

CHAPTER FOUR

KHAMNIGAN MONGOL

Juha Janhunen

Khamnigan Mongol is the Mongolic language spoken by the population known as the Khamnigan or the ‘Horse Tungus’ (also ‘Equestrian Tungus’ or ‘Steppe Tungus’) of Transbaikalia. The native territory of the Khamnigan comprises the Onon and Argun basins in northeastern Mongolia and northwestern Manchuria. More exactly, most of the historically recorded Khamnigan population seems to have been concentrated in the territory lying between the main basins of the Onon and Argun, along rivers such as the Onon-Borzya, Urulyngui, Lower Borzya, Middle Borzya, and Upper Borzya. From the point of view of the history of the Mongols the Khamnigan occupy a most important region, since it was exactly here where Chinggis Khan was born and where he started the amalgamation of the Mongol tribes into a world-conquering empire.

After the fall of the Mongol empire the Khamnigan territory remained in the northern periphery of Mongolia and China until, in the mid-seventeenth century, it came within the sphere of the eastward-expanding Russian empire. In 1654 the Russians established the fort of Nerchinsk, which became the administrative centre of the Amur source region, known to the Russians as Dauria or ‘the Dagur Land’. The Khamnigan were subsequently referred to as the ‘Nerchinsk Tungus’. Officially, the Khamnigan were brought under Russia by the influential tribal leader and political strategist Gantimur (*Gantumur*), whose Russianized descendants, known as the Gantimur (*Gantimurov*) princes, later functioned as the hereditary native rulers of the Khamnigan until Soviet times.

From the seventeenth to the early twentieth century most Khamnigan lived within the Russian sphere, interacting intensively with the Transbaikalian Cossacks as well as the Buryat. At the same time, however, an unknown number of Khamnigan stayed on the Mongolian side of the border, in the northern part of the modern Kentei Aimak. After the Russian Civil War, a considerable part of the Russian Khamnigan crossed the Argun together with Cossack and Buryat groups, entering the Hailar basin and the so-called Three Rivers Region (*Trexrech’e*) in the northern part of the Barga (*Bargu*) steppe. Most of these emigrant Khamnigan came to be concentrated in the basin of the local river Mergel, where they today inhabit their native autonomous unit officially known as the Ewenki Autonomous Arrow (*sumu*) of the Old Bargut (*Chen Baerhu*) Banner, which, in turn, belongs to Hulun Buir League of Inner Mongolia, China.

The fact that the Russians traditionally identified the Khamnigan as ‘Tungus’ is no accident. In a similar way, the modern ethnic administration of China classifies the Khamnigan as ‘Ewenki’ (‘Tungus Ewenki’). This is ultimately due to the fact that the Khamnigan as an ethnic group are a conglomeration of Mongolic and Tungusic elements. The dual affiliation of the Khamnigan is easy to trace in their social background (clan composition), but, even more importantly, it is also manifest in their inherited bilingualism, which involves the parallel use of two native languages, the one Mongolic and the other Tungusic. For historical reasons, it has been the Tungusic language according to which the Khamnigan have been classified by their neighbours. The term Khamnigan itself (*Kamnigan* : pl. *Kamnigad*) is the Mongolic name for the Ewenki.

From the linguistic point of view, the two languages of the Khamnigan are two separate entities. While the Mongolic language may be identified as Khamnigan Mongol, the Tungusic language can be comprised by the term Khamnigan Ewenki. However, a closer look at its taxonomic properties reveals that Khamnigan Ewenki is not a language in its own right, but forms part of the overall dialectal variation of the Northern Tungusic Ewenki language. Khamnigan Mongol, on the other hand, cannot be treated as a dialect of any other Mongolic language. Moreover, on the sociolinguistic side, Khamnigan Mongol is the dominant community language of the Khamnigan, while Khamnigan Ewenki (in two dialectal varieties) is only used inside families among part of the population.

The Khamnigan in the technical sense may, consequently, be defined as people speaking the Khamnigan Mongol language. A considerable proportion of these people are also fluent in Khamnigan Ewenki. Speaking of a first and a second language in this case would not be to the point, since both languages are learnt within the native community in early childhood. It is not known how long this bilingualism has characterized the Khamnigan, but historical information allows us to assume that the phenomenon is of several centuries old. There are, however, indications that the Khamnigan community may always have included sections (clans and individuals) monolingual in Khamnigan Mongol only. Under conditions of acculturation, even Khamnigan Mongol has tended to recede in favour of other languages, notably Buryat, Khalkha, and Russian.

Because of the taxonomic confusion concerning the ethnic position of the Khamnigan, it is impossible to assess the exact number of Khamnigan Mongol speakers in the past. Although the number of people registered in Russian statistics as 'Horse Tungus' reached *c.*25,000 individuals in the late nineteenth century, it is possible that there were never more than *c.*5,000 Khamnigan Mongol speakers. Even this number has gone rapidly down, and today there are few true Khamnigan left in Russia, while the situation in Mongolia is unknown. However, the Khamnigan population on the Chinese side, in spite of its official status as 'Ewenki', remains linguistically vigorous and continues to carry on both the Khamnigan Mongol language and the traditional bilingualism in Ewenki. The current size of this population may be estimated at *c.*2,000 individuals.

DATA AND SOURCES

Khamnigan Mongol was not recognized as a separate Mongolic language until very recently. For most early travellers in Transbaikalia, Khamnigan Mongol apparently represented a local variety of the Mongol language, possibly a variety specifically spoken by the 'Tungus'. Khamnigan Mongol language material, including words and phrases, can therefore be found in early travelogues and vocabularies under the general label of 'Mongol', or 'Daurian'. Khamnigan Mongol is also present on the early maps of Dauria, where most place names bear unmistakable Khamnigan features. Many of these place names are still in official use, even for localities now dominated by a Russian or a Buryat population.

Since Khamnigan Mongol is the dominant language of the bilingual Khamnigan, it penetrates also Khamnigan Ewenki at all levels of linguistic structure, especially the lexicon. It was, incidentally, Khamnigan Ewenki that first became the object of linguistic field work, in that M. A. Castrén based his Ewenki (Tungus) grammar (Castrén 1856) on the dialects of the 'Nerchinsk Tungus', among whom he stayed in 1848. Castrén did not work on Khamnigan Mongol, and he may not have realized its status as a separate

Mongolic language. Nevertheless, the Ewenki vocabulary collected by him is full of loanwords from Khamnigan Mongol, suggesting that his informants were fluent also in that language.

The first scholar to work specifically on Khamnigan Mongol seems to have been Ts. J. Jamtsarano, who in 1911 collected language samples and folklore from several informants in Russian Transbaikalia. His materials remained, however, unpublished, until the native Khamnigan scholar D. G. Damdinov prepared a volume of epic tales, which still remains the only published collection of Khamnigan Mongol texts (Jamtsarano and Damdinov 1982). Damdinov has also published a series of descriptive works on both the Khamnigan Mongol language and the ethnic history of the Khamnigan (Damdinov 1962, 1968, 1988, 1993). Other studies on the ethnic history of the Khamnigan alias the 'Horse Tungus' include those by A. S. Shubin (1973) and A. M. Reshetov (1986).

On the Mongolian side, Khamnigan Mongol material was collected in the 1950s and 1960s by Katalin (Käthe) Kõhalmi (1959) as well as L. Mishig (1961) and B. Rinchen (1969). Unfortunately, no modern follow-up study of the Mongolian Khamnigan has been made. Kõhalmi (1964, 1981) has also contributed to the understanding of the ethnic history of the Khamnigan. On the Chinese side, material on both Khamnigan Mongol and Khamnigan Ewenki, as spoken by the emigrant Khamnigan in the Mergel basin, has been collected by Juha Janhunen since the late 1980s (Janhunen 1990, 1991). He has also worked on the taxonomic status of Khamnigan Mongol as well as on the Khamnigan bilingualism (Janhunen 1992, 1996), topics earlier discussed by Gerhard Doerfer (1985).

