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## CHAPTER NINE

## ORDOS

Stefan Georg

Ordos (more properly Urdus) is spoken in the southernmost part of Inner Mongolia, south of the Yellow River and north of the Great Wall. Its territory borders on the Ningxia Hui Autonomous Region in the south and Shaanxi province in the southeast. Apart from Chinese, the linguistic neighbours of Ordos include the Urat and Tümet dialects of Mongol proper to the north and northeast, respectively. To the northwest, Ordos is bordered by Alashan Öelet, a subvariety of Oirat. Traditionally, the Ordos territory is divided into seven banners, namely Right Wing: Dalad, Wang, Junggar in the northeast, as well as Left Wing: Kanggin (NW), Otog (SW), Üüsin (SE), and Jasag (E), the first six of which were set up in 1649, following the submission of the Ordos clans to the Manchu state in 1635, and the last one being cut out of Üüsin in 1736 to form the administrative unit known as the Inner Mongolian league of Ike Juu (Yagae Juu).

The current number of Ordos speakers is unknown, since the Ordos Mongols are not distinguished from the rest of the Monggol nationality in official Chinese censuses. A field survey made in the mid-1950s (Todaeva) established, however, a figure of approximately 64,000 Ordos Mongols. The present population must be larger, though linguistic assimilation (by both Chinese and Mongol proper) may have reduced the percentage of native language speakers. A possible estimate for the present day might, then, be less than 100,000 speakers.

Ordos is not written in any form that would reflect its dialectal peculiarities. The modern standardized variety of Written Mongol is used in the region, as elsewhere in Inner Mongolia, alongside, of course, Chinese. However, the authors of some important Written Mongol literary documents were of Ordos provenance (such as Saghang Sechen, the author of 'Erdeni-yin Tobchi', possibly also Lubsandanjin, the author of 'Altan Tobchi'). Whether this fact is reflected to some degree in the language of their writings remains, however, to be investigated.

Although Ordos is generally not counted among the particularly 'archaic' members of the Mongolic family (like e.g. Dagur and Khamnigan Mongol), some historical retentions render Ordos data an important tool for a variety of issues in Mongolic comparative linguistics. Compared with the regular dialects of Mongol proper, Ordos is clearly different. It remains, however, a matter of opinion, whether Ordos should be regarded as a separate Mongolic language, or as a separate main dialect of Mongol proper. The official view, apparently also shared by most Ordos speakers themselves, is that it is part of the Mongol language.

The genetic and areal position of Ordos is also evident from its lexicon, which is overwhelmingly of Mongolic stock, continuing forms attested in Written Mongol and Middle Mongol mostly only with the expected phonetic changes. Owing to the role of Tibetan Buddhism among the speakers of Ordos, Tibetan loanwords are present, but their significance and sphere of use does not exceed that observed in other varieties of Eastern (or Central) Mongolic, where Tibetan cultural influence is likewise present. As elsewhere in

Inner Mongolia, lexical copies from Chinese do occur, but, again, their number and significance does not reduce the genuine Mongolic character of Ordos on the lexical level.

The Ordos territory is linguistically largely homogeneous. Minor differences between the subvarieties never stand in the way of mutual comprehensibility, nor do they impose any uncertainty on whether a given variety of speech is to be classified as Ordos or not. The present description is based on Antoine Mostaert's material, which was collected in the years 1906-26, most of the time in and around the town of Boro Balghasun, thus reflecting the southernmost varieties of Ordos, where the influence of Mongol proper is least felt. In a few instances, forms found in Todaeva (1985), have been cited (always marked $\mathrm{N}[$ orth $] \mathrm{E}[\mathrm{ast}]$ ), though it remains unclear whether the differences observed are due to dialectal variation, or whether they rather, given the time span separating the two scholars' field work, reflect diachronic developments.

## DATA AND SOURCES

The Belgian missionary-linguist Antoine Mostaert, C.I.C.M., was for a long time alone responsible for most of the work done on Ordos. To him the field owes a huge text collection (Mostaert 1937) with French translations (Mostaert 1947) and a three-volume dictionary (Mostaert 1941-4), which is sometimes regarded as the most complete dictionary ever made of any Modern Mongolic language or dialect. He also prepared a morphological sketch of Ordos (contained in Mostaert 1937) and a very detailed phonetic study (Mostaert 1926-7), though he did not attempt to formulate the phonology of the language. Additionally, he published material on the ethnography of the Ordos Mongols (Mostaert 1934, 1956).

On the basis of Mostaert's materials, very brief comments on Ordos were presented by Nicholas Poppe (1964). Another short sketch of Ordos, based on actual field work (1955-6) was prepared by B. X. Todaeva (contained in Todaeva 1985; the accompanying volume of texts published in 1981 does not contain Ordos material). Ordos dialect data are also included in Rudnev (1911), not collected by the author himself and of limited reliability, as well as, apparently the first publication on this variety of Mongolic, in G. N. Potanin (1893). Among other publications purporting to describe Ordos, M. G. Soulié (1903) is a rather weak treatment of Written Mongol without actually dealing with Ordos dialect data, while A. N. J. Whymant (1926) is an equally unsatisfactory description of Khalkha only. Other missionary publications deserving mention are those by Joseph Kler (1935) and J. L. van Hecken (1975).

Recently, details of Ordos phonology and grammar have been treated by linguists (sometimes native speakers of Ordos) from Inner Mongolia, including Baatar (1990), Erdenimunghe (1986, 1990, 1991, 1992), Has-Erdeni (1959), and Serengnorbu (1986). Inner Mongolian scholars have also worked on the cultural heritage of the Ordos Mongols, as discussed by, for instance, Serengpungsug and Hatanbaatar (1990).

While based on the lect found in Mostaert's text publications, which form by far the largest Ordos text corpus available, the present chapter does not adopt the narrow phonetic transcription employed by Mostaert. Instead, a phonemic transcription, mostly following the phonological analysis of John C. Street (1966), is used.

## SEGMENTAL PHONEMES

The southern dialect of Ordos has seven qualitative vowel phonemes (Table 9.1). Vowel length is distinctive, cf. e.g. bura- 'to swirl' vs. buraa 'foliage' vs. buura- 'to decrease'

TABLE 9.1 ORDOS VOWELS

| $u$ | $\ddot{u}$ | $i$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $o$ | $\ddot{o}$ | $e$ |
|  | $a$ |  |

vs. part. imperf. buuraa id. If the long vowels are analysed as monophonemic, the number of vowel phonemes rises to fourteen. As in other Mongolic languages, the long vowels arose historically through the elision of an intervocalic velar consonant $\left({ }^{*} x\right)$ and subsequent vowel contraction.

The Common Mongolic diphthongs (diphthongoid sequences) are mostly realized as monofocal long vowels. The diphthongs containing an original back vowel yield palatal qualities: ai [e:], oi [œ:], ui [y:]. Only ui seems to surface more often as [ui]. There are, however, strong reasons to maintain the notation of such front vowels as diphthongs. For one thing, the realizations [ $\varepsilon$ : œ: y:]., though phonetically palatal, remain phonologically velar and require the back variety of harmonizing suffixes. Also, nominal stems ending in a (diachronic) diphthong form a 'mixed' declension class: while the genitive suffix - $n$ is directly added to the stem (as with nouns ending in a short vowel), other cases (e.g. the ablative) require the insertion of $g$ between the stem and the suffix (as with stems ending in a long vowel). The diphthongs thus continue to form a natural class in Ordos, which should be acknowledged in the phonemic notation.

The surface vowel $i i$ [i]] has two sources, *ei and *ixi, which are still distinguishable by their different behaviour as stem-final vowels. The diphthong üi, as in üle 'work', remains distinct from $u i$ and tends, like the latter, to retain its original pronunciation. The diphthong $\ddot{\partial} i$ is extremely rare, although some cases of a secondary öi (-ö-i-) at morpheme boundaries make it clear that it results in [œ:]. Other vowel sequences consist of a high vowel (or glide) plus a long vowel: iee, iaa, ioo, uii, üii, üee, uaa (the latter two sequences occur only after the consonant $k$ ). There are also $u ̈ e ~ a n d ~ u a$, of which the latter is confined to Chinese loanwords.

Unlike in many other Mongolic languages, Ordos vowels are usually not reduced in non-initial syllables, which adds to the archaic flavour of the language. This feature of Ordos is also connected with two very important properties of the vocalism: (1) the absence of palatal breaking, e.g. biruu 'calf' < *biraxu (cf. Khalkha byaru), although cases of prebreaking assimilation do occur, e.g. nüdü̈ 'eye' < *nidü/n; and, even more diagnostically: (2) the regressive assimilation of initial-syllable *o and * $\ddot{\partial}$ into $u$ and $\ddot{u}$ under the influence of second-syllable *u resp. *ü, e.g. mudu 'tree' < *modu/n, yusu 'custom, habit' $<$ *yosu/n; note also the name urdus 'Ordos' $<$ *ordu.s 'royal tents'. Since initial-syllable ${ }^{*} o$ and ${ }^{*} \ddot{\partial}$ remain intact before second-syllable $* o$ and $* \ddot{\partial}$ (which often derive from *a resp. ${ }^{*} e$ by labial attraction), Ordos allows the proper reconstruction of the labial vowels of non-initial syllables ( ${ }^{*} O * \ddot{\partial}$ vs. ${ }^{*} u * \ddot{u}$ ), which in most other Mongolic idioms (including all dialects of Mongol proper) have undergone significant reduction or neutralization, and which are also indistinguishable in the Mongol script (cf. Written Mongol muduv, yusuv, vUrdus).

The consonant system of Ordos, as used in native vocabulary, comprises fifteen phonemes (Table 9.2). Additionally, several other consonant sounds, including the segments $p$ (strong labial stop), $f$ (labial fricative), and $w$ (labial glide), occur as marginal phonemes, largely restricted to the non-native layer of the Ordos lexicon.

TABLE 9.2 ORDOS CONSONANTS

|  | $t$ | $c$ | $k$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $b$ | $d$ | $j$ | $g$ |
| $m$ | $s$ | $s h$ | $n g$ |
|  | $n$ |  |  |
|  | $r$ | $y$ |  |

The basic division of the stops (including affricates) is between the strong (fortes) segments ( $p$ ) $t c k$ vs. the weak (lenes) segments $b d j g$. Phonetically, the strong stops are strongly aspirated, and the segments $t c$ are in intervocalic position (as well as between a preceding non-homorganic consonant and a following vowel) further accompanied by preaspiration. In difference from Mongol proper, the strong velar $k$ preserves its articulation as a stop in word-initial position in front-vocalic stems, whereas in backvocalic stems, and in most other positions, a fricative [ x ], or sometimes an affricate [kx], is heard. The weak stops are characterized by lack of aspiration, rather than voicedness. For $b$ and $g$ (but not for $d$ and $j$ ) fully voiced allophones do, however, occur, especially intervocalically or next to a nasal. Between vowels, both segments may further be weakened to the corresponding continuant sounds [ $\beta \mathrm{\gamma} \mathrm{\gamma}$ ].

As in several southern dialects of Mongol proper, including Southern Khalkha, initial strong stops in Ordos lose their aspiration and merge with their weak counterparts when the following syllable (in the same stem) likewise begins with a strong segment, e.g. data- 'to draw' $<$ *tata-. The same effect is triggered by the sibilants $s$ sh (which are also inherently strong, though they lack original weak counterparts), e.g. jasu 'snow' < *casu/n. Unlike in some of the Mongol dialects concerned, where this process may still remain subphonemic, the deaspirated (weakened) strong segments have in Ordos developed into true weak phonemes.

## WORD STRUCTURE

Ordos words invariably begin with the root morpheme, which may be modified by suffixes only. The latter may be subdivided into derivational suffixes, modifying the semantic content of the root, and desinential ones, operating on the morphosyntactic level.

Syllables may have one of the structures V (imp. a-la 'to kill'), VC, CV (al-ba 'tax'), or CVC (bal 'honey'). The vocalic nucleus can consist of a short (single) vowel (V), long (double) vowel (VV), or a diphthong. There are no word-initial (or syllable-initial) consonant clusters, and in loanwords (as from Sanskrit or Tibetan) such clusters are avoided by consonant elision or vowel addition, though most of the actual examples, like lama 'lama' (Written Mongol blame), suggest that the simplification took place already at the Common Mongolic level. Medial clusters of up to two consonants are fairly common both within morphemes and at morpheme boundaries, but the rules of syllabification divide them always between two syllables. Final clusters are rare and almost exclusively found in interjections.

Stress accent is nondistinctive, and falls phonetically on the initial syllable. However, in words with long vowels or diphthongs, the latter attract the accent to non-initial syllables,
e.g. gar 'hand' : dat. garda : instr. garaar : instr. refl. garaaraan. Generally, the Ordos accent is described as being much weaker than the heavily centralizing accent of Mongol proper. This is also the reason why the weakening (reduction or loss) of unaccented vowels typical of Mongol proper is absent in Ordos.

The morphophonology of the vowels is governed by the rules of vowel harmony, which allow only back or front vowels in a phonological word. In this context, the back vowels comprise a o $u$ (with the corresponding long vowels) as well as the diphthongs ai oi ui, while the front vowels comprise e $\ddot{o} \ddot{u}$ (with the corresponding long vowels) as well as the diphthongs $e i(\ddot{o} i) \ddot{u}$. The vowel $i$ is harmonically neutral. Exceptions from vowel harmony do occur in foreign words, but even then the principle is valid for any suffixes added, the vowel class being determined by the final syllable of the stem. The neutral vowel $i$ may co-occur stem-internally with vowels of both classes, e.g. sini.le- 'to celebrate the New Year' vs. sinta.ra- 'to become dull'. The harmonic class of such words is determined by the non-neutral vowels. Stems which only contain $i$ (with no non-neutral vowels) require front-vocalic suffixes.

In addition to palatal harmony, there is labial attraction, by which suffixes containing the low vowels $a e$ show the rounded vowels $o \ddot{o}$ after stems containing $o$ and $\ddot{o}$, respectively. There are, thus, two harmonizing (archiphonemic) vowels occurring in suffixes: the low vowel $A$, realized as а е о $\ddot{0}$, and the high vowel $U$, realized as $u \ddot{u}$. Sometimes, most notably after a syllable containing the diphthong oi, both labialized and non-labialized variants are attested. For instance, the ablative of nokoi 'dog' can be either nokoi/g-aas or nokoi/g-oos. In this as well as in some other cases, the variation may be due to the fact that the harmonizing vowel historically goes back to *a (*nokai), though there are counterexamples. Labial attraction can also be blocked in sequences of high + low vowel, e.g. bol- 'to become' : conv. succ. bol-kulaa. On the other hand, there are forms like oro'to rain' : conc. oro-togoi 'to rain' (<*oro-tugai), where even the high vowel of the suffix participates in labial attraction.

Some aspects of Ordos vowel harmony, like, for instance, the back-vocalic behaviour of the phonetically fronted (diachronic) diphthongs, lend support to the conjecture that the governing factor here is synchronically not really a front-back (palato-velar) opposition, but, rather, one based on some other feature, perhaps pharyngealization (normal vs. pharyngealized), as is the case in the rotated vowel systems of several dialects of Mongol proper. The issue remains to be studied in more detail.

When a stem-final or suffix-final vowel is immediately followed by a suffix-initial vowel, the resulting long crasis vowel usually maintains the quality of the latter. If, however, the stem-final vowel is short and the suffix begins with $i$ or $i i$, the result is not crasis, but rather a diphthong, which surfaces as phonetically monophthongized, like the diachronic stem-internal diphthongs, as in boro 'grey' [proper name] + acc. -iig : boroig [borœ:g], aka 'elder brother' + gen. -iin : akain [axe:n].

There are only few phonotactic or morphophonological phenomena affecting the consonant phonemes. Most importantly, the velar nasal $n g$ only occurs syllable-finally (and even then its contrast against $n$ is rather limited). As in other Mongolic languages, the liquids $l r$ are in native words usually restricted to non-initial contexts, though Chinese and Tibetan loanwords with initial $l$ are by no means rare.

At suffix boundaries, subphonemic voicing assimilation can take place, by which, for instance, suffix-initial $b$ may surface as [ $\beta$ ]. Also, the Common Mongolic strengthening of suffix-initial $d j$ (morphophonemically $D J$ ) into $t c$ takes place after obstruent stems and can occasionally lead to minimal pairs, e.g. imp. kuda.ldu 'to sell' vs. dat. kudal.tu 'calumny'. What is noteworthy in Ordos is that stems ending in the consonants $n l r s$
are ambivalent. More specifically, the strengthening of $d$ can be caused not only by stem-final $b d g s r$ but also by $l$, while the strengthening of $j$ can be caused by $n$. On the other hand, the strengthening of $d$ can be absent after $s$, while the strengthening of $j$ can be absent after $r$. All of this suggests that the rules of strengthening have become synchronically loose (or that there are problems in the phonetic data).

## WORD FORMATION

Among morphologically definable parts of speech in Ordos, nominals and verbals stand out as the two basic categories, distinguishable by their morphological behaviour. Derivational processes may, however, convert nominals into verbals and vice versa. The status of suffixes as derivational or desinential (inflexional) can best be determined by considering their position in the chain of affixes. Derivational suffixes typically occur next to the root, while inflexional elements are added after them. Also, most word forms contain only one inflexional marker, while there may be several derivative suffixes, though there are exceptions, such as the double case forms (discussed later).

A great number of Common Mongolic derived words, as also known from Written Mongol, survive in Ordos with only the usual phonological changes. It is, however, difficult to evaluate the synchronic status of many of these words, as no special study with native consultants has been made concerning the productivity of Ordos derivation. In this respect, the most transparent category is formed by deverbal verbs, for which there can be no doubt that at least the most frequent valence-changing suffixes are fully productive. Below, the four basic categories of derived words are illustrated with only a few selected examples for each.

Denominal nouns: .bci [cover of], e.g. jike 'ear' : jike.bci 'ear-muff'; -ci/n [occupation], e.g. koni 'sheep' : koni.ci 'shepherd'; .jin [female animals], e.g. guna 'three year old animal' [male] : guna. jin id. [female].

Deverbal nouns: Abstract nouns are formed by several suffixes, including .bUr/i, e.g. tail- 'to explain' : tail.buri 'explanation'; .g, e.g. bici- 'to write' : bici.g 'writing, letter', jori- 'to intend' : jori.g 'intention'; .l, e.g. jarla- 'to spread news' : jarla.l 'news, proclamation'; .lAng, e.g. jirga- 'to be happy’: jirga.lang ‘happiness'. The imperfective participle marker $-A A$ also yields fully lexicalized nouns, e.g. sana- 'to think' : san.aa 'thought'; with the further possibility of forming actor nouns (fully nominalized agentive participles) with the extended suffix .AA.ci [doing occupationally], e.g. bici'to write' : bic.eeci 'scribe'.

Denominal verbs: .cilA- [to make like, to be occupied with], e.g. bool 'slave' : bool.cilo- 'to take as slave', ail 'family, settlement' : ail.cila- 'to visit', yusu 'rule, law': yusu.cila- 'to act according to the law'; .lA- [general verbalizer], e.g. mии 'bad' : muи.la- 'to do/say bad things; to slander, to mistreat', terigüün 'head' : terigüü.le- 'to be first'.

Deverbal verbs: .gdA- [passive verbs, from vowel stems], e.g. üji- 'to see' : pass. üji.gde- 'to be seen'; -DA- [passive verbs, from consonant stems], e.g. ab- 'to take': pass. ab.ta- 'to be taken', ol- 'to find' : pass. ol.do- 'to be found'; .(G)UUl- [causative verbs], e.g. üji- 'to see' : caus. üj.üul- 'to make see, to show', ab- 'to take' : caus. ab.kuul'to let take'; other causative-suffixes are . $A A-$-, as in nura- 'to collapse' : caus. nur.aa- 'to demolish', .GA-, as in bol- 'to become' : caus. bol.go- 'to make', and .lgA-, as in suu- 'to sit' : caus. suu.lga- 'to set', bai- 'to be' : caus. bai.lga- 'to let be, to create'; .ldU- [reciprocal verbs], e.g. ala- 'to kill' : rec. ala.ldu- 'to kill each other'; .lci- [cooperative verbs], e.g. barkira- 'to shout' : coop. barkira.lci- id. (together with others).

An example of multiple derivation is: [nominal root] dabkur 'double' : [denominal verb] dabkur.la- 'to double' : [causative verb] dabkur.l.uul- 'to cause to double', to
which theoretically a further verbal suffix (e.g. passive) and a final nominalizer could be added.

## NUMBER AND CASE

Nominal words may bear markers for number, case and possession. There is no morphological distinction between substantival and adjectival nouns. Plural is distinguished from the unmarked singular by a considerable variety of suffixes. As in most other Mongolic languages, these tend to be optional and lexically determined, for which reason plural may still be considered to remain a derivational category.

The plural suffixes attested in Ordos include: .nAr, $. d, . s, . U U d, . U U s, . n U U d, . n U U s$, .$c U U d$. Of these,.$n A r$ is used with nouns designating humans or other rational beings. It may thus also be found on the plural personal pronouns. The suffix $d$ is used on nouns ending in one of the consonants $n l r$, which are replaced by the suffix, e.g. ejin 'prince': pl. eji.d, düsimel 'minister' : pl. düsime.d, üker 'bovine' : pl. üke.d. The suffix .s is used on vowel stems, e.g. nere 'name' : pl. nere.s. The suffixes .UUd and .UUs, containing a connective vowel and.$d$ or.$s$, respectively, can be added to any stem ending in a consonant (including $n l r$ ).

The suffixes.$n U U d$ and.$n U U s$ contain the additional segment $n$, which may simply represent the final consonant of nasal stems, but which might perhaps also be identified with the archaic pluralizer.$n$, still found in Ordos in a few isolated examples, including clan names like gakai 'pig': pl. gaka.n [as clan name]. Possessive adjectives in .tai also have the special plural .tan. The suffix . $c U U d$, finally, forms collectives, representing a class of (mostly human) individuals, rather than an accidental group of single entities, e.g. bayan 'rich' : pl. baya.cuud, galka 'Khalkha' : pl. galka.cuud. Plural markers may also be accumulated to add emphasis to the notion of plurality, e.g. .nAr.UUd, .d.UUd, .d.UUs.

The case paradigm in Ordos comprises eight suffixally marked cases: genitive, accusative, dative, ablative, instrumental, comitative, possessive, and directive (Table 9.3). The allomorphy of the case endings follows rules closely reminiscent of Mongol proper. Thus, both vowel stems (V) and consonant stems (C) take basically identical sets of suffixes, with only the dative (morphophonologically $-D U$ ) showing a separate allomorph for obstruent stems (O). The dative ending can dialectally also appear as (NE) -d $(-D)$. The accusative, ablative, and instrumental endings, which contain a long vowel, require the presence of the connecting consonant $g$ after stems ending in a long

TABLE 9.3 ORDOS CASE MARKERS

|  | $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ | O | N | $\mathrm{VV} / \mathrm{Ng}$ | Vi |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| gen. | $-(i) i n$ |  | $-(A) i$ | $/ g$ - $i i n$ | $-n$ |
| acc. | $-(i) i / g$ |  | $-i i$ | $/ g$ - $i i / g$ |  |
| dat. | $-d U$ | $-t U$ |  | $/ g-A A s$ |  |
| abl. | $-A A s$ |  |  |  |  |
| instr. | $-A A A r$ |  |  |  |  |
| com. | $-l A A$ |  |  |  |  |
| pos. | $-t A i$ |  |  |  |  |
| dir. | $-R U U$ |  |  |  |  |

vowel (VV), a diphthong (Vi), or a velar nasal ( Ng ). The same is true of the genitive ending, except that it has the simple allomorph $-n$ after diphthong stems. The directive ending (morphophonologically $-R U U$, basically realized as $-r U U$ ) has a special variant $(-l U U)$ used after vowel stems as well as consonant stems ending in the segments $n$ and (due to liquid dissimilation) $r$.

Further complications are connected with the genitive and accusative endings, which after stems ending in a stable $n$ have the variants gen. -(A)i and acc. -ii. With other consonant stems, the final $g$ of the accusative is optional ( $-i i \sim-i i / g$ ). Stems ending in an unstable $/ n$ use the nasal stem as a genitive, e.g. mori 'horse' : gen. mori-n. Although originally the nasal segment is not a case ending, it may synchronically be analysed as such on the analogy of the diphthong stems, e.g. gakai 'pig' : gen. gakai-n. Otherwise, the unstable $/ n$ appears in the dative, ablative, comitative, and possessive forms, e.g. acc. mor-iig : dat. mori/n-du : abl. mori/n-aas : instr. mori-aar : com. mori/n-laa : poss. mori/n-toi.

Functionally, the unmarked nominative is the case of the subject as well as the direct indefinite object, e.g. cinggis kaan minggan aba ködölgöji. . . ‘Chinggis Khan sent one thousand hunters and. . .'. The direct definite object is indicated by the accusative: cimbu lama-ig jalaba 'he invited Chimbu Lama'. The genitive indicates concrete or metaphorical possession: dargu-in eme 'Dargu's wife'; tenger-iin kele 'language of heaven'. It is also required by most postpositions.

The dative (dative-locative) has the widest range of functions. Its locative functions comprise the (static) location of items and processes, e.g. eljigen jiketei kaan cagaan balgasun-du suuji baiji 'the donkey-eared king lived in Chaghan Balghasun'; as well as the (dynamic) goal of motion, e.g. juu-kung-buu kaani urdu-du orojii 'Juu-Kung-Buu entered the Khan's palace'. The ablative, on the other hand, denotes the source of motion, e.g. tengeri/n-ees jasu unana 'snow falls from the sky'. Both local cases are also used for temporal reference, cf. e.g. (dat.) erte nege cag-tu 'once upon a time', (abl.) tere üdür-ees koisinain 'after that day'.

On a more abstract relational level, the dative denotes recipient, e.g. (pronominal example) ci nada olji ög 'find [it] for me!'; and also the agent of passive constructions, e.g. (dat. refl.) ere-de-en alagdasan 'she has been killed by her husband'. The ablative indicates the basis of comparison, while a similar construction with a reduplicated adjectival noun conveys the meaning 'extremely', e.g. ündür-ees ündür, öbösön-öös bogoni 'extremely tall [literally: 'high from high'], [yet] shorter than grass'.

The instrumental is used in the expected meaning, indicating an instrument or means of an action, e.g. sük-eer jabci- 'to cut with an axe', while the comitative indicates a co-subject: cinggis gitad-laa dailalciba 'Chinggis fought with the Chinese'. Generally, there is no functional difference between the comitative and the possessive, except that the latter form is also used in the possessive construction, e.g. gagcakan nege törösön küüken-tei baisan '[they] had only one daughter'.

The directive is more widely used in Ordos than in most other Modern Mongolic languages and dialects, and may therefore be considered a regular member of the case paradigm. As opposed to the dative, it is used to describe the entity towards which a motion is directed, without implying that this point is actually reached ('in the direction of'), e.g. ger-lüü 'towards the house', tere-lü̈̈ 'in that direction'.

Apart from the actual case paradigm, Ordos has also the marginal Common Mongolic terminative case, which appears with the non-harmonizing ending -cee. This form is used to indicate either the point of reference in comparisons (of size, height, etc.) or the point up to which a motion or a circumstance extends, e.g. ter goliin usu öbödög-cee bainaa 'the water in that river reaches up to the knees'; küni-cee ündür 'as tall as a man'.

Another form, a kind of comparative case with the ending -DUrUUn, is occasionally, though rarely, used instead of the ablative in comparative constructions to express the basis of comparison: (pronominal example) nada-duruun bayan bain 'he is richer than me'.

Finally, as in other Mongolic languages, the negative particle -güei (or =güei) 'without', when added after nouns, is functionally very close to a privative case marker. It corresponds to the possessive -tAi in all contexts, cf. e.g. bi ekener-tei bain 'I am married' (literally: 'I have a wife') vs. bi ekener-güei bain 'I am unmarried' (literally: 'I do not have a wife'). It has, however, no harmonic variants.

To a limited degree, two different case endings may be combined to form double cases. Among the more commonly found combinations are: genitive + locative 'at someone's (place)', e.g. bags-iin-du 'at the teacher's'; genitive + directive, e.g. noyon-oi-luu 'towards the prince's (palace)'; locative + ablative, e.g. ger-t-ees 'from the house'. A kind of double declension is also present in the suffix complex -dA-ki, as in goto-da-ki ger 'a house located in the city', which involves the nominativizing suffix - $k i$ added to the variant dative case ending $-d a(-)$.

## NUMERALS

The cardinal numerals for the basic digits have the shapes: 1 nige/n $\sim$ nege/n, 2 koyor, 3 gurba/n, 4 dörbö/n, 5 tabu/n, 6 jurgaa/n, 7 doloo/n, 8 naima/n, 9 yisü/n. The numerals for the corresponding decades are: $10 \mathrm{arba} / \mathrm{n}, 20 \mathrm{kori} / \mathrm{n}, 30 \mathrm{guci} / \mathrm{n}, 40 \mathrm{döci} / \mathrm{n}, 50 \mathrm{tabi} / \mathrm{n}$, $60 \mathrm{jira} / \mathrm{n}, 70 \mathrm{dala} / \mathrm{n}, 80$ naya/n, 90 yire $/ \mathrm{n}$; while the numerals expressing the powers of ten are: 100 juu $/ n, 1,000$ mingga/n, 10,000 tüme/n. All of these items (with the exception of 2 koyor ) end in the unstable $/ n$, which appears not only in their declension, but also for conjoining tens and digits, e.g. 11 arban nige/n, 75 dalan tabu/n. The basic (nominative) forms, as used, for example in counting, have no final nasal.

Higher numerals are copied from Tibetan: 100,000 bum, 1,000,000 saya, 10,000,000 jiba $\sim$ siba, 100,000,000 dongshuur. The use of these borrowed numerals is mostly confined to Buddhist contexts.

Ordinal numerals are formed by the suffix .dugaar, which does not harmonize in Ordos, suggesting that it may synchronically be a question of a compound construction, e.g. nige.dugaar (perhaps nige+dugaar) 'first', koyor.dugaar (koyor + dugaar) 'second', gurba.dugaar (gurba+dugaar) 'third'. Other numeral derivatives include the delimitatives in .kAn, e.g. gurba.kan 'only three', the collectives in .UUl, e.g. gurb.uul 'three together', and the multiplicatives in /n.tai, e.g. gurban.tai 'three times'; cf. also lexicalized derivatives such as gurba.da- 'to do three times', gurba.ljin 'triangle' : gurba.lji.la- 'to do three together'.

## PRONOUNS

Pronominal paradigms differ from those of regular nouns mainly by the presence of a certain degree of suppletivism, which is most salient in the personal pronouns (Table 9.4).

There are no true third person pronouns; instead, if emphasis is needed, the demonstrative pronouns en/e 'this' and ter/e 'that' are used. The corresponding oblique stems are ӥün- or enüün- and tüün- or terüün-. Exceptional formations are present in the genitive and accusative, which can optionally lack the case endings -ii resp. -ii/g. Thus, for instance, ene can have the accusative variants enüüniig, епӥӥnii, епӥӥи, ӥӥпіія, ӥӥnii, or ӥ̈̈n, of which епӥӥnii, епӥün, ӥünii, and ӥ̈̈n, can also function as genitives. The

TABLE 9.4 ORDOS PERSONAL PRONOUNS

|  |  |  | 1 p. |  |  | 2p. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sg. | nom. gen. |  | bi <br> mini |  |  | $c i$ <br> cini |  |
|  | acc. |  |  | namai/g |  |  | camai/g |
|  | dat. | nada |  | namaidu | camadu |  | camaidu |
|  | abl. | nadaas |  |  | camaas |  |  |
|  | instr. | nadaar |  | namaigaar | camaar |  | camaigaar |
|  | com. | nadalaa |  | namailaa | camalaa |  | camailaa |
|  | poss. | nadatai |  |  | camatai |  |  |
|  |  | excl. |  | incl. |  |  |  |
| pl . | nom. |  | bida |  |  | ta |  |
|  | gen. | mani |  | bidani |  | tani |  |
|  | acc. |  | manii/g |  |  | tanii/g |  |
|  | obl. |  | man- |  |  | tan- |  |

instrumental forms are also special, in that they incorporate the connective consonant $g$ : (en)ü̈ng-geer vs. t(er)üüng-geer.

The plural demonstratives, also used as replacements for the plural third person pronoun, are ede : eden- 'these' and tede : teden- 'those'. Their plural meaning may be further reinforced by the addition of separate plural suffixes, such as $-n U U d$, $-n U U s$.

The basic interrogative pronouns are: ken 'who', yü̈̈/n 'what', yamar 'what kind of'. Other related pronominal words include: kejee 'when', gecineen 'how much', kaa 'where'. The reflexive pronoun is the Common Mongolic öör- : gen. öör-iin 'one's own' : refl. öör-öön 'by oneself', or also öös- (<*öxesü/n) : refl. öös-öön, etc.

## POSSESSIVE SUFFIXES

The genitive forms of the personal pronouns may be used as prenominal possessive pronouns, but it is more common to use postnominally their shortened forms, which have acquired, by and large, the status of possessive suffixes (Table 9.5).

As far as the first and second person possessive forms are concerned, the grammaticalization of the postnominal personal pronoun genitives into true possessive suffixes is best understood as being still uncompleted in Ordos. The postnominal pronominal elements should therefore perhaps be viewed as clitics, especially since the plural possessive markers do not seem to follow the rules of vowel harmony ( $=$ min $:=\operatorname{cin}$ : $=$ man $:=\tan$ ). On the other hand, there is obligatory agreement between the possessive markers and a pronominal referent. There is no corrresponding system of predicative personal endings in Ordos.

The third person (singular and plural) possessive marker ( $<*^{*}-n i<*_{i n i}$ ) has a special position, in that it has no surviving counterpart in the system of independent pronominal roots. The variant $-n / i$ is used with most case forms, including the unmarked nominative, e.g. bagsi 'teacher' : px 3p. bagsi-ni ~ bagsi-n 'his/her/their teacher'. In combination with the accusative ending, the third person possessive suffix yields the complex -ii-n, e.g. acc. px 3p. bags-ii-n, while after the genitive ending the variant -iin is used, e.g. gen. px 3 p. bags-iin-iin 'of his/her/their teacher'.

TABLE 9.5 ORDOS POSSESSIVE SUFFIXES

|  | sg. | pl. |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1p. | -min |  | - man |
| 2p. | -cin | -n/i, -iin | -tan |
| 3p. |  |  |  |

TABLE 9.6 ORDOS IMPERATIVE MARKERS

|  |  | VV | marker |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| prec. | $/ g$ | $-A A$ | variant |
| vol. |  | $-y$ |  |
| vol. sg. | $-y-A n$ | $-y-A A$ |  |
| conc. | $-t U g A i$ | $-y$-in |  |
| perm. |  | $-g A$ | $/ g-A A$ |
| des. | $/ g$ | $-A A s A i$ |  |
| dub. | $-U U j A i$ | $-U U j i n$ |  |

Ordos has also the Common Mongolic reflexive declension, which indicates that the entity expressed by the governed noun is in a (concrete or metaphorical) possessive relation with the subject. The reflexive marker is $-A A n$, added with few complications directly to the case endings. The resulting suffix complexes, as used for vowel stems, are: acc. -iig-AAn, gen. -iin-AAn, dat. -D-AAn, abl. /g-AAs-AAn, instr. /g-AAr-AAn, com. (formally com. + instr.) -lAA-r-AAn, poss. -tAi/g-AAn, dir. $-R U U / g-A A n$. The plain reflexive form (without a case ending) functions as the accusative for consonant stems, e.g. em 'medicine' : refl. em-een, and as the genitive for stems ending in a stable $n$, e.g. kaan 'emperor' : refl. kaan-aan. In the latter stem class, then, the reflexive accusative and genitive forms coincide. Examples of reflexive forms: (refl.) aka köl-öön uguaasan 'the elder brother washed his feet'; (dat. ref1.) eke küüke-d-een kaikura-güei 'the mother does not care for her child'; (abl. refl.) bida ger nutug-aas-aan garci üdür udabaa 'we departed from our home long ago'.

## IMPERATIVES

Apart from the basic unmarked imperative, Ordos preserves the following Common Mongolic forms of the imperative sphere: precative, voluntative, concessive, permissive, desiderative, and dubitative (Table 9.6). Some of these have optional variants; notably, the voluntative $(-y)$, and permissive $(-g A)$, can add an emphatic long vowel $(-A A)$, formally identical with the precative suffix. Also, the voluntative in Ordos appears with two variants: the basic voluntative $(-y$ or $-y-A A)$ and the special singular voluntative $(-y-A n$ or $-y-i n)$. The precative, desiderative and dubitative suffixes require the addition of the connective consonant $g$ after stems ending in a long vowel or a diphthong (VV).

As in other Mongolic languages, the imperatives show a certain sensibility to the category of person, which is otherwise not grammaticalized in Ordos verbal morphology. The basic imperative and the precative indicate an order or command directed at the
second person, e.g. imp. ire-Ø or prec. ir-ee '[you] come!'. Marginally, the basic imperative may also be found with third person reference, as in aduu mal-cin jujaara-Ø 'may your [sg.] horse and cattle herds grow!'.

The voluntatives are used in reference to the first person. The basic voluntative ( $-y$ or $-y-A A$ ) can refer to both a singular and a plural subject, and expresses a firm determination to do something. Functionally, it is very close to a future tense, e.g. ide-y 'I/we want to eat; I am/we are determined to eat; I/we shall eat'. The expanded optative $(-y-A n$ or $-y-i n)$ refers only to a singular subject, and expresses a strong real or irreal wish to do something, e.g. bi nege sine malaga olji ab/u-yan 'I wish to buy a new hat; I wish I could buy a new hat!'. This form can be further reinforced by the postposed particles $=c i$ or $=d o$, as in bi camadu keleji ög/ö-yön=ci'if only I had told you! [implying that I did not]'.

The rest of the imperative forms are used in reference to a third person subject, though they may occasionally also refer to the second person. The concessive, permissive, and desiderative indicate various degrees of wish or willingness, e.g. conc. [hope] bicige boroon orotugai ( $\sim$ orotogoi) 'may it not rain!'; perm. [permission] kelege 'let him speak, may he speak'. Finally, the dubitative is used to describe possible future events, with the connotation that they are undesirable consequences of present behaviour or negligence, e.g. nokoi kaj-uujai 'let the dog not bite!', garaa kalaa/g-uujai, gecee 'you might burn your hand, pay attention!'.

## PARTICIPLES

Ordos preserves the Common Mongolic futuritive, imperfective, perfective, and habitive participles, as well as the almost completely deverbalized agentive participle (Table 9.7). The corresponding negative forms contain the postpositionally (suffixally or enclitically) used negative particle ügüei in various stages of phonological reduction (-ügüei, -güei, -üei, also -ügüee, -güee, -üee or -ügüii, -güii, -üii).

As in other Mongolic languages, the participles are polyfunctional forms with both verbal and nominal characteristics. Their nominal character consists in the fact that they may bear case endings, a strategy which is exploited for the formation of complex predications. Their main verbal feature, on the other hand, is their ability to take adverbal modifiers (objects, adverbials). In Ordos, however, they can also form independent sentential predications, i.e., they can function as finite verbs. The latter functional range sharply separates them from converbs. It is true, predicatively used participles can be accompanied by a copula.

Taking the perfective participle as an example, the syntactic roles of the participles may be illustrated as follows: (1) attributive (adnominal), yabu-san kün 'the man who

TABLE 9.7 ORDOS PARTICIPLE MARKERS

|  | VV |  | neg. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| part. fut. |  | $-k U$ | $-k(U-g)-\ddot{u} e i$ |
| imperf. | $/ \mathrm{g}$ | -AA | -AA-ügüei |
| perf. |  | -sAn | -sAng-güei |
| hab. |  | -DAg | -D-ügüei |
| ag. |  | -gci |  |

has come'; (2) predicative (finite), kün yabusan (bain) 'the man has come'; (3) objective, (acc.) küni yabu-san-iig bi üjisen 'I saw that the man came' (literally: 'I saw the man's coming'); (4) adverbial (quasiconverbial), (dat.) küni yabu-san-du bi untaba 'I was sleeping when the man came (literally: 'at the man's coming').

In Ordos, the imperfective participle refers mainly to the present tense, thus functioning as a kind of present participle, e.g. (attributive) güi/g-ee tuulai 'a running rabbit'; (predicative) ös abku cag boloo-ügüei 'the time to take revenge has not yet come'. The perfective participle, by contrast, refers to past and completed actions, e.g. (attributive) tere gurban sara dotoro gar-san kü̈̈ked 'the children born during those three months'; (predicative) üge keleji cida-san-güee 'he could not say a word'.

The futuritive participle has a wide range of functions, among them future reference. In predicative function, it is often followed by the copular element -im $\sim-y u m$ ( $<$ yum 'thing, fact; it is a fact'), e.g. temeendu yabu-ku-im 'I will go looking for the camels'. Most frequently, however, the futuritive participle has the function of a general action noun, e.g. alaga jodo-ku bicigiin surguul 'striking the palm, [that is] the school of letters' (i.e. 'pupils must be punished', proverb); (abl.) bi üji-k-ees idesen bain 'apart from seeing it, I also ate it'. The habitive participle, also used with -im $\sim-y u m$, denotes habitual actions: mini ene kürgenii ta teneg geji kele-deg 'you keep calling this son-in-law of mine stupid'; ene kün ide-deg yum bisi 'this is not something people eat' (with substantival yum).

Other deverbal nominal suffixes, which form derivatives somewhat reminiscent of participles, include.$m t A g A i$,.$m A g A i$, .mAi, .ngkai, denoting a penchant to do something, e.g. aim-tagai kün 'fearful person'; dusun bara.mai deng 'a lamp which consumes much oil'; as well as .si (nomen possibilitatis), e.g. yabu.si-ügüei 'impossible to go'.

## CONVERBS

Ordos has a considerable number of productive converbial forms, including the Common Mongolic modal, imperfective, perfective, conditional, concessive, terminative, and contemporal converbs. It also has the petrified quasiconverbial constructions functioning as the abtemporal, final, and successive converbs. Some of the suffixes concerned have several optional or dialectal variants (Table 9.8). A feature specific to Ordos is the form that may be termed the precedentive converb, also known as the converbum rei prius

TABLE 9.8 ORDOS CONVERB MARKERS

|  | VV | marker | variant |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| conv. mod. |  | -n |  |
| imperf. |  | $-C i$ | NE-Cii |
| perf. | $/ \mathrm{g}$ | -AAd |  |
| cond. (1) |  | -bal | -bal-AA |
| cond. (2) | $/ \mathrm{g}$ | -UUn/i | -ngg-UUn/i |
| conc. |  | -bAA | -bAci, NE -bc |
| term. |  | -tAr | -tAl |
| contemp. |  | $-m A g c A$ | -mAgci |
| abtemp. |  | -s-AAr |  |
| fin. |  | $-k-A A r$ |  |
| succ. |  | -kU-lAA | -kU-lAA-r |
| preced. |  | -mAA/n | -mAA(n)-jin |

agendae (Mostaert) in -mAA/n or -mAA(n)-jin. Another Ordos idiosyncracy is present in the suffix $-U U n / i$ or $-n g g-U U n / i$, used in the function of a conditional converb.

As a functional class, the Ordos converbs may best be described in negative terms. Unlike finite forms and participles, they are never used as finite predicates, and unlike participles (but like finite forms), they are never used attributively. Their use is thus confined to dependent predications, which most often precede a finite predication (expressed by either a finite form or a predicatively used participle).

The first three converbs are used for straightforward clause chaining, with an increasing degree of temporal distance between the converbial form and its headword. Thus, the modal converb is often close in function to an adverbial clause: bi cida-n yada-n kiiy 'I will do what I can' (literally: 'being able, not being able'). The imperfective converb chains predications that are either simultaneous or temporally close enough to each other to constitute a coherent chain of actions: öglööni bos-ci ündür mudundaaraan gar-ci. . . '(he) rose in the morning, climbed his high tree and. . .'; together with the auxiliary verb bai- 'to be', it is used to form the progressive construction: kara budaa ide-ji bai-ji karada-ji bain 'he has been eating plain millet and (now) he is sick'. The perfective converb, finally, may imply a greater (logical or temporal) separation of the conjoined predications: bagbaakai cino deilseni üj-eed, cinondu kelebe. . . 'the bat saw that the wolf had won, and said to the wolf. . . '.

The two different suffixes forming conditional converbs ( $-b A l$ or $-b A l-A A$ resp. $-U U n / i$ or -ngg-UUn/i) are apparently more or less synonymous. Additionally, though more marginally (mainly in fixed phrases), Ordos preserves the older conditional gerund in -bAAsU (<*-ba+axasu). All these forms tend to have conditional meaning ('if') when the following finite verb has a non-past temporal reference, as in tandu gal bai/g-uun, nada ög 'if you have a light (fire), give (it) to me!'. With past reference of the main verb, they have a temporal meaning ('when'), close to that of the successive converb. The concessive converb expresses a concessive relationship ('although'), e.g. killee ge-beci, kiisen yum ügüee 'although he says/said that he did (it), he has not done a thing'.

Most of the remaining converbs have a temporal function, e.g. conv. term. ('up to, until') öngörö-tör saruul bailaa 'he was (mentally) healthy up to the moment he died'; conv. contemp. ('immediately when’) gerteen kari-magca nadad bicig ilgee 'right after arriving home, send me a letter!'; conv. abtemp. ('after, since') bi budaagaan ide-seer yabuyaa 'I will go after having eaten', yabu-saar arban negen üdür bolji 'eleven days have passed since he left'; conv. succ. ('when, after') olood sura-kulaa, jurgaan akani kelebe 'after he had found and interrogated (them), the six brothers said'. The successive and precedentive converbs may be found with a conditional meaning as well, e.g. conv. succ. ('if') ci ese ire-külee, bi icikü-güee 'if you don't come, I won't go'; conv. preced. ('only if, only after') ci kiideleen büteeji ab-maajin. . . 'only after having completed all your tasks. . .'. The final gerund indicates purpose, as in conv. fin. ('in order to') cai uu-k-aar irelee 'he has come (in order) to drink tea'.

## FINITE INDICATIVE FORMS

Ordos has four finite indicative temporal-aspectual forms, which correspond to the Common Mongolic durative, terminative, confirmative, and resultative forms (Table 9.9). The durative and terminative markers have variants with or without a final long vowel. From the point of view of the morphological system it is interesting to note that the resultative marker is identical with the marker of the imperfective converb (both -Ci).

TABLE 9.9 ORDOS FINITE TENSE-ASPECT MARKERS

|  | function | marker | variant |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| dur. | present | $-n$ | $-n-A A$ |
| term. | past basic | $-b$ | $-b-A A$ |
| conf. | past perfect | $-l A A$ |  |
| res. | $-C i$ |  |  |

At least formally, then, though perhaps not functionally, the systems of converbs and finite forms overlap on this point, with a single suffix forming both finite and non-finite predicates.

The durative in Ordos is used with present time reference: mede-nee 'he knows', uilanaa 'he is weeping'. To underline the progressive Aktionsart, the progressive construction is also frequently (but not obligatorily) used, e.g. suu-ji bai-n 'he is sitting'.

The other three finite forms all refer to the past tense, but they have functional differences. The terminative may be viewed as the basic form, which expresses any past action or process, while the resultative carries the additional information that the speaker is sure (knows well, has no doubts) that the predication is true, cf. e.g. [question, unverified] $y a b u-b=u u$ (with the question particle $=U U$ ) 'did he go?; has he gone?' vs. [answer, verified] yabu-ji 'he went; he did go; he has gone'. The confirmative, finally, is close to a true perfect in that it describes a past action or process of which the consequences are still relevant for the moment of speaking: ire-lee 'he has come (and is now here)', ter gerteen kari-laa 'he went back home (and is now there)'. As in Mongol proper, it may also (with first person reference) be used to express the firm intent of the speaker to do something: bi yabu-laa 'I am just about to go' (literally: 'I have gone').

## SYNTAX

Throughout Ordos syntax, the head-final word order is observed. Thus, for instance, adjectival nouns, numerals, genitive attributes and pronominal specifiers precede their nominal headwords, e.g. tere nege minggan saikan mori 'those one thousand beautiful horses'. Also, subordinate clauses (both converbial and participial) are placed before the finite main clause. The constituents of a complex noun phrase do not agree in case or number, only the head being marked, e.g. (abl.) tere nege minggan saikan morin-oos. A corollary of these principles is the strictly observed SOV-order of sentential constituents. An indirect object precedes a direct object, as in ter nadad bicig biciji 'he wrote me a letter'.

Since the syntactic alignment of Ordos is nominative, the subjects of both intransitive and transitive predications are treated as unmarked (in the nominative case), while direct definite objects are treated as marked (in the accusative case). Indefinite objects are, however, unmarked, as in nege mori [indefinite] abci, keleji: ci ene mor-iig [definite] unaad. . . 'he took a horse and said: sit on this horse and. . .'.

The normal method of forming complex predications is to use converbs and participles, which link embedded and chained clauses with the main clause. There are virtually no subordinating conjunctions. Converbial clauses may be used for the simple co-ordination of equivalent predications, or they may indicate temporal, conditional, concessive or purposive subordination. The two most frequent functions of participial clauses are relativization (adnominal use), e.g. (part. perf.) manggusiig ala-san baatur 'the hero who
has killed the demon', and the formation of complement clauses (adverbal use), e.g. (part. perf. acc. px 3p.) cinggis koyuuliin ala-san-ii-n üjeed 'Chinggis saw that he [another person] had killed both of them and. . .'

Interrogative sentences, other than those containing an interrogative word (whquestions), are marked by the interrogative particle $=U U$, which may be analysed as a clitic. The interrogative particle is added to the final verb (finite form or participle) of the main clause, e.g. (term. interr.) shara ünege yabukuin üji-b=üü 'did you see the yellow fox run?'.
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