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**ALTAIC, SO FAR**

**SUMMARY**

This article consists of three parts. In the first one, I will present a bibliographical survey of the most important literature that appeared in the fields of study of five individual Altaic language groups (Japanese, Korean, Manchu-Tungusic, Mongolic, and Turkic), as well as comparative Altaic itself (including binary comparisons such as Koreo-Japonic), since the two fundamental works by Poppe in 1965 and 1975. The progress in certain fields of Altaic linguistics has been enormous within these years and the obvious necessity for a general overview has been long overdue. The recent book (1991) by Sergei Starostin, being the only substantial general contribution to the Altaic problem, unfortunately does not offer such an overview and suffers from several serious bibliographical omissions. In the second part of the article, I will address the myth that Altaic languages do not share common basic vocabulary, particularly that denoting body parts. Finally, in the third part, I will offer a short sketch of comparative verbal morphology, a task that has not been undertaken since Ramstedt’s 1952 comparative morphology that included Korea, Manchu-Tungusic, Mongolic, and Turkic. An exception was a short sketch by Baskakov (1981), that was, however, limited only to the three so-called “Micro-
1. A short bibliographical sketch of Altaic studies within last thirty years

Even today, a beginning scholar in the Altaic field starts his journey through the field by reading Nikolaus Poppe’s classic *Introduction to Altaic linguistics* (1965). It goes without saying that no serious work in the field is possible without familiarising oneself with this book, as well as with its supplement (Poppe 1975). These are presently most value as bibliographical guides. However, even though the reading of both these works is still a must, it is no longer enough in order to keep up with literature in the field. First, more than thirty years have passed and research on the individual Altaic groups, as well as that on comparative Altaic, has progressed considerably. Much more new data and dictionaries are available to us now than the scholars thirty years ago could have dreamt about. Second, while in the first two thirds of twentieth century Altaic research mostly was concentrated on Turkic, Mongolic, and Manchu-Tungusic, mostly due to the fact that that the founder of modern Altaic linguistics, Gustav Ramstedt, as well as Nikolaus Poppe were primarily Mongolists, the last third of the century saw a considerable tilt towards the inclusion into the Altaic studies of two other languages: Japanese and Korean. Little was known about the history of these two in the days of Ramstedt and Poppe, which led to a tentative inclusion of only Korean into Altaic, but even then the Korean data were not utilised to their full capacity. The situation today is quite different. Third, many historical linguists who are outsiders to the field tend to believe that the field essentially is the same as it was thirty years ago, and that no progress has been done. This leads to disseminating rumours about Altaic being “long dead”, “not supported by anyone in the field”, etc.

All this necessitates a new bibliographical survey of Altaic. Since it is impossible to give a full account of all the publications produced in the field, I will concentrate on those that have direct impact on Altaic comparative studies and, therefore, the following overview is not exhaustive. Special attention will be given to publications that have become the necessary tools of the profession. I will survey first the situation in the individual families, observed from the viewpoint of progress made towards reconstruction of individual protolanguages, and then I will discuss the present state of affairs in comparative Altaic.

**Japonic**

The Japonic (a term suggested by Leon Serafim) group of languages consists of two major subgroups: Japanese and Ryūkyūan. The Japanese subgroup includes a central dialect cluster, to which the dialects of the capital Tokyo (Eastern Central
Japanese) as well as of its cultural rival cities Kyoto and Osaka (Western Central Japanese) belong; as well as the more peripheral dialects of the island of Kyūshū, Hachijō islands and Northern Tōhoku, which are mostly not mutually comprehensive with either the central dialects or among themselves. The degree of language differentiation is even greater in Ryūkyū, where it increases from the North to the South. The primary division is between the Northern (Okinawa-Amami) and the Southern (Sakishima) sub-subgroups, with the Northern sub-subgroup divided into the Okinawan and Amami dialects, and the Southern sub-subgroup divided into the Miako and Yaeyama dialect clusters, as well as the isolated Yonaguni dialect. There is some evidence that the languages of the Koguryō kingdom, located in the Northern part of Korean peninsula and in Southern Manchuria (mid-4th – 668 A.D.), and of the Kara(k) kingdom on the Southern tip of Korean peninsula, were also languages in the same subgroup with Japanese and Ryūkyūan.

While the data on modern standard Japanese (based to a large extent on Tokyo speech) are readily available not only in English (e.g. Martin 1975 and Masuda 1974), but also in other major European languages (French, German, and Russian) and in Chinese and in Korean among Asian languages, first-hand access to the rich data of Japanese language history and the Japanese dialects unfortunately still presupposes a fairly well command of modern Japanese. There are some fortunate exceptions, however, that an Altaicist unfamiliar with Japanese still can use, and they concern mostly the reconstruction of Proto-Japanese. The only comprehensive reconstruction of Proto-Japanese containing several thousand entries is fortunately in English (Martin 1987). The rather comprehensive, although controversial in certain aspects reconstruction of Proto-Ryūkyūan by Thorpe (1983) is also in English. Frellesvig (1995) gave a diachronic study of Kyoto dialect phonology. An impressive diachronic study of the Northern Ryūkyūan Shodon dialect was made by Serafim (1985). Important aspects of Japanese reconstruction are discussed by Whitman (1985) (more accessible in Martin’s 1991 digest of it). Several other articles deal with various important aspect of Japanese reconstruction: Starostin (1975), Ramsey (1979), Ramsey (1980), Martin (1981), Whitman (1990), Vovin (1993a), Vovin (1997a). The only significant works published in Japanese on reconstruction are Hattori (1978–1979) and Itabashi (1998a).

The situation is quite the reverse in the field of descriptive linguistics. There is only one grammar of Old Japanese (8th century) available in English (Syromiatnikov 1981), that represents a translation of the Russian original (Syromiatnikov 1972). The grammar is sketchy, and the section dealing with the external relationship of Japanese is better avoided. Less problematic is access to Middle (Classical) Japanese (10–12th centuries), that has an excellent grammar in English by Ikeda Tadashi (1975), and less impressive, but still quite useful grammar by Syromiatnikov (1983). Less recommended are grammars by Komai (1979), McCullough (1988), and Komai and Rohlich (1991). Unfortunately, all Middle Japanese grammars mentioned above, except Syromitanikov 1983, rely heavily on the Japanese grammatical tradition and presuppose some knowledge of modern Japanese. The only existing histories of the Japanese language in languages other than Japanese
are by Sansom (1928) and Kolpakchi (1956), both considerably outdated. Certain parts of the work by Miller (1967) can be used as an introduction to the history of the language. Vovin (1997b) is a recent account of Old Japanese syntactic typology.


Editions of Old and Middle Japanese texts are numerous and easily accessible. Most Old Japanese and Middle Japanese texts are included in the one-hundred-volume Nihon koten bungaku taikei (Series of Japanese Classical literature) (NKBT 1957–65, several later editions as well). Those that are not, with very few exceptions, are or will be included in the even more comprehensive Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei (Series of Japanese Classical literature) (SNKBT 1990–), that has not yet been completed. Besides, there are individual editions of texts. All major Old Japanese texts, such as Kojiki [Records of matters in antiquity] (712 AD), Nihon-shoki [Annals of Japan] (720 AD), Fūdoki [Records of lands and customs] (737 AD), Man’yōshū [Collection of ten thousand leaves] (ca. 759 AD), Bussoku seki ka [Songs about Buddha’s footprint] (ca. 752 AD), and Senmyō [Imperial edicts] (794 AD) are provided with commentaries.

Compact sized dictionaries of 8th to pre-mid 19th century Japanese generally called Kogo jiten (A dictionary of Old language) are abundant, but not all of them are equally good. Many are directed to students studying Classical Japanese at school. Among those that are more academically oriented, I especially like Ohno et al. (1990) and Saeki & Mabuchi (1989). Hisamatsu & Satō (1973) and Kindaichi & Kindaichi (1973) are the next good examples. Among larger dictionaries, first of all it is necessary to mention Omodaka (1967), dedicated exclusively to the Old Japanese language up to the end of the 8th century, an indispensable tool for both studying Old Japanese and doing comparative work on Japanese. Unfortunately, nothing of the kind has yet been produced for Middle Japanese of the 10–12th centuries. All-inclusive (meaning that they include vocabulary up to the mid-19th century) useful large dictionaries are Nakada (1983) and Nakamura et al. (1982). Saeki (1983) is a very useful encyclopaedic dictionary of the largest Old Japanese text, the Man’yōshū, compiled ca. 759. Mochizuki (1974) is an alphabetised index of words found in the 1081 dictionary Ruiju myōgishō, which indicated pitch accent.

Most Japanese dialect dictionaries are not particularly useful for a comparativist’s work, since the overwhelming majority of them transcribe data in the Japanese kana syllabary that does not give any idea of the phonetic shape of a given word, particularly if it belongs to a dialect very different from dialects of central area. A
**Korean**

Korean is usually divided into Central, North-West, South-West, South-East, North-East, and Ceycwuto dialects. The latter two are quite divergent from the rest, and are probably better treated as separate languages.

Comparative work on Korean without a reading working knowledge of modern Korean is even more daunting than that on Japanese. Almost everything that exists on the historical stages and dialects of Korean – except for some outdated works in English and Japanese – is in Korean. As in the case with Japanese, there are, however, fortunate exceptions, but they are far and between. The best descriptive grammars of the modern language are Martin (1992) and Sohn (1994), the former also including a detailed sketch of the Middle Korean language from the 1440s onwards. Kholodovich (1986) is a sketch of Middle Korean grammar based on the text of a single text: the *Yongpi Ethyen ka* (1447). Kontsevich (1979) is a very careful study of the text of the *Hwunmin cengum* (1444), the royal edict that introduced the Korean alphabet (Hankul), also including a translation and a facsimile of the text. Several works dealing with various problems of Middle Korean phonology or morphology are the articles by Martin (1996a, 1996b, and 1997), King (1994, 1996a, 1998 – forthcoming), Ramsey (1984) and Vovin (1993c). Study of pre-Hankul texts is also represented by a few publications: Martin (1998),

However, as in the case of Japanese, North American and European scholarship dominates in the field of reconstruction of Proto-Korean. The real milestone is Ramsey (1991), dealing with such important issues as origin of pitch accent and aspirates. Also important are Martin (1995), Ramsey (1996), and Whitman (1996). Valuable insights into the prehistory of Korean can be found in the above-mentioned King (1991) and Martin (1992 and 1996b). Among Korean scholars, essentially only Yi Kimun came up with interesting proposals about the reconstruction of Proto-Korean. They are largely scattered in his Korean-language publications, although one of them (Yi 1961/1987a) was translated into German (Yi 1977) and another important one was published in English (Lee 1959). Recently, the Japanese linguist Itabashi Yoshizō has also published a series of articles on Old Korean and Korean reconstruction (1990b, 1991b, 1996b, 1996c).

The field of study of the history and dialectology of the Korean language is dominated by Korean language publications. Standard dictionaries of Middle and Early Modern Korean that also include some pre-15th century data are Yu (1987) and Nam (1987). Among numerous grammars of Middle Korean the most useful are Choy (1987), Co (1994), He (1981 & 1988) and Yi (1985). Ko (1987) is a useful pedagogical grammar of Middle Korean. The Middle Korean 16th century language is treated by Yi (1994) and He (1989). Yi (1987b) is the most useful historical phonology of Korean, and Yi (1987a) is the most widely known general introduction to the history of Korean. Among the numerous studies dealing with the Old Korean language represented by hyangka poems, the monographies by Kim Wancin (1986) and Yu Changkyun (1994) are the best. Kang (1991) and Kang (1995) deal with two important Middle Korean materials prior to the mid-14th century: a Chinese-Korean glossary of the early 12th century and a Chinese-Korean vocabulary from the beginning of the 15th century. Studies of early Middle Korean texts written in the kwukyel writing system are becoming quite frequent lately (An 1995, Kim 1993), but it is difficult to judge yet what kind of impact, if any, they would have on Korean comparative studies.

Korean dialect dictionaries are, as a rule, much more useful than their Japanese counterparts, since they include Romanised transcription. The most useful dialect dictionary is Choy (1978), although additional data can be secured from Kim (1986) and Kim (1987–95), the latter being a nine-volume edition dividing the material by the provinces of South Korea. The natural pitfall of these publications is that the first two contain only limited data from dialects spoken in North Korea, and the third does not include them at all. The situation can be remedied by consulting Kim (1980), which is one of few worthy North Korean publications. There are also several dialect dictionaries of the two divergent dialects, mentioned above,
e.g. of the Ceycwuto dialect (Pak 1988) and the Northern Hamkyeng dialect (Kim 1986), etc. However, their usefulness is diminished by the fact that they transcribe material in the Korean alphabet. The standard introduction to Korean dialectology is Choy (1991).