TAXONOMIC POSITION

The conclusion that Khamnigan Mongol is a separate Mongolic language is based on an assessment of the similarities and dissimilarities that exist between Khamnigan Mongol and its closest neighbours, notably Dagur, Buryat, and Mongol proper. In this framework, Khamnigan Mongol is characterized by a unique property, in that it is the single most conservative Mongolic language spoken today. Khamnigan Mongol simply lacks almost all the innovations that have affected its neighbours since Middle Mongol times. With some exaggeration, Khamnigan Mongol could therefore be considered a residual form of Middle Mongol. The distance to Proto-Mongolic is only slightly longer.

The conservativeness of Khamnigan Mongol is easiest to establish on the basis of its phonological characteristics. There are only eight taxonomically relevant phonological innovations that separate Khamnigan Mongol from Proto-Mongolic. Four of these innovations are shared with Dagur, Buryat, and Mongol proper: (1) loss of intervocalic **x*, (2) assimilation of **e-ü* into **ö-ü*, (3) assimilation of **O-A* into **O-O*, and (4) syllable-final neutralization of **n* and **ng*. One innovation is shared with Buryat and Mongol proper: (5) loss of initial **x*; one innovation is shared with Dagur: (6) neutralization of **i(x)e* and **i(x)a* into *ie* (*éé*); and two innovations are specific to Khamnigan Mongol: (7) assimilation of **A(x)U* into **OO*, and (8) assimilation of **U(x)A* into **OO*.

While Dagur, Buryat, and Mongol proper are additionally characterized by a multitude of other phonological innovations, Khamnigan Mongol remains generally unaffected by them. In this respect there are, however, slight dialectal differences. Khamnigan Mongol can be divided into two main dialects, which may historically be identified with the Daurian localities of Urulga (*Urul'ga*) and Mankovo (*Man'kovo*), respectively. The principal difference between these dialects is that the Urulga dialect incorporates three important innovations which are normally considered to be diagnostic of

Buryat: (9) syllable-final neutralization of **s* and **d* into *d*, (10) intervocalic weakening (desibilization) of **s* into *h* (*x*), and (11) paradigmatic neutralization of **ö* and **ü* into **ü* (*u*).

It would, however, be incorrect to classify the Urulga dialect of Khamnigan Mongol as an archaic form of Buryat, for there are many more separating than uniting features between the two idioms. It is considerably more likely that the Urulga dialect has undergone a secondary, and possibly even very recent, period of Buryat influence, which has superficially distanced it from the Mankovo dialect. It has to be noted that the Mankovo dialect is also linked with Buryat by two features, in that it tends to replace the two specifically Khamnigan innovations by (7a) assimilation of **A(x)U* into **UU*, and (8a) assimilation of **U(x)A* into **AA*. These features are, however, also shared by Mongol proper, and it is possible that the Mankovo dialect has been influenced by the latter.

Altogether, the areal position of Khamnigan Mongol would seem to make it a natural partner for any innovations spreading in the Mongolic context from the west (Buryat), south (Mongol), or east (Dagur). Moreover, it is documentably also involved in a relationship of intimate interaction with a non-Mongolic language in the north (Ewenki). The curious thing is that Khamnigan Mongol has nevertheless been so resistant to external influences. This situation is only today being changed by growing influence of the more dominant languages, notably Buryat and Mongol (Khalkha and Khorchin), as well as Russian and Chinese.

As far as dialectal details are concerned, the present survey is based on the language of the Khamnigan living in the Mergel basin, an idiom which may also be termed Mergel Khamnigan. Taxonomically, Mergel Khamnigan belongs to the broader context of the Urulga dialect. Bilingualism in Khamnigan Ewenki is widespread, while influence of other Mongolic or non-Mongolic languages is still minimal. The literary medium is Modern Written Mongol, which, due to its archaic orthography, corresponds in many details to the actual Khamnigan pronunciation. Morphologically and lexically there are, however, considerable differences between Mergel Khamnigan and Written Mongol.

SEGMENTAL PHONEMES

Khamnigan Mongol vowels are strongly affected by the phenomenon of rotation, which means that the harmonic pairs **a* vs. **e* and **u* vs. **ü* are more or less completely verticalized. In the case of **e*, velarization is accompanied by rounding. The opposition between **u > ü* vs. **o > o* is preserved, while the single (short) **ö* has been completely absorbed by the rotated value of **ü > u*. There are, consequently, only six paradigmatically distinct vowel qualities (Table 4.1).

The same qualities also occur as double (long) vowels: *aa ee ii oo üü uu*, which in Khamnigan Mongol are best to be analysed as sequences of two separate segments. Importantly, the earlier double vowel **öö* (as still preserved in Buryat) has merged with **ee*, as in *teeke* 'history' (< **tööke* < **teüke*). Diphthongoid sequences with *i* comprise *ai ei oi üi ui* as well as *ie iü iu*. The diphthongoid *ie* is particularly characteristic of

TABLE 4.1 KHAMNIGAN MONGOL VOWELS

| | |
|----------|----------|
| <i>u</i> | <i>i</i> |
| <i>ü</i> | <i>e</i> |
| <i>o</i> | <i>a</i> |

TABLE 4.2 KHAMNIGAN MONGOL CONSONANTS

| | | | |
|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| <i>p</i> | <i>t</i> | <i>c</i> | <i>k</i> |
| <i>b</i> | <i>d</i> | <i>j</i> | <i>g</i> |
| | <i>s</i> | | |
| <i>m</i> | <i>n</i> | | <i>ng</i> |
| | <i>l</i> | | |
| | <i>r</i> | | |
| <i>w</i> | | <i>y</i> | <i>h</i> |

Khamnigan Mongol and fills phonetically the niche of the (long) non-high front vowel [e] otherwise absent from the paradigm.

The consonant system is more congruent with the Common Mongolic type (Table 4.2). The original system has been augmented by the new marginal phonemes *p w* as well as the regular phoneme *h* < **s* (before vowels other than **i*). The paradigmatic position of *h* is open to various interpretations; it could be treated simply as a velar fricative, but it also has properties in common with the glides *w y*. Phonetically *h* is realized as a weak laryngeal fricative, and it is convenient for comparative purposes to keep it notationally distinct from the spirantized reflexes of **k* (> *x*) in other Mongolic languages. In Khamnigan Mongol, **k* normally undergoes no spirantization, though an affricated pronunciation [kx] is reported before velar vowels for some dialects or idiolects.

Due to the development **s* > *h* before vowels (and **s* > *d* syllable-finally) Khamnigan Mongol retains **s* only before **i*, as in *sine* ‘new’. There is, however, a new marginal *s*, which occurs in recent loanwords, such as *soyol* ‘education’. Phonetically, *s* in the sequence *si* has a palatal quality (as in other Mongolic languages). It seems that this same quality also occurs as an independent marginal phoneme *sh* in the speech of some Khamnigan. The absence of a phonemic distinction between *s* and *sh* seems, however, to be more common, e.g. *sasin* ~ *shasin* ‘religion’.

It is particularly important to note that, unlike any of its neighbours, Khamnigan Mongol lacks the phenomenon of palatal breaking. It therefore preserves the original **i* of the initial syllable intact, e.g. *sira* ‘yellow’, *mika/n* ‘meat’. Cases of prebreaking are also less common than elsewhere in Mongolic, but they do occur, e.g. *cono* ‘wolf’ < **cino*.

WORD STRUCTURE

Khamnigan Mongol preserves well the general agglutinative structure of Proto-Mongolic. The internal coherence of words is enhanced by vowel harmony, which still clearly opposes the (verticalized) segments *a* vs. *e*. The system is no longer complete, however, for in spite of its general conservativeness Khamnigan Mongol shows several developments pointing to a rather serious disruption of vowel harmony. Thus, in addition to the neutral vowel *i*, the diphthongoid sequence *ie* is also neutral and can therefore occur in combination with both *a* and *e*, as in *yarie/n* ‘speech’ vs. *erien* ‘mottled’. Also, the disappearance of **ö* from the paradigm left **o* > *o* without a harmonic counterpart.

