TURCOLOGICA

Herausgegeben von Lars Johanson

Band 110

2016
Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

# The Uppsala Meeting

## Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics

Edited by
Éva Á. Csató, Birsel Karakoç
and Astrid Menz


2016
Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

# Transeurasian basic verbs: Copy or cognate?

Martine Robbeets

## 1. Introduction

The present contribution is concerned with sets of basic verbs shared between the Transeurasian languages and their historical motivation. The label "Transeurasian" was coined by Johanson & Robbeets (2010: 1–2) with reference to a large group of geographically adjacent languages, traditionally known as "Altaic", that share a significant number of linguistic properties and include up to five different linguistic families: Japonic, Koreanic, Tungusic, Mongolic, and Turkic. The question whether all similarities between the Transeurasian languages should be accounted for by code-copying or whether some are cognate residue of a common ancestor is one of the most debated issues of historical comparative linguistics (see Robbeets 2005 for an overview of the debate).

Many scholars would agree that it is meaningful to apply the concept of "linguistic area" to the Transeurasian languages in the sense of a geographical concentration of linguistic features, that is at least partly motivated by language contact. Recent decades have witnessed an increase of interest in studies on structural convergence in the vast Transeurasian area such as Poppe 1964, Shibata 1979, Hattori 1980, Fabre 1982, Hayashi 1985, van der Hulst & Smith 1988, Rickmeyer 1989, Johanson 1992, 1996, 2002, Schönig 1994, Bisang 1998, Janhunen 2007 and Robbeets (forthcoming).

But, can we also apply the concept of "language family" to the Transeurasian languages? Can we find similarities between Japonic, Koreanic, Tungusic, Mongolic, and Turkic languages that are more likely to be due to common ancestorship than to code-copying? This is the question that underlies the present paper.

As a short-cut to the answer, I will concentrate on etymologies for verbs belonging to the basic vocabulary. As far as the basic vocabulary is concerned, I use the Leipzig-Jakarta list (Tadmor et al. 2010) because it includes more verbs than the traditional Swadesh 100 list (Swadesh 1955). My focus is on verbs because they enjoy a higher stability than nouns or nominal adjectives.

In the following section, I will list etymologies for basic verbs shared across the Transeurasian languages. In the third section, I will argue why common ancestorship can provide a more sensible account for these etymologies than code-copying. Finally, I will summarize my findings in a conclusion.



## 2. Etymologies for basic verbs

If we restrict the evidence to etymologies for verbs and verbal adjectives that have members in at least three different branches of the Transeurasian unity, we find the following 13 items on the Leipzig-Jakarta 100. The etymologies represent basic vocabulary in the sense that the basic meaning can be reconstructed to the common proto-Transeurasian form. Table 1 summarizes the etymologies, indicating the number of the relevant sound correspondences on the basis of the lists in the Tables 2 and 3 below as well as the passages in my previous work that deal with them in more detail.[1]

3. TO GO

pJ **na-* 'to go out, become': OJ *in-* (A) 'to go away, leave, depart', OJ *-in-* perfective auxiliary, J *nar-* (B), OJ *nar-* 'to become, come into being', J *nas-* (B), OJ *nas-* 'to make, do, give birth to'

pK **na-* 'to go out': K *na-*, MK *·na-* 'to go out, emerge, leave, become, come into being, come out', MK *¨nay-* 'to take out, produce' (**-i-* causative), MK *nat-* 'to appear' (**-t(i)-* passive), MK *-·na-* resultative

pTg **na:-* 'to go out': Evk., Even. *-na:-*, Sol. *-na:-*, Neg. *-na-*, Na. *-nda-*, Olch. *-ŋda*, Oroch, Orok, Ud. *-na-*, Sibe *-na-*, Ma. *-na-* ~ *-ne-* ~ *-no-* 'to go out (to verb)'

25. TO DO/MAKE

pJ **-ka-* 'to produce a sound or a sensation like the base onomatopoea': J, OJ *-k-*, pR **-k-*, e.g. in pJ **na* 'crying sound' in OJ *ne* (1.1) 'sound, crying, weeping' -> OJ *nak-* A 'to cry'; Shodon *nak'jum*, Shuri *nacjun*, Ishigaki *na(Q)kun*, Hateruma *naguN*, Yonaguni *naguN*, pR **naki* 'to cry'

pK **-ki-* 'to produce a sound or a sensation like the base onomatopoea': K, MK *-i-*, e.g. in K *kutek* 'nodding' -> K *kuteki*, MK *kuteki-* 'to nod (one's head)'

pTg **-ki:-* ~ *-gi:-* 'to produce a sound or a sensation like the base onomatopoea': Ma./Sibe *-ki-* ~ *-gi-*, Evk. *-ki:-* ~ *-gi:-*, Neg./Sol. *-ki-* ~ *-gi-*, Even *-k-* ~ *-g-*, *-kA-* ~ *-gA-*, Orok/Olch./Oroch /Ud./Na. *-ki-* ~ *-gi-*. e.g. in pTg **sim-ki* 'to cough' in Even *hi:mke-*, Evk. *simki-*, Neg. *simki-*, Olch. *siŋbi-*, Orok *sipki-*, Na. *siŋbi-*, *simki-*, Oroch *simpi-*, Ud. *simpi-* and Solon *simki-*.

pMo **ki-* 'to do, make; produce a sound or a sensation like the base onomatopoea': MMo. *ki-* '1 to do, make', WMo. *ki-* '1', Khal. *xij-* '1', Bur. *xe-* '1', Kalm. *ke-* '1', Ordos *ki:-* '1', Dong. *kie-* '1', Bao. *ke-*, *giə-* '1', Dag. *ki:-*, *xi:-*, *ši:-* '1', Mgr. *gi-*,

1 Note that Old Japanese distinguished between two values for later *e*, *i*, *o* in certain syllables, which are indexed with subscripts $i_1$ *versus* $i_2$, $e_1$ *versus* $e_2$ and $o_1$ *versus* $o_2$. Japanese verbs are distinguished according to two prosodic classes A and B. Type A corresponds to a high initial tone, type B to a low initial tone. For Middle Korean, Yale Romanization is modified to allow for the representation of unrounded vowels [ʌ] and [ɨ] by *o* and *u*. In proto-Korean these vowels are reconstructed as **ʌ* and **ɨ*.

