Werk

Label: ReviewSingle

Autor: Robbeets , Martine

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2008

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0012|LOG_0038

Kontakt/Contact

Reviews

Martine Robbeets, Onderzoekseenheid Taalkunde Blijde-Inkomststraat 21 - bus 3308 3000 Leuven België. E-mail: martine_robbeets@hotmail.com

1. Identifying the works

In both of these volumes the author makes a historical comparative study of verbal morphology in Manchu and Mongolian, based on material from corpora dating back to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and translated from Manchu into Mongolian or vice versa. Verbs and verbal suffixes are compared in the concrete context of the translated sentences in which they appear. Although the two volumes share basic material and approach, the nature, purpose and topic of each are radically different. Whereas the first volume (Tunguso-Sibirica 18) is a contrastive typological study that deals with functional parallels between Manchu and Mongolian, the second volume (Tunguso-Sibirica 19) contains a comparative genealogical study that addresses the question of linguistic affiliation. The former study concentrates on markers of verbal inflection in the category of diathesis such as transitive, intransitive, causative and passive, while the topic of the latter study is verbal derivation, comparing suffixes that derive verbs from nouns and verbs.

In spite of these differences I have chosen to evaluate both volumes in a single review because they are published as subsequent volumes in one series, have the same author and year of publication, and approach the same texts in a similar way. The main source underlying these studies is the *Manjou Shihlu* (1636), a Manchu dynastic genealogy written in Manchu, Mongolian and Chinese, in a version edited in 1781. Additional sentence samples are taken from the *Erdeni-yin Tobči* (1662), the classical chronicle on the history of the Mongols that was translated into Manchu in 1790. The approach taken in both volumes is to compare verbal morphology in the context of full sentences along with their translations. According to the author, the advantage of this procedure lies in the fact that the functions of the verbal suffixes are illustrated more accurately than would be the case when using lists of verb pairs (vol 18, 146: "Dadurch, daß die Wörter meistens in Sätzen und nicht in der lexikalischen Auflistung

angeführt wurden, wurden ihre Bedeutungen und Funktionen im Gebrauch konkret dargestellt"). As I will illustrate in a critical evaluation of the proposed cognates below (cfr. Ma. *-ca- / -ce- / -co-* denominal cooperative, Ma. *-ra- / -re- / -ro-* medium, Ma. *-cile-* denominal verb suffix, Mo. *-lǰa-* cooperative), her approach proves to be more fruitful for the contrastive and comparative typological study of the first volume than for the historical comparison of derivational suffixes of the second one.

In what follows, I will, for each volume separately, provide a theoretical background, describe the content and evaluate some theoretical issues. By way of conclusion, I will offer a joint assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of both works and briefly comment on the general significance of these volumes for the field.

2. Volume 18

In the first volume Maezono compares diathetical markers in Manchu and Mongolian from a contrastive typological viewpoint. Instead of studying concrete form-meaning correspondences in particular markers, she makes a comparative study of functional features and examines the category of diathesis in the abstract. In the goals section of the book (p. 11) the author claims that the typological contrasts and similarities between the languages under inspection can be used as a measure for genealogical classification. In this respect she refers to a study on the role of syntax in establishing genealogical relationship, written by Fokos-Fuchs in 1962. However, the author does not meet this goal in her analysis, as she restricts herself to factual comparisons, without going into theoretical issues.

Typological similarity may result from genealogical retention, but not necessarily so. Other possible motivations for structural parallels are coincidence, universal implicational tendencies (Greenberg 1966; Dryer 1992; Plank 1998), areal diffusion and substratum interference. Although it remains extremely difficult to distinguish between these different determinants of typological similarity, there is ongoing research unmentioned by the author that contributes to understanding stability of typological features (see especially Johanson 2002; Nichols 1992, 1995, 2003 and Maslova 2000).

Although Maezono does not rely on the typological comparisons advanced in her work, she makes it clear to the reader that she believes that Manchu and Mongolian share a common origin. Interestingly, she bases her argumentation on form-function matches instead of using the typological arguments referred to in the goals section. On p. 16, for instance, she finds that the elative or directive suffixes are cognate: "Die folgenden Beispielwörter zeigen, daß die NN-Suffixe (Ma) *-ši* und (Mo) *-ẏši* hinsichtlich der Formen sowie der Funktionen bzw. Bedeutungen auf den gleichen Ursprung zurückzuführen wären, von denen die Form (Mo) *-ẏši* älter als (Ma) *-ši* sein soll". On p. 34, she proposes a list of cognate verb roots including Ma. *bi-* 'sein' and Mo. *bü-* 'id.', Ma. *yabu-* 'gehen' and Mo. *yabu-* 'id.', Ma. *dasa-* 'in Ordnung bringen' and Mo. *ǰasa-* 'id.', Ma. *gabta-* '(mit dem Bogen / der Lanze) schießen' and Mo. *qarbu-* 'id.', Ma. *hori-* 'einschließen, sperren' and Mo. *qori-* 'id.', Ma. *ka-*

'(ab)sperren, belagern, umgeben' and Mo. *qaya-* 'id.', Ma. *saci-* '(ab)hacken' and Mo. *čabči-* 'id.', Ma. *tata-* '(ab)ziehen' and Mo. *tata-* 'id.', Ma. *temše-* 'streiten' and Mo. *temeče-* 'id.'.

It is not just a detailed theoretical framework -as it relates to the issue of using typological evidence as genealogical evidence- which is missing: what is also lacking is an up-to-date background on how the major empirical observations made in the book relate to other scholarly works on the subject.

The main similarities between Manchu and Mongolian diathetical constructions observed by Maezono are the following. Causatives derived from intransitive verbs mark the agent with an accusative suffix (p. 66-72), whereas causatives derived from transitive verbs mark the direct object with an accusative suffix and the agent with a second accusative or with a dative-locative suffix (p. 72-74). In the latter case, Mongolian, unlike Manchu, may also mark the agent with an instrumental suffix. From the examples on p. 88-90 it appears that dative-locative marked agents tend to be restricted to permissive causative constructions ("Zulassung vom Subjekt"). Maezono further finds two types of passive constructions in Manchu and Mongolian (p. 97-106). In the first type, a prototypical passive, the subject is the direct receiver and the agent is marked in the dative-locative. In the second type, which we can refer to as an adversative passive because the subject is negatively affected, the direct receiver is marked in the accusative and the agent is marked in the dative-locative.

As one of the most eye-catching contrasts, Maezono refers to the use of a causative-passive suffix in Manchu against the absence of such a polysemy in Mongolian (p. 22, 55): "Ein auffallender Unterschied zwischen den beiden Sprachen ist jedoch, daß im Mandschu das gleiche Suffix wie für die Transitiv-Kausativverbbildung auch für die Passivverbbildung verwendet wird, während im Mongolischen dafür selbständige Suffixe vorhanden sind". However, she adds examples (p. 95-96) of Mongolian causative constructions in which the subject is the receiver of an unexpected action, where a passive interpretation is possible, pointing out that: "... die letzten der oben als Kausativ angeführte Beispiele zeigen sogar eine dem Passiv ähnliche semantische Funktion".

The correlation between passive and causative observed in Manchu and to a certain extent in Mongolian is a somewhat mysterious correlation in view of the difference in syntactic characteristics of these verbal categories. Although it is left unexplained by Maezono, similar polysemies are attested cross-linguistically, and in the Transeurasian languages (Japanese, Korean, other Tungusic languages and Turkic languages) in particular. This polysemy finds its explanation in the historical development of passives across the world. The pathway of this development involves a permissive, a causative of the 'let' type and an adversative passive or a reflexive-causative construction (Johanson 1974, 1975; Keenan 1985: 262-263; Babby 1993; Malchukov 1993; Haspelmath 1990: 46-49, Robbeets 2007b). A semantic difference between causative and passive is that the former denotes two situations, whereas the latter denotes only one situation. A syntactic difference is that the initial subject becomes the direct object of causation, whereas it becomes the indirect object of the passive construction. The

permissive occupies a common ground between the two categories. Semantically it denotes two situations (Subject did not do sth. and agent does V because of that) as the factitive causative does (Subject did sth. and agent does V because of that), but the causation in permissives is nonvolitional (Subject did not want V to happen) and due to a nonoccurrence of an action. Syntactically, as with the passive, the agent can become the indirect object of the permissive construction. In Japanese, the native language of the author, for instance, the causative conversion of intransitives trans- forms the initial subject into an agent with the dative-locative suffix *ni* for permission and with the accusative suffix *wo* for coercion (Martin 1988: 292-293).[1] Malchukov (1993: 372) illustrates how in causative constructions of Even transitives, the agent is marked with an accusative suffix for factitives, whereas it is marked with a dative suffix for permissives. This is reminiscent of the dative-locative marked agents in permissive causatives in Manchu and Mongolian observed by Maezono. The availabil- ity of adversative passives in Manchu and Mongolian is paralleled by similar construc- tions in Japanese and other Tungusic languages. Malchukov (1993: 382-383) characterizes the Even adversative passive as a verbal category which combines the semantic features of a prototypical passive (one situation) on the one hand and the permissive causative (nonvolitional) on the other. This typological framework could account for the main empirical observations made by Maezono and correlate them as implicational features of causative-passive development.

3. Volume 19

In the second volume Maezono compares verb derivative suffixes in Manchu and Mongolian from a historical comparative viewpoint. Her purpose is to determine whether some of these suffixes can be traced back to a common origin. She situates her work against the background of the Altaic affiliation question, defining the Altaic languages as being made up of the Manchu-Tungusic languages, the Mongolic lan- guages and the Chuvash-Turkic languages. In reference to the scholarly literature on this subject, she leaves out some of the more recent contributions that also include Japanese and Korean such as Starostin et al. 2003 and Robbeets 2005. Investigating shared verbal morphology as an indicator of genealogical relationship between the languages under investigation, the author fills a considerable gap in Altaic literature.

Although this reviewer is in agreement with the conclusion that some derivational suffixes indicate that Manchu and Mongolian are genealogically related, this does not mean that every single etymology or every line of argumentation advanced by the author is found acceptable. Suffixes for which the author explicitly states that they come from a common origin in the sense that they (p. 100:) "sollen sowohl von den

---

[1]   For many speakers Japanese *Kodomo-ni gakkou-ni ika-se-ru* (child-dat. school-dat go-caus.-ind.) 'let the child go to school' seems to have a softer implication than *Kodomo-o gakkou-ni ika-se-ru* (child-acc. school-dat. go-caus.-ind.) 'make the child go to school'.

Formen als auch von den Funktionen her auf einen gleichen Ursprung zurückgehen"
are the Mongolian forms *-da-/ -de* (p. 68), *-la-/ -le-* (p. 100), *-ra-/ -re-* (p. 137) and
-siya- / -siye- (p. 150) along with their Manchu cognates. Suffixes for which she notes
a formal and functional similarity without tracing them back to a common origin are
the Mongolian forms *-du-/ -dü-* (p. 16, 87), *-ča- / -če-* (p. 33, 56), *-čila- / -čile-* (p. 62),
-lǰa-/ -lǰe- (p. 91) and *-ldu- / -ldü-* (p. 15) along with their Manchu parallels. In
reference to formally and functionally similar suffixes in the other Tungusic
languages, Japanese, Korean and the Turkic languages, genealogical retention can be
supported from a wider Transeurasian perspective for Mo. *-da-/ -de-* and *-la-/ -le-*
(Robbeets 2007 a & b, forthcoming). The comparison of Mo. *-lǰa-/-lǰe-*, *-siya- / -siye-*,
-ra-/ -re-, *-čila- / -čile-* and *-ldu- / -ldü-* is problematic due to an illegitimate internal
analysis. The shared properties between *-du-/ -dü-* and *-ča- / -če-* can more easily be
attributed to code-copying.

Although Maezono provides only a single example of a verb which includes the
suffix Mo. *-lǰa-/-lǰe-*, namely (p. 91) *gilbalǰa-* 'schimmern' and although she does not
attempt to define the functional load of the suffix, it is legitimate to posit a formant
MMo. *-lǰa-/ -lǰe-* in reference to verbs expressing multiple actants such as MMo.
a'ulǰa- 'pay one's respects to, meet', *bol-* 'become' => *bolǰa-* 'make an appointment',
verbs expressing multiple objects such as MMo. *si'a* 'bone stone (n.)' (over **si'ala-*?)
=> *si'alǰa-* 'play with bone stones', *unji-* 'rest, halt' => *unjilǰa-* 'hang down (e.g. of
feet)', *alhun* 'be missing' => *alǰa-* 'be in distress', and verbs expressing multiple
occurrences in rhythmic motions such as MMo. *sicabalǰa-* 'crawl', *darbalǰa-* 'jiggle',
gilba- 'gleam' => *gilbalǰa-* 'glimmer'. It is illegitimate, however, to analyze Mo. *-lǰa-/*
-lǰe- as a compound of a deverbal noun suffix *-l* and a denominal verb suffix **-ǰa-/ ǰe-*
since we lack internal evidence for the latter segment. Reconstructing Mo **-ǰa-/ ǰe-* in
reference to a Manchu look-alike *-ja- / -je- / -jo-* is methodologically circular because
it presupposes genealogical affinity in an attempt to demonstrate affinity. Besides,
although the semantics of the Manchu formant are left undescribed by Maezono, Ma.
-ja- / -je- / -jo- is described by Gorelova 2002: 237, 242-243 as a derivative suffix used
to form verbs which denotes the duration or intensity of the mental or emotional
process which a person experiences (e.g. *golohon* 'fright' => *golohonjo-* 'to be
exceedingly frightened'). The semantic comparison to the Mongolian cooperative
**-ǰa-/ ǰe-*, if ever it existed formally, would require some additional explanation.

Another problematic semantic analysis is that of the suffix Mo. *-siya- / -siye-*,
which the author characterizes as (p. 150:) "Intensivität" in contrast with Poppe's
(1954: 65) analysis as a suffix used "to express acknowledgement of the qualities
expressed by the primary noun, e.g. *sayin* 'good' => *sayišiya-* 'approve'". The exam-
ples provided by Maezono, Mo. *jöb* 'richtig' => *jöbsiye-* 'für recht halten' Mo. *buruɣu*
'Fehler, Unrecht, böse' => *buruɣusiya-* 'für unrecht halten'; Mo. *örü* 'Innen, Herz,
Innere' => *örüsiye-* 'Gnade gewähren' all contradict her own analysis and confirm
Poppe's. Applying the correct semantics reduces the quality of the functional match
with the so-called Manchu intensive, which Gorelova (2002: 236) describes as a
"derivative suffix used to form verbs to denote durative and continuous actions, e.g.

Ma. *banahu:n* 'lazy' => *banahu:ša-* 'be lazy'". The verb (p. 150) Ma. *sayiša-* 'für gut halten' is likely to be a case of direct verbal insertion, copied from WMo. *sayišiya-* 'approve'. The formal comparison is not without problems either because we have to suppose phonological reduction in Manchu. Besides, unlike Mongolian, the Manchu suffix is also used to derive duratives from verbs (Gorelova 2002: 242-432) and since it has no cognate in the other Tungusic languages, Benzing (1955: 1067) treats it as a phonological alternant of the Manchu *-ca-* intensive.

On p. 46 the author proposes a deverbal formant Ma. *-ra- /-re-/ -ro-*, which she compares to the medium or anticausative Mo. *-ra- / -re-*. There is, however, no evidence for such a suffix in Manchu. Maezono provides only a single example, namely Ma. *colgon* 'Bergspitze, hochragender Berg' => *colgoro-* 'hervorragen, übertreffen', but this example is invalid because it illustrates denominal rather than deverbal derivation.

Evidence is also missing for a denominal verb suffix Ma. *-cile-* 'geziemend handeln', for which Maezono gives only a single example with front vocalism in Ma. *deo* 'jüngerer Bruder' => *deocile-* 'sich als jüngerer Bruder richtig verhalten'. Gorelova (2002) does not mention this suffix in her grammar. Besides, the verb mentioned by Maezono can better be analyzed as a *-la- / -le-* derivation of the noun Ma. *deocin* 'Pflicht des jüngeren Bruders'.

There is no attempt to draw a distinction between code-copying and genealogical retention as a probable account for the shared properties. The author finds, for instance, that (p. 86-89): "Die Entsprechung der NV-Suffixe (Ma) *-du-* (NV) - Mo *-du- / -dü-* (NV) kommt im Textkorpus hauptsächlich in den Verben (Ma) *jabdu-* 'Zeit/ Gelegenheit haben, etw. zu tun' - Mo. *jabdu-* 'id.' vor. Es gibt im Mongolischen das Nomen (Mo.) *jab* '(freie) Zeit' und davon abgeleitet mehrere Wörter, während im Mandschu lediglich das Verb (Ma) *jabdu-* belegt ist". Since the suffix has only a single occurrence in Manchu and since the verb is morphologically complex in Mongolian while it is unsegmentable in Manchu, it goes without saying that we are dealing with a verbal borrowing from Mongolian into Manchu.

From the lack of internal evidence for Ma. *-du-*, it follows that a second comparison proposed by the author, namely (p. 15) the reciprocals Ma. *-ndu-* and Mo. *-ldu- / -ldü-* is based on an illegitimate morphological analysis. The author suggests treating these suffixes as compounds of a deverbal noun suffix Ma. *-n* and Mo. *-l* followed by the obscure common segment *-du-*. Besides being methodologically circular, this comparison disregards the fact that Ma. *-ndu-* goes back to pTg *-ldu-* (Benzing 1955: 1069). The comparison of the Tungusic and Mongolian reciprocals is far more elegant and simple without segmentation.

The author's assumption (p. 33) that Mo. *-lča- / -lče-* is morphologically complex, on the other hand, is legitimate because both the deverbal noun suffix *-l* and the denominal cooperative verb suffix *-ča-* are attested in Mongolian. The data seem to suggest that the cooperative Mo. *-ča-* was originally limited to denominal derivation, whereas Mo. *-ldu-* was used as a deverbal cooperative. Attached after verbal nouns in *-l*, the denominal suffix was reanalyzed as *-lča-* in analogy with *-ldu-* and Mo. *-ča-*

transferred to verbal bases. This scenario suggests that the deverbal cooperative *-ca- / -ce- / -co-* has entered and spread in Manchu as the result of extensive borrowing of Mongolian verb stems. In order to reduce the copying factor, we need examples of a denominal cooperative Ma. *-ca- / -ce- / -co-*. However, Gorelova (2002: 243, 250-51) and Benzing (1955: 1067) restrict the use of this suffix to deverbal derivation. Unfortunately, Maezono provides us only with a single example in support of denominal derivation, namely (p. 61) **ama* 'Hinten, Rücken, Norden' in *amaga* 'später, künftig', *amala* 'hinten, später, danach, hinterher', *amargi* 'Hinterseite, Rückseite, Norden', *amari* 'nachdem' => *amca-* 'nachgehen, nachfolgen, nachsetzen, verfolgen'. Finding more examples could help us distinguish between code-copying and genealogical retention.

In the conclusion the author recognizes that in cases of massive copying of verb bases along with derivational suffixes, the suffixes may spread in the recipient language and attach independently to unrelated bases. However, she claims that it is unlikely that non-native suffixes would be attached to borrowed bases. She takes the Manchu verb *dayisela-* 'vertretungsweise verwalten, verwesen', derived from a Chinese borrowing Ma. *dayise* 'Vertreter' and the denominal verb suffix Ma. *-la- / -le- / -lo-* as an indication that the Manchu suffix is native, i.e. not copied. Since speakers do not store diachronic information on productive suffixes, the logic of this argument is unclear. Other arguments against code-copying of verbal morphology are not given in the books, but reference can be made to Robbeets (2007b & forthcoming).

4. Conclusion

Coming to a joint analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of both volumes, a major methodological shortcoming is that Maezono restricts herself to comparisons at a synchronic level in order to draw conclusions about long-range diachrony. Whereas the tools of historical linguistics, internal and external reconstruction, could help us access forms and functions in proto-Tungusic or proto-Mongolic, Maezono does not attempt to go back further in time than the linguistic forms synchronically attested in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Above we have shown for instance how internal reconstruction could give us an insight into the historical development of the Mongolian cooperative suffix *-lǰa-/ -lǰe-*, how external comparison with the Tungusic languages could lead to the reconstruction of the cooperative pTg **-ldu-*, or how typological comparison with other Tungusic languages such as Even could provide information on the diachronic origins of passive morphology. In this respect it is unfortunate that no reference is made to comparative Tungusic perspectives such as those in Benzing 1955, to an up-to-date analysis of Manchu grammar as Goroleva 2002, to a typological reference work on Mongolic as Janhunen 2003 or to general typological studies such as the ones cited above.

A practical inconvenience for readers who are not fluent in Manchu and Mongolian is the lack of interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme glosses that give information about the meanings and grammatical properties of words and bound morphemes. Using

uniform glossing rules would have prevented many disturbing additions between brackets "(wörtlich: ...)".

The volumes contain only a few typographical mistakes or smaller misinterpretations such as (vol. 18, p. 96:) "*ene kelen* (=Agens)" for [*ene kelen* (=dir. Obj.)], (vol. 18, 150; vol. 19, p. 177:) Fokus-Fuchs [Fokos-Fuchs] and (vol. 18, p. 154:) Paitsak [Pritsak].

In spite of their weaknesses, both works have many strengths. Although controversy marks the literature on the genealogical relationship of Manchu and Mongolian, many linguists would agree on at least one point, namely that shared verbal morphology could help unravel the question. Altaic literature in general abounds with lexical comparisons, but relatively little research has been done in the field of comparative verbal morphology. In this respect Maezono's contributions fill a considerable gap in Altaic comparative linguistic literature. The further strengths of her work lie in the originality of her approach comparing translations of historical documents in order to retrieve linguistic information, the well-balanced selection of linguistically relevant passages and the accurate description and translation of sample sentences. Her work provides a solid empirical base for further theoretical research.

Although the volumes are written in German by a Japanese author, the phrasing is clear and exact in a way that it is easily accessible to native as well as non-native speakers of German with a moderate command of the language. Elementary knowledge of Manchu and Mongolian would help the reader to overcome the inconvenience caused by the missing glossing system. The volumes can be recommended to students and researchers of Manchu-Tungusic and Mongolic linguistics, but also to those with an interest in the history and development of the Transeurasian languages (Japanese, Korean, Tungusic, Mongolic and Turkic) in general. Typologists working on topics that relate to valency and historical linguists interested in controversial cases of language classification and in the impact of language contact will also benefit from reading these books. These readers will gain more by taking these two volumes into account than they would lose by not reading them.

References

Benzing, Johannes 1955. *Die tungusischen Sprachen. Versuch einer vergleichenden Grammatik.* (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse 11.) Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur.

Babby, Leonard H. 1993. Hybrid causative constructions: Benefactive causative and adversity passive. In: Comrie, Bernard & Polinsky, Maria (eds.) 1993. *Causatives and transitivity.* Amsterdam: Benjamins. 345-367.

Dryer, Matthew 1992. The Greenbergian word order correlations. *Language* 68, 81-138.

Gorelova, Liliya M. 2002. *Manchu grammar.* (Handbook of Oriental studies.) Leiden: Brill.

Greenberg, Joseph 1966. Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. In: Greenberg, Joseph (ed.). *Universals of language.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 73-113.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1990. The grammaticization of passive morphology. *Studies in Language* 14. 25-71.

Janhunen, Juha (ed.). 2003. *The Mongolic languages*. London: Routledge.

Johanson, Lars. 1974. Zur Syntax der alttürkischen Kausativa. In Voigt, Wolfgang (ed.) 1974. *XVIII. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 1. bis 5. Oktober 1972 in Lübeck*, 529-540. Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Johanson, Lars. 1975. Die Ersetzung der türkischen -t- Kausativa. *Orientalia Suecana* 23-24. 106-133.

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

Keenan, Edward L. 1994. Passive in the world's languages. In: Shopen, Timothy (ed.) 1994. *Language typology and syntactic description. Vol 1 Clause structure*, 243-281. Cambridge: University Press.

Malchukov, Andrej L. 1993. Adversative constructions in Even in relation to passive and permissive. In Comrie, Bernard & Polinsky, Maria (eds.) 1993. *Causatives and transitivity*, 369-384. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Martin, Samuel E. 1988. *A reference grammar of Japanese*. Tokyo: Tuttle.

Maslova, Elena 2000. A dynamic approach to the verification of distributional universals. *Linguistic typology 4*, 307-333.

Nichols, Johanna 1992. *Linguistic diversity in space and time*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Nichols, Johanna 1995. Diachronically stable structural features. In: Andersen, Henning (ed.) 1995. *Historical linguistics 1993: Papers from the eleventh international conference on historical linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 337-56.

Nichols, Johanna 2003. Diversity and stability in language. In: Joseph, Brian D. & Janda Richard D. (eds.) 2003. *The handbook of historical linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell, 283-310.

Plank, Frans 1998. The covariation of phonology with morphology and syntax: a hopeful history. *Linguistic Typology 2*, 195-230.

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

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

Robbeets, Martine 2007a. How the actional suffix chain connects Japanese to Altaic. *Turkic Languages* 11.1, 3-58.

Robbeets, Martine 2007b. The causative-passive in the Trans-Eurasian languages. *Turkic Languages* 11.2, 235-278.

Robbeets, Martine I. (forthcoming). Trans-Eurasian: Can verbal morphology solve the controversy? In: Johanson, Lars & Robbeets, Martine (eds.). *Verbal morphology and the historical comparison of the Transeurasian languages*. (Turcologica.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Starostin Sergei & Dybo Anna & Mudrak Oleg 2003. *Etymological dictionary of the Altaic languages*. Leiden: Brill.