Somewhat more intricate problems are connected with the synchronic status of the harmonic opposition **u* > *ü* vs. **ü* > *u*. These two vowels do contrast in monosyllabic stems of the type *jün* ‘summer’ < **jun* vs. *jug* ‘direction’ < **jüg*, but the opposition has

a low functional load, and the phonetic distinction diminishes towards the end of the word. It therefore appears tentatively possible to interpret all occurrences of **u* **ü* in non-initial syllables as manifestations of a single neutralized high vowel *u* < **u* & **ü*, e.g. *ûhu/n* ‘water’ < **usu/n* vs. *uhu/n* ‘hair’ < **xüsü/n*. For some speakers, this neutralization might also be valid for the initial syllable, at least if a harmonically distinctive vowel is present later in the word, as in *ûlaan* ~ *ulaan* ‘red’ < **xulaxan*.

Labial harmony is regularly present after an initial syllable containing a single (short) *o*, e.g. *koto* ‘town’: instr. *kotoor*. A double (long) *oo* does, however, not condition labial harmony. This is due to the fact that *oo* diachronically often derives from the sequence **axu*, as in *noor* < **naxur* ‘lake’: abl. *nooraaha*. Labial harmony is also disturbed by the development **uxa* > *oo* in non-initial syllables, which yields *oo* not only after an *o* of the initial syllable, but also after *a* or *u*, as in *ûhu/n* ‘water’: instr. *ûhoor* (possibly also *ohoor*) < **usu-xar*. Under such circumstances, the presence of the sequence *o-oo* in a word is not necessarily indicative of labial harmony, cf. e.g. *modu* ‘tree, wood’: instr. *modoor* < **modu-xar*.

Vowel stems and consonant stems take in many cases different suffix variants. Among consonant stems, obstruent stems (ending in *b d g r* as well as marginally *s*) form a distinct subtype, conditioning the presence of strong initial consonants in some suffixes, as in *ger* ‘yurt’: dat. *ger-tu* vs. *gal* ‘fire’: dat. *gal-du*. There are also ambivalent nominal stems ending in an unstable /*n*. The use of the stem-final nasal in these stems is considerably more frequent than in Mongol proper, and it is also permitted, though not obligatory, in the basic (nominative) form.

A stem-final consonant alternation *n* : *ng* is exhibited by nominal stems ending in the nasals *n* and *ng*. In final position, the two segments are represented by an unmarked/archiphonemic (phonetically velar) nasal, but there is a morphophonological difference, which may be indicated by using the notations *n* vs. *n/g*. The stems ending in *n/g* show a distinctive velar nasal *ng* in prevocalic position, as in *an/g* < **ang* ‘game, hunting’: instr. *ang-aar* vs. *on* < **on* ‘year’: instr. *on-oor*. The velar nasal is also present before *n*, e.g. *ang.na-* ‘to hunt’. On the other hand, even the dental nasal *n* is represented as a distinctive velar nasal before certain diachronically secondary and synchronically loose suffixes (or clitics) beginning with a nasal, e.g. *kuun* ‘man’: acc. *kuun-ii* : px sg. 1p. *kuung-mini*.

An important archaic feature of Khamnigan Mongol is the regular preservation of the connective vowel **U* after consonant stems before certain (morphologically determined) suffixes of both the nominal and the verbal inflexion. It is true, this segment is only observable at the surface in a few relatively rare forms, e.g. *ab-* ‘to take’: ben. *ab/u-gtui* ‘[please] take!’. However, its diachronic presence is still synchronically indicated by the development **uxa* > *oo* in suffixal syllables, as in conv. perf. *ab-ood* < **ab/u-xad* ‘having taken’. It might be speculated that the connective vowel is still there in such cases at the synchronic deep level.

Like many other Modern Mongolic languages, Khamnigan Mongol uses the connective consonant *g* at the juncture of the stem and a suffix between two long vowel elements (double vowels or diphthongoids), as in *boo-* ‘to descend’: conv. perf. *boo/g-aad*, *bai-* ‘to be’: conv. perf. *bai/g-aad*. In nominal declension the hiatus (suffix border) can, depending on the stem, also be marked by *n* (representing the unstable /*n*), which in these cases functions almost as a connective consonant, as in *galoo* ‘goose’: abl. *galoo/g-aaha* or *galoo/n-aaha*.

While word-internal vowel sequences at the juncture of the stem and a suffix (V-V) are reflected as monophthongized double vowels (VV), vowel sequences at the border of

two words are affected by the phenomenon of elision. This elision takes place under conditions of syntactic sandhi, i.e. when the two words are pronounced contiguously. Normally, the first vowel (the final vowel of the first word) is dropped, as in *gert'oroo* < *gertu oroo* 'he] entered the yurt'. If the first vowel is a double vowel, the second vowel (the initial vowel of the second word) is dropped, but only in certain grammaticalized suffixes (or clitics), notably the negative particle *ugui*, as in part. imperf. neg. *iree-gui* from **iree+ugui* 'he] did not come'.

NUMBER AND CASE

In spite of the fact that Ewenki, the other ethnic language of a considerable part of the Khamnigan, has a regular suffixally formed plural declension, Khamnigan Mongol has not developed a consistent inflectional plural for nouns. The plural may therefore still be regarded as an optional derivational category, as it was also in Proto-Mongolic. The most common simple plural suffix is *.d*, which replaces a stem-final *n* (and /*n*), as in *keegen* 'child' : pl. *keege.d*, *mori/n* 'horse' : pl. *mori.d*. Complex suffixes based on *.d* are also used, e.g. *baisin/g* 'building' : pl. *baising.uu.d*, *bacagan* 'girl' : pl. *bacagan.nuu.d*. A kind of lexicalized suppletive plural is present in *kuun* 'man, person' : *jon* 'people'.

The nominal paradigm in Khamnigan Mongol consists of the six Common Mongolic cases: genitive, accusative, dative, ablative, instrumental, and possessive. The material shapes of the case endings are directly connected with the corresponding Common Mongolic suffixes. The basic shapes of the endings are attested after stems ending in a single vowel (V), while stems ending in a general consonant (C), an obstruent (O), a dental nasal (N), or also a double vowel (VV) or a diphthongoid (Vi), require special variants for some suffixes (Table 4.3). When no special variant is required, the diphthongoid stems follow the double vowel stems, while the obstruent and nasal stems follow the consonant stems. Otherwise all stem types follow the simple vowel stems.

The formal variation in the shapes of the case markers reflects, among other things, the impact of the connective consonant *g*, which essentially transforms any stems ending in a long vowel element into consonant stems ending in *g*. All suffix-initial vowel elements following this *g*, or any other stem-final consonant, are long (double vowels or diphthongoids). This means that the suffixes actually contain a connective vowel, normally *A*, which follows the rules of vowel harmony. In a form like abl. *dalai/g-a-aha* from *dalai* 'sea' it is therefore only the final element *-aha* that represents the actual case suffix, while the preceding elements *g* and *a* are connective segments with no semantic function. This is the diachronic situation, but it may also be valid in a synchronic description.

TABLE 4.3 KHAMNIGAN MONGOL CASE MARKERS

| | V | C | O | N | VV | Vi |
|--------|-------------|---------------|------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------|
| gen. | <i>-in</i> | <i>-A-in</i> | | <i>[n]-ie</i> | <i>/g-A-in</i> | <i>-n</i> |
| acc. | <i>-i</i> | <i>-ii</i> | | | <i>/g-ii</i> | |
| dat. | <i>-du</i> | | <i>-tu</i> | | | |
| abl. | <i>-AhA</i> | <i>-A-AhA</i> | | | <i>/g-A-AhA</i> | |
| instr. | <i>-Ar</i> | <i>-A-Ar</i> | | | <i>/g-A-Ar</i> | |
| poss. | <i>-tie</i> | | | | | |

From the comparative point of view, the most interesting feature of the Khamnigan Mongol nominal declension is that the long vowel elements present in the case forms of stems ending in a single vowel are still transparent as far as their morphological segmentation is concerned, e.g. *tala* ‘steppe’: acc. *tala-i*: abl. *tala-aha*. This is especially evident in back-vocalic stems, in which the original stem types are visible in spite of the transformation of the sequences **u-a* and **i-a* into *o-o* and *i-e*, respectively, as in *jagahu/n* ‘fish’: acc. *jagahu-i*: abl. *jagaho-oha* < **jagasu-asa*, *mori/n* ‘horse’: acc. *mori-i*: abl. *mori-eha* < **mori-asa*. In front-vocalic stems the neutralization of the opposition between **ee* and **öö* has led to some merger between the stem types, as in *nere* ‘name’: acc. *nere-i*: abl. *nere-ehe*, *nidu/n* ‘eye’: acc. *nidu-i*: abl. *nide-ehe*.