**Manchu-Tungusic**

The Manchu-Tungusic group consists of two subgroups, as the name suggests: the Manchu subgroup, that includes Classical and Modern Manchu, Sibe and the extinct Jurchen language; and the Tungusic group that comprises all other languages. The Tungusic subgroup is further subdivided into the Northern sub-subgroup, including Ewenki, Ewen, Solon, Neghidal and Kili (Kur-Urmi), and the Southern group including Nanai, Ulcha, Oroch, Orok, and Udehe. Although the term “Tungusic” is predominantly used nowadays in the literature as a cover term for both the Manchu and the Tungusic subgroup, it is misleading, since Manchu and the Tungusic represent the highest split in the group, based on a series of exclusively shared innovations in phonology, morphology and lexicon within each of the two groups.

The period from late sixties to late eighties was the golden age of Tungusic studies in Russia. It was at this time that the major comparative two-volume dictionary of Manchu-Tungusic languages was published (Tsintsius 1975, 1977). The publication of this work, although it had some pitfalls, such as the lack of a reverse index, revolutionised both Manchu-Tungusic and Altaic studies, since this dictionary did not just conveniently bring together material from all modern and old Tungusic languages, but also included otherwise inaccessible archival material. The third part of Orest Sunik’s comparative Manchu-Tungusic grammar was also published at this time (Sunik 1982), as was Boldyrev’s nominal word formation monograph (Boldyrev 1987). Other major works included a series of sketches of all the Tungusic languages spoken in the former USSR (Skorik et al. 1968), the second volume of Ocherki dialetkov evenskogo iazyka by Novikova (1980), which contained a short and the best dictionary of standard Ewen (but as all other dictionaries based on standard Ewen writing system omitted such important features as vowel length, etc.), Tsintius’ Neghidal dictionary, texts, and short grammar (1982), Sunik’s Ulcha dictionary, texts, and short grammar (1985), Avrorin’s and Lebedeva’s Oroch texts and dictionary (1978), Onenko’s comprehensive Nanai-Russian dictionary (1980) and Russian-Nanai dictionary (1986), Sem’s grammar of the Ussuri dialect of Nanai (1976), Avrorin’s Nanai texts (1986) and Robbek’s study of the Ewen Berezovka dialect (1989). One must also mention among pedagogical works Lebedeva, Konstantinova, and Monakhova’s Ewenki manual (1985), and four dictionaries intended for school usage: Ewenki-Russian and Russian-Ewenki (Kolesnikova 1983), Nanai-Russian, and Russian-Nanai (Onenko 1982), Ulcha-Russian and Russian-Ulcha (Sunik 1987), Ewen-Russian and Russian-Ewen (Robbek, Dutkin, and Burykin 1988). With the passing away of two major Tungusic linguists, Tsintsius in 1982, and Sunik in 1986, the golden age was over. Only three major works done by Russian linguists in the field of
Tungusic studies appeared in the nineties: a very useful Russian-Ewenki dictionary (Boldyrev 1994), sketches of the Tungusic languages in the new series “Languages of the world” (Alpatov et al. 1997) and a comprehensive description of Ewenki (Nedialkov 1997). However, the sketches in the second mentioned publication were all done by scholars of the older generation, with the exception of the Jurchen sketch by Aleksandr Pevnov, and the third mentioned work was published in the West. Unless the scholars of the younger generation are able to live up to the legacy of their teachers under the current stringent economical and political conditions in Russia, Tungusic linguistics in that country could decline considerably, or even become extinct.

Starting from the mid-eighties the centre of gravity of Manchu-Tungusic studies began to shift to China, where a number of important works have been published since that time. Most spectacular was the development of Manchu studies: two new large dictionaries have recently been published, An (1993) and Hu (1994), the second being especially useful in that it contains textual examples with text addresses and Chinese-Manchu and English-Manchu indexes. In addition, there is a recent comprehensive grammar of Manchu (Li et al. 1986) and two textbooks of Manchu, one of Classical Manchu (Aisin Giyoro and Mala Sicun 1986) and one of both Classical and modern colloquial Heilongjiang Manchu (Li et al. 1989). There is also a recent Jurchen dictionary (Jin 1984). Studies of other Manchu-Tungusic languages are also quickly catching up: there are now several short grammars and vocabularies of Sibe (Li & Zhong 1986), Nanai (An 1986), Solon (Hu & Chaoke 1986) and Ewenki (Hu 1986), a rather detailed grammar of Solon (Chaoke 1995) and a Sibe grammar and dictionary (Li et al. 1984). Recently Chaoke published the first comparative Manchu-Tungusic grammar in Chinese (1997).

If Chinese scholars are now leaders in Manchu and Ewenki-Solon studies, in Japan, Ikegami Jirō and his two students, scholars of younger generation, Kazama Shinjirō, and Tsumagari Toshirō are leading the way in studies of the South Tungusic languages. The major event is a publication of Ikegami’s Orok dictionary (1997). There is also another Orok-Japanese dictionary worth mentioning (Magata 1981). Japanese dictionaries of Orok are especially precious, as Orok is the only Tungusic language that has not even a short vocabulary published in Russia. So far Kazama has published some of his field material on Nanai, Ulcha, and the Oroch languages (1993, 1996a, 1996b, 1996c, 1997a, 1998a), as well as a series of very interesting articles (1996d, 1997b, 1998b). I am also familiar with a couple of not less interesting publications by Tsumagari (1993, 1997), who is working on Kur-Urmi and Orok. Judging by the amount of their productivity, we should expect major works from both of them in no time. I also find very useful Kiyose’s study of Jurchen (1977) and Kawachi’s grammar, reader and dictionary of Manchu (1996).

Not much has been produced in the West, although the following publications are all useful. Fuchs et al. (1968) is a general introduction to Manchu-Tungusic linguistics and philology. Norman’s concise Manchu-English dictionary (1978) is compact but very practical, and is the only source for those who cannot use the Russian, German, Chinese and Japanese dictionaries of Manchu. A Reverse Index of Manchu by William Rozycki (1981) is a very useful tool, too. Rozycki’s more recent
monograph (1994b) conveniently puts together Mongol loanwords in Manchu and other Tungusic languages. Kane (1989) is an important study of Jurchen. Janhunen (1991) describes a previously unknown and peculiar dialect of Ewenki. A few books have been published on Manchu philology in both Germany and Russia, but they fall outside of a scope of this survey. There are several journal articles that might be worth mentioning here, too. Rozycki (1993) persuasively revises an important segment of Tungusic reconstruction. Janhunen (1994) gives a very innovative and fresh overview of Sinitic scripts in Mediaeval Northern China. Janhunen (1997a) and Tsumagari (1997) provide the general background for Tungusic in China and Russia. Vovin (1993d) attempts to provide a new classification of the Manchu-Tungusic languages, and Vovin (1997c) makes a proposal concerning the internal reconstruction of Manchu, which has a direct impact on Altaic studies.

Mongolic

The modern Mongolic languages are usually divided into the Eastern, Western, and Northern subgroups. The Eastern subgroup represents a cluster of closely related dialects, with Khalkha (the official language of Mongolian People’s Republic) and Chakhar (the official spoken language of Inner Mongolia) as the major representatives. The Northern subgroup is represented by Buriat and its dialects, and the Western by the Oirat dialects, including Kalmyk. Middle Mongolian and the Written Mongolian languages do not belong to any of these groups. The classification still has to be done for the Mongolic “outliers” (I have borrowed the term from Polynesian linguistics), namely several divergent languages, scattered in Gansu, Qinghai and Inner Mongolia – Daghur, Monguor, Dongxiang, Baoan, Shira, Yugur and one distant language in Afghanistan, Moghol – that do not fit in any of the three major groups.

Mongolic studies developed quite dynamically in the West and in Russia. Since the 1980s China has also effectively joined this process. Several important dictionaries have been published in the West: a Khalkha-English dictionary (Hangin 1986), Oirat-English (Krueger 1978–84), a reverse dictionary to the Secret History of Mongols (Vietze et al. 1969) and an index to it (de Rachewiltz 1972). Lessing’s dictionary of Written Mongolian was reprinted three times (1973, 1982, 1995; originally published 1960). A number of Written and Middle Mongolian texts were published by Mongolia Society and Akadémiai Kiadó (the Hungarian Academy of Sciences), e.g., Krueger ed. (1965a, 1965b, 1978); Lörincz (1982), Ligeti (1971). An excellent edition of a pre-Classical Written Mongolian text with a very detailed commentary was published by Poppe (1967). Rozycki (1994a) wrote an important article dealing with a problem of reconstruction of proto-Mongolic. Poppe et al. (1964) gave a general introduction to Mongolic linguistics and philology. Important new material on Middle Mongolian are Mostaert (1977, 1995), edited by de Rachewiltz, and Ligeti (1990), edited by Kara, followed by an index compiled by Kara (1990). Janhunen (1990) gave a description of a previously unknown Mongolian language in China.

A number of very important works were done by Chinese and Inner Mongolian scholars: a comparative dictionary of all Mongolian languages and dialects spoken in China (plus Written Mongolian and Outer Mongolian standard Khalkha) (Sun ed. 1990), short grammar sketches and vocabularies of Mongolian languages spoken in China: Chakhar Mongolian (Daobu, 1983), Dahur (Zhong, 1982), Dongxiang (Liu, 1981), Baoan (Buhe & Liu, 1982), East Yuigu (Zhaonasitu, 1981), Monguor (Zhaoonasitu, 1981), comprehensive Mongolian-Chinese (n.a. 1975) and Chinese-Mongolian dictionaries (Wu, 1983).

Turkic

The Turkic classification is very controversial. Everyone essentially agrees that the group can be divided into Chuvash and the rest (Common Turkic). Within Common Turkic, most specialists will admit Yakut as a split-off on the next level. Within the rest, there are two well-defined sub-subgroups: the South-West (Oghuz) subgroup, which includes Turkish, Azerbaijani, Turkmen, Gagauz and some minor Turkic languages (or dialects?) in Iran; and the North-West (Qypchaq) subgroup, which includes Tatar, Bashkir, Qumyq, Nogai, Karachay-Balkar, Kazakh and Qaraqalpaq. The classification of other languages remains controversial.

There are two useful dictionaries of Old Turkic: Nadeliaev et al. (1969) and Clauson (1972). The second is less user-friendly than the first (it is structured more like a Semitic than like a Turkic language dictionary), but being quasi-etymological it also includes parallels from other Turkic languages. Those who find the organization of material in Clauson 1972 difficult to handle, might want to use an excellent index to it compiled by Rona-Tas (1981–82). A short etymological dictionary by Rässänen was also published about this time (1969). The monumental etymological dictionary of Turkic, started by Sevortian (1974, 1978, 1980), was continued under the general editorship of Levitskaia (1989) and then Blagova (1997). There are still several volumes to appear, and it may well take another twenty years to complete. Dictionaries of several languages important for compara-
tive Altaic studies have been also published during these thirty years: Chuvash-
Russian (Skvortsov ed. 1985), Russian-Chuvash (Andreev & Petrov ed. 1971),
Russian-Yakut (Afanas’ev & Kharitonov ed. 1968), Yakut-Russian (Sleptsov ed.
1972), Russian-Turkmen (Charyiarov & Altaev ed. 1986), a new etymological
dictionary of Chuvash (Fedotov 1996, that was published thirty years after the first

A number of grammars of Old Turkic (Tekin 1968, Aidarov 1971, Kono-
nov, 1980) as well as an important study in Old Turkic word-formation (Erdal 1991)
have appeared. Vasíl’ev (1983) and Kormushin (1997) published newly discovered
Yeniseian Old Turkic texts. There are also studies of other mediaeval Turkic lan-
guages, notably those of Volga Bulgar by Khakimzianov (1978, 1987) and Erdal
(1980s or 1990s). Several historical comparative grammars of Turkic or its bran-
1979, 1988); Musaev (1975), Levitskaia (1976), Rassadin (1978), Fedotov (1980,

The re-discovery of the Khaladj language by Doerfer and his students led
to a series of important publications on this otherwise unknown Turkic language:
Doerfer (1971, 1988a), Doerfer & Tezcan (1980). There are also grammars of other
languages, insufficiently known or poorly described before. Rassadin described the
Tofalar language, poorly known before (1971, 1978). Baskakov continued his work
on the dialects of the Altai language (1985), which he had started in the early six-
ties. Tenishev produced an excellent grammar and vocabulary of Salar (1976), and
Dmitrieva described the Baraba Tatar language (1981). There are also sizeable
grammars of Khakas (Baskakov ed. 1975), a new grammar of Yakut (Ubirotova
1982, 1995) and new grammar of Tuvinian (Krueger 1977). Short sketches of all
the known Turkic languages, old and modern, were published in Tenishev (1997).

Chinese scholars published several grammars and sketches of Turkic langu-
ages spoken in China: a sketch of Salar (Lin 1985), a sketch of West Yuigu (Chen &
Lei 1985), a grammar of Kazakh (Geng 1989), a grammar of Uighur (Yi & Gao
1998), a sketch of Kyrgyz (Hu 1986) and a sketch of Uzbek (Cheng & Abudoureh-
man 1987). There is also a general introduction to Turkic linguistics (Li 1992).
There are likewise quite a number of pedagogical grammars of Uighur and other
Turkic languages, but they fall outside the scope of this survey.

Comparative Altaic

The single most important book on comparative Altaic published in this pe-
riod is Starostin (1991). Although it suffers from a number of defects, such as, for
example, its outdated treatment of the Korean data and certain important bibliogra-
phical omissions (e.g., Martin 1987), it is still the best and fullest treatment of com-
parative Altaic phonology and vocabulary. Starostin (1991) is definitely not a book
for a beginner. It is necessary to have a good background in comparative Altaic in or-
der to make the most of this book. On the other hand, a decent introductory text (unfortunately excluding Japanese and not providing anything new on Korean) is Baska-
kov (1981). Martin’s recent book on Korean and Altaic (1996b) contains some critical insights into Altaic theory from the viewpoint of Martin’s version of the recon-
struction of proto-Korean. There have also been a number of volumes including collec-
tions of articles by single or several authors dealing with various problems of comparative Altaic: Sinor (1990), Sunik (1971, 1978; Tsintsius (1972, 1979); Tsint-
sius & Dmitrieva (1984), Bitkeev (1975). Dybo (1996) is an interesting study of se-
matic reconstruction in Altaic, and Kormushin (1984) is a study of the verbal sys-
tem in Altaic. Both monographs do not involve Japanese or Korean. Nowadays, one
of the very few linguists able to successfully work with all five branches of Altaic is
the Japanese linguist Itabashi Yoshizō, author of a series of very interesting publica-
tions, who has published many of his works in English (1990, 1991, 1993a, 1993b,
1996, 1998b). The most important recent publications in the general Altaic field are
several articles by Manaster Ramer and his co-authors (1997a, 1997b, 1998a, 1998b).

Three monographs by Roy A. Miller (1967, 1971, 1980), as well as his other numerous publications (see the bibliography), are dedicated to the compari-
sion of Japanese and other Altaic languages. Although a number of brilliant ideas
belong to Roy A. Miller, and his theoretical basis is firmly set in the classical comparative method, the actual application of this method in his works must be
taken with a grain of salt, as frequently his proposals are supported by poorly veri-
fied data. Miller’s last book (1996) unfortunately does not contain anything new
that was not proposed in earlier publications. A careful study of some Japanese-Al-
taic etymologies is Street & Miller (1975) and Street (1977), unfortunately never
actually published and circulating as a draft version. There is also an interesting comparative study of Japanese and Altaic by Menges (1975). Great progress has
been made in the binary comparison of Japanese and Korean, starting with Martin's
work (1966), which is completely out of date as far as reconstructions are con-
cerned, but still very important for the etymologies it contains, many of which are still
valid. Martin’s reconstruction was significantly revised in the work by Whitman
(1985), which was an important milestone in comparative Koreo-Japonic studies.
Vovin (1997a) has attempted to explain the origins of register in Japanese from the
Altaic perspective, further providing an importance evidence for Altaic origins of
Japanese. A binary comparison of Korean and Manchu-Tungusic was published by
Kim Tongso (1981), but it is unfortunately, very weak. The recent monograph by
Shcherbak (1997) aims at refutation of the genetic relationship between Turkic and
Mongolic, explaining all parallels as the result of interborrowing. There are numer-
ous articles dealing with the binary comparison of Turkic and Mongolian, but most
of them either do not have anything to do with comparative Altaic, or are written
on a very low scholarly level. There have been no other binary comparative studies
worth attention during this period, although Janhunen, nowadays probably the most
serious opponent of Altaic, stated in his recent book that he believes that Manchu-
Tungusic and Mongolic are probably related (1997b: 251–52).
2. Body part terms in Altaic languages

There is a persistent myth that Altaic languages have very few common items of basic vocabulary. In particular, this statement (which is false, as we will see below) is frequently made in regard to body parts (Doerfer 1988b). Doerfer’s arguments concerning body parts in the so-called “Micro-Altaic” group (Manchu-Tungusic, Mongolic, and Turkic) were answered by Alexis Manaster Ramer, Paul Sidwell, and myself (Manaster Ramer, Vovin, Sidwell 1998 forthcoming). Here I am going to elaborate further on this myth, including data also from Japanese and Korean.

Usually opponents of Altaic claim that their standard in defining how many body part terms related languages are supposed to share is based on Indo-European. However, since the majority of anti-Altaicists are Turcologists by training, it appears that their standard of deciding how “few” are few is based on Turkic. In order to demonstrate this, I have chosen ten very stable body part terms (“nose”, “eye”, “ear”, “tongue”, “mouth”, “hand”, “foot”, “bone”, “blood”, and “heart”). I will provide the comparative charts containing these words in Turkic, Altaic and three control families: Indo-European, Austronesian, and Afroasiatic. Since the Altaic family contains five distinct primary branches, I will also use five primary branches in other examples, although Indo-European, Austronesian, and Afroasiatic contain more than five such primary branches, and Turkic contains less. I will denote cognates or non-cognates using letters A, B, C, D and E in the charts.

First, I present Turkic data. There is a consensus that the Chuvash language represents a higher order branching in Turkic, all the other languages being classified as “Common Turkic”. It is, however, possible to argue, that there are two other early splits within Common Turkic, namely that of the Yakut and Sayan group (includes Tuvinian and Tofalar, possibly also Salar), although many Turcologists would disagree with this point of view, especially regarding Sayan Turkic. I have also selected Turkish and Kazakh as representing the South-West and North-East Turkic languages among the remaining Turkic subgroups, besides Chuvash, Yakut, and Tuvinian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body part terms</th>
<th>Turkic</th>
<th>Kazakh</th>
<th>Tuvinian</th>
<th>Yakut</th>
<th>Chuvash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘nose’</td>
<td>burun A</td>
<td>mörön A</td>
<td>dumčuk B</td>
<td>murun A</td>
<td>şumes A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘eye’</td>
<td>göz A</td>
<td>köz A</td>
<td>qaraq B</td>
<td>xarax B</td>
<td>kuç A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ear’</td>
<td>kulak A</td>
<td>qöлаq A</td>
<td>qulaq A</td>
<td>qulGa:x A</td>
<td>xölxA A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘tongue’</td>
<td>dil A</td>
<td>til A</td>
<td>dil A</td>
<td>til A</td>
<td>çölxe A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘tooth’</td>
<td>diš A</td>
<td>tis A</td>
<td>diš A</td>
<td>ti:s A</td>
<td>şol B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘hand’</td>
<td>el A</td>
<td>qol B</td>
<td>xol B</td>
<td>ili: A</td>
<td>al: A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘foot’</td>
<td>ayak A</td>
<td>ayaq A</td>
<td>but B</td>
<td>ataq A</td>
<td>ura A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘bone’</td>
<td>kemik A</td>
<td>söyek B</td>
<td>söök B</td>
<td>uğuox B</td>
<td>şume A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘blood’</td>
<td>kan A</td>
<td>qan A</td>
<td>xan A</td>
<td>xan A</td>
<td>yun A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘heart’</td>
<td>yurek A</td>
<td>jörek A</td>
<td>čurek A</td>
<td>sürex A</td>
<td>çere A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is not necessary to be a historical linguist in order to notice that at least four of the five languages presented (excluding maybe Chuvash) are related, since all cognates in this chart are also look-alikes. As for Chuvash, it underwent a number of unusual phonetic developments and it took more than a century to recognise it as a Turkic language. Even such a prominent Turcologist of the late 19th century – early 20th century as W. Radloff considered it a Finno-Ugric language that underwent significant Turkic influence. Anyway, the percentage of cognates among Turkic body part terms is very high:

- ‘nose’: 3-way cognate
- ‘eye’: one 3-way cognate and one 2-way cognate
- ‘ear’: 5-way cognate
- ‘tongue’: 5-way cognate
- ‘tooth’: 4-way cognate
- ‘hand’: one 3-way cognate and one 2-way cognate
- ‘foot’: 4-way cognate
- ‘bone’: 3-way cognate
- ‘blood’: 5-way cognate
- ‘heart’: 5-way cognate

Among the ten chosen words, there are four 5-way cognates, two 4-way cognates, four 3-way cognates, and two 2-way cognates (words for “eye” and “hand” have two cognate sets each). What is very important, there is not a single word that does not have a cognate set.

Now if we take five modern Altaic languages from different groups, the situation is, of course, going to be different. Languages change over time and lose commonly inherited elements. Vocabulary is especially prone to replacement, as it can be borrowed (although this does not happen with basic vocabulary as a whole, unless we deal with bilateral language mixing) or replaced due to taboos, etc. Therefore, it is important to realise that five modern Altaic languages belonging to five different Altaic groups cannot possibly contain as much common vocabulary as five modern Turkic languages do. It is also important to remember that not only words come and go, but their phonetic shape also changes over time. Thus, true cognates after a certain period of time may no longer look alike, while other words can look alike, but be totally unrelated. Russian что “what” and German was “id” are cognates in spite of the fact that they do not look similar, but Japanese тане, “seed”, and Turkish тане “id” are not, notwithstanding the fact that they have identical segmental shapes (the latter is a Persian loanword). Therefore, our only criterion for defining cognates is and must be based on regular phonetic correspondences (for the list of Altaic regular phonetic correspondences reflecting genuine cognates and not later loanwords see /Starostin 1991: 21/, or /Vovin 1994a: 387/, that may be more accessible). The five modern languages I have selected are modern standard

1 An important addition to this system of correspondences is Leon Serafim’s proposal that proto-Altaic might have at least one series of labiovelars *k’w, reconstructed on the basis of the correspon-

Body parts in five modern Altaic languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Ewenki</th>
<th>Khalkha</th>
<th>Chuvash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘nose’</td>
<td>hana A</td>
<td>kho A</td>
<td>oŋokto A</td>
<td>xamər A</td>
<td>səmsa B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘eye’</td>
<td>me A</td>
<td>nun A</td>
<td>eṣa A</td>
<td>nuðon A</td>
<td>kuç B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ear’</td>
<td>mimi A</td>
<td>kwi B</td>
<td>s’en C</td>
<td>čixən D</td>
<td>xəlxə B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘tongue’</td>
<td>sita A</td>
<td>hye A</td>
<td>inji B</td>
<td>xel B</td>
<td>čəlxə C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘tooth’</td>
<td>ha A</td>
<td>[ppal] B</td>
<td>iːkte C</td>
<td>šudən D</td>
<td>šəl D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘hand’</td>
<td>te A</td>
<td>son B</td>
<td>ŋaːla C</td>
<td>gar D</td>
<td>ała C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘foot’</td>
<td>asi A</td>
<td>pal B</td>
<td>halgan B</td>
<td>xəl C</td>
<td>ura D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘bone’</td>
<td>hone A</td>
<td>ppyə A</td>
<td>giramna B</td>
<td>yasən A</td>
<td>šənə C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘blood’</td>
<td>ti A</td>
<td>phi B</td>
<td>se:kse C</td>
<td>čišən A</td>
<td>yun D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘heart’</td>
<td>sinzð A</td>
<td>sımcan B</td>
<td>meːwan C</td>
<td>ʒarəx D</td>
<td>čare D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This time the situation is quite different from that found in Turkic. One has to be a historical linguist, well trained in at least historical phonology of all the five groups in question as well as in comparative Altaic phonology to detect the cognates. The results are as follows:

- ‘nose’: 4-way cognate (Japanese, Korean, Ewenki, Khalkha)
- ‘eye’: 4-way cognate (Japanese, Korean, Ewenki, Khalkha)
- ‘ear’: 2-way cognate (Korean, Chuvash)
- ‘tongue’: two 2-way cognates (Japanese, Korean) and (Ewenki, Khalkha), possibly 4-way cognate (Japanese, Korean, Ewenki, Khalkha)
- ‘tongue’: two 2-way cognate (Khalkha, Chuvash)
- ‘hand’: 2-way cognate (Ewenki, Chuvash)
- ‘foot’: 2-way cognate (Korean, Ewenki)
- ‘bone’: 3-way cognate (Japanese, Korean, Khalkha)
- ‘blood’: 2-way cognate (Khalkha, Chuvash)

There are two 4-way cognate sets and possibly one more 4-way cognate set (if not 4-way, than two 2-way cognate sets), one 3-way cognate set and five or seven 2-way cognate sets (depending on the validity of the one tentative 4-way set mentioned above). Similar to the case with Turkic, there are no examples without any cognates at all, but in contrast with Turkic there are no 5-way cognate sets. This lack of 5-way cognate sets is often brought forward by opponents of Altaic theory as “proof” that Altaic languages are not related. These scholars claim that in order to be related languages must exhibit such across-the-board cognate lexical
sets (see, for example, Janhunen 1997b: 247–48). However, if such a claim is made, it must be supported by evidence from otherwise uncontroversial and generally recognised families, roughly of the same relative age as Altaic. The fact that such sets exist in Turkic is of no relevance here, since Turkic, being a branch of Altaic, is much younger, and, therefore, must have preserved more common elements than the latter. Let us look at Indo-European, Austronesian and Afroasiatic.

First, let us examine five modern Indo-European languages, all belonging to five different primary subgroups of Indo-European (I have chosen English, Russian, New Greek, Albanian and Hindi). If the anti-Altaistic claim is true, that Indo-European is a valid family and Altaic is not, we should expect to find more cognate sets among modern Indo-European languages, including 5-way cognate matches, than among modern Altaic languages.

### Body parts in five modern IE languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>New Greek</th>
<th>Albanian</th>
<th>Hindi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nose</td>
<td>нос A</td>
<td>нось B</td>
<td>hundë C</td>
<td>na:k A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eye</td>
<td>глаз B</td>
<td>μάτι C</td>
<td>sy D</td>
<td>ākh E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ear</td>
<td>ухо A</td>
<td>αυτί A</td>
<td>vesh A</td>
<td>kaːn B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tooth</td>
<td>зуб B</td>
<td>γλώσσα B</td>
<td>gjuhë C</td>
<td>jiːbh D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hand</td>
<td>рука B</td>
<td>χέρι C</td>
<td>dorë C</td>
<td>haːth D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foot</td>
<td>нога B</td>
<td>πόδι A</td>
<td>këmbë C</td>
<td>Tāːg D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bone</td>
<td>кость B</td>
<td>κόκκαλο C</td>
<td>koskë D</td>
<td>haDDiː E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blood</td>
<td>кровь B</td>
<td>αίμα C</td>
<td>gjak D</td>
<td>xuːn E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heart</td>
<td>сердце A</td>
<td>καρδιά A</td>
<td>zëmër B</td>
<td>ḥrday A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly to the case with Altaic, and contrary to the Turkic case, one has to be a trained in historical linguists to detect cognates, as, e.g. cases like English heart and Russian сердце do not even look alike. The results of cognate set count is as follows:

- ‘nose’: 3-way cognate (English, Russian, Hindi)
- ‘eye’: no cognates
- ‘ear’: 4-way cognate (English, Russian, Greek, Albanian)
- ‘tongue’: 2-way cognate (English, Russian)
- ‘tooth’: one 3-way cognate (English, Greek, Hindi) and one 2-way cognate (Russian, Albanian)
- ‘hand’: 2-way cognate (Greek, Albanian)
- ‘foot’: 2-way cognate (English, Greek)
- ‘bone’: no cognates
- ‘blood’: no cognates
- ‘heart’: 4-way cognate (English, Russian, Greek, Hindi)
Surprisingly for some, and not surprisingly for others, the picture turns out to be much worse than in the case with Altaic. There is one 4-way match, there are two 3-way matches, four 2-way matches, and, most importantly, three cases with no matches at all. There are no 5-way cognate sets either. However, the Indo-European family is exceptional in the sense that it is lucky to have several languages that are attested pretty early. Therefore, relying on our knowledge that languages lose cognate vocabulary over time, we can try to improve our chances by looking at the earliest attested language in each of the primary groups, rather than at their contemporary forms. As this is the cases with all languages in the chart above, except Albanian, I will then compare Old English, Old Church Slavic, Ancient Greek, Albanian, and Sanskrit.

Body parts in four old Indo-European languages and Albanian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Old English</th>
<th>Old Church Slavic</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Albanian</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘nose’</td>
<td>nosu A</td>
<td>ὥσκα A</td>
<td>ῥίς B</td>
<td>hundë C</td>
<td>na:s- A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘eye’</td>
<td>čage A</td>
<td>ὠκό A</td>
<td>ὀφθαλμός A</td>
<td>sy D</td>
<td>aksi A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ear’</td>
<td>čare A</td>
<td>ὅχο A</td>
<td>ὦς A</td>
<td>vesh A</td>
<td>karsta- B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘tongue’</td>
<td>tunge A</td>
<td>ἀλβάκικικι A</td>
<td>γλώσσα B</td>
<td>giuhë C</td>
<td>jihva:-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ear’</td>
<td>tōp A</td>
<td>ἄκκεθ B</td>
<td>ὀδόες A</td>
<td>dhemp B</td>
<td>dant- A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘hand’</td>
<td>hand A</td>
<td>ἕκκα B</td>
<td>χείρ C</td>
<td>dorë C</td>
<td>hasta- D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘foot’</td>
<td>fōt A</td>
<td>ἡμνα B</td>
<td>πούς A</td>
<td>këmbë C</td>
<td>pad- A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘bone’</td>
<td>bān A</td>
<td>κατσίκι B</td>
<td>ὁστέον C</td>
<td>koskë D</td>
<td>asthi- C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘blood’</td>
<td>blōd A</td>
<td>κραλίμι B</td>
<td>αἷμα C</td>
<td>gjak D</td>
<td>asan- E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘heart’</td>
<td>heorte A</td>
<td>ἄγαλλιδιε A</td>
<td>καρδία A</td>
<td>zëmër B</td>
<td>ῥῆδ[aya]- A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The new results are as follows:

- ‘nose’: 3-way cognate (OE, OCS, Sanskrit)
- ‘eye’: 4-way cognate (OE, OCS, Greek, Sanskrit)
- ‘ear’: 4-way cognate (OE, OCS, Albanian, Sanskrit)
- ‘tongue’: 2-way cognate (OE, OCS)
- ‘tooth’: one 3-way cognate (OE, Greek, Sanskrit) and one 2-way cognate (OCS, Albanian)
- ‘hand’: 2-way cognate (Greek, Albanian)
- ‘foot’: 3-way cognate (OE, Greek, Sanskrit)
- ‘bone’: 2-way cognate (Greek, Sanskrit)
- ‘blood’: no cognates
- ‘heart’: 4-way cognate (OE, OCS, Greek, Sanskrit)

One still has to be a specialist in comparative linguistics in order to detect the genetic relationship, but there is a definite improvement in contrast with the comparison of the modern languages. We have now three 4-way matches, three 3-
way matches, four 2-way matches (there are two separate etymons for the word “tooth”), but still one word does not show any matches at all. Nor do we have a single 5-way match. Thus, using the Indo-European as a control family, we must come to a choice: either the anti-Altaists’ claim that related languages must exhibit across-the-board matches is false, or the Indo-European languages are not related. At the very least, the claim that refutation of Altaic is based on criteria used in Indo-European linguistics simply is not true.

In order to further evaluate the universality of the claim that the Altaic family has few cognates for body part terms in comparison to uncontroversial families, as well as the claim that there must be across-the-board cognate sets, let us look at two other families: Austronesian and Afroasiatic. First, let us look at the same body part terms in five modern Austronesian languages. Since the Austronesian family consists of several primary subgroups, all located on Taiwan (Formosa) except the Malayo-Polynesian branch that includes all other Austronesian languages (Blust 1977) I have chosen four Formosan languages (Squliq Atayal, Tsou, Puyuma, and Bunun), and the lexically archaic Malay from among Malayo-Polynesian languages.

Body parts in modern Austronesian languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Squliq Atayal</th>
<th>Tsou</th>
<th>Puyuma</th>
<th>Bunun</th>
<th>Malay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘nose’</td>
<td>ŋuhuu A</td>
<td>ŋucu B</td>
<td>ŋTI-an C</td>
<td>ŋutus B</td>
<td>hidung D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘eye’</td>
<td>loziq A</td>
<td>mcoo B</td>
<td>maTa B</td>
<td>mata? B</td>
<td>mata B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ear’</td>
<td>papak A</td>
<td>koeu B</td>
<td>Tariña C</td>
<td>tæñi?a C</td>
<td>telinga C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘tongue’</td>
<td>hamli? A</td>
<td>umo B</td>
<td>ridan C</td>
<td>ma?ma? D</td>
<td>lidah E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘tooth’</td>
<td>?nux A</td>
<td>hisi B</td>
<td>wali C</td>
<td>nipun D</td>
<td>gigi E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘hand’</td>
<td>qba? A</td>
<td>mucu B</td>
<td>rima C</td>
<td>‘ima? C</td>
<td>tangan D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘foot’</td>
<td>rapal A</td>
<td>capha B</td>
<td>kui C</td>
<td>dalapa D</td>
<td>kaki E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘bone’</td>
<td>qni? A</td>
<td>caheh B</td>
<td>ukak C</td>
<td>tohmað D</td>
<td>tulang D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘blood’</td>
<td>ramu? A</td>
<td>hmueu B</td>
<td>dasah C</td>
<td>hairaŋ D</td>
<td>darah C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘heart’</td>
<td>kualun A</td>
<td>t?uhu B</td>
<td>muRduRdu C</td>
<td>haputus D</td>
<td>jantung E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with Altaic and Indo-European, one must be a specialist in comparative Austronesian to identify all cognates correctly (I was helped by Robert Blust: without his help I would have erroneously assumed two or three extra cognates), although maybe the situation is not that extreme due to the fact that the Austronesian phonemic inventory is much simpler than that of Indo-European or Altaic (I followed Blust’s reconstruction of Proto-Austronesian). The results are as follows:

- ‘nose’: 2-way cognate (Tsou, Bunun)
- ‘eye’: 4-way cognate (Tsou, Puyuma, Bunun, Malay)

---

2 My sincere thanks to Robert Blust for his valuable consultation in identifying cognates among Austronesian languages. Data for the Formosan languages come from the following sources: Squliq Atayal (Ferrell 1969), Tsou (Tung 1964), Puyuma (Tsuchida 1980), Bunun (Ferrel 1969).
• ‘ear’: 3-way cognate (Puyuma, Bunun, Malay)
• ‘tongue’: no cognates
• ‘tooth’: no cognates
• ‘hand’: 2-way cognate (Puyuma, Bunun)
• ‘foot’: no cognates
• ‘bone’: 2-way cognate (Bunun, Malay)
• ‘blood’: 2-way cognate (Puyuma, Malay)
• ‘heart’: no cognates

We have one 4-way cognate, one 3-way cognate set, four 2-way cognate sets and three cases with no matches. This situation is slightly worse than that found among modern Indo-European languages above, and is even inferior to that observed in Altaic. There are also no 5-way matches. Likewise, Squliq Atayal has no matches at all with any other language, and if we had only this evidence, we would have to come to the conclusion that it is not an Austronesian language. Unlike Indo-European, there is only one Austronesian language known for any considerable depth of time, Javanese, and it is not very helpful for historical purposes. Therefore, in order to improve our results, we have to compare reconstructions of the relevant Austronesian branches. Unfortunately, only three reconstructions are available Li (1981) for proto-Atayal, Tsuchida (1976) for proto-Tsou, and Adelaar (1992) for proto-Malay. Further complications arise from the fact that none includes all the vocabulary relevant here, so not being an Austronesianist I patched the holes with modern forms, already cited above. Nevertheless, even this partial use of reconstructions will improve our results.

Body parts in three reconstructed Austronesian varieties and two modern languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proto-Atayal</th>
<th>Proto-Tsou</th>
<th>Puyuma</th>
<th>Bunun</th>
<th>Proto-Malay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘nose’</td>
<td>ŋuhuu A</td>
<td>ŋucu B</td>
<td>ungT-an C</td>
<td>ɲutus B</td>
<td>*hidung D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘eye’</td>
<td>loziq A</td>
<td>*macá B</td>
<td>maTa B</td>
<td>mata? B</td>
<td>*mata B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ear’</td>
<td>*caŋiʔa A</td>
<td>*caliŋaha A</td>
<td>Tariŋa A</td>
<td>ᵀaŋiʔa A</td>
<td>*tAlinga(?) A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘tongue’</td>
<td>*hoŋa? A</td>
<td>umo B</td>
<td>ridam C</td>
<td>maʔmaʔ D</td>
<td>*dilah E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘tooth’</td>
<td>*giŋup A</td>
<td>hisi B</td>
<td>wali C</td>
<td>nipun A</td>
<td>*gigi D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘hand’</td>
<td>qbaʔ A</td>
<td>mucu B</td>
<td>rima C</td>
<td>‘imaʔ C</td>
<td>*tangan D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘foot’</td>
<td>rapal A</td>
<td>capha B</td>
<td>kui C</td>
<td>dalapa D</td>
<td>*kaki E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘bone’</td>
<td>qniʔ A</td>
<td>caeha B</td>
<td>ukak C</td>
<td>tohaŋaʔ D</td>
<td>*tulang D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘blood’</td>
<td>*daŋuʔ A, C</td>
<td>*carah, ia B,</td>
<td>daRah C</td>
<td>hairaŋ D</td>
<td>*darah C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*raga? C?</td>
<td>*himuru</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘heart’</td>
<td>kualun A</td>
<td>ʔuʔu B</td>
<td>muRduRdu</td>
<td>hapuŋ D</td>
<td>jantung</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results are as follows:

• ‘nose’: 2-way cognate (Tsou, Bunun)
• ‘eye’: 4-way cognate (Tsou, Puyuma, Bunun, Malay)
• ‘ear’: 5-way cognate (Atayal, Tsou, Puyuma, Bunun, Malay)
• ‘tongue’: no cognates
• ‘tooth’: 2-way cognate
• ‘hand’: 2-way cognate (Puyuma, Bunun)
• ‘foot’: no cognates
• ‘bone’: 2-way cognate (Bunun, Malay)
• ‘blood’: 2-way cognate (Puyuma, Malay)
• ‘heart’: no cognates

We have one 5-way match, one 4-way match and five 2-way matches. The situation has improved slightly compared to the comparison of the modern languages, and now we even have a 5-way match that finally connects Atayal to the rest of the family. But overall, the partial comparison of reconstructions of the Austro-Nesian branches yields inferior results to the comparison of old Indo-European languages. However, both control families reveal an important fact: the deeper in time we base our comparisons for the genetically related languages, the better our results become. If this is the case, we should expect that comparing reconstructions of the Altaic primary branches rather than the modern languages should also yield better results. Before we do that, however, let us have a quick look at our third control case, the Afroasiatic family. I omit comparison of modern Afroasiatic languages, simply because I do not have access to the data. Below is a chart based on the reconstruction of the Afroasiatic vocabulary given by Ehret (1995), with the reconstructions he provides for four out of six Afroasiatic branches (proto-Semitic, proto-Cushitic, proto-Chadic, proto-Omotic) and Egyptian, which cannot be reconstructed by comparative method, since it is an isolate, but which is old enough to be used along with the reconstructions. Unlike the previous charts, only cognates are provided in the chart below.

### Body parts in Afroasiatic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Semitic</th>
<th>Egyptian</th>
<th>Cushitic</th>
<th>Chadic</th>
<th>Omotic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘nose’</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘eye’</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>irt</td>
<td>*?il</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ear’</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘tongue’</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘tooth’</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘hand’</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘foot’</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>rd</td>
<td>*riiz</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘bone’</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>qs</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>*k’asu</td>
<td>*k’os-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘blood’</td>
<td>*dm</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>*d-m-</td>
<td>*dam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘heart’</td>
<td>*lbb</td>
<td>ib</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>*lib</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are only three 3-way cognates ("bone", "blood", and "heart") and two 2-way cognates ("eye", "foot"). We obviously see here a much weaker case than either Indo-European or Austronesian: there are not any 5-way matches, nor 4-way matches, and there are 5 cases with no matches at all.

Now let us see where comparison of five reconstructed Altaic branches would fit among these three control families.

**Body parts in five reconstructed sub-proto-languages of Altaic:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P-Japanese</th>
<th>P-Korean</th>
<th>P-Ma.-Tung.</th>
<th>P-Mongolic</th>
<th>P-Turkic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'nose'</td>
<td>*pana A</td>
<td>*koh A</td>
<td>*koŋa A</td>
<td>*kaŋ-bar A</td>
<td>*kaŋ A,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*burun B,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*sense C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'eye'</td>
<td>*ma- A</td>
<td>*nun A</td>
<td>*ŋə- A</td>
<td>*ni(n)-dün A</td>
<td>*gör₂ B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ear'</td>
<td>*mimi A</td>
<td>*kul[i] B</td>
<td>*kul[i]- B,</td>
<td>*ciki-n D</td>
<td>*kul₁gak B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*sian C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'tongue'</td>
<td>*sil[-]ta A</td>
<td>*hiT A</td>
<td>*xil-ŋa B</td>
<td>*kele-n B</td>
<td>*dil C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'tooth'</td>
<td>*pa A</td>
<td>*ni B</td>
<td>*xü- C</td>
<td>*si(l)-dün D</td>
<td>*dil₂,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*sil D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'hand'</td>
<td>*ta- A</td>
<td>*son B</td>
<td>*ŋa:la C</td>
<td>*ɡar D</td>
<td>*lälæ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'foot'</td>
<td>*pank A,</td>
<td>*pal A</td>
<td>*palga-n A</td>
<td>*köl C</td>
<td>*daq D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*asi B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'blood'</td>
<td>*ti A</td>
<td>*pVki B</td>
<td>*sia-C</td>
<td>*ti-sun A</td>
<td>*kaŋ D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'heart'</td>
<td>*kəkəŋ A</td>
<td>*mañʌm B</td>
<td>*miawan C</td>
<td>*jirek D</td>
<td>*yürek D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results are as follows:

- **'nose'**: 5-way cognate (PJ, PK, PMT, PM, PT)
- **'eye'**: 4-way cognate (PJ, PK, PMT, PM)
- **'ear'**: 3-way cognate (PK, PMT, PT)
- **'tongue'**: two 2-way cognates (PJ, PK) and (PMT, PM), possibly 4-way cognate (PJ, PK, PMT, PM)
- **'tooth'**: 2-way cognate (PK, PT)
- **'hand'**: 2-way cognate (PMT, PT)
- **'foot'**: 3-way cognate (PJ, PK, PMT)
- **'bone'**: 3-way cognate (PJ, PK, PM)
- **'blood'**: 2-way cognate (PJ, PM)
- **"heart"**: 2-way cognate (PM, PT)

Thus, we have one 5-way match, one 4-way match and one more possible 4-way match, three 3-way matches and three or five 2-way matches, depending on whether a possible 4-way match turns out to be valid. Therefore, like Indo-European and Austronesian, the number of matches in Altaic increases with the depth of
time. Moreover, the percentage of cognates between Altaic branches is higher than between branches of the other control families. All this should suggest that the Altaic family, contrary to Starostin (1991), is not very old. It is at least younger than Indo-European, considerably younger than Austronesian, and is a baby compared to Afroasiatic. Although we will never be able to calculate its absolute age, it probably may be estimated as 4,000–5,000 years old, taking into consideration some extralinguistic evidence that I will discuss some other time.

In conclusion, I will provide some commentaries to the chart above, explaining unusual phonetic developments, outlining obvious innovations, and providing extra etymologies to some words without cognates in the chart.

- “nose”: PJ *pana is related to the rest of forms, since PJ *p- here reflects PA labiovelar *k’w- (see footnote #1). Other examples: PJ *pana- “wing”, “feather”, PT *kana-t “wing” (PA *k’wana-); PJ *upa- “top”, “above”, PK *uhV “id” (PA *uk’wa-); PJ *basi “eagle”, PMT *gusi “id” (PA *gwäśi); PJ *bata “guts”, PMT *gude- “stomach, peritoneum”, PM *gede “stomach, belly” (PA *gwäde), etc.

- “eye”: PJ *ma- < **ña-, cf. also J mu- and Ma.-Tung. ńuu-’6’, OJ mwomwo and Ma.-Tung. *-ama: ‘100’, etc. Turkic *gör is an innovation. It is a nominalisation *gör2 < *gör-i of the verb *gör- ‘see’. A possible Turkic cognate might be hidden in Turk. yaš ‘tear’, if it goes back to *ya ‘eye’ + *ut2 ‘water’ (cf. Ma.-Tung. *ula ‘river’, Mong. usun ‘water’ < *u(l)-sun

- “ear”: cf. also J *kika- ‘hear’ and. Mong. qulqu ‘middle ear’.

- “tongue”: it is possible that PJ *sita can be separated into *si-ta on the basis of PR *siba “tongue”. In this case, *si- is probably from earlier *siri, according to Whitman’s r-loss law (Whitman 1990), reflecting PA *k’iele- “tongue”. PJ *s-bal < *i < PA *k’-, cf. also OJ se- “to do” < pre-PJ *sia-, MK hoy- “id” < pre-PK *hia-, PM *ki- “id”, PT *kil- “id.” (Vovin 1994b: 247-48). It is frequently argued, however, that the Ryūkyūan form is actually *sunpa “lip, tongue” (Leon Serafim, p.c.), not related to the Japanese form. I believe that the Ryūkyūan contaminated *si-npa “tongue” and *sunpa “lip”, as some reflexes of the alleged *sunpa are not regular.

- “tooth”: PAltaic *sil- “tooth” is possible also reflected in Korean -sal in pi-sal ‘comb teeth’. PJ *pa is cognate to PMT *palo/a- “molar”, “hammer”, and to Korean -pal in ni-s-pal ‘tooth’. PMT *xü-, on the other hand, is probably related to MJ kiba < *ku/o-Ci-no pa ‘fang’. The MK form ni “tooth” probably is of substratal Ainoid origin (proto-Ainu *nii “tooth”)

- “foot”: PJ *asi “foot” is related to PMT *alcu “ankle”, “ankle-bone” and PT *al,j ieq “ankle”.

- “heart”: PJ form *kör is related to MK kwokoyyang ‘kernel’, WM köke/iin ‘breast’, PT *kör, ‘chest, breast’ (as frequently suggested the PMT parallel is probably unrelated, due to irregularity of reflexes).
3. A sketch of comparative Altaic verbal morphology

The Altaic theory today continues to be passionately defended (e.g., Manaster Ramer 1997) and no less passionately argued against (e.g., Scherbak 1997). For more than thirty years the Altaic debate has rotated around the problem of common vocabulary: do the Altaic languages share some common vocabulary or can they all be explained away as loanwords? Surprisingly enough, only a few scholars have taken up the issue of morphology, the most notable exceptions being Ramstedt (1952), presently considerably out-of-date, and Baskakov (1981), more up-to-date, but too sketchy and short. The latest attempt to prove linguistic affinity of “Macro-Altaic” (Turkic, Mongolic, Tungusic, Korean, and Japanese) (Starostin 1991) does not consider morphology, either.

There are, of course, treatments of particular parts of Macro-Altaic morphology, such as numerals (Murayama 1962; Miller 1971: 219-245; Miller 1975), verb classes (Miller 1981), negative markers (Miller 1971: 245–285; Miller 1985), pronouns (Miller 1971: 155–178), case markers (Murayama 1957; Miller 1992; Itabashi 1990a, 1991a, 1993a, 1993b, 1996a) or binary morphological comparisons, such as Martin’s overview of Japanese-Korean comparative morphology (Martin 1990), but they are all limited either by the number of the languages involved, or by the scope of the comparison itself, and what’s more important, some of these earlier treatments are outdated now due to the development in the respective fields.

This kind of situation is extremely bizarre. While the existence of a common morphology cannot be considered the only possible proof of genetic relationship – since there are quite a few language families without morphology or with rudimentary morphology – for the languages of the Altaic type, possessing rich agglutinative morphology, morphological affinity must have precedence over lexical affinity simply because morphology is not so prone to borrowing as is vocabulary.

Although I believe that methodologically a comparison of corresponding reconstructions offers the best shortcut for proving a genetic relationship, in this paper I will use both reconstructions and actually attested data. The latter will be provided, when possible, from the oldest attested languages: Old Japanese (8th century), Middle Korean (15–16th century), Manchu (17–19th centuries), Middle Mongolian (13–14 centuries) and Classical Mongolian (17–18th, centuries), and Old Runic Turkic (8th century). Although we have access to Old Korean (7–10th centuries), being the oldest attested form of Korean, the Old Korean materials are limited to 26 short poems written in a cumbersome ideo-syllabic script, which has yet to be completely deciphered. Therefore, I will use Old Korean data only when it is absolutely necessary, such as in the case when a form has not survived into Middle Korean. Otherwise, using alphabetically written Middle Korean is more advantageous than proposing tentative reconstructions for Old Korean. Jurchen (14th century), which is the oldest attested Tungusic language, is not used for the same reasons: although there are several reconstructions of Jurchen, also written in an
ideo-syllabic script, they are riddled with numerous problems, mostly stemming from an inadequate usage of Chinese transcriptions. Thus, I give preference to the alphabetically written Manchu. Sometimes I will also appeal to data from modern Tungusic languages, when it is necessary, mostly due to the fact that Manchu did not preserve some crucial parts of verbal morphology.

There is no reconstruction of proto-Japanese morphology per se, although both Hattori (1978–79) and Martin (1987 & 1990) offer many valuable insights into it. The same is true of proto-Korean morphology, although some important observations can be found in Yi (1961), Ramsey (1991), and Martin (1995). There is a comprehensive reconstruction of proto-Tungusic morphology (Sunik 1962 and 1982), but considerable parts of it are now outdated. Generally, although not in all cases, I will follow Poppe (1955) for the reconstruction of Proto-Mongolic morphology and Tenishev et al. (1988) for the reconstruction of Proto-Turkic morphology.

A modern sketch of the Altaic case marking system was done by Itabashi Yoshizō in several publications both in English and in Japanese. I agree with some of his conclusions, while disagreeing with others. Other parts of the nominal morphology, such as pronouns and plural marking still await up-to-date systematic treatment. I will defer this treatment to a next time, mainly for the reason that it is not possibly to do this here, since some of the detailed responses to Itabashi’s proposals would involve quite a lengthy discussion. Besides, nominal markers in Altaic languages tend to be less bound to stems than verbal ones, and, therefore, at least theoretically, more prone to borrowing. Thus, I will limit myself to surveying only key points of Altaic verbal morphology, followed by a limited number of examples.

A few words about the sources of the examples are in order.

It is relatively easy to find necessary examples in Old Japanese, Middle Korean and Old Turkic texts, since there are excellent editions of these texts as well as dictionaries that include citations from texts with text addresses in their entries. I have also used an Old Japanese computerised database that includes all Old Japanese texts written phonetically and compiled by myself and my graduate assistant John Bentley in 1994–1996. However, the dictionaries of Manchu-Tungusic and Mongolic dictionaries normally do not provide us with such a luxury. The wonderful exceptions to this otherwise universal rule are the New Manchu-Chinese dictionary (Hu 1994), the Russian-Ewenki dictionary (Boldyrev 1994), although it contains only textual examples, no text references, and the Wörterbuch zu Manghol-un Niuca Tobca’an (Haenish 1939). Therefore, in the absence of an electronic database with Manchu or Mongolian texts it is more difficult to find textual examples.

1 I disagree with Martin 1995 to a considerable extent, mostly with his interpretation of a number of MK suffixes as bound auxilliaries, as I believe that the evidence he presents in many cases is based on an atomistic analysis rather than on evidence from language itself. Unfortunately I cannot go into details here, but plan to do so elsewhere.
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(1) NEGATIVE MARKER *-an[V]-

OLD JAPANESE: *-an-, az-(<*-an-s[e]>, where se- is a stem of the verb “to do”) /-n-, -z-, verbal negative marker, e.g. kyik-an-u uta “a poem, that [I] do not hear”, tasukey-n-u patokey “Buddha, who does not save”.

MIDDLE KOREAN: ani, negative marker, e.g. ka-ri ani ho-ta “not to go”, salom-i ani-wo “isn’t [he] a man?”

MANCHU-TUNGUSIC: Manchu akû < *ankû (Vovin 1997c), negative marker, e.g. ere bira akû “this is not a river”, ojor-akû “it won’t do”. Cf. also Ewen aan, Oroch ana, Ulchi ana, Orok ana, Nanai anaa “not”, “no” (Tsintsius 1975: 41a)

TURKIC: Chuvash an, negative imperative particle, used in preposition to a verb: an ürken ‘don’t be lazy’ (Andreev 1966: 58).

The Japanese-Korean comparison suggested by Martin (1966), Manchu and other parallels Tungusic proposed here for the first time.

Examples:

OLD JAPANESE:
kokoro-yu mo omop-an-u apyida-ni
heart-ABL PT think-NEG-ATTR interval-LOC
while [I] did not think even in (lit.: from) my heart (MYS V-794)

MIDDLE KOREAN:

pwulhwuy kiph-un namk-on polom-ay ani mwuy-lssoy
root deep-ATTR tree-TOP wind-LOC not be bent-because
because a tree with deep roots is not bent by the wind (YP 2)

MANCHU:

ba na-i ton udu minggan-de isi-k-akû
place land-GEN number several thousand-LOC reach-PERF-NEG
The number of our lands did not reach several thousands (SA 18)

CHUVASH:
an tup
NEG/IMP find
Do not find (Andreev 1966: 52)

(2) NEGATIVE MARKER *-ma-

KOREAN: MK :mal- < *màló- (possibly from **ma-la-), negative auxiliary verb, e.g. two-ti manota “does not turn”, towoy-ti manoni “does not become”.

TURKIC: OT -ma/-mâ-, verbal negative marker, e.g. al-ma-di-m “I did not take”,
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öl-mä-di-m “I did not die”. Attested in other languages Turkic languages as well. This comparison is proposed here for the first time.

Examples:

**MIDDLE KOREAN:**

nacwoh-i towoy-ti ma-no-n-i  
Evening-NOM become-INF NEG-PRES-PERF-NML  
Evening does not come (TSEH X: 20)

**OLD TURKIC:**

üč er-ig al-ma-di-ŋ  
three warrior-ACC take-NEG-PAST-2ps  
*You did not capture* three warriors (YEN 28: 3)

(3) NOMINALIZER *(V)m


KOREAN: MK -(o/u)m, nominaliser (CV+m, CVC+o/um), e.g. cwuk-um “death” ⇐ cwuk- “to die”, twoW-om “help” ⇐ twoW- “to help”.

MONGOLIC: -(V)m unproductive nominaliser. E.g., WM toqo- “to saddle”, toqo-m “saddle cloth”; navad- “to play”, navad-um “game, play” (Poppe 1964: 47–8), Khalkha xerci- “cut in pieces”, xerci-m “piece”; alxa- “to walk”, alxa-m “step” (Todaeva 1951: 56).

TURKIC: OT *(V)m, nominaliser, also found in the majority of Turkic languages. E.g., Turkish yut- ‘to swallow’, yut-um ‘mouthful’; öl- ‘to die’, öl-üm ‘death’; dil- ‘to slice’, dil-im ‘slice’; bas- ‘to print’; basum ‘print, printing’.


Examples:

**MIDDLE JAPANESE:**

anakura ya  
EXCL dark PART  
Oh, is it dark? (GM 50)

**MIDDLE KOREAN:**

kuli-m kuli-ki-yey  
draw-NML draw-INF-LOC  
when drawing a picture (TSEH XVI: 25)
KHALKHA:  
ix naada-m deer načın naaŋ arslanŋ awray-uud jagsal xii-n  
great play-NML on falcon elephant lion titan parade do-PRES  
At the great festival, Falcons, Elephants, Lions, and Titans (ranks given to distinguished wrestlers) go on parade (Hangin 1987: 153)  
OLD TURKIC:  
sünjug bat-im-i qar-ıry søk-ipän  
spear submerge-NML-INSTR snow-ACC make way-GER  
Making the way through the snow deep as a spear (KTb 35)  

(4) NOMINALIZER *-gi  
JAPANESE: OJ -yi < *-Ci < **-Gi², nominaliser, e.g., kak- “to write”, kak-yi “writing”; yom- “to count”, yom-yi “counting”.  
KOREAN: MK -ki, nominaliser, e.g., ho- “to do”, ho-ki “doing”; psu- “to use”, psu-ki “using”.  
TURKIC: OT -i/-i < *-yi, *-gi, unproductive nominaliser, e.g. qal- “remain”, qal-i “remainder”; yaz- “to be stretched”, yaz-i “steppe”, “plain”.  
Proposed here for the first time.  
OLD JAPANESE:  
多爾具久能佐和多流伎波美  
tani-ŋ-kuku-no sa-watar-u kyipam-yi  
valley-GEN toad PREF-go across-ATTR be extreme-NML  
the limits to where the toad of the valley crawls (MYS V: 800)  
MIDDLE KOREAN:  
kul su-ki-Gwa kal psu-ki-Gwa poyhwo-n-i  
letter write-NML-COM sword use-NML-COM study-PERF-NML  
[he] studied belle letters and martial arts (TSEH VII: 15)  
OLD TURKIC:  
il-güri şanṭuŋ yaz-i-ka tági sülā-d-im  
east-DIR Shandong be stretched-NML-DAT up war-PAST-1ps  
To the east, I waged war up to the Shandong plain. (KTs 3)  

4 I assume that we have to reconstruct different protoforms for the Japanese –i (see below) and the derived noun –i, since they exhibit different accentuation (in 11th century Middle Japanese the derived noun –i is atomic, while the infinitive –i is tonic, see Martin 1987: 211–214 for details). Martin believes that both the infinitive and the derived noun in –i in Japanese go back to the protoform *-Ci (Martin 1987: 667). I prefer to keep them separate on the basis of the different accentuation pattern mentioned above, as well as on the basis of different external evidence (the derived noun –i < *-Ci < **-gi, and the infinitive –i < **-e).  
5 See Sevortian 1966: 239–263 for the survey of the different hypotheses concerning the origin of this suffix.
(5) TRANSITIVITY FLIPPER *-gi-

JAPANESE: OJ -iy- in -ey-/iy- < *V-Ci- < **V-Gi-, transitivity flipper, e.g. tuka- ‘to be attached’, tukey- ‘to attach’ (< *tuka-Gi-), yaka- ‘to burn (tr.)’, yakey- ‘to burn (intr.)’ (<yaka-Gi-).

KOREAN: MK -Gi-, -hi-, -ki-, etc. transitivity flipper, e.g.: hel- ‘to break’ (tr.), helGi- ‘to break’ (intr.), anch- ‘to sit’, anchhi- ‘to make smbd. sit’.

MANCHU-TUNGUSIC: Ewenki: -gii-, transitivity switcher, e.g.: kesee- ‘to suffer’ ⇒ keseeGii- ‘to torture’, aru- ‘to regain consciousness’ ⇒ arugi- ‘to revive’, jalup- ‘to get filled’ ⇒ jalupkii- ‘to fill’, ulap- ‘to get wet’, ulapkii- ‘to make wet’ (Vasilevich 1940: 93), possibly also Manchu relic anticausative -gi- in algi- “be known”, “be famous” < ala- “to report”, “to say”.

The Japanese-Korean comparison was suggested by Martin (1987 and 1990); the Manchu example is the author’s, and the Ewenki parallel was suggested by Ralf Stefan Georg (personal communication).6

Examples:

OLD JAPANESE:

おもしろきの野ばなやきしょ Do not burn the pretty field. (MYS XIV-3452)

てる火木篱焚けキ The fence from fire-wood that will burn (KK 109)

MIDDLE KOREAN:

大物の大きな物を壊した The big thing was broken (KKK I: 7)

도끼의 대개는 못할 수는 없네 Blade could not be broken and...

EWENKI:

プラットホーム入場者を積み上げ The platform was filled by passengers who came. (Boldyrev 1994: 213b)

6 Ramstedt suggested that Mongolic –ji- < *-gi- is also to be included (1952:171). However, his examples are dubious, e.g. he proposes pairs WM (h)angɤa- “to open” (v.t.) and angɤ-ji- “to be open” (1952:171). Unfortunately, this segmentation cannot be justified as VM angɤa- does not mean “to open”, but “to be thirsty” (Lessing 1995: 43).
dilacaaw cuutuuma-wa tige-keen-me-tin jalup-iknan-in-ñama-t jalup-kii-caa-n sun blue-ACC cup-DIM-ACC-3ppp fill-GER-3ppp warmth-ABL fill-TS-PAST-3ps The sun filled with warmth their blue cup up to the edges (Boldyrev 1994: 213b)

(6) ATTRIBUTIVE *-VrV

JAPANESE: OJ -uru, -u (< *-uru), attributive, e.g. kwop-uru pyito “person whom [I] love”, yem-u uta “song that [I] compose”.

KOREAN: MJ -(u/o)lq (?< *(V)lV), imperfective attributive, e.g. ho-lq salom “a person who will do/does”, cap-ulq ssyang “an elephant whom [I] will catch”.

MANCHU-TUNGUSIC: MA -ra/-re/-ro, imperfective attributive, e.g. hûla-ra bithe “manual, (lit.: a book for study)”, jide-re niyalma “a person who will come”. Cf. Ewenki -ra, -rî, Nanai -ri, etc.

MONGOLIC: WM -r, unproductive marker of verbal noun, e.g. amu- “to rest”, amu-r “peace”; belci- “inundate”, belci-r- “conflux”; belcige- “to pasture”, belcige-r “pasturage” (Poppe 1964: 79).

TURKIC: present-future attributive -r, e.g. Old Turkic bar-ĭr kisi “the person who goes/will go”.

Japanese-Korean as well as Turkic-Tungusic comparisons are widely known; but the 5-way comparison is suggested here for the first time. Baskakov (1981: 73) compares Turkic and Tungusic forms with Mongolic gerund of goal -Vra/-Vre, analyzing it as -Vr-a and -Vr-e (obviously following Poppe 1964: 98), but there is no internal Mongolic evidence for this segmentation, since -Vr does not occur by itself or with other case markers besides the alleged dative-locative -al/e. It is more likely that this Mongolian gerund is a cognate with MK -Vle, gerund of goal. Note that Miller compares Tungusic -ra and -rî with the hypothetical *-ra and *-rî in Japanese (Miller 1980: 89–92), which cannot be reconstructed on the basis of Japanese internal evidence.

OLD JAPANESE:

年月波奈何流流其等斯
tosi tuki pa nagar-uru goto-si
year month TOP flow-ATTR like-FIN like the flowing of years and months (MYS V: 804)

MIDDLE KOREAN:


MANCHU:

amba hecen-i ʃurdeme bisi-re cooha big city-GEN around be-ATTR troops The troops that are around the capital. (SA 23)
KHALKHA:
ama-r bain-uu
rest-NML exist-QP
How are you? (Luvsandendev 1957: 34)

OLD TURKIC:
kör-ür köz-üm kör-mäź teg bil-ir bil-ig-im bil-mäź teg bol-tï
see-ATTR eye-1psp see-NEG/FUT like know-ATTR know-NOM-1psp know-
NEG/FUT like become-PAST
My watching eyes stopped to see, my knowlegeable mind stopped to understand
[lit.: My seeing eyes. [became] like not seeing, my knowing mind became like not
knowing.] (KTb 50)

(7) FINAL PREDICATION MARKER *-bi (probably from *bi- “to be”)

OLD JAPANESE: -u (< *-wi < *-bi), final predication marker, e.g. pyitï uk-uki “a
person will go”, myikwo k-u “the prince will come”.

OLD KOREAN: -ta-Wi (written 如) (< *-ta-bi), final predication marker” (> MK -
ta), e.g. wo-ta-wi “she comes”.

MANCHU-TUNGUSIC: MA -bi, final predication marker, tuwa-mbi (< *tuwa-me-bi)
“looks”, tuwa-mbi-he-bi “has been looking”, se-mbi “says”, se-mbi-he-bi “has been
saying”.

OLD JAPANESE:
伊波爾恵利都久多麻爾惠利都久
ipa-ni wer-i-tuk-u tama ni wer-i-tuk-u
rock-LOC cut-INF-attach-FIN precious stone-LOC cut-INF-attach-FIN
[I] will cut [Buddha’s footprint] in the rock, [I] will cut [it] in the precious stone.
(BS 3)

OLD KOREAN:
慕容有如白遺賜立
kuli-lq salom is-tawi solp-kwo-si-l-i
long for-ATTR person be-FIN say-?-HON-ATTR-NML
saying that there is a person who longs [for the Pure Land] (HK 9)

MANCHU:
Yehe gurun-i cooha-i emgi aca-fi Sancara angga-be tuci-mbi
Yehe country-GEN troops-GEN with meet-GER Sancara barrier-ACC go out-FIN
[The Ming army] met with troops of the Yehe tribe and passed through barrier
Sancara. (SA 19)
(8) **INFINITIVE *-e**

JAPANESE: OJ -[y]i < *-i, infinitive, e.g. kyik-yi “hears and...”, “hearing”; ip-yi “says and...”, “saying”.

KOREAN: MK -e/-ye/-a, infinitive, e.g. kel-e “walks and...”, “walking”; kask-a “breaks and...”, “breaking”.

TURKIC: OT -ä/-a, gerund, e.g. egir-ä “surrounds and...”; tut-ä “holds and...”. This gerund is preserved in a number of modern Turkic languages as a relic form (Tenishev et al. 1988: 474).

Proposed here for the first time.

OLD JAPANESE:
都流俊多皆許志爾刀利波积佐都由美乎多爾伎利物知提
turugyi-tati kosi-ni twor-i-pak-yi satu-yumi-wo ta-nigyor-i-mot-i-te sword-long sword waist-LOC take-INF-insert into the belt-INF hunting-bow-ACC hand-squeeze-INF-hold-INF-PERF
[joung lads], sashing swords at their waists and holding hunting bows in their hands (MYS V: 804)

MIDDLE KOREAN:
kil pes-e sswo-sy-a sey sal-ay ta ti-n-i
way take off-GER shoot-HON-INF three arrow-LOC all fall-PERF-NML
[He] swerved and shot, and all [three of his pursuers] fell from three arrows. (YP 36)

OLD TURKIC:
tozq er-ig egir-ä toqã-dã
nine warrior-ACC surround-GER hit-PAST
He surrounded nine warriors and defeated [them]. (KTb 36)

(9) **GERUND *-mye**

JAPANESE: OJ -myi < *-mi, subordinative gerund of quality verbs, e.g. puka-myi “[because/when] X is deep”, “X is deep and...”; taka-myi “[when/because] X is high”, “X is high and...”.

KOREAN: MK -(u/o)mye, coordinative gerund, e.g. ka-mye “goes and...”, ho-mye “does and...”; kiph-umye “is deep and...”.

MONGOLIC: Classical WM -mu/-mii, present tense suffix (possibly from -m, gerund + bii “to be”), Pre-Classical WM -m, -mu/-mii, id. (Poppe 1964: 91).

MANCHU-TUNGUSIC: MA-me, coordinative and subordinative gerund, e.g. jabu-me “answers and...”, isi-me “reaches and...”, cf. also Ewenki -mii, Nanai -mi/-mei.

The Korean-Tungusic comparison is widely known; Japanese and Mongolic are
added here for the first time.

Examples:

OLD JAPANESE:
心乎痛見奴要子鳥卜歡居者
kōkoro-wo ita-myō nu-ye-nai-ku-nai-wor-e-ba
heart-ABS painful-GER nu-ye-little-bird PREF-cry-be-EV-GER
when [my] heart hurts and little nu-ye birds are crying (MYS I: 5)

MIDDLE KOREAN:
twomang-ay myeng-ul nwołGay-yey ilhwum mit-un-i
escape-LOC mandate-ACC believe-GER song-LOC name believe-PERF-NML
While fleeing [he] believed in the [Heavenly] Mandate, in the song [he] believed [his] name. (YP 16)

WRITTEN MONGOLIAN:
qamury bùgüde rāyī rábge-dür adali seq-kʊi
all all only son-DAT like think-PRES
[He] thought of everybody as [his] only son. (Üliger-ün dalai, cited from Grønbech & Krueger 1976: 40)

MANCHU:
na-de sinda-ci haira-me angga-de aʃu-fi
ground-LOC put-GER regret-GER mouth-LOC hold in the mouth-GER
[She] did not want to put [the fruit] on the ground, so [she] held [it] in [her] mouth. (MYK 3a)

(10) PERFECTIVE MARKER *-k'e

JAPANESE: OJ -kyi < *-ki, retrospective, e.g. omog-yi-kyi "[I] have an experience of thinking about you".

KOREAN: MK perfective -ke/-kal/-Ge/-Ga, e.g. tina-ke-n "passed", ni-ke-n-i “the one who went”.

MANCHU-TUNGUS: MA -ha/-he/-ho < *-kV (Vovin 1997c), perfective attributive (can be used as final form as well), e.g. te-he “[he] sat”, ala-ha niyalma “a man who said”. Cf. Evenkii -ca-, past tense marker, Nanai -xa(n), Udehe -ha(n), id.

MONGOLIC: WM -vyn/-gen deverbial noun marker, e.g. ide- “to eat”, ide-gen “food”; bayildu- “to fight”, bayildu-yan “battle”, also probably -ya/-ge- in perfective gerund -yad/-ged (d being a dative case marker).

TURKIC: OT-ya/-gân, perfective attributive (< -yagä, perfective + -n past attributive, see #12 below), e.g., al-ya- “the one who has taken”, kes-ken “one who has cut”. This form is attested in all modern Turkic languages except Oghuz group (Tenishev et al. 1988: 420).
Comparison of Manchu-Tungusic, Mongolic (deverbal noun), and Turkic forms is well known (Baskakov 1981: 74). Japanese and Korean parallels are added here for the first time.

Examples:

OLD JAPANESE:
kyimyi-wo yasasi-myi arawas-az-u-ar-i-kyi
lord-ABS bashful-GER show-NEG-FIN-be-INF-RETR
Because [I] felt bashful toward you, [I] did not reveal [my feelings]. (MYS V-854)

MIDDLE KOREAN:
cwuk-taka sal-Ge-n poykseng
die-GER live-PERF-ATTR people
people who were dying, but survived (YP 25)

MANCHU:
enduri saksaha-i sinda-ha fulgiyan tubihe
god magpie-GEN put-PERF/ATTR red fruit
the red fruit that the divine magpie put [on her clothes] (MYK 3a)

WRITTEN MONGOLIAN:
ene bars-un ide-gen yarun
this tiger-GEN eat-NML what
What does this tiger eat? [lit.: what is this tiger’s food?] (UD 13)

OLD TURKIC:
törü-t-gän igid-gän keč-ür-gän iði-m
origin-CAUS-PERF/ATTR support-PERF/ATTR cross-CAUS-PERF/ATTR master-1psp
My Lord, who creates, supports, and leads [me] (QB 1)

(11) PERFECTIVE *-ta-

JAPANESE: OJ -te (< *-ta-Ci) perfective aspect marker, e.g. todomey-te-m-u “[he] will stop”, orgs-i-te-kyi “[he] has put down”.

KOREAN: MK -te/-ta-, retrospective marker, e.g.: ho-ta-n salom “a person who has done”, ka-te-n toy “a place where [he] has gone”.

TURKIC: OT -dï/-di , past tense suffix, e.g. al-tï-m “I took”, öl-ür-tï-miz “we killed”. This affix is attested in all Turkic subgroups.

Examples:

OLD JAPANESE:
余能許等奈礼婆等登尾可祢都母
yq-no koto nar-e-ba todomiv-kane-t-u mo
life-GEN thing be-EV-GER stop-cannot-PERF-FIN PART
[One] cannot stop life, alas. (MYS V: 805)

MIDDLE KOREAN:
wonol-s i-il kitali-ñop-te-n-i
today-GEN deed-ACC wait-HUM-RETR-ATTR-NML
[They] waited for the today’s deed. (WCK 88).

OLD TURKIC:
sü-si-n buz-dï-m el-i-n an-ta al-tï-m
army-3psp-ACC defeat-PAST-1ps people-3ps-ACC that-LOC take-PAST-1ps
I defeated his army, I took his people. (BQ 34)

(12) PERFECTIVE *-n-

JAPANESE: OJ -n-, perfective aspect marker, e.g. watas-i-n-i-kyer-i “[we] have
crossed over”, tamap-yí-n-i-kyí “[he] has granted”.

KOREAN: MK -(o/ù)n, perfective attributive, e.g. ka-n-i “[he] went”, kel-un salom
“person who walked”.

MANCHU-TUNGUSIC: Nanai -n in -xa(n)/-xe(n), -ki(n), -ci(n); Udehe -n in -ha(n)/
he(n), past attributive.

TURKIC: relic past attributive form in -n (Tenishev et al. 1988: 452ff), e.g. yïl-a-n
“snake” < yïl- “crawl”, bul-u-n “captive” < bul- “to find”; also final -n in refective
attributive -ɤan-/gän (see#10)

Japanese-Korean and Tungusic-Turkic comparisons are widely known, but they are
brought here together for the first time.

Examples:

OLD JAPANESE:
許良爾佐夜利奴
kø’-ra-ni sayar-i-n-u
child-PLUR-DAT be kept from-INF-PERF-FIN
[I] am kept from [leaving this world] by [my] children. (MYS V-899)

MIDDLE KOREAN:
ma-pyeng-on mol tho-n pyeng i-wo
horse-troops-TOP horse ride-PERF/ATTR troops be-FIN
Cavalry are the troops that ride horses. (WS I-27)

7 Note the unetymological spelling kø, instead of the expected kwo, “child”.
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NANAI:

`tugde-tugde-lu-xen-i`

Rain has started to rain. (Avrorin 1961: 71)

TURKIC:

It has started to rain.

(13) TENTATIVE *-[V]m[V]

JAPANESE: OJ -(a)m(a)-, tentative marker with broad meanings of probability, volition, etc., e.g. `ika-m-u` “I want/will probably go”, “[you] should go”, `kwopiy-m-u` “[I] will love”

KOREAN: MK `-ma`, intention marker, e.g. `cwu-ma` “I will give”, `hwo-ma` “I intend to do”.

MANCHU-TUNGUSIC: Ewenki `-mu/-mee^8`, optative marker, e.g. `suru-mu` “to want to go”, `jem-mu` “to want to eat”

Proposed by the author for the first time.

OLD JAPANESE:

opo-kyi two-ywori ukakap-yi-te korosa-m-u to sura-ku-wo sir-an-i

big-ATTR door-ABL peek-INF-PERF kill-TENT-FIN DV do-NML-ACC know-NEG-INF

not knowing that [they] are peeking from the big door and intend to kill [him] (NK 18)

MIDDLE KOREAN:

na-y ne-tolye kolochy-wo-ma

I-NOM thou-DAT teach-MOD-INT

I will teach you. (PT I-10)

EWENKI:

um-mu-ja-m

drink-OPT-FUT-1ps

I want to drink. (Konstantinova 1964: 186)

(14) SUBJUNCTIVE *-macV

JAPANESE: OJ `-masi`, subjunctive marker, e.g. `sira-masi` “[he] would know”, `ika-masi` “he would go”.

---

^8 Allomorph –me occurs only after the verb `aa` “to sleep”: `aame` “to want to sleep” (Konstantinova 1964: 169).
MANCHU-TUNGUSIC: Nanai -mca/-mce, Ewenki -mcaa/-mcee⁹, subjunctive marker, e.g. Nanai wa-mca-su “you (pl.) would catch/kill”, xodi-mca “he would finish”.

Proposed by the author for the first time.

OLD JAPANESE:
麻嵬比苔珥阿利勢壓岐農岐勢壓之塲多知波開摩之塲
matu pyito n-i ar-i-se-ba kyniu kyi-se-masi wo tati pakey-masi wo
wait-ATTR / pine¹⁰ person be-INF be-INF-do-GER silk wear-CAUS-SUBJ PART
long sword make sash-SUBJ PART
If [you], pine, were a person whom [I] await, [I] would make [you] wear silk. [I]
would make [you] sash the long sword. (NK 27)

NANAI:
Min-du miocan bi-cin oosi-ni mi miocala-mca-i
I-DAT gun be-PAST/ATTR become-GER I shoot-SUBJ-1ps
If I had a gun, I would shoot. (Avrorin 1961: 137)

(15) CAUSATIVE *-bu-

KOREAN: MK -W/-woy- < *-bV-, relic causative marker, e.g. MK :solW- “to inform”, âlwoy- “let know” (cf. OK sol- “to say”, MK al- “to know”)
MANCHU-TUNGUSIC: Manchu -bu-, Ewenki -w-, Nanai -wan/-wen-, -bowan/-buwen-, etc., causative/passive marker, e.g. Manchu te-bu- “to make sit”, wa-bu- “to be killed”, “to make kill”.

Proposed by the author for the first time.

MIDDLE KOREAN:
co-swon-ci-kyeng-ol sin-mwul-i solW-on-i
child-grandchild-GEN-fortune-ACC god-thing-NOM inform-PERF/ATTR-NML
The divine animal informed about the fortune of [his] descendants. (YP 22)

MANCHU:
si facuhûn gurun-be dasa-me tokto-bu-me banji-Ø
thou disordered country-ACC rule-GER fix-CAUS-GER live-IMP
You pacify and rule a country in disorder and thus live. (MYK 3)

(16) GERUND *-ku/-ko

JAPANESE: OJ -ku, quality verb gerund, e.g. topo-ku “far and...”, omgsirwo-ku “attractive and...”.

---

⁹ Konstantinova, without providing any supporting evidence, suggested that Ewenki –mcaa historically consists of the optative –mu and the participle –ca (Konstantinova 1964: 186).

¹⁰ OJ matu is a play on words. It can mean both “wait” (both FIN and ATTR forms) and “pine tree”.
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KOREAN: MK -kwo/-Gwo, subordinative gerund, e.g., towoy-Gwo “becomes and...”, ho-kwo “does and...”, kiph-kwo “deep and...”, possibly also adverbialiser -key/-kay, and infinitive -ki.

? MANCHU-TUNGUSIC *-ko/-ku: Nanai: -go/-gu, gerund of goal, Oroch: -kum, consecutive gerund (ana-kum “as soon as [he] pushed” (Tsintsius 1949a: 156), Orok: -gatci/-getci/-gotci, subordinative gerund (Petrova 1967: 112). Morphological structure in Oroch and Orok is unclear, and in addition it is not quite obvious whether Oroch -k/- can correspond to Nanai and Orok -g/- (see Tsintsius 1949b: 218ff).


OLD JAPANESE:
imwo-to nbor-e-ba sagasi-ku mo ar-az-u beloved-COM climb-EV-GER steep-GER PART be-NEG-FIN
When [I] climb with my beloved, [the mountain Kurapasi] is not steep at all. (KK 70)

MIDDLE KOREAN:
nyeth-wo-si-kwo stwo kiph-i-si-n-i shallow-CAUS-HON-GER again deep-CAUS-HON-PERF/ATTR-NML
[Heaven] made [the sea] shallow, and then made [it] deep again. (YP 20)

NANAI:

(17) HONORIFIC *-s(V)-

OLD JAPANESE: -*s(e)-, honorific marker, e.g. kaywopa-s- “to go back and forth (hon.)”, tata-s- “to set out”.

MIDDLE KOREAN: -(o/u)s_i/-/(o/u)sy-, honorific marker, e.g. ka-si- “to go (hon.)”, cap-osi- “to catch (hon.)”.


OLD JAPANESE:
kupasi-mye-wo ar-i to kyiko-s-i-te beautiful woman-ABS be-FIN DV hear-HON-INF-PERF/GER
[He] heard that there is a beautiful woman, and... (KK 2)
**Conclusion: the way ahead**

Nevertheless, many things remain to be done in Altaic comparative studies. The most urgent and the most difficult task is the reconstruction of Altaic vocalism. So far the vocalic correspondences between Altaic languages remain poorly elaborated and baffling. Starostin (1991) suggested a number of diphthongs to be reconstructed for the protolanguage; he may be ultimately right, but so far his version of vocalism does not cover all possible cases either.

An etymological dictionary of the Altaic languages is the next urgent task. Hopefully, Starostin and Dybo can get out their version by the end of the millennium. Hopefully, it will make the myth that “Altaic languages do not share basic vocabulary” less viable, as has happened with some other language families that were called ‘controversial’ until respective etymological dictionaries appeared.

Comparative morphology of Altaic must be written anew: Itabashi’s work on case marking and the author’s sketch of verbal morphology is just a first approximation. Future work will certainly reveal other cognate morphemes and will meet other challenges, too.

Reconstruction of individual members of Altaic family must also continue. While Turkic and Japanese reconstructions are quite reliable (although a number of problems remain), this is not the case with the other three branches. Some progress has been made with Manchu-Tungusic, but it is still quite far from final stages. Our
understanding of proto-Mongolic is based largely on combined data from Written Mongolian and Middle Mongolian. Although theoretically possible, such reconstruction remains potentially hazardous, as it is not quite clear how a number of divergent Mongolic languages would fit exactly into the picture. And, in spite of brilliant work on reconstruction of proto-Korean, done by Ramsey and others, the reconstruction of proto-Korean has barely scratched the tip of the iceberg, as this is a language with a number of very unusual and complex phonological developments.

Pending all this work, scholarly research and not guess-work must be done on internal Altaic classification. So far, different proposals have been made, mostly for binary second-order nodes within Altaic: Turco-Mongolic (Ramstedt), Mongolo-Tungusic (Poppe), Japanese-Korean (Martin, Starostin), Japanese-Korean-Tungusic (Miller), Japanese-Tungusic (Murayama). The most elaborate of these is the Japanese-Korean proposal, but like most others it rests on commonly shared retentions rather than exclusively shared innovations. It seems to me that so far there is good ground to speak of a Mongolo-Tungusic intermediate node: both languages seem to share certain exclusive innovations in their consonantal system. Everything else so far remains covered in fog, although it may eventually turn out that Japanese and Korean represent another intermediate node. Turkic in all probability represents an independent offshoot, that separated from the rest of the family at a comparatively early stage.

ABBREVIATIONS

Grammar terms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABL</th>
<th>Ablative</th>
<th>INT</th>
<th>Intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>Absolutive</td>
<td>INSTR</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTR</td>
<td>Attributive</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Modulator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCA</td>
<td>Beginning continuous aspect</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>Comitative</td>
<td>NML</td>
<td>Nominaliser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>Diminutive</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>Nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>OPT</td>
<td>Optative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV</td>
<td>Defective verb</td>
<td>PAST</td>
<td>Past tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV</td>
<td>Evidential</td>
<td>PART</td>
<td>Particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCL</td>
<td>Exclamation</td>
<td>PERF</td>
<td>Perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>PLUR</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>PROH</td>
<td>Prohibitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>Gerund</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Processive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HON</td>
<td>Honorific</td>
<td>RETR</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>Humble</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>Transitivity flipper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>TOP</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Transitivity switcher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Languages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Manchu</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>proto-Altaiic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJ</td>
<td>Middle Japanese</td>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>proto-Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK</td>
<td>Middle Korean</td>
<td>PK</td>
<td>proto-Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Middle Mongolian</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>proto-Mongolic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCS</td>
<td>Old Church Slavic</td>
<td>PMT</td>
<td>proto-Manchu-Tungusic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>Old English</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>proto-Ryūkyūan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJ</td>
<td>Old Japanese</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>proto-Turkic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Old Korean</td>
<td>WM</td>
<td>Written Mongolian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>Old Turkic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Texts:

Japanese

- BS: Bussoku seki ka, ca. 753
- GM: Genji monogatari, ca. 1001
- KK: Kojiki kayō, 712
- MYS: Man’yōshū, ca. 759
- NK: Nihonshoki kayō, 720

Korean

- KKK: Kumkang kyeng enhay, 1464
- PT: Pak thongsa, first edition, before 1517
- TSEH: Twusi enhay, first edition, 1481
- WCK: Welin chenkang ci kwok, 1449
- WS: Welin sekpo, 1459
- YP: Yongpi echenka, 1445

Manchu

- MYK: Manju-i Yargiyan Kooli, ?late 17th century
- SA: Taizu Hīwangdi Ming gurun-i cooha-be Sargū alin-de ambarame efulehe baita-be tucibume araha bithe, ?late 17th – early 18th century

Written Mongolian

- UD: Üliger-ün dalai, ?18th c.

Old Turkic

- BQ: Bilgä Qayan inscription, 735 A.D.
- KTb: Kül Tegin “big” inscription, 732 A.D.
- KTts: Kül Tegin “small” inscription, 732 A.D.
- QB: Qutadu bilig, 1069–1070 A.D.
- YEN: Yenisei inscriptions (?8–11th c.), after Malov 1952.
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Alexander Vovin

ALTAJSKA HIPOTEZA: DOSTIGUĆA DO DANAS

SAŽETAK

Članak je sastavljen od tri dijela. U prvome, autor daje bibliografski pregled najvažnije literature proteklih tridesetak godina kako na području istraživanja pojedinih altajskih skupina (japanske, korejske, tunguško-mandžurske, mongolske i turske /turkijske/), tako i u usporedbeno-po-vijesnoj altaistici (uključujući područje dvojnih usporedbi, primjerice korejsko-japanske). Dostignuća u različitim područjima altajske lingvistike bila su značajna u ovim godinama, pa je opći pregled te literature već odavno nedostaje. U drugome dijelu članka autor se kritički osvrće na mit, uvelike raširen u lingvističkim krugovima, kako altajski jezici nemaju zajednički temeljni rječnik, osobito zajedničke izraze za dijelove ljudskoga tijela. Konačno, u trećem dijelu, daje se kratak ogled usporedbene glagolske morfologije svih pet altajskih grana, što dosad nitko i nigdje nije učinio. U zaključku autor naznačuje najaktualnije probleme s kojima će se morati suočiti altajska lingvistika.

KLJUČNE Riječi: altajski, japanski, korejski, tunguško-mandžurski, mongolski, turski (turkijski), usporedbena metoda, altajska bibliografija, nazivi djelova ljudskog tijela, usporedbena glagolska morfologija

Александр Вовин

АЛТАЙСКА ГИПОТЕЗА: ПРОГРЕСС К СЕГОДНЯШНЕМУ ДНЮ

РЕЗЮМЕ

Настоящая статья состоит из трех частей. В первой части содержится библиографический обзор наиболее важной литературы как по отдельным алтайским группам (японский, корейский, тунгусо-маньчжурский, монгольский и тюркский), так и по сравнительно-историческому алтайскому языкознанию за последние тридцать лет. Прогресс в различных областях алтайского языкознания был очень значительным за эти годы, и необходимость общего обзора этой литературы давно назрела. Во второй части критически разбирается широко циркулирующий в лингвистических кругах миф о том, что алтайские языки не имеют достаточного количества общей базисной лексики, особенно среди лексем, обозначающих части тела. Наконец, в третьей части дан краткий очерк сравнительной морфологии глагола по всем пяти алтайским группам, что до сих пор еще не было сделано. В заключении упоминаются наиболее острые проблемы стоящие перед современным алтайским языкознанием.

КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА: алтайский, японский, корейский, тунгусо-маньчжурский, монгольский, тюркский, сравнительный метод, алтайская библиография, название частей тела человека, сравнительная глагольная морфология