



International Journal of Sanskrit Research

अनन्ता

ISSN: 2394-7519
IJSR 2017; 3(2): 25-31
© 2017 IJSR
www.anantaajournal.com
Received: 12-01-2017
Accepted: 13-02-2017

Milorad Ivanković
Omladinski trg, Vršac,
(Verschez), Serbia.

A New Language Classification on the Vedic Model

Milorad Ivanković

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.

Key Words: Vyasa, Anasas, Prakrit, Paisaci, SU-family, Hu-family

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) Vyāsas vs. Anāsas

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 *anāsas*. The term is derived from Sanskrit *ās* (akin to Latin *os*, and Slavic *usta* "mouth") with negative prefix *an-*, meaning "voiceless, speechless, dumb" (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" (*mr̥dhavācas*) "dumb" (*anāsas*). The *Panīs* were an ancient Iranian tribe known to the Greek historian Strabo as *Parnoi*. Note that the Vedic retroflex "n" in *Panīs* 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 *Panīs*, 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 *thiudisk* "belonging to the people" from *theod* "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 *tuyi* or *tudzi*).

But as Hillebrandt correctly noticed, all Slavic nations to this day use the term "Dumb" (or *Němci* in Slavic to denote ethnic Germans, the term being derived from Old Slavic *němu* "speechless, mute, dumb" semantically identical with Vedic *anāsas*). Thus, from the previous exposition it is absolutely clear that both Iranians and Germans were considered by ancient Vedans and Slavs as "dumb" 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 *swastika* (depicted on red butcher's cloth-like flag) is not Aryan at all, since authentic *swastika* being symbolic of the beneficent power of the Sun, must have been "arya *hiranya swastika*" 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 **η-gels* or **η-gols* (from Slavic **ne-gols* via metathesis **ne-glas*)

Correspondence
Milorad Ivanković
Omladinski trg, Vršac,
(Verschez), Serbia.

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 Vyasa. 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. Prakrit

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 *Paiśācī*.

C) Aryan vs. Paiśācī-tongues

The Paiśācī-group of languages is named after an ancient Aryan classification of Indian vernaculars or vulgar tongues, known as Prakrit, of which Paiśācī shares the main common phonetical features with Sumerian, Altaic, Etruscan,

Anatolian, Germanic, ancient Egyptian, Chinese, Cretan, Mycaean, 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 devoiced (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 *Piśācas* 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 Paiśācī-tongue phonemes in script:

a) **Abstract Phonemic 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

b) **Real Phonetic 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.

APR	vs.	RPR
Sumerian <i>Dingir</i>	“Heaven, god”	Altaic (Beltir) <i>Tingir</i> (D vs. T)
<i>egal</i>	“palace”	Akkadian <i>ekallu</i> (g vs. k)
<i>unedug</i>	“letter”	<i>unetukku</i>
Chinese Pinyin <i>Di</i>	“Heaven, god”	Chinese Wade <i>Ti</i> (D vs. T)
<i>Tian</i>	“Heaven, day”	<i>T'ien</i> (T vs. T ^h)

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, but in Latin it derived from Aspirated Plosives only, viz. from *ph, bh, dh, ghw*) 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 *ūmu* > 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) š-Type Phonetic Mutation

Ancient Egyptian and Anatolian Hittite display *š-type phonetic mutation* derived from authentic **t**-phoneme, while Biblical Hebrew as well as German display the *š-type mutation* that sprung from **s**-phoneme. The most illustrative example of *š-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 *šiba* 'h viz. "seven (masculine cardinal number)" > *šabī* 'ī viz. "seventh (masculine ordinal number)" is phonetically closest to the Germanic/Gothic *sibun* > German *sieben*, and Hittite *šipta* "seven" (featuring both "š" 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 *aṣṭau* in Sanskrit, related to the Old Iranian *ašti* meaning "the width of four fingers". Thus *aṣṭau* 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 deduced from the Greek variants *hebdomos* 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. Whatsoever, 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. *šabbāt* 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. Tetragrammaton").

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 *sloboda* in South Slavic) "freedom, liberty, RELEASE", all derived from the reflexive pronoun *self* (*se, sebe, svobho*). And again German form matches the Hebrew, both displaying *š-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 *nefeš*, German *Neffe*, Old English *nefa*, > modern *nephew*, etc. And though Hebrew and Germanic share the same *f-type* and *š-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 *Me(y)ika*, 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

blow”, *piskavac* and *piščenac* “a small chicken which usually produces such unpleasant high-pitch sound“, and verbs *piskati/pištati* “to produce such ear-irritating sound, resembling chicken’s voice“.

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. Brhadaranyaka Upanisad, V II 3. it is written:

“evaīṣa *daivī vāg anuvadati stanayitnur 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. *dīdeti* “he shines“ etc.). However, the same rootword *di* is preserved in Slavic compound *duž-di* 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 denote “rain (sc. rainy sky)”, in its modern variants spelled variously as e.g. *dažd, dažd’, deszcz, dež, dešt’, dožd’* etc. with final short reduced unaccented vowel “i” of the authentic rootword *di* (authentically mid central neutral unrounded unmarked, non-labialized vowel) now pronounced as mid-central vowel “ə”, 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 *Tangere*, 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 *Thien*, 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 Dyaus, 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*.”

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* (ninth 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 *śukla-kṛṣṇa*, or in its older form *śukra-kṛṣṇa* 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. **diu* > pronounced *div* or *dyu* (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” *kṛṣṇanebhih* “adorned with pearls”, in contrast to its Diurnal Bright aspect pictured as a red Bull viz. *usriya 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 *Šiu* < **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 *Iove-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 is actually pronounced), derived from Old Chinese **Tig(s)* matching exactly the Anglo-Saxon *Tig* (or *Tiw*, genitive *Tiwes* > *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 *Tiyaz*, Lydian *Tiv*, Luvian *Tiwat* “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 *Tiwari(ya)* “pertaining to Sun-god”, 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 *Dyau(s)*. On the other side, the ancient Greek form for Heaven, viz. *Zeus* < **Dieu(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 Mycaean 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 superstitiously 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 *Diau* 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. *Diau-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) + i/y (Bright Heaven) + a (twilight) + u/v (Dark Heaven) = *Dyau*, 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 *muh-nip-yuh-ley-shuhn*, 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 *Iove*) 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 “tweeter”, viz. a small high-frequency loudspeaker, in contrast with “woofer”, 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-mnah* 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-dhita* (with inverted vowel sequence *sua*) “well-placed, solid, firm” (besides usual simple Zero Grade form *su-dhita*), etc. Greek compound words are composed with irregular prefix *eu-* (instead of the proper form **heu-*), 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 *Harahvaiti* 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. 3rd Mandarin tone), related to Avestan *hu-*, Greek *hu-*, **heu* > *eu*; Sanskrit and Slavic, *su-*, *sau-*; Old Irish *so-scel(a)e* “good-news, viz.

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

1b) *hao* “to love, like” (entering tone, viz. 4th Mandarin tone), related to Cymric (Welsh) *hy-gar* “love-able, 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 *hapta* Latin *septem* vs. Greek *hepta* all denoting “seven”, but there are other examples involving Chinese Mandarin words too:

2) *huang* “brilliant, shining”, Avestan *huvarā*, (Late Avestan *hu, huro*) Gen. *hvāng* “Sun”, Cymric *haul*, Breton *heol*, Old Cornish *heuul*; Vedic *suar* and *suvar*, *sur-ya*, Latin *sol*, Old Slavic *slūnice* (modern *sunce*) “Sun”, Old Irish *suil* “eye”.

3) *Xi Huo* (or *He*) “Sun-Goddess (solar charioteer)” reconstructed as **hral* (or *hnral*) *gool* (by Zheng Zhang, 1987, 2003), related to **hueghuel* < PIE **sueghuel* “the Sun” (Pokorny/Starostin, 2016). NB. Zhou Ji Xu (2003) reconstructed it erroneously as **sral gwaal*, 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.
2. Collected and analyzed by Alfred Hillebrandt, cf. Vedic Mythology, Appendix II, The Panis in the Rigveda.
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 (*śuk*)*lam*, by apheresis, Chinese *yin* “dark” < Old Chinese **(k)yim*, downsized from Sanskrit *kri(śna)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), **t'ek-s* (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”!

8. cf. France > French, Caster > Chester, Wales > Welsh, England phonetically Inghend, gray > grey, Mary, marry and merry spelled almost the same as the latter, etc.

References

1. Baxter WH, Sagart L. Reconstruction of Old Chinese, Version 1.1, 20 September, 2014 at <http://osbaxtersagart.lsa.umich.edu> Last modified January 10, 2016.
2. Clackson J. Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction, Cambridge, 2007.
3. Complete Jewish Bible. translated by David H. Stern, Messianic Jewish Publishers, 1998, at www.biblegateway.com Visited throughout September and October, 2016.
4. Dyeus, at <https://www.en.wikipedia.org> Last modified January 28, 2017.
5. Edzar DO. Sumerian Grammar, Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2003.
6. Eliade M. A History of Religious Ideas, Vol. I, From the Stone Age to the Eleusinian Mysteries, Chicago University Press, Chicago, 1978,
7. Eliade M. Shamanism: Archaic Techniques of Ecstasy, Princeton University Press, Princeton, reprint, 2004.
8. Formant, at <https://www.en.wikipedia.org> Last modified, 2016.
9. Hebrew-English Bible. at www.mechon-mamre.org accessed, 2016.
10. Hebrew Interlinear Bible. at www.scripture4all.org/Online/Interlinear/Hebrew_Index.htm Visited throughout September and October, 2016.
11. Helmoldi Presbyteri Bosoviensis Chronica Slavorum, Presbyterium Bosoviensis, Bosau. 1167,
12. Hillebrandt A. (1927-1929), Vedic Mythology, Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi, translated from the original German edition, Breslau, 1981,
13. The Holy Bible. New International Version, Biblica, Inc. New York, 2011,
14. The Geography of Strabo, Vol.II, transl. W.Falconer, publ. George G.Bohn, London, 1856.
15. Griffith RTH. (1889-1892), The Hymns of the Rig-Veda, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Studies, Varanasi, 1963, reprint.
16. Interlinear Bible, Greek Hebrew. Transliterated, at <http://www.biblehub.com/interlinear> Visited throughout September and October, 2016.
17. Ivankovic M. Pūṣan Āghṛi, (A Monograph on Vedic Religion and Literature) University of Zagreb, Faculty of Philosophy, Zagreb, 1988,
18. Ivankovic M. Veda vs. Tetragrammaton: Decrypting the greatest Enigma in History, International Journal of Sanskrit Research, 2017; 3(1):21-25.
19. Liddell HG, Scott R. A Greek-English Lexicon, with a Supplement, Clarendon Press, Oxford University, Oxford, 1968,
20. Macdonell AA. Vedic Mythology, Verlag von Karl Trubner, Strassburg, 1897,
21. Mallory JP, Adams DQ. The Oxford Introduction to Proto-Indo-European and To Proto-Indo-European World, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2006.
22. Mayrhofer M. KEWA (Kurzfassertes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen/ A Concise Etymological Sanskrit Dictionary, I-IV, Carl Winter, Heidelberg, 1980,
23. Mayrhofer M. EWA (Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindiarischen), Winter Universitätsverlag, Heidelberg, 1992-2001,
24. Monier-Williams M. A Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1899,
25. The Names of God Bible Baker Publishing Group, 2011, at www.biblegateway.com
26. Orthodox Jewish Bible. Artist for Israel International, 2011, at www.biblegateway.com
27. Pischel R. Comparative Grammar of the Prakrit Languages, Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi, 1957. translated from original German, 1900
28. Poebel A. Grundzuge der sumerischen Grammatk, Rostock, 1923,
29. Pokorny J, Starostin G. Indo-European Etymological Dictionary, updated by G.Starostin at <http://dnghu.org/indoeuropean.html> Visited throughout. 2016.
30. Radhakrishnan S. The Principal Upanishads, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1953,
31. Rgvedasamhita samhita evam padapatha, sampadaka Moksamullar, The Hymns of the Rig- Veda in the Samhita and Pada Texts, ed. by Friedrich Max Muller, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi-1, reprint II Volumes, 1965.
32. Vyasa. at <https://www.en.wikipedia.org> Last modified, 2017.
33. Vowel. at <https://www.en.wikipedia.org> Last modified, 2016.
34. Walker B. Hindu World: An Encyclopedic Survey of Hinduism, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1968,
35. Wolfram von S. Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik, Analecta Orientalia 33, Roma, 1952,
36. Whitney WD. A Sanskrit Grammar, Breitkopf and Hartel, Leipzig, 1879.
37. Wei JL. Dao and De: An Inquiry into the Linguistic Origin of Some Terms in Chinese Philosophy and Morality, SPP 2005, 165.
38. Zheng Zhang SF. Old Chinese Rhyme System and the Origins of the Four Grades, Medials, and Tones, Journal of Wenzhou Normal College, 4th issue, 1987,
39. Zheng Zhang SF. Old Chinese Phonology, Shanghai Jiaoyu Chubanshe, Shanghai, 2003.
40. Zhou JX. Correspondences of Cultural Words between Old Chinese and Proto-Indo-European, SPP 2003, 125.