

Linguistic Analysis using the Pāṇinian System of Sounds and Finite State Machines

Shreekanth M Prabhu¹ and Abhisek Midye²

¹ – Department of Computer Science and Engineering, CMR Institute of Technology, Bengaluru (Formerly)

² – Department of Information Science and Engineering, CMR Institute of Technology, Bengaluru (Formerly)

Abstract

The study of spoken languages comprises phonology, morphology, and grammar. Analysis of a language can be based on its syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. The languages can be classified as root languages, inflectional languages, and stem languages. All these factors lead to the formation of vocabulary which has commonality/similarity as well as distinct and subtle differences across languages. In this paper, we make use of the Pāṇinian system of sounds to construct a phonetic map and then words are represented as state transitions on the phonetic map. Each group of related words that cut across languages is represented by a m-language (morphological language). Morphological Finite Automata (MFA) are defined that accept the words belonging to a given m-language. This exercise can enable us to better understand the inter-relationships between words in spoken languages in both language-agnostic and language-cognizant manner. Based on our study and analysis, we propose an Ecosystem Model for Linguistic Development with Sanskrit at the core, in place of the widely accepted family tree model.

Keywords: Pāṇini's system of sounds, State Machines, Finite Automata, Phonology, Morphology, m-language, Comparative Linguistics, Ecosystem Model

Biographical Notes

Dr. Shreekanth M Prabhu worked as a Professor and Head of the Department of Computer Science and Engineering at CMR Institute of Technology, Bengaluru, India, till March 31, 2024. His research interests include Social Networks, E-Governance, and Comparative Linguistics.

Mr. Abhisek Midya is currently working as an Assistant Professor in the Department of Computer Science and Engineering at RV College of Engineering, Bengaluru. His research interest is in Theoretical Computer Science.

Corresponding Author Email: shreekanthpm@gmail.com

Co-author Email: abhisekmidyacse@gmail.com

Introduction

Linguistics is a fascinating discipline going back millennia and has been a field for intense scholarly pursuit in India. Particularly among them are contributions by Pāṇini whose work on the system of sounds and formal grammar has inspired significant advances worldwide. Then there were generations of scholars enriching the field such as Kātyāyana, Patanjali, and Bhartṛhari. In recent times pioneering work by Chomsky has been the hallmark of the advances. According to Chomsky [1], the primary purpose of language is not communication, rather it is cognition as language is the primary vehicle for thoughts. Chomsky [2] also differentiated between I-language and E-language. Here I-language is a universal language that applies to all spoken/human languages. E-language caters to specific natural languages factoring in cultural and geographic aspects. Linguistics as a field comprises phonology which deals with the sounds in spoken languages, morphology pertains to the construction of words, and grammar which primarily describes the rules for the orderly usage of words to construct sentences. Alternatively, the languages can be studied in terms of syntax which concerns different parts of speech, semantics which deal with meaning, and pragmatics whose preoccupation is with the usage of words that vary from milieu to milieu.

In the last few centuries, Comparative Linguistics has emerged as a fertile field for fervid research. Here languages are compared for the similarity of words and then their structural properties. Using that approach linguistic families are formed and even ancestral languages are hypothesized at times drawing far-reaching to far-fetched conclusions about the history of populations and their movements. Not just languages but literary sources also can be considered as containers of words.

Bulk work related to comparing languages concerns itself with comparing words across them. Comparing the words also may mean comparing root words, inflections, and derivations. This generally calls for specialist know-how from the field of linguistics. In many cases, there are disputes as different linguists draw different conclusions based on their predilections.

In this paper, we take an alternate approach, where we primarily focus on morphology, and how the words are constructed using a state machine approach. We look at the granularity of word groups that can be related phonetically, semantically, or pragmatically. For each word group, we propose a formal language and alphabet using Finite Automata that is useful to decide if a given word belongs to that word group. The word groups can be extended and interconnected. Each m-language will have a core alphabet and an extended alphabet. We feel that this approach can enrich the field of linguistics. We make use of Pāṇini's system of sounds and construct a phonetic map that has the symbols that serve as states for representation as a State Machine. Further, we attempt to gauge the distance between words on the phonetic map and look for insights.

The rest of the paper is as follows. Section 2, Linguistics Overview covers the literature in the field of linguistics that is pertinent to our work. Section 3, Comparative Linguistics Considerations explains the relevance of this paper to the field. Section 4, Analysis of words using Pāṇini's Sounds, where words are analyzed across languages and word groups are identified. Section 5, Linguistic Analysis using Finite State Machines describes the methodology we have proposed to arrive at unified Morphological Languages that cater to given word groups. Section 6, Discussions, revisits the antiquity of Vedic Sanskrit, language formation, and word formation and proposes an Ecosystem Model for Linguistic Development

with Sanskrit at the core. Section 7, Vocabulary refers to the vocabulary we have used for analysis. Section 8, Conclusions, concludes the paper.

2. Linguistics Overview

Linguistics, by providing a structure to words and language, makes the task of understanding language manageable. Otherwise understanding millions of words individually can prove to be daunting and time-consuming. Without Linguistics, languages keep changing with time and place and literature becomes incomprehensible in a matter of a century or two.

Linguistics as a field has its roots in ancient India. The Vedas are preserved for millennia by oral transmission. To ensure accurate pronunciation, understanding, and appropriate usage of Vedic Hymns in Yajna, the scholarly tradition mandates the study of six Vedāngas as a pre-requisite and co-requisite for the study of Vedas. These six Vedāngas are Śiksha (phonetics, phonology, and pronunciation), Chandas (prosody), Vyākaraṇa (grammar and linguistic analysis), Nirukta (etymology, explanation of words), Kalpa (ritual instructions), and Jyotiṣa (astronomy). Here the first four have laid the foundation for Indian Linguistics. The expositions [3-6] give a very cogent explanation of ancient Indian Linguistics. In India knowledge is maintained using a 4-fold mechanism that includes Sutra, Vārtika, Bhāṣya, and Kārika. Here Sutras are very compact, cryptic, and formulaic. Vārtikas are elaborations and Bhāṣyas are interpretations of Sutras. Kārika captures the essence. Shyamsundar [7]

has done an elaborate study of Pāṇini's contribution to linguistics and related it to the theoretical foundations of modern computing. Paul Kiparky[8] elaborates on Pāṇini's Linguistics covering grammar, morphology, phonology and phonetics,

There is a continuing tradition of grammars in India and Pāṇini's Astādhyāyī superseded all earlier traditions and core ideas from there spread to other languages and locales worldwide. Astādhyāyī not only covers Vedic Sanskrit but also classical Sanskrit. Patanjali's Bhāṣya on Pāṇini's grammar is the most popular. The tradition has continued for centuries with newer Bhāṣyas. Because of such rigorous discipline, the Vedas were transmitted without any corruption for millennia. This also benefitted Classical Sanskrit as even the works such as Ramāyana which are a few thousand years old are still intelligible to modern scholars. Otherwise, it is common that in the case of most languages, the works done just a few centuries ago are hard to understand for modern speakers of the language.

Generally, linguistics can be approached from the viewpoint of words (Śabda) or sentences (Vākya). Whichever way you approach it both Śabda and Vākya are inextricably linked. The only purposeful way of using Śabda is in the form of Vākya. The only way to decipher and understand Vākya is by breaking it down into Śabdās. Vyākaraṇa thus is called Śabda Śāstra. Pāṇini's Astādhyāyī analyses sentences; identifies words and then components, and arrives at Dhātus (roots of words). Each word is viewed as consisting of Prakṛi (the original part) and Pratyaya (suffixes). By combining Prakṛi and Pratyaya, the Padas (usable words) are formed. With a good discipline of grammar using a single Dhātu typically 360 words can be formed. There are at least 2000 Dhātus, resulting in lakhs of words. This framework enables Sanskrit to be a powerful language where new words can be easily composed using components and they become conveniently intelligible to those conversant with the language. When it comes to the right use of words, it can be done only with meaning in mind.

Three things are critical to interpreting the meaning of individual words in a sentence to arrive at the intended meaning of the sentence: Ākāṅkshā (expectancy), Yogyata (suitability), and Sannidhi (proximity). According to Vedic tradition, the six objectives of precise grammar are Rakshā (prevention from distortion), Asandeha (absence of ambiguity), Ūhā (modification of Vedic Mantras due to the possibility of more than one interpretation), Āgama (ease of augmentation), and Laghuh (easy means of acquiring knowledge).

Modern linguistics like ancient linguistics comprises phonology (the science of sounds), morphology (word formation using sounds), and grammar (deriving new words and constructing sentences). Analyzing the sentences thus consists of syntax analysis, semantic analysis, and pragmatics. The methodology for the analysis of natural language can be compared with the approach taken by the compiler to analyze programming languages. A compilation process consists of a scanning phase where a statement is broken into components (lexemes) and then in the parsing phase, a syntax tree is constructed comprising of lexemes and validated for grammatical correctness. Even though natural language processing is similar, the grammar is not context-free and morphology (the constructions of words) itself makes use of grammar in addition to the construction and analysis of sentences. However, some key constructs such as finite automata and the concept of language from theoretical computer science can be leveraged. That is the endeavour of this paper.

3. Comparative Linguistics Considerations

The relationship between languages did not get the attention of scholars in Europe as according to Biblical tradition, Hebrew was considered the universal language which then broke into other languages. In India, Sanskrit was considered the mother of all languages while scholars were very much aware of Sanskrit words and words native to a given language. In Europe, as acknowledged by Mallory [9], James Parsons [10] was probably one of the first to do a systematic study of thousands of common words across European Languages. However, according to Mallory [9], a century before that it was Joseph Scaliger who attempted to divide the languages of Europe into four major groups, each labelled after their word for God. The transparent relationship of what we today call the Romance languages was recognized in the 'Deus' group (for example, Latin 'Deus', Italian 'Dio', Spanish 'Dio', and French 'Dieu'), and contrasted with the Germanic 'Gott' (English God, Dutch God, Swedish 'Gudy' and so on); Greek 'Theos'; and Slavic Bog (such as Russian 'Bog', Polish 'Bog' and Czech 'Buh'). This exercise of comparing languages was also undertaken by visitors to India in the 15th century. In India, it was Filippo Sassetti and Thomas Stephens were the first two who noticed the similarity between Indian and European Languages. Singh B [11] identifies Thomas Stephens as the first Englishman in India. Pedro Redondo [12] explains that the motivation of Sassetti was that of the humanist whereas that of Stephens was evangelical and theological. All these exercises and the well-known discourse of William Jones [13] culminated in the proposal of not only the Indo-European Family of Languages but also the acceptance of the language family as a universal construct.

According to modern Linguistics, certain words are considered isolates i.e. they are unique to that language or a narrow set of languages. The isoglosses cause dialectical variations. These differences may be phonological, lexical (different words), or different linguistic features. Cognates sound similar across languages carrying the same/related meaning. The cognates are classified as adstrate words when these are loan words due to trade and migration. Then there

are substrate words where it is presumed that speakers of one language dominated the speakers of other languages resulting in an asymmetric transfer of words. In contrast, in Indian tradition, the words in a language are divided into three categories: Tatsama (same as words in another language generally Sanskrit), Tadbhava (derived from words in another language), and Deshya (native words).

Initially, Sanskrit was considered the mother of the Indo-European Languages as it had cognates across Indo-European Languages and the most complete grammar with eight cases as well as duals in addition to singular and plurals. But then scholars who are generally known as Indologists who call themselves mainstream changed their stance. Bryant [14] puts forward the 'main-stream' view that (i) There has to be a proto-language probably spoken by all speakers before that broke into Indo-European (IE) Languages; (ii) All the IE speakers stayed in a common homeland before they separated; (iii) The proto-language could not have been Sanskrit; (iv) There was Proto-Indo-European (PIE) Language that broke into Celtic, Germanic, Romance, Baltic, Slavic, Greek, and Indo-Iranian families with PIE at the root. Thus, Sanskrit was relegated as a leaf node within the Indo-Iranian family and India as yet another output of IE speakers.

Bryant explains how Sanskrit was dethroned using linguistic arguments. One of the reasons given by Linguists to propose PIE is that Sanskrit has innovated a, e, and o sounds to a sound. Greek has retained the original sounds. A typical example given is that 'bhend' in Greek becomes bandh in Sanskrit. Another example the scholars give is Greek Deca (for number 10) is not derivable from Sanskrit Daśa, hence there needs to be a common ancestral language to both. The languages are further classified as Kentum and Satem languages based on the word for the number 100 and here Kentum Languages are considered more archaic. Sanskrit is considered Satem Language and ruled out as an archaic language. Further, since Sanskrit had retroflexes, which many European languages did not have, some linguists say it cannot be a proto-language. To support their hypothesis scholars claimed that Sanskrit borrowed cerebralization from Dravidian Languages and any word in Sanskrit that is not in common with European Languages is a loan from Dravidian or Munda languages. This is in contrast to Indian tradition where Sanskrit words appear either as Tatsama or Tadbhava forms across languages and seldom the other way around. As an example, the word for water is Neer only in Sanskrit and Dravidian Languages but not in most Indo-Aryan Languages. Hence, one may conclude that the word was loaned into Sanskrit. But any such conclusion may be hasty as Greek also uses neró for water, which is likely from Sanskrit.

Bryant and Patton [15] examine the issue of Indo-European origins from multiple perspectives in an edited volume. Among the linguists who contributed to that endeavour, Mishra [16] claims that Sanskrit is more archaic than all others. The main features where Sanskrit is shown to deviate from Indo-European is the merger of IE 'a', 'e', and 'o' into 'a' in Sanskrit and the change of palatal k, etc. to palatal s, etc. in Sanskrit. Mishra counters this and among many other arguments gives the example of the Gypsy language where Indo-Aryan 'a' remains 'a' in Asiatic Gypsy but becomes a, e, o in European Gypsy. This confirms that the original IE a was the same as Sanskrit a and remained a in the Indo-Iranian languages, but changed to a, e, o in their sister languages. Then he gives the case where Sanskrit retains both Vākya and Vāchya. According to Mishra, ś becomes k before it becomes s in Sanskrit. He maintains that ś and k are allophonic. Thus, the k which was allophonic to ś in Sanskrit might have been generalized in the Centum languages. He also gives examples of Lithuanian, a Satem Language

sporadically presenting ‘k’ sound. Witzell [17] continues to champion the mainstream view that Aryans are outsiders to India and that Vedic language is an import into India and he is a strong proponent of the import of Munda words into Vedic Sanskrit, whereas Kuiper [18] considered many Sanskrit words were of Dravidian origin

The worldview of Europeans is guided by the prism of conflict, conquest, co-location, and commerce. India was also subject to conquests from the 7th century AD onwards which targeted Indian civilization with religious conversions and political conquests. However, the essential characteristics of the civilization that survived have been convergence, confluence, continuity, and contiguity aided by amalgamation, and assimilation. Thus, India has a continuing civilization going back millennia and a sense of unity that stems from identification with the larger sacred geography unified by common traditions, scriptures, belief systems, holy places, and value systems. Diana Eck [19] rightly observes that India is a country united by the footsteps of pilgrims. The migrations of people within India have been continuous and in particular priestly classes have migrated across India and have maintained essential unity of traditions. Many southern kings also have northern lineages. Such movements have resulted in far greater homogenization of languages across India. The languages which were neighbours to the Sarasvati River region such as Konkani and Punjabi are inflectional like Vedic Sanskrit. The South Indian Languages tend to have more agglutination of consonants and less conjunction of consonants. However, subject-object-verb order is common across all Indian Languages.

Further, the larger geography which included Afghanistan and Central Asia was considered contiguous to India with cultural transmission and exchange. The Central Asian Republics continue to use ‘Sthan’(place) as part of their names (Kazakhstan, Tajikistan) showing the influence of Sanskrit on them. Greater India thus consisted of Uttara Kuru as well as Uttara Madra regions. Another point to be considered is the Sinhala language of Sri Lanka located to the south of Dravida region is Indo-Aryan with commonality with Vedic Sanskrit retaining a few rather archaic words.

Sanskrit for most of the time served as the lingua franca across India thus serving as the donor language of words that represented abstract concepts on one hand to mundane reality on the other. In Sanskrit, refined and accurate pronunciation was not only important for rituals but also considered a hallmark of the civilized. Generally, Apabramsha(mispronounced) forms of a Sanskrit word that is easier to pronounce were used by the commoners. Thus, Śrāvan word for the rainy season changed to Sāvan in Hindi. We notice that some languages (Kannada, Konkani, Bengali) retain the original. The word for cotton Karpasa is considered to have derived from Kāpas a Munda word. But other Indian Languages (Konkani, Marathi, and Gujarati) use Kāpas only, they are far away from Munda-speaking regions. Some argue that Kāpas is Apabramsha for Karpasa and not necessarily a loan word from Munda. In India, the direction of changes is from Sanskrit to Prākṛit to vernaculars as India had a tradition of Chandas (language for prosody) and Bhasha (language for common use) concurrently evolving. This runs counter to the linguists’ view where they expect the transformation to happen from simple/primitive to refined.

In addition, different regions of India and languages there have shown a preference for certain sounds and a lack of preference for others. Thus, the retroflex sound ‘ṇ’ is not in vogue in Hindi, but very much there in Konkani, Marathi, and Punjabi. Bengali uses o instead of a and ‘b’ sounds instead of ‘v’, in certain cases. In Bihar, ‘s’ sound is used more than the ‘ś’ sound.

On the other extreme, Iranian languages have replaced ‘s’ with ‘h’. In many cases Sanskrit has more than one sound, say for people Jana is used as well as Gaṇa is used. The same is true with Dik and Disha both words are used for direction in Sanskrit but for different cases. Further, Sanskrit uses a word starting with K for Kendra (center) which very few European Languages (Greek, Armenian), use, and most use centrum which starts with the ‘s’ sound.

Thus, analysis of European Linguists using their worldview and rules may need revisiting using a formal approach that can address voluminous vocabulary across languages. In particular, Sanskrit commonly has more than ten words to represent the same entity or concept. European Languages are generally compared only with Sanskrit, but not as much with other Indian Languages. It is also worth comparing the phenomena that Indian Language words underwent as they carried forward Sanskrit words and comparing the same with what could have happened to Sanskrit words which are borrowed by/found in common with European Languages. Dr. Gintaras Songaila [20] elaborates on enormous affinities that are directly there between Indo-Aryan and Lithuanian without any connection with the Iranian language. Subhash Kak [21] also makes a long list of common words among European languages; and Sanskrit. Both scholars emphasize the contiguity of central Asia with India from ancient times. The borrowing of words also spans disciplines, ‘Astipathi’ in Sanskrit becomes osteopathy, and ‘Jara’ the word for old age in Sanskrit leads to geriatrics. The same is true with the common medical word sputum which has a natural association with Sphut, a Sanskrit word than spit, an English/Latin verb. The English word ‘pāth’ is due to ‘path’ in Sanskrit (as used in Rajpath i.e. King’s Road) leading to words such as allopathy and homeopathy. Hence the transmission of words has continued for centuries and millennia.

Also, few studies compare Dravidian Languages with other Indian languages. A study by Swaminath Aiyar [22] is a rare exception. Aiyar after a very unique and highly detailed comparative study of languages says “My views differ from those of all previous scholars because they contended themselves with comparing Dravidian Languages with Classical Sanskrit and naturally saw no deep-seated affinities. When one language is extensively affected by another, we need to look for *the* source of influence not in the artificial language of high literature but in the spoken idioms of common people. It is necessary to compare Dravidian idioms with the Vedic Dialects and the Prākritis of pre-Christian Centuries before we can decide the question of Aryo-Dravidian affinities”. It was Bishop Caldwell who compared Classical Sanskrit and Dravidian Languages and pronounced the differences. At the same time, there were other scholars such as Pope, who also was a missionary did not agree. Pope opined the decision to consider Dravidian Languages as disjoint from Aryan Languages was rather abrupt. He expressed the opinion “(i) that between the languages of Southern India and those of the Aryan family, there are many deeply seated and radical affinities and (ii) that the differences between the Dravidian Tongues and Aryan are not so great as between the Celtic (for instance) languages and the Sanskrit; and (iii) that by consequence the doctrine that the place of Dravidian dialects is rather with the Aryan than with Turanian families is still capable of defence”. He illustrated these positions using copious illustrations and pointed out that “the resemblances appeared in the most uncultivated Dravidian dialects’ and that “the identity was most striking in the names of instruments, places, and acts connected with a simple life”. He promised to follow on with a paper that looked at derivative words and showed that the prefixes and affixes were Aryan. The work of Aiyar thus fills that gap.

In summary, the dethroning of Sanskrit as a proto-language needs to be revisited. In the least, confining Sanskrit as a daughter language under the Indo-Iranian branch is a travesty. Further, the inter-relationship between Dravidian Languages and Indo-Aryan Languages needs many more studies.

4. Analysis of words using Pānini's System of Sounds

In this section, we introduce the concept of m-alphabet which is the set of phonemes used to construct a word. The core m-alphabet is the set of sounds that pertain to the original part (Prakriti) of the word, that too where the chosen sounds are common cutting across languages or that pertain to the suspected original word. The m-languages consist of words belonging to a word group that are related phonetically, semantically, grammatically, and ontologically. The word groups across different languages are compared and analyzed using these morphology-based constructs. We make use of Pānini's System of Sounds which represents natural language sounds comprehensively in a scientific manner.

4.1 Pānini's System of Sounds

Pānini developed the system of human/natural language sounds after a careful study of how they are generated by the vocal box. Pānini's Śikṣa (phonology) explains the form of each Varṇa ((letter/sound) is determined by Svāra (intonation), Kāla (time taken to pronounce it), Sthāna (place of articulation), and Karaṇa. Abhyantara Prayatna (effort within the oral cavity) and Bāhya Prayatna (effort outside the oral cavity) are two additional factors. Figure 1, illustrates Pānini's System of Sounds.




Figure 1: Pānini's System of Sounds

Sounds that do not face any obstruction when we speak are termed vowels. These may vary depending on whether they are short, long, or very long. In his scheme, there are 13 vowels and two additional vowels which can be used only in conjunction with other sounds namely am and ah. The sounds that face obstruction are termed consonants. He classifies them based on place of articulation. The guttural/velar/Kanṭavya sounds are produced in the throat. Next, palatal/ Tālavya Sounds are generated by touching one's tongue to the pallet. The next set of

sounds are Cerebral/Murdhya sounds. They are also called hard palatal sounds or retroflex sounds as it requires one to reverse the direction of the tongue while generating them. The fourth set of consonants is dental/Dantavya. They are generated by touching the tongue to the teeth. The fifth set of consonants is labial/Austa. Here the lips are involved in generating the sounds. Each of these groups of 5 consonants can be further classified – (i) unvoiced and unaspirated/tenuis ii) aspirated, (iii) voiced (iv) voiced and aspirated, and (v) nasal.

Then there are other consonants which are called semivowels, sibilants, and aspirates. Figure 1 below illustrates Pānini’s System of Sounds. Rajesh Kumar [23] and Anuradha Chaudhari [24] explain Pānini’s system of sounds covering modern linguistics and traditional Indian vocabulary.

Whereas Pānini’s System of Sounds is very comprehensive and representative, some sounds are not represented specifically. Vedic Sanskrit and many Indian Languages have a cerebral ḷ sound which is at times used instead of the ḍ sound as in Ḫḍa, and Ḫḷa. This is not represented above.

Alveolar sounds are intermediate sounds typically used when English say “Tea”, “Table” or “Tennis”. They are not fully dental. A person who is a native speaker of a language that has retroflex sounds; may treat them as such. Then there are additional alveolar sounds in Tamil which are not there in North Indian Languages. Tamil and probably other Dravidian Languages early on had far too limited an alphabet or far fewer phonemes. Tamil continues to have a limited alphabet consisting of vowels: a, ā, i, ī, u, ū, e, ai, o, ō, au, with the omission of r, rr, lr. The consonants are k, nasal (k), c, nasal(c), t, n, ṭ, ṇ p, m, y, r, l, v, ḷ, ḷ, r, n. The last four are alveolar sounds and are unknown to Sanskrit Alphabet. In each class of consonants, instead of 5 members, only tenuis (the first), and nasal (the last) sounds are there.

Generally, European Languages do not use cerebral/retroflex sounds, except in a few North European Languages such as Swedish. Some languages such as French use only dental sounds. The Tamil Language also has far fewer sounds and the script uses the same symbol for four consonants of the same category.

Further, there are a total of nine fricative consonants in English: /f, θ, s, ʃ, v, ð, z, ʒ, h/, and eight of them (all except for/h/) are produced by partially obstructing the airflow through the oral cavity. These are: /f/: far, /v/: sve, off, /θ/: think, /ð/: those, /s/: sir, race, /z/: zoo, rise, /ʃ/: sharp, chef, pressure, sugar, motion, /h/: ahead.

4.2 Analyzing Words using Sounds

In this section, we build a word bank cutting across languages. Table 1 indicates the encoding we have used for the languages.

Table 1: Encoding to indicate the language of the word

European Languages	Indian Languages
English (En), German (Ge), Russian (Ru), Greek (Gr), Romanian (Ro), Latin (La), Latvian (Latv), French (Fr), Lithuanian (Li), Italian (It), Welsh (We), Danish (Da), Dutch (Du), Spanish (Sp), Polish (Po), Portuguese (Por), Bulgarian (Bu), Corsican (Co),	Sanskrit (Sa), Prākṛit (Pr), Hindi(Hi), Marathi(Mar), Punjabi(Pu), Konkani(Ko), Bengali(Be), Gujarati, Kannada(Ka), Tamil(Ta), Telugu (Te), Malayalam(Ma), Sinhala(Si)

Croatian (Cr), Uranian (Uk), Scot Gaelic(SG), Irish (Ir), Slovak (Sl)	
---	--

Subhash Kak did a study of words derived from Sanskrit in European Languages. Table 2 below lists Sanskrit words, and corresponding cognates in European Languages. We have also added a word in Kannada and Konkani for water.

Here we also list basic sounds used in Sanskrit words which we call m-alphabet (Morphological Alphabet). This is followed by an extended alphabet to represent all words, sounds gained, replaced, and lost. Also listed are related words. All words in a given row can be considered to constitute an m-language (Morphological Language).

Table 2: Sanskrit Words and Cognates in European Languages

Sanskrit Word	m-alphabet (Sanskrit)	Word (Language)	m-alphabet (Extended)	Sounds Gained	Sounds Changed	Sounds Lost	Related words
āvāsa	a,ā,v,s	house (En) haus (Ge)	a,ā,v,s,h,o,u	h, o, u	v to u		
dam	d,a,m	Dom (Ru) Damus (La)	d,a,m,o,u,s,h	o, u, s ,h	a to o		domicile, domestic
grha	g,r,h,a	Casa (La) Cass (Sp)	g,r,h,a,k,s	k, s	g to k, s to h	r	
vāri	v,r,ā,i	Water (Du)	v,r,ā,i,t	t		i	
udaka	u,d,k,a	Uda (Ko) Voda (Ru)	u,d,k,a,v	v	u to v		
āp	a,p	Apa (Ro)	a,p,				
nīr	n,r, ī	Nero (Gr) Dur (We) Neeru (Ka)	n,r, ī, d, u	d, u, o	n to d		
dhara	dh,r,ā	Terra (It) Dal (We)	dh,r,ā,d,l,t,e	d, l, t, e	dh to t, dh to d		
nabha	n,a,bh	Nebo (Ru, Cr) Nebe (Cz)	n,a,bh,b,e,o	b, e, o	bh,a		
Varun	v, r, ṇ, u,a	Ouranos (Gr)	v, r, ṇ, u, a,o	o	v		
yuva	y,u,v,a	Youth (En) Jeunesse (Fr)	y, u, v, a,	t, h			Juvenile

Thus, the formation of cognate words may involve sound shifts, and closely related sounds (voiced versus voiceless, aspirated versus unaspirated, changes of vowels) as well as changes

to grammar (gender-related or other changes) or due to any other peculiarities of receiving languages. Thus, we can define a grammar that can cater to such scenarios which can determine if a word belongs to a word group or not. Additionally, we may be able to generate candidate words that can prospectively belong to the same word group.

The words from Vedic Sanskrit have gone through a variety of transformations in Indian Languages. This is accepted by all. Now we hypothesize that the transformation of those words in European Languages can also be considered the manifestations of the same phenomena that happened as the words got carried over to European Languages. For example, Graha in Sanskrit becomes Kar in spoken Punjabi but in Hindi, it remains as Ghar. Thus, it can be seen that it is not just European languages that use the ‘k’ sound.

Tables 3 to 7 illustrate the concept of m-alphabet and m-language with additional examples which we have collected. Note that this is based on Google Translate output and our knowledge which may have missed certain synonyms that are cognate. Annexure 1[25] has a bank of Indian and European words, which we have enumerated. nearly two hundred groups of words for which m-languages can be defined.

Table 3: m-language for word group “Being in the middle”

Theme	Being in the middle, in between
m-language	madhya (Sa), mādhyam(Sa), middle, medium, mediate, media , midten(Da), midden(Du), madhala(Ma), madhyama(Ka), milieu(Fr), mezzo(It), mitte(Ge), meio(Po), mijloc(Ro), maeda(Si), meadhan(SG), mesaio(Gr)}
Non-members	natuttara(Ta), lar(Ir), vidu(latv), vidurio(Li), sredina(Ru)
m-alphabet(core)	{ m, d, y, a, i }
m-alphabet(Extended)	{ m, d, y, a, I, t, n, l, c, z }
Remarks	Sanskrit, Indic, Germanic, Greek and Romance language and Scot Gaelic, use the above m-alphabet.
Extended Vocabulary	mezzanine floor, meso (between micro and marco)

Table 4: m-language for word group “Face, Mouth”

Theme	Face, Mouth
m-language	mukh(Sat), moga (Ka)}, muh(Hi)}, mouth, mukhya(Sa:Main), mund(Da), mond(Du), mute(Latv), tond(Ko)
Non-members	Face, Chehera(Hindi), beul(Irish), Bayi(Kannada) Usta(Slovenian)
m-alphabet(core)	{ m, u, kh, o, g, t, n, h, d }
m-alphabet (Extended)	{ m u, k, kh, h, o, g, y, d, n, t }
Remarks	Face and mouth words get overlapped. Tond may belong to another m-language with Sanskrit Connection, Tunda – trunk. Germanic and Sanskrit languages have commonality.

Table 5: m-language for word group “Long. Tall”

Theme	Long, Tall
m-language	long, lamba(Hi), lāmb(Ma), labi(Gu), long(Fr), lang(Sw)
Non-members	dugo – Baltic and Slavic languages use words cognate with deergha. fada(Irish), makrys(Greek)
m-alphabet(core)	l, n, m, b, g, a, o, i
m-alphabet (Extended)	NA
Remarks	Here Indian Languages have direct cognates with European Languages. Sanskrit tends to use Deergh. However Sanskrit word vilamb(delay) indicates Sanskrit origin of the above words.

Table 6: m-language for word group “High”

Theme	High
m-language	unc(Hi), ucca(Sa), ucca(Be) hoch(Ge), hoog(Du) hog(Sw), Haut(Fr)
Non-members	Uyar(Ta)
m-alphabet(core)	{u, c }
m-alphabet (Extended)	{u, n, c, t, g, a, u, e }

Table 7: m-language for word group “Below, Low, Lowly”

Theme	Lowly/below
m-language	Lowly:nīc(Sa), Below: nīce(Hi), nizhe(Ru) nizens(Sl)
Non-members	Many
m-alphabet(core)	n, c
m-alphabet (Extended)	n, c, ī, e, zh, s

Next, we analyze the Dravidian Language words using sounds. In Table 8 below, we analyze how the words for numbers are constructed in Dravidian Languages. There are sound shifts from pa to ha (Pattu and Hattu) in Kannada. The ‘b’, ‘p’, and ‘v’ sounds also seem to be used interchangeably. Malayalam and in some cases, Tamil manage without the suffix ‘u’, whereas others customarily use it.

Table 8: Words for numbers in Dravidian Languages

Number	Kannada	Tulu	Telugu	Tamil	Malayalam	m-alphabet (Extended)	m-alphabet (core)
One	ondu	onji	okati	onru	onn	o,n,d,u,j,I,k,a,t,r	o,n
Two	eraḍu	radd	raṇḍu	irand	rand	e,r,a,d,u,n,i	r,a,d
Three	mooru	mooji	muḍu	munr	munnn	m, ū,r,u,j,I,d,r	m, ū
Four	nālku	nāl	nālugu	nānku	nal	n,ā,l,k,u,g,n	n,ā,l
Five	aidu	ain	aidu	aintu	anj	ai,d,u,n,t,a,j	ai,n
Six	āru	āji	aru	āru	ār	ā,r,u,j,i	ā,r
Seven	elu	el	edu	elu	el	e,l,u,d	e,l
Eight	entu	edma	enimidi	ettu	ett	e,n,t,u,d,m,ā,I,d	e,t
Nine	ombattu	ormbā	tommidi	onpatu	ompat	o,m,b,a,t,u,r,ā,d,n,p	o,m,t
ten	hattu	patt	padi	pattu	patt	h,a,t,u,p,d	p,a,t
twenty	ippattu	irva	irvai	irupat	irupat	I,p,a,t,u,r,v,i	I,r,v,p,a,t
thirty	muvattu	muppa	muppai	muppatu	muppat	m,u,v,a,t,p	m,,u,p,a,t
fourty	naluvattu	nālpa	nalabhai	narpatu	nalpat	n,ā,l,u,v,a,t,u,p,b,h,r	n,ā,l,p
fifty	aivattu	aiva	yabhai	aimpatu	ampat	ai,v,a,t,u	ai, v, p,
Phonemic Affinity	u, v, d	j,ā	d,bh	n, r	a, n, m		
Excluded Phonemes				v	v		

Next, we look at the study of inter-relationships between Indo-Aryan and Dravidian Languages done by Swaminath Aiyar [22]. The Drāvidian Languages were historically divided into the Andhra Group with Telugu and a set of languages and the Dravida group consisting of Tamil, Kannada, Malayalam, and Tulu. Andhra Group is independently influenced by neighbouring Prākṛats as well as a greater propensity to use Sanskrit words. Aiyar's main conclusion is that in addition to a large number of clear Sanskrit (Tatsama) words in the Drāvidian Languages, there are a significant number of Tadbhava words that are derived from Sanskrit. He claims that when Caldwell came up with the hypothesis that Dravidian Languages have a low affinity

for other Indian Languages, he compared words from Classical Sanskrit which indeed were different for the sample he had chosen. Aiyar invalidates Caldwell's conclusions by comparing South Indian Language words with other Sanskrit words that are closer to Vedic Sanskrit, Prākritis, and other Indian Languages. Table 9 contrasts Caldwell's approach with that of Aiyar's.

Table 9 Comparison of Sanskrit and Tamil Words

Sr.No.	English Word	Sanskrit Word (Caldwell)	Tamil, Telugu, Kannada, Malayalam	Proposed Word (Aiyar)	Remarks
1	hair	kesha	Mayir(Ta)	Śmashru(Sa)	
2	mouth	mukha	Vay(Ta)	Vac(Sa)	Vac is alternate word from Vedic Sanskrit
2(a)	nose		Mūku(Ta), Mūgu(K), Mukku(Te)		Words derived from Mukha are used for face and mouth. Here it is proposed to be used for nose as well
3	ear	karna	Shevi(Ta)	Śrava(Sa), shravika(Sa)	
4	hear	sru	Kel(Ta)	Karna(Sa)	
5	eat	bhaks	Tin(Ta)	Tr̥ṇu(Sa), Tr(Sa),	
6	walk	car, cel	Egu(Ta)	Ya(Sa), i(Sa)	
7	night	nak	Ira, Iravu	Rātri(Sa)	
8	mother	matr	Āyi(Ta)	Yāyi(Paisc.)	
9	tiger	vyaghra	Puli(Ta)	Vengai(Tamil)	
10	deer, beast	mrga	Marai, Man, Ma(Ta)	Mrga(S), Maga(Pr_	
11	Fire	Agni	Ti(ta)	Tejas(Sa), Tij(Sa)	
12	Snake	Sarpa	Pāmbu.(Ta), Aravu (Ta), Arava(Ma)	Prasarpa, Sarpa, Sarpaks	
13	Village	grama	Ūr(Ta), Ūru(Ka)	Pura(Sa)	
14	buffalo	mahiSa	Erumai(Ta), Emme(Ka)	Heramba(ka)	Associated words are swapped
14(a)			M āDu(Ta)	MahiSa(Sa)	
15	horse	ashva	Kuthirai(Ta)	Ashvatara(ka)	
16	hill	parvata	Malai(Ta)	Paruppu(Tam)	Matching Associations found

According to Swaminath Aiyar, a large number of Dravidian words, in particular in Tamil that appear to have no affinity with Sanskrit are Tadbhava words from Sanskrit. As Tamil has a highly constrained Alphabet, they went through a lot more transformation and corruption compared to North Indian Vernaculars and appear unrelated. To get the whole picture one needs to look at a plurality of Sanskrit words and Prākrit words and inter-relationships between Dravidian Languages, as the closest word could belong to Telugu or Tamil in most cases and then further transformed in modern Kannada and Malayalam. Table 10, contains a sample of words analyzed by Aiyar and inferred as Sanskrit words. Aiyar derives Dravidian words from

Sanskrit/Prākṛat words with a variety of rules such as sound elision, sound substitution, and suffix additions.

Table 10: Tadbhava Dravidian Words which are derived from Sanskrit

Sr. No	Sanskrit Word	Meaning	Tamil/Dravidian Word/Other Indian Language	Meaning
1	Paksha	Wing, Side	Pakka(Ta)	Side
2	See	Pashya	Paar(Ta), Paḷe(Ko)	See
3	Dakshina	South	Tenkāṇa(Ta)	South
4	Bhru	Brow	Pubbu(Ta), Hubbu(Ka)	Eye-brow
5	Satya	Truth	Sari(Ka), Sahi(Hi)	Correct
6	Vayalah	Bangle	Baḷe(Ka), Vaḷai(Ta)	Bangle
7	Lokah	People, Word	Olaku(Ta)	People, World
8	Mridu	Soft	Mella(Ka)	Slowly, Gently
9	Mrda	Mud	Maṇṇu(Ka), Maṇṇ (Ta)	Soil, Earth
10	Dhvani	Voice, Sound	Toni(Ta)	Sound
11	Vandyah	Barren Woman	Banje(Ka), Vandi(Ta)	Barren woman
12	Shabdah	Word	Sadd(Pu), Saddu(Ka)	Sound
13	kāṣṭakah	Wood	Koṭṭai(Ta), Kaṭṭige(Ka)	Wood (Collected from Forest)
14	Mṛtya	Perishable (Body)	Mai(Ka)	Body
15	Svithra	Silver/White	Velli(Ta), Belli(Ka), Belagu(Ka), Belaku	Silver, White, Light
16	Sreṇi	Line	Eṇi(Ka)	Ladder
17	Chayah	Hand	Kai(Ka, Ta)	Hand
18	Śirah	Head	Sir(Hi), Tale(Ka), Tare(Tu)	Head
19	Kāṣapaṇa	Coin or weight	Kāṇam(Ta) Kāhavaṇo(Pr) Kāhān(Or)	
20	Meṣa	Sheep/Goat	Meḍam(Ta), Meke(Ka)	Goat

According to Aiyar, the original Dravidian Languages were under the influence of Aryan Languages from the early days. He claimed after omitting clear Sanskrit words, there may be 1000 root words in Dravidian Languages. The tense and mood signs are highly influenced by Indo-Aryan Languages. In conclusion, he says the basic portion of Dravidian vocabulary consists largely of words of Indo-European origin. But owing to the extremely limited character of Tamil and Dravidian Alphabet (sounds), these words have been greatly corrupted and are very difficult to recognize as similar. In addition, he identifies around a hundred suffixes in Dravidian languages used for indicating tenses and modes of verb forms as of Aryan origin.

He disputes the contention of other scholars that Dravidian Languages have influenced Vedic Sanskrit. He claims cerebralization of sounds in Sanskrit is internal development. Dravidian Languages all along have retained a few alveolar forms from historic times and two still retain them. They have no particular preference for cerebral sounds vis-à-vis alveolar sounds or dental sounds. Languages like Telugu do not tolerate cerebral sounds ś and ṇ. Other changes in Indian Languages are due to the transition from the synthetic stage to the analytical stage. In summary, he says Dravidian scholars have mistaken the reflection for the original and the original for reflection.

Annexure 2[26] has a list of Dravidian words which are Tadbhava words, derived from Sanskrit words that appear very distinct to lay persons. As against the commonly accepted view that mainly the abstract forms in Dravidian languages are from Sanskrit, Aiyar demonstrates that

even day-to-day and common words are Tadbhava forms from Sanskrit that too in large numbers. One only needs to trace the transformation journey.

5. Linguistic Analysis using Finite State Machines

Pānini's method of understanding the language consists of

- Breaking the sentence into words
- Words into Prakriti (original part) and Pratyaya (suffix).
- Further break Prakriti into components if possible and needed.
- These components are repeatedly seen in multiple words
- Map these repeating components with repeating meanings
- Assigning meanings to these components
- Also observe how these meanings in a sentence are connected

Pānini's method of analyzing words consists of

- Observing the repeated occurrences of letters or groups of letters in different words
- Observe the repetition of the same meaning in different words
- Map repeating sounds with repeating meanings.
- Assigning meaning to the component of a word.

This process results in deriving common Dhātus (root words) out of the Prakriti component and identification of Pratyayas (common suffixes) that get attached to multiple words depending on the meaning to be conveyed. Pānini ordains a step-by-step process for joining the Prakriti and Pratyaya. Phonetic and intonation changes when words come together (Sandhi and Samāsa) also need to be considered.

The proposed methodology builds on these foundational concepts.

5.1 Proposed Methodology

In this paper, we propose the following methodology.

- We construct a phonetic map using Pānini's System of sounds.
- We represent sounds and words including parts of words under construction as states and represent each word as a state-transition diagram.
- Construct a unified state transition diagram for words belonging to a word group with associated m-language and m-alphabet. Here a completed word is represented as an accepting state.
- Compute distances on the phonetic map, each word traverses as it gets constructed. Compute inter-word distances for word groups. This can be useful to identify central words or original words that have led to other words.
- Associate a grammar (NT, T, P, S) where NT is a set of non-terminals, T is a set of Terminal Symbols, S is the starting Symbol, and P is a set of production rules, with each m-language.
- Derive a Finite Automaton that accepts words that belong to a given m-language.
- The m-languages can be expanded to include groups based on ontological considerations when words express related concepts and grammatical considerations when words are used to convey related constructs.

- The Finite Automata can be extended to accommodate suffixes that also have commonality across languages as well as undergo transformation within languages.

Once we have a repository of m-languages we can derive additional words and discover linkages between words that were not widely known. The overall idea is to analyze words beyond the confines of individual languages and improve their intelligibility without necessarily requiring one to know the corresponding language in its entirety. The proposed approach can enable us to appreciate how the words change over temporal, geo-spatial, cultural, religious, professional locales, landscapes, and milieu.

Here we have used Google Translate (translate.google.com) extensively. We also have used dictionaries (learn.sanskrit.com) and our knowledge of languages as native speakers.

5.2 Proposed Phonetic Map of Sounds

First, we lay out a geometric space of sounds as per Pāṇini's System of Sounds. This is used to create the phonetic map. In this map, each word is a path traversed. Comparing two words is a matter of comparing two paths. Words with common roots may be naturally represented as they share the first part of the word. Words that have sound shifts may show divergence only at those points where the shift has happened. Figure 2, illustrates the proposed Phonetic Map.

The topology of the map, we have constructed using the following thought process. Origin is when no sound is produced and no effort is exercised. On the Y axis, lower coordinates are given for vowels and higher Coordinates are given for consonants. The semi-vowels are accommodated next to vowels. Sibilants and aspirates are accommodated just before consonants. On the X-axis, the velar sounds have low coordinates and labial sounds have higher coordinates. Thus, we have depicted the voice box on the left bottom extreme and the mouth at the right bottom extreme. Then among consonants, we have given a lower X coordinate for an unaspirated sound and a higher coordinate for the aspirated sound. The voiced sounds are placed higher compared to unvoiced sounds.

Certain vowels are considered a combination of basic vowels. For example, we consider sound ai gets constructed due to the quick succession of sounds a and i. Then we consider sound e is composed due to the combination of sounds 'a' and 'i'. Similar considerations apply to au and o sounds which make use of 'a' and 'u' sounds.

Alternative topologies also may be considered where labials get low X-coordinates and velars get high X-coordinates. In such as case, the distance from the origin may be a better indicator of the effort required to generate a sound. However, the present layout, we feel is acceptable and easier to relate to.

Nose

17	ङ		ञ		ण(ṇ)		न्(n)		म्(m)		Nasal
16		घ(gh)		झ(jh)		ढ(dh)		ध(dh)		भ(bh)	Voiced-Aspirated
15	ग(g)		ज(j)		ड	ढ(l)	द(d)		ब(b)		Voiced
14		ख(kh)		छ(ch)		ठ(th)		त्(t)		फ(ph)	Aspirated
13	क(k)		च(c)		ट(t)		त्(t)		प्(p)		Tenue
12	ह(h) aspirate		श्(ś)		ष(ṣ)		स्(s)				Sibilant
	Kantavya		Talavya		Murdhva		Datavya		Austa		
	Guttaral		Palatal		Cerebral		Dental		Labial		
11	व्(v)										Semi-vowels
10	ल्(l)										
9	र्(r)										
8	य्(y)										
7	अ(a)	आ(ā)	इ(i)	ई(ī)	ऋ	ॠ	ऌ	ॡ	उ(u)	ऊ(ū)	Vowels
6	ऐ(ai)										
5	ए(e)										
4	औ(au)										
3	ओ(o)										
2	ं: (am)										
. 1	ः(ah)										
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

Vocal Box

Mouth

Figure 2: Phonetic Map of Indic Sounds (Devanagari)

Next, we tabulate the coordinates of sounds on the phonetic map in tables 11-13. Table 14 contains examples of words.

Table 11: Vowel Sounds

Sound	Coordinate	Sound	Coordinate	Sound	Coordinate
अ	(7,1)	आ	(7,2)	इ	(7,3)
ई	(7,4)	ऋ	(7,5)	ॠ	(7,6)
ऌ	(7,7)	ॡ	(7,8)	उ	(7,9)
ऊ	(7,10)	ऐ	(6,2)	ए	(5,2)
औ	(4,5)	ओ	(3,5)	ं	(2,5)
ः	(1,1)				

Table 12: Consonant Sounds

Sound	Coordinate	Sound	Coordinate	Sound	Coordinate
क	(13, 1)	ख	(14, 2)	ग	(15,1))
घ	(16,2)	ङ	(17, 1.5)	च	(13,3)
छ	(14,4)	ज	(15,3)	झ	(16,4)
ञ	(17, 3.5)	ट	(13,5)	ठ	(14,6)
ड	(15,5)	ढ	(15,6)	ढ	(16,6)
ण	(17,5.5)	त	(13,7)	थ	(14,8)
द	(15,7)	ध	(16,8)	न	(17, 7.5)
प	(13,9)	फ	(14,10)	ब	(15, 9)
भ	(16, 10)	म	(17, 9.5)		

Table 13: Sibilants and Semivowels

Sound	Coordinate	Sound	Coordinate	Sound	Coordinate
श्	(12, 3.5)	ष्	(12,5.5)	स्	(12, 7.5)
ह्	(12, 1.5)	य्	(8, 2.5)	र्	((9, 3.5)
ल्	(10,4.5)	व्	(11, 5.5)		

Table 14: Word Examples

Word	Path	Word	Path
kapi	(13,1) (7,1) (13,9) (7,4)	hrudaya	(12,1.5) (9, 3.5) (7,1) (15,7) (7,1) (8,2.5), (7,1)
ape /eip/	(5,2) (13,9)	heart /ha:t/	(12,1.5) (7,2) (9,3.5) (14,8)
go	(15,1) (3,5)	mana	(17,9.5) (7,1) (17,7.5) (7,1)
cow/kau/	(13,1) (4,5)	mind mΛind/	(17,9,5) (6,2) (17,7.5)(15,7) (7,1)
bo	(15,9) (3,5)	mental /'ment(ə)l	(17, 9.5) (5,2) (17,7.5) (13,7) (7,1) (10,4.5)

In the above table, it can be argued that the English word mental is closer to the Sanskrit word mana rather than ‘mind’. In the case of hrudaya, ‘hrut’ is the root word that is close to the heart as well. The Irish word ‘bo’ is the word for cow. This may be unrelated but it ends with the same vowel sound as go, the Sanskrit word for cow. The old English word for cow is coo. English uses the word bovine as a generic term to mean “affecting cattle”. The German word for cow is kuh. Persian has retained go. Latvian also has retained govs. Otherwise, most European Languages use words starting from k for the cow. In contrast, when it comes to interrogatives, Sanskrit and Indian Languages as well as a majority of European Languages, use words starting with the ‘k’ sound whereas Germanic languages use words such as who and hvem. The etymological analysis of the word wheel also leads one to a root starting with ‘k’. Thus, which word is original can become a matter of debate and controversy.

The sounds which are not included in Pānini’s System of Sounds such as Alveolar or fricative sounds can be given intermediate coordinates on the phonetic map.

5.3 Finite State Machine Preliminaries

A state machine consists of states and transitions. There may be one or more initial states and one or more terminal states. From the terminal States, no further transitions happen. There can be transitions back to the same state as well. Figure 3 below illustrates a state machine. Here S1, S2, S3, and S4 are states represented by circles, and T1, T2, T3, and T4 are transitions depicted using arrows. S1 is the start state. S4 the terminal state is represented using a donut-shaped circle. The transitions happen from state to state depending on the input given to the system in a particular state.




Figure 3: Finite State Machine

A Finite Automata is a State Machine that takes a string of symbols as input and changes the state accordingly. For a given input, the automaton can move to another state or remain in the same state. After processing a symbol string if the Automaton reaches an accepting state, then it has accepted that string as a valid string. One can also configure bad states, where from a given state when a particular input symbol is encountered it will reach the bad state when the string is rejected. There are two kinds of Finite Automata: Deterministic and Non-deterministic. Here a string $w=a_1a_2\dots a_n$, where a_1, a_2, \dots are input symbols.

A Deterministic Finite Automata (M) is a Quintuple

$$M = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$$

Q : a finite set of states

q_0 : Start State, where $q_0 \in Q$.

Σ : a finite set of input symbols

F : final states where $F \subseteq Q$

δ : Transition function where $\delta: Q \times \Sigma \rightarrow Q$

The language accepted by DFA M is

$$L(M) = \{w \mid \delta^*(q_0, w) \in F\}$$

If for a given input, more than one kind of transition happens such an automaton is non-deterministic. If for a given input there is no clarity on what happens such automata are non-deterministic. Finite automata with multiple start states are non-deterministic. Thus, only automata with a single start state and a uniquely defined transition for every input are considered Deterministic.

The most basic and foundational construct for processing symbols is the Atomic Proposition. Here AP is a set of Atomic Propositions and AP-INF is a set of infinite words over Power Set (AP). A set of words is termed as language. To form words, one needs an alphabet. For example, let us say (a, b) is the alphabet. Then, a formal/rule-based language can accept only a's, only b's or a's and b's alternating. In the case of a language that takes only a's as input,

when we model it as a finite automaton, the initial and end-states are the same. In this case, since there is no transition defined when the input is b, it is considered a Non-deterministic Finite Automaton. Figure 4 below shows an automaton that accepts only 'a' as the input. Here 'a', 'aa', and 'aaa' are the words of the language.




Figure 4: Finite Automaton which accepts only "a"

Thus, we have:

Alphabet $\{a,b\}$

Language $a^* = \{ \epsilon, a, aa, aaa, aaaa, a^5, \dots \}$

Another example of Language using the same alphabet is

$L1 = \{ \epsilon, ab, abab, ababab, \dots \}$

Here ϵ is an empty symbol and a word of length 0. The language accepts alternating 'a's and 'b's or empty symbols.

The following finite automaton illustrates a language where the initial symbol is a, and one or more b's. Figure 5, illustrates the same. The language

$L2 = \{ a, ab, ab^2, ab^3, \dots \}$




Figure 5: Finite Automaton that accepts a and then one or more b's

For example, if Σ is alphabet, Σ^* is the set of all words over Σ , a word starting with 'a' and ending with 'a' can be represented as $a\Sigma^*a$.

The languages that are accepted by finite automata are called regular languages and for every regular language, there is a DFA that accepts it. Every NFA (Non-deterministic Finite Automaton) can be converted to an equivalent DFA (Deterministic Finite Automaton).

5.4 Application of Proposed Methodology

We take a group of words that relate to each other phonetically, semantically, grammatically, and/or ontologically. This we call m-language and give it a unique identifier. The sounds that are used in constructing the words of the m-language constitute m-alphabet. This analysis and construction of m-language requires reasonable knowledge about the words and languages involved. At the same time, the process of analysis itself can be educative. We can extend the m-language and cover related concepts. In certain languages, by adding specific sounds we end up with an antonym.

Next, we look at representative cases. In the following m-language, we address the poetry theme. Here starting phoneme is common. Figure 6, illustrates the state transition diagram where each phoneme as well as word under construction are states. The completed word is accepting state.




Figure 6: State Transition Diagram for words related to Poetry Theme

Here we have represented Kavi(poet), Kavita(poem), Kavana(poem), Kāvya(Epic in poetic form), and Kavana(poem). The last word is found only in Kannada. Other words are common across Indic languages. With each m-alphabet, we associate the coordinates on the phonetic map covered in the last section. Thus, corresponding

$$\text{m-language} = \{ \text{kavi, kavita, kāvya, kavana} \}$$

m-alphabet = { k,v,t,y,n,a,ā,i} = {(13,1), (11,5.5), (13,7), (8,2.5), (17,7.5), (7,1), (7,2) (7,3)}

Here k and v are basic alphabets that are extended to make new words. Here basic sounds remain the same and new word forms are due to grammar. The way sounds were associated with coordinates on the phonetic map, the combination of sounds and words can be associated with phonetic distances that traverse. Table 15 illustrates the method used to compute distances for states. We express distance as X and Y components.

Table 15: Words with Poetry theme

Input and Coordinates			State and Manhattan Distance			Input and Coordinates			State and Manhattan Distance		
Null	0	0	Null	0	0	Null	0	0	Null	0	0
k	13	1	k	13	1	k	13	2	k	13	1
a	7	1	ka	19	1	a	7	1	ka	19	1
v	11	5.5	kav	23	5.5	v	11	5.5	kav	23	5.5
i	7	3	kavi	27	8	a	7	1	kava	27	10
t	13	6	kavit	33	12	n	17	7.5	kavan	37	16.5
ā	7	2	kavita	39	17	a	7	1	kavana	47	23
Null	0	0	Null	0	0						
k	13	1	k	13	1						
ā	7	2	kā		2						
v	11	5.5	kāv	23	5.5						
y	8	2.5	kāvy	26	8.5						
a	7	1	kāvya	27	10						

Next we can tabulate inter-word distances. See Table 16 below.

Table 16: Inter-word distances Poetry Theme

	Kavi	Kavita	Kāvya	Kavana	Row Sum
Kavi	0,0	12,9	0,2	20,15	32,26
Kavita	12,9	0,0	12,7	8, 6	32, 15
Kāvya	0,2	12,7	0,0	20,13	32, 22
Kavana	20,15	8,6	20,13	0,0	48,34

The above analysis alludes to the possibility that Kavita and Kāvya are central words. Kavi here is the most basic word. We can repeat the same analysis by excluding Kavana. Here Kāvya is more central than Kavita.

Table 17: Inter-word distances Poetry Theme excluding Kavana

	Kavi	Kavita	Kāvya	Row Sum
Kavi	0,0	12,9	0,2	12, 11
Kavita	12,9	0,0	12,7	24, 16
Kāvya	0,2	12,7	0,0	12,9

For the above case, Figure 7 below illustrates the Deterministic Finite Automata, which we term Morphological Finite Automata (MFA). Here Q0 is the starting symbol, Q5, Q7, Q11, and Q4 are accepting states. We have made use of null symbols to end with an accepting state and continue to form more words in parallel. Along with the word, in the parenthesis, the language is indicated.




Figure 7: MFA for Kavita and related words

Corresponding the above MFA, the production rules for the grammar can be written as follows.

Q0 ->kQ1; Q1->aQ2; Q2->vQ3;Q3->iQ4; Q4-> tQ6; Q6 ->ā
 Q0->kQ1;Q1->āQ8; Q8->vQ9;Q9->yQ10; Q10->a

Here tā and ya are standard and commonly used suffixes in Indian Languages. The production rules can be rewritten as follows by accommodating the suffixes as terminal symbols in their own right. Similar words are Savita, Kartavya, etc.

Q0 ->kQ1; Q1->aQ2; Q2->vQ3;Q3->iQ4->tā

Q0->kQ1;Q1->āQ8; Q8->vQ9;Q9->ya

m-language(L) = {S->* W, W is related to Poetry Theme}

Below we look at words that mean “the well”, cutting across languages. Sanskrit uses Koopa for a deep well and Vapi for a broad well. Figure 8 below depicts the corresponding MFA.




Figure 8: MFA for words meaning “the well”.

The production rules can be arrived at similarly as in the previous case. Here the m-alphabet corresponding to Koopa is {k,p,v} and vowels. By adding b to the same alphabet, we can accommodate a second set of words i.e. Vāpi and Bāvi.

Next, we look at an example that also starts with a common phoneme but cuts across languages. We take up the word for God in Indo-European Languages, which starts with the sound ‘d’ in a majority of the languages except Germanic and Russian which uses the Bhag derivative. See Figure 9.

Corresponding m-language = {deva, devs, dio, dia, theos, dieu, devaru, devudu}

m-alphabet = {d, th, a, i, u, o, s, d, r}

Greek is using “th” sound with coordinate (14,8) instead of ‘d’ sound with coordinate (15,7). Both sounds are dental. Other than that, sounds used are nearly the same. The ‘s’ sound is used for plurals in Vedic Sanskrit and Indo-European Language. In Kannada and Telugu, the word for God is in the plural form and they use the ‘r’ and retroflex ‘D’ sounds respectively




Figure 9 State Transition Diagram for words cognate with Deva

The state computation diagram for the MFA in Figure 7 is given in Table 8 below.

Table 18: Distances on Phonetic Map for Words with Sanskrit Deva

deva	deu	dio	dia	devs	theos	divine(davain)
35, 4.5	23,6	27,2	23,2	35,3.5	29,4	43, 12/5

The corresponding inter-word distances are given in Table 19 below.

Table 19: Inter-word Distances words cognate with Deva

	deva	deu	dio	dia	devs	theos	Row Sum
deva	0,0	12,1.5	8,2.5	12,2.5	0,1	6,0.5	38,8
deu	12,1.5	0,0	4,4	0,4	12,2.5	6,2	34,14
dio	8,2.5	4,4	0,0	4,0	8,1.5	2,2	26,10
dia	12,2.5	0,4	4,0	0,0	12,1.5	6,2	34,10
devs	0,1	6,2.5	8,1.5	12,1.5	0,0	6,0.5	32,7
theos	6,0.5	6,2	2,2	6,2	6,0.5	0,0	26,7

Here ‘theos’ seems to be the basic form whereas ‘deva’ and ‘deu’ seem to be more refined forms. However, if you compare the distance between ‘divine’ and words for God, the

following picture emerges. Phonetically the word ‘divine’ is rendered as ‘davain’. Table 20 below gives the distance of ‘divine’ between different words for God.

Table 20 Distance between divine and cognate words for God

	deva	deu	dio	dia	devs	theos
divine	8,8	20, 6.5	16,10.5	20,10.5	8,9	14, 4.5

The MFA for the above set of words is depicted in a compact manner below.




Figure 10 MFA for words cognate with Deva

The production rules in the corresponding grammar are as follows:

Q0->dQ1|thQ1; Q1->eQ2; Q2->vQ3; Q3->aQ4; Q4->Q5|rQ7; Q7->uQ8

Q1->iQ12; Q12->{a,u,o}Q13->Q14.

Q0->thQ1; Q1->iQ12; Q12->oQ13; Q13->sQ15;

Overall, our claim is that Vedic Sanskrit in prosodic form has retained the most accurate form of a word with a high degree of fidelity, while Indian and European Languages have tended to retain simpler and at times mispronounced forms in colloquial and then written forms. When

you analyse a group of words (cognates and related words), the root word across languages is likely to be from Sanskrit. In India, Chandas (prosodic form) used by scholars and Bhasha (colloquial forms) used by commoners have been concurrent traditions.

Next, we look at kinship words that end with “ta” sound. These include Pitā, Mātā, Bhrātā, Duhitā, Tātā in Sanskrit. In Figure 11, we cover these and cognate words in other languages and illustrate the State Transition Diagram.




Figure 11: Kinship words ending with “ta”




Figure 12 MFA for Kinship words ending with Ta

The corresponding MFA is illustrated in Figure 9. Here we have represented common endings by using null transitions in between.

Corresponding to the above kinship words m-language={pitā, mātā, bhrātā, duhitā} and m-alphabet = {p,m,bh,r,d,t,h,a,i,u} The state computation table for the MFA in Figure 8 is given in Table 21.

Table 21: Kinship words

Null	0	0	Null	0	0	Null	0	0	Null	0	0
p	13	9	p	13	9	d	15	7	d	15	7
i	7	3	pi	19	15	u	7	9	du	23	9
t	13	7	pit	25	19	h	12	1.5	duh	28	16.5
ā	7	2	pitā	31	24	i	7	3	duhi	33	18
m	17	9.5	m	17	9.5	t	17	9.5	duhit	43	24.5
ā	7	2	ā	27	17	ā	7	2	duhitā	53	32
t	13	7	māt	33	22	t	17	9.5	t	17	9.5
ā	7	2	mātā	39	27	ā	7	2	ta	27	17
bh	16	10	bh	16	10	t	17	9.5	tāt	37	24.5
r	9	3.5	bhr	23	16.5	ā	7	2	tātā	47	32
ā	7	2	bhrā	25	18						
t	17	9.5	bhrāt	35	25.5						
ā	7	2	bhrātā	45	33						

Using the same alphabet, we can derive Pitṛ, Matr, Bhratr, and Duhitar which correspond to father, mother, brother, and daughter as well as Pateras, Mitera in Greek and by adding ‘k’ sound, Dukra in Lithuanian. Other cognate words for daughter are Dushterya(Bulgarian), Doch (Russian), and Dcera (Slovak). Among Indian languages, only Duva (Konkani), Dhi (Punjabi), Dikari (Gujarati), and Diyania(Sinhala) have retained the word. In Gujarati, Dikara(son) is related to the word for daughter Dikari. Incidentally, Dikari(Gujarati) and Dukra (Lithuanian) sound similar. Nepali uses Chori (word for a girl used for daughter) sounds akin to Corka(Polish). Many Indian Languages use Chokri. Here Romance Languages do not seem to take part in the cognate word group related to daughter. It is commonly believed that people of Sri Lanka, originally went from Orissa. However, Sinhala language has some archaic words that are common with Konkani and Vedic Sanskrit.

The word for sister is Bhagini in Sanskrit which goes with Bhrāta and thus Indian Languages use words such as Behen (Hindi), Bahini(Konkani), and Bona(Bengali). Then Sanskrit uses Svasa for sister with cognates Seusa (Lithuanian), Soror (French), and Sistra (Russian). Even Finnish has Sisko. The only exceptions are Celtic Languages and Greek which seem to use very different words. Also, unlike the common understanding that retroflexes are probably loans from Dravidian Languages, they are well-established in Konkani, Punjabi, and Marathi.

[illegible]

Here Sanskrit word ‘sunu’ has a cognate word in Germanic as well as Baltic languages but not so much in Romance languages. The concept of Daughter-in-law when interpreted as a son’s wife is ‘snusha’ in Sanskrit. Similar constructs are Snuka(Bulgarian) and Soon/Suna(Konkani) Words Nuha(Punjabi), Nos(Kashmiri), Nuos(Ancient Greek) and Nora(Portuguese) seem to have commonality with the same word group. Incidentally the word in Kananda for Daughter-in-law is Sose. The state computation table for the above MFA is given in Table 22 below. Only a subset of words is represented.

san	sunu	sunus	son	nora	soon	snusha	snuka	nuha	sose
27,20.5	37,12	42,12.5	35,12	39,12	27,12.5	37,16	39.18	37,17	37,18

The MFA for words meaning the daughter-in-law is shown in Figure 14 below.




Figure 14 MFA for words meaning Daughter-in-law

Corresponding to the above MFA, basic m-alphabet = {s,n,u,a,o}. Here we can consider derivations such as Snusha and Snuka as language-specific. Thus, a minor extension of m-alphabet as m-alphabet = {s, sh, h, u, a, k, o, r} can enable the generation of all the above words.

In summary, Sanskrit words in the kinship category have cognates cutting across the Indo-European Languages. The kinship word group in Sanskrit as a whole is coherent and self-contained/derived.

Next, we look at the Apabramsha phenomenon using the word for long. It is in Sanskrit and the corresponding word is Dīg in Konkani. Other Indian Languages either use Dīrgh as is or use some other word. Cognates are available also in Croatian, Czech, Bosnian, Macedonian, Bulgarian, Polish, Serbian, Slovak and Russian. The m-language = {Dīrgha, Deeg, Dugo, Dluho, Dulgi, Duohi, Dlugi, Dlinyy}. Here two words have same sounds but with a swap of neighbouring sounds. Thus, languages either drop r or replace r with l and arrive at the Apabramsha form. Thus, core m-alphabet for this word = {d, g}. Sinhala old and isolated Indo-European Language has retained Digu. The words and distances on the phonetic map are given in Table 23 and the corresponding MFA is depicted in Figure 15.

Table 23: Words cognate with Dīrgha and Distances

dīrgha	dīg	dugo	dulgi	dlugi	digu
41,13	31,13	43,21	39,19	39,24	39,21




Figure 15: MFA for words cognate with dīrgha(“long”)

Most Indian languages use the words lamba or lambi which is closer to long in English. Both Germanic and Romance languages also use similar forms. Konkani uses lāmb to mean hang from a height (or become longer). Sanskrit uses lamb as a verb to hang/linger, with viḷamba used for delay, but the direct word for long continues to be Dīrgha. We can make a point that inter-relationships between individual Indian Languages and European Languages should also be studied. We came across a Wiktionary that attempts to derive long from 'dlogos'.

The word for a boy is 'Chello' in Konkani and 'Chele' in Bengali. The word for girl is 'Chelli' in Konkani, but Bengali uses 'Meye' for the girl. Some connection may be there with the English word boy and, the Sanskrit word 'Bālaka', Latvian 'Puika', and Lithuanian 'Berniukas'.

Finally, we take up Sanskrit forms and Dravidian Forms which were worked on by Aiyar. Figure 16 illustrates the MFAs for Sanskrit words and their Tadbhava forms in Dravidian Languages.




Figure 16 MFA for Sanskrit words and their Tadbhava Forms

In the first example, from the ‘Sarpa’ Sanskrit word first syllable is elided and the sound shift between pa and va sounds results in the ‘Aravu’, Tamil form which includes the suffix. The second example alludes to common origin for the word for ear in Sanskrit and Dravidian Languages. In the third case, ‘Pashya’ the word for seeing, is close to the Tamil form. In a similar vein, common words for night, sheep, night, and perceiving also seem to have commonalities. In summary, Finite State Machines serve as useful mechanisms for linguistic analysis across languages and can throw up not-so-obvious inter-relationships.

6. Discussions

In this section, we revisit the antiquity of Vedic Sanskrit, then reexamine how the languages are formed, in particular Sanskrit. This is followed by an analysis of word formation. Drawing on these analyses, we propose an Ecosystem Model for Linguistic Development with Sanskrit at the core.

6.1 Revisiting the Antiquity of Vedic Sanskrit

The speculated date of 1200-1500 BCE for Vedas, opened up the possibility of other Indo-European languages older than Vedic Sanskrit. These also led to the inference that the Indus civilization pre-dated the Vedas. Both these inferences are now widely questioned by scholars from fields as diverse as archeology to astronomy.

Amitabha Ghosh [27] analyzed the astronomical observations referred to in Vedic texts such as stellar conjunctions, eclipses, equinoxes, solstices as well as exaltation of planets such as Mars. These observations were picked from Vedas, Brahmanas, and associated literature and the plausible dates are arrived at using modern astronomical software.

Table 24: Astronomically Derived Dates in Vedas

Period	Dates of Astronomical Observations
Pre-Vedic and Early-Vedic	8326 BCE 4677 BCE 4539 BCE 4350 BCE 4105 BCE
Vedic	3961 BCE 3928 BCE 3541 BCE 3281 BCE 2948 BCE 2924 BCE

These dates give very early provenance to Vedic Sanskrit. Vedic Scholar K. Suresh [28] divides the period of Vedic literature fourfold: (1) The period of creation of Mantras (2) The

period of collection of Mantras (3) The Brahmanas period and (4) the Sutras Period. The seers involved were numerous spanning multiple generations generating mammoth literature. Rigveda had 21 Shākhās(branches/variants), Yajurveda had 109 Shākhās, Samaveda had 1000 Shākhās and Atharvaveda had 50 Shākhās There are references to 109 Upanishads. All this adds credence to the inference that the Vedic literature would have taken millennia to evolve and Vedic Sanskrit indeed is ancient.

Over and above this, Rigveda describes the river Sarasvati as fully flowing and merging into the sea. Now it is known that the river Sarasvati dried up by 1900 BCE or so. The dating of Vedas has to be much earlier. There were questions about the lack of horse bones and chariots in archeological findings. These have been put to rest with recent findings such as at Sinauli. As Rigveda did not seem to have mentioned Iron, the date of use of Iron was another marker. Even that date, with new archeological findings, has been shifted back from 1200 BCE to 2000 BCE.

The Indus Culture and Vedic Culture were contemporary if not the same, as Vedic Altars have been found in many Indus Sites. Prof. Gaya Charan Tripathi [29] makes a plea to revisit the dating of Rigveda and covers these points eloquently.

6.2 How Languages Are Formed

On one hand, the European Scholars have hypothesized a Proto-Indo-European Language as the mother of Sanskrit and other Indo-European Languages. On the other hand, traditional wisdom in India considers Sanskrit as the mother of all Indian Languages. Dattaraj Deshpande [30] examines this quandary, with a unique perspective.

In his exposition, Deshpande first lists the hypotheses used in the field of comparative linguistics.

- H1: Every Language has a start date before which it did not exist.
- H2: Languages are pure in their original form and then get corrupted or decay over time
- H3: Languages change with locality and over time
- H4: Languages loan words to one another
- H5: Words get modified beyond recognition due to faulty pronunciation
- H6: Languages that have the most distorted words are older. Older languages are simpler and raw.
- H7: Original language has pure and precise pronunciation. Borrowing language has distorted and corrupted pronunciation.
- H8: A linear sense of time of Western scholars, in place of cyclical as in Indian Tradition
- H9: With time world gets more and more chaotic. (2nd law of thermodynamics)

Languages go hand-in-hand with cultures and civilizations. The way words are pronounced changes with date, time, climatic conditions as well as the ability to pronounce them. A child, a person with speaking disabilities will invariably distort words. Another aspect is the effort to pronounce a word, in colloquial settings, the words tend to get simplified, and simpler forms are more popular. Different regions as well as languages prefer certain sets of sounds.

In the above list, hypotheses H6 and H7 contradict each other. But both phenomena are possible. According to Western Linguists, the original languages are more primitive. Secondly, natural languages decay over time and based on such decay the age of language can be assessed. Both these assumptions do not hold for Sanskrit. With Sanskrit there has been a constant focus on precision, Sanskrit has generally co-existed with Prākṛit's or colloquial forms where such decay is possible. But that decay is continually arrested when the language is used in say Vedas, as there is a strong focus on preserving the hymns without any error. Secondly, Sanskrit preserves multiple forms of the same word and routinely reintroduces the formal word back into Prākṛit's or natural language. There was so much stress on preserving exact pronunciation that the sounds and words are retained even when the meanings are a matter of debate. Ram Gopal [31] details multiple ways Vedas are interpreted. That debate has gone on for centuries. Deshpande considers one language being the mother of another language as not the right way to look at linguistic development. He seems to allude that languages co-evolve over time. Thus, he considers Sanskrit being the mother of all Indian languages as not the right way to frame the question.

Sanskrit is endowed with a rich and robust grammatical tradition that allows for auto-correction, and a community of scholars takes responsibility for that. In addition, multiple ways of memorizing Vedas from Padapāṭha to Ganapāṭha provided a mechanism that is even more powerful than modern checksum, to ensure the integrity of the text. Even the pitches, accents, and tones were preserved for generations. Because of such precision and richness, Buddhist literature which was initially in Pali moved to Sanskrit.

6.3 How Words Are Formed

There probably is a huge body of literature in linguistics on word formation. However, there are probably rather few studies with a perspective that is as grounded as it is exalted as done by Ram Swarup.

Ram Swarup [32] does a detailed analysis of how the words are formed. He starts with the observation that certain sounds singly or in combination express certain phenomena or emotions. Among the Pāṇinian sounds, some sounds express softer sentiments whereas others virile sentiments. Then he dwells on how things are named. According to him, many new things are named based on the names of older things unless they are completely new. Then he looks at the roots of words. Sanskrit in particular is very rich in roots. Then he describes synonyms and how multiple words are used for the same phenomenon such as fire using different roots that manifest different aspects of fire - lighting, purification, etc. Then there are 'manas' words and 'buddhi' words. Here former connects with mind/sense perception and the latter with intellect/cognition enabling abstract concepts. Then there is a continual attempt to unlock higher meanings into words. In the words of Ram Swarup: 'Word is a living thing. It is pregnant with life and possibilities. It grows and expands meanings in a hundred directions. The process of unfoldment and development like all truly vital processes, is unconscious, but truly intelligent and wise'.

In general, Sanskrit has served as a morphological foundry for a large number of languages. Thus, Sanskrit lives through words in other languages. For example, to craft a word to mean empowerment, a modern concept, in Sanskrit as 'Sabalīkarana', is rather effortless. Thus, Sanskrit continues to be the destination of new concepts and words.

6.4 Ecosystem Model for Linguistic Development

Our analysis so far drives us to the conclusion that the formation of words and languages is way too complex to be explained by a family-tree model of languages. An alternative model is required that is more holistic and harmonizing.

To that end, we propose the Ecosystem Model for Linguistic Development. Here Sanskrit (Vedic or otherwise) invariably develops in intimate proximity with natural language/Prākṛits where the speakers of natural languages contribute to Sanskrit and Sanskrit in turn enriches natural languages, by being a donor for words. Then over time certain languages and words migrate, in other cases, Sanskrit itself migrates either as a language, literature, or technical knowledge. In some cases, the words migrate as is whereas in other cases words change beyond recognition and only with a good degree of analysis, the common roots and basic words can be discovered. With every language in currency, certain sounds may be preferred and certain other sounds rarely used. Some sounds may be unique to a language. All these lead to the adaptation of words to a new milieu. Then these words and expressions are reorganized as per the evolving grammar of languages. Figure 17, depicts Linguistic Ecosystem with Sanskrit at its core. Figure 12, illustrates the ecosystem phenomena at play.




Figure 17: Linguistic Ecosystem




Figure 18: Ecosystem Phenomena at Play

Firstly, the formation of words can be described as an ‘emergence’ phenomenon. Here players participate without necessarily being conscious and purposeful. Thus, certain sounds get associated with certain meanings and get used to refer to certain entities. Then the existing words in part or whole contribute to the formation of new words. Words may have a particular meaning at one time and a radically new meaning may emerge for the same word due to social phenomena. Secondly, the words, as well as languages, ‘coevolve’ due to varied interactions, commonality of speakers, shared spaces and times, beliefs, traditions, culture, and civilization. Thirdly, as words move from language to language and language moves from region to region they get exposed to new climatic conditions and new groups of speakers. Such movements will result in the adaptation of words and languages. The context for the use of language is another important dimension that determines the nature of adaptation. In certain contexts, precision gives way to ease of use. In other situations, the sounds may get shifted to the extent that it becomes rather hard to link the changed word with the original word. Finally, every language has certain self-organization which sets rules for word and sentence formation. This organization may be cognitive based on well-defined grammar or habitual based on collective behaviors. Even here languages may be influenced by neighboring languages. For example, Indian Languages commonly follow the subject-object-verb order unlike English which follows the subject-verb-object order. Here Sanskrit is unique where the meaning does not change with the order of parts of speech.

Ecosystem is a very powerful paradigm. The paper [33] dwells on the ecosystem paradigm extensively as it applies to the complex agricultural sector.

7. Vocabulary

The words we have used for our analysis and inferences are given in the following annexures.

Annexure 1[25], provides a list of cognate and related works across Indian and European Languages, based on our analysis.

Annexure 2[26], provides a list of words sourced from Dravidian Theories [20] which demonstrate the linkage between Sanskrit and Dravidian Languages.

Annexure 3 at the end of this paper, provides further details on word formation and can give insight into the diffusion of roots, words, and meanings across the linguistic ecosystem. Here you can see that commonality of words cuts across seemingly unrelated languages and from a single root a wide canvas of words is created that spans the whole linguistic ecosystem. Here we have sourced some of the words from Ram Swarup's work [30].

8. Conclusions

In this paper, we have analyzed languages with a particular focus on words. The words are divided into word groups where a set of these words form m-language (morphological language). With a given m-language, we associate an m-alphabet. The m-alphabet may have a basic version with common sounds and an extended version with all sounds. Corresponding to these morphology-based constructs we construct state transition diagrams, here every phoneme is a state and so is a sequence of phonemes. A valid word, a member of m-language is an accepting state. A suitable grammar can thus determine whether a word belongs to the word group or not. To enable that we construct a unified Morphological Finite Automata which is expressed compactly and accepts all words belonging to the m-language, that cuts across multiple natural languages. Secondly, this exercise can enable us to infer new words that may belong to the same word group and give insights into hitherto unknown associations between two words either belonging to the same or different languages.

We have used Pānini's System of Sounds to represent sounds and words. In addition, we have defined a phonetic map that geometrically manifests these sounds on a 2-dimensional plane. Thus, each phoneme has a coordinate on the phonetic map. Each word has an associated distance measure that gives an indication of the quantum of traversal required on the phonetic map. This measure we have used to analyse differences between words. Thus, based on the distance we can term some words as basic words, some as refined words, and some others as central words. These ideas we believe are useful in comparative linguistics.

The phonetic-map distance measure we believe is an improvement on the current mechanism to compare words in natural languages. One approach is to use Levenshtein Distance, where natural language words need to be transliterated first in English. Here the number of substitutions/modifications required to get two words to match is used as distance. This misses the phonetic dimension. The second well-known measure is Soundex. This works well for European Languages, in particular for de-duplication of names. Here each word is associated with a code such as M460. Soundex uses the following codes: 1=B,P,F,V; 2=C,S,G,J,K,Q,X,Z;3=D,T;4=L;5=M,N;6 = R. The letters A, E, I, O, U, Y, H, and W are not coded. Compared to these measures the scheme we have proposed is more elaborate and promising. In an earlier paper [34], Soundex-based measures were used for language classification.

Based on our analysis in this paper, we surmise the following: Vedic Sanskrit as part of Chandas (prosody) has retained the most refined forms from which simpler forms can be derived. Thus, in certain cases, a word in Sanskrit may result in a high distance measure on the phonetic map. Also, the Sanskrit word in many cases is a central word that has cognates cutting across languages, and language groups. If we were to use a genetic or clustering viewpoint,

Sanskrit words have some relationship or other in some manner/context or other with all other languages among the Indo-European Languages. At times Greek/some other language may appear to have a more basic or original word compared to Sanskrit, but when you do the same analysis at the word group level that includes derived and related words, Sanskrit words are indeed central. Secondly, Sanskrit is *the* donor language when it comes to the Dravidian Languages, even for day-to-day words. Hence, based on morphological analysis, a more accurate representation for the comparative linguistics field may be Sanskrit occupying the hub from which words have been transmitted to all other languages and groups of languages that underwent transformations in transit. The process of transformation of Sanskrit words in Indian Languages and European Languages is similar. This process has very likely happened over millennia due to well-acknowledged migrations within India and less understood outward transmissions to Europe.

Further, based on the insights gained from this study and drawing on the wisdom of Sanskrit scholars rooted in Indian tradition, we propose an ecosystem model for the analysis of languages in place of the genealogical model. With the genealogical model languages are born and die, giving rise to other languages in the interim. Languages age over time making them almost intelligible, if the speakers of distant generations were to converse. Along with this are tied the hypotheses that make certain sounds older and primitive and inferences are drawn giving or denying motherhood/ancestry to languages. With the ecosystem model, words and languages emerge due to complex interaction, orderly and refined forms are preserved and multiple forms of words co-exist. Then words and languages coevolve as they participate in a common civilization, culture, or context. Then as words and languages migrate, they adapt to newer geographies and preferences/limitations of the users of language. The context of use also guides these adaptations. Finally, rich and robust grammar can organize this evolution in a guided manner, which Sanskrit has been and continues to be particularly well-endowed with.

References

1. Chomsky, Noam, Understanding Linguistics, Talks at Google, 2014, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Y3PwG4UoJ0Y>
2. Chomsky, Noam, Language Arts & Disciplines. MIT Press, 1995
3. Pavana, Nagendra, Śikṣā – The Art and Science of Vedic Chanting, Open Learning for All, Video 27, Chinmaya Vishwa Vidyapeetha, November 2020. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WUDgKX_CbnM&list=PLbQHD8oHpmE15FcG2rPWejiQnGL0TC_m2&index=28
4. Gokranakar, Shreehari, Chandas – The Vedic Meters, Open Learning for All, Video 28, Chinmaya Vishwa Vidyapeetha, November 2021, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7BNkWHUXcds&list=PLbQHD8oHpmE15FcG2rPWejiQnGL0TC_m2&index=29
5. Mahulkar, Gauri, Nirukta - The Etymological Studies in the Veda, Open Learning for All, Video 31, Chinmaya Vishwa Vidyapeetha, November 2021, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q_AYmuaXA-8&list=PLbQHD8oHpmE15FcG2rPWejiQnGL0TC_m2&index=32
6. Pavana, Nagendra, Vyakarana – Linguistics from Vedas, Open Learning for All, Video 32, Chinmaya Vishwa Vidyapeetha, November 2021.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Hi1yItWodw0&list=PLbQHD8oHpmE15FcG2rPWejiQnGL0TC_m2&index=33

7. Shyamasundar, R.K., Computing Processes and Pānini's Aṣṭadhyayi, *Bhāvanā*, Volume 5, Issue 3, July 2021, <https://bhavana.org.in/computing-processes-and-pan%CC%A3inis>
8. Kiparsky, Paul, Pāninian Linguistics, Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics, <https://web.stanford.edu/~kiparsky/Papers/encycl.pdf>, Accessed on February 29, 2024.
9. Mallory, J.P., In Search of the Indo-Europeans, Language, Archaeology and Myth, Thames and Hudson, 1991, ISBN-13 : 978-0500276167
10. Parsons, James, Remains of Japhet: : being historical enquiries into the affinity and origin of the European languages.1705-1770, <https://archive.org/details/remainsofjaphetb00pars/page/n19/mode/2up>
11. Singh, B (1995) The first Englishman in India Thomas Stephens (1547–1619). *J South Asian Literature* 30(1/2):146–161
12. Redondo, Pedro, Filippo Sasseti and Thomas Stephens in the beginnings of Indo-European linguistics, *Academia Letters*, 10.20935/AL2158.
13. Jones SW. Discourses delivered before the Asiatic society; and miscellaneous papers, on the religion, poetry, literature, etc., of the nations of India. C. S. Arnold, Michigan, 1824
14. Bryant, Edwin, The Quest for the Origins of Vedic Culture: The Indo-Aryan Migration Debate Paperback – Illustrated, 11 March 2004, OUP USA, ISBN-13 : 978-0195169478
15. Bryant, Edwin and Patton Laurie, The Indo-Aryan Controversy Evidence and Inference in Indian History, Edited By Edwin Bryant, Laurie Patton, 2005, ISBN 9780203641880, Published August 2, 2004 by Routledge
16. Mishra, Satya Swaroop, The date of the Rigveda and the Indian Migration, *Fresh Linguistic Evidence*, ibid
17. Witzel, Michael. Indocentricism, Autochthonous Visions of Ancient India, ibid
18. Kuiper, F.P.J., Selected Writings on Indian Linguistics and Philology, *Leiden Studies in Indo-European*, Volume: 8, 1997, ISBN: 978-90-420-0235-7
19. Eck, Diana L, India A Sacred Geography, Harmony; Reprint edition (26 March 2013); ISBN-13 : 978-0385531924
20. Songaila, Gintaras Affinities between Vedic and Baltic Cultures || Sangam Talks, Aug 22, 2020. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-OlsA9KMf-0>
21. Kak, Subhash, Sanskrit and Ancient Migrations, 2021, *Itihas Darpan*, vol. 26, pp. 12-18
22. Aiyar, Swaminatha, Dravidian Theories, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers (1 January 1987), ISBN-13 : 978-8120803312
23. Kumar, Rajesh, Basics of Language Science, NPTEL Swayam, April 2021, https://onlinecourses.nptel.ac.in/noc21_hs12/preview
24. Chaudhary, Anuradha, Lecture 02: Sounds of Spoken Sanskrit: Its Alphabet, IIT Kharagpur, October 2018, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UgVwzueOKRU&list=PLbRMhDVUMngfYG2GVf2bQnIgsIOY923g3>
25. Prabhu, Shreekanth, Annexure 1: Word Groups for Indian and European Languages, ResearchGate, January 2023, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/367361269_Annexure_1_Word_Groups_for_Indian_and_European_Languages
26. Prabhu, Shreekanth, Annexure 2: Dravidian Theories, ResearchGate, January 2023, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/367411879_Annexure_2_Dravidian_Theories

27. Ghosh, A., & Ghosh, A. (2020). Chronology of Vedic and Vedānga Periods. *Descriptive Archaeoastronomy and Ancient Indian Chronology*, 109-137.
28. Suresh, K, A Brief History of Vedas, Ghanpāti, Chennai, India, June 2021, https://archive.org/details/HsjD_a-brief-history-of-vedas-by-k-suresh-the-ghana-pathi-chennai/page/n7/mode/2up
29. Tripathi, Gaya Charan Revisiting the date of Rigveda, Sangam Talks, August 2020, <https://youtu.be/HraoKemxmiU>
30. Deshpande, Dattaraj, Is Sanskrit Really the Mother of all Languages? Sethu Foundation, May 2023, <https://youtu.be/UsjKtJ897nw>
31. Ram Gopal, The History and Principles of Vedic Interpretation, Concept Publishing, 1983.
32. Swarup, Ram, The Word as Revelation: Name of Gods, Voice of India (Aditya Prakashan) (1 January 2011)
33. Prabhu, S. M., & Subramanyam, N. (2023). Analysis of India's agricultural ecosystem using knowledge-based Tantra framework. *CSI Transactions on ICT*, 11(2), 129-155. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40012-023-00384-z>
34. Girdhar, R., Nayak, P.S., Prabhu, S.M. (2022). Linguistic Classification Using Instance-Based Learning. In: Saraswat, M., Sharma, H., Balachandran, K., Kim, J.H., Bansal, J.C. (eds) *Congress on Intelligent Systems. Lecture Notes on Data Engineering and Communications Technologies*, vol 111. Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-9113-3_63

Annexure 3: Word Formation

Generally, the first two letters are used to indicate language. The languages listed are supported in Google Translate (translate.google.com). Retroflex sounds are capitalized.

Word(English)	Cognates (Tatsama/Tadbhava
Pāth	Path(Sa) Hādi(Ka)
People	Lok(Sa) Log(Hi)
Group	Group(En), Gumpu(Ka)
Cave	Gavi(Ka) , Cave(En)
Colour	Varna(Sa) BaNNa(Ka)
Clan, Parent's house for married lady	Kula(Sa), Kula(Ko)
Old Person	Vraddha(Sa) BooDa(Hi)
	Aristo(crati) (En) Shreshta(Sa)
Throwing and flying	UDai(Ko) Throw UDana(Hi) Fly
Covered	Kavida (Ka) MoDa Kavida Covered with Clouds Covered (En)
Namaste	Vande(Sa) VaNakkam(Ta)
	Soona (Hi):Depressing, Shoonya(Sa):Zero, empty
Medicine	Medicine (En) Maddu(Ka)
Search	Shodh(Sa) So~dhi(Ko)
Touch	Tvak(Sa), Touch(En)
Cover	Topar(Sp) Topi(Hi):Cap
Proof/Evidence	Purave(Ka) Proof (En) Prova(Po) Purava(Ma)
Native: Born in a place, belonging to a place.	Naadu(Ka) our land, Naadiga- Person belonging to Naadu, Naati(Ka) – may mean something else.
Money	Cash(En), Kaasu(Ka)
Money	Paisa(Hi), Peso(Sp)
Habit	Havyasa(Ka), Habit(En) Abhyasa(Sa)=Practice
Bull	Vrishabh(Sa) Basava(Ka)
Think	Yochane(Ka) Sochna(Hi)
Hand	Kara(Sa), Kai(Ka)
Light (not heavy)	Laghu(Sa), Hagura(Ka)

after	Apar(Sa) as in Aparhana(afternoon) Aparo(Ta)
North-East	Ishanya(Sa) Here East and Isha whose ruler is Sun God. The ruler of Ishana is Shiva
Eat	Tran(Sa) Root Tinnu(Ka) Tindi Tran(Sa)=Grass, Tan(Ko) = Grass, food for cattle
Lame	KunTa (Ka)
Vaikunta(Sa)	Without being Kunta(Sa): Dull, Blunt (Blunt edge to the foot?)
Turning around	Ulta(Hi), Volte face(En) : Turning around, changing stance
Steal	Steal(En) Asteya(Sa): Not stealable. Same root St
School	Shāla(Sa)=Branch originally then school, Shole(Ge) School(En) Ecole(Fr) Shaale(Ka)
Pillar	Sthambha(Sa), Khamba(Hi,Ko) Tamh(Pu) Tun(Ta) Kanua(Si), Stob(Ru) Saila(No) Syun(Ar)
Lake/Pond	TāTaka(Sa) TaLe(ko) Sara(Sa) Sarasu(Te) Tādakam(Ma) Kere(Ka) Eri(Ta)
Well	Vaapi (Sa) Well(En) Bavi(Ka)
	Kona(S): Angle KoNe(Ka)-Room (generally at the corner)
Or	Va(Sa) or(En) Ve(Ko)
Time	Hour(En), Hora(Sa), Hottu(Ka)

English	Sanskrit	Tamil	Kannada	Malayalam	Telugu
Turmeric	Haridra	Manjai	Arisina	Manyal	Pasupu

Semantic Drift - Now to today

Ee Hottu(Ka): This time	Ivattu(Today)
Adya(Sa) Now Adhuna(Sa) Now	Aaj(Hi), Aaaji(Ko) Today Aatt(Ko): Now
Adya(Sa) Now	Udya(Mar) _Tomorrow

Roots and Words (Ram Swarup)

Root/Basic word	Word
bhan(Sa): speak	Phone: voice or sound
pas(Sa)/spas(Sa):see	Telescope
Graphein (Gr): scratch,write	Telegraph, carve (En)

Tāra(Sa):star, astron(Gr), nau(Sa):boat	astronaut
Peda(Gr):steering oars	Pilot (originally plying boats)
daa(Sa): give	dāna(Sa), donation(En), dose, condone
spand(Sa): vibrate	pendere(La), pensive, pendulum, append, suspend, expend,poise, ponder
sthā (Sa)	sthala(place).sthāna(place), sthāa(receptacle), sthāpatya(architecture) sthapati(architect), sthira(stationary), sthitha(standing firm), sthuna(post,pillar), stand, state, stationary, statue, status, stable, sthambha (pillar)
bhu(sa) phynai(gr): to be born	Bhava(existence), bhavana(abode, mansion), bhuta(has been), bhavishya(future). physics, physical, buan(ge):dwell, be, build, bower, fui(La): I have been
Jnā (Sa):to know	Jnāna(knowledge), ājñā permission), gignoskein(Ge), gnoscere(La), know, knowledge, acknowledge, gnostic, ignorant, znate(Ru), noble, cunning, keen, can, narrate
path	path(Sa):Path pathya:suitable food (for journey)
brh(Sa): To tear vrasa(Sa): To cut down	Vraksha(Sa):Tree
rad(Sa): to bite, scratch rodere(La):to gnaw	rat
mus(Sa,Gr,La):To steal muis(Ru) maus(Ge)	mushaka (Sa): mouse, mouse(En), muscle:looks like mouse
undare(La) und(Sa), ud(Sa): to flow, bathe	Udan(water), hudor(Gr), Wanduo(Li), wasser(Ge), water(En), udāk(Ko), unda(La):wave, undulating, redundant, abundant, abound

vira(Sa):brave	virtue
nad(Sa):To make roaring sound	nadi(Sa):river
agni(Sa):Fire, ignis(La)	ugnis(Li), ogni(Sl), ignition
apa(Sa):water	aqua(La)
vāri(Sa):water	urine
shvān(Sa):dog	canine(La), sobaka(Ru)
tam(Sa):gasp of breath timere(La): to fear	timid
vah(Sa): to move uhere(La): to carry, transport	Heavy, weighty,
vāk(Sa):speech	Voice, vocal, vowel, vouch, invoke, evoke, revoke, provoke, advocate, vocation, convocation, equivocal, vocabulary
bhid(Sa):break, divide	biting
kuta(Sa):knife	cutting
svad(Sa):To taste, to eat	Sweet, hedus (Gr)
vid (Sa): To know, To see	eidenai(Gr):To know, idein (Gr):To see, Wizze, wisdom, vidya Vision, view, vista, visit Veda, Vedas (known as well as seen by seers)