

Sambandh and Samband: Etymological Diplomacy between India and Iceland

Dr Vineeta Dwivedi 

Abstract

This article explores the linguistic and cultural connection between Icelandic and Hindi, a relationship highlighted by the striking similarity between the words ‘*samband*’ (Icelandic) and ‘*sambandh*’ (Hindi) during the 2026 India–Nordic summit. Through comparative-historical analysis of phonological correspondences, cognate sets, and mythological parallels, the study investigates how these distant languages are linked through a shared Proto-Indo-European (PIE) ancestor and governed by systematic phonetic shifts such as Grimm’s Law. By analysing Iceland’s unique morphological conservatism, which functions as a “living museum” of ancient speech, and the linguistic-archaeological evidence of the Steppe (Kurgan) Hypothesis, the article traces the migration of Steppe pastoralists who spread advanced technology and social structures across Eurasia. This demonstrates that shared roots for language, and deep-seated mythological parallels reveal a collective history of innovation and a “hidden architecture” of speech that bridges the North Atlantic and the Indian subcontinent. *The article illustrates how political actors mobilise deep linguistic heritage to construct a transnational cultural community.* while also activating symbolic cues of shared identity and affiliation consistent with insights from Social Identity Theory. *The samband/sambandh parallel is a study in what can be called “etymological diplomacy.”*

Keywords: Etymological Diplomacy | Social Identity Theory | Linguistic Heritage | Cultural Diplomacy | Comparative Linguistics | India–Iceland Relations | Indo-European Languages

Submitted : May 26, 2026

Published : June 30, 2026

DOI: doi.org/10.65320/ice.vol.1.issue3.21

1* Associate Professor, S P Jain Institute of Management and Research, Mumbai, India.
(Vineeta.dwivedi@spjmr.org)

**Corresponding Author*



This paper is blockchain-verified. Scan the QR code to verify its authenticity.

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2026 The Author(s). Journal of CortexPlore published by Managers Without Borders Community Confederation.

I. INTRODUCTION

During the India–Nordic summit in Oslo in May 2026, India’s Prime Minister Narendra Modi pointed¹ out that the Hindi word ‘sambandh’ (relationship, connection, bond) sounds almost identical to the Icelandic word *samband*, which carries nearly the same meaning. Iceland’s Prime Minister Kristrún Mjöll Frostadóttir responded to the observation, remarking that Icelanders feel a deep loyalty to their language and that *samband* is a distinctly Icelandic term that reflects the heightened need for connection in the contemporary world.

What made the exchange striking was not merely the linguistic similarity, but the ease with which audiences immediately recognised it. Similar terms conveying connection, relation, or union are found in Norwegian, Swedish, and Faroese; the “sam-” root, meaning togetherness, predates contemporary nation-states by thousands of years.

This phonetic correspondence is no mere coincidence or modern borrowing; it is a vital clue to the “hidden architecture” of human speech. Both words descend from a single ancestral tongue, Proto-Indo-European (PIE), which branched out millennia ago to form the “genealogical language family tree” that includes both the Germanic and Indo-Aryan languages. When Icelandic and Hindi speakers use these terms, they are not merely communicating; they are tracing an ancient, collective history that leads back to the Eurasian steppe, demonstrating common language origins.

Yet the significance of this exchange extends beyond the linguistic. When a head of government publicly invokes an etymological parallel to build

rapport with a foreign counterpart, language is being deployed as diplomatic currency. This article proposes the term *etymological diplomacy* to describe this practice: the mobilisation of a shared linguistic heritage, specifically, the invocation of genealogical cognates, to construct a transnational cultural community in a political context. The *samband/sambandh* parallel is an unusually transparent instance of this practice, precisely because the phonetic similarity is audible to a non-specialist, the semantic overlap is exact, and the genealogical connection is strongly supported by comparative-historical linguistics. These properties, together, make it a symbol of shared origin and a useful diplomatic instrument.

Icelandic is notably conservative as a language, having preserved many older grammatical and phonetic forms that changed elsewhere in Europe. While English and Mainland Scandinavian languages merged or lost many of their complex structures, Icelandic has remained remarkably resilient from the era of Old Norse to the present day. Most notably, Icelandic still productively marks all four nominal cases — nominative, accusative, dative, and genitive — and preserves inherited argument structures that have vanished elsewhere. This morphological resilience allows modern Icelandic speakers to maintain a direct structural link to the same Proto-Indo-European patterns found in ancient Sanskrit, effectively bridging thousands of years of linguistic history.

This article adopts a comparative-historical and interpretive approach, drawing on established Indo-European linguistic scholarship and discourse-oriented analysis of the 2026 summit exchange.

¹ <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/need-more-sambandh-iceland-pm-draws-attention-to-purely-icelandic-word-with-pm-modi-on-stage-at-nordic-conference-watch/articleshow/131202465.cms>

II. PRIOR SCHOLARSHIP: INDO-EUROPEAN COMPARATIVE LINGUISTICS

The scholarly foundations for this article on intersecting bodies of literature: the comparative-historical study of Indo-European languages, the specific literature on Icelandic morphological conservatism, scholarship on Hindi-Sanskrit continuity within the Indo-Aryan branch, and the sociolinguistic field of language ideology.

Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) offers a useful lens for understanding the symbolic force of linguistic similarity in diplomatic contexts. The theory proposes that individuals and groups derive part of their identity from perceived membership in shared social categories. Linguistic familiarity and recognisable cultural markers may therefore function as symbolic cues of affinity, reducing perceived social distance and encouraging a sense of commonality between otherwise distant groups. Later work on ethnolinguistic identity (Giles & Johnson, 1987), suggest that language functions not merely as communication but as a marker of shared group affiliation and social belonging. Contemporary sociocultural linguistic scholarship further emphasises that linguistic forms actively participate in the construction and negotiation of social identity (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005).

In the Modi–Frostadóttir exchange, the recognition of a shared cognate pair arguably operated as a subtle act of symbolic in-group construction at the level of civilisational identity.

Indo-European Comparative Linguistics. The existence of a Proto-Indo-European ancestor language from which both the Germanic and Indo-Aryan branches descended is among the most robustly established findings in historical linguistics (Beekes, 2011). The standard account of this family, its reconstruction, its internal

branching, and the systematic sound changes that distinguish its daughter languages is documented in Ringe (2006) and Mallory and Adams (1999), which together constitute the principal reference infrastructure for the cognate analysis in this article. Recent large-scale quantitative work by Anderson et al. (2025) has produced a dataset of Indo-European cognate relationships across 170 core meanings, spanning Germanic and Indo-Aryan among other branches, providing a rigorous empirical basis for the cognate pairs discussed here. The correspondences are not accidental: they are governed by the regular, exceptionless sound laws first systematised by Grimm (1822) and subsequently refined by the Neogrammarians in the late nineteenth century (Fortson, 2010). The particular sound shifts separating the Germanic branch from Indo-Aryan - the First Germanic Consonant Shift described by Grimm's Law- have been extensively studied and are not in scholarly dispute (Wiese, 2023). These language groups spread from the Eurasian steppe, connecting the archaeological and genetic evidence surveyed by Haak et al. (2015) to the linguistic patterns that are this article's central concern.

Icelandic Morphological Conservatism. Among the Germanic languages, Icelandic occupies a distinctive position due to its extraordinary morphological conservatism. Where English, Swedish, Danish, and Norwegian have largely shed the case system inherited from Proto-Germanic, Icelandic retains all four nominal cases productively across its entire noun paradigm (Thráinsson, 2007). Quantitative and comparative work by Martín (2014) demonstrates that Icelandic paradigms have remained "remarkably resilient" from Old Norse to the present, occupying a distinct retention trajectory from other North Germanic languages.

