ASJP World Language Tree of Lexical Similarity: Version 3 (July 2010)

by

André Müller, Søren Wichmann, Viveka Velupillai, Cecil H. Brown, Pamela Brown, Sebastian Sauppe, Eric W. Holman, Dik Bakker, Johann-Mattis List, Dmitri Egorov, Oleg Belyaev, Robert Mailhammer, Matthias Urban, Helen Geyer, and Anthony Grant

The World Language Tree graphically illustrates relative degrees of lexical similarity holding among 4350 of the world's languages and dialects (henceforth, languages) currently found in the ASJP database (ASJP stands for Automated Similarity Judgment Program). Languages branched more closely together on the ASJP tree are lexically more similar than those branched less closely together. While most lexical resemblance charted in the tree almost certainly is related to genetic affiliation, closely branched languages cannot routinely be assumed to be closely genetically associated since lexical resemblance among languages can be due to factors other than genetic relatedness (see below).

The tree is generated through use of the neighbour-joining computer algorithm originally designed to depict phylogenetic relationships in biology (Saitou & Nei 1987). This is implemented in MEGA 4 (Kumar et al. 2008), the software that we use. The algorithm is applied to a matrix of lexical similarity scores based on Levenshtein (or edit) distances holding between all possible pairs of the 4350 languages (for details about this, including how we modify the Levenshtein distances for our purposes, see Bakker et al. 2009: 169). All languages of the database are compared to one another with respect to lexical similarity relating to their words for 40 referents determined statistically in Holman et al. (2008) to be most stable among core vocabulary items commonly used in lexicostatistical analysis. The tree is unrooted, but organized around a midpoint, i.e., the point which is equidistant between the two most lexically dissimilar languages in the network. Finally, the tree is annotated to show how it corresponds to the classification used in the latest version of the online World Atlas of Language Structures (Haspelmath et al. 2008), with some updates from Dryer (personal communication). This annotation is presented for ease of orientation, not necessarily because ASJP agrees with it. The language names used are normally simply those

¹ http://www.megasoftware.net/

² http://wals.info/

of the sources consulted. The sources, as well as corresponding language names of *Ethnologue*, are provided in a continuously updated wiki.³

Four factors influence lexical similarity registered in the tree: (1) genetic or genealogical relationship of languages, (2) diffusion (language borrowing), (3) universal tendencies for lexical similarity such as onomatopoeia, and (4) random variation (chance).

Languages branched closely together on the tree may be so because of strong lexical similarity produced by any one or a combination of the four factors. Genetic relationship would appear to be the most dominant factor accounting for close branching, followed next by diffusion. Universal tendencies and chance are less significant contributors to close branching than either genetic relationship or diffusion, but nonetheless clearly contribute to the overall structure of the tree.

Typically, all languages of non-controversial language families such as Austro-Asiatic, Uralic, or Mayan, are respectively branched together on the tree. When some languages of a non-controversial family are not found branched together, this is because they are substantially lexically different from other members of their family despite unambiguously belonging to that family. Occasionally, a language can be so lexically different from co-members of its family that it is found branched more closely with some language or languages with which it is not genetically related at all, usually because of chance lexical similarity or similarity due to borrowing. (When such languages are geographically remote from one another, chance usually explains close branching.)

Typically, branching accords closely with genetic subgroups recognized by experts within non-controversial language families. When branching is not isomorphic with genealogical subgrouping, this often reflects diffusion among languages of the family promoted by language contact. Thus, when used in conjunction with expert classifications of non-controversial language families, the tree can be helpful in calling attention to historical relationships (contact) among genetically related languages that sometimes might not be otherwise apparent.

The tree may also suggest relationships heretofore not noticed among languages that may be profitably investigated. For example, if two languages not known to be related in any way are found together on a terminal branch, this may indicate a relationship between them entailing either inheritance or contact, especially if they are not geographically remote from one another. If the two languages are geographically distant, their close lexical similarity is

http://lingweb.eva.mpg.de/asjp/index.php/ASJP

more likely explained by chance than by either inheritance or diffusion. Also, language isolates may join one another on a terminal branch because they have nowhere else to go in the tree, creating the illusion that exciting, new far-flung relations may be in evidence. One should be cautious in the interpretation of these cases.

Earlier versions of the ASJP World Language Tree did not include languages regarded as creoles and pidgins, while this version does. Excluding creoles and pidgins would allow human judgments to intrude into the classification (or, in this case non-classification). It is of general interest to show how such languages pattern in the classification when preconceived notions of how they should be treated are avoided.

References

- Bakker, Dik, André Müller, Viveka Velupillai, Søren Wichmann, Cecil H. Brown, Pamela Brown, Dmitry Egorov, Robert Mailhammer, Anthony Grant, and Eric W. Holman. 2009. Adding typology to lexicostatistics: a combined approach to language classification. *Linguistic Typology* 13: 167-179.
- Holman, Eric W., Søren Wichmann, Cecil H. Brown, Viveka Velupillai, André Müller, and Dik Bakker. 2008. Explorations in automated lexicostatistics. *Folia Linguistica* 42.2: 331-354.
- Haspelmath, Martin, Matthew S. Dryer, David Gil and Bernard Comrie. 2008. *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library.
- Kumar S., J. Dudley, M. Nei, and K. Tamura K. 2008. MEGA: A biologist-centric software for evolutionary analysis of DNA and protein sequences. *Briefings in Bioinformatics* 9: 299-306.
- Saitou, Naruya and Masatoshi Nei. 1987. The neighbor-joining method: a new method for reconstructing phylogenetic trees. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 4: 406-425.

Language family abbreviations

Afro-Asiatic Chon AAChn Aik Aikana Cho Choco Ain Ainu Chq Chiquito Alacalufan Cht Chitimacha Ala Alg Algic Chu Chumash

Chukotko-Kamchatkan Alt Altaic CK Cmu Amto-Musan Chimúan AM An Austronesian CN Cacua-Nukak Candoshi AP Awin-Pare Cnd Arafundi Cof Cofán Ara Arc Araucanian Com Comecrudan Arutani Cre Creoles & Pidgins Art

Aru Arauan Cui Cuitlatec

Arw Arawakan CW Chapacura-Wanhan

Ata Atakapa Dos Doso Austro-Asiatic Dravidian AuA Dra Australian EA Eskimo-Aleut Aus EB Aym Aymaran East Bougainville Ban Bangi Me **EBH** East Bird's Head **EGB** East Geelvink Bay Bar Barbacoan

Bas Basque Ele Eleman

Beo Beothuk ES East Strickland
Bil Bilua GA Great Andamanese

Bor Border Gcu Guaicuruan GS Bos Bosavi Gogodala-Suki Guahiban Brs Burushaski Gua Bul Bulaka River Had Hadza Haida Bur Burmeso Hai Cad Caddoan Har Harakmbet Cah Cahuapanan HM Hmong-Mien Cam Hok Camsá Hokan Car Cariban Huavean Hua Cayuvava Hui Huitotoan Cay Chi Chibchan ΙE Indo-European

Chi Chibchan IE Indo-Europe Chk Chimakuan IG Inland Gulf Chl Cholón Ira Irantxe Chm Chimila Iro Iroquoian Ito Itonama May Mayan Jab Jabuti MGe Macro-Ge Mis Misumalpan Jap Japanese Jiv Jivaroan Mol Molof Kad Kadugli Mom Mombum Kam Kamula Mon Monumbo Kap Kapixana Mos Mosetenan Kar Karok Mov Movima Kat Katukinan Mrw Morwap

Kau Kaure MUM Morehead and Upper Maro Rivers

Kay Kayagar Mur Mura Ken Kenaboi Mus Muskogean KF Kwomtari-Fas MZMixe-Zoque Kho Khoisan Nah Nahali

Kiw Kiwaian Nambikuaran Nam Kol Kolopom Nat Natchez Kor Korean NC Niger-Congo Krt Kartvelian NDa Nakh-Daghestanian

KT Kiowa Tanoan NDe Na-Dene Nimboran Ktn Kutenai Nim Nivkh Kui Kujarge Niv NS

Kun Kunza Nilo-Saharan

Kus Kusunda **NWC** Northwest Caucasian

Kut Kuto OC Oregon Coast

Kwa Kwalean Odi Odiai Kwe Kwerba Oks Oksapmin Oto-Manguean Kwz Kwaza OM Lavukaleve Lav Pae Paezan

Lec Leco Pan Panoan LeM Pat Left May Pataxo Len Lencan Pau Pauwasi Lower Mamberamo LMa Pen Penutian LP Lakes Plain Pui Puinave LS Leonhard Schultze PY Peba-Yaguan

LSR Lower Sepik-Ramu Que Quechuan Mai Sal Salishan Mairasi

Marind South Andamanese Mar SAn

Mas Mascoian Sav Savosavo Mat Matacoan Sen Senagi

Sep	Sepik
Sho	Shom Peng
Sio	Siouan
Clro	Clro

Sko Sko Sln Salinan Slv Sáliban Snt Sentani

ST Sino-Tibetan

Tac Tacanan
Tak Takelma
Tar Tarascan
Tau Taushiro

Teb Teberan-Pawaian Teq Tequistlatecan

Tic Ticuna Tim Timucua TK Tai-Kadai

TNG Trans-New Guinea

TO Tor-Orya
Tof Tofanma
Tol Tol
Ton Tonkawa
Tor Torricelli

Tot Totonacan
Tou Touo
Tru Trumai
Tuc Tucanoan

TuK Turama-Kikorian

Tup Tupian
UA Uto-Aztecan
UC Uru-Chipaya
Un Unknown
Ura Uralic
Urr Urarina
Usk Usku

UY Upper Yuat VJ Vaupés-Japurá Wak Wakashan Wao Waorani War Warao Was Wasi

WBg West Bougainville WBm West Bomberai WF Western Fly WP West Papuan Wsh Washo

WY Wappo-Yukian

Xin Xincan Yal Yale Yam Yamana Yan Yanomam Yaw Yawa Yel Yele Yen Yeniseian Yka Yukaghir Yrb Yareban Yrr Yaruro Yua Yuat Yuc Yuchi Yur Yuracare Yuw Yuwana

Zamucoan

Zaparoan

Zuni

Zam

Zap

Zun

























































































