The ending of the possessive case has widely developed into the harmonically neutral shape *-tie*, though pronunciations suggesting the original harmonic shapes **-tai* resp. **-tei* can also be heard. A harmonic neutralization seems also to be present in the genitive ending *-n-ie*, as used of stems ending in the nasal *-n*, as in gen. *galoo/n-ie* ‘goose’, *kuun-ie* ‘man’. It is not clear whether these harmonic neutralizations are original Khamnigan developments, or due to the recent areal influence of the nearby dialects of Mongol proper (especially Khorchin).

As in many other Modern Mongolic languages, the possessive case presents problems for the synchronic analysis of the morphological system. The possessive forms are used both adnominally, as in *mori-tie kuun* ‘a man with a horse’, and adverbally, as in *mori-tie iree* ‘[he] came with a horse’. In the former function we could still speak of possessive adjectival derivatives, i.e. *mori.tie* ‘equipped with a horse’. Even in the latter function, however, we could analyse the possessive forms simply as adverbally used adjectival nouns. Other adjectival nouns can also be used both adnominally and adverbally, e.g. *hain kuun* ‘a good man’, *hain yaboo* ‘[he] travelled well’. It is therefore controversial, whether the possessive forms should be included in the context of the nominal case paradigm.

On the other hand, if we recognize the synchronic presence of a possessive case, we probably also have to postulate a privative (caritive) case, which in Khamnigan Mongol has the harmonically neutral ending *-gui* for double vowel stems and *-ugui* for all other stem types. Stems ending in a single vowel lose the vowel before the privative ending (vowel sandhi), e.g. *nere* ‘name’: priv. *ner-ugui*. The privative ending is transparently based on the Common Mongolic negative noun *ugui* < **ügei* ‘absent, not’. The resulting complex behaves syntactically as an exact parallel to the possessive formation, and it can also be used adverbially. It would be difficult to analyse the two forms separately from each other: either they are both derivatives or they are both case forms.

NUMERALS

The numerals for the basic digits are: 1 *nege/n*, 2 *koir*, 3 *gürba/n*, 4 *durbe/n*, 5 *tabu/n*, 6 *jürgaa/n*, 7 *doloo/n*, 8 *naima/n*, 9 *yuhu/n*. The corresponding decades are expressed as: 10 *arba/n*, 20 *kori/n*, 30 *güci/n*, 40 *duci/n*, 50 *tabi/n*, 60 *jira/n*, 70 *dala/n*, 80 *naya/n*, 90 *yere/n*, and the numerals for the lower powers of ten are: 100 *joo/n*, 1,000 *mingga/n*, 10,000 *tume/n*. All of these are native words, and with the exception of 2 *koir* all belong to the stem type ending in an unstable */n*. As in several other Modern Mongolic languages, the numeral 1 *nege/n* behaves exceptionally, in that it loses the final nasal in adnominal use, e.g. *nege kuun* ‘one person’ vs. *gürban kuun* ‘three persons’. It is also affected by vowel sandhi, e.g. *neg’udur* ‘one day’ vs. *gürban udur* ‘three days’.

In its currently surviving variety Khamnigan Mongol (Mergel Khamnigan) uses 10,000 as the basis for the higher powers of ten, as in 100,000 *arban tume/n*, 1,000,000 *joo tume/n*. This pattern reflects, without doubt, the influence of Chinese, transmitted through Written Mongol and Mongol proper, as used in Inner Mongolia. Also through Written Mongol comes the Tibetan numeral 100,000,000 *donsiur*. Chinese influence may be present in the commonly used expressions 100 *nege joo/n*, 1,000 *nege mingga/n*, 10,000 *nege tume/n* (with *nege* ‘one’).

Complex numerals are expressed by means of mechanic addition and multiplication. The resulting constructions seem to be either compound words (addition) or regular attributive phrases (multiplication), e.g. 11 *arban+nege/n*, 21 *korin+nege/n*, 200 *koir joo/n*, 300 *gurban joo/n*. In technical contexts, under the influence of the Chinese system and Mongol proper, the literary conjunction *bugeed* ‘and’ is used to indicate missing intermediate units (zeros) in complex numerals, as in 101 *nege joo bugeed nege/n*, 1001 *nege mingga bugeed bugeed nege/n*.

Regular derivatives based on the numeral stems include the ordinals in *.dAki* or *.dugAAr*, e.g. *gurban.daki* or *gurban.dugaar* ‘third’; the collectives in *.Ula/n*, e.g. *durbe.ele/n* ‘four together’, *tabo.ola/n* ‘five together’; and the approximatives in *.Ad*, e.g. *tabi.ed* ‘about fifty’, *jira.ad* ‘about sixty’. In all these cases, the numeral stems ending in the unstable /*n* lose this segment. The multiplicative function is normally filled by the noun *üdaa* (> *+udaa*) ‘time’, before which the unstable /*n* is lost. Additionally, the final vowel of the numeral stems is lost due to sandhi, suggesting that it is a question of compound words, e.g. *neg+udaa* ‘once’, *gurb+udaa* ‘three times’. The multiplicative constructions can also indicate the ordering of consecutive actions, ‘for the first time’, ‘for the third time’.

PRONOUNS

Unlike some other peripheral Mongolic languages, and in spite of its general conservativeness, Khamnigan Mongol has a pronominal system relatively close to Mongol proper. In the personal pronouns (Table 4.4.), only the first and second person stems are preserved, and the innovative first person plural inclusive stem has replaced the original pronoun in the basic form (nominative). The difference between the exclusive and inclusive functions is, however, consistently made in the oblique paradigms. The morphology of the personal pronouns is regular with the exception of the variation in the stem structure (Table 4.4).

The basic forms of the monosyllabic personal pronouns also have the longer shapes sg. 1p. *bii*, 2p. *cii*, pl. 2p. *taa*, which are used in stressed positions. The stem pl. 2p. *taa*

TABLE 4.4 KHAMNIGAN MONGOL PERSONAL PRONOUNS

| | | | | |
|-----|------|--------------|----------------|--------------|
| | | 1p. | | 2p. |
| sg. | nom. | <i>bi</i> | | <i>ci</i> |
| | gen. | <i>minii</i> | | <i>cinii</i> |
| | obl. | <i>nama-</i> | | <i>cima-</i> |
| pl. | | excl. | incl. | |
| | nom. | | <i>bide</i> | <i>ta</i> |
| | gen. | <i>manie</i> | <i>bidenie</i> | <i>tanie</i> |
| | obl. | <i>man-</i> | <i>biden-</i> | <i>tan-</i> |

functions both as a regular plural pronoun and as an honorific address to a single person. To make the difference more clear, the plural function can also be expressed by the suffixally marked derivative *taa.nar*. The plural oblique stems 1p. excl. *man-* and 2 p. *tan-* serve as the basis for the special forms *mantaasi* and *tantaasi*, which function as a kind of directives: 'to our/your place'. Formally, they conform to the pattern of the petrified demonstrative directives *naasi* 'to this place, over here' and *caasi* 'to that place, over there'.

The demonstrative pronouns are *ene* : obl. *eneen-* 'this' vs. *tere* : obl. *tereen-*, with the corresponding plurals *ede* 'these' vs. *tede* 'those'. Another stem functioning as a demonstrative is *eehun-*, which, however, originally is a reflexive pronoun (< **öxe.sü/n*). The pronoun *tere* is also used in the function of the personal pronoun for the third person 'he, she, it', which can be further substantivized into *tere kuun* 'that person'. In the personal function, the plural is *tedeen* 'they', against *tedegeer* 'those'. The form *tedeen*, like *taa.nar*, can also be used for the second person plural 'you', replacing the ambiguous primary pronoun *ta*.

