CHAPTER FIFTEEN

MANGGHUER

Keith W. Slater

Mangghuer, or Minhe Mangghuer, is spoken in Minhe Hui and Tu Autonomous County, at the extreme eastern edge of China's Qinghai Province, just north of the Yellow River. Mangghuer has not usually been described as a language in its own right. Rather, it has been treated as one of the two main dialects of the ethnic 'language' spoken by the official 'Monguor' (*Tu*) nationality, the other dialect being (Huzhu) Mongghul, spoken mainly in Huzhu Tu Autonomous County, also in Qinghai. However, Mangghuer speakers and Mongghul speakers alike report that they are unable to understand each other. While no comprehensive study of the differences between these two linguistic systems has been undertaken, it is fairly clear that they are different enough to warrant independent treatment. Since the two speech communities are not geographically contiguous, this ought not to be surprising.

Mangghuer is spoken by approximately 25,000 people. There is a high degree of bilingualism; most Mangghuer speakers have at least some proficiency in the local Mandarin dialect, which is the language of much commerce and social interaction, as well as that of education. In folktale narratives, Mangghuer speakers use codeswitching as a quotative device; it thus appears that a Mangghuer audience may be expected to have significant competence in Qinghai Mandarin. Culturally, the Mangghuer are Buddhists of the Tibetan dGe.lugs.pa ('Yellow Hat') School, and there is evidence of a history of bilingualism in local forms of Tibetan. Additionally, many non-Mangghuer people of the region (Tibetans, Salar, Han and Hui Chinese) have some fluency in Mangghuer.

Owing to a long history of multilingualism, the results of language contact in Mangghuer, and in neighbouring languages, are profound. Indeed, the languages of this Gansu-Qinghai border region, which originate in four language families (Mongolic, Turkic, Sinitic, and Bodic), are all converging towards one common set of structural features. The region may well be considered a linguistic area, or *sprachbund*, and thus, it is often difficult (and probably ill-advised) to identify specific paths of borrowing, or of structural interference. Although a particular grammatical pattern may have originated in, for example, Tibetan, we cannot say with any certainty that it came into Mangghuer directly from Tibetan. Most of the local features are shared by languages from too many different families to allow for such conclusions.

Mangghuer core vocabulary and most of its morphosyntax are clearly of Mongolic origin; however, Mangghuer has essentially Sinitic phonology, as well as a large body of Sinitic loanwords in its lexicon. Mangghuer also exhibits many Sinitic structural patterns, as well as some patterns which probably originated in Tibetan. It is thus difficult to assign Mangghuer to a place within the Mongolic family. Some of the features which it shares with other Mongolic languages – such as, for example, the sound system which Mangghuer shares with Santa, or the category of perspective which it shares with Mongghul and (Qinghai) Bonan – may be due to shared innovation, but might just as likely be due to identical contact-induced changes, undergone independently. Such

features, which are extremely common in Mangghuer, cannot be used to argue for genetic affiliation, because they may not represent common inheritance.

The proportion of Chinese loanwords in Mangghuer varies depending on genre and style. In a word list based on folktale material, it is fairly high, approximately 35 per cent. However, the basic vocabulary, and therefore, the most frequently occurring items, are generally Mongolic. The text frequency of Chinese borrowings, as calculated from a corpus of four folktales (totalling over 1,400 words), was found to be only 15 per cent. Interestingly, in this corpus, no Tibetan loanwords could be identified, though many such words could certainly be found in religious discourse, and perhaps in other domains.

Very little sociolinguistic information is available for Mangghuer. Speakers report noticeable dialect differences, particularly in the areas of phonology and lexicon, but a systematic study has not yet been undertaken. Minhe County has recently been opened to foreign visitors, and it may be hoped that scholars from outside China will join those from within the country in investigating and describing the varieties of this neglected but very important language.

