

# DOWNLOAD PDF SELKUP TEXTS WITH PHONETIC INTRODUCTION AND VOCABULARY (URALIC AND ALTAIC SERIES)

## Chapter 1 : Uralic languages - Linguistic characteristics | calendrierdelascience.com

*Selkup Texts With Phonetic Introduction and Vocabulary (Uralic and Altaic Series) [Laszlo Szabo] on calendrierdelascience.com \*FREE\* shipping on qualifying offers. First published in Routledge is an imprint of Taylor & Francis, an informa company.*

Moreover, Strahlenberg did not express the idea of ainity explicitly and he only compared a few words appended in a table to his work Jankowski. However, while he stressed that the ainity of Uralic languages was proven, he argued that the relationship of the Turkic, Mongolian and Manchu-Tungusic languages must be resolved in the future. Kim Juwon and Ko Dongho eds. *Current Trends in Altaic Linguistics: Altaic Society of Korea*, On recapitulating his first series of contributions to Altaic studies which consisted of an introduction. The languages of these groups were differentiated and individual tribes started to separate quite. *Altaic Languages and Historical Contact* early Kotwicz. He stressed that language contacts were more intensive between the Mongols and Turks than Tungus peoples who inhabited a territory more remote from them. Kotwicz says that the existence of a common Altaic language is doubtful. Kotwicz. As for Korean, Kotwicz is of an opinion that Korean remained in contact with southern Tungusic in the north and with Mongolian in the north and east, though it is a separate language. The relation of Korean to hypothetical Altaic is therefore similar to Hungarian which absorbed many Turkic components. Kotwicz. *Assessment of Altaic hypothesis*. The Altaic hypothesis has some weak points. Secondly, the Altaic hypothesis has not traced the history of Altaic and has not proposed a sound periodisation. Most importantly, it has not given a thorough reconstruction of Altaic. I start this discussion without any a priori thesis, though I believe that in addition to linguistic criteria we need to resort to history and archaeology. When debating on the validity of Altaic, we should keep in mind that not the number of reconstructed words, but their character and the correctness of reconstruction methods is essential. Some advocates of Altaic theory, referring to Collinder and Aalto, stress that the number of common words that go back to the Indo-European origin in Swedish and Greek is very low. Miller. As we can see, the low number of reconstructed words does not invalidate a hypothesis. When we assess the Altaic hypothesis, it is not correct to neglect Korean. At this point it is essential to stress a different perspective between the study in the East which links Altaic with Korean and sometimes with Japanese, and the West where the researchers link it rather to Uralic languages. Janhunen. Korean is closer to Tungusic than Turkic and the study on Korean should first focus on Tungusic languages. Naturally a better and safer way is to limit the discussion to two neighbouring groups which are or were in mutual linguistic. *Altaic Languages and Historical Contact* relations, that is Turkic with Mongolian, Mongolian with Tungusic and Tungusic with Korean. However, by doing so we restrict, if not drop the concept of Altaic. In fact, the debate on the Altaic hypothesis is so difficult that some scholars just keep away from it. It is quite indicative that the Altaic hypothesis received only seven pages and a half in the otherwise excellent introduction by Rachewiltz and Rybatzki. *Altaic homeland*. It is evident that the Altaic Mountains may not be the territory of a hypothetical Altaic language since this region is unsuitable for larger human groups to contact. However, the valleys of the rivers are good enough to live in them. In fact the Altai Mountains were inhabited by the man as early as the Upper Palaeolithic. Human settlements in Altai are better known from 21â€”20 millennia. Okladnikov. It is this culture that gives the first evidence of copper and bronze tools and utensils. Okladnikov. Much better known Altai culture is the Pazyryk Iron Age culture, formerly dated to the 6thâ€”2nd centuries BC and attributed to the Scythians. These cultures are tentatively identified with the Scythians or the Sakas, but 4. Some researchers provide different periods, e. It was already Ramstedt who realised the unsuitability of the term Altai and the Altai region for the homeland of Turkic, Mongolian and Tungusic peoples. Thus Altay would barely be the western border of the Altaic homeland. As is known, the origin of the Xiongnu is still a debatable question. There were attempts to relate the Xiongnu language or at least the language spoken by the leading ethnic group of the Xiongnu to Turkic, Mongolian, Iranian, recently also to Yeniseian. Vovin. *Altaic*

## DOWNLOAD PDF SELKUP TEXTS WITH PHONETIC INTRODUCTION AND VOCABULARY (URALIC AND ALTAIC SERIES)

Languages and Historical Contact In short, the adherents of the Altaic hypothesis should offer the idea of a territory where the common Altaic language could have been spoken. An alternative to the idea of a static Altaic homeland may be the idea of a few changing regions of areal contacts. We may accept a large area of contacts which spans the territory north of the Great Chinese Wall in the east and East Europe in the west.

Hypothetical Altaic language and its history In general, the theories which establish proto-languages have a weakness related to time – the established proto-languages are dated not earlier than the Neolithic Age. When discussing the time of the hypothetical emergence of Altaic, we can draw a parallel to the Uralic languages. However, before discussing some aspects of lexical correspondences, it is worthy of stressing that the similarities between the Altaic languages rest in phonetics, morphology and syntax, while the vocabulary evidences common elements in culture words, title and rank names, and synsemantic functional words, which are clear products of language contact. For example, many Korean words in Ramstedt are compared with Tungusic languages, but Current Trends in Altaic Linguistics Mongolian and Turkic correspondences are lacking. Another weakness lies in selecting correspondences among culture words. Another problem with Korean is the reading of Chinese characters in which Korean texts were written. It is not my aim to discredit the Altaic reconstruction and comparisons done by Ramstedt and Poppe, but it must be said that many correspondences proposed by them are unacceptable. From the 1950s on, there has been much criticism against the Altaicists, e.g. However, the critics also committed mistakes. In his case against the Altaic theory, Clauson set up two lists of hundred words of the hypothetical basic vocabulary and tried to prove that basic words in Turkic, Mongolian and Tungusic languages are unrelated and therefore, these languages may not go back to a common origin. For example, he argued that Trk. He exemplified his claim with the English word head which semantically corresponds to German Kopf, but which etymologically should be linked to German Haupt Ligeti

The weakness of Altaic reconstructions is even more evident from the works of later Altaicists, e.g. For example, in Dybo there are both phonetical, morphological and historical shortcomings. While the former proto-word is supposed to yield Trk. Leaving aside the question of the semantical problem with the former word Mong. The period of hypothetical Altaic is usually assumed to last between 4, and 3, BC. However, the question remains if this word originated from a common Altaic word and developed into the forms as above or spread from Trk. This word has neither Mongolian nor Tungusic equivalents. The Tungusic equivalents of the Trk. The attempt to look for a common Altaic origin of the Trk. This word has a clear Turkic etymology, it is derived from topra-, according to Clauson

The next important group of words is metal terminology which is crucial to Bronze and Iron Age cultures. However, accepting the existing periodisation, one must be aware that the terms for metals have been coined or borrowed after the dissolution of Altaic and may only be regarded as culture words. Therefore, it may not be an Altaic word. It is not used in Mongolian and the extant evidence in Oirat is doubtful Rybatzki

The last term which is evidenced in all Altaic languages is Trk. The form in Mongolian speaks in favour of a loanword, which probably spread among the Turk. However, on the other hand the lack of this word in Altaic does not invalidate the existence of such a common language, since iron – identically to bronze and copper – was unknown then. Therefore, such words as Trk. The etymology of Trk. It is derived from the Trk. However, this may be just another name of an identical object. With the present methods we cannot reconstruct the languages spoken earlier, because in the Mesolithic and Palaeolithic Ages the size of the extant human groups, their migration and their communication system were totally different from those in the Neolithic Age. However, this is not a single opinion. Some scholars date the beginning of anatomically modern man to 40,000 years ago and judging upon such cultures as Cro-Magnon, they assume the start of behavioural modernity at about 43,000 years ago. Archaeologists have proved that in the Middle Palaeolithic period the same culture of Mousterian type as in Europe existed on the Yenisei and in Mongolia Okladnikov

Human settlements dated to the period of the Upper Palaeolithic existed in the valley of the Orkhon river near Karakorum Okladnikov

Among the Palaeolithic population of Siberia and Mongolia there were artists who produced cave paintings e.g. It is therefore an unquestionable fact that we have to do with modern man who certainly was able to speak. This culture shows first Mongoloid features. After the glacial period in the

## DOWNLOAD PDF SELKUP TEXTS WITH PHONETIC INTRODUCTION AND VOCABULARY (URALIC AND ALTAIC SERIES)

Mesolithic and Neolithic ages we can reckon with domestic cattle breeding in Mongolia Okladnikov Naturally, we have no proof to extend the beginning of the established proto-languages such as Proto-Uralic to such an early dates, there are no grounds for that. However, we should ask if the languages in earlier ages were really completely different. It is supposed that in Siberia and Mongolia there existed areas of intensive language contacts at least in the Neolithic Puszta Recent studies demonstrated that many common words once thought to be inherited from a common proto-language are in fact later loanwords which were borrowed due to language contacts. For example, a lot of words common for Mongolian and Turkic were identified as Turkic loanwords Clark These words pertain to such semantic fields as horses, falconry, arms and clothing Lee The Ancient Turkic, Mongol and Tungus languages were spoken in the areas where they were in contact with other languages. We can indicate a few areas of this type. For instance, if we take 14 For earlier studies on Old and Middle Turkic loanwords in Mongolian, see the references in Clark The notion ancient language which is a stage in the development of a language preceding its old stage called old language should not be confused with with the notion proto-language which is the first stage of the historical development of a language. In most cases, both ancient languages and proto-languages are hypothetical, reconstructed structures. For those languages which are the established offshoots of a proto- family such as Proto-Indo-European or Proto-Uralic, we do not normally apply the proto- prefix for a single language. However, such languages as the latter are reconstructed from all known or recorded daughter languages, while a proto-language which does not have an established family must be reconstructed from its old stage. Needless to say, proto-languages were also in contact with other proto- languages. In the case of many languages without a written tradition, including Turkic, Mongolian and Tungusic, we may only speak of their old or even middle periods. Moreover, some modern languages are assumed or established as newly emerged languages that have their roots in another language, cf. It is evident that before we reconstruct Ancient Turkic, Ancient Mongol, Ancient Tungus and the question of Altaic, we cannot discuss the contacts of Altaic with other languages. In the following, I will discuss some issues related to the contacts of these languages with Ancient Samoyedic.

## DOWNLOAD PDF SELKUP TEXTS WITH PHONETIC INTRODUCTION AND VOCABULARY (URALIC AND ALTAIC SERIES)

### Chapter 2 : Altaic languages - Wikipedia

Full text of "Selkup Texts with Phonetic Introduction and Vocabulary" See other formats 20 Selkup Texts 1. *tabe\*k mat one'k tul'de^p tawee\*j;ap, one\*k tabe \* p gaj{ee\* gap, one'k mooyne\* gagle, Iggrak, one\*k tabe \* t qooby\*mdg n'iijglee\*be.*

The distribution of Uralic languages Establishment of the family Determining the geographic location, material culture , and linguistic characteristics of the earliest stages of Uralic at a period thousands of years prior to any historical record is a problem beset with enormous difficulties; consensus among Uralic scholars is limited to a handful of general hypotheses. The original homeland of Proto-Uralic is considered to have been in the vicinity of the north-central Urals , possibly centred west of the mountains. Following the dissolution of Uralic, the precursors of the Samoyeds gradually moved northward and eastward into Siberia. The Finno-Ugrians moved to the south and west, to an area close to the confluence of the Kama and Volga rivers. Shared cognates Several kinds of indirect evidence support the above supposition. One approach attempts to reconstruct the natural environment of these groups on the basis of shared cognates related words for plants, animals, and minerals and on the distribution of these words in the modern languages. Because the range of this type of fir tree is restricted to more northern climates , it is generally assumed that the widespread consistent association of the name and the tree suggests a period in which Proto-Uralic was spoken within that zone. Several other terms for plants e. The central Volga location of Proto-Finno-Ugric is strongly supported by an abundance of shared terminology dealing with beekeeping , which constitutes a significant part of the culture of this region. Contacts with unrelated languages A second approach to determining the location of Proto-Uralic is based on contacts with other, unrelated languages as evidenced by loanwords from one group to the other. Early Finno-Ugric borrowed numerous terms from very early dialects of Indo-European. Though these words are entirely lacking from the Samoyed languages, within the Finno-Ugric division they are shared by the most remotely related members and show the same phonetic relationships as the native Finno-Ugric vocabulary. Examples include agricultural and apicultural terminology e. The distribution of the daughter languages The central Volga origin hypothesis is also supported by the geographic distribution of the daughter languages. Except for Hungarian, which moved westward across the steppes, the Finno-Ugric languages form two chains distributed along major waterways, with the confluence of the Kama and Volga at their centre. One chain extends northward along the Kama , across the northern tip of the Urals into the Ob watershed, then southward along the Ob and its tributaries. The second extends to the northeast along the Volga to the Gulf of Finland. The extinct Merya, Murom , and Meshcher languages were once links in this chain. Finally, assumptions about the more distant relationships of Uralic have influenced views concerning its original location. Earlier, proponents of the Ural-Altai hypothesis tended to place the Uralic homeland in south-central Siberia , near the sources of the Ob and the Yenisey , but there is no substantive support for this view. Current distribution The Finno-Ugric languages are represented today by some 20 languages scattered over an immense Eurasian territory. In the west they include the European national languages Hungarian , Finnish , and Estonian as well as the Sami or Lapp languages, the westernmost members of the group, spoken by numerous distinct communities across the northern Scandinavian Peninsula from central Norway to the White Sea. The remaining Finno-Ugric languages are located in the Baltic countries and in Russia , all formerly republics of the Soviet Union , with one major concentrationâ€™ which includes Estonian, Livonian, Votic, Karelian, and Vepsâ€™ extending from the Gulf of Riga to the Kola Peninsula. The Mordvin and Mari languages are found in the central Volga region; from there extending northward along river courses west of the Urals are the Permic languages â€™Udmurt, Komi Zyryan , and Permyak or Komi-Permyak. East of the Urals, along the Ob River and its tributaries, are the easternmost representatives of the Finno-Ugric groupâ€™ Mansi and Khanty. The largely nomadic Samoyeds are sparsely distributed over an enormous area extending inward from the Arctic shores of Russia from the White Sea in the west to Khatanga Bay in central Siberia in

## DOWNLOAD PDF SELKUP TEXTS WITH PHONETIC INTRODUCTION AND VOCABULARY (URALIC AND ALTAIC SERIES)

the east. Nenets, the westernmost of these languages, reaches eastward to the mouth of the Yenisey River and includes a small insular group on Novaya Zemlya. Speakers of Enets are located in the region of the upper Yenisey. The lower half of the Taymyr Peninsula is the habitat of the Nganasan, the easternmost of the Uralic groups. The fourth language, Selkup, lies to the south in a region between the central Ob and central Yenisey; its major representation is located between Turukhansk and the Taz River. A fifth Samoyedic language, Kamas Sayan, spoken in the vicinity of the Sayan Mountains, survived into the 20th century but is now extinct. Yukaghir is represented by two small language groups designated Tundra and Kolyma in far northeastern Siberia, between the tundra east of the Alazeya River and the upper tributaries of the Kolyma. The political history of the various Uralic groups largely has been one of resisting encroachment from adjacent European especially Germanic and Slavic and Turkic groups and from other Uralic neighbours. Only the three largest and westernmost groups—Hungary, Finland, and Estonia—have succeeded in achieving political independence. The political status of the Uralic groups within Russia generally reflects their demographic significance. The five largest minority groups, with populations ranging from , to almost 1., speakers, are centred in the largely autonomous republics of Mordoviya, Mari El, Udmurtiya, Komi, and Karelia. Four other groups possess autonomy to a lesser degree: The Sami, who are widely distributed across four countries Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Russia, have achieved only local political recognition. A number of the smaller Uralic language communities, such as Votic, face extinction through cultural assimilation. Because the names designating many of the Uralic peoples have never been standardized, a wide range of appellations is encountered in references to these groups. Earlier designations, especially in the case of the groups in Russia, tended to be taken from derogatory names used by neighbouring peoples. See table for the names in use. Standard usage is in the left column, and earlier, Russian-based forms are in parentheses. The name that the group uses for itself and certain other information, such as Russian and Old Russian forms, are in the right column. Languages of the family The two major branches of Uralic are themselves composed of numerous subgroupings of member languages on the basis of closeness of linguistic relationship. Finno-Ugric can first be divided into the most distantly related Ugric and Finnic sometimes called Volga-Finnic groups, which may have separated as long ago as five millennia. Within these, three relatively closely related groups of languages are found: The Permic group consists of Komi, Permyak, and Udmurt. The Ob-Ugric group includes Mansi and Khanty. The Ugric group comprises the geographically most distant members of the family—the Hungarian and Ob-Ugric languages. Finnic contains the remaining languages: There is little accord on the further subclassification of the Finnic languages, although the fairly close relationship between Baltic-Finnic and Sami is generally recognized and is called North Finnic; the degree of separation between the two may be compared to that between English and German. Mordvin has most frequently been linked with Mari a putative Volga language group, but comparative evidence also suggests a bond with Baltic-Finnic and Sami that is, West Finnic. The extinct Merya, Murom, and Meshcher tongues, known only from Old Russian chronicles, are assumed to have been spoken by Finnic peoples and, from their geographic location northwest of Mordvin, must have belonged to West Finnic. One hypothesis for the internal relationships of the Uralic family as a whole is given in the figure. Family tree diagram of the Uralic languages, including their probable relationship to Yukaghir. The precursor of the modern Samoyedic languages is thought to have divided near the beginning of the 1st century ce into a northern and a southern group. North Samoyedic consists of Nenets, Enets, and Nganasan. South Samoyedic contains a single living language, Selkup, and numerous other dialects now extinct: Ugric Hungarian Hungarian, the official language of Hungary, remains the primary language of the fertile Carpathian Basin. Bounded by the Carpathian Mountains to the north, east, and southwest, the Hungarian language area is represented by several million speakers outside the boundaries of Hungary—mostly in Romanian Transylvania and in Slovakia. To the south a substantial Hungarian population extends into Croatia and Serbia, and other large Hungarian populations exist in Austria and Ukraine. Hungarian emigrant communities are found in many parts of the world, especially in North America, Israel, and Australia. The ancestors of the Hungarians, following their separation from the other Ugric tribes,

## DOWNLOAD PDF SELKUP TEXTS WITH PHONETIC INTRODUCTION AND VOCABULARY (URALIC AND ALTAIC SERIES)

moved south into the steppe region below the Urals. As mounted nomads, in contact with and often in alliance with Turkic tribes, they moved westward, reaching and conquering the sparsely settled Carpathian Basin in the period 896–905. Concern for a common literary medium, closely tied with Hungarian nationalism, began in the late 18th century. More recent foreign influences on the language were suppressed and replaced by native words and constructions. The literary form received a broad dialect base, facilitating its use as a national language. Modern Hungarian has eight major dialects, which permit a high degree of mutual intelligibility. One of the earliest recorded references to the Hungarians, a Byzantine geographic survey of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus; died entitled *De administrando imperio*, lists the *megyer* as one of the Hungarian tribes, but, as was typical in early reports, the Hungarians were not distinguished from their Turkish allies. Khanty and Mansi Widely dispersed along the Ob River and its tributaries, the so-called Ob-Ugric peoples, the Khanty and the Mansi, are among the least demographically significant of the Finno-Ugric groups. Although the Khanty have decreased in number over the past few centuries, their language is still maintained by about 9, speakers census. The Mansi, by contrast, had only some 12, ethnic representatives by the early 21st century; of these, fewer than 1, claimed Mansi as their mother tongue. To a large extent both groups have been assimilated by their Russian and Tatar neighbours. It is likely that the precursors of the Ob-Ugric tribes were still centred west of the Urals well within historic times, long after the division of Proto-Ugric into distinct languages. The Russian Primary Chronicle of Nestor, which assigned to the Khanty and Mansi the common name *jugra*, places them in the vicinity of the Pechora River in 939; they did not shift to the Ob waterways until several centuries later. Both groups live for the most part within the Khanty-Mansi autonomous okrug, which has its administrative centre in Khanty-Mansiysk at the confluence of the Ob and Irtysh rivers. The Khanty are concentrated along the Ob and its eastern tributaries, while the Mansi are found along the western tributaries primarily north of the Irtysh and just east of the Urals; a few Mansi speakers are also found in the Arctic lands west of the Urals. Because of the great distances between the various groups, the dialects of both languages show considerable divergence. They are usually designated by the name of the river on which they are spoken. Mansi has four main dialect groups, of which one Tavda is practically extinct and another Konda is spoken only by individuals above a certain age. The largest dialect group Northern is centred on the Sosva and serves as the basis for the literary language. Khanty is divided into three main dialects: Literary Khanty has been based primarily on the northern group, but standardization remains weak, and since other dialects have also been used. Both of the Ob-Ugric languages first appeared in printed form in 1711 as a result of Gospel translations published in London, but it was not until after the formation of their autonomous okrug in 1928 that any sort of literary form of either language really existed. Until numerous books were published using a modified Latin roman alphabet; since then Cyrillic has been used. Some elementary education is conducted in the native languages within the okrug. Finnic Finnish Finnish, together with Swedish an unrelated North Germanic language, serves as a national language of Finland. It is now spoken by more than 5.3 million people, including about 95 percent of the inhabitants of Finland plus some 1 million Finns in North America, Sweden, and Russia. Finnish as the common language of the Finns is not the direct descendant of one of the original Baltic-Finnic dialects; rather, it arose through the interaction of several separate groups in the territory of modern Finland. Early Russian chronicles refer to these as *jemj*, *sumj*, and *korela*. The intermixture of the three groups is still reflected in the distribution of the five main modern dialects, which form a western and an eastern area. The Finnish word for their land and their language is *suomi*, the original meaning of which is uncertain. The province of Norwegian Lapland is called Finnmark. Finnish was accorded official status in 1809, when Finland entered the Russian Empire after six centuries of Swedish domination. Estonian Estonian serves as the official language of Estonia, located immediately south of Finland across the Gulf of Finland. Most of the more than 1.1 million speakers of Estonian live within Estonia, but others can be found in Russia, North America, and Sweden. Modern Estonian is the descendant of one or possibly two of the original Baltic-Finnic dialects. The modern language has two major dialects, a northern one, which is spoken in most of the country, and a southern one, which extends from Tartu to the south.

## DOWNLOAD PDF SELKUP TEXTS WITH PHONETIC INTRODUCTION AND VOCABULARY (URALIC AND ALTAIC SERIES)

### Chapter 3 : Uralic & Altaic Book Series | The Sinor Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies

*Enter your mobile number or email address below and we'll send you a link to download the free Kindle App. Then you can start reading Kindle books on your smartphone, tablet, or computer - no Kindle device required.*

The idea that the Turkic, Mongolic, and Tungusic languages are closely related was allegedly first published in by Philip Johan von Strahlenberg, a Swedish officer who traveled in the eastern Russian Empire while a prisoner of war after the Great Northern War. However, as has been pointed out by Alexis Manaster Ramer and Paul Sidwell, von Strahlenberg actually opposed the idea of a closer relationship among the languages that later became known as "Altaic". For much of the 19th and the early 20th centuries, the theory of a common Uralic-Altaic family was widespread, based on such shared features as vowel harmony and agglutination. However, while the Uralic-Altaic hypothesis can still be found in encyclopedias, atlases, and similar general references, it has generally been abandoned by linguists. For instance, it was characterized by Sergei Starostin as "an idea now completely discarded". Polivanov advocated the inclusion of Korean. Poppe considered the issue of the relationship of Korean to Turkic-Mongolic-Tungusic not settled. Included languages[ edit ] Micro-Altaic includes about 66 living languages, [17] to which Macro-Altaic would add Korean, Japanese and the Ryukyuan languages, for a total of about 74 depending on what is considered a language and what is considered a dialect. An alternative classification, though one with much less currency among Altaicists, was proposed by John C. Street, according to which Turkic-Mongolic-Tungusic forms one grouping and Korean-Japanese-Ainu another, the two being linked in a common family that Street designated as "North Asiatic". The same schema was adopted by James Patrie in the context of an attempt to classify the Ainu language. The Turkic-Mongolic-Tungusic and Korean-Japanese-Ainu groupings were also posited by Joseph Greenberg; however, he treated them as independent members of a larger family, which he termed Eurasiatic. Anti-Altaicists Gerard Clauson, Gerhard Doerfer, and Alexander Shcherbak argued that the words and features shared by Turkic, Mongolic, and Tungusic languages were for the most part borrowings and that the rest could be attributed to chance resemblances. They noted that there was little vocabulary shared by Turkic and Tungusic languages, though more shared with Mongolic languages. They reasoned that, if all three families had a common ancestor, we should expect losses to happen at random and not only at the geographical margins of the family; and that the observed pattern is consistent with borrowing. Furthermore, they argued that many of the typological features of the supposed Altaic languages, such as agglutinative morphology and subject-object-verb SOV word order, usually simultaneously[ clarification needed ] occur in languages. In sum, the idea was that Turkic, Mongolic, and Tungusic languages form a Sprachbund—the result of convergence through intensive borrowing and long contact among speakers of languages that are not necessarily closely related. Doubt was also raised about the affinities of Korean and Japanese; in particular, some authors tried to connect Japanese to the Austronesian languages. Altogether, Starostin concluded that the Altaic grouping was substantiated, though "older than most other language families in Eurasia, such as Indo-European or Finno-Ugric, and this is the reason why the modern Altaic languages preserve few common elements". Unger advocates a family consisting of Tungusic, Korean, and Japonic languages but not Turkic or Mongolic; and Doerfer rejects all the genetic claims over these major groups. According to many scholars it only comprises a small number of monosyllabic lexical roots, including the personal pronouns and a few other deictic and auxiliary items. For these, other possible explanations have also been proposed. It contains 2, proposed cognate sets, a set of sound laws based on those proposed sets, and a number of grammatical correspondences, as well as a few important changes to the reconstruction of Proto-Altaic. It tries hard to distinguish loans between Turkic and Mongolic and between Mongolic and Tungusic from cognates; and it suggests words that occur in Turkic and Tungusic but not in Mongolic. All other combinations between the five branches also occur in the book. The debate continues unabated—e. Georg anti-Altaic; S. According to Roy Andrew Miller Similarity metrics[ edit ] A analysis using the

## DOWNLOAD PDF SELKUP TEXTS WITH PHONETIC INTRODUCTION AND VOCABULARY (URALIC AND ALTAIC SERIES)

Automated Similarity Judgment Program resulted in the Japonic languages being grouped with the Ainu and Austroasiatic languages, but showing no connection to Turkic and Mongolic. Analytic grammatical constructions acquired or transformed in Ainu were likely due to contact with Japanese and the Japonic languages, which had heavy influence on the Ainu languages with a large number of loanwords borrowed into the Ainu languages, and to a smaller extent, vice versa. No genealogical relationship between Ainu and any other language family has been demonstrated, despite numerous attempts. Thus, it is a language isolate. Ainu is sometimes grouped with the Paleosiberian languages, but this is only a geographic blanket term for several unrelated language families that were present in Siberia before the advances of Turkic and Tungusic languages there. Early attestation[ edit ] The earliest known texts in a Turkic language are the Orkhon inscriptions, 6th–8th AD. However, Radloff was the first to publish the inscriptions. The first Tungusic language to be attested is Jurchen, the language of the ancestors of the Manchus. A writing system for it was devised in AD and an inscription using this system is known from see List of Jurchen inscriptions. The earliest Mongolic language of which we have written evidence is known as Middle Mongol. It is first attested by an inscription dated to 1271 AD and by the Secret History of the Mongols, written in 1252 see Mongolic languages. Japanese is first attested in a few short inscriptions from the 5th century AD, such as the Inariyama Sword. The first substantial text in Japanese, however, is the Kojiki, which dates from 712 AD. Ural-Altai The prehistory of the peoples speaking these languages is largely unknown. Whereas for certain other language families, such as the speakers of Indo-European, Uralic, and Austronesian, we are able to frame substantial hypotheses, in the case of the proposed Altaic family much remains to be done. List of Altaicists and critics of Altaic[ edit ] Note: The dates given are those of works concerning Altaic. For Altaicists, the version of Altaic they favor is given at the end of the entry, if other than the prevailing one of Turkic–Mongolic–Tungusic–Korean–Japanese. Common ancestor of Korean, Japanese and traditional Altaic dated back to the 7th or 8th millennium BC Roy Andrew Miller, 1968, 1990, 1997. Supported the inclusion of Korean and Japanese. Turkic–Mongolic–Tungusic and perhaps Korean.

# DOWNLOAD PDF SELKUP TEXTS WITH PHONETIC INTRODUCTION AND VOCABULARY (URALIC AND ALTAIC SERIES)

## Chapter 4 : Negation in Selkup | BeĀĵta Wagner-Nagy

*Uralic & Altaic Book Series. Selkup Texts with Phonetic Introduction and Vocabulary. The Uralic and Altaic Program of the American Council of Learned Societies.*

Bring fact-checked results to the top of your browser search. Linguistic characteristics The linguistic structure of Proto-Uralic has been partially reconstructed by a comparison of the similarities and differences among the known Uralic tongues. Not all existing similarities can be attributed to a common Uralic origin; some may also reflect universal pressures and limitations on language structure e. Phonological characteristics The correspondences of sounds in cognate Uralic words are illustrated in the table. Thus, a p in the beginning of a Finnish word corresponds to f in Hungarian puu: In most of these instances, Finnish has retained the consonants of the Proto-Uralic consonant system. An asterisk marks a form that is not found in any document or living dialect but is reconstructed as having once existed in an earlier stage of a language. Palatalization is the modification of a sound by simultaneous raising of the tongue to or toward the hard palate. By careful examination of such systematic relationships, it is possible to sketch out much of the phonological structure of early Uralic. The reconstructions in the last column of the table are based on the view that the vowel system of Baltic-Finnic is relatively more conservative , whereas the consonant contrasts have been best preserved in Sami. Consonants The following consonant sounds are generally posited for the early stages of Uralic: Hungarian, on the other hand, has a larger number of consonants by virtue of a newly introduced distinction between sounds made with and without vibration of the vocal cords voicing , such as voiceless p, t, s as opposed to voiced b, d, z; e. Vowels Essentially nothing is known of the Proto-Uralic vowels, and there is little agreement about the nature of the Proto-Finno-Ugric vowel system. It is clear, however, that, in contrast to a relatively limited number of consonants, Finno-Ugric must have had a fairly large number of vowels nine to 11 are usually posited. One hypothesis is that the original vowel system was essentially like that of Finnish, which has eight vowel sounds: A second approach posits a Proto-Uralic vowel structure closely resembling that of Khanty, with seven full vowels and three reduced vowels. The early Finno-Ugric system of vowels most likely possessed quantitative vowel contrasts long versus short, or full versus reduced. The possibility of influence by neighbouring languages cannot be ruled out in the case of vowel length, because western Finno-Ugric languages have been in close contact with Slavic and Germanic languages with similar vowel contrasts, and the eastern languages form an areal group among themselves. The remaining languages lack vowel quantity and are in intimate contact with Russian , which has lost the original contrastive vowel quantity of Indo-European. Stress In numerous Uralic languagesâ€”including Finnish , Estonian , Hungarian , and Komi â€”stress is automatically on the first syllable of the word; it is likely that Proto-Uralic also had word-initial stress. Closely related to this initial stress is the apparent severe limitation on early Finno-Ugric noninitial vowels; the full range of contrasts was permitted only in the first syllable. In certain languages, such as Eastern Mari and the Yazva Komi dialect, stress is not bound to a given syllable, and determining the place of stress requires information concerning vowel quality as wellâ€”e. Stress at the end of a word is also foundâ€”e. Nganasan has a mora-counting stress, falling on the third unit of vowel length from the end of the word where short vowels count as one unit, long vowels as two. Vowel harmony Vowel harmony is among the more familiar traits of the modern Uralic languages. Although most Uralic scholars trace this feature back to Proto-Uralic, there is good reason to question this view. Vowel harmony is said to exist when certain vowels cannot occur with other specific vowels within some wider domain, generally within a word. The distinction is marked phonetically by putting two dots over the front vowels. The unrounded front vowels, i and e, may occur with any of the other vowels. Hungarian has essentially the same system, differing only in certain minor details short e is the front vowel counterpart of a â€”e. Frequently confused with the true harmony situations above are partial and total assimilations of vowels in adjacent syllables. These assimilations illustrate a universal tendency of vowel interaction and are of relatively recent origin; they are best held apart from the

## DOWNLOAD PDF SELKUP TEXTS WITH PHONETIC INTRODUCTION AND VOCABULARY (URALIC AND ALTAIC SERIES)

question of vowel harmony. Examples of vowel assimilations abound. Considered from an areal viewpoint, two aspects of Uralic vowel harmony must be considered. First, those languages that show productive or active vowel harmony, with the exception of Baltic-Finnic, have had recent Turkic neighbours whose languages exhibited vowel harmony. For languages such as Mansi and Khanty, dialects with vowel harmony are located close to Tatar groups. The distinction between palatalized and nonpalatalized consonants has the same acoustic basis as the contrast of front and back vowels *i*. Indeed, in Erzya Mordvin, vowel harmony and palatalization appear to be conditioned by essentially the same rules. Instead of seeking a genetic explanation of vowel harmony in Uralic, a somewhat more recent areal origin—in part under Turkic influence—must be considered. Of significance is the further consideration that, among the northwestern languages, far from Turkic influence, it is precisely Sami and the Baltic-Finnic Estonian and Livonian that do not have vowel harmony and that have developed special syllable-accent systems thus, they lack both traits of the Eurasian union.

**Consonant gradation** The alternation of consonants known as consonant gradation or lenition is sometimes thought to be of Uralic origin. Despite their essential differences, the Baltic-Finnic and Sami gradations appear to be areally related. The Baltic-Finnic type, which represents a more plausible phonetic change, indicates that early Sami may have acquired its gradation under Baltic-Finnic influence. The existence of analogous consonant weakening in various Samoyedic languages Nganasan, Selkup is the result of independent innovation.

**Syllable- accent structures** Closely related to the gradation phenomena is the development of syllable-accent structures in Estonian, Livonian, and Sami. A multitude of analyses of Estonian quantity have been proposed, although not all have recognized the phenomenon as a function of whole syllables bound to stress—in other words, that it is an accent phenomenon. One orthographic dictionary by E. Muuk, for example, utilizes this principle, placing a grave accent mark before syllables with extra quantity. Otherwise, Estonian orthography marks the three degrees of duration only for stops: Because the extra quantity is in part tied to an original open next syllable, it frequently operates together with gradation alternations. The syllable quantity accent in Sami superficially resembles that in Estonian and, like the former, occurs only under stress and is in part conditioned by the openness of the next syllable. In North Sami Utsjoki, alternations in paradigms involve three grades of quantity shaping: The other northern and eastern Sami languages display similar alternations, but there is considerable diversity in the phonetic details. This pattern has been best preserved in the more eastern languages, especially Samoyed, Yukaghir, and Ob-Ugric. This order is common but optional in the languages of central Russia. Sami, Baltic-Finnic, and Hungarian now show the typical European subject-verb-object order: Estonian sentence structure somewhat resembles that of German, with its tendency to place the finite verb in second position while the rest of the verb complex remains at the end of the sentence. The following Hungarian sentences reflect this situation: Negative sentences and questions Negative sentences in Early Uralic were indicated by means of a marker known as an auxiliary of negation, which preceded the main verb and was marked with suffixes that agreed with the subject and perhaps tense. This is best reflected in the Finnic, Samoyedic, and Yukaghir languages. Ugric employs undeclined negative particles *e*. The use of intonation changes in pitch in interrogative sentences is currently widespread. In Hungarian it is the only way to form direct yes-no questions, although in indirect questions a particle *-e* is used. Both coordination and subordination in sentences are marked by a wide range of constructions, especially by means of infinitive verbs, participles, and gerunds. The case system Suffixes and postpositions Case suffixes and postpositions were and are used to show the function of words in a sentence. Prefixes and prepositions were unknown in Proto-Uralic. Adjectives, demonstrative pronouns, and numerals originally did not show agreement in case and number with the noun, as is still the case in Hungarian. The modern languages show a range from 3 cases in Khanty, 6 in Sami, 14 in Finnish, up to 16 to 21 for Hungarian the case status of several suffixes is debatable. The average number of cases is about For the most part, these cases are the same for all nouns, singular and plural, and many are similar in function to English prepositions. Postpositions, preposition-like elements following a noun, are more independent than cases, and they also function as adverbs. They often resemble inflected nouns

## DOWNLOAD PDF SELKUP TEXTS WITH PHONETIC INTRODUCTION AND VOCABULARY (URALIC AND ALTAIC SERIES)

e. The original case relationships of essiveâ€”lativeâ€”ablative form a three-way set of contrasts that has been extended into several parallel series of cases in the modern languages. In Finnish the personal pronouns are declined throughout on a pronoun stemâ€”e. In Hungarian, however, only the nominative and accusative forms are formed this way, and the remaining cases are formed by adding the possessive suffixes to a form of the case marker sometimes expanded â€”e. Suffixes for the plural in the various Uralic languages are so diverse as to suggest that early stages of Uralic did not possess a specialized number markerâ€”e. If Proto-Uralic had plural and dual suffixes, they were probably used only with the personal pronouns. In the modern languages personal pronouns often take a plural marker different from that of the nouns, and in Sami the dual formation is restricted to pronouns and personal affixes. Hungarian alone has a definite article, a z , a demonstrative in origin; Mordvin has three sets of inflectional endings: Possession In possessive constructions the possessor noun precedes the possessed noun, or, in the case of a personal pronoun possessor, possessive suffixes are usedâ€”e. Compounding The formation of nouns in Proto-Uralic included compounding adding two or more words together as well as derivation by the use of suffixes word endings. Proto-Uralic did not have specialized voice markers, such as the Indo-European passive; rather, the function of voice was interwoven with topicalization a way of indicating the main subject of a sentence , emphasis, and definiteness of the subject and object as well as with verbal aspect. This system is best preserved in Finnish: The widespread use of separate subjective and objective conjugations among the Uralic languages as in Mordvin , Ugric, and Samoyedic are the result of an original system for singling out the subject or object for emphasis focus , and not simply a device for objectâ€”verb agreement similar to subject agreement. Yukaghir similarly employs distinct conjugations to reflect sentence focus; e. Mari and Komi have two past tense formations with related function. Again, the westernmost languages have passive constructions similar to those in both Slavic and Germanic. Verbal derivation was richly developed already in Proto-Uralic with a wide variety of verbal nouns, infinitives, and participles. Several of the modern Uralic languages make extensive use of their native derivational processes to eliminate foreign loanwords; e. A word Karelian fragment also dates from the 13th century. Old Permic, the earliest attested form of Komi, received its own alphabet based on the Greek and Old Slavic symbols in the 14th century, through the missionary efforts of St. Stephen, bishop of Perm. The first Finnish and Estonian texts are 16th-century printed works. Sami was first written in the 17th century. Since the 17th century nearly all the more populous Uralic languages have a written form. All the above-mentioned languages and most semiautonomous groups in Russia have a native literature, the exception being Karelia, which uses Finnish instead of one of the native Karelian dialects. Currently, Uralic languages used within Russia are written with a modified Cyrillic alphabet ; the others employ the Latin alphabet , adapted to the peculiar demands of their own sound systems.

## DOWNLOAD PDF SELKUP TEXTS WITH PHONETIC INTRODUCTION AND VOCABULARY (URALIC AND ALTAIC SERIES)

### Chapter 5 : Holdings : Selkup texts : | York University Libraries

*The Uralic and Altaic Program of the American Council of Learned Societies, / With an introd. by William Riley Parker. PL 1 L6 Proceedings of the XXVIII Permanent International Altaistic Conference, Venice, July, / edited by Giovanni Stary.*

Linguistic Features All the Ural-Altaic languages share certain characteristics of syntax, morphology, and phonology. The languages use constructions of the type the-by-me-hunted bear rather than "the bear that I hunted," and a-singing I went rather than "I sang as I went. Suffixation is the typical grammatical process--that is, meaningful elements are appended to stems, as in house-my, "my house," go- past -I, "I went," house-from, "from the house," go-in-while, "while in the act of going," and house- plural -my-from, "from my houses. Thus poly, "dust," is a possible word in Finnish because o any y are both mid vowels and hence belong to the same phonetic class; likewise polku, "path," is possible because o and u are both vowels. Words such as polu or poly are not possible, because o and u, or o and y, are too dissimilar. Stress generally falls on the first or last syllable; it does not move about, as in the English series family, familiar, familiarity. Typically, the Ural-Altaic languages have no verb for "to have. Family Status According to the standards set by linguists, languages that make up a family must show productive-predictive correspondences. The shape of a given word in one language should be predictable from the shape of the corresponding word, or cognate, in another language. Thus Hungarian -d at the end of stems, as in ad, "he gives," is known to correspond to the Finnish consonant sequence -nt- in the interior of words, as in Finnish anta-, "give. But Altaic is not a language family in the same sense that Uralic is, for laws of correspondence such as those available for Uralic have yet to be discovered in Altaic. Altaic does have three branches, however--Turkic, Mongolian, and Manchu-Tungus--each of which forms a subfamily. Turkic and Mongolian on the one hand, and, to a lesser extent, Mongolian and Manchu-Tungus on the other, exhibit many striking resemblances. But the shared features may reflect only borrowing, and not a common origin. Finno-Ugric in turn contains two subgroups: Baltic-Finnic Finnish, with 5 million speakers, and Estonian, with 1 million, are the best known of the Baltic-Finnic languages. Others are Karelian, spoken by , people in northwestern Russia and eastern Finland; Veps, spoken by 8, people between the Dnepr and the Volga; Votian, spoken by people of the Udmurt Autonomous Republic of the former USSR; and Livonian, spoken by people in the Livonia district of Latvia. Lapp is similar in structure to Finnish, but the various Lapp dialects--spoken by 40, people spread over Norway, Sweden, Finland, and the Kola Peninsula of Russia--diverge greatly from each other in phonology and even to some extent in grammar. Finnish is famous above all for its many cases, 12 of which are productive--that is, any Finnish noun can be followed by one of the 12 case suffixes. Finnish is also distinctive in having a verb that, translated roughly, means "not to. Both of them, but especially Mordvinian, are close to Finnish in grammar and vocabulary. Less like Finnish are the Permian languages--Zyrien with its , speakers, and Votyak with its , in northeastern European Russia. All of the Volga-Finnic and Permian languages have a negative verb and a large number of cases. Ugric The Finnic languages are more or less geographically contiguous, but the Ugric languages lie at opposite ends of the Finno-Ugric area--Hungarian occupying the extreme west, and the Ob-Ugric languages, Vogul and Ostyak, occupying the extreme east. Hungarian has 13 million speakers--the largest number of any Uralic language--who live in the Danube Basin and adjacent areas. One of the most striking Ugric linguistic features is the so-called objective conjugation. In Hungarian, for instance, adok means "I give," and adom means "I give it" or "I give them. Vogul and Ostyak are still more precise. In these languages the objective conjugation has three distinct forms, to indicate whether the object is "it," "them" plural , or "the two things" dual. Furthermore, Vogul and Ostyak can also express the subject in the singular, plural, or dual. Hungarian has more productive cases--upward of than even Finnish has. Vogul and Ostyak, however, have only from four to seven cases, depending on dialect. The Ugric languages have no consonant gradation. Samoyed The Samoyed languages are the easternmost representatives of Uralic.

## DOWNLOAD PDF SELKUP TEXTS WITH PHONETIC INTRODUCTION AND VOCABULARY (URALIC AND ALTAIC SERIES)

Presumably they were the first to separate, as a group, from the original, proto-Uralic language. They are spoken in the northeastern corner of Europe, near Zyrian, and in north-central Siberia. Yurak, with 28, speakers, Tavgi, with 1, and Yenisei, with , form a North Samoyed group, and they can be distinguished from the South Samoyed language, Selkup, with 4, speakers. Other Samoyed languages, now extinct, are known only from 18th- and 19th-century records.

**Loan Words and Early Records** In the course of their histories, the individual Uralic languages have come into contact with a great many languages from other families--Turkic, Germanic, Baltic an earlier form of Latvian and Lithuanian , and Slavic. Finnish kuningas, "king," is an early loan from a Germanic language, hence its resemblance to English king and German Konig. Finnish vapaa, "free," was borrowed from a Slavic language--compare the Slavic root svobod-. The same Slavic root found its way, independently, into Hungarian, as evidenced by the word szabad. The oldest significant text written in a Uralic language is a funeral sermon in Hungarian from about Finnish and Estonian texts survive from the Protestant Reformation, which swept over Scandinavia and much of the Baltic in the 16th century; the reformer of the Finns, Michael Agricola , also translated the Bible into Finnish. Zyrien was recorded in the 15th century by Saint Stephen of Perm, apostle of the Zyriens, who fashioned a special alphabet for the language.

**Altaic Languages** The Altaic languages are spread over an area that is even larger than that covered by Uralic. Of the three branches of Altaic, Turkic ranges from Anatolia to the Volga basin and central Asia; Mongolian extends from China and Mongolia as far west as the lower Volga and Afghanistan; and Manchu-Tungus occupies the northern coast of northeastern Siberia, and runs as far south as the Amur and as far west as the Yenisei, which divides Siberia into its eastern and western halves.

**Turkic** Written evidence of the Turkic languages begins with the Orkhon inscriptions of the 8th century AD, found near the river Selenga in Mongolia, and continues wherever and whenever a Turkic population came into contact with one of the higher religions, such as Islam, Judaism, Christianity, or Manichaeism. Linguistically, the Turkic languages form a tightly knit group. Knowledge of one Turkic language usually enables an investigator to analyze words and simple sentences in any other Turkic language except Chuvash. To explain this, it is hypothesized that an original, proto-Turkic language split into two branches: West Turkic and East Turkic. West Turkic went its own way, both phonetically and in terms of contact with other languages, and eventually became Chuvash, now spoken by 1, people living in the Volga Basin in the Chuvash Autonomous Republic of the former USSR. The early speakers of East Turkic must have remained together for a longer time and split up only comparatively recently into the many present-day languages. Still, the East Turkic languages are usually classed into five subdivisions: Turkish, like Finnish, has vowel harmony. It also uses cases and possessive suffixes, which can combine as in ev-ler-im-in, "of my houses," made up of the word elements found in ev-ler, "houses," ev-im, "my house," and ev-in, "of the house. The vigorous but short-lived military conquests of Genghis Khan in the 13th century brought the Mongols well into Europe, and to this day traces of Mongolian may be discovered in a few provinces of Afghanistan, and over , Kalmyk-Mongols live in the Kalmyk republic of the former USSR. Khalkha is the language of the Mongols of Mongolia, with its capital at Ulan Bator. The grammatical processes encountered in the Mongolian languages are similar to those of Turkic. The Mongolian languages have many cases and in that respect they resemble some of the Uralic representatives, notably Finnish and Hungarian.

**Manchu-Tungus** Just as the Turkic languages can be thought of as the western wing of Altaic, the Manchu-Tungus--also known simply as the Tungus--languages constitute the eastern wing. Most of these languages have been known only since the 19th century, but two of them, Manchu and Jurchen, are preserved in historical records that go back much further. Manchu, now spoken by only a few thousand people, was the original language of the tribe of horsemen that became the Qing Ching dynasty and occupied the Chinese throne from to Similarly, Jurchen, now extinct, was the language of the tribes that became the Jin Chin dynasty, ruling from to The Manchu-Tungus languages fall into two groups. But the correspondences between the two groups of languages are unsystematic; they could be the result of borrowing or chance. No precise predictive-productive sound laws, for instance, have been established. Alternatively, it is argued that the parallels between Uralic and Altaic are slight because the two groups split apart a long time ago.

## DOWNLOAD PDF SELKUP TEXTS WITH PHONETIC INTRODUCTION AND VOCABULARY (URALIC AND ALTAIC SERIES)

### Chapter 6 : Selkoupe - Wikimonde

*Buy Selkup texts by Laszlo Szabo from Waterstones today! Click and Collect from your local Waterstones or get FREE UK delivery on orders over Â£*

In Chinese Scholars on Inner Asia, some of the best work of the past half-century by leading Chinese scholars on the history and peoples of Inner Asia is presented for the first time in English. The fifteen essays were selected by a team of contemporary Chinese specialists to represent the unique and important contributions made to the field of Inner Asian studies by Chinese scholarship. In addition, many of the essays have been revised and enhanced by their authors especially for this volume of translations. Chinese Scholars on Inner Asia. Geier, and John R. Language, Culture and History. Books of the Mongolian Nomads: Modern Literary Uzbek I. Weather Magic in Inner Asia. Mongol Elements in Manchu. Nazarov, Bakhtiyar and Sinor, Denis editors. Essays on Uzbek History, Culture, and Language. Chronicle of the Hungarians. Medievalia Hungarica Series, vol. Hu Zhen-hua and Guy Imart. A Bibliography of Soviet Publications ] [in Russian]. Hangin, Gombojab et al. A Modern Mongolian-English Dictionary. The Mongols of the West. Studies in Finnic Folklore. Nomads and Ottomans in Medieval Anatolia. Essays in Comparative Altaic Linguistics. Zygas, Victoria Egle and Voorheis, Peter editors. Festschrift for Felix J. Between the Hammer and the Anvil? Chinese and Russian Policies in Outer Mongolia, Kwanten, Luc and Hesse, Susan. Tangut Hsi Hsia Studies: Order from RoutledgeCurzon The Structure of the Turkic Languages. Preliminary Studies in Turkic Historical Phonology. Aspects of Altaic Civilization II. Bloomington, June July 5, Bloomington and Louvain Edition Peeters. The Political Role of Mongol Buddhism. Cheremis Literary Reader with Glossary. The Livonian Rhymed Chronicle. The Rub of Cultures in Turkey: Literary Views of Education. Citizens of Four Countries. Index to the Secret History of the Mongols. Texts from the Social Sciences and Related Fields. Die Mandschu-Sprachkunde in Korea. The Peoples and Culture. Zyrian Loanwords in Vogul. The Old Estonian Folk Religion. The Annals of Kokonor. Ottoman Diplomacy in Hungary. The Uralic and Altaic Series: The Russian Colonization of Kazakhstan. Inner Asia A Syllabus. A Treasury of Aphoristic Jewels: A Concise English-Mongolian Dictionary. Mongolian Epigraphical Dictionary in Reverse Listing. Educational Problems in Turkey, Die Frage des Finnougrischen Substrats in der russischen Sprache. On Emphasis and Word Order in Hungarian. Selkup Texts with Phonetic Introduction and Vocabulary. History of Finnish Literature. Thesaurus Linguae Tschuvaschorum, vol. A Grammar of Orkhon Turkic. A Grammar of the Votic Language. The System of Hungarian Sentence Patterns. Consonant Quantity and Phonological Units in Estonian. A Study in Continuity and Change. Mongolia and the Mongols, vol. Basic Course in Uzbek. Studies on the Secret History of the Mongols. Basic Course in Estonian. Methods and Principles of Hungarian Ethnomusicology. Customary Law of the Nomadic Tribes of Siberia. Basic Course in Azerbaijani. Fundamental Principles of Mongol Law. Morphemic and Semantic Analysis of the Word Families: A Primer and Reader. Mongols of the Twentieth Century, Part 2: Mongols of the Twentieth Century, Part 1. Basic Course in Finnish. Peoples of Central Asia. Aspects of Altaic Civilization. A Reference Grammar of Modern Turkish. Structural Tendencies in Uralic Languages. Finnish Reader and Glossary. The Samoyed Peoples and Languages. American Studies in Altaic Linguistics. Latvian and Finnic Linguistic Convergence. Introduction, Grammar, Reader and Vocabulary. The Phonology of Modern Standard Turkish. An Eastern Cheremis Manual: Phonology, Grammar, Texts, and Glossary. Grammar, Texts and Lexicon. American Studies in Uralic Linguistics. Quantity in the Skolt Lappish saami Language: Moses, Larry and Halkovic, Stephen A. Introduction to Mongolian History and Culture. Rozycki, William, with the assistance of Rex Dwyer. A Reverse Index of Manchu. Phonological and Lexical Aspects of Colloquial Finnish. Some Linguistic Aspects of Iambic Verse.

### Chapter 7 : Uralic languages | calendrierdelascience.com

## DOWNLOAD PDF SELKUP TEXTS WITH PHONETIC INTRODUCTION AND VOCABULARY (URALIC AND ALTAIC SERIES)

*Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.*

### Chapter 8 : Finno-Ugric languages - Wikipedia

*uralic and altaic series, volume 3. HAKULINEN, LAURI THIS INDIANA UNIVERSITY PUBLICATION IS AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION AND REVISION OF THE FINNISH ORIGINAL "SUOMEN KIELEN RAKENNE JA KEHITYS," (OTAVA, HELSINKI, AND ).*

### Chapter 9 : Proto Uralic | Revolv

*Selkup Texts With Phonetic Introduction And Vocabulary Uralic Altaic S Records Of Shelley Byron Volume 1 Bmw 3 Series Owners i Livingstone Saga Book One Birth.*