This conservatism is not merely a structural accident; it is partly the product of deliberate

language policy. Kristinsson (2012) documents how the Icelandic Language Council has institutionalised *nýyrðamyndun* - the systematic coining of Icelandic neologisms rather than borrowing from English and other languages as a strategy of lexical purism.

The Icelandic identity is bound up with the language to an unusual degree among European nations. This purism, under contemporary pressure from English (Vikør, 2010), is well argued by many experts. It is within this context that Frostadóttir's description of *samband* as "a purely Icelandic word" should be understood: the remark draws on a deeply embedded cultural ideology of linguistic authenticity (Woolard, 1998). The relevance of this conservatism for the present study is direct. Because Icelandic has preserved inherited PIE structures with exceptional fidelity, the cognate relationships it displays with Hindi are more transparent and more numerous than those available through the more transformed Germanic languages.

Hindi-Sanskrit Continuity and the Indo-Aryan Branch. Hindi participates in these Indo-European cognate networks through its Indo-Aryan lineage, and modern Hindi also preserves and reintroduces many Sanskritic lexical forms, including tatsama vocabulary such as *sambandh*.

Masica (1991) provides the foundational account of this continuity in *The Indo-Aryan Languages*, establishing the systematic relationship between Vedic, Classical Sanskrit, Prakrits, Apabhraṃśa, and the modern North Indian languages, including Hindi. Bubeník (1998) traces the specific phonological and morphological changes through the late Middle Indo-Aryan period, while Shapiro (2003) situates Modern Hindi within this genealogy and documents the features that mark its descent from the same IE stock as Icelandic. Cardona and Luraghi (2007) provide the broader

typological context. Sanskrit has historically been constructed in Indian cultural and political discourse as a sacred and uniquely prestigious language, a construction that parallels, in interesting ways, the Icelandic ideology of linguistic purity documented by Kristinsson (2012). Both languages, in other words, have been the objects of deliberate heritage ideologies, and it is precisely these ideologies that the 2026 diplomatic exchange activated.

Language Ideology Another body of literature relevant to this article is the sociolinguistic study of language ideology: the beliefs, values, and assumptions that speakers and institutions attach to language and linguistic forms (Silverstein, 1979; Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994). This field has established that language is never merely a communicative medium; it is always also a bearer of social meaning, a marker of identity, and a site of political contestation (Blommaert, 2006; Kroskrity, 2000). Within this framework, the mobilisation of linguistic heritage in a diplomatic context, as in the Modi-Frostadóttir exchange, is a recognisable ideological act: the deployment of etymological capital (Heller, 2003) to construct transnational solidarity. Pavlenko (2001) documents how heritage language ideology links speakers to ancestral communities across vast distances of time and geography; the 2026 exchange represents this ideology operating at the level of heads of state rather than individual speakers. Woolard's (1998) distinction between authenticity-based and anonymity-based language prestige is directly relevant: Frostadóttir invokes authenticity (this is *our* word) while Modi implicitly invokes a form of shared heritage that cuts across the authenticity/anonymity binary. To the authors' knowledge, the specific conjunction of PIE genealogy and contemporary diplomatic practice has not previously been theorised in the language ideology literature, and the concept of

etymological diplomacy proposed here represents a contribution to that field.

The scholarly consensus holds that Icelandic and Indian languages share inherited similarities because they belong to the Indo-European language family, with recurring cognates, sound correspondences, and mythological parallels traceable to a common proto-language.

III. THE LAW OF COGNATES: DECODING THE SHARED VOCABULARY

The cognate set examined in this article is drawn from two primary sources: the Swadesh-derived core vocabulary documented in Anderson et al. (2025) and the etymological reconstructions in Mallory and Adams (1999) and Kroonen (2013). Selection was restricted to cognate pairs that (a) show regular, law-governed phonological correspondence consistent with Grimm's Law and standard Indo-Aryan sound change, (b) are attested in both Modern Icelandic and Modern Hindi or Classical Sanskrit, and (c) carry semantic transparency sufficient to be recognisable to a non-specialist reader. The resulting set (illustrated in Table 1) is deliberately illustrative rather than exhaustive; it is intended to demonstrate the principle of systematic correspondence rather than to quantify the total cognate inventory between the two branches, which falls outside the scope of this article.

The deep structural relationship between Icelandic and Hindi is defined by systematic cognates and regular sound correspondences rather than accidental similarities (Beekes, 2011). Rules strictly govern these connections; the differences we observe today follow predictable, rule-based patterns that emerged as dialects branched away from Proto-Indo-European. Mallory and Adams (2006) argue that these structural markers provide the essential linguistic context for tracking how foundational sounds and

the technologies they described travelled from the Eurasian Steppes to both the Indian subcontinent and the North Atlantic.

The primary phonetic threshold separating the Germanic branch (Icelandic) from the Indo-Aryan branch (Sanskrit) is **Grimm's Law**, formally described by Jacob Grimm in 1822. This law establishes that PIE consonants underwent a systematic "First Germanic Consonant Shift," operating on two major rules that explain the divergence between Sanskrit and Icelandic:

PIE Voiceless Stops → Voiceless Fricatives: The original hard sounds *p, *t, *k shifted in Proto-Germanic into fricatives *f, *þ (th), *h. Sanskrit, which bypassed this shift, retains the original hard sounds. *Example:* The PIE word for 'three', *tréyes, retained a hard "t" in Sanskrit (*tráyah*) but shifted to the fricative "þ" in Icelandic (*þrír*).

PIE Voiced Aspirated Stops → Voiced Unaspirated Stops: The aspirated sounds *bh, *dh, *gh shifted into the cleaner voiced stops *b, *d, *g in Germanic. Sanskrit (Wiese, 2023) preserved these original aspirations. The PIE root for binding, *b^hend^h-, kept its aspirated "bh" and "dh" sounds in Sanskrit (*báṇḍhati*), while Grimm's Law reduced these to the clean "b" and "d" sounds found in the Germanic verb *to bind*. Table 1 below illustrates these correspondences by placing Icelandic and Sanskrit/Hindi cognates side by side:

Table 1: Shared roots of Icelandic and Hindi/Sanskrit words

Concept	Icelandic	Sanskrit / Hindi	PIE Root / Note
Relationship	<i>samband</i>	<i>sambandh</i>	PIE *sem- ('one, together') + *b ^h end ^h - ('to bind'). Direct cognates via regular sound correspondence.
Mother	<i>móðir</i>	<i>mātr</i>	PIE *méh ₂ tēr. Both forms show regular branch-specific developments.
Brother	<i>bróðir</i>	<i>bhrātṛ</i>	PIE *b ^h réh ₂ tēr; Grimm's Law: *bh- > *b- in Germanic.
Name	<i>nafn</i>	<i>nāman</i>	PIE *h ₁ nóm _{n̥} ; Proto-Germanic *namô > Icelandic nafn.
Mead / Sweet	<i>mjóðr</i>	<i>mádhu</i>	PIE *médh _u ; classic shared culinary and cultural vocabulary.
Wheel	<i>hjól</i>	<i>cakra</i>	PIE *k ^w ék ^w los; reflects shared pre-separation transport technology.
To Bear/Bind	<i>bera / binda</i>	<i>bhárati / bándhati</i>	PIE *b ^h er- and *b ^h end ^h -; Grimm's Law: aspirated stops lose aspiration in Germanic.

Source: Author compilation based on cognate reconstructions and comparative Indo-European linguistic data from Mallory and Adams (1999), Kroonen (2013), Beekes (2011), and Anderson et al. (2025).

IV. THE MODI-FROSTADÓTTIR EXCHANGE AS ETYMOLOGICAL DIPLOMACY

The concept of language ideology, which holds that beliefs, assumptions, and social values that speakers attach to language and linguistic forms, provides a productive analytical frame for understanding the political significance of the 2026 India-Nordic summit exchange (Silverstein, 1979; Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994). Language has long been understood not merely as a system of communication but as a bearer of identity, belonging, and cultural memory (Blommaert,

2006; Kroskrity, 2000). Within this framework, naming a linguistic parallel in a diplomatic setting is never ideologically neutral; it is a performative claim about the relationship between peoples.

Modi's invocation of *sambandh* and *samband* at the summit drew on Pavlenko's (2001) description of the *heritage language ideology*, the belief that shared linguistic roots constitute a form of shared personhood. This genealogical bond precedes and transcends political arrangements. Seen through the lens of Social Identity Theory, the exchange also served as a symbolic reduction of intergroup distance by activating shared linguistic heritage. In invoking a PIE cognate pair, the symbolism is that the India-Iceland relationship is not merely geopolitical but civilisational: rooted in a common ancestral culture that predates both nations by

several millennia. This is true at the linguistic level and strategically useful at the diplomatic level, and an unusual combination that gives etymological diplomacy its particular force.

Frostadóttir's response introduced a second ideological register: that of linguistic purity and prestige. Icelandic language policy has, for centuries, been characterised by deliberate resistance to foreign loanwords, a practice formalised by the Icelandic Language Council (*Íslenska málnefndin*) and institutionalised in the tradition of *nýyrðamyndun*, the coining of new Icelandic words rather than borrowing from English or other languages (Kristinsson, 2012). When Frostadóttir described *samband* as "a purely Icelandic word," she invoked this ideology of purity and affirmed that Icelandic has maintained its inherited form intact, unmarked by external influence. The irony, or rather, the deeper truth, is that this "purely Icelandic" word is purely Icelandic precisely because it faithfully preserves a Proto-Indo-European root that it shares with Hindi. Icelandic purism and Indo-Aryan inheritance are, at this point, the same.

This convergence is not coincidental. It reflects what Woolard (1998) identifies as the *authenticity* and *anonymity* axes of language ideology: languages derive prestige either from being rooted in a specific community (authenticity) or from appearing to be nobody's in particular (anonymity). Icelandic ideology emphasises the former - *samband* is prestigious because it is genuinely, irreducibly Icelandic. Yet the PIE genealogy reveals that the same form is also, in a meaningful sense, shared property, the common inheritance of a vast language family. The diplomatic power of the Modi-Frostadóttir exchange lies precisely in this tension: a word that is "purely Icelandic" turns out to be profoundly Indian as well.

The broader implications of this case extend beyond the bilateral relationship. As Heller (2003) has argued, language increasingly functions as *capital* in the global political economy, a resource that can be accumulated, deployed, and exchanged for symbolic and material benefits. The *samband/sambandh* parallel represents a specific form of this capital: what we might call *etymological capital*, the accumulated symbolic value of demonstrable linguistic heritage. In an era of increasing nationalism and cultural competition, the ability to point to a shared ancestral language as the ground of a diplomatic relationship offers an alternative to zero-sum identity politics. Etymology, in this reading, is not merely historical curiosity; it is a resource for constructing solidarity across difference.

V. MYTHOLOGICAL PARALLELS

The connection between Icelandic and Hindi is not confined to the dictionary; it extends to the structure of myth. Comparative religion and historical philology have established that geographically dispersed Indo-European cultures share deep structural parallels in their mythologies, specifically regarding cosmogonic myths centred on the primordial sacrifice and dismemberment of a cosmic being (Lincoln, 1986). These cultures share not only words but a shared way of imagining the universe — a "mythological affinity" traceable to their common proto-language. Each of the parallels below reinforces the central argument of this article: that the bond encoded in *samband/sambandh* reflects a far deeper and wider inherited heritage. Some examples from comparative mythology are:

The Sky Father. The most foundational parallel is the concept of a "Sky Father," reconstructed as PIE *Dyēus Ph₂tēr. In the Vedic tradition, this became *Dyaus Pitā*, while in the Germanic/Icelandic branch, it evolved into Týr (historically the principal sky deity before Odin became prominent). Both figures reflect a worldview in

which the heavens are conceived as a masculine, paternal force (Puhvel, 1987).

The Storm God and the Serpent. A further striking parallel is the myth of a storm god who slays a multi-headed serpent blocking the waters (Watkins, 1995). In the Vedic tradition, the god Indra slays the dragon Vritrasura with his thunderbolt (*Vajra*); in the Norse tradition, Thor is the eternal enemy of the world-serpent Jörmungandr. Both myths symbolise the triumph of order over chaos and the release of life-giving forces. West (2007) compares the attributes of Indra's *Vajra* and Thor's *Mjölner* in detail, arguing that the myth functioned as a cultural metaphor for early pastoral communities overcoming seasonal drought and adversarial forces.

The World Tree and Axis Mundi. Both cultures place immense spiritual significance on the World Tree as the axis of the universe — Yggdrasil in Norse tradition and the Ashvattha (Banyan) in Vedic thought. Eliade (1958) conducts a direct thematic comparison between the two, demonstrating how both conceptualise the cosmos as suspended from an immense, sacred arboreal axis.

The Divine Twins and the Sacred Horse. The spoke-wheeled war chariot and the horse were not merely military tools; they were divine symbols. The Vedic Ashvins (literally “the horsemen”) share a Proto-Indo-European ancestral archetype with the Germanic divine twins, such as the Alcis mentioned by Tacitus and the legendary founding brothers Hengist and Horsa (Ward, 1968).

The Trifunctional Structure. The Indo-European speakers who arrived in new territories brought “highly structured social systems.” This tripartite social organisation is the subject of the Trifunctional Hypothesis, proposed by the French philologist and mythographer Georges Dumézil (1958) — a foundational framework in

comparative Indo-European studies. Dumézil argued that Proto-Indo-European society and its pantheons were structurally divided into three functions: Sovereignty/Priesthood (Brahmins in India; Goðar/Kings in Iceland); Force/Warfare (Kshatriyas in India; Berserkers/Warriors in Iceland); and Fecundity/Pastoralism (Vaishyas in India; Farmers/Pastoralists in Iceland). Whether in ancient India or medieval Iceland, this tripartite pattern organised both human life and the supernatural world.

VI. THE PIE FAMILY TREE AND THE KURGAN HYPOTHESIS

The Indo-European languages function as a genealogical language family tree. At the root sits Proto-Indo-European, which branched over time into distinct modern groupings: the Germanic branch (English, Dutch, German, Icelandic), the Indo-Aryan branch (Sanskrit, Hindi), and other relatives, including Iranian (Persian), Hellenic (Greek), Italic (Latin, Spanish), Balto-Slavic (Russian), and Celtic (Welsh). The Iceland–India axis examined in this article represents two of the most geographically distant branches of this single family.

The geographical spread of the Indo-European family, from Iceland to India, is explained most persuasively by the Steppe (Kurgan) Hypothesis — a model supported by historical linguistics, archaeology, and ancient DNA research. Between 3000 BCE and 1500 BCE, Steppe pastoralists migrated out of their homeland in successive waves (Haak et al., 2015). One wave moved into Central and Northern Europe, intermarrying with or displacing local Neolithic farming populations and establishing the Corded Ware Culture; this wave eventually gave rise to the Celtic, Italic, Germanic, and Slavic language branches. Another branch migrated eastward into Central Asia (the Sintashta Culture), where the spoke-wheeled war chariot was invented. These chariot riders subsequently moved south into Persia and the

northern Indian subcontinent around 1700–1500 BCE, bringing early Indo-Aryan languages (Vedic Sanskrit) with them.

Language expansion does not always require the total replacement of a native population. In many territories, small bands of Indo-European speakers arrived with technological, pastoral, and social advantages that may have contributed to the language shift. As they established themselves as ruling elites, local populations gradually adopted the prestige language, and over centuries, local dialects receded. Ancient DNA research has confirmed that massive migrations from the Eurasian steppe shaped Europe's genetic and linguistic landscape (Haak et al., 2015). Shared PIE linguistic roots for technologies such as the wheel (*k^wék^wlos), axle (*h₂éks-), and yoke (*yugóm) indicate that these populations shared advanced transport technology before separating — a finding that directly corroborates the lexico-historical argument of this article.

VII. CONCLUSION

This article has argued that the samband/sambandh parallel, brought to public attention by the 2026 India-Nordic summit exchange between Prime Minister Modi and Prime Minister Frostadóttir, constitutes a case of etymological diplomacy. The analysis has demonstrated that this parallel is not merely rhetorically convenient but scientifically grounded: the two words share a Proto-Indo-European root, are connected through regular, law-governed phonological correspondences consistent with Grimm's Law and standard Indo-Aryan sound change, and are embedded in a wider network of shared cognates, morphological patterns, and mythological structures that testify to a genuine common inheritance. The diplomatic power of the exchange derives precisely from this combination of semantic precision and

genealogically verifiable properties that make the parallel a symbol of shared origin. The exchange demonstrates how linguistic recognition may operate not only as cultural symbolism but also as a subtle mechanism of identity affiliation and perceived commonality.

Through the systematic correspondences of Grimm's Law and the remarkable morphological resilience of Icelandic, the echoes of ancient Steppe pastoralists remain audible in the basic vocabularies of both languages: *móðir/mātṛ* (mother), *nafn/náman* (name), *hjól/cakra* (wheel). The linguistic bridge exemplified by *samband/sambandh* demonstrates that these cultures did not merely inherit shared words but a unified way of imagining the world, expressed through common mythological structures and social organisation. Ultimately, these linguistic echoes remind us that, despite superficial differences, Iceland and India share far more than either geography or recent history might suggest: they share a common origin, and with it, a common heritage of thought. However, linguistic affinity does not automatically translate into political alignment, shared policy interests, or cultural sameness.

It should also be noted that not all Indian or European languages belong to this family. Dravidian languages of southern India (such as Tamil and Telugu) and isolates such as Basque, as well as Uralic languages such as Finnish, belong to entirely different language families. Finnish *isä* (father), for instance, shares no genealogical roots with its Indo-European counterparts. This boundary clarifies rather than diminishes the significance of the Indo-European connections described above.

VIII. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Limitation and Future work

This article employs comparative-historical linguistic analysis to examine the relationship between Icelandic and Hindi through three lenses: phonological correspondence (the systematic sound shifts that separate the Germanic and Indo-Aryan branches from their common PIE ancestor), morphological conservatism (the degree to which each language preserves inherited structural features), and mythological parallelism (the structural similarities between Norse and Vedic cosmological and theological systems). This study does not address potential loanwords, areal diffusion, or contact-induced convergence; all cognate pairs discussed are assumed to reflect vertical inheritance from PIE unless otherwise noted. The mythological parallels examined are treated as structural rather than genealogically certain that is, the article argues for shared deep patterns consistent with common origin, not for direct textual transmission between Norse and Vedic sources. These are recognised limitations of the comparative mythology tradition more broadly (Littleton, 1982; Witzel, 2012).

REFERENCES

1. Anderson, C., Scarborough, M., Jocz, L. *et al.* The Indo-European Cognate Relationships dataset. *Sci Data* **12**, 1541 (2025). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-025-05445-3>
2. Barðdal, J. (2009). The development of the case in Germanic. In J. Barðdal & S. L. Chelliah (Eds.), *The role of semantic, pragmatic, and discourse factors in the development of case* (pp. 123–159). John Benjamins Publishing. [Please verify page range and volume details]
3. Beekes, R. S. P. (2011). *Comparative Indo-European linguistics: An introduction* (M. de Vaan, Ed.; 2nd ed.). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
4. Blommaert, J. (2006). Language ideology. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (2nd ed., Vol. 6, pp. 510–522). Elsevier.
5. Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4–5), 585–614.
6. Cardona, G., & Jain, D. (2007). *The Indo-Aryan languages*. Routledge.
7. Dumézil, G. (1958). *L'idéologie tripartite des Indo-Européens*. Latomus.
8. Eliade, M. (1958). *Patterns in comparative religion*. Sheed & Ward.
9. Fortson, B. W. (2010). *Indo-European language and culture: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
10. Fulk, R. D. (2009). *A comparative grammar of the early Germanic languages*. John Benjamins Publishing.
11. Giles, H. & Johnson, P. (1987). Ethnolinguistic Identity Theory: A Social Psychological Approach to Language Maintenance. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 1987(68). 69–100.
12. Haak, W., Lazaridis, I., Patterson, N., Rohland, N., Mallick, S., Llamas, B., ... Reich, D. (2015). Massive migration from the steppe was a source for Indo-European languages in Europe. *Nature*, 522(7555), 207–211. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14317>
13. Heller, M. (2003). Globalization, the new economy, and the commodification of language and identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(4), 473–492
14. Kristinsson, A. P. (2012). Language policies in Iceland. In J. Fishman & O. García (Eds.), *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity*
15. Kroonen, G. (2013). *Etymological dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Brill.
16. Kroskrity, P. V. (Ed.). (2000). *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, and Identities*. School of American Research Press.
17. Lincoln, B. (1986). *Myth, cosmos, and society: Indo-European themes of creation and destruction*. Harvard University Press.
18. Mallory, J. P., & Adams, D. Q. (1999). *Encyclopedia of Indo-European culture*. Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers.
19. Martín, F. M. D. P. (2014). Grammatical change begins within the word: Causal modeling of the co-evolution of Icelandic morphology and syntax. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society*, 36.
20. Masica, C. P. (1991). *The Indo-Aryan Languages*. Cambridge University Press.
21. Max-Planck-Gesellschaft. (2015, March 2). *A massive migration from the steppe brought Indo-European languages to Europe*. Max Planck Society. <https://www.mpg.de/9005184/humans-migration-indo-european-languages>
22. Pavlenko, A. (2001). "In the world of the tradition, I was unimagined": Negotiation of identities in cross-cultural autobiographies. *The International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5(3), 317–344.
23. Post, M. W. (2025, September 29). *Hindi, Greek and English all come from a single ancient language – here's how we know*. The Conversation.
24. Puhvel, J. (1987). *Comparative mythology*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
25. Ringe, D. (2006). *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic*. Oxford University Press.
26. Silverstein, M. (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In P. Clyne, W. Hanks & C.

- Hofbauer (Eds.), *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels* (pp. 193–247). Chicago Linguistic Society.
27. Shapiro, M. C. (1989). *A primer of modern standard Hindi*. Motilal Banarsidass.
 28. Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). *An integrative theory of intergroup conflict*.
 29. Thráinsson, H. (2007). *The Syntax of Icelandic*. Cambridge University Press.
 30. Vikør, L. S. (2010). Language purism in the Nordic countries. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2010(204).
 31. Ward, D. (1968). *The divine twins: An Indo-European myth in Germanic tradition*. University of California Press.
 32. Watkins, C. (1995). *How to kill a dragon: Aspects of Indo-European poetics*. Oxford University Press.
 33. West, M. L. (2007). *Indo-European poetry and myth*. Oxford University Press.
 34. Wiese, H. (2023). *Sanskrit as an Indo-European language*. Heidelberg Asian Studies Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.11588/hasp.1238>
 35. Woolard, K. A., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1994). Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 23, 55–82. — The essential overview