*gə-* '1', Mogh. *ki-* '1', Eastern Yugur *gə-* '1'; iconic in e.g. **čis* (mimetic for *chirping*) > WMo. *čiski-* 'to chirrup, chirp, twitter, tweet'

pTk **kï(-)l-* 'to do, make, produce a sound or a sensation like the base onomatopoea': OT *kïl-* '1 to do, make', Tk. *kïl-* '1', Tat. *qïl-* '1', Uzb. *qil-* '1', Uigh. *qil-* '1', Az. *gïl-* '1', Tkm. *qïl-* '1', Khak. *xïl-* '1', Balkar *qïl-* '1', Shor *qïl-* '1', ,Tuva *qïl-* '1', Yak. *kïn-* '1', Dolg. *gïn-* '1' , Kirg. *qïl-* '1', Kaz. *qïl-* '1', Nog. *qïl-* '1', Bash. *qïl-* '1', Karaim *qïl-* '1', Kpak *qïl-* '1', Kum. *qïl-* '1',Chu. *ĕś-xĕl* 'deed'; iconic in e.g. **su* (mimetic for snapping) -> OT *sukï-* 'snap (one's fingers)'.

36. TO HIT/BEAT

pJ **tuk-* 'to pound, hit with force': J *tuku* B, OJ *tuk-* 'to pound, husk, beat, hit with force'; Shuri *cicun*

pK **t(ʌ)hi-* < **t(ʌ)ki-* 'to hit, strike': MK *·thi-* 'to hit, strike',

pTg **dug-* 'to hit with force': Evk. *dug-* '1 to hit, beat, hammer', Even *duɣ-* '1', *duɣ-* '2 to batter, hit repeatedly', Neg. *dụw-* ~ *duɣ-* '2', *dukte-* '1', Ma. *du-* ~ *du:-* '1, thresh', Jur. *du-ŋu-mij* '1', Olcha. *dụ:čï-* '2', Orok *du:* 1, *dụ:čï-* '2', Na. *du:-* 1, *do:čï-* '2', Oroch *du:-* '1, 2', Ud. *du:-* '2', *dukte-* '1'

46. BITE

pJ **kam-* 'to bite, chew': J *kamu* (B), OJ *kam-* 'to bite, gnaw, chew, masticate, eat'; Hirara *kam*, Ishigaki *kamuŋ*, Yonaguni *kamuŋ*, pR **kamu-* 'to bite'

pMo **keme-* 'to bite' (+**-lA-/ *-li-* intensive-iterative suffix): MMo. *kemile-* 'to gnaw', WMo. *kemeli-*, *kemele-* '1 to gnaw, nibble, crack with one's teeth (tr.)', *kemki-* '2 to bite, snap with the teeth (tr.)', Khal. *ximle-*, *xemle-* '1', Bur. *ximel-* '1', Bur. (Bargu dial.) *ximil-*, Kalm. *kemḷ-* '1', Ordos *kemele-* '1', *kemχel-* '2', Bao. *kamel*, Bao. (Dahejia dial.) *kaməl-* 'to bite', Dag. *keme-* '1', Eastern Yugur *kemle-*, *kelme-* '1'

pTk **kem-* 'to bite, chew (intr.)' (+ **-(U)r* causative): OT (Karakhanide) *kemür-* '1 to gnaw, chew (tr.)', Tk. *gemir-*, *kemir-* '1', Az. *gämir-* '1', Tkm. *gemir-* '1', Gag. *kemir-* '1', Uz. *kemir-* '1', Uig. *kemi(r)-* '1', Tat. *kimer-* '1', Khak. *kimər-* '1', Karaim *kemir-* '1', Kirg. *kemir-* '1', Kazakh *kemir-* '1', Nog. *kemir-* '1', Bash. *kimer-* '1' Balk. *kemir-*, Kpak *kemir-* , Kum. *gemir-*, Tuva *xemir-* '1', Tof. *xemir-* '1'

53. GIVE

pJ **(w)ura-* 'to sell': J *ur-* (A), OJ *ur-* 'to sell', Naze *uryuŋ* 'to sell', Shuri *uyuŋ*, Nakasuji (Miyako) *Qvi(i)*, Yonaguni *uruŋ*, pR **uri-* 'to sell'

pK **pʌlʌ-kʌ-* 'to sell': K *phal-*, MK *pho(l)-* /*·phol(o)-* 'to sell'

pTg **bu:-* 'to give': Evk. *bu:-*, Even *bö:-*, Neg. *bu:-*, Solon *bu:-*, Olcha *bu:wu-* Orok *bu:-*, Na. *bu:-*, Oroch *bu:-*, Ud. *bu:-*, Sibe *bu-*, Ma. *bu-*

55. TO BURN

pJ **tak-* 'to burn (tr.)': J *taku* (A), OJ *tak-* 'to burn, boil, cook (tr.)', Shuri *tak-* 'to burn', Hirara *yakʷï*, Ishigaki *yakuŋ*, Yonaguni *daguŋ*



pK **tʌhʌ-* < pK **takʌ-* 'to burn (intr.)': MK *·tho-* 'to burn, be on fire (intr.)', MK *ta·hi-*, K *ttay-* 'to make (fire), heat (with fire) (tr.)' (MK *-i* causative-passive)

pTk **ya-k-* 'to ignite, burn (tr.)': OT (Karakhanide) *yak-* '1 to ignite, burn (tr.)', Tk. *yaq-* '1', Tkm. *yaq-* '1', Gag. *yaq-* '1', Az. *yax-* '1', Uz. *yɔq-* '1', Uig. *yaq-* '1', Kirg. *ǰaq-* '1', Kaz. *žaq-* '1', Bash. *yaq-* '1', Nog. *yaq-* '1', Tat. *yaɣ-* '1', Karaim *yaq-* '1', Kum. *yaq-* '1', Kpak *žaq-* '1', Yak. *saq-*, Tofa. *ča'q-* 'to produce fire', Khalaj *ya:q-* '1', Chu. *śot-* '1'

62. TO HEAR

pJ **uka-* 'to receive, perceive, hear': J *uke-* (B), OJ *uke₂-* 'receive', J *uketamawar-* (B), OJ *uke₂tamapar-* 'to humbly listen, hear, receive' (OJ *tamapar* - 'humbly receive, be given'); Shodon *uk'ïïyum*, Shuri *ukiyuŋ*, Yonaha (Miyako) *ukiï*, Ishigaki *uki(ru)ŋ*

pMo **uka-* 'to understand, think': MMo. *uqa-* (HY, SH) '1 to understand, think', *uqa* (SH) ~ *uxa'an* (HY) '2 mind', WMo. *uqa-* '1', *uqaɣa(n)* '2', Dag. *ogo*, *owo* 'brain', *uka:* ~ *uha:n* '2', Khal. *uxa-* '1'; *uxa:* '2', Bur. *uxa-* '1', *uxā(n)* '2', Kalm. *uxə-* '1', *uxa:n* '2', Ordos *uxa:* ~ *uxa:n* '2', Eastern Yugur *χGua-tu* '2'

pTk **uk-* 'to hear, understand': OT *uq-* '1 understand', Az. (dial.) *uɣuz* 'knowing much', Uz. *uq-* '1', Uig. *uq-* '1', Tat. (dial). *ux-* '2 hear', Kirg. *uq-* '2', Kaz. *uɣin-* '1', Kpak. *uq-* '1', Khak. *ux-* '1, 2', Shor *uq-* '1', Tuva *uɣ-* '1'

65. RED

pK **pil-ki-* 'to be red' (pK **-·ki-* ~ *-·kʌ-* inchoative, e.g. MK *nul-* 'to increase, be(come) longer, be better' → MK *nulk-* 'to be old, grow old (intr.)' < pK **nil-·ki-* (Robbeets 2015: 257-258): K *pwulk-*, MK *pulk-* 'to be red, be crimson (intr.)'

pTg **pula-* 'to be red': Evk. *xularin (Evk. -rin* colour suffix*)*, *xulama* 'red' (Evk. *-ma* ~ *-me* ~ *-mo-* deverbal noun suffix), *hularga-* 'to redden, turn red' (Evk. *-rgA-* deverbal intransitive inchoative suffix), Even *xulal-* 'to become red', *xulańa:* 'red' (Even *-ńa:* ~ *ńe:* deverbal colour suffix), Neg. *xolayin* 'red', Solon *ụlā̃* 'red', Na. *folǵā(n)*, Ud. *xulaligi*, Ma. *fulara-* 'to be red, to blush', *fulǵan* 'red', Sibe *fələǵan*, *fulǵan* 'red', Jur. *fula-gian* 'red'

pMo **pula-ɣan* 'red' (*-GAn* resultative deverbal noun suffix, e.g. *uda-* 'to tarry' -> *udaɣan* 'slow'): MMo. *xula'an* (HY, SH) ~ *hola:m* ~ *hula'an* ~ *hula:n* (Muq), *hulan* 'red', WMo. *ulaɣan*, Dag. *xula:n* ~ *hula:n*, Khal. *ula:n*, Bur. *ula:n*, Kalm. *ula:n*, Ordos *ula:n*, Dong. *xulan*, *xulaŋ*, *fulaŋ*, Bao. *felaŋ*, *fulaŋ*, Eastern Yugur *ła:n*, Mgr. *fula:n*, Mog. *ulo:n*

70. TO CARRY

pJ **əpə-* ~ *ənpə-* 'to carry on the back (tr.)': J *ow-* (B), OJ *op-* 'to bear, carry on the back', EOJ *opuse-*, OJ *opose-*, J *oose-* (B) 'to charge with', J *obuw-* (B), OJ *obup-* 'to carry on the back'; Nakijin (Okinawa) *QuuruN*, Shuri *QuuyuN* 'to carry a load, carry a responsibility or sin'

pK **ep-* 'to carry on the back': K *ep-*, MK *ep-* 'to carry on the back (tr.)'

pTg *ebe- 'to carry': Na. *ïwarï-* 'to tunload', Evk. *ewe-* 'to carry', Even *iw-* 'to bring in, to carry inside, to import', Oroč. *ewu-gi-* 'to bring', *iwa-dala-* 'to put a person on one's shoulder'

77. THICK

pJ *puta- 'to be thick': J *hutoi* (B) 'to be thick, burly, fat', OJ *puto*$_1$- 'to be thick, fat' (< *puta-wo-ra (thick-COP-ADN); see Robbeets 2015: 339-340); Shuri *buta-saN*, Ikema (Miyako) *udakai*, pR *buta- 'stout, thick'

pK *pwuti- 'to become thick': K *pu:s-* 'to swell (intr.)', MK *¨pwuT-* 'to swell, increase'

pMo *büdü- 'to be large': WMo. *büdügün, bidügün* 'large, huge, big' (WMo *-yun / -gün* deverbal noun deriving quality words (Poppe 1954: 46)), MMo. *bidun*, Dag. *budun, budu:n*, Khal. *büdü:n*, Bur. *büdü:n*, Kalm. *büdü:n, bödü:n*, Ordos *büdü:n, bidü:n*, Dong. *biedun*, Bao. *beidoŋ*, Eastern Yugur *budü:n*, Mgr. *budin, bidun*, Mog. *beidü:n, beidun*

87. TO CRY / WEEP

pK *uli-'to cry, howl': K *wu:l-* 'to cry, weep, shed tears (of humans); howl, sing (of animals); sound, ring (of things) (intr.)', MK *wul-* ~ *¨wu(l)-* 'to cry, howl, sound (intr.)'

pMo *uli 'to howl': MMo. *uli-* '1 to howl (of dogs, wolves, etc.)', WMo. *uli-* '1', Khal. *uli-* '1', Bur. *uli-* '1', Kalm. *uĺ-, ulə-* '1', Ordos *uli-* '1', Eastern Yugur. *olo-* '1'

pTk *u:lï- 'to cry, howl': OT *ulï-* 'to cry (of humans), to howl (of wolves and other animals)', Tk. *ulu-*, Gag. *ulu-*, Az. *ula-*, Tkm. *u:li-*, Uig. *ulu-*, Kaz. *ŭli-*, Nog. *uli-*, Bash. *ŭlŭ-*, Kpak. *uli-*, Karaim *ulu-*, Tat. *ula-*, Kirg. *ulu-*, KBalk. *ulu-*, Kum. *ulu-*, Khak. *ulu-*, Tuva *ulu-*, Yak. *uluy-*, Dolg. *uluy*, Chu. *ălax-* 'to neigh'

96. WIDE

pJ *nənpa- > *nənpi- 'to become long and wide': J *nobe-* (B), OJ *nobe*$_2$- 'to stretch, spread, lengthen (tr.)', J *nobi-* (B), OJ *nobi*$_2$- 'to extend, lengthen, stretch, spread, grow; be postponed (intr.)', J *nobas-* (B), OJ *nobas-* 'to extend, lengthen, stretch, spread (tr.)'; Shuri *nubir-* 'to spread, extend (tr.) (B) *nubas-* (B) 'to extend, lengthen (tr.)'

pK *nelp(i)- 'to be wide': K *nelp-* 'to be wide', MK *nep-* 'to be wide', MK *nelu-* 'to be wide'

pTg *nepte- 'to become flat and wide': Even *nebde-* 'to pull off the skin in one piece', *nebde* 'open(ness); wide(ness)', *nebden-* 'to unfold widely; open up (of cloth, wings); straighten out; open up (of leaves) (intr.)' (Even *-(A)n*$_{(2)}$- processive), *nebdeńe:* 'flat, wide' (Even *-ńA* deverbal adjectivizer), *nebder-* 'to open, come out (of flowers) (intr.)', *nebdeku* 'opened up; wide', Evk. *nepte-* 'to unfold, smooth out, spread out', nepteme 'even, flat', Neg. *nepte-nepte* 'even', Na. *nepte-nepte* 'even', Olch. *nepte-nepte* 'even', Orok *nette-* 'spread out', Oroch *nepteŋge* 'even, flat', Ud. *neptele* 'even, flat'



pMo *nebse- 'to be(come) wide and long': WMo. *nebseger* 'wide and long' (WMo. *-GAr* deverbal quality noun (Poppe 1954: 46)), WMo. *nebseyi-* 'to be wide and long (of clothes), to be tattered, in rags (intr.)' (pMo *-yi- anticausative), WMo. *nebsegene-* 'to move (of something wide and long)' (WMo. *-GA-* factitive; Poppe 1954: 61, pMo *-nA-* processive; Robbeets 2015: 235-237), Khal. *nevsiy-*, Bur. *nebši-*

99. HARD

pJ *kata- 'to be hard': J *kata-* (A), OJ *kata-* 'to be hard, solid, tough, rigid'; Shuri *kata-* A 'to be sturdy, sure, saturated',

pK *kata- 'to be hard, severe': K *kwut-*, MK *kwut-* 'to be hard', K *kkatalop-*, MK *skatalwop-* 'to be hard, difficult, complicated; be harsh, severe' (adj. n. + MK *-lwop-* 'to be characterized by'; pK *s(u/o)-* intensive prefix)

pMo *kata- 'to become hard': WMo. *qata-* '1 to become hard, dry (intr.)', *qata-ɣu* '2 hard' (WMo *-ɣu / -gü* deverbal noun deriving quality words (Poppe 1954: 46)), MMo. *qata'u* '2', *qətəmər* 'dried (meat)', Dag. *katən, katen, katu:* '1', Khal. *xat-* '1', *xatu:* '2', Kalm. *xatə-* '1', *xatu:* '2', Ordos *ɣatu:* '2', Kalm. *xatə-* '1', *xatu:* '2', Ordos *ɣatu:* '2', Dong. *qidun, qitun* '2', Bao. *χotoŋ* '2', Eastern Yugur *ɣadu:* 1, Mog. *xata* '2', Mgr. *xada:-* '1', *xadoŋ* '2'

pTk *kat- 'to be hard': OT *kat-* 'to be hard, firm, though', *katïɣ* '2 hard', OT (Karakhanide) *kat-* '1', *katïɣ* '2', Tk. (dial.) kat '2', Az. *gatï* '2', Tkm. *gat, gatï* '2', Uz. *kɔtik* '2', Uig. *ketik* '2', Khak. *xatïɣ* '2', Shor *kadïɣ* '2', Tuva *ka'dïɣ* '2', Yak. *kïta:nax* '2', Dolg. *kïta:nak* '2', Tat. *katï* '2', Kirg. *katu:'*2', Kaz. *kattï* '2', Nog. *kat* '2', Bash. *katï* '2', Kpak. *kattï* '2', Kum. *kati*, Chu. *xidă*

*Table 1. Summary of the basic vocabulary comparative sets in support of Transeurasian affinity*

| LJ item | Proto-Japonic | Proto-Koreanic | Proto-Tungusic | Proto-Mongolic | Proto-Turkic | Corr. no | Robbeets |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 to go | *na- 'go away' | *na- 'go out' | *-na:- 'go out to' | | | 27, 32 | 2015: 149-151 |
| 25 to do/make | *-ka- iconic | *-ki- iconic | *-ki- iconic | *ki- 'do, make' | *kïl- 'do, make' | 13, 40 | 2015: 239-245 |
| 36 to hit/beat | *tuk- 'hit with force' | *t(ʌ)ki- 'hit, strike' | *dug- 'hit' | | | 9, 39, 16 | 2015: 141 |
| 46 to bite | *kam- 'bite' | | | *keme- 'bite' | *kem- 'gnaw' | 13, 33, 26 | 2005: 383, 584-585 2015: 146-147 |
| 53 to give | *(w)ura- 'sell' | *pʌlʌ-kʌ- 'sell' | *bu:- 'give' | | | 3, 39, 30 | |

| LJ item | Proto-Japonic | Proto-Koreanic | Proto-Tungusic | Proto-Mongolic | Proto-Turkic | Corr. no | Robbeets |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 55 to burn (intr.) | *tak- 'burn (tr.)' | *tʌkʌ- /*taki- 'be on / set fire' | | | *yak- 'burn (tr.)' | 9, 32, 14 | 2015: 139-140 |
| 62 to hear | *uka- 'receive, perceive, hear' | | | *uka- 'understand' | *uk- 'understand, hear' | 46, 14, 32 | 2005: 394, 911-912 |
| 65 red | | *pɨl-ki- 'be red' | *pula- 'be red' | *pula-ɣan 'red' | | 1, 39b, 31 | 2005: 406-407, 499 |
| 70 to carry | *əpə- 'carry on back' | *ep- 'carry on back' | *ebe- 'carry' | | | 34, 4, 34 | 2015: 137 |
| 77 thick | *puta- 'be thick' | *putʌ- 'increase (intr.)' | | *büdü- 'large' | | 3, 38, 10 | 2015: 111-112 |
| 87 to cry/weep | | *uli- 'cry, howl' | | *uli- 'howl' | *u:lï- 'cry, howl' | | |
| 96 wide | *nənpa- 'become wide and long' | *nelpʌ- 'be wide' | *nepte- 'become flat and wide' | *nebse- 'be wide and long' | | 27, 34, 6, 33 | 2015: 148, 149 |
| 99 hard | *kata- 'be hard' | *kata- 'be hard' | | *kata- 'become hard' | *kat- 'be hard' | 13, 32, 8, 32 | 2015: 107-108 |

## 3. Arguments for cognacy

### 3.1 Borrowing hierarchy

Empirically it is observed that languages tend to copy nouns more easily than verbs (e.g. Moravcsik 1975, 1978, Wichmann & Wohlgemuth 2008, Wohlgemuth 2009, Matras 2009, Tadmor et al. 2010). From the seventeeth to the nineteenth century, for instance, Japanese underwent intensive contact from Dutch leading to the global copying of over 300 words and the selective copying of syntax, but Japanese did not copy a single verb from Dutch (Irwin 2011). The relative stability of verbs is interrelated with a number of factors, such as the fact that verbal semantics tend to be less culturally determined than the meanings of nouns, that verbs are less perceivable as a distinct unit because they need more adaption to the morpho-syntactic frame of the sentence, and that there simply are less verbs than nouns.

### 3.2 Basic vocabulary

Traditionally, the strength of basic vocabulary lies in the fact that words with basic meanings tend to resist borrowing more successfully than random lexical items. The basic vocabulary list most commonly used in historical linguistics is the Swadesh



100 list (Swadesh 1955). However, this list contains mostly nouns and few verbs. Therefore, it produces too few useful comparanda in families with a verb-oriented lexicon, such as in the Transeurasian family where verbs are basic to word formation and many nouns are derived from them (e.g. in Tungusic and Mongolic the basic items for 'breast' are derived from the verbs 'to suck': pTg **xökö-* 'to suck' -> **xökö-n* 'breast' and pMo **kökö-* 'to suck' -> **kökö-n* 'breast' ). Recently, the Swadesh list has been updated by the Leipzig-Jakarta list (Tadmor et al. 2010), which partly remedies this imbalance in the vocabulary. There is an overlap for 62 items on the lists, but differences are triggered by the fact that the Leipzig-Jakarta list includes factors other than low copiability such as the degree to which the meanings are universal, the degree to which the words are simplex and the probability of attrition.

### 3.3 Typology of verbal borrowing

As far as the mechanisms of loan verb accomodation are concerned, most recipient languages can be categorized into two distinct groups: borrowed verbs either arrive as verbs, needing no formal accommodation, or, they arrive as non-verbs and need formal accommodation. In Wohlgemuth's (2009) terminology, the first group represents "Direct Insertion", while the second group represents either "Indirect Insertion", when the formal accommodation involves a verbalizer or else, "Light Verb Strategy", when the borrowed verb is integrated into a complex predicate. Most Transeurasian languages can be assigned to the second group because they display a clear preference for the non-verbal strategy (Wohlgemuth 2009: 159, 161); for instance, Tk. *klik-le-* and *klik et-* << English *click*; Khal. *zee-l-* << Mandarin *zhài* 'borrow, lend'; K *coking ha-*, J *zyogingu suru* 'to jog' << English *jog;* J *demo-r-* << English *demonstrate.* Whereas the northern Tungusic languages prefer to borrow verbs through direct insertion, e.g. Evk. *vypolńaj-* << Russian *vypolnja-t'* 'to fulfill, carry out', the southern Tungusic languages use verbalizers, e.g. Ud. *tancewa-la-* << Russian *tancewa-t'* 'to dance' and Na. *voprosa-la-* << Russian *voproša-t'* 'to inquire, question'. If the 13 basic verb sets above would be the result of code-copying, they would represent instances of "direct insertion". This would run against the observable preference of the Transeurasian languages to apply the non-verbal strategy to verbal copies.

### 3.4 Regularity of sound correspondence

The cognate sets for basic verbs summarized in Table 1 display regular correspondences for each consonant of the verb root and for each but the root-final vowel, conform to the requirements in Table 2 and 3. Phonology can help to unmask verbal copies, even if extensive contact can result in strata of loanwords that exhibit systematic sound correspondences. The stratum of loanwords from Middle Chinese that has entered both Japanese and Korean during the Tang period (618–906 AD) is known as Sino-Japanese and Sino-Korean and these strata display regular sound correspondences with Middle Chinese (Miyake 1997: 180). Nevertheless, phonological

correspondences in strata of loanwords are the result of imitating the donor sounds as accurately as possible within the limits of the recipient's phonology. As opposed to imitation, the phonological correspondences between cognates are expected to reflect divergence. An example of a sound correspondence that is difficult to explain by code-copying is found in the cluster correspondence in 96. WIDE. The original cluster correspondences in Table 2 can be divided into homoganic and heteroganic clusters. Homoganic clusters are composed of a sonorant and a stop (pTEA *-*Rp*-, *-*Rt*-, *-*Rk*-) and merge in a nasal cluster (pJ *-*np*- > OJ -*b*-, pJ *-*nt*- > OJ -*d*-, pJ *-*nk*- > OJ *-*g*-) in Japanese. In heteroganic clusters, as illustrated in 96. WIDE on the other hand, the nasal and the stop have a different place of articulation, which results in the insertion of a parasitic stop (pTEA *-$m^{(P)}$*T*-, *-$n^{(T)}$*K*-, *-$ŋ^{(K)}$*T*-). The nasal is lost in the continental Transeurasian languages (*-*PT*-, *-*TK*-, *-*KT*-), whereas Korean and Japanese lose the final stop (pJ *-*mp*- > OJ -*b*-, pJ *-*nt*- > OJ -*d*-, pJ *-*ŋk*- > OJ *-*g*-.) Such a complex correspondence cannot easily be explained by code-copying.

*Table 2. Consonant correspondences between the Transeurasian languages (Robbeets 2005, 2015)*

| | pJ | pK | pTg | pMo | pTk | pTEA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | *p- | *p- | *p- | *p- | *b- | *p- |
| 2 | *-p- | *-p- | *-p- | *-γ- | *-p- | *-p- |
| 3. | *p- / *w- | *p- | *b- | *b- | *b- | *b- |
| 4. | *-p-/*-w- | *-p- | *-b- | *-b-/ -γ- | *-b- | *-b- |
| 5. | *-np- | *-pC- | *-PC- | *-PC- | *-P(C)- | *-$m^{(P)}$T- |
| 6. | *-np- | *-Rp- | -RP- | *-RP- | *-RP- | *-Rp- |
| 7. | *t- | *t- | *t- | *t- | *t- | *t- |
| 8. | *-t- | *-t- | *-t- | *-t- | *-t- | *-t- |
| 9. | *t- /*y- | *t- (ci-) | *d- (ji-) | *d- (ji-) | *y- | *d- |
| 10. | *-t-/ *-y- | *-l- | *-d- (-ji-) | *-d- (-ji-) | *-d- | *-d- |
| 11. | *-nt- | *-c- | *-TC- | *-TC- | *-TC- | *-$n^{(T)}$K- |
| 12. | *-nt- | *-Rc- | *-RT- | *-RT- | *-RT- | *-Rt- |
| 13. | *k- | *k- | *k- | *k- | *k- | *k- |
| 14. | *-k- | *-k- (-h-) | *-k- | *-k- | *-k- | *-k- |
| 15. | *k- | *k- | *g- | *g- | *k- | *g- |
| 16. | *-k- | *-k- (-h-) | *-g- | *-g- | *-g- | *-g- |
| 17. | *-nk- | *-kC- | *-KC- | *-KC- | *-KC- | *-$ŋ^{(K)}$T- |
| 18. | *-nk- | *-Rk- | *-RK- | *-RK- | *-RK- | *-Rk- |
| 19. | *t- | *c- | *č- | *č- | *č- | *č- |
| 20. | *-t- | *-c- | *-č- | *-č- | *-č- | *-č- |
| 20b. | *-si | *-l(i) | *-l(č) | *-l(č) | *-l(č)~ -š | *-lč |
| 21. | *k- | *k-, h- | *x- | *k- | *k- | *x- |
| 22. | *-k- | *-k- | *-x- | *-g-~~k- | *-g-~~k- | *-x- |
| 23. | *s- | *s- | *s- | *s- | *s- | *s- |
| 24. | *-s- | *-s- | *-s- | *-s- | *-s- | *-s- |



| | pJ | pK | pTg | pMo | pTk | pTEA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 25. | *m- | *m- | *m- | *m- | *b- | *m- |
| 26. | *-m- | *-m- | *-m- | *-m- | *-m- | *-m- |
| 27. | *n- | *n- | *n- | *n- | *y- | *n- |
| 28. | *-n- | *-n- | *-n- | *-n- | *-n- | *-n- |
| 29. | *-r- | *-l- | *-r- | *-r- | *-r- | *-r- |
| 30. | *-r- | *-l- | *-r- | *-r- | *-$r_2$- | *-r- |
| 31. | *-r- | *-l- | *-l- | *-l- | *-l- | *-l- |

*Table 3. Vowel correspondences between the Transeurasian languages (Robbeets 2015)*

| | OJ < pJ | MK < pK | pTg | pMo | pTk | pTEA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 32. | -a- < *-a- | -a- < *-a- | *-a- | *-a- | *-a- | *-a- |
| 32b. | *CaCa | *CʌCʌ | *CaCa | *CaCa | *CaC | *CaCa |
| 33. | -a- < *-a- | -e- < *-e- | *-e- | *-e- | *-e- | *-ə- |
| 34. | -o- < *-ə- | -e- < *-e- | *-e- | *-e- | *-e- | *-ə- |
| 35. | -o- <? *-o- | -wo- < *-o- | *-o- | *-o- | *-o- | *-ɔ- |
| 36. | -u- < *-o- | -wo- < *-o- | *-o- | *-o- | *-o- | *-ɔ- |
| 37. | -o- < *-ɨ- | -u- < *-i- | *-ö- | *-ö- | *-ö- | *-o- |
| 38. | -u- < *-u- | -wu- < *-u- | *-u- (gü) | *-ü- | *-ü- | *-u- |
| 39. | -u- < *-u- | -o- < *-ʌ- | *-u- | *-u- | *-u- /-ï- | *-ʊ- |
| 39b. | PaRu- < *PauRu- | *PʌRʌ- ~ *PiRi- | *PuRu- | *PuRu- | *PuR- | *PʊRʊ- |
| 40. | -i- < *-i- | -i- < *-i- | *-i- | *-i- | *-i-/-ï- | *-i- |
| 41. | a- < *-a- | a- < *a- | *a- | *a- | *a- | *a- |
| 42. | o- < *ə- | e- < *e- | *e- | *e- | *e- | *ə- |
| 43. | o- <? *o- | wo- < *o- | *o- | *o- | *o- | *ɔ- |
| 44. | o- < *ɨ- | ø < ? *i- | *ö- | *ö- | *ö- | *o- |
| 45. | u- < *u- | wu- < *u- | *u- | *ü- | *ü- | *u- |
| 46. | u- < *u- | ø < ? *ʌ- | *u- | *u- | *u- | *ʊ- |
| 47. | i- < *i- | i- < *i- | *i- | *i- | *i- | *i- |

### 3.4 Absence of prototypical copy-characteristics

Even if it is improbable that basic verbs get copied, it is not impossible. But in such cases, there are still a number of characteristics that can betray a set of copied verbs. They include morphological complexity, semantics and distribution. Code-copying is a likely explanation in cases when the similarity concerns a morphologically complex verb in one language that cannot be analyzed as such in the other language. For instance, the Turkic and Tungusic languages share a cognate verb root reflecting the Leipzig-Jakarta item 73. TAKE (i.e. pTg *al- 'to take, receive' in Even *al-* '1 to

take, receive', Evk. *al-* '1', Neg. *al-* '1', Solon *ali-* '1', Orok *alị-* '1', Na. *alị-* '1', Olcha *alu:-* '2 to give, hand over ', Oroch *alo:-* '2', Ud. *ali-* '1', *alu-* '2', Sibe *iali-* '1', Ma. *ali-* '1', Jur. *ali-* '2' and pTk **al-* 'to take' in OT *al-* 'to take', Tk. *al-*, Tkm. *al-*, Az. *al-*, Gag. *al-*, Uz. *ɔl-*, Uig. *al*, Tat. *al-*, S-Yug. *al-*, Kirg. *al-*, Kaz. *al-*, Nog. *al-*, Bash. *al-*, Balk. *al-*, Karaim *al-*, Kpak. *al-*, Salar *al-*, Kum. *al-*, Khak. *al-*, Shor *al-*, Tuva *al-*, Tofa. *al-*, Yak. *ɨl-*, Dolg. *ɨl-*, Khalaj *al-*, Chu. *il-*) The Mongolic languages reflect an imperative form 'give!', notably WMo *ali*, Khal. *aĺ*, *aliv*, Bur. *aĺe:*, Kalm. *aĺ*, *aĺə*, Ordos *ali*, Dong. *ali*, Bao. *an* and Mgr. *ali*. This situation represents a typical case of code-copying, whereby a verb form is only copied in one inflected form, namely the imperative, but does not reflect a complete verbal paradigm.

A second example is the correspondence between Ma. *amila-* 'to anoint a Buddhist icon's eyes with blood and thereby impart life to it' and WMo. *amila-* 'to give live, enliven, animate an image by making strokes on a sacred image, come to life' (Rozycki 1994: 5, 17-18). The Mongolian verb is a denominal derivation from WMo. *ami(n)* 'life, breath' with the manipulative suffix WMo. *-lA-* (Robbeets 2015: 221-222). The derivation holds for Mongolian but not for Manchu because the basic nominal form is absent there. The unparalleled morphological complexity of the Mongolic form in Manchu is indicative of code-copying. The observation that Manchu semantics is restricted to a Buddhistic cultural context further confirms the borrowing scenario of a complex Mongolian verb into Manchu.

Another example of sharing only secondary semantics is the correspondence between Manchu *tala-* 'to confiscate, seize property as a legal punishment' and the Mongolic and Turkic verbs for 'to plunder' (pMo **tala-* 'to plunder' in WMo. *tala-* 'to take away, confiscate, plunder, ruin', (SH) MMo. *tala-* '1 to rob, plunder', Khal. *tala-* 'to rob, confiscate', Kalm. *talə-* '1', Ordos *tala-* '1', Dag. *tale-* '1' and pTk **tala-* 'to plunder, harm' in OT *tala-* 'to damage, pillage', Karakhanide *tala-* '1 to pillage, plunder', Tk. *tala-* '1', Tat. *tala-* '1', MTk. *tala-* '1', Uz. *tala-* '1', Uig. *tala-* '1', Az. *tala-* '1', Tkm. *ta:la-* '1', Khak. *tala-* '1', Chu. *tula-* 'harm, slander', Yakut *tala:-* '1', Kirg. *tala-* '1', Kaz. *tala-* '1', Nog. *tala-* '1', Bash. *tala-* '1', Karaim *tala-* '1', KKalp. *tala-* '1', pTk **tala-* 'to plunder, harm'). The verb MMo. *tala-* occurs in the *Secret History* with the meaning 'rob, plunder'. Only later, within the context of Mongolian customary law, it developed the meaning 'confiscate', which is reflected in Khal. *tala-* 'rob, confiscate'. The Manchu verb *tala-* 'confiscate, seize property as a legal punishment' is restricted to this secondary, culturally specific meaning (Doerfer 1965: 543). This observation indicates that *tala-* is a copy from Mongolian into Manchu. The restricted distribution of the verb root in Tungusic further confirms the borrowing scenario. Apart from Ma. *tala-* 'confiscate, seize property as a legal punishment', Evenki and Even have *tala:-* 'rob, plunder, take away' (Cincius 1977: 156). The North-Tungusic verbs are thought to have been copied from Yakut *tala:-* 'rob, pillage, plunder' (Malchukov 2003: 246).

It can be noted that the distribution of the Japonic cognates in the Ryukyuan languages reduces the probability of borrowing of the verbs from Korean at a time when Mainland Japanese had already separated from the Ryukyuan languages and was spoken on the Mainland.



### 3.6 Broken contact chain

Code-copying is typically unidirectional and linear, progressing from one contact language into the other and then, perhaps, into the next. Genealogical divergence, by contrast, can be pictured as the rings formed when a stone is thrown into the water: innovations start in the center and push the older forms towards the periphery. This observation explains why some very conservative inherited items leave traces in remote areas, but are barely attested elsewhere in the linguistic continuum. Thus, gaps in the attestation of members of an etymology may be relevant. When the contact chain is broken, a genealogical explanation presents itself. The absence of a corresponding verb in one or more intermediate contact languages can be observed in 46 TO BITE, 55 TO BURN, 62 TO HEAR, 77 THICK, 87 TO CRY/WEEP and 99 HARD.

### 3.7 Multiple setting

Most examples of borrowed verbs have a binary setting in common: they typically go from a model language into a recipient language. Examples of the same verb progressing into a third or fourth language are relatively rare, except in prestige settings where one language serves as a lingua franca or dominates many others. The English verb *to film*, for instance, has been exported to many other languages such as German / Dutch *filmen*, French *filmer*, Polish *filmować*, Greek *filmaro*, Hungarian *filmez*, Finnish *filmata* etc. The Transeurasian languages consist of 5 families and, based on the archeological records, do not reflect a unilateral prestige relationship. Hence, it is unlikely that the 13 sets of common basic verbs above should be accounted for by code-copying.

## 4. Conclusion

In this article, I examined sets of basic verbs shared between the Transeurasian languages and weighed code-copying against cognacy as a possible historical motivation for the observed similarities. For this purpose, I advanced 13 etymologies for basic verbs and verbal adjectives, for which the reconstructed meaning of the proto-Transeurasian verb is an item of the Leipzig-Jakarta list. I required the etymologies to reflect cognates in at least three out of the five Transeurasian branches.

It is safer to attribute the similarities among the basic verbs to common ancestorship than it is to attribute them to code-copying. The indications of genetic continuity are the following: (1) the hierarchical tendency that nouns are more easily and frequently copied than verbs, (2) the overall stability of basic vocabulary, (3) the typological feature that the Transeurasian languages display a clear preference for the non-verbal strategy of verbal copying, (4) the absence of characetristics prototypical for borrowed verbs such as poor distribution, morphological complexity and

only secondary semantics in common, (5) the regularity of the sound correspondences for each subsequent consonant and vowel of the root, except the root-final vowel, (6) the absence of a corresponding verb in one or more intermediate languages in the presumed contact chain and (7) the multiple occurrence of a cognate, simultaneously in three or more branches. By consequence, it becomes increasingly difficult to explain the basic verbs as copies, all the way from Turkic into Japanese. For all the shared properties across the Transeurasian languages that are induced by contact, I cannot but attribute the cognates discussed here to common ancestorship.

## Abbreviations

| | |
|---|---|
| Az. | Azerbaijanian |
| Bao. | Bao'an |
| Bash. | Bashkir |
| Bur. | Buriat |
| Chu. | Chuvash |
| Dag. | Dagur |
| Dolg. | Dolgan |
| Dong. | Dongxiang (Santa) |
| Evk. | Evenki (Tungus, Ch. Elunchun) |
| J | (standard Tokyo) Japanese |
| Jur. | Jurchen |
| K | (standard Seoul) Korean |
| Kalm. | Kalmuk |
| Kaz. | Kazakh |
| Khal. | Khalkha |
| Khak. | Khakas |
| Kirg. | Kirgiz |
| Kpak | Karakalpak |
| Kum. | Kumyk |
| Ma. | Manchu |
| MK | Middle Korean |
| MMo. | Middle Mongolian |
| Mgr. | Monguor |
| Mogh. | Moghol |
| Na. | Nanai (Goldi, Ch. Hezhe) |
| Neg. | Negidal |
| Nog. | Nogai |
| OJ | Old Japanese |
| Olch. | Olcha (Ulcha, Ulchi, Olchi) |
| OT | Old Turkic |
| pJ | proto-Japonic |
| pK | proto-Koreanic |
| pMo | proto-Mongolic |
| pR | proto-Ryukyuan |
| pTg | proto-Tungusic |
| pTk | proto-Turkic |
| SH | Secret History of the Mongolians |
| Sol. | Solon |
| Tat. | (Volga) Tatar |
| Tk. | Turkish |
| Tkm. | Turkmen |
| Tof. | Tofalar |
| Ud. | Udehe (Ude, Udege) |
| Uigh. | Uighur |
| Uz. | Uzbek |
| WMo. | Written Mongolian |
| Yak. | Yakut |



## References


Bisang, Walter 1998. Structural similarities of clause combining in Turkic, Mongolian, Manchu-Tungusic and Japanese. A typological alternative to the hypothesis of a genetic relationship. In: Johanson, Lars (ed.) *The Mainz meeting. Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 199–223.

Cincius, Vera I. (ed.) 1975/1977. *Sravnitel'nyj slovar' tunguso-man'čžurskich jazykov*. 2 vol. Moscow: Nauk.

Doerfer, Gerhard 1963–1975. *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung älterer neupersischer Geschichtsquellen, vor allem der Mongolen- und Timuridenzeit*. 4 vol. Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Fabre, André 1982. Comparaison typologique du Japonais et du Coréen. *Langages* 68, 124–141.

Hattori, Shirō 1980. The vowel system of Old Japanese and its vowel harmony in relation to those of Korean and the Altaic languages. In: *Mélanges offerts à M. Charles Haguenauer en l' honneur de son 80 ième anniversaire*. Paris: l'Asiathèque. 31–38.

Hayashi, Tōru 1985. Türkçe ve Japonca işaret zamirleri üzerine. In: *Beşinci Milletler Arası Türkoloji Kongresi 5*. Istanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi. 131–138.

Irwin, Mark 2011. *Loanwords in Japanese*. (Studies in Language Companion Series 125.) Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Janhunen, Juha 2007. Typological expansion in the Ural-Altaic belt. *Incontri Linguistici* 30, 71–84.

Johanson, Lars 1992. *Strukturelle Faktoren in türkischen Sprachkontakten*. (Sitzungsberichte der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der J. W. Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main. 29, 5.) Stuttgart: Steiner.

Johanson, Lars 1996. Altaische Postterminalia. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungarica* 49, 257–276.

Johanson, Lars 2002. *Structural factors in Turkic language contacts*. Richmond: Curzon.

Johanson, Lars & Robbeets, Martine 2010. Introduction. In: Johanson, Lars & Robbeets, Martine (eds.) *Transeurasian verbal morphology in a comparative perspective: genealogy, contact, chance*. (Turcologica 78.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 1–5.

Malchukov, Andrej 2003. Russian interference in Tungusic languages in an areal-typological perspective. In: Ureland, Sture (ed.) *Studies in Eurolinguistics 1. Convergence and divergence of European languages*. Berlin: Logos. 235–251.

Matras, Yaron 2009. *Language contact*. Cambridge: University Press.

Miyake, Marc Hideo 1997. Pre-Sino-Korean and Pre-Sino-Japanese: Reexamining an old Problem from a modern perspective. *Japanese Korean Linguistics* 6, 179–211.

Moravcsik, Edith 1975. Borrowed verbs. *Wiener Linguistische Gazette* 8, 3–30.

Moravcsik, Edith 1978. Language contact. In: Greenberg, Joseph G. (ed.) 1978. *Universals of human language*. Vol 1. *Method & theory*. Stanford: University Press. 93–122.

Poppe, Nicholas 1954. *Grammar of written Mongolian*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Poppe, Nicholas 1964. Der altaische Sprachtyp. In: Spuler, B. & al. (eds.) *Handbuch der Orientalistik. Band 5: Altaistik. Abschnitt 2: Mongolistik*. Leiden: Brill. 1–16.

Rickmeyer, Jens 1989. Japanisch und der altaische Sprachtyp. Eine Synopsis struktureller Entsprechungen. *Bochumer Jahrbuch zur Ostasienforschung* 12, 313–323.

Robbeets, Martine 2005. *Is Japanese related to Korean, Tungusic, Mongolic and Turkic?* (Turcologica 64.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Robbeets, Martine 2015. *Diachrony of verb morphology: Japanese and the Transeurasian languages*. (Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 291.) Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Robbeets, Martine (forthcoming). The Transeurasian languages. In: Hickey, Raymond (ed.) *The Cambridge handbook of areal linguistics* (Cambridge Handbooks in Language and Linguistics.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rozycki, William 1994. *Mongol elements in Manchu*. Bloomington: Indiana University Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies.

Schönig, Claus 1994. Relativsatzbautypen in den sogenannten altaischen Sprachen. *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 46, 327–338.

Shibata, Takeshi 1979. Some syntactic similarities between Turkish, Korean, and Japanese. *Central Asiatic Journal* 23, 293–296.

Swadesh, Morris 1955. Towards greater accuracy in lexicostatistic dating. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 21, 121–137.

Tadmor, Uri & Haspelmath, Martin & Taylor, Bradley 2010. Borrowability and the notion of basic vocabulary. *Diachronica* 27, 226–246.

van der Hulst, Harry & Smith, Norval 1988. Tungusic and Mongolian vowel harmony: a minimal pair. In: Coopmans, Peter & Hulk, Aafke (eds.) *Linguistics in the Netherlands*. Dordrecht: Fortis Publications. 79–88.

Wichmann, Søren & Wohlgemuth, Jan 2008. Loan verbs in a typological perspective. In: Stolz, Thomas & Palomo, Rosa & Bakker, Dik (eds.) *Aspects of language contact. New theoretical, methodological and empirical findings with special focus on romancisation processes*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 89–121.

Wohlgemuth, Jan 2009. *A typology of verbal borrowings*. (Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 211.) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

## Acknowledgement

This article is written with the support of the Humboldt Foundation, providing the facilities for my research fellowship at the Seminar für Orientkunde of the Johannes Gutenberg University of Mainz in 2006-2007. The research leading to these results has further received funding from the European Research Council under the Horizon 2020 Program/ ERC Grant Agreement n. 646612.

# Turkish word order in Germany among children aged 5–10: Evidence from the post-predicate elements

Çiğdem Sağın Şimşek

## 1. Introduction

As a result of the processes of immigration, Turkish has come into contact with many languages in Western Europe, leading to an increase in research on language contact phenomena. So far, many studies have been conducted on the differences between Turkish and the immigrant Turkish spoken in Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, Finland, etc., and it is argued that Turkish in European contexts is subject to change due to its contact with other languages (see Backus 2001 for more information on Turkish in contact with other languages in Europe).

Following these studies, this paper aims to provide a limited observation of changes in Turkish word order in a German context. On the basis of data obtained from both Turkish-German bilingual children and monolingual Turkish children, this paper examines the properties of the post-predicate elements in Turkish-German bilinguals' speech. In particular, the paper argues that the post-predicate elements used by the Turkish-German bilinguals is in the process of gaining new properties, presumably due to language contact phenomena.

## 2. Post-predicate elements in Turkish

In terms of its word order, Turkish exhibits the features of an object-verb language and is considered to have SOV typology (with V to be understood more generally as a "predicate") (Göksel & Kerslake 2005; Kornfilt 1997; Csató & Johanson 1998). This canonical SOV order is, however, open to variations in actual usage for various communicative functions. It often occurs, especially in spoken discourse, that certain constituents are placed after the predicate, forming Inverted Word Order constructions (henceforth IWO) (Erdal 1999; Yükseker 2002).

In Turkish the post-predicate position is the position associated with background information. A large number of the post-predicate elements are considered as discourse predictable (old information) and have various pragmatic functions (Erguvanlı 1984; Ruhi 1992; Kornfilt 1994; Göksel & Kerslake 2005). These functions are: