

CHAPTER FIVE

BURYAT

Elena Skribnik

Buryat (*buryaad xelen*) is a Northern Mongolic language presently spoken by c. 363,000 people out of an ethnic population of 421,380 (according to the census of 1989). The Buryat are divided among three administrative units of the Russian Federation: (1) the Buryat Republic or Buryatia, east and south of Lake Baikal, (2) the Aga National District (*okrug*) of Chita Province (*oblast'*), east of Buryatia, and (3) the Ust'-Orda National District of Irkutsk Province, west of Lake Baikal. Additionally, there are at least 100,000 ethnic Buryat in the northern and eastern provinces of Mongolia as well as in Inner Mongolia, China.

Traditionally, the Buryat are divided into two principal territorial groups: the Western (or Cis-Baikalian) Buryat and the Eastern (or Trans-Baikalian) Buryat. This division correlates with both dialectal and cultural differences, which have tended to grow since the eighteenth century, when the Eastern Buryat started to convert from Shamanism to Buddhism, while the Western Buryat were Christianized. As a result, the effects of acculturation and linguistic Russification are more pronounced among the Western Buryat, while the Eastern Buryat have retained cultural and linguistic links with the rest of the Mongolic world.

The current level of native-language proficiency among ethnic Buryat varies (according to Dyrxееva) from 78.7 per cent in the cities of Buryatia to 95.5 per cent among the rural population of the Aga District. At the same time, the knowledge of Russian as either the first or the second language varies between 97.3 and 99.5 per cent for all Buryat groups living in the Russian Federation. The proportion of children monolingual in Buryat is rapidly decreasing especially in the cities, where only 18.1 per cent of Buryat children attend a Buryat primary school against 48.9 per cent in the villages. The patterns of bilingualism are different for the Buryat groups in Mongolia and China, but the general trend is that Buryat is being abandoned in favour of the more dominant languages.

Historically, the linguistic ancestors of the Buryat are known to have been living in the Baikal region since the ninth and tenth centuries. The emergence of Buryat as a separate Mongolic language, however, took place only later, and was possibly due to a Tungusic substrate. The assumption of Tungusic influence is supported by data from archaeology, anthropology, ethnography, onomastics, folklore, and linguistics. The most important linguistic argument is the prevocalic development $*s > h$, which distinguishes Buryat from all other Mongolic languages with the exception of Khamnigan Mongol. It has to be noted that Buryat, with its numerous divergent dialects, shows generally very little diachronic coherence. The reasons why Buryat is traditionally regarded as a single language are, therefore, partly extralinguistic.

Small remnant populations of Tungusic (Ewenki) speakers survive up to the present day in some parts of Buryatia, notably in the Barguzin valley east of Lake Baikal. Other aboriginal neighbours of, especially, the Western Buryat include the Turkic speaking populations of the Sayan region (Tuva, Tofa). It is also generally assumed that the Upper Lena basin west of Lake Baikal was once inhabited by the Kurykan Turks (*Üc Quriqan*),

the linguistic ancestors of the modern Yakut. Part of the Kurykan Turks were apparently assimilated by the Mongolic speaking ancestors of the Western Buryat, while another part moved along the Lena towards the north. Until the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, there were also Samoyedic and Yeniseic speakers in the Western Buryat sphere of influence.

DATA AND SOURCES

Buryat was the first living Mongolic language to become an object of synchronic description. The pioneering Buryat grammar of M. A. Castrén (1857) has been followed by several other grammars and grammatical sketches, including those by Nicholas Poppe (1938, 1960, 1964), G. D. Sanzheev (1941), T. A. Bertagaev (1968), and A. A. Darbeeva (1997). The first official 'academic' description of Buryat phonology and morphology was prepared under the editorship of Sanzheev *et al.* (1962), complemented by a separate volume on syntax by Bertagaev and C. B. Cydendambaev (1962). A Western textbook of Buryat was compiled by James Bosson (1962).

More specific treatments of Buryat phonetics and phonology, both synchronic and diachronic, are those by I. D. Buraev (1959, 1987), B. Zh. Budaev (1981), as well as, most importantly, V. I. Rassadin (1982). Issues of grammatical categories, syntactic functions, sentence structure, and stylistics are discussed by Cydendambaev (1979), C.-Zh. Cydyrov (1972), Elena Skribnik (1988), and L. D. Shagdarov (1974). The largest bilingual dictionaries are those by Cydendambaev (1954) and K. M. Chermisov (1973), while U.-Zh. Sh. Dondukov (1964) and C. B. Budaev (1978) discuss other aspects of lexicology. G. A. Dyrxeeva (1996) has analysed the current sociolinguistic position of Buryat.

Altogether, Buryat is one of the best documented and researched Mongolic languages. This is partly due to the fact that Buryat is the literary language of a relatively large ethnic population with a high general level of education. The existence of the literary language has, however, not diminished the interest in research into the Buryat dialects. To the contrary, dialectological research (as well as political considerations) have caused important changes in the dialectal basis of the literary language. After the already very detailed and sophisticated work of A. D. Rudnev (1913–14), there has appeared a vast literature on Buryat dialectology. Some of the most important recent dialectological contributions include those by Budaev (1992), Buraev (1996), and Rassadin (1996, 1999).

Before the introduction of the modern literary language, the Eastern Buryat (but generally not the Western Buryat) used, starting in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Written Mongol as their principal literary medium. Few of the early texts compiled in the Buryat sphere are preserved, but from the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries there is a representative corpus of literature, including historical chronicles, genealogical descriptions, and translations of religious and philosophical texts.

Written Mongol, as used by the Buryat, gradually received features from the spoken language, making it different from the written language used by the speakers of Mongol proper. Some of the specific features of 'Written Buryat-Mongol' are discussed by G. C. Cybikov (1993). In 1905, another Buryat scholar, Agvan Dorzhiev, following the principles of the Oirat script, created an entirely separate orthography for Buryat. The new orthography was based on the phonemic principle and contained a set of thirty-six letters, graphically invariant for all positions (initial, medial, final). The Buryat phoneme *h* was expressed by a special letter, while diacritics were used to indicate vowel length

and palatalization. However, Dorzhiev's creation never received wider applications, probably because it was culturally inferior to the Mongol script.

DIALECTS

In the history of Buryat language studies, several classifications of dialects have been proposed. The central problem of all classifications concerns the border between Buryat and its Mongolic neighbours, Mongol proper and Khamnigan Mongol. Most Buryat linguists regard Khamnigan Mongol as a Buryat dialect, but the normal criteria of linguistic taxonomy (the number of positive isoglosses) do not support this identification. Similarly, the so-called Tsongol and Sartul dialects, spoken at the border between Buryat and Khalkha, are conventionally counted as belonging to the Buryat language, although almost all of their taxonomic characteristics, including even the behaviour of prevocalic *s, point to an intimate connection with Mongol proper. Linguistically, the Tsongol and Sartul dialects may be viewed as varieties of Mongol proper, which since the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries have been spoken on the Russian side of the border.

With these qualifications, the actual dialects of Buryat may be divided into the following five entities:

- (1) The Lower Uda (Nizhneudinsk) dialect, spoken in the western periphery of the Buryat territory. This is the most isolated Buryat dialect, which shows the strongest traces of Turkic (as well as, possibly, other non-Mongolic) substratal and adstratal influences.
- (2) The Alar–Tunka group, spoken to the southwest of Lake Baikal, and comprising the Alar, Tunka–Oka, Zakamna, and Unga dialects. Some speakers of the Tunka dialect have, mainly relatively recently, moved to the Mongolian side of the border.
- (3) The Ekhirit–Bulagat group, dominant in the Ust'-Orda National District and adjacent territories, located mainly to the west of Lake Baikal, and comprising the Ekhirit–Bulagat (proper), Bokhan, Ol'khon, Barguzin, and Baikal–Kudara dialects.
- (4) The Khori group, spoken to the east of Lake Baikal, and comprising the Khori (proper), Aga, Tugnui, and North Selenga dialects. Most of the Buryat living in Mongolia, as well as a small group of emigrants living in Hulun Buir League of Inner Mongolia, are also speakers of the Khori group of dialects.
- (5) The Bargut group, spoken since the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in the territory of the modern Hulun Buir League (historically known as Barga), and comprising the Old Bargut (or Chibchin) and New Bargut dialects.

Of these, the Lower Uda dialect, the Alar–Tunka group, and the Ekhirit–Bulagat group are spoken by people territorially representing the Western Buryat, while the Khori and Bargut groups are spoken by the Eastern Buryat. It may be noted, however, that some of the dialects with a Western Buryat background, notably the Barguzin dialect of the Ekhirit–Bulagat group, are actually distributed to the east of Lake Baikal, in territories otherwise dominated by the Eastern Buryat. This mixture is the result of a relatively recent expansion of the Western Buryat across Lake Baikal to previously non-Buryat territories.

For political reasons, the first modern literary language used by the Buryat, created in 1931 and using the Roman alphabet, was based on the actually non-Buryat Tsongol and Sartul dialects, also known as 'Southern Buryat'. The intention was to create a literary standard that could also have served the Mongols of Mongolia. In 1936, the basis of the

literary language was changed to correspond to the Khori dialect, spoken by the majority of all Buryat. Since 1939, the Buryat literary language has employed a Cyrillic orthography with three extra letters (for *h ö ü*). Though dialectally alien to the Western Buryat, the standard language has increased the coherence of the Buryat as a single linguistic entity. In addition to its use in printed publications, the standard language is used orally in education, as well as in radio and television broadcasting. The description below mainly follows the norms of the standard language.

SEGMENTAL PHONEMES

The Buryat vowel system (Table 5.1) has six short (single) and seven long (double) vowels. This is because the short vowel **ö* has merged with **ü*, while the long vowels *üü* and *öö* are preserved as separate entities, cf. e.g. *xül* ‘foot, leg’ < **köl*, *böö* ‘shaman’ < **büxe*. A tendency to merge short **i* and **e* is also observed under certain conditions, as in *shene* ‘new’ < **sine*, but with no paradigmatic consequences. Phonetically, the qualities of *e ü u o* show a considerable impact of rotation.

The neutralization **ö* and **ü > ü* is often considered to constitute one of the distinctive characteristics of Buryat, but it is actually also widely attested in dialects of Mongol proper, as well as in Khamnigan Mongol and Dagur. On the other hand, **ö* is preserved as a distinct short vowel in most dialects of the Western Buryat group, which in this, as well as in several other respects, resemble Oirat. The taxonomic value of the Buryat vowel paradigm is therefore small.

In addition to the six short (single) vowels *a e i o u ü* and the seven long (double) vowels *aa ee ii oo öö uu üü*, Buryat has the four ‘diphthongs’ (diphthongoid sequences) *ai oi ui üi*, of which *ai* [ɛ:] *oi* [œ:] *üi* [y:] often receive monophthongoid realizations. Dialectally, there is also a distinction between the long vowel *ee* [ɛ:] and the ‘diphthong’ *ei* [e:]; in the standard language, this distinction is present only at the morphophonological and orthographical levels. The synchronic status of the unique long vowel *öö* [o:], as opposed to both *oo* [o:] and *oi* [œ:], remains problematic. There remains the possibility that *öö* might be best analysed as another ‘diphthong’, perhaps *ue*.

In the consonant system, Buryat has maximally 30 phonemes (Table 5.2), which, according to the manner of articulation, comprise the strong stops *p py t ty k ky*, the weak stops *b by d dy g gy*, the strong fricatives *s sh x xy*, the weak fricatives *z zh*, the nasals *m my n ny ng*, the laterals *l ly*, the vibrants *r ry*, and the glides *w y h*. In difference from Mongol proper, the phonetic distinction between the strong and weak stops often involves, even in initial position, the feature of voicing (unvoiced vs. voiced), rather than aspiration (aspirated vs. unaspirated). The distinction between the strong and weak sibilants is always based on voicing.

All categories of consonants, with the exception of the glides, are characterized by an opposition between unpalatalized (plain) and palatalized segments. Palatalization is phonetically realized either as a secondary articulation (*py by my*), as alveopalatalness

TABLE 5.1 BURYAT VOWELS

<i>u</i>	<i>ü</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>o</i>	(<i>ö</i>)	<i>e</i>
	<i>a</i>	

TABLE 5.2 BURYAT CONSONANTS

<i>p</i>	<i>py</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>ty</i>	<i>ky</i>	<i>k</i>
<i>b</i>	<i>by</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>dy</i>	<i>gy</i>	<i>g</i>
		<i>s</i>	<i>sh</i>	<i>xy</i>	<i>x</i>
		<i>z</i>	<i>zh</i>		
<i>m</i>	<i>my</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>ny</i>		<i>ng</i>
		<i>l</i>	<i>ly</i>		
		<i>r</i>	<i>ry</i>		
<i>w</i>				<i>y</i>	<i>h</i>

(*ty dy sh zh ny ly ry*), or as palatalness (*ky gy xy*). Diachronically, the palatalization of an initial consonant is normally due to the palatal breaking of the following back vowel, as in *myaxa/n* ‘meat’ < **mika/n*. In non-initial syllables also, palatalization reflects an original **i*, and it is also observed before the long front vowels *ee üü ii*, as in *eryeen* ‘motley’ < **eriyen*, *tülxyüür* ‘key’ < **tülkixür*, *mori/n* ‘horse’: acc. *mory-iiyi*.

The strong stops *p py k ky* are secondary marginal phonemes, which only occur in recent loanwords and descriptive items. The same is true of the labial glide *w*, which, moreover, is distinctive (against *b*) only in initial position. The velar nasal *ng* < **ng*, on the other hand, though originally a separate phoneme, has almost completely lost its distinctive status, merging with **n* in most positions. Stem-finally *ng* remains, however, morphophonologically distinctive, and the distinction can at least dialectally be present even at the phonological level in the position before a suffix-initial dental obstruent, as in *an/g* ‘game, hunting’: instr. *ang/g-aar*: dat. *ang-da* (also > *an-da*) vs. *on* ‘year’: instr. *on-oor*: dat. *on-do*. In the standard orthography, *n* and *ng* are not distinguished.

The most important diachronic peculiarity of the Buryat consonant system is the spirantization of the affricates **c* vs. **j* into *s sh* vs. *z zh*, accompanied by the weakening (desibilization) of the sibilant **s* > *h* before vowels other than **i*. This has removed the original palatal affricates from the paradigm, though secondary dental affricates of the type *ts dz* are attested as emerging marginal phonemes in proper names of foreign origin. Due to the parallelism of the developments **s* > *h* and **c* > *s*, no actual neutralization of segments has taken place in cases like **sang* > *han/g* ‘store house’ vs. **cang* > *san/g* ‘cymbal/s’. A neutralization has, however, affected the sequences **ci* **si* **shV*, as in **cinar* > *shanar* ‘quality’ vs. **sira* > *shara* ‘yellow’ vs. *shabi* ‘disciple’ < **shabi*.

The spirantization of **c* **j* is paralleled by that of the original strong velar stop **k* > *x xy*, and from the Buryat point of view it could be a question of a single diachronic process. In the comparative context, however, the spirantization of **k* is a separate phenomenon, widely present in Mongolic. In the Western Buryat dialects (like in Oirat), this development is only observed before original back vowels, while in the Eastern Buryat dialects (like in Mongol proper) it is valid for all prevocalic positions, as in **kola* > *xolo* ‘distant’, **kele/n* > *xele/n* ‘tongue’. It has to be noted that the opposition of *x* (velar fricative) vs. *h* (laryngeal spirant) is typologically rather precarious, and it has tended to be lost in at least the Bargut dialects, in which pairs like *xara* ‘black’ < **kara* vs. *hara* ‘moon’ < **sara* seem to have been regularly neutralized.

WORD STRUCTURE

Generally, the Proto-Mongolic rules of word structure are well preserved in Buryat. Most importantly, there is no elision of final vowels, though the medial loss of a vowel

segment is observed under circumstances not yet fully understood, as in *malgai* ‘hat’ < **malagai*, *mülyhe/n* ‘ice’ < **mölisü/n*. As a new type, words with the final consonant cluster *rd* have appeared in descriptive vocabulary, as in *shard* [sound of oil boiling in a pan], *tard* [sound of cloth being torn].

As a sign of incipient vowel reduction, the paradigm of short vowels in non-initial syllables has slightly diminished. Thus, the high rounded vowels **u* **ü* have merged with the low vowels **a* **e*, as in *aba* ‘father’ < **abu*, *üder* ‘day’ < **ödür*. After the segments *sh zh*, at least orthographically, the neutral vowel **i* has likewise merged with **a* **e*, as in *bagsha* ‘teacher’ < **bagsi*. The distribution of vowels is also governed by vowel harmony (both palato-velar and labial), e.g. *xana* ‘wall’ : dat. *xana-da* : abl. *xana-haa*, *bodol* ‘thought’ : dat. *bodol-do* : abl. *bodol-hoo*, *düü* ‘younger brother’ : dat. *düü-de* : abl. *düü-hee*, *böö* ‘shaman’ : dat. *böö-de* (for **böö-dö*) : abl. *böö-höö*. The short vowel *i* can be followed by either a front or a back vowel, as in *nidxer-* ‘to work [leather]’, *nizal-* ‘to pound’, while the long vowel *ii* (normally < **ei*) can only be followed by a front vowel, as in *diile-* ‘to win’ (< **deile*).

Complications to vowel harmony arise after an initial syllable containing the short vowel *ü* (< **ü* & **ö*). In such cases, a following non-high long vowel is normally *öö* irrespective of what the original harmonic pattern of the word is, cf. e.g. *xül* ‘foot, leg’ (< **köl*) : refl. *xül-öö* (< **köl-öö*), *üile* ‘deed’ (< **üile*) : instr. *üil-öör* (< **üil-eer*). The stem *xün* ‘man’ (< **küün*), however, preserves its original pattern and requires *ee*, e.g. abl. *xün-hee*. Labial harmony is transmitted forward by a syllable containing *e*, as in *üder* ‘day’ : instr. *üder-öör*, but not by syllables containing *uu* *üü*, as in *orshuul-* ‘to translate’ : part. fut. *orshuul-xa*, *böölüül-* ‘to have a shamanist rite performed’ : part. imperf. *böölüül-ee*.

Phenomena pertaining to consonant morphophonology include the strengthening of a suffix-initial *d* into *t* after obstruent stems, to which also stems ending in *r* belong, e.g. *mal* ‘cattle’ : dat. *mal-da* vs. *ger* ‘house’ : dat. *ger-te*; as well as the nasalization of a suffix-initial *l* into *n* after a stem-final nasal, e.g. *uha/n* ‘water’ : *uha.la-* ‘to water’ vs. *gem* ‘guilt’ : *gem.ne-* ‘to accuse’ (< **gem.le-*). It has to be noted that monosyllabic consonant-stem verbs have been restructured into vowel stems, which has removed some instances of suffix-initial consonant alternations, cf. e.g. *olo-* ‘to find’ (< **ol-*) : conv. imperf. *olo-zho* (for **ol-ji*) vs. *aba-* ‘to take’ (< **ab-*) : conv. imperf. *aba-zha* (for **ab-ci*).

As a feature of Common Mongolic origin, a suffix-initial long vowel conditions in Buryat the presence of the connective consonant *g* after stems ending in a long vowel, as in *zhooloo* ‘bridle’ : instr. *zhooloo/g-oor*. As in most dialects of Mongol proper, the connective consonant also appears after stems ending in *n/g* < **ng*, as in *zan/g* ‘habit’ : instr. *zang/g-aar*. Most interestingly, due to phonological restructuring, the connective consonant is used between a stem-final *n/g* and the ablative ending (< **-AAha*), which gives rise to the otherwise unattested three-consonant medial cluster *nggh* (*ng/g-h*), as in *den/g* ‘candle’ : abl. *deng/g-hee*. The stems ending in *n/g* are also characterized by the alternation between *n/g* and *g*, as in *an/g* ‘game, hunting’ : *ag.na-* ‘to hunt’ (< **ang.la-*). A stem-final *n* < **n*, on the other hand, alternates with *ny* (before *ii*) and *m* (before *b*), as in *xün* ‘man’ : gen. *xün-ei* : acc. *xüny-iiyi* : vx sg. 1p. *xüm-bi*.

The unstable */*n* of nominal stems is generally well preserved in Buryat in the absolute form (nominative), though it is regularly absent in certain inflected forms. Another stem-final phenomenon is the deletion of all final short vowels before suffixes beginning with a vowel, which makes the inflected forms of vowel stems indistinguishable from those of consonant stems, as in *nerē* ‘name’ : instr. *ner-eer* vs. *ger* ‘house’ : instr. *ger-eer*. Final *i* is also deleted, but it causes the palatalization of the stem-final consonant, as in *mori/n* ‘horse’ : instr. *mory-oor*.

NUMBER AND CASE

Like most other Mongolic languages, Buryat has a system of derivational plural marking. Forms marked for the plural express a multitude as a group; with non-animate nouns the plural markers are not obligatory. The plural markers are: *.UUd* after most consonants, e.g. *tüseb* ‘plan’ : pl. *tüseb.üüd*; *.nUUd* after vowels and the liquids *l r*, e.g. *baxa* ‘frog’ : pl. *baxa.nuud*, *gaxai* ‘pig’ : pl. *gaxai.nuud*, *sar* ‘oxe’ : pl. *sar.nuud*; *.d* after stems ending in an unstable */n* as well as after the actor noun suffixes *.gshA* and *.AAshA*, e.g. *shubuu/n* ‘bird’ : pl. *shubuu.d*, *huragsha* ‘pupil’ : pl. *huragsha.d*, also *nüxer* ‘friend’ : pl. *nüxe.d*; and *-nAr* after stems denoting social categories (profession, kinship, also pronouns), e.g. *bagsha* ‘teacher’ : pl. *bagsha.nar*, *axa* ‘elder brother’ : pl. *axa.nar*.

The case paradigm in Buryat is of the Common Mongolic type and comprises six suffixally marked cases: genitive, accusative, dative, ablative, instrumental, and possessive (Table 5.3). The unmarked basic form functions as a nominative. From the point of view of suffix allomorphy, the nominal stems may be divided into short-vowel stems (V), long-vowel stems (VV), ‘diphthong’ stems (Vi), including stems ending in *ii*, velar-nasal stems (Ng), obstruent stems (O), and other consonant stems (C), including stems ending in *n*. Generally, consonant stems follow the pattern of vowel stems except for the genitive, while obstruent stems differ from other consonant stems only in the dative. Long-vowel stems and velar-nasal stems follow the pattern of ‘diphthong’ stems, with some differences in the occurrence of the connective consonant *g*.

Most case endings show additional variation due to vowel harmony (both palatal and labial). Because of the specific features of vowel harmony in Buryat, the dative and possessive endings have three variants each (*-da* : *-do* : *-de* for the dative and *-tai* : *-toi* : *-tei* for the possessive), while the ablative and instrumental endings have four variants each (*-haa* : *-hoo* : *-hee* : *-höö* for the ablative and *-aar* : *-oor* : *-eer* : *-öör* for the instrumental). The genitive ending of consonant stems, also used after the connective consonant *g* for the long-vowel stems and velar-nasal stems, has three variants (*-ai* : *-oi* : *-ei*). Only the accusative ending is harmonically neutral (*-ii-yi*, written as *-iiye* in the standard orthography).

The unstable */n* of nominal stems is generally preserved in the case declension, except in the accusative. In the unmarked form (nominative), however, a functional distinction is present between the full variant (with the final nasal) and the short variant (without the nasal). The full variant occurs as a subject or an unspecified attribute, as well as with postpositions, e.g. *halxi/n* ‘wind’ : (attributive construction) *halxin teerme* ‘wind mill’, *modo/n* ‘tree’ : (postpositional construction) *modon deere* ‘on a tree’, while the short variant occurs as an unmarked object and as a component in compound words, e.g. *xoni/n* ‘sheep’ : (compound construction) *xoni yamaa/n* ‘small cattle’ (literally: ‘sheep and

TABLE 5.3 BURYAT CASE MARKERS

	V	C	O	Vi	VV	Ng
gen.	<i>-iin</i>	<i>-Ai</i>		<i>-n</i>	<i>/g-Ai</i>	
acc.	<i>-iiyi</i>			<i>-yi</i>		<i>/g-iiyi</i>
dat.	<i>-dA</i>		<i>-tA</i>			
abl.	<i>-hAA</i>					<i>/g-hAA</i>
instr.	<i>-AAr</i>			<i>/g-AAr</i>		
poss.	<i>-tAi</i>					

goats'). A similar distinction is possible in the instrumental, with the full variant having a comitative meaning, e.g. *mori/n* 'horse' : instr. (short) *mory-oor* 'on horseback' vs. (full) *morin-oor* '[together] with a horse'.

Examples of case paradigms: *xada* 'mountain' : gen. *xad-iin* : acc. *xad-iyyi* : dat. *xada-da* : abl. *xada-haa* : instr. *xad-aar* : poss. *xada-tai*; *besheg* 'letter' : gen. *besheg-ei* : acc. *besheg-iyyi* : dat. *besheg-te* : abl. *besheg-hee* : instr. *besheg-eer* : poss. *besheg-tei*; *mori/n* 'horse' : gen. *mori/n-oi* : acc. *mory-iyyi* : dat. *mori/n-do* : abl. *mori/n-hoo* : instr. *mory-oor* or *mori/n-oor* : poss. *mori/n-toi*; *dalai* 'sea' : gen. *dalai-n* : acc. *dalai-yi* : dat. *dalai-da* : abl. *dalai-haa* : instr. *dalai/g-aar* : poss. *dalai-tai*; *düü* 'younger brother' : gen. *düü/g-ei* : acc. *düü-yi* : dat. *düü-de* : abl. *düü-hee* : instr. *düü/g-eer* : poss. *düü-tei*; *den/g* (orthographically **den**) 'candle' : gen. *deng/g-ei* : acc. *deng/g-iyyi* : dat. *deng-de* or *den-de* (**dende**) : abl. *deng/g-hee* : instr. *deng/g-eer* : poss. *deng-tei* or *den-tei* (**dentei**).

In the sentence, the nominative is the case of the subject and direct unspecified object, while the accusative indicates the direct specific object, e.g. *dorzho-iyyi stol-do uri-ba-d* 'they invited Dorzho to the table'. The genitive expresses various types of adnominal attribute, e.g. (possession) *ax-iin nom* 'brother's book', (part of a whole) *xübüü.d-ei negen* 'one of the children', (other relation) *namar-ai üder* 'autumn day', (postpositional construction) *urog-oi hüül-de* 'after the lesson' (with dat. *hüül-de* 'after' from *hüül* 'tail'). The genitive also marks the primary actants of deverbal nouns (and non-finite predicates), e.g. *uhan-ai uradxa* 'flow of water', *shuluun nüürhen-ei maltalga* 'mining of coal'.

The dative (dative-locative) and ablative function as the two local cases with both spatial and temporal meanings, e.g. dat. *hurguuli-da* 'at school, to school', *xarangxi-da* 'in the dark', abl. *tengeri-hee* 'from the sky', *xabar-haa* 'since the spring'. The dative also marks the addressee and recipient, while the ablative marks the source, e.g. dat. *egeshe-de* 'for the elder sister', abl. *hamgan-haa* 'from a woman'. More specifically, the dative indicates positive emotional reaction, e.g. (pronominal example) *bi tan-da duratai-b* 'I like you', while the ablative indicates negative emotional reaction, e.g. *xüiten-höö ai-xa* 'to be afraid of the cold'. The dative is also the case of the actor in passive constructions, e.g. *taryaan münder-te soxyuul-aa* 'the corn was beaten by hail'. Finally, the ablative (ablative-comparative), indicates the referent of comparison, e.g. *zürxeny-iiny shuluun-haa xatuu* 'his heart is harder than stone'.

The instrumental, when formed from inanimate nouns, indicates a variety of circumstances, e.g. (tool) *xutag-aar* 'with a knife', (means) *san-aar* 'by ski', (payment) *arba müngg-öör* 'for ten copecks', (material) *tümer-öör* 'from iron', (route) *xargii/g-aar* 'by the road', (time) *übel-öör* 'in winter', (period) *olon zhel-eer* 'for many years', (cause) *ööriinggöö xereg-eer* 'because of one's own business', (manner, from adjectival nouns) *bat-aar* 'firmly'. It is also used in constructions of measurement, e.g. *ayaga-tai sai* 'a cup of tea' (literally: 'tea with a cupful'). When formed from animate nouns, however, it typically implies the active participation of a second participant, e.g. *nüxer-öör-öö damzhuul-xa* 'to send by one's friend', *nüxed-öör-öö arxida-xa* 'to drink with one's friends'.

The instrumental may be compared with the possessive, which, when used adverbially, indicates simple accompaniment, e.g. *bagsha-tai* 'together with a teacher, accompanied by a teacher'. In adnominal use, the possessive retains its original function as a possessive adjectival noun. Stems ending in an unstable /n have differentiated the two functions, with the full stem being used in the actual possessive case form, as in *morin-toi* 'with a horse' vs. *mori.toi* 'having a horse'. In both functions, the possessive is paralleled by the privative construction (or privative case) in *-güi* or *.güi* 'without', e.g. *mori-güi* 'without a horse', *zürxe.güi* 'heartless'.

NUMERALS

The Buryat shapes of the Common Mongolic numerals for the first decade are: 1 *nege/n*, 2 *xoyor*, 3 *gurba/n*, 4 *dürbe/n*, 5 *taba/n*, 6 *zurgaa/n*, 7 *doloo/n*, 8 *naima/n*, 9 *yühe/n*, 10 *arba/n*. The other non-composite numerals are, for the decades: 20 *xori/n*, 30 *gusha/n*, 40 *düshe/n*, 50 *tabi/n*, 60 *zhara/n*, 70 *dala/n*, 80 *naya/n*, 90 *yere/n*; and for the powers of ten: 100 *zuu/n*, 1,000 *myanga/n*, 10,000 *tüme/n*. For higher numerals, the Tibetan loanwords 100,000 *bum*, 1,000,000 *saya* ‘million’, and 100,000,000 *donshuur*, were used in the older language, but they are now obsolete. In the modern literary standard, the unadapted Russian orthographical shapes **million** ‘million’ and **milliard** ‘billion’ are used.

All numerals have a regular case paradigm. In composite numerals, only the last member (indicating units) is inflected. The unstable /n/ of numeral stems is normally preserved in attributive use, except in the item 1 *nege/n*, e.g. *nege xün* ‘one person’ vs. *taban xün* ‘five persons’. All numerals drop the final nasal in counting: *nege xoyor gurba dürbe taba* etc. The variants without the final nasal are also used adverbially as multiplicatives, e.g. *dürbe soxi-xo* ‘to strike four times’, and predicatively in multiplication, as in *taban taba, xorin taba* ‘five times five is twenty five’. Fractions are expressed by the genitive, e.g. *arban-ai negen* ‘one tenth’, while the possessive expresses age, e.g. *arba-tai* ‘ten years old’.

Derivatives based on the numerals include the ordinals in *.dAxi*, e.g. *nege.dexi* ‘first’, the distributives in */g.AAd*, e.g. *gurb.aad* ‘three (for) each’, the collectives in *.UUlan*, e.g. *dürb.üülen* ‘four together’, and the delimitatives in *.xAn*, e.g. *taba.xan* ‘only five’. Etymologically conditioned special forms are present in distr. *nezh.eed* ‘one each’ and *xosh.ood* ‘two each’. In coll. *zurgaa.l.uulan* ‘six together’, *doloo.l.uulan* ‘seven together’, the derivative suffix is partly reduplicated. For the ordinals, the Khalkha suffix *.dUGAAr* is also occasionally used in the literary language. Before all these suffixes, the stem-final unstable /n/ is dropped. With the exception of the distributives, the numeral derivatives have a regular nominal paradigm, e.g. coll. gen. px pl. 1p. *gurb.uulan-ai-mnai* ‘of the three of us’, dat. refl. *gurb.uulan-d-aa* ‘for the three of themselves’.

The distributive suffix, when added to numerals denoting decades or the higher powers of ten, is also used to form approximatives, e.g. *arb.aad* ‘about ten’, *zuu/g.aad* ‘about a hundred’. For the units, approximation is expressed syntactically by placing two consecutive numerals together, the former of which drops the unstable /n/, e.g. *gurba+dürben* ‘three or four’, *taba+zurgaan* ‘five or six’. For an approximate number exceeding a lower limit, the pronoun *xeden* ‘several’ (< ‘how many’) can be used, e.g. *arban xeden zhel* ‘more than ten years’.

PRONOUNS

The Buryat system of personal pronouns is of the Common Mongolic type and comprises only items for the first and second persons, with the first person plural oblique paradigm being divided into exclusive and inclusive forms (Table 5.4).

In the singular pronouns the elision of the original medial vowel has resulted in different stem allomorphs being used for the accusative (*nama-yi* : *shama-yi*, orthographically **namaye** : **shamaye**) and for the other oblique cases (*nam-* : *sham-* < **nama-* : **cima-*). The plural pronouns can also appear as suffixally marked plural forms: 1p. excl. (colloquial style) *maa.nar* or *maa.na.d* : incl. (literary style) *bide.ner* or *bide.ne.d* : 2p. *taa.nar*. The second person plural pronoun *ta* is most often used in polite reference to

TABLE 5.4 BURYAT PERSONAL PRONOUNS

		1p.		2p.
sg.	nom.	<i>bi</i>		<i>shi</i>
	gen.	<i>minii</i>		<i>shinii</i>
	acc.	<i>namayi</i>		<i>shamayi</i>
	obl.	<i>nam-</i>		<i>sham-</i>
		excl.	incl.	
pl.	nom.		<i>bide</i>	<i>ta</i>
	gen.	<i>manai</i>	<i>bidenei</i>	<i>tanai</i>
	obl.	<i>man-</i>	<i>biden-</i>	<i>tan-</i>

a single person, though it has plural reference in combinations like *ta xoyor* ‘you two’, dat. *ta noyo.d-to* ‘to you, gentlemen’.

The basic demonstrative pronouns are: *ene* ‘this’ : obl. *eneen-* : pl. *ede-* or *ede.ner* : obl. *eden-* or *edeen-* vs. *tere* ‘that’ : obl. *tereen-* : pl. *tede* or *tede.ner* ‘those’ : obl. *teden-* or *tedeen-*. Correlative derivatives include: *iime* or *iime.rxüü* ‘like this’ vs. *tiime* or *tiime.rxüü* ‘like that’, *edii* ‘this much’ vs. *tedii* ‘that much’ (also *edii tedii* ‘some’), *ende* ‘here’ : abl. *ende-hee* vs. *tende* ‘there’ : abl. *tende-hee*, dir. *iishe* ‘in this direction’ vs. *tiishe* ‘in that direction’, *ii-(+ge)-* ‘to do like this’ and *tii-(+ge)-* ‘to do like that’. Another demonstrative correlation is present in *ünöö* ‘this’ vs. *münöö* ‘now, today’, *ünöö-xi* ‘exactly this’ vs. *münöö-xi* ‘the present one’.

The basic interrogative pronouns are *xen* ‘who’ : pl. *xe.d* and *yüü/n* ‘what’ : pl. *yüü.d*. The stem *xe-* is also preserved in a number of derivatives, including *xer* ‘how’ : instr. *xer-eer* id., *xezee* ‘when’, *xeden* ‘several’, *xedii* : obl. *xediin-* ‘how many, how much’ : ord. *xedii.dexi* ‘how many’ : coll. *xedii.lüülen* ‘in a group of how many’. Some case forms of *yüü/n* appear in lexicalized uses, such as dat. *yüün-de* ‘why’, instr. *yüü/g-eer* ‘at what price’. Other interrogatives include: *ali* ‘which’, *yamar* ‘what kind of’, *xaana* ‘where’ : abl. *xaana-haa* : pros. *xaa/g-uur* ‘which way’ : dir. *xai-sha* ‘in which direction’. The interrogative verb is *yaa-* or *yaa+ge-* ‘to do what’ : conv. imperf. *yaa-zha* ‘how’ : perf. *yaa/g-aad* id.

The interrogative pronouns also function as indefinite pronouns, often accompanied by *nege/n* ‘one, some, certain’, e.g. *xen nege/n* ‘somebody’, *xezee nege/n* ‘sometime’, *yamar nege/n* ‘some kind of’, *ali nege/n* or *ali+baa* ‘any’. Another indefinite pronoun is *zarim* ‘some’ : dat. refl. *zarim-d-aa* ‘sometimes’. Generic pronouns with the meaning ‘everything, all’ include *bügeden*, *büxeli*, *büxii*, *xamag*, *xuu*, *bulta/n*, *baran*, as well as (only adjectivally) *büxen* ‘every’, *büri* ‘each’. Intensifying pronouns are: *ondoo* or *nügöö* ‘other’, *busa* or *beshe* ‘other, different’.

The reflexive pronoun has the stems *öör* and *ööhen* (< **öxe.sü/n*) ‘oneself’ : pl. *ööhe.d*. The inflected forms, including a distinct nominative unmarked for the category of case, normally take the reflexive marker, e.g. nom. *öör-öö* : acc. *öör-ii/g-öö* : dat. *öör-t-öö* : abl. *öör-h-öö* : instr. *öör-öör-öö* : poss. *öör-tei/g-öö*. The reflexive marker can, however, be absent in the genitive: *öör-iin* or *öör-iing/g-öö*. Instead of the reflexive pronoun, the reflexive forms of the regular noun *beye* ‘body’ can also be used, as in refl. *beye-ee bari-xa* ‘to keep oneself under control’, instr. refl. *beye-ee-ee* ‘by oneself, personally’. The reduplicated *öör&öör* and refl. *beye&beye-ee* ‘each other’ (with further case forms)

fill the function of a reciprocal pronoun. In the Lower Uda dialect, the reflexive pronoun sg. *ööhen* : pl. *ööhed* functions as the third person personal pronoun.

POSSESSIVE SUFFIXES

Buryat has the full Common Mongolic set of possessive suffixes (Table 5.5). The relatively recent origin of the possessive suffixes is still signalled by the fact that they do not follow the rules of vowel harmony. Also, the adding of the possessive suffixes occasionally produces otherwise unattested complex consonant clusters, e.g. *ger* ‘house’ : px. pl. 2p. *ger-mai* (with the three-segment medial cluster *rtn*).

There are, nevertheless, several morphophonological alternations connected with the possessive suffixes. In the first person, the full variants sg. *-mni* : pl. *-mnai* occur only after vowels, while after consonants the variants sg. *-ni* : pl. *-nai* are used. In the third person, the variant *-ny* is normally used only after vowels, while consonants require the presence of the connective vowel *ii*, e.g. *axa* ‘elder brother’ : px. sg. 1p. *axa-mni* : 3p. *axa-ny* vs. *ger* ‘house’ : px. sg. 1p. *ger-ni* : 3p. *ger-iiny*. A final *n* (of any function or origin) merges with the initial *m* of the first person possessive suffixes, but is otherwise preserved, e.g. *mori/n* ‘horse’ : px. sg. 1p. *mori/m-ni* : 2p. *morin-shni* : 3p. *moriny-iiny* : pl. 1p. *mori/m-nai* : 2p. *morin-tnai*. The first person singular possessive suffix *-mni* can optionally be shortened into *-m*, e.g. *axa-m* ‘my elder brother’.

In the basic possessive construction, the possessive suffixes can be replaced by an analytically used genitive attribute, as in px. sg. 1p. (*minii axa-m(ni)* or *minii axa* ‘my elder brother’). On the other hand, possessive suffixes can be attached even to pronouns in order to stress the mutual relations in the communicative situation, as in sg. 2p. px. sg. 1p. *shi-mni* ‘you of mine’, sg. 3p. px. sg. 2p. *tere-shni* ‘he of yours’. The third person possessive suffix often expresses individualization, e.g. *morinoi negeny-iiny* ‘one of the horses’, *xara-ny* ‘the black one’.

When added to the case endings, the possessive suffixes show some special developments. Most interestingly, the third person suffix, when added to the instrumental case ending, yields the complex *-AAr-ny* (with the final cluster *rny*), which seems to contrast with the first person form in *-AAr-ni*. The combinations of all case endings with the singular possessive suffixes may be exemplified as: *mori/n* ‘horse’ : gen. 1p. *morin-oi-mni* : 2p. *morin-oi-shni* : 3p. *morin-oi-ny* : acc. 1p. *mory-iiyi-mni* : 2p. *mory-iiyi-shni* : 3p. *mory-iiyi-ny* : dat. 1p. *morin-do-mni* : 2p. *morin-do-shni* : 3p. *morin-do-ny* : abl. 1p. *morin-hoo-mni* : 2p. *morin-hoo-shni* : 3p. *morin-hoo-ny* : instr. 1p. *mory-oor-ni* : 2p. *mory-oor-shni* : 3p. *mory-oor-ny* : poss. 1p. *morin-toi-mni* : 2p. *morin-toi-shni* : 3p. *morin-toi-ny*.

The reflexive marker appears in Buryat as *-yAA* after stems ending in a short vowel, and as */g-AA* after other stem types, e.g. refl. *axa-yaa* ‘elder brother’, *ger-ee* ‘house’, *düü/g-ee* ‘younger brother’. When combined with the case endings, the reflexive marker conditions special alternations. In the genitive, an element *-ng/g-* appears in all stem

TABLE 5.5 BURYAT POSSESSIVE SUFFIXES

	sg.	pl.
1p.	<i>-m/ni</i>	<i>-m/nai</i>
2p.	<i>-sh(ni)</i>	<i>-tnai</i>
3p.		<i>/ii-ny</i>

types, including nasal stems, e.g. *mori/n* ‘horse’ : gen. *morin-oi* : poss. *morin-oi-ng/g-oo*. In the ablative, the reflexive marker merges with the vowel of the case suffix, but a distinction is created by exceptionally retaining the original final */n of the reflexive form, e.g. abl. *morin-hoo* : refl. *morin-h-oo-n*. In the possessive, the final component of the ‘diphthong’ becomes consonantal, e.g. poss. *morin-toi* : refl. *morin-toy-oo*. There are no complications in the dative and instrumental: dat. refl. *morin-d-oo* : instr. *mory-oor-oo*. There is no marked accusative case in the reflexive declension.

FINITE VERBAL FORMS

Compared with most other Mongolic languages, the spheres of imperative and indicative forms are in Buryat somewhat more closely integrated. In addition to occasional functional overlapping between the two spheres, a morphological link is created by the predicative personal endings, which (as in Oirat and Kalmuck) can be added to both imperative and indicative markers. A consistent formal distinction is, however, retained in the negative constructions. Most of the finite markers in Buryat (Table 5.6) originally belong to the imperative sphere, while only two or three forms survive from the Proto-Mongolic and Common Mongolic system of indicative temporal-aspectual forms.

The imperative sphere in Buryat comprises, in addition to the basic unmarked imperative, the following forms: precative, voluntative, optative (both simple and expanded), benedictive, prescriptive, permissive, and dubitative. Most of the imperative markers take personal endings, with only the benedictive and permissive remaining systematically without personal marking; personal marking is optional in the voluntative, optative, and prescriptive. The negation of all imperative forms takes place by the prepositional prohibitive particle *bü* ~ *büü*.

Functionally, the basic unmarked imperative and the benedictive are opposed not so much by the degree of politeness as by the different subject number (singular vs. plural), e.g. imp. [sg.] *oro* ‘come in!’ vs. ben. [pl.] *oro-gtii* ‘[you, many] come in!’. A more polite request is expressed by the precative, e.g. prec. sg. 2p. *duul-ii-sh (daa)* ‘please sing!’, pl. 2p. *sai ayagal-ii-t* ‘please pour tea!’, while the prescriptive normally refers to an action to be performed later (‘future imperative’), e.g. prescr. pl. 2p. *yab-aarai-t* ‘you can go (later)’. An order directed at the third person is expressed by the permissive, e.g. perm. *unsha-g* ‘let him read!’.

TABLE 5.6 BURYAT FINITE VERBAL MARKERS

	person	marker	
prec.	2p.	/g-ii-	+vx
vol.	1p. pl.	-yAA	(+vx)
opt.	1p.	-hUU	(+vx)
opt. exp.	1–3p.	-hAi	+vx
ben.	2p.	-gtii	
prescr.	2p.	/g-AArAi	(+vx)
perm.	3p.	-g	
dub.	1–3p.	/g-UUzhA/n	+vx
dur.	1–3p.	-nA	+vx
term.	1–3p.	-bA	+vx
conf.	1–3p.	-lAi	+vx

Among the forms referring to the first person plural, the voluntative in *-yAA* (orthographically *-ya*, *-ye*, *-yo*) or vx. pl. 1p. *-yAA-bdi* presupposes an inclusive subject, e.g. vol. *unsha-yaa* or vol. vx. pl. 1p. *unsha-yaa-bdi* ‘let us read (together with you)’, while the optative in *-hUU-bdi* presupposes an exclusive subject, e.g. opt. vx. pl. 1p. *unsha-huu-bdi* ‘we shall read (without you)’. The optative marker *-hUU* (an irregular development of **-sU*) is also used in reference to a first person singular subject, either with or without a personal ending, e.g. opt. *unsha-huu* or opt. vx. sg. 1p. *unsha-huu-b* ‘let me read!’. The expanded optative in *-hAi* (< **-sU-xAi*) expresses an irreal wish and has a full personal conjugation, e.g. opt. exp. 3p. *yaba-hai* ‘if only he/they could go!’ : vx. sg. 1p. *yaba-hai-b* : 2p. *yaba-hai-sh* : pl. 1p. *yaba-hai-bdi* : 2p. *yaba-hai-t*.

The dubitative occasionally retains its original cautionary meaning in the third person, e.g. dub. *duul-uuzha* ‘I hope he does not hear’. Generally, the dubitative has in Buryat developed into an indefinite future tense with only a vague modal content, e.g. dub. vx. pl. 1p. *yab-uuzha-bdi* ‘we shall go [later, sometime]’. The connection with the imperative sphere is, however, indicated by the use of the prohibitive particle *bü* (*büü*) for negation, e.g. neg. dub. vx. sg. 1p. *bü yab-uuzha-b* ‘I shall not go’. With no functional difference, the dubitative marker can also appear with a final *n*, e.g. dub. sg. 1p. *yab-uuzham* (< **yab-uuzham-bi*) : 3p. *yab-uuzhan*.

The general present and past tenses of the indicative sphere are expressed by the durative and terminative forms, e.g. sg. 1p. dur. *huu-na-b* ‘I sit’ : term. *huu-ba-b* ‘I sat’. Both forms are negated by the element *-güi*, e.g. dur. neg. *mede-ne-güi* ‘[he] does not know’, term. neg. *oro-bo-güi* ‘[he] did not enter’. The durative can also be used to refer to a proximate future. A third indicative form is the confirmative, which, however, is obsolete in the modern standard language. It is recorded with both the temporal meaning of a declarative past, as in *xelseenggüi hain yabaad yere-lei-b* ‘I went there and came back with very good results’, and the modal meaning of caution (close to the original function of the dubitative), as in conf. sg. 2p. *una-lai-sh* ‘you can fall’ [i.e. ‘take care, do not fall!’].

PARTICIPLES

The category of participle is exceptionally richly represented in Buryat. In addition to the five primary participles inherited from Proto-Mongolic, there are at least four secondary forms that may be classified as participles. In view of their functions, these forms may be termed the resultative, passive, potential, and qualificational participle. Also, the agentive participle (actor noun) retains in Buryat both of its Common Mongolic variants in productive (more or less synonymic) use (Table 5.7).

The futuritive participle can still refer to the future tense, e.g. (part. fut.) *übhende gara-xa xiniüüd* ‘people who [will] go to haymaking’, though it also has more general applications. In combination with modal derivatives of the type *xereg.tei* ‘necessary’ : *xereg.güi* ‘unnecessary’, it forms analytic predicates, e.g. *xolo osho-xo xereg.güi* ‘one must not go far’. The perfective and imperfective participles express completed (past) and uncompleted (continuing) action, respectively, e.g. (part. perf.) *gerhee hayaa garazha yaba-han exener* ‘a woman who just went out of the house’, (part. imperf.) *enyeezhe bai-gaa basagan* ‘a smiling girl’. The habitive participle expresses habitual action, e.g. (part. hab.) *daisanai bai-dag gazarnuud* ‘places where the enemy [forces] are situated’, while the agentive participle may be characterized as denoting frequentative action, e.g. (part. ag.) *xara-gsha basagam* ‘the girl I saw [several times]’.

TABLE 5.7 BURYAT PARTICIPLE MARKERS

		neg.
part. fut.	-xA	-xA-güi
imperf.	/g-AA	g/-AA-güi
perf.	-hAn	
hab.	-dAg	-dAg-güi
ag. (1)	-gshA	-gshA-güi
ag. (2)	/g-AAshA	/g-AAshA-güi
res.	-ngxAi	
pass.	/g-AAAtAi	
pot.	-xAAR	+beshe
qual.	-mAAR	+beshe

The negation of all the basic participles takes place by the suffix *-güi*, with the exception that the negative counterpart of the perfective participle is normally replaced by the corresponding imperfective construction in */g-AA-güi*. The imperfective participle marker can also be followed by the negative suffix *-dii* ‘not yet’ (< **edüi*), yielding */g-AA-dii*. Interestingly, the agentive participle in */g-AAshA* can be negated both by */g-AAshA-güi* and by */g-AA-güi-she*, revealing the original morphological connection with the imperfective participle marker in */g-AA*. The agentive participle in *-gshA* has only the negation *-gshA-güi*.

The resultative and passive participles are functionally close to the perfective participle, e.g. (part. res.) *puladaar üheeye uyazharxi-ngxai exener* ‘a woman who has tied her hair with a scarf’, (part. pass.) *uy-aatai morin* ‘a tethered horse’. Materially, the resultative participle involves an old deverbal derivative (**ng.kU.i*), which has gained (or retained) full productivity in Buryat, while the passive participle is the possessive derivative of the imperfective participle (**/g-AA.tAi*). It may be noted that the passive participle marker does not contain a formal passive marker. The Common Mongolic derivational passive marker *.gdA-* is, however, present in the corresponding negative suffix *.gd-AA-güi*.

The potential participle (‘possibility’) in *-xAAR* and the qualificational participle (‘suitability’) in *-mAAR* are diachronically instrumental case forms of the futuritive participle (**-kU*) and a deverbal noun (**-m/A*), respectively. The form in *-xAAR* is elsewhere in Mongolic often analysed as a converb, while the form in *-mAAR* is analysed as a derivative. In Buryat both may be viewed as participles because of their fully productive adnominal use, as in (part. pot.) *xeneishye magta-xaar beri* ‘a daughter-in-law that can be praised by anyone’, (part. qual.) *seregte aba-maar morid* ‘horses that are fit to be taken to the war’. The special origin of these two forms is, however, still shown by the corresponding negative constructions, which employ the postpositive particle *beshe*, e.g. (part. qual. neg.) *etige-meer beshe xereg* ‘an unbelievable thing’.

The basic form (nominative) corresponding to the suffix *-mAAR* also survives on the periphery of the Buryat participial system as *-mA*, denoting the quality of action (‘so that’, ‘such that’), e.g. *odool shanagiin zogso-mo güüledeg edyeesheg sai* ‘tea so strong that, as they say, even the spoon stands [in it]’. The corresponding negative meaning is expressed by the suffix *-sha-güi*, e.g. *xele amanda oro-sho-güi muuxai ügenüüd* ‘words so bad that they do not [even] enter the tongue and mouth’.

CONVERBS

As many as twenty five converbial forms have been established for Buryat, but many of them are rare or dialectally restricted. In the standard language, less than fifteen converbs are commonly used (Table 5.8).

The converbial system involves three diachronic levels. At the first and most basic level, there are the Proto-Mongolic modal, imperfective, and perfective converbs, as well as the corresponding negative form, based on the modal converb. The second level comprises the Common Mongolic conditional, concessive, and terminative converbs. The third level comprises forms of quasiconverbial origin, including the contemporal, abtemporal, final, intentional (supine), successive, and comparative ('instead of', 'rather than') converbs. At a still more secondary level, converb-like functions are also filled by many other, synchronically fully transparent quasiconverbial constructions, such as part. fut. dat. *-xA-dA* 'when' : abl. *-xA-hAA* 'since', part. fut. abl. *-hAn-hAA* 'after', part. imperf. neg. dat. *-AA-güi-de* 'while not' : *-AA-düi-de* 'while still not', and others.

The modal, imperfective, and perfective converbs are strongly dependent on the lexical and temporal-aspectual characteristics of their syntactic heads. They are used mostly in same-subject constructions, e.g. (conv. mod.) *ezhii morin deerehee harabshala-n udaan xarana* 'the mother looks into the distance from horseback, screening her eyes with her hand'; (conv. imperf.) *una-zha, bodo-zho bai-zha xoinohoony shergüüseldenebdi* 'we are trailing after him, falling down and rising again'. In different-subject constructions, the dependent subject is unmarked for case, e.g. (conv. imperf.) *urgasa nogoon unasatai bai-zha*, (conv. mod. neg.) *burunuudshye üxe-n xata-nggüi, hü myaxan gansata elbegzhee belei* 'grass being abundant, calves not dying, milk and meat became plentiful'; (conv. perf.) *ger-nai düresh-ööd, gansal ene shubuunai ger ülöö geeshe* 'our house having burnt, only this chicken yard was left'.

The subject of the other converbs is most often expressed by a possessive or reflexive ending, e.g. (conv. term. px pl. 1p.) *tende xürezhe osho-tor-nai dain baldaan duuhaxa yohotoi* 'by the time we get there the war will surely be over'; (conv. contemp. sg. 3p.) *edege-mseer-ny busaxabdi* 'we will come back right after she gets well'; (conv. abtemp. px sg. 1p.) *tanixashye bolo-hoor-ni oroidoo hara güüsügüi* 'it is not even a month since I got acquainted [with her]'; (conv. succ. rx) *butedmaa tereniyyi tani-xalaar-aa*

TABLE 5.8 BURYAT CONVERB MARKERS

	marker	neg.	
conv. mod.	<i>-n</i>	<i>-ng-güi</i>	+rx
imperf.	<i>-zhA</i>		
perf.	<i>/g-AAd</i>		
cond.	<i>-bAl</i>		+px
conc.	<i>-bA-shye</i>		
term.	<i>-tAr</i>		+px/rx
contemp.	<i>-ms-AAr</i>		+px/rx
abtemp.	<i>-h-AAr</i>		+px
fin.	<i>-x-AAr</i>		
intent.	<i>-xA/y-AA</i>		
succ.	<i>-xA-lAAr</i>		+px/rx
comp.	<i>-ngx-AAr</i>		

bayarlashaba ‘recognizing him, Butedmaa was glad’. A nominal subject can also stand in the genitive case, e.g. (gen. + conv. cond.) *xashangxa xabar-ai bolo-bol, buxalshye übhen ünetei bolodog xa* ‘if a difficult spring comes, even a stock of hay can be valuable’; (gen. + conv. conc.) *xand-iin abyaagüi xebte-beshye, amilxany elixen bolozhol baiba* ‘though Khanda lay without a sound, her breathing was clearly heard’.

The final, intentional, and comparative converbs are only attested in same-subject constructions, e.g. (conv. fin.) *debshen hain xün gegde-xeer hain yüüme yüü xeeb* ‘what good has Debshen done to be called a good man?’; (conv. intent.) *tedenerte öxibüüdiiny tuhal-xayaa yerengxei* ‘their children have come to them in order to help’; (conv. comp.) *neree xuxara-ngxaar yahaa xuxara* ‘rather than break your name, break your bones!’. Two other forms with a similar restriction are those in *-ngg-AA* (< conv. mod. + rx), expressing simultaneous action (the so-called ‘concomitant’ converb), e.g. *shi gazaa gara-ng/g-aa tülyee asaraarai* ‘bring firewood on your way out’, and *-mgAsh-AA*, indicating an unusual manner in which the action of the main verb is performed, e.g. *shi bai-mgashaa ünyeegee haadag güsh* ‘do you milk your cow standing?’.

Converbs form the basis for two kinds of analytic construction. The first kind involves the modal, imperfective, and perfective converbs in combination with *c.50* auxiliary verbs, which express various types of aspectuality, directionality, and modality. The most basic auxiliary is *bai-* ‘to be’, e.g. (conv. imperf. + *bai-*) *nom unsha-zha baina* ‘[he] is reading a book’ [progressive]; (conv. mod. + *bai-*) *nom unsha-n baina* ‘[he] reads a book [briefly, at the moment]’ [non-progressive]; (conv. perf. + *bai-*) *unsh-aad baina* ‘[he] has read [it]’ [perfective]. Other common auxiliaries include *orxi-* ‘to throw’ [perfective], *oro-* ‘to enter; to begin’ vs. *gara-* ‘to exit; to stop’ [inchoative vs. terminative], *yere-* ‘to come’ vs. *osho-* ‘to go’ [direction to vs. from], *xööre-* ‘to ascend’ vs. *buu-* ‘to descend’ [direction up vs. down], *üge-* ‘to give’ vs. *aba-* ‘to take’ [benefactive], *shada-* ‘to be able’ vs. *yada-* ‘to be unable’ [potential].

The other type of construction involves the final and intentional converbs in combination with the auxiliary *bai-* ‘to be’, or intentional verbs of the type *shiide-* ‘to decide’, *zabda-* ‘to intend’, *tegiül-* ‘to strive’; *tüxeer-* ‘to prepare’, *zürxel-* ‘to dare’. The meaning is that of intentionality, e.g. (conv. intent. + *bai-*) *shi xüügediyyi ürgezhe aba-xayaa bainash* ‘[so] you intend to adopt a child’; (conv. fin. + *zabda-*) *maidar yaba-xaar zabdaba* ‘Maidar decided to go’, (conv. intent. + *tegiül-*) *xadamda zhedemde gara-xayaa tegiülhen baigaa gü* ‘does she strive to marry?’.

PREDICATIVE PERSONAL ENDINGS

Most finite predicates in Buryat incorporate a personal ending of the Common Mongolic type (Table 5.9). The third person singular is unmarked, while the third person plural can

TABLE 5.9 BURYAT PREDICATIVE PERSONAL ENDINGS

	sg.			pl.		
	V	C	N	V	C	N
1p.	-b	-bi	/m(-bi)	-bdi	-di	/m-di
2p.	-sh	-shi		-t	-tA	
3p.	-Ø			[-d]		

be marked by the nominal plural suffix **.d*. In the first and second persons, there are separate variants for vowel stems (V) and consonant stems (C), in the first person also for nasal stems (N). In the first person singular, the actual personal element can be lost after a stem-final nasal (*/m < /m-bi < */n+bi*).

The predicative personal endings are added both to finite forms, including most forms of the imperative sphere, and to participles functioning as finite predicates. By contrast, the subject of non-finitely used participial forms and converbs, is normally expressed by either the possessive suffixes (dependent absolute person) or the reflexive suffix (dependent relative person), as in (px sg. 1p.) *nüxedtöö xelexe-de-m ünenshexe-güi* ‘when I tell [it] to my friends, they will not believe [it]’ (dependent absolute person expressed by a possessive suffix); (rx) *inzhener boloxo-d-oo mede-xe-b* ‘when I become an engineer, I will know [it]’ (dependent relative person expressed by the reflexive suffix).

A special case is formed by the futurity participle, which occurs in finite use in combination with both the predicative personal endings and the possessive suffixes. The forms with the predicative personal endings have a temporal reference (general future), while the forms with the possessive suffixes involve a modal connotation (inevitability or necessity), e.g. part. fut. sg. 1p. vx *unsha-xa-b* ‘I will read’ vs. px *unsha-xa-m(ni)* ‘I will [have to] read [soon, for sure]’. In a somewhat similar use, the possessive suffixes can be attached to the perfective participle, which then assumes a role close to that of a subordinate predicate (succession of opposed actions), e.g. (part. perf. px sg. 1p.) *gansaxiyyi edixeb gezhe hana-ha/m-ni, xoyor baina gü* ‘I intended to eat only one, but there seem to be two [here]’.

All predicatively conjugated finite and non-finite forms fuse into a single system of functional distinctions. In this system, the present tense range is represented by the durative (actual present) and the habitive participle (general present), while the past tense range has as many as five forms: the terminative (simple past), the confirmative (declarative past), the imperfective participle (actual past), the perfective participle (perfective past), and the resultative participle (resultative past). The participles can also be combined with the auxiliary *bai-* ‘to be’, yielding additional distinctions, e.g. (part. hab. + dur.) *baatar nom unsha-dag bai-na* ‘Baatar usually reads books’ (habitual action); (part. perf. + dur.) *bagsha gerte oro-hon bai-na* ‘the teacher has entered the house’ (actual for the present); (part. perf. + part. imperf.) *bagsha gerte oro-hon bai/g-aa* ‘the teacher had entered the house’ (actual for the past).

Many of the analytic forms with *bai-* ‘to be’ involve the connotation of inferentiality and/or mirativity (the speaker finds out a fact by watching its results), e.g. (dur. + part. fut.) *teresh ende huu-na bai-xa* ‘he must be sitting here’; (part. res. + dur.) *zhargal yabangxai baina* ‘[it turned out that] Zhargal had gone away long ago’; (part. perf. + part. fut.) *ailnuud zuhalandaa hayaxan buu-han bai-xa* ‘[it will turn out that] the settlements have just moved to their summer pastures’; (part. perf. + term.) *iigezhe duugaralsazha baitaraa, nege xaraxadamni, ezhiimni untasha-han bai-ba* ‘so I talked for a while, [but] when I looked up, [it turned out that] my mother had fallen asleep’.

PREDICATIVE PARTICLES

Important functional distinctions in the predicate are also expressed by predicative particles, a category which can be divided into interrogative, negative, modal, evidential, and copular particles. From the formal point of view, the predicative particles are either prepositional or postpositional. Some of the latter have developed into suffixes or clitics.

(1) Interrogation is expressed by the general question particle *gü* and the corrogative (special question) particle *be* (< **bui*), both of which are used postpositionally. After vowels, the corrogative particle takes the shape *-b*, which might also be analysed as a clitic (= *b*). Another interrogative particle is *aal*, used for rhetoric questions, e.g. *agaarhaa ünetei yüümen bii yüm aal* ‘is there anything more precious than air?’.

(2) Negation of most verbal predicates takes place by the suffix *-güi* (or clitic = *güi*) ‘not’ (< **ügei* ‘absent’). The imperfective participle can also be negated by the suffix *-dii* (or clitic = *dii*) ‘not yet’ (< **edüi* ‘this much’), while imperatives can only be negated by the preposited prohibitive particle *bü* ~ *büü* ‘do not!’. Contrastive negation of any part of the sentence is expressed by *beshe* ‘other than’ (postpositional).

(3) Modal particles express either confirmation, e.g. *agsha*, *bshuu*, *daa*, *geeshe*, *shuu*, *le* > *l*, or probability, e.g. *aa*, *aab*, *aabza*, *aalam*, *altai*, *geebii*, *gelei*, *beze*, *xa*, *xayaa*. An irreal wish is expressed by the optative particle *hai* ‘if only’. Diachronically, many of the modal particles are petrified finite and non-finite forms of a few auxiliary verbs, notably **a*- > Ø- ‘to be’, **bü*- > **bi*- > *be*- id., *ge*- ‘to say’.

(4) The futuritive participle *gexe* (< **ge-kü*) of the verb *ge*- ‘to say’, most often combined with the perfective participle of the predicative verb, functions as an evidential particle (hearsay evidential with elements of doubt), e.g. *bazardaan gariiyiny xazazharxihan ge-xe* ‘Bazardaan, so they say, bit his hand’. Somewhat less grammaticalized forms with a similar function are dur. *ge.lse-ne* and part. hab. *ge.lse-deg*, based on the derivative cop. *ge.lse*- ‘to say together’.

(5) Some modal particles are so void of modal content that they are better classified as copular (constatational) particles. The most common copular particles are *yüm* (< **yexüme* ‘something’) for the present tense, and *belei* (< conf. **bi-lüxei*) or *hen* (< part. perf. **a-gsan*) for the past tense, e.g. *teresh ene nomiiyi unshahan yüm* ‘he has read this book’, *nüxershni yeree hen* ‘your friend has come (already)’. In combination with the futuritive participle, the particles *belei* and *hen* express a hypothetical (counterfactual) circumstance, e.g. *suglaan boloxo hen* ‘there should have been [there was supposed to be] a meeting’.

The basic elements of the predicate follow each other in the order: stem – finite or non-finite markers – negation – interrogation – predicative personal endings, e.g. (dur. + negation + interrogation + vx sg. 2p.) *shi yaba-na-güi gü-sh* ‘do you not go?’. By contrast, possessive suffixes indicating the subject of a finite predicate precede the interrogative particle *gü*, e.g. (part. fut. + px sg. 1p. + *gü*, disjunctive function) *yaba-xa-m gü*, *bai-xa-m gü* ‘shall I go or not?’ (literally: ‘shall I go, shall I stay?’). Other predicative particles are variously placed either before or after the predicative personal endings, e.g. (part. fut. + negation + modal particle + vx sg. 1p.) *bi eneeniyiyi xezhe shada-xa-güi xa-b* ‘maybe I will not be able to do it’, (part. ag. + modal particle + vx pl. 2p. + *daa*) *boroogoi urda osho-gsho hai-t daa* ‘you had better go before the rain’.

SIMPLE SENTENCES

Buryat follows the Common Mongolic word order subject–object–predicate (SOV). The subject position can be filled by a noun, nominal phrase, headless relative clause, or a clause with nominalizers. The subject of a finite clause is in the nominative and determines the personal agreement of the predicate and the use of the reflexive marker within the clause, e.g. (dat. refl. + part. fut. px sg. 1p.) *bi xüdelmeri-d-öö osho-xo-m* ‘I will go to my work’. To stress the subject as a topic, intensifying particles can be used: *xadaa*,

geeshe (also used as a predicative particle), *bolbol* (written language), e.g. *ene zhel xadaa nahan soom egeel zoltoi zhel baiba* ‘this year was the happiest year of all my life’; *baigal geeshe delxei deere egeen yexe nuur yüm* ‘Baikal is the biggest lake on earth’; *xün bolbol uxaatai amitan* ‘man is a thinking creature’.

A noun in the object position can be either in the accusative or in the unmarked oblique stem form (without the unstable /*n*). The accusative implies a specific focused object, mostly (but not necessarily) definite, e.g. *bi tanai mory-iyyi xaraab* ‘I saw your horse’, *ene tere lama bööner-iyyi shütezhe huudag baigaa* [people] used to believe in lamas, shamans, and such’. The unmarked stem implies an unspecific unfocused object, e.g. *bazar shandaga agnazha oshoo* ‘Bazar went to hunt hares’. Thus, proper names and personal pronouns are used as objects only in the accusative, e.g. *bi damdiny-iyyi xaraab* ‘I saw Damdin’. Possessive suffixes also require the accusative ending, e.g. *xutag-iyye-ny xursada* ‘sharpen his knife!’, while the reflexive marker implies object position without accusative marking, e.g. *xutag-aa xursada* ‘sharpen your knife!’.

The predicate position can be occupied by either a verbal or a nominal form, including a nominal case form. Nominal predicates require a copula (*bai-* ‘to be’, *bolo-* ‘to become’) only if marked tenses or moods, or a change of state, have to be expressed. The negation of nominal predicates takes place by the particle *beshe*. Clauses with nominal predicates can be divided into equative, ascriptive, locational, existential, and possessive. The most simple type is represented by equative clauses, in which the nominal predicate expresses either classification, e.g. *bi bagsha-b* ‘I am a teacher’ (the referential noun functions as the subject), or identification, e.g. *bagsha bi-b* ‘I am the teacher’ (the referential noun functions as the predicate). The nominal predicate can also take possessive suffixes, e.g. *mergen shinii yüün-shni* ‘what is Mergen for you?’.

In ascriptive sentences, the nominal predicate is typically an adjectival noun in the nominative, but it can also be a numeral, an adverb, or a nominal case form, e.g. *tengeri selmeg* ‘the sky is clear’; (gen.) *ene nom zuun-ai* ‘this book costs [one] hundred [rubles]’; (poss. corr. vx sg. 2p.) *shi xen-tei-b-shi* ‘who are you with?’. With human subjects, an adjectival predicate is almost invariably complemented by a classifying noun like *xün* ‘man, person’ or *zon* ‘people’, e.g. *sogto hain xün* ‘Sogto is [a] good [man]’. Comparison in ascriptive clauses is expressed syntactically by adding an ablative noun phrase denoting the referent, e.g. *enesh baran-haa uxaatai xün* ‘he is (a) more clever (man) than anyone [else]’.

In locational clauses, the predicate is a local or temporal adverb, a local case form, or a postpositional phrase, e.g. *axash xaanaab* ‘where [is] your brother?’; *tarilgada garalgan xezee yüm* ‘when do we go (to) sowing?’; *sesegmaa gertee xa yüm* ‘Sesegmaa is at home’. Existential clauses have a similar structure, but a reversed word order, e.g. *gazaany tarimal sesegüüd* ‘outside [there are] garden flowers’; *züün xoito bulanda nabtaran modon oron* ‘in the northeastern corner [there is] a low wooden bed’. The predicate of existential clauses can be complemented or replaced by an existential noun, which is either the affirmative *bii* (< **bu*) : intensive *bii=l* or the negative *ügii* (< **ügei*), e.g. *oi taiga bii=l* ‘[there] is taiga forest [here]’; *badma ügii* ‘Badma is not [here]’.

Possessive clauses do not constitute a distinct structural type of their own. Instead, possession is expressed by three different structures, two of which follow the ascriptive and one the existential pattern. In the first ascriptive structure, the noun indicating the possessor functions as the predicate in the genitive case, e.g. *ene buush minii nüxer-ei=l* ‘this gun belongs to my friend’ (literally: ‘is of my friend’). In the second ascriptive structure, the noun indicating the thing possessed occupies the predicate position in the possessive case, e.g. *yeshe münge-tei hen gü* ‘did Yeshe have money?’ (literally: ‘was

Yeshe with money?'). In the third structure, the noun indicating the possessor is in the dative case, e.g. *nam-da saarhan ügii* 'I have no paper' (literally: 'to me there is no paper').

The existential (possessive) pattern is also used to describe internal states, e.g. *nam-da xüiten* 'I feel cold' (literally: 'to me it is cold'); *nam-da ayagiü baiba* 'I was ill at ease' (literally: 'to me it was uncomfortable'); *nam-da yexel honin baiba* 'I felt very interested' (or: 'it was very interesting for me'). For external states the locational pattern is used, e.g. *gazaa xüiten* '[it is] cold outside'; *iishemnai xülgöötei bolo-ngxoi* '[it] had become dangerous here'; also metaphorically, e.g. *dosoomni xarangxii boloo* 'I got sad' (literally: 'inside of me it became dark').

Sentences with a verbal predicate can be divided into those with and those without governed participants. No manifest participants are present with verbs denoting natural processes (*verba meteorologica*), e.g. *xeden xonogtoshye shuurgalzha boloxo* 'it will be storming for several days'. Only a non-governed participant (subject) is present with verbs denoting states and activities, e.g. *bi huuxab* 'I will sit down', *suglaan boloxony* 'a meeting will (have to) take place'. Other verbs have governed participants, as required by the government pattern of each given verb. Verbs of action normally have their governed participant (object) in the accusative, while verbs of emotion are combined with the dative (positive emotion) or ablative (negative emotion), e.g. (dat. refl.) *tere nüxer-t-öö suxaldaq* 'he got angry at his friend'; (abl.) *teresh xulgahan-haa aidag* 'he is afraid of mice'. Even polyvalent verbs, such as verbs of motion, are most often combined with only one manifest participant (source, route, or target), e.g. (source) *tedener xaana-haa yereeb* 'where did they come from?'.

The government pattern of the verb can be changed by adding voice affixes to the verbal stem. The passive (formed by *.gd-* after vowel stems, *.dA-* or *.tA-* after etymological consonant stems) decreases the valence by demoting the actor. Passivized verbs usually express the state after action, e.g. (pass. part. fut. px 3p.) *xargiinuuq xaa.gda-xa-ny* 'the roads will be closed'. A retained actor stands in the dative, e.g. (dat. + pass. part. res.) *taryaan tüimer-te galga.gda-ngxai* 'the crops were burnt by fire'. The causative (normally formed by *.UUL-* after single-vowel stems and *.lga-* after double-vowel stems) increases the valence by adding the causator argument. The actor is lowered to the indirect object position with dative marking, e.g. (dat. refl. + caus. part. imperf. vx sg. 1p.) *bi basagan-d-aa sai x.üül-ee-b* 'I made my daughter pour me tea'.

COMPLEX SENTENCES

From the structural point of view, there are three types of complex sentence in Buryat: monofinite synthetic sentences, monofinite analytic sentences, and bifinite analytic sentences. From the semantic point of view, there are also three types: modus-dictum (event-mind) constructions, dictum-dictum (event-event) constructions, and coreferential constructions. In modus-dictum constructions, the dependent clause is governed by the main predicate. In dictum-dictum constructions, one event acts as a modifier for another. In coreferential constructions, two events are coordinated through a common participant.

Of the three structural types, bifinite analytic sentences play only a marginal role. The two finite clauses are connected by either a number of secondary conjunctions, including *ba* 'and' (from Written Mongol) and *xarin* 'but' (conv. mod. of *xari-* 'to return'), or by connectors based on non-finite forms of the pronominal verbs *ii-(+ge)-* and *tii-(+ge)-* 'to do like this/that', e.g. *oshood yeriish daa, xarin türgen busaarai* 'go, but come back soon!'; *hain le gazarta, berxeer le aduulaaraigtii, tii-xe-de-tnai targalxa, hütei boloxobsho bii*

daa ‘herd [your animals] in good places and with care, so that [they] will get fat and give more milk’. Constructions with paired or correlated pronouns are also possible, e.g. *ali hain xün gū, ali muu xün gū* ‘is he a good man or (is he) a bad man?’, *xaana baigaa hembib, tendee baixab* ‘where I stood, there I will stand’.

Two finite sentences can also be connected by the form conv. imperf. *ge-zhe* of the verb *ge-* ‘to say’. Since this verb is used to introduce direct speech, the dependent predicate in same-subject phrases has the form of the first person singular, e.g. *shi xointoxogüi-b gezhe hain medene gū-sh* ‘are you sure that you will not be late?’. In different-subject phrases, the rules of indirect speech are applied, and the dependent predicate has the form of the third person, while the dependent subject is in the accusative, e.g. *bi shamayi neeree xudalaar xelee gezhe hanaa-b* ‘I thought that you actually lied’. Further grammaticalization of this connector leads to different semantic variants, such as the expression of purpose, e.g. (part. fut. + *gezhe*) *üglöögüür gertee xarixa gezhe gazaashaa garaba* ‘in the morning [he] went out in order to return home’. The form part. perf. *ge-hen* is used before nouns, e.g. *xoyuulaa oshogtii gehen temdeg nyüdööröö ügebe* ‘[she] gave a sign with her eyes to go [there] together’.

The core of the complex sentence system is formed by monofinite sentences, in which the dependent predicate is expressed by a non-finite verbal form. A nominal subject is in the genitive, while a pronominal subject can also be expressed by a possessive or reflexive form. The most important subsystem of such sentences is formed by those with a participial case form as the predicate. Most typically, it is an adverbial case form, used quasiconverbially in a dictum–dictum construction. All such combinations have to a varying degree been idiomatized and grammaticalized.

Examples of quasiconverbial dictum–dictum constructions: (part. fut. dat. refl.) *tereny gazarta una-xa-d-aa xaxa xüreshebe* ‘when it fell to earth, [it] broke into pieces’; (part. fut. neg. dat.) *xünei oldo-xo-güi-de nima-seren zübshöölöö ügebe* ‘since no [other] person could be found [for this task], Nima-Seren agreed’; (part. perf. dat. px sg. 1p.) *oroidol gurban üder hata-han-da-m yüünde oroobshi* ‘why do you worry like that, just because I was three days late?’; (part. imperf. neg. dat. refl.) *tyeed münöö tüly-ee-güi-d-öö yüüşhye xeeгүйb* ‘but today I did not prepare [anything], because I did not heat [the stove]’; (part. fut. abl. px sg. 1p.) *туруunай табараа сонос-хо-хуу-м бешэ үүимэ ухаандам ороогүй* ‘except that I heard the clatter of hoofs, nothing else reached my consciousness’; (part. fut. abl.) *shi yere-hen-hee baigaad oshooroi* ‘since you have come, stay for a while before leaving’; (part. imperf. neg. abl.) *zuugaad shaxuu ereshöolei dainhaa bus-aa-güi-höö xüshe xüregdööгүй* ‘since about a hundred men did not come back from the war, there is not enough manpower’.

In modus–dictum constructions, the participial predicate of the dependent clause is governed by the finite predicate of the main clause. The finite predicate in such constructions typically expresses a mental process or its result. The choice of the participial form in the dependent predicate is basically free, restricted only by the semantics of the main predicate. The case form of the dependent predicate, on the other hand, depends on the government pattern of the verb functioning as the main predicate. The case forms that can occur in the dependent predicate include both the basic grammatical cases (nominative, genitive, accusative) and most of the adverbial cases (dative, ablative, instrumental).

The accusative is required by three large semantic groups of verbs, yielding constructions with different formal characteristics:

- (1) Verbs denoting information processing can occur in both same-subject and different-subject phrases. They can also be combined with any participial form, including

negative forms, e.g. *debshenei yüünde yere-h-iiyi* (*yere-x-iiyi*, *yer-ee-güi-yi*, etc.) *bi medeneb* ‘I know why Debshen came (will come, did not come, etc.)’.

- (2) Verbs denoting immediate perception occur only in different-subject phrases, and only in fixed combination with the futuritive participle in affirmative use, e.g. *butid tagarai myaxa sabsha-x-iiyi-ny xarana* ‘Butid watches how Tagar chops meat’.
- (3) Verbs denoting causation (manipulation) likewise occur only in different-subject phrases in combination with the futuritive participle, but with the possibility of negation, e.g. *hü asar-x-iiyi-m elygeebe* ‘[he] sent me to bring some milk’; *tsibaan xünde xelexe-güi-yi-ny hamgandaa zaxiba* ‘Tsibaan ordered his wife not to tell people [about it]’.

The dative and ablative are required by verbs denoting positive and negative emotional reaction, respectively, e.g. (part. fut. neg. dat.) *xarin üdeshelen radiogoinggoo duugar-xa-güi-de yexel gaixaba* ‘but in the evening [she] was astonished [by the fact] that the radio did not talk’; (part. fut. abl. px sg. 2p.) *aluul-xa-haa-sh ainab* ‘I am afraid that you will be killed’. The subgroup of verbs denoting emotional prognosis (‘to hope’, ‘to believe’) requires the dative in different-subject phrases; in same-subject phrases, the intentional converb is used. The ablative is used in complex comparative constructions when referring to the action serving as the point of comparison: *xünyüiyi adagla-xa-da, öörüigöö adagla-gsha-haa belen* ‘to watch others is easier than to watch oneself’.

The dative is also required by adjectival predicates expressing value judgement (‘good/bad’, ‘merit/guilt’, ‘advantage/disadvantage’), e.g. *tyeed bi üshöö hurguulida yaba-dag-güi-d-öö zemetei aalbi* ‘but am I guilty [of the fact] that I no longer go to school?’. In a similar function, the nominative can be used, placing the participle in the position of the subject, e.g. *shamtai uulza-ha-m yexe hain baigaa* ‘it was very good that I met you’. More important from the systemic point of view is the use of the nominative with three other types of predicate with specific characteristics:

- (1) passive derivatives of verbs denoting information processing, e.g. *nyodondo tereentei uulza-ha-mni namda hana.gda-ba* ‘I recalled [literally: ‘it was recalled to me’] that I had met him last year’; cf. the active sentence *nyodondo tereentei uulza-hanaa bi hanazharxyoob* ‘I [suddenly] recalled that I had met him last year’;
- (2) causative derivatives of verbs denoting emotion, e.g. *üüdeyee xab yab xaagaad gara-hany-iiny namayi gomd.uul-ba* ‘[the fact] that he went out, slamming the doors, offended me’; and
- (3) possessive adjectival predicates from nominal stems denoting an emotional state, e.g. *üüdeyee xab yab xaagaad gara-hany-iiny namda gomdol-toi bai-ba* ‘[the fact] that he went out, slamming the doors, was offensive to me’, cf. the corresponding construction with dative government *üüdeyee xab yab xaagaad gara-han-da-ny bi gomdonob* ‘I regret [feel offence from] the fact that he went out, slamming the doors’. It can be seen that the three case forms (nominative vs. dative vs. accusative) used with emotive predicates express three different grades of activity from the point of view of the ‘experiencer’. For verbs denoting intellectual processes only two grades are differentiated (nominative vs. dative).

The genitive occurs in prenominal participial clauses. Nouns requiring the genitive are: names of relations between events (‘cause’, ‘result’, ‘time’), e.g. *teretnai xuuxi uu-x-iin shaltag* ‘all of this [of yours] is a cause to drink [some] wine’; names of modal relations (‘possibility’), e.g. *namayi tiishe zöölgelse-hen-ei xereg yüün baixab* ‘what is the reason [necessity] that you brought me here?’; or nouns correlated with verbs denoting

emotion and information processing, e.g. *uulza-han-aing/g-aa bayar xubaldayaal daa* ‘let us share the joy of our meeting!’.

The instrumental is used in complex constructions with verbs denoting inferring. The circumstance that is inferred is expressed by the accusative, while the instrumental indicates the basis of the conclusion made, e.g. (part. perf. acc. + part. perf. instr.) *esegiinggee olzotoi yere-h-iiyi alybar noxoin türiiün yere-h-eer medebe* ‘from [the fact] that his dog Alibar came running ahead, he knew that that his father had come with a catch’.

POSTPOSITIONAL CONSTRUCTIONS

Especially in dictum–dictum constructions, the meaning of the participial case form can be specified by a postposition. The possessive and reflexive suffixes are variously added either to the postposition or to the participial case form. Most of the actual combinations are grammaticalized to a variety of temporal and causal meanings. Examples:

part. fut. poss. px/rx + *adli* ‘right after’, e.g. *xuurai shenehe neme-xe-tei-mnai adli osho xayalan, tas nyas tashaganashaba* ‘right after we threw [into the fire] a dry larch tree, sparkles flew cracking’;

part. fut. abl. + [conc.] *baitagai* ‘not only . . . but’, e.g. *tede duugar-xa-haa baitagai, xüdelxeshye bolyood huunad* ‘they stopped not only talking, but even moving’;

part. fut. + *büri* + px/rx (‘in proportion’) as’, e.g. *tedenei yaba-xa büri-ny nogoono iurgasa haizharna* ‘as they went farther, the grass became higher’ (or: ‘the farther they went, the higher the grass became’);

part. fut. + *deere* + px/rx ‘just before’, e.g. *yabaxa deere-m nüxerni yeree* ‘just before I left, my friend came’;

part. perf. + *deere* + px/rx ‘while’, e.g. *tengxeetei bai-han deer-ee taigahaa garazha oshoxo xeregtei* ‘while you have the strength to do it, you must leave the taiga’;

part. fut./perf./hab. + abl. *deere-hee* + px/rx ‘because’, e.g. *moridiyi ende asarxa argagüi bai-han deerehee-ny bide бүхий ажалга гараараа хөхө баатай болообди* ‘because it was impossible to take horses here, we had to do all the work with our hands’;

part. fut. abl. px/rx + *gadna* ‘not only – but’, e.g. *müngge zööröyer demzhelge üzööl-xe-hee-tnai gadna, ulas түрин талаар ашаг олзо олохо абахбди* ‘not only will you help financially, but also we will get political advantage’;

part. perf. gen. px/rx + dat. *hüül-de* ‘after’, e.g. *xübüün shogonoxon bultaizha xaraham-aing/g-aa hüülde gazaashaa garaba* ‘after peeping out and looking [at us] for a time, the child came out’;

part. fut. gen. px/rx + dat. *oron-do* ‘instead’, e.g. *bayar xürge-x-iing/g-öö orondo xaragaad toniloo gedeg* ‘instead of thanking, he cursed and disappeared, they say’;

part. imperf./perf. + dat. *sag-ta* + px/rx ‘when’, e.g. *amidii bai/g-aa sagt-aa tere üxedeliyi tabixagüib* ‘as long as I am alive, I will not set this villain free’;

part. perf. + dat. *sheg-te* + px/rx ‘still in the state of’, e.g. *tuwaang-xamba garaa namanshal-han shegt-ee xüdelenggüi zogsono* ‘Tuwaan Khamba stands without moving, [still in the state of] keeping his hands joined in prayer’;

part. perf. + *soo* ‘[in the way] as, according to’, e.g. *tanai hana-han soo, bagshanaarai hurga-han soo hainda xürtezhe, xamta yabaxabdi* ‘we shall go together, striving for goodness, [in the way] as you dreamed [and] as [our] teachers taught [us]’;

part. fut. + *teeshe* + px/rx ‘(closer to the time) when’, e.g. *ali edege-xe teeshe-ny orozho üzexe güb* ‘or shall I go to visit him (closer to the time) when he gets better?’;

part. perf./hab. (neg.) + *tula* ‘because’, e.g. *urdany iime tüxeleri medüülelnüüd yexeer xereglegde-deg-güi tula abahaar obyoorogdoggüi baigaa* ‘because sentences of this type were not much used formerly, they were not [even] paid attention to’;

part. fut. gen. + *tülöö* ‘in order to’, e.g. *sülööshel-x-iin tülöö ede xoyoriyi amindaxanany bishixan gerte oruulaa hemneibdi* ‘we have put these two in a separate little house, so that they feel free’;

part. perf. gen. + px/rx + *tülöö* ‘for, because’, e.g. *ene nomiiyim esesteny xüreter unsha-han-ai-tnai tülöö bayartaib* ‘I thank you for reading this book of mine to the end’;

part. fut. abl. + *türiün* ‘before’, e.g. *moskwa osho-xo-hoo türiün tere manda oro-zho yeree* ‘before going to Moscow, he came to visit us’;

part. fut. abl. + px/rx + *urda* ‘before’, e.g. *xarin yere-xe-hee-ny urda balgaanuudaa barixa yohotoibdi* ‘but before he comes we must build a hut’;

part. fut. + dat. *üye-de* + px/rx ‘when’, e.g. *institut-ta hura-xa üyed-öö sambo barildaanda yabadag hem* ‘while studying at the college, I went in for sambo wrestling’;

part. fut. poss. + *xamta* ‘at the same time as’, e.g. *negenyiiny le minii duugarzharxi-xa-tai xamta, gente xüzüügee ürgen, shagnaarxaad ababa* ‘and one of them, when I started speaking, suddenly raised its head [neck] and listened’;

part. fut./imperf./perf./hab. + *hen* + *xoinoo* ‘because’, e.g. *mergen uran zoxyoolshin garaar temdeglegde-hen hen xoinoo sedyxel xüdelgemöör besheetei baina* ‘because it is described by the hand of a skilful writer, it is written so that it touches the heart’;

part. fut. + dat. *xooron-do* + px/rx ‘at the time when’, e.g. *lepyoshko бага багaxanaar xazazha huu-xa xoorondo-m, damdinzhab miniishye mori emellezherxibe* ‘while I was biting from the cake little by little, Damdinzhab saddled my horse, too’;

part. fut. + *zuura* + px/rx ‘while’, e.g. *dorzho hamganaingгаа xazhuugaar alad gara-xa zuur-aa gashuunaar gezhe aalixan shebenebe* ‘while passing by his wife, Dorzho whispered: ‘stronger!’.

A category close to postpositions is formed by the postpositional connectors known as conjunctive particles (often termed conjunctions in Buryat grammars). The most important conjunctive particles are *aad* ‘but’ (conv. perf. < **a-xad*), *haa* ‘if’ (< conv. cond. **a-xasa*), and *xada* id. (< part. fut. dat. **a-ku-du*), all of which are petrified non-finite forms of the obsolete auxiliary **a-* ‘to be’. With the exception of the particle *aad*, which is combined with a nominative subject, clauses with conjunctive particles have the subject in the genitive, when not expressed by a possessive or reflexive form, e.g. (part. hab. + *haa* + px 3p.) *xerbee shamayi honirxuul-dag haa-ny, xelxedemnishye, boloxol daa* ‘if [it] interests you, I can tell [you]’; (part. imperf. + neg. + *xada*), e.g. *minii udaan yereegüi xada, shi bü xülyeegereei* ‘in case I do not come for a long time, do not wait for me!’; cf. (part. perf. + *aad*) *sharaldai üngen gente hūxeyee dalai-han aad, gasarta abyagūixen huushaba* ‘Old Sharaldai tossed up his axe, but suddenly sat down without a sound’.

RELATIVE CLAUSES

All participles can serve to build a relative clause. The basic restrictive relative clause precedes the head noun, though it can be separated from the latter by simple attributes (such as adjectival nouns or numerals). For marking the relativized position of the head noun in the relative clause, the gap strategy is used.

If the object position is relativized, the subject is in the genitive, and the head noun can optionally be marked by the possessive or reflexive suffixes, e.g. (part. fut.) *ene*

shinii xe-xe azhal beshe geeshe ‘this is not a work you can do’; (part. perf. + px 3p.) *aldar-ai baryaad bai-han tülxyüür-iiny multarshaba* ‘the key that Aldar had held fell down’; (part. perf. + rx) *hurguuli düürge-hen zhel-ee hanabab* ‘I remembered the year when I graduated from the school’. Although it occasionally may seem that the possessive suffixes express possession in such constructions, they actually always only refer to possession through action; if the possessor and the actor are two different persons, the possessive suffixes are determined by the actor person, e.g. (part. perf. + px sg. 2p.) *zun namda aba-han samsa-shni xaanab* ‘where is the shirt that you bought for me last summer?’ (literally: ‘where is your shirt [that was] bought for me last summer?’).

If the adverbial position is relativized, case markers are omitted, e.g. (part. hab.) *malshad-ai bai-dag ger* ‘the house where the shepherds live’. Postpositions are retained, but the omitted noun is replaced by the third person possessive suffix, e.g. (postp. + px 3p. + part. hab.) *manaadai doro-ny zagaha bari-dag xüürge endehee xolo beshe* ‘the bridge under which we usually fish is not far from here’. The relativized attributive position is also marked by the third person possessive suffix, which in these cases always expresses possession (part/whole relationship). Unlike in Mongol proper, only attributes to subjects can be relativized in Buryat, e.g. *ünööxi amhar-iiny бүтүүл-һен korzina-yaa asarba* ‘[he] brought that covered basket of his’ (literally: ‘he brought that basket of his, the opening of which was covered’).

Headless relative clauses have basically the same structure as normal relative clauses, except that the morphological marking that would be present in the head noun goes to the participle, e.g. (part. perf. acc.) *biden-ei shana-h-iiny tere edixeyeeshye hanaagüi* ‘he did not even want to eat what we cooked’; (part. perf. abl.) *bagsh-iing/g-aa xööre-hen-һee xelehüü* ‘let me tell [you something] from what my teacher said!’. Instead of headless clauses, nominalizers of the type *xün* ‘man’, *yüüme/n* ‘thing’, *gasar* ‘place’, *sag* ‘time’, can be used, e.g. (part. perf. + *yüüme/n* + px sg. 2p.) *altan gezhe hanazha yabahan yüümen-shni miin le guulin* ‘the thing that you believed to be gold is just copper’. All such sentences represent the coreferential type of syntactic construction.

LEXICON

Buryat shares much of its core vocabulary with Mongol proper, the chief differences arising from the derivational patterns. In some respects of lexical structure, however, Buryat may be regarded as a more ‘Siberian’ language than Mongol proper. Sound symbolism, for instance, is particularly typical of Buryat. Words with sound symbolism have often only a very vague descriptive meaning, cf. e.g. *palxagana-* ‘to move [of a short fat man]’, *papagana-* ‘to sway, to move from side to side [of something fluffy or shaggy]’, *tezhexei* ‘a short-legged pot-bellied being’, *dedegenüür* ‘speaking fast and muddled’. Correlations based on idiosyncratic phonetic principles are frequent, cf. e.g. *tarshagana-* ‘to crack’, *torshogono-* ‘to crash’, *türshegene-* ‘to knock’; *parshagana-* ‘to speak hoarsely’, *porshogono-* ‘to bubble, to gurgle’, *pirshagana-* ‘to squeak, to peep’.

Language contacts have also contributed to the differentiation between Buryat and the other Mongolic languages, as well as between the Buryat dialects. In the Western Buryat sphere there are some Turkic loanwords with a dialectal distribution, e.g. *sordon* ‘pike’, *saazha* ‘plait’, *töörseg* ‘milk container’, *sool* ‘[kind of] stove’, *ühee* ‘[beam of] ceiling’, *xii* ‘dried dung’. The Turkic donor languages include Khakas, Tofa, and Yakut. Tungusic borrowings (from Ewenki) are mainly confined to toponyms and special terms relating to the boreal environment, e.g. *zegeen* or *zantaxi* ‘wolverine’, *onggolo* ‘nutcracker’.

In premodern times, especially among the Eastern Buryat, loanwords were received from Chinese and Tibetan, though in most cases they entered through the intermediation of Mongol proper and/or Written Mongol. The Chinese loanwords are often connected with material culture and obsolete administrative structures, e.g. *buu* ‘gun’, *den/g* ‘candle’, *taishaa* [head of local government], while the Tibetan loanwords are typically terms of religion and science, e.g. *bumba* ‘gravestone’ (< ‘urn’), *dasan/g* ‘temple’, *debter* ‘notebook’, *zula* ‘icon-lamp’. Most conspicuously, a large proportion of the personal names still favoured today by the Eastern Buryat are of Tibetan origin. Of course, many of the Tibetan terms and names are ultimately literary borrowings from Sanskrit.

Modern cultural vocabulary has penetrated into Buryat mainly from Russian. The Western Buryat dialects were affected first, starting in the seventeenth century. The earlier borrowings are phonologically fully adapted, cf. e.g. *potoloog* ‘ceiling’ (< Russian **potolok**), *xileemen* ‘bread’ (< Russian **xleb**), *xubaahan* [kind of drink] (< Russian **kvass**), *shumdaan* ‘suitcase’ (< Russian **chemodan**), *üshöö* ‘yet’ (< Russian **yeshhë**), *shüüd* ‘a little’ (< Russian **chut’**). Full nativization is also indicated by the presence of productive derivational patterns, cf. e.g. *xaarta* ‘playing cards’ (< Russian **karta**): *xaarta.lda-* ‘to play cards’: *xaarta.shan* ‘gambler’. In more recent borrowings, especially from the Soviet period, the literary standard preserves the Russian orthographical shape, while orally various degrees of adaptation are normally present.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READING

- Bertagaev, T. A. (1968) ‘Buryatskii yazyk’, in *Mongol’skie, tunguso-man’chzhurskie i paleoaziatskie yazyki* [= Yazyki narodov SSSR 5], Leningrad: Nauka, pp. 13–33.
- Bertagaev, T. A. and C. B. Cydendambaev (1962) *Grammatika buryatskogo yazyka: Sintaksis*, Moskva: Izdatel’stvo vostochnoi literatury.
- Bosson, James E. (1962) *Buryat Reader*, supervised and edited by Nicholas Poppe [= Indiana University Publications, Uralic and Altaic Series 8], Bloomington.
- Budaev, B. Zh. (1981) *Akcentuaciya buryatskogo yazyka: Slovesnoe udarenie v xorinskom dialekte*, Moskva: Nauka.
- Budaev, C. B. (1978) *Leksika buryatskix dialektov v sravnitel’no-istoricheskom osveshhenii*, Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Budaev, C. B. (1992) *Buryatskie dialekty (opyt diachronicheskogo issledovaniya)*, Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Buraev, I. D. (1959) *Zvukovoi sostav buryatskogo yazyka*, Ulan-Udë: Buryatskii kompleksnyi nauchno-issledovatel’skii institut SO AN SSSR.
- Buraev, I. D. (1987) *Stanovlenie zvukovogo stroya buryatskogo yazyka*, Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Buraev, I. D. (1996) ‘Problemy klassifikacii buryatskix dialektov’, in *Problemy buryatskoi dialektologii*, Ulan-Udë, pp. 3–16.
- Castrén, M. Alexander (1857) *Versuch einer burjätischen Sprachlehre nebst kurzem Wörterverzeichnis* [Nordische Reisen und Forschungen], herausgegeben von Anton Schiefner, St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Cheremisov, K. M. (1973) *Buryatsko-russkii slovar’*, Moskva: Sovetskaya enciklopediya.
- Cybykov, G. C. (1993) [1924] *Grammatika buryat-mongol’skogo pis’mennogo yazyka*, in L. D. Shagdarov (ed.), Ulan-Udë: Buryatskii nauchnyi centr.
- Cydendambaev, C. B. (1954) *Russko-buryat-mongol’skii slovar’*, Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel’stvo inostrannyx i nacional’nyx slovarei.
- Cydendambaev, C. B. (1979) *Grammaticheskie kategorii buryatskogo yazyka v istoriko-sravnitel’nom osveshhenii*, Moskva: Nauka.
- Cydygov, C.-Zh. (1972) *Analiticheskie konstrukcii v buryatskom yazyke*, Ulan-Udë: Buryatskoe knizhnoe izdatel’stvo.

- Darbeeva, A. A. (1997), 'Buryatskii yazyk', in *Mongol'skie yazyki – Tunguso-man'chzhurskie yazyki – Yaponskii yazyk – Koreiskii yazyk* [Yazyki Mira], Moskva: Rossiiskaya Akademiya Nauk & Izdatel'stvo Indrik, pp. 37–51.
- Dondukov, U.-Zh. Sh. (1964) *Affiksali'noe slovoobrazovanie chastei rechi v buryatskom yazyke*, Ulan-Udè: Buryatskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Dyrxeeva, G. A. (1996) 'Osobennosti funkcionirovaniya buryatskogo i russkogo yazykov v Respublike Buryatiya i buryatskix nacional'nyx okrugax', in *Problemy buryatskoy dialektologii*, Ulan-Udè, pp. 17–33.
- Poppe, Nicholas [N. N.] (1938) *Grammatika buryat-mongol'skogo yazyka*, Moskva & Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.
- Poppe, Nicholas N. (1960) *Buriat Grammar* [= Indiana University Publications, Uralic and Altaic Series 2], Bloomington.
- Poppe, Nicholas [Nikolaus] (1964) 'Die burjätische Sprache', in *Mongolistik* [= Handbuch der Orientalistik I: V, 2], pp. 108–14.
- Rassadin, V. I. (1982) *Ocherki po istoricheskoi fonetike buryatskogo yazyka*, Moskva: Nauka.
- Rassadin, V. I. (1996) *Prisayanskaya gruppa buryatskix govorov*, Ulan-Udè: Izdatel'stvo Buryatskogo nauchnogo centra SO RAN.
- Rassadin, V. I. (1999) *Stanovlenie govora nizhneudinskix buryat*, Ulan-Udè: Izdatel'stvo Buryatskogo nauchnogo centra SO RAN.
- Rudnev, A. D. (1913–14) *Xori-buryatskii govor (Opyt izsledovaniya, teksty, perevod i primexaniya)* 1–3, Petrograd: Fakul'tet Vostochnyx yazykov Imperatorskogo S.-Peterburgskogo Universiteta.
- Sanzheev, G. D. (1941) *Grammatika buryat-mongol'skogo yazyka*, Moskva & Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.
- Sanzheev, G. D. et al. (eds) (1962) *Grammatika buryatskogo yazyka: Fonetika i morfologiya*, Moskva: Izdatel'stvo vostochnoi literatury.
- Shagdarov, L. D. (1974) *Funktional'no-stilisticheskaya differenciatsiya buryatskogo literaturnogo yazyka*, Ulan-Udè: Buryatskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Skribnik, Elena [Ye. K.] (1988) *Polipredikativnye sinteticheskie predlozheniya v buryatskom yazyke*, Novosibirsk: Nauka.