

Contents

Preface — vii

1	Introduction — 1
1.1	Goals of this study — 1
1.2	The Transeurasian languages — 4
1.2.1	From “Altaic” to “Transeurasian” — 4
1.2.2	Internal taxonomy of the individual branches — 7
1.2.2.1	Turkic — 7
1.2.2.2	Mongolic — 12
1.2.2.3	Tungusic — 16
1.2.2.4	Koreanic — 20
1.2.2.5	Japanic — 22
1.2.3	The Transeurasian hypothesis — 30
1.2.4	The languages underlying the reconstructions — 33
1.2.4.1	Languages included in this study — 33
1.2.4.2	Transliteration conventions — 37
1.3	Previous research — 41
2	Methodology — 45
2.1	Historical comparative morphology — 45
2.2	Procedures for establishing morphological correlations — 47
2.2.1	Collection and reconstruction of participant morphemes — 47
2.2.2	Comparison of individual proto-morphemes — 48
2.2.2.1	Formal correlations — 48
2.2.2.2	Functional correlations — 49
2.2.2.3	Combinational correlations — 51
2.2.2.4	Typological correlations — 51
2.2.2.5	Paradigmatic correlations — 53
2.2.3	Top-level reconstruction — 55
2.2.3.1	Reconstruction of proto-morphemes — 55
2.2.3.2	Reconstruction of family-inherent grammaticalization patterns — 56
2.2.3.3	Reconstruction of proto-systems — 57
2.3	Reducing the chance factor — 58
2.4	Eliminating code-copying — 61
2.4.1	Understanding copiability — 61

2.4.2	Indications of code-copying —	64
2.4.2.1	Productivity restricted to shared roots —	64
2.4.2.2	Unilateral morphological complexity —	66
2.4.2.3	Mismatch of morpheme boundaries —	67
2.4.2.4	Multiple marking of a single inflectional category —	68
2.4.2.5	Functional mismatch —	69
2.4.2.6	Phonological mismatch —	70
2.4.2.7	Distribution limited to contact zones —	70
2.4.2.8	Specific morphosyntactic subsystems affected —	71
2.4.3	Indications of genealogical retention —	72
2.4.3.1	Globally shared grammaticalization —	72
2.4.3.2	Categorial opacity —	76
2.4.3.3	Shared cumulation —	76
2.4.3.4	Unreduced allomorphy —	77
2.4.3.5	Multiple comparative setting —	78
2.4.3.6	Missing intermediaries —	79
2.5	Methodological misunderstandings —	80
2.5.1	“The comparative method is not universally applicable” —	80
2.5.2	“One cannot demonstrate unrelatedness” —	81
2.5.3	“Absence of evidence is evidence of absence” —	83
2.5.4	“Proto-languages are unrealistic” —	84
2.5.5	“Multiple comparison increases chance probability” —	86
2.5.6	“Shared morphology is a <i>conditio sine qua non</i> ” —	87

3 Verb Roots — 89

3.1	The distinction between nouns and verbs —	89
3.2	Verbal adjectives within a mixed adjective typology —	91
3.2.1	Japanese —	91
3.2.2	Korean —	94
3.2.3	Tungusic —	95
3.2.4	Mongolic —	97
3.2.5	Turkic —	99
3.2.6	Scenario for the development of Transeurasian adjective typology —	101
3.2.7	Underlying data —	106
3.3	Verbs —	118
3.3.1	Relevant consonant correspondences —	118
3.3.2	Relevant vowel correspondences —	124
3.3.3	Suprasegmental correlation —	132
3.3.4	Underlying etymologies —	134

3.4	Copular verbs — 153
3.4.1	pTEA *a:- ‘to be’ — 154
3.4.2	pTEA *bɔ:l- ‘to sit down, be sitting; become, be’ — 159
3.5	Stability — 163
3.5.1	Notion — 163
3.5.2	Basic vocabulary — 164
3.5.3	A typology of verbal borrowing — 166
3.5.4	Copy-proof properties of the verbal comparisons — 169
4	Negation — 174
4.1	The development of negation and its genealogical relevance — 174
4.2	Previous comparative approaches — 177
4.3	pTEA *ana- negative verb — 179
4.3.1	pJ *ana- negative verb — 179
4.3.1.1	Negative suffix — 179
4.3.1.2	Negative auxiliary — 180
4.3.1.3	Independent negative verb — 183
4.3.1.4	The development of pJ *ana- — 183
4.3.2	pK *an- negative verb — 185
4.3.3	pTg *ana- auxiliary negative verb — 186
4.3.3.1	Manchu <i>aku</i> : — 186
4.3.3.2	Even <i>ac</i> , <i>acca</i> , <i>a:n</i> ~ <i>a:ŋ</i> — 187
4.3.3.3	Evenki <i>a:cin</i> — 188
4.3.3.4	Udehe <i>anci</i> , <i>ata-</i> — 189
4.3.3.5	Nanai <i>ana</i> ~ <i>ana:</i> — 190
4.3.3.6	The development of pTg *a:na- — 191
4.4	pA *ə- negative verb — 192
4.4.1	No evidence for pJ *e- — 192
4.4.2	Insufficient evidence for pK *e- — 192
4.4.3	pTg *e- negative verb — 193
4.4.3.1	Even <i>e-</i> — 193
4.4.3.2	Evenki <i>e-</i> — 193
4.4.3.3	Udehe <i>e-</i> — 194
4.4.3.4	Nanai negative — 194
4.4.3.5	Overview — 196
4.4.4	pMo *e- negative verb — 198
4.4.4.1	Negative particle — 198
4.4.4.2	Independent negative verb — 198
4.4.4.3	The development of pMo *e- — 199
4.4.5	pTk *e- auxiliary negative verb — 200

4.4.5.1	Karakhanide <i>aŋ / eŋ</i> ‘no, not’ —	200
4.4.5.2	Chuvash an prohibitive —	200
4.4.5.3	The development of pTk * <i>e</i> - —	202
4.5	Insufficient evidence for pTEA * <i>ma</i> - auxiliary negative verb —	202
4.6	The historical development of negation in Transeurasian —	205
5	Verbalization and actionality —	209
5.1	The suffix class “actionality” and its diachronic relevance —	209
5.2	Previous research —	211
5.3	pTEA * <i>-lA-</i> manipulative denominal verb suffix —	213
5.3.1	pJ * <i>-ra-</i> (~ <i>-rə-</i>) —	213
5.3.1.1	Manipulative denominal verb suffix —	213
5.3.1.2	Loan verb marker —	216
5.3.2	pTg * <i>-lA-</i> —	217
5.3.2.1	Manipulative denominal verb suffix —	217
5.3.2.1.1	Manchu <i>-lA-</i> —	217
5.3.2.1.2	Even <i>-lA-</i> —	218
5.3.2.1.3	Evenki <i>-lA-</i> —	219
5.3.2.1.4	Udehe <i>-lA-</i> —	219
5.3.2.1.5	Nanai <i>-lA-</i> —	220
5.3.2.2	Loan verb marker —	220
5.3.3	pMo * <i>-lA-</i> —	221
5.3.3.1	Manipulative denominal verb suffix —	221
5.3.3.2	Loan verb marker —	222
5.3.4	pTk * <i>-lA-</i> —	222
5.3.4.1	Manipulative denominal verb suffix —	223
5.3.4.2	Loan verb marker —	224
5.3.5	The nature of the historical connection —	224
5.4	pTEA * <i>-nA-</i> processive —	227
5.4.1	pJ * <i>-na-</i> (~ * <i>-nə-</i>) —	227
5.4.2	pK * <i>-nO-</i> —	229
5.4.3	pTg * <i>-nA-</i> —	230
5.4.3.1	Manchu <i>-nA-</i> —	231
5.4.3.2	Even <i>-(A)n₍₂₎-</i> —	232
5.4.3.3	Evenki <i>-nA-</i> —	233
5.4.3.4	Udehe <i>-nA-</i> —	233
5.4.3.5	Nanai <i>-nA-</i> —	234
5.4.4	pMo * <i>-nA-</i> —	235
5.4.5	pTk * <i>-(X)n-</i> —	237
5.5	pTEA * <i>-ki-</i> iconic —	239

5.5.1	pJ <i>*-ka-</i> — 239
5.5.2	pK <i>*(k)i-</i> — 240
5.5.3	pTg <i>*-ki:-</i> (~ <i>*-gi:-</i>) — 241
5.5.3.1	Manchu <i>-ki-</i> ~ <i>-gi-</i> — 242
5.5.3.2	Even <i>-k-</i> , <i>-kA-</i> ~ <i>-gA-</i> — 242
5.5.3.3	Evenki <i>-ki(:)-</i> ~ <i>-gi(:)-</i> — 242
5.5.3.4	Nanai <i>-ki-</i> ~ <i>-gi-</i> — 243
5.5.4	pMo <i>*-ki-</i> (~ <i>*-gi-</i>) — 243
5.5.5	pTk <i>*-kl-</i> — 244
5.6	pTEA <i>*-mA-</i> inclination — 246
5.6.1	pJ <i>*-ma-</i> (~ <i>*-mǝ-</i>) — 246
5.6.2	pK <i>*-mO-</i> — 250
5.6.3	pTg <i>*-mA:-</i> — 252
5.6.3.1	Manchu <i>-mi-</i> — 252
5.6.3.2	Even <i>-mA:-</i> , <i>-mi:-</i> — 252
5.6.3.3	Evenki <i>-mA-</i> , <i>-mi-</i> — 252
5.6.3.4	Udehe <i>-mA-</i> — 253
5.6.3.5	Nanai <i>-mAsi-</i> — 253
5.6.4	pMo <i>*-mA-</i> — 253
5.7	pTEA <i>*-gA-</i> inchoative — 255
5.7.1	pJ <i>*-ka-</i> — 255
5.7.2	pK <i>*-kO-</i> — 256
5.7.3	pTg <i>*-gA-</i> — 259
5.7.3.1	Manchu — 259
5.7.3.2	Even — 260
5.7.3.3	Evenki — 262
5.7.3.4	Udehe — 262
5.7.3.5	Nanai — 263
5.7.4	pMo <i>*-gA-</i> — 263
5.7.5	pTk <i>*(X)k-</i> (~ <i>-(X)g-</i>) — 264
5.8	The historical development of actionality in Transeurasian — 266
6	Valence and voice — 271
6.1	The suffix classes “valence” and “voice” and their diachronic relevance — 271
6.2	Previous research — 274
6.3	pTEA <i>*-ti-</i> causative — 276
6.3.1	pJ <i>*-ta-</i> — 276
6.3.2	pK <i>*-ti-</i> — 277
6.3.3	pTg <i>*-ti-</i> — 281

6.3.3.1	Manchu <i>-tA-</i> — 282
6.3.3.2	Even <i>-t- ~ -ci-</i> — 283
6.3.3.3	Evenki <i>-t- ~ -ci-</i> — 285
6.3.3.4	Udehe <i>-si-</i> — 286
6.3.3.5	Nanai <i>-ci- ~ -si-</i> — 287
6.3.4	pMo <i>*-ti-</i> — 288
6.3.5	pTk <i>*-ti-</i> — 290
6.4	pTEA <i>*-pU-</i> reflexive-anticausative — 292
6.4.1	pJ <i>*-pa-</i> (<i>~ -pə-</i>) — 292
6.4.2	pK <i>*-pO-</i> — 294
6.4.3	pTg <i>*-p-</i> — 296
6.4.3.1	Ma. <i>∅</i> — 297
6.4.3.2	Even <i>-(A)b-</i> — 297
6.4.3.3	Evenki <i>-p-</i> — 298
6.4.3.4	Udehe <i>-p-</i> — 298
6.4.3.5	Nanai <i>-p-</i> — 298
6.4.4	pMo <i>*-βU-</i> — 299
6.4.5	pTk <i>*-U-</i> — 300
6.5	pTEA <i>*-dA-</i> fientive — 301
6.5.1	pJ <i>*-ya-</i> — 301
6.5.2	pTg <i>*dA:-</i> — 303
6.5.2.1	Manchu <i>-dA-</i> — 303
6.5.2.2	Even <i>-dA:-</i> — 303
6.5.2.3	Evenki <i>-dA-</i> — 304
6.5.2.4	Udehe <i>-dA-</i> — 304
6.5.2.5	Nanai <i>-dA-</i> — 304
6.5.3	pMo <i>*-dA-</i> — 305
6.5.4	pTk <i>*-(A)d-</i> — 306
6.6	pTEA <i>*-rA-</i> anticausative — 309
6.6.1	pJ <i>*-ra-</i> — 309
6.6.2	pK <i>*-(u)l-</i> — 310
6.6.3	pTg <i>*-rA-</i> — 311
6.6.3.1	Manchu <i>-rA-</i> — 312
6.6.3.2	Even <i>-r-</i> — 312
6.6.3.3	Evk. <i>-rA-</i> — 313
6.6.4	pMo <i>*-rA-</i> — 313
6.6.5	pTk <i>*-rA-</i> — 314
6.7	pTEA <i>*-gi-</i> causative — 315
6.7.1	pJ <i>*-(C)i-</i> — 315
6.7.2	pK <i>*-ki-</i> — 320

- 6.7.3 pTg *-gi:- — 321
- 6.7.3.1 Manchu — 322
- 6.7.3.2 Even — 322
- 6.7.3.3 Evenki — 323
- 6.7.3.4 Udehe — 324
- 6.7.3.5 Nanai — 324
- 6.8 The historical development of valence and voice in Transeurasian — 324

7 Nominalization and the development of finite temporal distinctions — 330

- 7.1 Direct insubordination and its diachronic relevance — 330
- 7.2 Previous research — 335
- 7.3 pTEA *-rA aspectually neutral (ad)nominalizer — 339
- 7.3.1 pJ *-ra (~ *-rə) — 339
- 7.3.1.1 Ryukyuan — 341
- 7.3.1.2 Mainland Japanese — 344
- 7.3.2 pK *-l — 347
- 7.3.3 pTg *-rA — 349
- 7.3.3.1 Manchu -rA — 350
- 7.3.3.2 Even — 351
- 7.3.3.3 Evenki — 352
- 7.3.3.4 Udehe — 353
- 7.3.3.5 Nanai — 354
- 7.3.4 pMo *-r — 355
- 7.3.5 pTk *-rV — 357
- 7.3.5.1 Old Turkic — 357
- 7.3.5.2 Chuvash — 359
- 7.3.5.3 Yakut — 360
- 7.4 pTEA *-mA — 361
- 7.4.1 pJ *-m — 361
- 7.4.1.1 Ryukyuan — 363
- 7.4.1.2 Mainland Japanese — 364
- 7.4.2 pK *-m — 366
- 7.4.3 pTg *-mA — 367
- 7.4.3.1 Manchu — 368
- 7.4.3.2 Even — 371
- 7.4.3.3 Evenki — 372
- 7.4.3.4 Udehe — 373
- 7.4.3.5 Nanai — 373

7.4.4	pMo *- <i>m</i> (<i>A</i>) — 374
7.4.5	pTk *- <i>m</i> (<i>A</i>) — 376
7.4.5.1	Old Turkic — 377
7.4.5.2	Chuvash — 378
7.5	pTEA *- <i>n</i> aspectually neutral (ad)nominalizer — 379
7.5.1	pJ *- <i>n</i> — 379
7.5.1.1	Ryukyuan — 380
7.5.1.2	Old Japanese — 381
7.5.2	pK *- <i>n</i> — 383
7.5.3	pTg *- <i>n</i> (<i>A</i>) — 385
7.5.3.1	Manchu — 386
7.5.3.2	Even — 386
7.5.3.3	Evenki — 388
7.5.3.3	Udehe — 390
7.5.3.4	Nanai — 390
7.5.4	pMo *- <i>n</i> — 391
7.5.5	pTk *- <i>n</i> — 393
7.5.5.1	Old Turkic — 393
7.5.5.2	Chuvash — 395
7.6	pTEA *- <i>xA</i> ~ *- <i>kA</i> — 396
7.6.1	pJ *- <i>ka</i> — 396
7.6.1.1	Ryukyuan — 397
7.6.1.2	Mainland Japanese — 398
7.6.2	pK *- <i>kAi</i> — 400
7.6.3	pTg *- <i>xA</i> : ~ *- <i>kA</i> : — 402
7.6.3.1	Manchu — 403
7.6.3.2	Even — 405
7.6.3.3	Evenki — 406
7.6.3.4	Udehe — 406
7.6.3.5	Nanai — 407
7.6.4	pMo *- <i>xA</i> ~ *- <i>kA</i> — 408
7.6.5	pTk *- <i>xA</i> ~ *- <i>kA</i> — 411
7.6.5.1	Old Turkic — 411
7.6.5.2	Chuvash — 416
7.7	pTEA *- <i>sA</i> — 417
7.7.1	pJ *- <i>sa</i> — 417
7.7.1.1	Ryukyuan — 417
7.7.1.2	Mainland Japanese — 418
7.7.2	pK *- <i>s</i> — 422
7.7.3	pTg *- <i>sA</i> — 423

7.7.3.1	Manchu — 424
7.7.3.2	Even — 424
7.7.3.3	Evenki — 427
7.7.3.4	Udehe — 427
7.7.3.5	Nanai — 429
7.7.4	pMo *-sA — 431
7.7.5	pTk *-sA — 432
7.7.5.1	Old Turkic — 432
7.7.5.2	Chuvash — 434
7.8	The historical development of finite suffixes in Transeurasian — 436
8	Converbs — 449
8.1	Converbs and their diachronic relevance — 449
8.2	Previous research — 453
8.3	pTEA *-i ~ ∅ deverbal noun suffix — 455
8.3.1	pJ *-i ~ ∅ — 455
8.3.1.1	Mainland Japanese — 455
8.3.1.2	Ryukyuan — 458
8.3.2	pK *-i ~ ∅ — 459
8.3.3	pTg *-i: ~ ∅ — 461
8.3.3.1	Ma. -i ~ ∅ — 461
8.3.3.2	Even — 461
8.3.3.3	Evenki — 462
8.3.4	pMo *-l ~ ∅ — 462
8.3.5	pTk *-l ~ ∅ — 464
8.4	pTEA *-xU ~ *-kU deverbal noun suffix — 466
8.4.1	pJ *-ku — 466
8.4.1.1	Mainland Japanese — 466
8.4.1.2	Ryukyuan — 468
8.4.2	pK *-ku ~ *-k(ʌ) — 469
8.4.3	pTg *-xu: ~ *-ku: — 471
8.4.3.1	Manchu — 472
8.4.3.2	Even — 473
8.4.3.3	Udehe — 473
8.4.3.4	Nanai — 475
8.4.4	pMo *-gU ~ *-kU < ? *-xU ~ *-kU — 476
8.4.5	pTk *-xU ~ *-kU — 478
8.4.5.1	Old Turkic — 478
8.4.5.2	Chuvash — 480

**8.5 The historical development of converb suffixes
 in Transeurasian — 482**

9 Evaluation — 485

9.1 The correlations — 485

9.1.1 Formal correlations — 487

9.1.2 Functional correlations — 488

9.1.3 Combinational correlations — 488

9.1.4 Typological correlations — 489

9.1.5 Paradigmatic correlations — 490

9.1.5.1 Ordered sets — 490

9.1.5.2 Quirks — 491

9.1.5.3 Extended paradigmaticity — 493

9.2 How likely is coincidence? — 493

9.3 How likely is borrowing? — 494

9.3.1 Guidelines — 494

9.3.2 Indications against code-copying — 494

9.3.3 Indications in support of inheritance — 497

**9.4 Why is the evidence not consistent with the Indo-European
 model? — 501**

9.4.1 Inconsistency — 501

9.4.2 Typological differences — 501

9.4.3 Chronological differences — 503

9.5 Conclusion: a family picture through morphology — 505

Abbreviations — 507

References — 511

Language index — 542

Subject index — 547