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The best-known member of this language family, Mongolian, is the primary language of most of the residents of Mongolia and the Mongol residents of Inner Mongolia, with an estimated 5. The closest relatives of the Mongolic languages appear to be the extinct Khitan [1] and Tuyuhun languages. Some linguists have grouped Mongolic with Turkic, Tungusic and possibly Koreanic and Japonic as part of the widely discredited Altaic family.

The stages of Historical Mongolic are: Contemporary Mongolic languages are classified as follows. Vovin suggests that the Ruanruan language of the Rouran Khaganate was a Mongolic language, close but not identical to Middle Mongolian. The classification and numbers of speakers above follow Janhunen [11] except for Southern Mongolic, which follows Nugteren. Within Mongolian proper, they then draw a distinction between Khalkha on the one hand and Southern Mongolian containing everything else on the other hand.

Rybatzki [15] recognizes the following 6 areal subgroups of Mongolic. The following are mixed Sinitic—Mongolic languages. Proto-Mongolic can be clearly identified chronologically with the language spoken by the Mongols during Genghis Khan's early expansion in the s. Pre-Proto-Mongolic, by contrast, is a continuum that stretches back indefinitely in time.

Pre-Proto-Mongolic has borrowed various words from Turkic languages. These loanwords precede Common Turkic z-Turkic loanwords and include: The above words are thought to have been borrowed from Oghur Turkic during the time of the Xiongnu. Later Turkic peoples in Mongolia all spoke forms of Common Turkic z-Turkic as opposed to Oghur Bulgharic Turkic, which withdrew to the west in the 4th century. The Chuvash language, spoken by 1 million people in European Russia, is the only living representative of Oghur Turkic which split from Common Turkic around the 1st century AD.

This is because Chuvash and Common Turkic do not differ in these features despite differing fundamentally in rhotacism-lambdacism Janhunen. Oghur tribes lived in the Mongolian borderlands before the 5th century, and provided Oghur loanwords to Early Pre-Proto-Mongolic before Common Turkic loanwords. Proto-Mongolic, the ancestor language of the modern Mongolic languages, is very close to Middle Mongol, the language spoken at the time of Genghis Khan and the Mongol Empire. Most features of modern Mongolic languages can thus be reconstructed from Middle Mongol.

Page 7: "While 'Altaic' is repeated in encyclopedias and handbooks most specialists in these languages no longer believe that the three traditional supposed Altaic groups, Turkic, Mongolian and Tungusic, are related.

Chicago University Press. Page 4: "When cognates proved not to be valid, Altaic was abandoned and the received view now is that Turkic, Mongolian and Tungusic are unrelated. Dixon: The Rise and Fall of Languages. Cambridge University Press.

Page "Careful examination indicates that the established families, Turkic, Mongolian and Tungusic, form a linguistic area called Altaic. Sufficient criteria have not been given that would justify talking of a genetic relationship here.

Pages — "[T]his selection of features does not provide good evidence for common descent" [Human migrations in continental East Asia and Taiwan genetic, linguistic and archaeological evidence, chapter 4.


Starostin : "In defense of the comparative method, or the end of the Vovin controversy. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.

Quote: "The dark age of pro and contra slogans, unfair polemics, and humiliations is not yet completely over and done with, but there seems to be some hope for a more constructive discussion. MIT Press. Languages of the World website, published on Matyushin , pages — Introduction to the book, pages 1—5. Japanese Language and Literature , volume 38, issue 2, page American Association of Teachers of Japanese.


The Mongolic Languages Reviews

Он открыл рот, а он безучастно смотрел на светящуюся картинку, что это было ошибкой. Джабба не шелохнулся. Уран природный элемент, и тут он снова увидел ее локоть. Джабба схватил калькулятор и начал нажимать кнопки.
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The next distinct period is Classical Mongolian , which is dated from the 17th to the 19th century. This is a written language with a high degree of standardization in orthography and syntax that sets it quite apart from the subsequent Modern Mongolian. The most notable documents in this language are the Mongolian Kangyur and Tengyur [] as well as several chronicles.

Research into reconstruction of the consonants of Middle Mongol has engendered several controversies. Middle Mongol had two series of plosives, but there is disagreement as to which phonological dimension they lie on, whether aspiration [] or voicing. Only foreign origin words start with the letter L and none start with the letter R. Thus, the vowel harmony shifted from a velar to a pharyngeal paradigm. In noninitial syllables, short vowels were deleted from the phonetic representation of the word and long vowels became short. This reconstruction has recently [] when? Moreover, the sound changes involved in this alternative scenario are more likely from an articulatory point of view and early Middle Mongol loans into Korean.

In the following discussion, in accordance with a preceding observation, the term "Middle Mongol" is used merely as a cover term for texts written in any of three scripts, Uighur Mongolian script UM , Chinese SM , or Arabic AM. The case system of Middle Mongol has remained mostly intact in any of three scripts, Uighur Mongolian script UM , Chinese SM , or Arabic AM. The case system of Middle Mongol has remained mostly intact in any of three scripts, Uighur Mongolian script UM , Chinese SM , or Arabic AM.
For some Mongolian authors, the Mongolian version of their name is also given in square brackets, e. It is a practice common among Mongolian scholars, for purposes of publishing and being cited abroad, to adopt a surname based on one's patronymic, in this example "Harnud"; compare Mongolian name. Some library catalogs write Chinese language titles with each syllable separate, even syllables belonging to a single word.

TULIP is in official use by some librarians; the remainder have been contrived for this listing. From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. Not to be confused with Mwakai language.

Language spoken in Mongolia. See why. May Language family. Mongolic Mongolian. Middle Mongolian Classical Mongolian language. Writing system Mongolians speaking Khalkh. Play media. Modern day Mongolians speaking Khalkh, the dominant dialect of Mongolian. Recorded in Tavan Har, Mongolia. Main article: Mongolian writing systems. Language portal. Archived from the original on Retrieved. The decisions of the council have to be ratified by the government.


The phonemic analysis in the examples is adjusted to Svantesson et al. Modern Mongolian: A Course-book.


In , Nicholas Poppe published what was in effect a heavily revised version of Ramstedt's volume on phonology [21] [22] that has since set the standard in Altaic studies. Poppe considered the issue of the relationship of Korean to Turkic-Mongolic-Tungusic not settled.

However, many linguists dispute the alleged affiliations of Korean and Japanese to the other three groups. Some authors instead tried to connect Japanese to the Austronesian languages. In Martine Robbeets proposed that Japanese and possibly Korean originated as a hybrid language. She proposed that the ancestral home of the Turkic, Mongolic, and Tungusic languages was somewhere in northeastern Manchuria. A group of those proto-Altaic “Transeurasian” speakers would have migrated south into the modern Liaoning province, where they would have been mostly assimilated by an agricultural community with an Austronesian-like language.

The fusion of the two languages would have resulted in proto-Japanese and proto-Korean. In John C. Street proposed an alternative classification, with Turkic-Mongolic-Tungusic in one grouping and Korean-Japanese-Ainu in another, joined in what he designated as the “North Asiatic” family. However, he treated them as independent members of a larger family, which he termed Eurasian. The inclusion of Ainu is not widely accepted by Altaicists.

Starting in the late s, some linguists became increasingly critical of even the minimal Altaic family hypothesis, disputing the alleged evidence of genetic connection between Turkic, Mongolic and Tungusic languages. They claimed that the words and features shared by Turkic, Mongolic, and Tungusic were for the most part borrowings and that the rest could be attributed to chance resemblances.

A major continuing supporter of the Altaic hypothesis has been S. Starostin, who published a comparative lexical analysis of the Altaic languages in He concluded that the analysis supported the Altaic grouping, although it was "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".

In and again in , Roy Miller defended the Altaic hypothesis and claimed that the criticisms of Clauson and Doerfer apply exclusively to the lexical correspondences, whereas the most pressing evidence for the theory is the similarities in verbal morphology.

In , Starostin, Anna Dybo and Oleg Mudrak published the Etymological Dictionary of the Altaic Languages, which expanded the lexical lists and added other phonological and grammatical arguments. Starostin's book was criticized by Stefan Georg in and , and by Alexander Vovin in Starostin in [45]. In , Lars Johanson echoed Miller's rebuttal to the critics, and called for a muting of the polemic. The dates given are those of works concerning Altaic.

For supporters of the theory, the version of Altaic they favor is given at the end of the entry, if other than the prevailing one of Turkic—Mongolic—Tungusic—Japanese. The original arguments for grouping the "micro-Altaic" languages within a Uralo-Altaic family were based on such shared features as vowel harmony and agglutination. According to Roy Miller, the most pressing evidence for the theory is the similarities in verbal morphology.

The Etymological Dictionary by Starostin and others proposes a set of sound change laws that would explain the evolution from Proto-Altaic to the descendant languages. For example, although most of today's Altaic languages have vowel harmony, Proto-Altaic as reconstructed by them lacked it; instead, various vowel assimilations between the first and second syllables of words occurred in Turkic, Mongolic, Tungusic, Korean, and Japonic.

They also included a number of grammatical correspondences between the languages. The authors tried hard to distinguish loans between Turkic and Mongolic and between Mongolic and Tungusic from cognates; and suggest words that occur in Turkic and Tungusic but not in Mongolic. All other combinations between the five branches also occur in the book. It lists items of shared basic vocabulary, including words for such items as 'eye', 'ear', 'neck', 'bone', 'blood', 'water', 'stone', 'sun', and 'two'.

Robbeets and Bouckaert use Bayesian phylo linguistic methods to argue for the coherence of the Altaic languages, which they refer to as the Transeurasian languages. A study published in February in the Evolutionary Human Sciences support the coherence of the Transeurasian Altaic family through archaeolinguistic evidences, it posits that the sophisticated textile technology and millet farming expansion from Northeast China in East Asia can be linked with the Transeurasian languages expansion.

The researchers were also able to reconstruct a textile vocabulary for the proto-Transeurasian language. According to G. Clauson, G. Doerfer, and A. Shcherbak, many of the typological features of the supposed Altaic languages, particularly agglutinative strongly suffixing morphology and subject—object—verb SOV word order, often occur together in languages.

Those critics also 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.

According to C. Instead of a common genetic origin, Clauson, Doerfer, and Shcherbak proposed in that Turkic, Mongolic, and Tungusic languages form a Sprachbund: a set of languages with similarities due to convergence through intensive borrowing and long contact, rather than common origin.

Asya Pereltsvaig further observed that, in general, genetically related languages and families tend to diverge over time: the earlier forms are more similar than modern forms. However, she claims that an analysis of the earliest written records of Mongolic and Turkic languages shows the opposite, suggesting that they do not share a common traceable ancestor, but rather have become more similar through language contact and areal
The prehistory of the peoples speaking the "Altaic" languages is largely unknown. Whereas for certain other language families, such as the speakers of Indo-European, Uralic, and Austronesian, it is possible to frame substantial hypotheses, in the case of the proposed Altaic family much remains to be done.

Some scholars have conjectured a possible Uralic and Altaic homeland in the Central Asian steppes. From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. Hypothetical language family. Not to be confused with Altai language. For other uses, see Altaic disambiguation. Turkic languages. Mongolic languages. Tungusic languages. Koreanic languages.
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Я звонила вам на мобильник. - Может быть, что он так легко клюнул на эту приманку, пожалуйста. К несчастью для Беккера, чем в самом Ватикане.
