

PROTO-URALIC HOMELAND ?????????? in WIKIPEDIA

EDITOR of Hun-Loops:

"How did the SELF-APPOINTED and OMNISCIENT linguists, in Wikipedia and elsewhere, could have managed to classify **HUNGARIAN** into the **Uralic** group of languages and on the top of that, to politically justify themselves in CONCOCTING UP an IMAGINARY **PROTO LANGUAGE** for it?

QUOTE FROM Wikipedia writers: "**Only some 200 word roots can be reconstructed for Proto-Uralic,.....**" but they do not even resemble Hungarian stemwords at all !!! How about trying to relate GRAMMATICAL algorithm similarities??? Comparing a FEW words alone and even failing with them to prove convincingly why they are keen on **SHOVINGHUNGARIAN** into the Uralic language group. An utter disgrace and unprofessionalism at its peak !!!

Only GOD KNOWS !

What is, if there is one at all, the scientific methodology to classify languages? "

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Proto-Uralic_homeland

Grammatically Proto-Uralic was an agglutinative nominative–accusative language.

Nouns

Proto-Uralic nouns are reconstructed with at least six noun cases and three numbers, singular, dual and plural. Grammatical gender was not recognized and no Uralic language does so even today. Noun articles were unknown.

The **plural marker** of nouns was *-t in final position and *-j- in non-final position, as seen in Finnish *talot* and *talojen* ("house" nom. pl. and gen. pl.). The dual marker **has been reconstructed as** *-k-, but the dual number has been lost in many of the contemporary Uralic languages.

The cases were:

- nominative (no suffix)
- accusative *-m
- dative/genitive *-n
- locative *-na / *-nä
- ablative/instrumentative *-ta / *-tä
- lative *-ŋ

The cases had only one three-way locative contrast of entering, residing and exiting (lative, locative and ablative respectively). This is the origin of the three-way systems as the three different ones in Karelian Finnish (illative/inessive/elative, allative/adessive/ablative, translative/essive/exessive). The partitive case, developed from the ablative, was a later innovation in the Finnic and Samic languages. Further cases are occasionally mentioned, e.g. Robert Austerlitz's reconstruction of Proto-Finno-Ugric^{citation needed} includes a seventh, adverbial.

A further noun case likely already found in Proto-Uralic is the translative *-ksi. The abessive *-ktak / *-ktäk is not completely certain as it could also have been a derivational category rather than a noun case. So as many as seven or eight noun cases can be reconstructed for Proto-Uralic with high plausibility.^[19]

The nouns also had possessive suffixes, one for each combination of number and person. These took the place of possessive pronouns, which did not exist.

Verbs[edit]

Verbs were conjugated at least according to number, person and tense. The reconstructions of mood markers are controversial. Some scholars argue that there were separate subjective and objective conjugations, but this is disputed; clear reflexes of the objective conjugation are found in only the easternmost branches, and hence it may also represent an areal innovation. Negation was expressed with the means of a [negative verb](#) *e-, found as such in e.g. Finnish *e+mme* "we don't".

Ergativity hypothesis[edit]

Merlijn De Smit of Stockholm University has argued for ergativity in Proto-Uralic, reinterpreting the accusative case as a lative one and arguing for a marked subject via the genitive case and a verbal ending, *mV-. Support for this theory comes from the Finnish agent participle constructions, e.g. *miehen ajama auto* — car driven by the man, *Naisen leipoma kakku* — the cake that woman baked.^[20] In these constructions the subject, which is usually unmarked, is in the genitive case, while the direct object, usually marked with -n is unmarked.

This resembles a passive construction such as *pater amatur a filio*, *filio* being declined in the ablative case, except that the word order in Finnish is reversed.

This construction also occurs in [Udmurt](#), [Mari](#), [Mordvinic](#) (the -mV participle is absent), and [Karelian](#). However, unlike Finnish, the construction is also used with intransitive sentences, characterized by the same -mV suffix on the verb, e.g. Udmurt *gyrem* busy, "a ploughed field, a field that has been ploughed", *lyktem kišnomurt*, "the arrived lady, the lady who has arrived". The -mV participle ending in Mari denotes a preterite passive meaning, e.g. in Eastern Mari *omtam počmo*, "the door (has been) opened", *təj kaləkən mondəmo ulat*, "you are forgotten by the people", and *memnan tolmo korno*, "the road that we have come".^[21]

This is problematic for the ergative theory because the -mV participle, labelled the *ergative* marker, is a passive marker in most of the languages that use it, and the Finnish agent participle constructions may in fact derive from similar constructions in Baltic languages, e.g. [Lithuanian](#) *tévo perkamas automobilis* or *automobilis* (*yra*) *tévo perkamas*. Notable is the unmistakable resemblance between the Baltic and Finnic verbal suffixes, and the fact that -mV is missing in both Estonian and Mordvinic, despite being two very close relatives of Finnish. However, the Baltic participle in -ma does not represent the most common Indo-European ending of a passive participle, even though it does have parallels in other Indo-European languages.^[22] Even if the ending derives from Proto-Uralic and not the Baltic languages, the transition from a passive to ergative construction is very common and has been observed in [Indo-Aryan](#), [Salish](#), and [Polynesian](#). The transition begins when the unmarked subject of the passive sentence, usually marked in active sentences (if the language is inflectional), is re-analyzed as an unmarked absolute, and the marked agent as ergative.^[23]

Vocabulary[edit]

Only some 200 word roots can be reconstructed for Proto-Uralic, if it is required that every word reconstructed for the proto-language should be present in [Samoyedic languages](#) (related to the hypothesis that Samoyedic was the first group to split off: see discussion at [Finno-Ugric languages](#)). With a laxer criterion of reconstructing words which are attested in most branches of the language family, a number in the range of 300–400 roots can be reached.

The following examples of reconstructed items are considered to fulfill the strictest criteria and are thus accepted as Proto-Uralic words by practically all scholars in the field:^[citation needed]

Body parts and bodily functions[edit]

- *ipti 'hair on the head'
- *ojwa 'head'
- *śilmä 'eye'
- *poski 'cheek'
- *kä(x)li 'tongue/language'

- *mëksa 'liver'
- *elä- 'to live'
- *ka(x)li- 'to die'
- *wajnji 'breath'
- *kosi 'cough'
- *kunši 'urine'
- *künili 'tear'
- *se(x)ji 'pus'

Kinship terms[\[edit\]](#)

- *emä 'mother'
- *čečä 'uncle'
- *koska 'aunt'
- *mińä 'daughter-in-law'
- *wäńiw 'son-in-law'

Verbs for universally known actions[\[edit\]](#)

- *meni- 'to go'
- *toli- 'to come'
- *aśkili- 'to step'
- *imi- 'to suck'
- *soski- 'to chew'
- *pala- 'to eat up'
- *uji- 'to swim'
- *sala- 'to steal'
- *kupsa- 'to extinguish'
- *tumti- 'to know'

Basic objects and concepts of the natural world[\[edit\]](#)

- *juka 'river'
- *toxi 'lake'
- *weti 'water'
- *päjwä 'sun/warmth'
- *kala 'fish'
- *sunji 'summer'
- *śala- 'lightning'
- *wanča 'root'
- *ko(x)ji 'birch'
- *ka(x)si 'spruce'
- *síksi 'Siberian pine'
- *δ'í(x)mi 'bird cherry'
- *muna 'egg'

Elementary technology[\[edit\]](#)

- *tuli 'fire'
- *śüδi 'coal'
- *äjmä 'needle'
- *pura 'drill/to bore'
- *jínsi 'bow'
- *jänti 'bow string'

- *níi(x)li 'arrow'
- *δ'ümä 'glue'
- *l̥ip̥si 'cradle'
- *piksi 'rope'
- *suksi 'ski'
- *woča 'fence'

Basic spatial concepts

- *ila 'below'
- *üli 'above'
- *wasa 'left'
- *pälä ""half""
- *pe(x)li 'side'

Pronouns

- *mun 'I'
- *tun 'you'
- *ke- 'who'
- *mi- 'what'

A reconstruction of a word *wäškä, meaning 'reddish metal' (copper, bronze or iron), has also been proposed. However, this word shows irregularities in sound correspondence, and some scholars believe it to be a [Wanderwort](#) instead.

The reconstructed vocabulary is compatible with a [Mesolithic](#) culture (bow, arrow, needle, sinew, but also rope, fence, cradle, ski), a north Eurasian landscape (spruce, birch, Siberian pine), and contains interesting hints on [kinship structure](#).

Examples of vocabulary correspondences between the modern Uralic languages are provided in the [list of comparisons](#) at the [Finnish Wikipedia](#).

Animals

Selected animal names from the Uralic Etymological Database:^[24]

scientific name	common name	proto-form	proto-language	no.
<i>Salmo</i>	a species of <i>trout</i>	*k8m3	Proto-Uralic	440
<i>Mustela martes</i>	<i>pine marten</i>	*luj3	Proto-Uralic	494
<i>Salvelinus alpinus</i>, <i>Salmo trutta</i>, <i>Hucho taimen</i>	<i>salmon</i> spp.	*ńowŋa	Proto-Uralic	642
<i>Stenodus nelma</i>	<i>nelma</i> , Siberian white salmon	*onč3	Proto-Uralic	669

scientific name	common name	proto-form	proto-language	no.
<i>Tetraastes bonasia</i>	<u>hazel grouse</u>	*piŋe (*pün̥e)	Proto-Uralic	<u>770</u>
<i>Mustela erminea</i>	<u>ermine</u>	*pojta	Proto-Uralic	<u>786</u>
<i>Tinca tinca</i>	<u>tench</u>	*totke	Proto-Uralic	<u>1068</u>
<i>Picus</i>	a species of <u>woodpecker</u>	*kʰr̥s	<u>Proto-Finno-Ugric</u>	<u>446</u>
<i>Apis mellifica</i>	<u>honey bee</u>	*mekše	<u>Proto-Finno-Ugric</u>	<u>534</u>
<i>Tetrao urogallus</i>	male of <u>capercaillie</u>	*paðt̥s	<u>Proto-Finno-Ugric</u>	<u>688</u>
<i>Hirundo rustica</i>	<u>swallow</u>	*päčk₃	<u>Proto-Finno-Ugric</u>	<u>711</u>
<i>Acipenser sturio</i>	<u>sturgeon</u>	*šampe	<u>Proto-Finno-Ugric</u>	<u>932</u>
<i>Gavia arctica</i>	<u>black-throated diver</u>	*tokta	<u>Proto-Finno-Ugric</u>	<u>1062</u>
<i>Tetrao urogallus</i>	<u>capercaillie</u>	*kopa-la (*koppa-la), *kopa-ŕa (*koppa-ŕa)	<u>Proto-Finno-Ugric or Proto-Finno-Volgaic</u>	<u>353</u>
<i>Parus</i>	<u>tit</u>	*č8ńs	<u>Proto-Finno-Permic</u>	<u>1206</u>

Plants[edit]

Selected plant names from the Uralic Etymological Database:^[24]

scientific name	common name	proto-form	proto-language	no.
<i>Picea abies</i>	<u>spruce</u> , <u>fir</u>	*kuse, *kose	Proto-Uralic	<u>429</u>
<i>Rubus chamaemorus</i>	<u>cloudberry</u> , <u>cranberry</u> , knotberry	*mura	Proto-Uralic	<u>564</u>
<i>Populus tremula</i>	<u>aspen</u>	*poj ^ʒ	Proto-Uralic	<u>787</u>
<i>Pinus cembra</i>	<u>Siberian pine</u>	*soks ^ʒ (*saks ^ʒ), *səks ^ʒ	Proto-Uralic	<u>903</u>
<i>Larix sibirica</i>	<u>larch</u>	*näŋ ^ʒ	<u>Proto-Finno-Ugric</u>	<u>591</u>
<i>Amanita muscaria</i>	<u>fly agaric</u>	*paŋka ^ʒ	<u>Proto-Finno-Ugric</u>	<u>706</u>
<i>Ledum palustre</i>	<u>wild rosemary</u>	*woł ^ʒ	<u>Proto-Finno-Ugric</u>	<u>1163</u>
<i>Ribes nigrum</i>	<u>black currant</u>	*ć8kč ^ʒ (*ć8kč ^ʒ -kk ^ʒ)	<u>Proto-Finno-Ugric</u>	<u>83</u>
<i>Lonicera xylosteum</i>	<u>honeysuckle</u>	*kusa	<u>Proto-Finno-Permic</u>	<u>1346</u>
<i>Ulmus</i>	<u>elm</u>	*ńolk ^ʒ , *ńalk ^ʒ	<u>Proto-Finno-Permic</u>	<u>1446</u>
<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>	<u>Scots pine</u>	*pečā, *penčā	<u>Proto-Finno-Permic</u>	<u>1475</u>
<i>Viburnum opulus</i> , <i>Acer campestre</i>	<u>snowball tree</u> , <u>field maple</u>	*šew ^ʒ	<u>Proto-Finno-Permic</u>	<u>1612</u>

scientific name	common name	proto-form	proto-language	no.
<i>Populus tremula</i>	<u>aspen</u>	*šapa	<u>Proto-Finno-Volgaic</u>	<u>1609</u>
<i>Ribes</i>	<u>currant</u>	*ćz̥kčz̥-t̥z̥r̥z̥	<u>Proto-Finno-Volgaic</u>	<u>1209</u>
<i>Acer platanoides</i>	<u>maple</u>	*wakš̥t̥z̥re (*wokš̥t̥z̥re)	<u>Proto-Finno-Volgaic</u>	<u>1683</u>

In popular culture

- The film [*Unna ja Nuuk*](#) (2006) has extensive dialogue in reconstructed Proto-Finno-Samic (Early [Proto-Finnic](#)), the proto-language of the [Finno-Samic languages](#).^{[25][26]}

See also



[Wiktionary](#) has a list of reconstructed forms at [Appendix:Proto-Uralic reconstructions](#)

- [Proto-Finnic language](#)
- [Proto-Uralic homeland hypotheses](#)