Commonly used correlative derivatives from the demonstrative stems include: *eime* 'like this' vs. *teime* 'like that, such' (with an unexpected second-syllable vowel against Written Mongol **vjimu** vs. **tajimu**), *edui* 'this much' vs. *tedui* 'that much, so much', and *ende* 'here' vs. *tende* 'there'. The modal forms conv. mod. (**ei-n* vs. (**tei-n* are mainly preserved in the composition of the verbal compounds conv. perf. *ein/g+geed* 'thus' vs. *tein/g+geed* or *tei+geed* 'so' (based on either +*ge-* 'to say' or +*ki-* 'do do'). The derivative *odoo* 'now' is morphologically isolated and seems to have lost its synchronic connection with the demonstrative pronouns.

The interrogative pronouns are *ken* 'who' and *yee/n* < **yexü/n* 'what' : dat. *yeen-du* 'why'. The latter stem frequently appears in the shape *yuu/n*, which seems to be influenced by other Mongolic languages (Buryat and/or Mongol proper). The stem *yee-* is also present in the indefinite pronoun *yee.me* 'something', while the root *ke-* yields the derivatives *ker* 'how' and *kejje* 'when'. Other interrogative words are *kaa-* : loc. *kaa-na* 'where' : dir. *kaa-si* 'in what direction', as well as *yamar* 'what kind of' and *yaa-* 'to do what' : conv. perf. *yaa/g-aad* 'how, why'.

Finally, Khamnigan Mongol has the Common Mongolic reflexive pronoun *eer-* 'oneself', which regularly appears in combination with the reflexive marker, as in refl. abs. *eer-ee/n* 'by oneself', dat. *eer-te-e/n* 'for oneself'. Only the genitive form is used without the reflexive marker: gen. *eer-ein* 'one's own'. Reciprocity is normally expressed by the reflexive forms of the construction *nege nege/n* 'the one and the other', e.g. dat. refl. *nege negendee/n* 'to each other'.

POSSESSIVE SUFFIXES

Like all the neighbouring Mongolic languages, Khamnigan Mongol has a set of possessive suffixes based on the postposed and slightly modified genitive forms of the personal pronouns (Table 4.5). For the third person (both singular and plural), a neutralized reflex of the original pronominal genitives is used.

The possessive suffixes can also be added to the oblique case forms, e.g. instr. px sg. 2p. *morier-cini* 'with your horse'. The genitive case often incorporates the nominativizer *-ki-*, e.g. gen.(-nom.) px 3p. *akaing-ki-ni* 'of his elder brother'. Compared with the case markers, the bond of the possessive suffixes with the preceding (inflected or uninflected) word is clearly weaker. This is indicated both by the nasal sandhi, e.g. px 3p. *moring-ni*

TABLE 4.5 KHAMNIGAN MONGOL POSSESSIVE SUFFIXES

| | sg. | pl. |
|-----|---------------|---------------|
| 1p. | - <i>mini</i> | - <i>mAnA</i> |
| 2p. | - <i>cini</i> | - <i>tAnA</i> |
| 3p. | | - <i>ni</i> |

‘his horse’ (morphophonologically from *morin+ni*), and by the apparent absence of labial harmony (in the pl. 1p. and 2p. suffixes).

It is apparent that the use of the possessive suffixes in Khamnigan Mongol is supported by the presence of an analogous system in Khamnigan Ewenki. The possessive suffixes are, however, not obligatory. In ordinary speech, three alternatives are available for the expression of the possessive relationship: (1) the synthetic construction involving a possessive suffix, e.g. *ijii-mini* ‘my mother’, (2) the analytic construction involving a pronominal genitive plus a noun in basic form, e.g. *minii ijii* id., and (3) the pleonastic construction containing both the synthetic and the analytic marker of possession, e.g. *minii ijii-mini* id. However, in well-developed style, as in folklore texts, the synthetic construction seems to prevail.

As elsewhere in Mongolic, the suffixes sg. 2p. *-cini* and 3p. *-ni* are frequently used without direct reference to a possessor. In such use they are probably best analysed as deictic determinants connected with the category of *definiteness*. In this function, the possessive suffixes can be incongruent with a preceding pronominal genitive, as in *tanie koir ukin-cini yaagaa* ‘what happened to your [honorific pl. 2p.] two daughters [px sg. 2p.]?’ Possessive suffixes which refer to the discourse situation can also be added to pronouns and pronominal adverbs, e.g. px sg. 2p. *ene-cini* ‘this one here [of which we are talking]’, px sg. 2p. *bide-cini* ‘we here [who are talking to you]’, px 3p. *tende-ni* ‘there [in the situation under talk]’.

Khamnigan Mongol retains the Common Mongolic reflexive paradigm, which is marked by the element *-A-A/n*, preceded by the connective consonant *g* after double vowel stems. The basic (absolutive) reflexive form denotes the direct object and replaces the accusative, while the other case forms involve a combination of the case endings with the reflexive marker, e.g. *aka* ‘elder brother’ : abs. refl. *aka-a/n* : abl. *aka-aha-a/n* : instr. *aka-ar-a-a/n*. As in the possessive declension, the genitive shows the additional element *k*, e.g. gen. (-nom.) refl. *aka-ing-k-a-a/n*. The dative is also exceptional, being based on the suffix variants *-dA-* resp. *-tA-* (instead of *-dU-* resp. *-tU-*), e.g. *nitug* ‘homeland’ : dat. refl. *nitug-ta-a/n*.

IMPERATIVES

In addition to the basic verbal stem there are three commonly used imperative forms, which correspond to the Common Mongolic volunative, benedictive, and prescriptive forms (Table 4.6). The plain suffix variants are attached to stems ending in a single vowel (V), while consonant stems (C) and double vowel stems (VV) are under certain conditions accompanied by connective segments. It may be noted that, in difference from Written Mongol (and, as it seems, Proto-Mongolic), consonant stems do not require the connective vowel before the volunative suffix.

Functionally, the prescriptive and benedictive, as compared with the basic unmarked imperative, express successively more polite requests addressed to the second person,

TABLE 4.6 KHAMNIGAN MONGOL IMPERATIVE MARKERS

| | C | VV | V |
|---------|-----|-------|-------|
| vol. | | | -yAA |
| ben. | -U- | | -gtUi |
| prescr. | -U- | /g-A- | -Arie |

TABLE 4.7 KHAMNIGAN MONGOL NON-FINITE VERBAL MARKERS

| | C | VV | V | O |
|------------|-----|-------|------|------|
| part. fut. | | | -ku | |
| imperf. | /u- | /g-A- | -A | |
| perf. | | | -hAn | |
| hab. | | | -dAg | -tAg |
| ag. | /u- | /g-A- | -Aci | |
| conv. mod. | /u- | | -n | |
| imperf. | | | -ji | -ci |
| perf. | /u- | /g-A- | -Ad | |
| cond. | /u- | /g-A- | -Aha | |

both singular and plural, e.g. imp. *yabu* ‘go!’, prescr. *yaboorie* ‘[please] go!’, ben. *yabugtui* ‘[would you please] go!’. In practice, the benedictive is often combined with the honorific use of the pronoun *ta* ‘you [honoured one]’. The voluntative refers to the first person, both singular and plural, e.g. vol. *yabuyaa* ‘let me/us go!’.

NON-FINITE VERBAL FORMS

As far as non-finite forms are concerned, Khamnigan Mongol retains in productive use all the Common Mongolic participle markers as well as at least four basic converb markers (Table 4.7). Several markers have different variants for vowel stems (V), double vowel stems (VV), consonant stems (C), as well as, more specifically, obstruent stems (O).

It may again be noted that, due to morphological restructuring, the perfective and habitive participle markers do not require a connective vowel after consonant stems in Khamnigan Mongol, although a connective vowel is diachronically present in these cases, as is still evident from Written Mongol. For the perfective participle, this restructuring was obviously conditioned by the simplification of the original suffix-initial consonant cluster: *-hAn* < **-sAn* < **-gsAn*, e.g. part. perf. *ab-han* ‘[the one who has] taken’ < **ab/ug-san*. The connective vowel, or a synchronically transparent morphological trace of it, is, however, well preserved in the other relevant categories of the non-finite conjugation.

Although all the mentioned non-finite forms may be regarded as productive in Khamnigan Mongol, not all of them have retained their original status and functions. Thus, the imperfective participle is rarely used in the nominal (substantival or adjectival) function, but it is well preserved in its predicative use, in which it functions as the main form of the past tense. Also, the modal converb seems to have been more or less completely replaced by the imperfective converb, except in lexicalized phrases like *karin*

‘but, however’. It survives, however, in the negative construction of the type conv. mod. neg. *kele-ng-gui* ‘without saying’, from *kele-* ‘to say, to speak’. The imperfective converb itself cannot be negated, so its negative counterpart is inevitably based on the modal converb.

The agentive participle marker in *-Aci* < **-xA-ci*, whose diachronic status as a participle marker is controversial, is probably also synchronically most appropriate to analyse as a simple deverbal nominal derivative suffix, e.g. part. ag. *keleeci* (*kele.eci*) ‘speaker’, *abooci* (*abo.oci* < **abu-xa-ci*) ‘taker, the one who takes’. The Common Mongolic alternative suffix variant *-gci* < **-g.ci* is present in recent borrowings from Written Mongol and Mongol proper, e.g. *sūru.gci* ‘student’. It is also attested in the apparently native lexicalized formation *ge.gci* ‘called [by name]’, which is used predicatively, as in *ken ge.gci bei* ‘how are [you] called?’.

The conditional converb shows the original Proto-Mongolic marker (**-xA-sU* >) **-xA-sA*, e.g. *ire-ehe* ‘if [he] comes’, *oci-eha* ‘if [he] goes’. The item *aaha* < **a-xa-sa* ‘if it is’, based on the otherwise lost auxiliary root **a-* ‘to be’, has been lexicalized into what may synchronically be analysed as a conditional conjunction with the meaning ‘if’. A similar lexicalization has taken place in the terminative converb form *kurter* < **kür-tel* ‘until’, based on *kur-* ‘to reach’. The terminative converb does not appear to survive as a productive category in Khamnigan Mongol.

FINITE INDICATIVE FORMS

The finite conjugation in Khamnigan Mongol preserves the durative, terminative, resultative, and confirmative forms of Proto-Mongolic (Table 4.8). None of the markers concerned requires a connective vowel after consonant stems, but the resultative marker retains its special variant for obstruent stems (O). Diachronically, the most remarkable feature of the Khamnigan Mongol indicative conjugation is the preservation of the final nasal in the durative marker *-nAn* < **-nAm*. The durative is also the only indicative form which has a suffixally marked plural, synchronically used as a part of the personal paradigm.

The durative form functions as a general present tense, e.g. dur. sg. 3p. *yabunan* ‘[he] travels’, pl. 3p. *yabunad* ‘they travel’. It can, in principle, also refer to habitual or future actions, but in these spheres its use is restricted by the fact that the habitive and future participles can be used predicatively to replace the indicative verb, e.g. part. hab. *yabudag* ‘[he] always travels’, part. fut. *yabuku* ‘[he] will travel’. Similarly, the terminative, confirmative, and resultative forms all refer to past or completed actions, but in normal speech they are replaced by the predicatively used imperfective participle, e.g. part. imperf. *yaboo* ‘[he] went’, as used for sg. 3p. term. *yabubaa*, conf. *yabulaa*, res. *yabujie*. By contrast, the perfective participle is normally not used predicatively in Khamnigan Mongol.

TABLE 4.8 KHAMNIGAN MONGOL FINITE TENSE-ASPECT MARKERS

| | | | |
|-------|----------------|--------------|-------------|
| | | pl. | O |
| dur. | <i>-nAn</i> | <i>-na-d</i> | |
| term. | <i>-bA(-A)</i> | | |
| conf. | <i>-lAA</i> | | |
| res. | <i>-jie</i> | | <i>-cie</i> |

For all verbal categories, a periphrastic progressive construction can be formed by using the imperfective converb followed by the required form of the auxiliary *bai-* ‘to be’. The converb suffix can also be amalgamated with the auxiliary stem into *-jai-* or (for obstruent stems) *-cai-* (without vowel harmony), which synchronically may be analysed as a deverbal derivative suffix expressing the progressive (continuative) aspect. The progressive construction most often occurs in the durative form, e.g. *yabu-ji bai-nan* or *yabu.jai-nan* ‘[he] is travelling’. The use of the progressive construction does not seem to be obligatory, however.

PREDICATIVE PERSONAL ENDINGS

Khamnigan Mongol, like its immediate neighbours in the west (Buryat) and east (Dagur) belong to the type of Mongolic languages that have a set of personal predicative endings, based on the personal pronouns. The endings are formally transparent and more or less identical with the basic forms of the corresponding pronouns (Table 4.9).

The pl. 3p. element *-d* is strictly speaking not a personal ending, but a plural suffix of nominal derivation. It is only used in connection with the durative marker (*-na.d*), in which it replaces the final nasal of the corresponding singular form (*-na.n*). In all other cases both the singular and the plural remain unmarked (\emptyset) in the third person.

The predicative personal endings can, in principle, be attached to any word used as the predicate of a main clause, be it a noun, a finite verbal form, or a participle. In case of a nominal predicate, no copula is required, e.g. vx sg. 1p. *kuun-bi* ‘I am a man’ : 2p. *kuun-ci* ‘you are a man’ : 3p. *kuun* ‘[he] is a man’; (nom.) pl. 1p. *ende-ki-bide* ‘we are from here’ : 2p. *ende-ki-te* ‘you are from here’ : 3p. *ende-ki* ‘[they] are from here’. Depending on the context, however, the use of the personal endings can be facultative. This may be due to the influence of languages with no personal conjugation (Written Mongol, Mongol proper), but it may also reflect an internal tendency, within Khamnigan Mongol.

There are also some restrictions governing the use of the personal endings in connection with the finite forms. Most importantly, the endings are normally not used in connection with the imperative paradigm. Of the indicative paradigm, only the durative is commonly conjugated in persons, e.g. *kara-* ‘to watch’ : dur. vx sg. 1p. *kara-nam-bi* ‘I watch’ : 2p. *kara-nan-ci* ‘you watch’ : 3p. *kara-nan* ‘[he] watches’ : pl. 1p. *kara-nam-bide* ‘we watch’ : 2p. *kara-nan-ta* ‘you watch’ : 3p. *kara-na.d* ‘they watch’. This is apparently due to the fact that the durative is a living form used in regular colloquial speech. By contrast, the terminative, confirmative, and resultative forms are mainly restricted to folkloric texts, in which they normally refer to the third person with zero ending.

It has to be noted that the markers of the terminative, confirmative, and resultative forms all typically end in a long vowel element (double vowel or diphthongoid).

TABLE 4.9 KHAMNIGAN MONGOL PREDICATIVE PERSONAL ENDINGS

| | sg. | pl. |
|-----|-------------|--------------|
| 1p. | <i>-bi</i> | <i>-bide</i> |
| 2p. | <i>-ci</i> | <i>-ta</i> |
| 3p. | \emptyset | <i>[-d]</i> |

Although this is in itself no obstacle to personal conjugation, the narrative context of these forms, accompanied by their phrase-final position, often implies an element of emphasis. This pattern can be extended to the durative marker, which then appears as *-nAA*, e.g. dur. emph. *yabu-naa*. Unlike the regular durative marker, the emphatic variant does not seem to take personal endings.

To compensate for the loss of the temporal-aspectual categories now only marginally expressed by the terminative, confirmative, and resultative forms, Khamnigan Mongol (like Buryat) uses the imperfective participle, which therefore is fully conjugated in persons, e.g. part. imperf. sg. 1p. *kara-a-bi* 'I watched' : 2p. *kara-a-ci* 'you watched' : 3p. *kara-a* 'he watched' : pl. 1p. *kara-a-bide* 'we watched' : 2p. *kara-a-ta* 'you watched' : 3p. *kara-a* 'they watched'. This suggests that the earlier complex system of aspectual distinctions is being transformed into a simple tense system with a present and a past temporal sphere.

The temporal system formed by the finite indicative durative and the predicatively used imperfective participle is completed by the futuritive participle, which, when used predicatively, expresses the future tense, e.g. part. fut. vx sg. 1p. *kara-ku-bi* 'I shall watch' : 2p. *kara-ku-ci* 'you will watch' : 3p. *kara-ku* '[he] will watch' : pl. 1p. *kara-ku-bide* 'we shall watch' : 2p. *kara-ku-ta* 'you will watch' : 3p. *kara-ku* 'they will watch'. Similarly, the habitive participle can be used predicatively to express habitually or frequently occurring action, e.g. part. hab. vx sg. 1p. *kara-dag-bi* 'I use to watch, I frequently watch', etc. Thus, there are altogether four verbal forms that occur productively in combination with the personal endings. Their functions may be summarized as: present tense (durative), past tense (imperfective participle), future tense (futuritive participle), and habitive aspect (habitive participle).

While the subject of a main clause is indicated by the predicative personal endings, the possessive and reflexive suffixes can fill a similar role in subordinated clauses. This is very common in quasiconverbs (converbially used adverbial case forms of participles), e.g. part. fut. dat. px 3p. *ire-ku-du-ni* 'when he comes/came [with a change of subject in the following clause]', part. fut. dat. refl. *yabu-ku-da-a/n* 'when he goes/went [with no change of subject in the following clause]'. The possessive suffixes can also be attached to the conditional converb, though apparently only in the third person, e.g. conv. cond. px sg. 3. *iree-he-ni* 'if he comes'. Other converbs do not take personal endings of any kind.

SYNTAX

Khamnigan Mongol exhibits most of the typical Common Mongolic syntactic patterns at the level of both simple clauses and complex sentences. Within the clause, the basic unmarked word order is invariably subject-object-predicate (SOV), with the attribute preceding its nominal headword (GAN). Embedded sentences are linked to their headwords by converbs and quasiconverbs (adverbial), as well as by participles (attributive). With some exceptions (elaborated above), there is agreement between the person of the subject and the personal ending of the predicate (vx or px).

Apart from word order and inflectional forms, syntactic relations and sentence types are distinguished by particles. The particle for *interrogation* has the shape *gu*, which follows the fully conjugated predicate, either nominal or verbal, e.g. *hain gu* 'is [it] good?', part. imperf. vx sg. 2p. *yadaraaci gu* 'are you tired?'. Sentences which contain an interrogative word take, however, the corrogative particle *bei*, e.g. *tere ken bei* 'who is he?',

ta kejie ireete bei ‘when did you come?’, *ci yaagaad eime teneg bei* ‘how come are you so stupid?’. In casual speech, the particle *bei* can be omitted, e.g. *bide yaanan* ‘what shall we do?’.

For the expression of *negation*, Khamnigan Mongol uses the Common Mongolic negative particles *bisi*, *buu*, *ugui*. The particle *bisi* functions as a negative copula and negates the identity of a nominal phrase, e.g. *ene bisi* ‘[it is] not this [one]’, *hain bisi* ‘[it is] not good’. The particle *buu* expresses prohibition and negates the finite forms of the imperative paradigm, e.g. *buu kele* ‘do not mention [it]!’, prescr. *buu martaarie* ‘[please] do not forget [it]!’. It is also used in the fixed phrase *buu mede* ‘I do not know; who knows?’ (literally: ‘do not know!’).

The functions of the negative particle (noun) *ugui* are the most variegated and vacillate, as in other Mongolic languages, between syntax and morphology. In Khamnigan Mongol, *ugui* is used (1) as a separate phrase forming a general negative answer with the meaning ‘no’; (2) as a negative existential predicate with the meaning ‘there is not’, e.g. *kuun ugui* ‘there is not a person [there]’; (3) as the negation of possession, e.g. *manie kajaar ugui*, *emeel ugui* ‘we do not have a bridle, nor a saddle’; (4) as the negation of the presence of a nominal attribute, e.g. *ner’ ugui* ‘without a name, nameless’; (5) as the negation of several predicatively used finite or infinite verbal forms. In the last two functions, *ugui* can, under appropriate phonological and morphological conditions, take the shape *-gui*, which may also be analysed as a suffix of either the nominal declension (privative case) or the verbal conjugation (negative conjugation).

The verbal forms which can be negated with *-(u)gui* are: (1) the predicatively used futuristic, imperfective, and habitive participles, e.g. part. fut. neg. *yabu-k-ugui* ‘[he] will not go’, part. imperf. neg. *yabo-o-gui* ‘[he] did not go’, part. hab. neg. *yabu-dag-gui* ‘[he] (normally) does not go’; (2) the durative form of the indicative finite conjugation, e.g. *yabu-nang-gui* ‘[he] does not go’; and (3) the modal converb, e.g. *yabu-ng-gui* ‘without going’. As it seems that the terminative, confirmative and resultative forms cannot be negated and the perfective participle does not occur predicatively, the imperfective participle is the only form of the past tense sphere that has negation. Similarly, in the converbial sphere the only form that can be negated is the modal converb.

The status of the element *-(u)gui* in the negative verbal constructions is open to several alternative analyses. The morphophonological variation between *-ugui* and *-gui* suggests that it may be a question of a suffix, though at least the full shape *-ugui* might also be analysed as a clitic (= *ugui*). From the point of view of morpheme order it is important to note that the endings of the predicative personal conjugation always follow *-(u)gui*, e.g. part. fut. neg. vx sg. 1p. *yabu-k-ugui-bi* ‘I will not go’. On the other hand, the suffixal bond of the personal endings seems also to be rather loose, which might allow the negative complexes to be analysed as purely syntactic sequences (with the impact of sandhi phenomena): *yabuk’ ugui bi*.

Another enclitic particle is *=ci*, which originally had a general emphatic function, but which in Khamnigan Mongol mainly serves to mark the indefinite use of interrogative pronouns, e.g. *yee/n* ‘what’ : *yee=ci* ‘something, anything, whatever’. The indefinite pronouns are also used in negative clauses, in which case the particle *=ci* functions as a *connegative* marker (implicating the presence of negation in the clause), e.g. *yee=ci kie-gui-bi* ‘I did not do anything’, *yamar=ci amitan baik-ugui* ‘there is no animal of any kind [there]’.

The marking of *topicalization* is not well developed in Khamnigan Mongol, though the non-possessive use of the px sg. 2p. *-cini* after a subject noun or pronoun may occasionally be assumed to have a topicalizing connotation. In a style approaching Modern

Written Mongol and Mongol proper, the particle *bol* can, however, be used, although it does not seem to be native in Khamnigan Mongol, e.g. *manie abu ijii bol baroon koitu jug yaboo* ‘[as for] our father and mother [they] went to the northwest’. The corresponding native expression is conv. cond. *bai/g-aaha* ‘as for’, from *bai-* ‘to be’, but it is rarely used in normal speech.

LEXICON

The areal position of Khamnigan Mongol is well reflected in the lexicon. In details for which Buryat and Mongol proper show different semantic or derivational developments, Khamnigan Mongol normally goes together with Buryat. In some of these cases it may be a question of innovations, as in *tariki/n* ‘head’ (Mongol ‘brain’), *hamagan* ‘wife’ (Mongol ‘old woman’), *ilaahu/n* ‘fly’ (Mongol **ilaxa/n* ‘gadfly’), but in others Khamnigan Mongol and Buryat preserve the more original state, e.g. *kubee/n* ‘son’ (lost in Mongol), *udesi* ‘evening’ (marginalized in Mongol). There are also some lexical items that are only attested in Buryat and Khamnigan Mongol, notably the word *jon* ‘people’.

The archaicness of Khamnigan Mongol is even more obvious from lexical items which in Mongol proper have undergone sporadic phonological innovations, e.g. *kuun* ‘man, person’ (Mongol **küxün* > **kün*), *huni* ‘night’ (Mongol **söni* > **sinö*), *caarhu/n* ‘paper’ (Mongol **caarsu/n* > **caasu/n*), *nilbuhu/n* ‘tear/s’ (Mongol **nilbusu/n* > **nulmusu/n*), *mulihu/n* ‘ice’ (Mongol **mölisü/n* > **mösü/n*), *ucugul-dur* ‘yesterday’ (Mongol **öcegel-dür* > **öcige-dür*). In these cases Buryat normally also reflects the original state, though, at the same time, it has undergone other (regular) innovations absent in Khamnigan Mongol.

For the historical dialectology of Mongolic, lexical items which show irregular phonological innovations shared by Khamnigan Mongol and Buryat are of particular interest. Such items do, indeed, exist, but they are not numerous. Possible examples are *keeged* ‘children’ (with **k* > *g*, cf. Mongol **keüke.d*) and *degel* ‘coat’ (with **x* > *g*, cf. Mongol **dexel* < **depel*). On the other hand, in many cases it is impossible to determine which side is ultimately more innovative. For instance, *gajaa* (< **gaja-xa* << **gadi-xa*) ‘outside’ and *jocoo* (< **doco-xo* << **doti-xa*) ‘inside’ (Mongol **gada-xa* and **dota-xa*) show a special development in Khamnigan Mongol and Buryat, but the difference with regard to Mongol proper seems to go back to a primary variation in Proto-Mongolic.

It goes without saying that Khamnigan Mongol has also received secondary lexical influences from both Buryat and Mongol proper. These are technically distinguishable from the inherited native lexicon only when they show non-Khamnigan phonological features. Loanwords connected with social and technological concepts are often adopted through Written Mongol, which means that they automatically receive a more archaic look than they have in contemporary Mongol proper, e.g. *ulus* ‘country’, *kübiskal* ‘directly’. Some non-technical items have, however, reached Khamnigan Mongol directly through the oral medium, e.g. *bas* ‘also’, cf. the native Khamnigan Mongol *baha* ‘still’ (< **basa*).

The principal sources of non-Mongolic lexical elements are Russian and Chinese. Russian elements prevail in the premodern layer of cultural vocabulary, e.g. *ciuske* ‘pig’, *kartoobka* ‘potato’, *istool* ‘table’, *laampa* ‘lamp’, while the current source of similar items is Chinese (Mandarin), e.g. *suuliu* ‘plastic’ (also native *küika* id.), *nangku* ‘vacuum bottle’ (also native *kaloon haba* ‘hot bottle’). In some cases it is possible that Russian and Chinese loanwords have actually entered Khamnigan Mongol through the intermediation

of the dialects of Mongol proper, e.g. *masiin* ‘car’ (from Russian), *congko/n* ‘window’ (from Chinese).

Due to the inherited bilingualism of the Khamnigan, the language with which Khamnigan Mongol contacts most intensively on a daily basis is, of course, Ewenki (Khamnigan Ewenki). It is, however, curious that, apart from structural interference in the past, there are very few Ewenki elements in regular Khamnigan Mongol speech. Lexical influence is transmitted almost solely from Khamnigan Mongol into Khamnigan Ewenki, but not vice versa. This situation is, without doubt, indicative of the inherent dominance of Khamnigan Mongol as the community language of the entire Khamnigan population.

For the bilingual Khamnigan it must, nevertheless, be of practical importance that Khamnigan Mongol and Khamnigan Ewenki share a large number of lexical items. Some of these are very basic grammatical words, e.g. *bi* ‘I’, *gu* [interrogative particle], whose diachronic interpretation can still be disputed. Most are, however, unambiguous loanwords transmitted from Mongolic into Tungusic during a sequence of historical periods of contacting. In the most recent layer, Khamnigan Mongol words are simply used as such in Khamnigan Ewenki, but in the older layers various differences are observed, through which insights can be gained into the diachrony of both languages and language families.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READING

- Castrén, M. Alexander (1856) *Grundzüge einer tungusischen Sprachlehre nebst kurzem Wörterverzeichnis* [Nordische Reisen und Forschungen], herausgegeben von Anton Schiefner, St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Damdinov, D. G. (1962) ‘Predvaritel’nye dannye o yazyke xamniganov Chitinskoi oblasti’, *Kratkie soobshheniya Buryatskogo kompleksnogo nauchno-issledovatel’skogo instituta SO AN SSSR* 4: 128–37.
- Damdinov, D. G. (1968) ‘Etno-lingvisticheskie ocherk xamniganskogo govora’, in *Issledovanie buryatskix govorov* 2 [= Trudy Buryatskogo instituta obshchestvennykh nauk BF SO AN SSSR 2], Ulan Udë: Buryatskoe knizhnoe izdatel’stvo, pp. 74–116.
- Damdinov, D. G. (1988) ‘Ob arхаicheskih osobennostyax govora ononskix xamnigan’, in *Razvitie i vzaimodeistvie dialektov Pribaikal’ya*, Ulan Udë: AN SSSR, pp. 69–79.
- Damdinov, D. G. (1993) *Ononskie xamnigany (Voprosy duxovnoi kul’tury)*. Ulan-Udë: AN SSSR.
- Doerfer, Gerhard (1985) ‘Das Kamniganische’, *Hoppo Bunka Kenkyu* (Bulletin of the Institute for the Study of North Eurasian Cultures, Hokkaido University) 17: 69–75.
- Jamtsarano, Ts. J. [C. Zh. Zhamcarano] and D. G. Damdinov (1982) *Uligery ononskix xamnigan*, Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Janhunen, Juha (1990) *Material on Manchurian Khamnigan Mongol* [= Castrenianumin toimitteita 37], Helsinki.
- Janhunen, Juha (1991) *Material on Manchurian Khamnigan Evenki* [= Castrenianumin toimitteita 40], Helsinki.
- Janhunen, Juha (1992) ‘On the Position of Khamnigan Mongol’, *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 84:
- Janhunen, Juha (1996) ‘Mongolic Languages as Idioms of Intercultural Communication in Northern Manchuria’, in Stephen A. Wurm and Peter Mühlhäusler and Darrell T. Tryon (eds) *Atlas of Languages of Intercultural Communication in the Pacific, Asia, and the Americas* [= Trends in Linguistics, Documentation 13], vol. II.2: 827–34.
- U.-Köhlmi, Käthe (1959) ‘Der mongolisch-kamniganische Dialekt von Dadal Sum und die Frage der Mongolisierung der Tungusen in der Nordmongolei und Transbaikalien’, *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 9: 163–204.

- U.-Kõhalmi, Käthe [K. Urai-Këxal'mi] (1964) 'Yeshhe raz k voprosu o proïsozhdenniï xamnigan', *Kratkie sobshheniya Instituta narodov Azii* 83: 156–64.
- U.-Kõhalmi, Käthe (1981) 'Daurien: Das Keimen und Absterben eines Nomadenreiches', *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 35: 255–73.
- Mishig, L. (1961) 'Mongol Ard Ulsin zarim nutgiin xamnigan ayalguug surwaljilsan ny', *Olon ulsin mongol xel bichgiin erdemnii anxdugaar ix xural* 1, Ulaanbaatar, pp. 183–203.
- Reshetov, A. M. (1986) 'Xamnigany – problemy etno-kul'turnogo razvitiya', in *Istoriko-kul'turnye kontakty narodov altaïskoi yazykovoi obshhnosti*, Tezisy dokladov XXIV sessii postoyannoi mezhdunarodnoi altaïsticheskoi konferencii (Tashkent), vol. 1: *Istoriya, literatura, iskusstvo*, Moscow, pp. 59–61.
- Rinchen, B. (1969) *Mongol Ard Ulsin xamnigan ayalguu*, Ulaanbaatar: BNMAU Shinjlex Uxaani Akademiin Xewlel.
- Shubin, A. S. (1973) *Kratkii ocherk etnicheskoi istorii evenkov Zabaikal'ya (XVII-XX vv.)*, Ulan-Ude: Buryatskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo.