International Journal of Sanskrit Research 2017; 3(6): 70-75

International Journal of Sanskrit Research

अनन्ता

ISSN: 2394-7519
IJSR 2017; 3(6): 70-75

www.anantaajournal.com
Received: 14-09-2017
Accepted: 15-10-2017

Milorad Ivankovic
Omladinski trg 6/4, SRB-26300
Vrsac, Serbia

Correspondence
Milorad Ivankovic
Omladinski trg 6/4, SRB-26300
Vrsac, Serbia

Sanskrit-Slavic-Sinitic their common linguistic heritage

Milorad Ivankovic

Abstract
Though viewing from the modern perspective they seem to belong to very distant and alien traditions, the Aryans, the Slavs and the Chinese share the same linguistic and cultural heritage. They are the only three cultures that have developed and preserved the religio-philosophical concept of Integral Dualism, viz. *śukram-kṛṣṇam* or *yang-yin* (see Note 1). And the existing linguistic data firmly supports the above thesis.

Key Words: *l*-forms, *l*-formant, *l*-participles, ping, apple, kolo

Introduction
In spite of persistent skepticism among so called Proto-Indo-Europeanists, in recent years many scholars made attempts at detecting the genetic relationship between Old Chinese and Proto-Indo-European languages (e.g. T.T. Chang, R.S. Bauer, J.X. Zhou, J.L. Wei, etc.), but they proposed solely lexical correspondences with no morphological ones at all. However, there indeed exist some very important morphological correspondences too.

The L-Forms in Chinese
In Modern Standard Mandarin Chinese there is a particle spelled *le* and a verb spelled *liao*, both functioning as verb-suffixes and represented in writing by identical characters. Some researchers hold that the particle *le* actually derived from *liao* since "the verb *liao* (meaning "to finish, complete"), found at the end of the Eastern Han (25-220 CE) and onwards, around Wei and Jin Dynasties (220-581 CE) along with other verbs meaning "to finish" such as *jing*, *qi*, *yi* and *bi* started to occur in the form Verb (Object) + *completive* to indicate the completion of the action indicated by the main verb. When the structure V(O) + completive first occurred after the Eastern Han, there were two constraints of the pattern. First, the completives mentioned above and *liao* usually occurred in an utterance-final (viz. sentence-final or sentence-end), but not in a discourse-unit-final, hence disoccur with stative situations as well as in discourse-final position. These are significant changes, which finally led to the emergence of the particle *le* in modern Chinese". (Berg & Wu, 2006) [4].
The Chinese particle *le,* is viewed either as aspectual (hence called "aspect particle *le*" or "verb *le*" or "the verb-suffix *le"*) or modal one (called also "sentential particle *le"* or "the sentence-final particle *le"* or "the sentence-end particle *le").* "*Le* as a suffix is to be distinguished from the homophonic particle *le* which occurs in the very end of a sentence (or to be more precise, of a clause). Thus, several usages of the particle *le* can be distinguished, and all of them can in one way or another be generalized as coding the relevance of the situation of the reference time. This generalization allows us to treat *le* as a marker of perfect, as such relevance is exactly the core meaning of this category. One can regard the relevance of a certain event for the state of affairs at the reference time as the common component of different usages of *le.* Based on this idea, many scholars assume this particle to be the perfect marker in Mandarin." (Khoroshkina, 2014) [9].
Wan-ling Tsai "aims to explain the different interpretations of the sentential particle *le* with a unified account. Due to s different interpretations in different contexts, it is labeled as different identities such as an inchoative marker, a perfect marker and a marker of change. Having examined the theories mentioned above we find that the most functions of the sentential particle *le* is similar to the perfect aspect." (Tsai, 2016) [8]. The aspect particle *le* marks the perfective aspect of an action, it indicates that an action is completed.

It occurs immediately after the main verb in a sentence. The term *perfective aspect* means that the action as indicated by the main verb has attained its completion by a certain point in time. It should be emphasized that it is not a past tense indicator. It has nothing to do with the grammatical sense of "tense", since it may be used to denote a past action, a present action, and a future action as well. It is about the completeness of an action, not when it actually happened. "The category of aspect is very different from that of tense….Mandarin has no markers of tense…Aspect refers to how the situation itself is being viewed with respect to its own internal makeup." (Li & Thompson, 1891).

"A time expression alone or even context itself is sufficient to show time, such as the past, the present and the future. Therefore, inflection is not at all necessary, and is non-existent in Chinese. In a given time, in Chinese an action is viewed with an emphasis on a particular phase along the course of its progress, which can be its beginning, its continuation, or its completion. Each of these stages is referred to as an aspect" (Hung-nin, 1994) [8].

As for comparison with Indo-European languages, "In Greek the difference between the present, aorist and perfect tenses, when used outside of the indicative (that is, in the subjunctive, optative, imperative, infinitive and participles) is almost entirely one of grammatical Aspect, NOT of Tense. That is, the aorist refers to a simple action, the present to an ongoing action, and the perfect to a state resulting from a previous action. An aorist infinitive or imperative, for example, does not refer to a past action, and in fact for many verbs (e.g. "kill") would likely be more common than a present infinitive or imperative. In some participial constructions, however, an aorist participle can have either a tensal or *aspectual* meaning. It is assumed that this distinction of *aspect* was the original significance of the Early Proto-Indo-European "*tenses*", rather than any actual tense distinction, and that tense distinctions were originally indicated by means of adverbs, as in Chinese!" (Quiles, 2009).

The following examples will clarify the usage of particle *le*, past (A) present (B) and future (C):

A. Women *xue le* liang nian Zhongwen. ("We studied two years of Chinese.")
B. Keren dou *dao le.* ("The guests have all arrived.")
C. Ni *dao le,* gei wo da dianhua. ("When you have arrived, give me a phone call.")

The origin of the Chinese L-Forms

As to the origin of the particle *le, "*according to most researchers the perfective marker *le* has derived from the full verb *liao (*complete, finish) and gradually transferred into *le* in Early Mandarin" (10th to 15th c., viz. "Early Song Dynasty (960-1279) is the period when the perfective particle *le* starts to take its position in the pattern Verb + *le* " (Berg & Wu, 2006) [4] "The history of developing the clitics *le* is not as clear cut…However, according to C. Sun,

the clitics *le* has derived from the verb *lai* (come, approach)…" (Khoroshkina, 2014) [9]. Namely, Chao Fen Sun holds that "the history of *le* involves two linguistic signs in Middle Chinese: *liao* "to complete" and *lai "*to come". The former is treated as the origin of the perfective marker *le,* in Mandarin Chinese, the latter as the origin of the perfect marker *le* in Modern Mandarin." (Sun, 1996). But, as Xiu-Zhi Zoe Wu points out "In a very informative paper G. Wu shows that there is a good evidence that *liao* first repositioned itself right-adjacent to the verb, and only much later underwent reduction *le.* Among other evidence for this conclusion is a particularly telling argument from Korean. In the Korean textbook of Mandarin Chinese called *Chunggan Nogolta*e written in 1795 the element corresponding to modern day verb *le* is transcribed as having a pronunciation equivalent to *liao* not *le.*" *(*Wu, 2004) [20].

However, as Wan-ling Tsai demonstrated, there is no essential difference between those two seemingly different functions of the particle. Whatsmore, the conclusion drawn by Guo Wu cannot explain why there are instances in which both *liao* and *le* occur paired side-by-side, e.g. Pingguo mai bu *liao le*, viz. "Apples cannot be purchased any more (for they all have sold out)"!

Old Chinese reconstruction by Baxter-Sagart having neither *liao "*complete, finish" nor *le,* it offers only *lai "*come" < Middle Chinese form *loj*, reconstructed as Old Chinese **mə.rˁək* from which derived **rˁək > loj> lai (*Baxter-Sagart, 2014) [3].

Nor does Zhengzhang (2003) [21] have them. However, similar homophonic characters *le* and *liao* of different meanings are reconstructed as **raawg* and **reew (*or *rew?)* respectively. But according to Chang (1988) [1] "Characteristic of Old Chinese consonantism is the absence of *r*-initial"!

After taking all this into consideration, it seems most plausible to conclude with pertinent critical observations made previously by Julie Lee Wei: "Modern Standard Mandarin is often closer to the corresponding Indo-European than the reconstructed sound. 'Asterisks are NOT infallible' (citing J.H. Greenberg). The modern sound is attested, while the reconstruction is built on an edifice of inferences…Some of the correspondences in the present list indicate that the Modern Mandarin and Cantonese sounds are closer in sound to the corresponding IE words than the Middle Chinese and Old Chinese reconstructions" (Wei, 2005) [19].

The Slavic L-Formant

There is a stunning parallelism between the functioning of the Chinese particle *le* and the Slavic *l*-formant of the *l*-participle. Viewed historically, the Slavic *l*-participle is an adjectival form of the verb. Hence, it agrees in gender and number with its subject, though it is not inflected for case, except when it functions purely as an adjective. The *l*-participle also known as *Completive* or *Resultative* or *Second Past Active Participle* is formed by attaching the *l*-formant to the infinitive stem or root of a verb with the addition of personal endings for masculine, feminine and neuter gender, viz. *l(u), la, lo (*singular), and *li, le, la* (plural), e.g. from the verb *dati* "give" > root/stem *da* + *l, la, lo, li, le, la = dal, dala, dalo, dali, dale, dala;* from *znati "*know" > root/stem *zna* + *l, la, lo* etc. = *znal, znala, znalo* etc.

The Chinese particle *le* may well be analyzed as consisting of the *l*-formant plus undifferentiated ending *–e* (that covers all the variety of the Slavic personal endings), whereas the form *liao* may be viewed as merging of the *l*-formant with different personal endings, viz. *l*-formant *+i + a + o = liao.*

Thus, the Chinese *main verb + le* construction matches exactly the formation and functioning of the Slavic *l*-participle, since it also may express a past action, a present action or a future action just like its Chinese counterpart. By combining it with the auxiliary verbs, viz. *sam, si, est (*am, art, is), *smo, ste, su (*we are, you are, they are) it is used in constructing present perfect and past perfect, and with auxiliary *budem, budeš, bude* (I, thou, s/he will be) *budemo, budete, budu (*we, you, they will be) or its downsized forms (in some dialects, viz. *bum, buš, bu, bumo, bute, buju)* it is used to form future perfect.

NB. Except for Russian whereby the *l*-participle alone with no auxiliary verb is used to denote a past action (analogously as in Chinese), e.g. "Oni *zakončili* rabotu" (viz. They finished the job).

"The participles are adjectives which have been assimilated to the verbal system, having thus verbal inflection. The reconstructed PIE shows an intense reliance on participles, and thus a certain number of participles played a very important role in the early language…Gerundives and Absolutives, Verbal adjectives not assimilated to the verbal system of Tense and Voice. Those which indicate need and possibility are called gerundives. Verbal Adjectives and Adjectives (as Verbal Nouns and Nouns) cannot be easily differentiated. Whereas the same Passive Participles are found, i.e. *–to, -no, -mo,* there are two forms especially identified with the Gerundives in Late PIE dialects:

a) *–lo-* and *–li-* are found in Latin, Balto-Slavic, Tocharian and Armenian;

Note: For suffix *–lo-* as a Participle Suffix, cf. Russian *videlŭ,* Latin *credulus, bibulus, tremulus,* etc." (Qiles, 2009) [16]. **NB**. As for Baltic, "Lithuanian has neither *l*-participle nor neuter gender and both of aorists" (Gržetić, 1900).

The Sanskrit L-Forms

However, Proto-Indo-Europeanists have completely overlooked the fact that the *l*-forms in Latin, Slavic, Armenian and Tocharian correspond always to the Vedic *r*-forms, (analogously as in other type of words, e.g. Vedic *suar, sūr-ya* vs. Latin *sol* "the Sun"), mostly Adjectives and Agent Nouns (exactly as *l*-participles in South Slavic languages), in *–ra, -ri, -ru,* e.g. *asu-ra* "spirit", *śuk-ra* "white", *angu-ri* "finger", *pata-ru* "flying", but also the *l*-forms in younger Vedic, for example, in *–la, -li* and *–lu* as the semantic equivalents of those Older Vedic *r*-forms, e.g. *śuk-la* "white color", *angu-li* "finger", *pataya-lu* "flying" completely matching the Latin forms mentioned above. The Vedic suffix *–la,* a later form of *–ra,* is equivalent in sense and usage to the latter, sometimes also interchangeable with it" (Macdonell, 1910) [11].

The L-Forms in other languages

"The gerundives of Tocharian use the suffix *–l-* which may be attached to the present stem (gerundive I) or to the subjunctive stem (gerundive II). The West Tocharian form *–lye* goes back to PIE **-lyo-,* (viz. *–lio-,* cf. the Classical Armenian Prospective participles *sire-li* "lovable", *ga-l-oc "*who is about to come" in 4.4); the East Tocharian form *–l* goes back to PIE **-lo-* (cf. the Classical Armenian Perfective participles in *–eal* and the infinitive in *–l,* and the Old Slavic *l*-participle used in the perfect system *nes-lŭ jes-mi* "I have brought" (Hewson & Bubenik, 1997) [7].

"Until the discovery of Tocharian, Slavic and Armenian alone among the branches of IE had a substantive (participial or infinitive) Morpheme *–**l*** as a part of the verbal inflectional system … the Armenian verbal system is based on two stems, a present and an aorist. From the present stem an infinitive can be formed, e.g. *bere-m "*I carry", *bere-l* "to carry, to be carried". It can take *–o* stem inflection, which correspond to the thematic inflection of IE; hence the suffix **-le* or **-lo* ... it may be active or passive" (it should be emphasized that in Slavic however, it is always Active), "…From the infinitive we get a substantive derivative in *–li* (again indifferent in voice) that is inflected for case and number…From the present stem infinitive one can also form a future participle, e.g. *bere-l-oc* "one who is to carry or be carried". In addition to these three forms …is one based on the aorist stem, e.g. *gorc-eal "*having done, having been done". With the "to be" it forms a Compound Tense that is normally intransitive, e.g. *cneal em "*I am born"…The *–l* formation we are discussing is not only basically indifferent to voice, but to tense as well. Its meaning as present, past or future is determined by the tense stem from which it is derived or by a tense marker, as in the future *bere-l-oc* ... In Old Slavic a participle in *–lu,* derived from the infinitive-aorist stem of the verb, forms Compound Tenses with various forms of the verb "to be", e.g. *neslŭ jesmi "*I have carried" (literally "having carried or "a carrier I am"). Meillet considers the Slavic form to correspond to the Armenian Compound Tense based on the *–l* participle of the aorist stem, e.g. *bereal em "*I have carried" (Greenberg, 2000) [5].

"It may seem disconcerting that, while the Armenian infinitive is of course basically a verbal abstract, the corresponding **-lo-* derivatives of other languages, such as the Slavic *Active Preterite Participle* and Latin formations of the type *figulus "*potter", must be considered verbal adjectives/participles… If the type of inherited **-lo-* stems in e.g. the Slavic participle, at some point indicated the simple notion of the verbal action, the conception of the original diathesis, which is apparently active (nomina agentis) in proto-language" (Olsen, 1999) [15].

However, it should be heavily emphasized now that only Slavic *l*-participle among Indo- European languages (Armenian, Tocharian, Latin) is used without any morphological change to form all three grammatical tenses, past, present and future, exactly as the Chinese main verb + verb-suffix *le* construction is applied in Chinese Mandarin grammar.

The above evidence shows clearly that the *l*-formant (viz. suffix *–lo-*) was fully integrated in Late PIE as a deverbal derivative in forming participles and gerundives. This also means that the form *liao* (which supposedly evolved into *le*) in Chinese was genetically related to the Proto-Indo-European suffixes *–lo, -li, -lio* from prehistoric times, but they might have been also re-introduced into Chinese by later historical contacts between Chinese and Indo-Europeans.

The emergence of the verb-suffix (particle) *le* cannot be accidental because of the complete morphological matching in composition and functioning between the Chinese construction: main verb + verb-suffix *–le* and the Slavic *l*-participle.

The Slavic L-Participle

The Slavic *l*-participle is first attested in written documents at the time of Saint Cyril and Methodius (863 CE) the monks who invented a specialized "glagolitic" script for the translation of the Bible into Slavic in order to record faithfully Old Slavic pronunciation. This means that the attested usage of the Slavic *l*-participle predates the emergence of the particle *le in* Early Mandarin which occurred around 960 CE onwards, in the Early Song Dynasty (Berg & Wu, 2006, Khoroshkina 2014) [4, 9].

The Slavic *l*-participle was used in Old Slavic to form Compound Tenses: present perfect, past perfect (preterite and pluperfect), future perfect and of the moods Conditional (called also Conditional-Optative), just like South Slavic vernaculars, e.g.:

1. The present perfect is formed by combining the *l*-participle with the auxiliary verb *jes* (Sanskrit *as*) e.g. *nosilŭ/a/o jesmi, jesi, jestŭ* "I/she/it have carried" etc.

2. The past perfect or preterite is formed the same as present perfect, but using the past time adverbials (viz. time expressions) to distinguish past from present action, exactly as is the case in Chinese Mandarin. In this connection Tsai compares "the Present Perfect Puzzle in English, that is, English present perfect is NOT compatible with the past time adverbials, while there is NO restriction (just like in Slavic) on the sentential particle *le.* Furthermore, in German too, the present perfect is compatible with past time adverbials (as in Slavic and Chinese) e.g.

a) German: Boris ist *gestern* gekommen, literally: "Boris is yesterday come"

b) In Slavic too it is utilized present perfect + past adverbials, e.g "Boris est *juče* doša *(l*)".

"This shows that the incompatibility of English present perfect with the past time adverbials cannot be the reason to reject the proposal that the sentential particle *le is a* Perfect Marker. Rather, the present perfect puzzle is parametric" (Tsai, 2016) [18].

3. The pluperfect is formed in various ways, by combining the *l*-participle with the perfect, imperfect or aorist of the auxiliary verbs, e.g. *nosilŭ bylŭ jesmi/ nosilŭ bĕahŭ* "I had carried" etc.
4. The future perfect is formed with the auxiliary verb *byti* "to be" in the sense "will be", e.g. *nosilŭ bǫdǫ* (or in modern vernaculars *nosil bum/budem*) "I shall carry" literally "I shall have carried".
5. The conditional is formed with the addition of special modal forms (viz. subjunctive or aorist) of the verb *byti* "to be", e.g. *nosilŭ bimŭ* or *byhŭ* (modern *nosil bih*) "I would carry".

NB. In modern South Slavic vernaculars Old Slavic has *lŭ,* featuring the mid central vowel transcribed as *ŭ* with a semicircular diacritical mark known as *brevis* or *breve*, being pronounced the same as the Chinese syllable *le.*

In most South Slavic vernaculars the masculine singular *l*-ending changes into an unaccented *-a, -o* or *–u,* e.g. the variants of the *l*-participle from the verb *biti* "to be" are as follows: *bil* > *bia, bio,* and *biu.* In the dialects featuring *a*-change (as in the archaic language of the Ivankovic Village) the verbs with consonantal stems insert between the stem and the *l*-formant in the masculine singular an epenthetic *a*-vowel, which merges with (viz. lengthens) the final *-a* < *l* into long vowel, e.g. *rek-* "to say" > *rek-a-l* > *rek-a-a* > *rekā!*

However, when the *l*-participle functions purely as an adjective it retains final *–l* in masculine singular, e.g. Ovaj plod est *zrel. (*"This fruit is matured")/ Ovo est *zreli* plod ("This is a matured fruit"). (The form *zrel* is the indefinite aspect, whereas *zreli* is the definite aspect of the adjective.)

Table 1: *L*-Adjectives Table

Indefinite Form		Definite Form
svietal	"bright"	*svietli*
zrel	"mature"	*zreli*
vrel	"hot"	*vreli*
debel	"fat"	*debeli*
vesel	"cheerful"	*veseli*

The indefinite forms of the last two examples, viz. *debel* and *vesel* have variants (used concurrently) whereby the ending *–el* changes into *–o,* viz. *deb-o* and *ves-o,* respectively. **NB.** Chinese as non-inflected language differs from Slavic in that it has no personal endings. For comparative studies the usage of the *l*-forms in the archaic language of the Ivanković Village is of special importance. Just like the construction main verb + particle *le* in Chinese, the Slavic *l*- participle is found in everyday communication by the people speaking an archaic South Slavic vernacular spoken in *Ivanković Selo* (viz. Ivanković Village) and adjacent areas. One of the special features of the Ivanković Village vernacular is the non-standard usage of the *l*-participle, which is identical with the usage of the verb + particle le construction in Mandarin Chinese, e.g.

1. Chinese: "Keren *dao le*" = Slavic: "Gosti *doš-li*" (with No Auxiliary Verb), literally "The guests arrived" in the sense: "The guests *have* arrived NOW (sc. this very moment!)". In standard South Slavic, the usage of the auxiliary verb form *su* (=are) is obligatory.
   The *L*-participle actually denotes the Completeness of an action in the Time (viz. moment) of Speech, therefore it does NOT refer to Past Time, but to Present Perfectiveness of the verb, unless Past Adverbials are used to indicate that the action took place in the Past!
2. Here are more examples: "Evo, gosti nam *doš-li.*!" or in English: "Lo! Behold, the guests to us arrived! (sc. now, this very moment, they are appear before us)". Again, in the standard, the auxiliary *su* is obligatory.
3. Ja *bi-o* juče kod doktora" or "*Bi-o* ja juče kod doktora", which in English literally means: "I *been* yesterday at the doctor (=physician)", or "*Been* I yesterday at the doctor". In the standard, the auxiliary *sam* (viz. *am)* is obligatory.

NB. In the above example the ending *–l* of the masculine singular *bil* (viz. *been)* changes into *–o* as pointed out previously.

4. "Evo nas, mi *doš-li*" *(*or: *stig-li)*!" or in English: "Lo! Here it's us! We arrived (now, this very moment)!" In standard language the auxiliary *smo* (viz. *are)* again is obligatory.

It should be repeated that the Slavic *l*-participle authentically is NOT meant to indicate Past Tense, viz. Preterite, as is now used in Modern Russian Grammar. Even in Russian, it quite conspicuously denotes Present Perfect when used without past adverbials, e.g.

"Gosti *priš-li" or* "Gosti *prieha-li"* or in English literally, "The guests arrived (now, this very moment, in the time of speech)"! with NO Time Specified.

5. The *L*-participle alone with No Auxiliary verbs is also used in the Subjunctive mood, e.g.

"*Živi-li* dok ne *posivi-li*!" or in English: "Long live (ye) till (become) grayed!"

NB. The Slavic *l*-participle functions also as Agent Noun, just like the *l*-forms and *r*-forms in Sanskrit (cf. previous chapter on the *l*-forms in Sanskrit) for it is an Active Participle e.g. from the verb *prdekati* "to fart often in a sequence" (it is the frequentative of the verb *prditi* "to fart" related to the **S**anskrit verbal root *pard* > *pardate* "to break wind downwards", also related to the English verb *fart* (but English as a typical Paiśācī-tongue, like Chinese, it used to change the Aryan stop/plosive sounds into fricatives, viz. *p* > *f,* etc. as well as the Aryan Voiced sounds into Unvoiced), viz. "to fart", the *l*-participle (functioning as agent noun) is formed in the following way: present verb stem *prdeka* + suffix *lo* = *Prdekalo* literally "Farter" or precisely "one who farts very often in a sequence" denoting actually "Motorbike", NOT a human person.

As demonstrated previously, there is some ambiguity with the usage of the Chinese main verb + *le* construction just as with Slavic *l*-participle, naturally because they do not indicate Tense but the completion of an action. Thus, depending on

context and added adverbials, the same phrase may denote different tense, viz. different time of action, e.g.

1. "Ta *lai le*" may mean: "He has (or: is) come", but also "He is coming over now", i.e. "He is on the way", viz. "He has started to coming over here".
2. "Ta *zou le"* means: "He has (already) left (is not here anymore)", but if I say "Wo *zou le*" it means that only my intention to leave is completed, while I am still here, so it is translated accordingly, viz. "I am leaving now".
3. "Keren *dao le"* means: "The guests have arrived (now)", but with past adverbials the same expression denotes past tense, viz. past action, e.g.: "Zuotian wanshang keren *dao le*". i.e. "Yesterday evening the guests arrived".

As for *liao,* it is often used as a potential complement with both the positive particle *de* and negative particle *bu.* Thus, *de liao* indicates that something is "given, viz. allowed to achieve or complete (potential possibility or possible potentiality)", whereas *bu liao* indicates that it is "prohibited, viz. not allowed to achieve or complete (impossible potentiality)", e.g. "Pao *de liao* he shang, pao *bu liao* miao", literally "To run away (is) allowed with now, to run away (is) not allowed (with) the temple (or monastery)", i.e. "It is possible to run away now (this time) but it is not possible to run away with the temple" (sc. "you cannot carry the temple with you, so you have to come back again to the temple", this being naturally said of a monk, thus warning him that he must return to the temple sooner or later, and will be caught by the temple authorities, they certainly will get him).

Common Heritage

Since ancient times Chinese and Slavic people have much in common. The most frequent Chinese family name (viz. surname) is *Li* meaning "plum", e.g. the most famous Chinese poet Li Tai Bo alias Li Bai from the Tang dynasty, and in our times the famous martial artists Bruce Lee alias Li Yuan Fan, and Jet Li alias Li Lian Jie.

As T.T. Chang argued that "The common word plum *li* among Chinese, German and Slavic languages is very instructive as positive evidence against the Western Theory prevailing among Indo-Europeanists who would have limited the original homeland of Indo-Europeans to a small zone of Middle Europe with beech and birch trees" (Chang 1988) [1].

Among South Slavs the surnames derived from the Old Slavic word *sliva* "plum" are quite frequent and have many variations, e.g. *Sliva, Slivac, Slivak, Slivka, Slivnjak, Slivonja, Slivar, Slivarić Slivšek, Šljivo, Šljivac, Šljivečka, Šljiva, Šljivić, Šljivarić*). There are many species of Plums, e.g. "Blue plum (or the plum proper)", "Yellow plum (in China known as *Huang mei*), round in form and smaller in size", "Red plum, also round but bigger than yellow plum, and is called *Cimbura* (pronounced *Tsimboorah*) in Ivanković Village.

Every householder in the countryside uses to cultivate the plum-trees for the needs of his household and engages himself in producing fine domestic home brandy called *Šljivka* or *Šljivovica,* sometimes mixed with medical herbs and plants as home medicine, hence called *Travarica* viz. herbal plum-brandy (from the word *trava* "grass, herb"). And the plum-brandy prepared with honey called *Medovača* viz. mead-like brandy (reminiscent of the favorite drink *Medovina* "mead" by ancient Slavs) is especially appreciated for its healing properties.

Ancient Cultural Exchange

The fermented drink made from honey was the favorite drink of the ancient Vedic Aryans (Vedans) too. It is likely that honey (probably *mead* also) were introduced to ancient Chinese by the Indo-Europeans settled in Tukhara ot Tocharistan (present-day *Xinjiang* Autonomous Region in the People's Republic of China), and its medieval oasis city-states (as the resting places for the caravans on the Silk Road), populated by traders of mixed origin, as the Chinese word *mi "*honey" indicates, being borrowed through the medium of the so-called Tocharian languages that were spoken roughly from 6th to 9th centuries CE (Quiles, 2009), (in the *Talimu Pendi,* viz. Tarim Basin, Xinjiang Province, China, where the mummies of Europoid people were discovered (Mallory & Mair, 2000) [13], around the time of the emergence of the particle *le* in Early Mandarin, though Tocharian forms *mit* "honey" and *mot* "alcoholic drink, (Mallory & Adams, 2006) [12] apparently were adopted from the Slavic *medŭ* "honey" and the Sanskrirt *madhu* respectively. The Tocharians were not a nation, nor Tocharian was actually a language, but a form of an ancient PIDGIN comprising hybrid heterogenous linguistic and genetic elements common to every mixed trading community as the linguistic material from Tocharian itself reveals clearly, e.g. Tocharian word for hundred *känt* or *kante* is close to Latin (a descendant of Trojan spoken in Anatolia) *kentum,* but the word for woman *śana* undoubtedly is an adaptation of the Slavic *žena,* since Voiced phonemes as a rule becomes de-Voiced viz. Unvoiced by all *Paiśācī*-tongues when adopting Aryan words (see Note 3).

This genetic diversity is fully corroborated by the DNA analysis of the Chinese Mystery Mummies found in Tarim Basin, undertaken by the Nation Geographic geneticist Spenser Wells and his Chinese colleagues led by Professor Li from Shanghai proved (NGTV, 2009) [14]. This may account for the presence of the Slavic elements among the mixed languages of Tocharistan and their very influence onto ancient Chinese.

NB. Since Mandarin has NO Markers of Tense (being a non-inflected language), the construction: main verb (viz. verb root) + verb-suffix (viz. particle) *le* + past or present or future adverbials, has an all-encompassing grammatical significance in Chinese language. Therefore, the particle *le* cannot be viewed and treated just as one among many hundreds of various Morphemes found in other inflectional languages, but as the one having the central pivotal position in whole Chinese grammar, without which daily communication would be absolutely impossible.

The complete matching between the Chinese verb + *le* construction and the Slavic *l*-participle cannot be accidental or coincidental. Such 100% structural, morphological and semantical matching cannot occur by chance, but it undoubtedly came from close encounters between ancient Chinese, Slavs and Vedic Aryans in antiquity.

**The Wheel or ****Kolo*

There are many other easily detectable proofs that Chinese language is genetically related to Indo-European tongues.

The common Sino-Tibetan word for "wheel, chariot" is **kolo,* which is actually Old Slavic word used even today simultaneously in Ivanković Village and in most Chinese Mandarin and Tibetan dialects whereby it is pronounced very similarly or identically as in Slavic, e.g. *kulu, kulun,* in Mandarin dialects and *kolo* itself in Bodic (i.e. Tibeto-Burman) dialects such as *Luoba, Luoba-Bogaer,* and *Manang-Gyaru* (Bauer, 1994) [2].

NB. As for Pidgin Tocharian forms (variants) of the word *kolo,* viz. Tocharian A *kukal* and Tocharian B *kokale,* they represent the typical Talk PIDGIN forms of the Greek *kuklos.*

Moreover, besides the common Chinese-Slavic word for "plum" *s-**li**-va* there is another very important common word for fruit, viz. "apple" or Chinese *ping*, its Old Chinese form being reconstructed as **pl$^{\varsigma}$ən* (Baxter-Sagart, 2014) [3] *which* is undoubtedly genetically related to German *Apfel* and Slavic *(j)ablŭko "*apple" (in South Slavic vernaculars *jabuka)* and even more importantly Slavic *(j)ablonĭ* originally "apple-tree" (> modern *jablan* "poplar"), for in Chinese it means "apple-tree" as is seen from the compound *ping-guo* in which *guo* means "fruit" and the whole compound denotes "the fruit from the apple-tree, hence apples", featuring the typical Devoicing process of the Aryan Voiced phonemes as by all *Paiśācī*-tongues when adopting Aryan words, observable in Germanic, Hittite, Greek (especially island dialects as Cretan), and Chinese likewise. Hence, the Voiced "*b"* in Slavic *jablŭko* became Unvoiced *"p"* in all those Paiśācī-tongues (German, English, Chinese etc.).

Significantly, the Chinese positive and negative particles *de* "yes" and *bu* "no, not, nay" are related to the Slavic particles of the same meaning, viz. *da* and *ma*, respectively. Chinese *bu*, has actually derived from **mu*, both initials being bilabials, hence interchangeable in those instances when a speaker suffers from the inflammation of the mucous membrane of the paranasal sinuses, which causes a narrow passage and obstruction of the free air passage (viz. breathing) through the nose, which in turn prevents the speaker to pronounce clearly the nasal sounds like *"m",* substituting it naturally by the sound articulated in the same way and in the same place, but without the natural *nasalization* of the original phoneme, wherefore it sounds like *"b"* instead. Some speakers physiologically are unable (due to some congenital defect that caused a narrow passages of the sinuses) to pronounce clearly and distinctly the nasal sound "*m",* permanently substituting it by "*b",* for example, some people pronounce the word "*film*" as "*filb*".

In Slavic *ma* is an exclamatory prohibitive and menacing particle used in the sense" don't, must not or can't do this (because it is not allowed/permitted, it is forbidden). Conversely, in the Yin-Yang pattern, the Slavic affirmative particle *da*, presumably derived from the verb *dati "*to give", actually reveals wherefrom the Chinese related particle *de* derived its meaning "to allow, permit", since what is "given" is quite naturally "allowed, viz. permitted"!

But there is even more connections and relations between these Slavic and Chinese "yes" and "no" particles, namely, South Slavic languages (spoken by Serbs, Montenegrins, Bosnians and Croats) has also 4 tones as in Mandarin Chinese. The Slavic particle *ma* is pronounced with a sharp falling (departing) tone just like Chinese *bu* (reconstructed Old Chinese form is **pə* by Baxter-Sagart, 2014) [3], de-voiced as a rule by all Paiśācī-tongues, but originally, as it is clarified previously, it evolved from **mə*! Moreover, the Slavic particle *da* grammatically categorized also as bearing a short falling tone, but in everyday real communication actually, it is mostly pronounced in a rising tone (equivalent to 2nd tone in Mandarin), thus reflecting warmly and affectively positive and affirmative attitude of the speaker, expressive of the sense "yes, it is allowed, permitted", exactly as with the Chinese *de!*

Conclusion

The examples from Sanskrit, Slavic and Sinitic languages presented above show unmistakably their genetic relationship beside an obvious influence of the Vedic Sanskrit and Slavic onto Chinese language and culture.

Notes

1. cf. "The Vedic origin of the Chinese concepts of dao, yinyang and Pan Gu", IJSR, 3(5), 90-98.
2. Named after the ancestors and forefathers of mine, who lived there for centuries.
3. cf. "The New Language Classification on the Vedic Model", IJSR, 2017, 3(2), 25-31.

References

1. Chang TT. Indo-European Vocabulary in Old Chinese, SPP 7, 1988.
2. Bauer RS. Sino-Tibetan *kolo "Wheel", SPP 47, 1994.
3. Baxter VH, Sagart L. Old Chinese Reconstruction, version 1.1, 20, 2014, at www.baxter-sagart.org
4. Berg ME, Wu G. The Chinese Particle Le; Routledge, London, 2006.
5. Greenberg JH. Indo-European and its Closest Relatives: The Eurasiatic Language Family, Grammar, Stanford University Press. Lexicon, Stanford University Press, Stanford, 2000-2002, 1.
6. Grzetic N. Mythologia Comparativa Slavorum, Author's edition, Mostar, 1900.
7. Hewson J, Bubenik V. Tense and Aspect in Indo-European Languages, John Benjamin Publishing, Amsterdam, 1997.
8. Hung-nin SC. A Practical Chinese Grammar, CUHK, Hong Kong, 1994.
9. Khoroshkina AS. Perfect in Modern Mandarin Chinese; US-Foreign Language, 2014; 12(2):108-120.
10. Li CN, Thompson SA. Mandarin Chinese: A Functional Reference Grammar, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1981.
11. Macdonell AA. Vedic Grammar; Verlag von Karl J.Trubner, Strassburg, 1910.
12. Mallory JP, Adams DQ. The Oxford Introduction to PIE and to PIE World, Oxford, University Press, 2006.
13. Mallory JP, Mair VH. The Tarim Mummies, Thames & Hudson, London, 2000.
14. NGTV China's Mystery Mummies; National Geographic Television, NGS, 2009.
15. Olsen BA. The Noun in Biblical Armenian, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, 1999.
16. Qiles C. A Grammar of Modern Indo-European, 2009 at http://dnghu.org/
17. Sun DA. Word-Order Change and Grammaticalization in the History of Chinese, Stanford University Press, 2002.
18. Tsai WL. The Perfectness of the Sentential Particle le in Mandarin Chinese, National Tsing Hua University, 2016. at www.ling.nthu.edu.tw
19. Wei JL. Knotting and Counting: Correspondences between Old Chinese and Indo- European, SPP 162, 2005.
20. Wu X-Z.Z. Grammaticalization and Language Change in Chinese, RoutledgeCurzon, New York, 2004.
21. Zhengzhang, S. Old Chinese Phonology (in Chinese), Shanghai, 2003.
22. Zhou JX. Correspondences of Cultural Words between Old Chinese and Proto-Indo- European, SPP No. 125, 2005.