belonging to the *HU*-family of languages too) viz. the Chinese *Tian* “Heaven” to the Greek *Zan* and *Zen*, remarking that “sadly for the lack of self-criticism, since *Zen* is an old accusative of *Zeus*” being completely ignorant of the fact that the nominative vs. accusative of the ancient nasal-ending forms like *Zan/Zen* were distinguished by different accents (cf. “A New Language Classification on the Vedic Model”, IJSR, 3(2), 2017). Besides, the nasal ending forms are much earlier than the forms comprising diphthongs, such as Vedic *Dyauh*, *Dyava*, *Dyave*, and other related forms, viz. Latin *Love*, Biblical *Yahweh*, Greek *Zeus*.
6. Brereton inferred this from his misrendering of the Vedic term *vrata* as “authority, commandment” by drawing the connection between Varuna and the concept of *vrata* which authentically meant “vow, promise, will” (from which derived Biblical Hebrew *bryt*, cf. Veda vs. Tetragrammaton”, IJSR, 3(1), 2017), cf. Mitra and Varuna are called *dhṛtavrata* “who keep their vows” (and not commandments).
7. Americans have determined to privatize the Sun, viz. Solar energy and sell it to the poor just like they sell electricity, for there is nothing for free in capitalism.
8. Earlier scholars Grassmann, Griffith, Macdonell, Geldner all translated the participle *bruvāna* either as Active or Reflexive-Active Participle.
9. The Poetic Edda, Lokasenna, stanza 35.
10. cf. Herodotus Historia, 1.131. As for Mitra “Love, Friendship” cf. Kanga’s explanation of the Avestan Hymn to Mithra “In the pf. 116-117, the proportion as to how much *Friendship* and *Sympathy* should be between the next of kin, businessmen, disciple and teacher, etc. is mentioned. Amongst these, the proportion of maintaining *Love* towards the Mazda-worshipping Religion of the virtuous person is considered most supreme”, p.129.
11. As for Mitanni viz. Mitanni language, it is neither Vedic nor Epic Sanskrit but apparently a Prakrit (viz. vulgar vernacular) close to Avestan, cf. the Mitanni names of kings and gods, *Šatti-vaza* vs. Sanskrit *Sati-vāja*, *Uruvana* vs. Sanskrit *Varuna*, *Našatiya* vs. Sanskrit *Nāsatya* etc.
12. Thieme using double standard defined *mi-tra* as a noun of means, but brazenly evaded to do the same with *vṛ-tra*.

## References and Bibliography

1. Anghelina C. On the Nature of the Vedic Gods, SPP, 213, 241.
2. Anghelina C. On the Date of the Aryan Religion and the Minoan Religion of the Bull, SPP, 2014, 248.
3. Bazin G. A History of Art from Prehistory to the Present, Bonanza Books, N.Y., 1959.
4. Brereton JP. The Rgvedic Adityas, American Oriental Series 63, New Heaven, 1981.
5. Cheng Man-ch’ing and Smith, R.W. T’ai Chi, the Supreme Ultimate Exercise for Health, Sport and Self-Defense, Tuttle, New York, 1967.
6. Geldner FK. Rigveda in Sanskrit und Deutsch, I-IV, Harvard Oriental Series, Cambridge, MA, 1951-1957.
7. Gershevitch, I. The Avestan Hymn to Mithra, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1959.
8. Gonda, J. The Vedic God Mitra, Orientalia Rheno-Traiectina, Leiden, 1972.
9. Grassman, H. Rig-Veda, I-II, F.A.Brockhaus, Leipzig, 1886-1887.
10. Griffith RTH. The Hymns of the Rig Veda, the Chowkhamba Sanskrit Studies, Varanasi, (1889-1892), reprint, 1965.
11. The History of Herodotus, parallel English/Greek, transl. by G.C.Macaulay, publ. Macmillan, London, 1890.
12. Ivankovic M. A New Language Classification on the Vedic Model. International Journal of Sanskrit Research. Delhi, 2017; 3(2), 25-31.
13. Jamison SW, Witzel M. Vedic Hinduism, in: The Study of Hinduism, ed. A.Sharma, University of South Carolina Press, 2003.
14. Jamison SW, Brereton JP. The Rigveda the Earliest Religious Poetry of India, Oxford University Press, New York, 2014.
15. Kanga, KE. Yasht-Bā-Maāni, translated into English from the original 1901 Gujarati edition by M.F. Kanga, The Trustees of the Parsi Punchayat Funds and Properties, Bombay, 2001.
16. Lommel H. Die Sonne des Schlechtesten ? Oriens. 1962; 15:360-373.
17. Luders H. Eine arische Anschauung über den Vertragsbruch, Sitzungberichte der Königl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, I. Berlin, 1917, 347-374.
18. Luders H, Varuna I. Varuna und die Wasser, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1951.
19. Luders H, Varuna II. Varuna und des Rta, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1959.
20. Macdonell AA. A Vedic Reader for Students, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1917.
21. Meillet A. Le dieu indo-iranien Mitra, Paris, Imp. nationale, 1907.
22. Oberlies T. Die Religion des Rigveda I, Institut für Indologie der Universität Wien, Gerold, Wien, 1998.
23. Oberlies T. Die Religion des Rigveda II, Institut für Indologie der Universität Wien, Gerold, Wien, 1999.
24. The Poetic Edda. at <http://www.sacred-texts.com>
25. Schmidt HP. Mitra in Old Indian and Mithra in Old Iranian, Encyclopaedia Iranica, New York, 2006.

26. Simson von G. Zum Ursprung de Gotter Mitra und Varuna, IJ, Brill, Leiden, 1995; 40(1); 1-35.
27. Smith RW. Chinese Boxing: Masters and Methods, Kodansha International, Tokyo and New York, 1974.
28. Thieme P. Der Fremdling im Rigveda. Eine Studie uber die Bedeutung der Worte ari, arya, aryaman und ārya, AKM 23.2, Leipzig, 1938.
29. Thieme P. Mitra and Aryaman, Transaction of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1957, 41.
30. Thieme P. The Aryan Gods of the Mitanni Treaties, JAOS, 1960, 80:301-317.
31. Thieme P. King Varuna, German Scholars on India, Vol.I, The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi, 1973, 333-349.
32. Thieme P. The Concept of Mitra in Aryan Belief, Mithraic Studies I, Manchester, 1975, 21-39.
33. Thieme P. Mithra in the Avesta, Acta Iranica 17, Leiden, 1978, 501-510.
34. Witzel M. Goto T. Rig-Veda, Das heilige Wissen, Erster und zweiter Liederkreis, Insel Verlag Frankfurt am Main und Leipzig, 2007.
35. Witzel M., Goto T. & Scarlata S. Rig-Veda, Das heilige Wissen, Dritter bis funfter Liederkreis, Insel Verlag Berlin, 2013.
36. Zimmer H. Myths and Symbols in Indian Art and Civilization, ed. by J.Campbell, The Bollingen Series VI, Pantheon Books, Washington, D.C., 1946.