DATA AND SOURCES

Descriptions of 'Monguor' have generally focused on Mongghul, though some authors have commented on differences between Mongghul and Mangghuer. In particular, Chingeltei and Li Keyu (1988) and Junast (1981) give examples of Mangghuer constructions for comparison. The description of 'Monguor' by B. X. Todaeva (1973) also contains some relevant data. For the history, cultural heritage, and social setting of the Mangghuer, information is provided by Louis M. J. Schram (1954–61).

At present, there are only three published works devoted exclusively to the Mangghuer language. The monograph of the present author (Slater 2003) is a descriptive grammar and historical description. The paper by Zhu Yongzhong, Üjiyediin Chuluu, and Kevin Stuart (1995) presents a single folktale. Another paper by Zhu Yongzhong, Üjiyediin Chuluu, and Kevin Stuart (1999) deals with a grammatical and typological detail of Mangghuer, with comparative material quoted also from the other Mongolic languages of the Gansu-Qinghai region.

Research on the Gansu-Qinghai Sprachbund is only beginning, and not all of the participating languages and dialects have been adequately described. The language of greatest relevance for Mangghuer studies is the so-called Gangou 'creole', which is spoken in the immediate neighbourhood of Mangghuer, and which seems to share particularly many typological features with the latter. A preliminary survey of the Gangou 'creole' is contained in the paper by Zhu Yongzhong, Üjiyediin Chuluu, Keith Slater, and Kevin Stuart (1997), who also discuss some structural details of Mangghuer. Two other papers of relevance to Mangghuer are those by Charles N. Li (1986) on tones and Scott DeLancey (1992) on the evidential systems (category of perspective) in Tibetan.

The description presented below is based primarily on the author's own analysis of Mangghuer, developed through elicitation and analysis of a body of folktale narratives, which were recorded and transcribed by Zhu Yongzhong, a native speaker of Mangghuer. In the present description, any elicited examples are identified as such; all other examples are taken from folktale texts. The publication by Chen Zhaojun *et al*. (forthcoming) will present a large body of grammatically analysed Mangghuer folktales, including those from which the examples given in this chapter have been taken. Additional text materials can be found in Dpal-ldan-bkra-shis *et al*. (1996).

On the analogy of the recently created Mongghul literary language there exists an unofficial orthographical norm for Mangghuer also, based on the Pinyin Romanization of Mandarin Chinese. Because of its practical potential this orthography has been used in the linguistic and folkloristic publications of Mangghuer materials mentioned above. The first and so far only extant practical publication, intended also for native Mangghuer readers, is the folktale reader by Wang Xianzhen (2001). Following this incipient tradition, the Mangghuer data in the present description are quoted in the same Roman orthography.

SEGMENTAL PHONEMES

The reason why it is so convenient to write Mangghuer with an orthography based on the Mandarin Pinyin system is that the Mangghuer segmental inventory is almost identical to those of neighbouring Qinghai Mandarin dialects (and the Gangou 'creole').

Mangghuer has a five-vowel system (Table 15.1), comprising the single low vowel **a** (*a*), the non-low rounded vowels **o u** (*o u*), and the non-low unrounded vowels **e i** (*e i*). When following a voiceless consonant, the vowels **i u e** may optionally be devoiced; this most commonly occurs in unstressed syllables with a fricative onset and no coda consonant. There is no vowel harmony.

The consonant system comprises twenty-six phonemes (Table 15.2), which can be divided into six series according to their place of articulation: the labials (including dentilabials) **p b f m w** (*p b f m w*), the dentals (alveolars) **t d c z s n l** (*t d ts dz s n l*), the palatals (postalveolar laminals) **q j x y** (*c j sh y*), the retroflexes (postalveolar apicals) **ch zh sh r** (*tr dr sr r*), the velars **k g h ng** (*k g x ng*), and the uvulars (postvelars) **kh gh** (*q gh*). By manner of articulation, eight classes can be distinguished: the strong (aspirated) stops **p t k kh**, the weak (unaspirated) stops **b d g gh**, the strong (aspirated) affricates **c ch q**, the weak (unaspirated) affricates **z zh j**, the fricatives **f s sh x h**, the nasals **m n ng**, the liquids **l r**, and the glides **w y**.

TABLE 15.1 MANGGHUER VOWELS

u		**i**
o		**e**
	a	

TABLE 15.2 MANGGHUER CONSONANTS

p	**t**			**k**	**kh**
b	**d**			**g**	**gh**
	c	**ch**	**q**		
	z	**zh**	**j**		
f	**s**	**sh**	**x**	**h**	
m	**n**			**ng**	
	l	**r**			
w			**y**		

Originally, there was only one series of alveopalatal affricates (**c *j*), but these were differentiated into palatals (**q j**) and retroflexes (**ch zh**). The palatal and retroflex series probably appeared first in Chinese borrowings. However, they have also developed in native Mongolic roots. The original affricates became palatals when preceding any front vowel, and retroflexes when preceding any non-front vowel. A similar differentiation took place in the alveopalatal (sibilant) fricative (**sh*), which is represented either as a retroflex (**sh**) or as a palatal (**x**), although this split does not appear to have developed along exactly the same lines as did the splitting of the affricates; the retroflex **sh** appears in more Mongolic environments than the simple front/non-front vowel rule would predict.

Another secondary phoneme is **f**, which seems to have also been adopted primarily through loanwords. The uvular stops **kh gh**, on the other hand, occur only in native words, where they derive from positional variants of the Common Mongolic velar stops **k *g*. They are the only Mangghuer phonemes with no parallels in nearby Sinitic languages.

The retroflex liquid **r** is usually pronounced with some spirantization, and is thus, phonetically, a voiced counterpart to voiceless **sh**. This feature (as well as the frequent spirantization of high vowels and **y**) is shared with many neighbouring languages.

WORD STRUCTURE

Mangghuer syllable structure is nearly identical to that of neighbouring Mandarin dialects. In fact, some phonologically possible syllables which, for historical reasons, do not actually occur in Mandarin, also are not found in Mangghuer. For example, the syllable ***mong** (*mung*) is absent both in Mandarin and Mangghuer, which is one of the reasons why the ethnonym **Mangghuer** has the shape it has.

The Mangghuer syllable is of the type ((C)C)V(C). An onset cluster CC may consist only of an initial consonant plus a medial glide (*w y*, written as **u i**). A coda consonant may only be a final glide (*w y*, written as **u o i**), nasal (**n ng**), or retroflex liquid (**r**). Historically, Mongolic allowed several additional coda consonants. These have all been lost in Mangghuer (> Ø), except ***l**, which became **r**, and **s*, which became the onset of a new syllable when a final vowel **i** was inserted.

Only a restricted set of vowels appear with coda glide consonants. The four allowed sequences are **ai** (*ay*), **ei** (*ey*), **ao** (*aw*), and **ou** (*ew*). There are no V V sequences (long or double vowels). All vowel distinctions are neutralized before the coda consonant **r**. Any V + **r** sequence within a syllable is realized as **er**, phonetically a retroflex schwa [ɚ].

With essentially Sinitic segmental phonology, Mangghuer has almost no morphophonemic alternation. One alternation which does occur, however, concerns the voluntative (first person imperative) suffix, which has three allomorphs: **-wa** following the segments **u o** (*u w*), **-ya** following the segments **a i** (*a i y*), and **-a** elsewhere, e.g. **yao-wa** ‘let me walk!’, **xi-ya** ‘let me go!’, **duoke-a** ‘let me chop!’.

The suprasegmental feature of stress displays an interesting mixture of Mongolic and Sinitic characteristics. Stress consists primarily of high pitch, and appears on the final syllable of a root, or on the final one of any suffixes or enclitics added to a root. Word boundaries, then, can be identified on the basis of stress, a stressed syllable being the final syllable of a phonological word. In Chinese borrowings, however, stress behaviour is different. The basic rule seems to be that in a borrowed word, stress is assigned to any syllable which, in the donor language, had a tone pattern which included a high pitch. A Chinese borrowing, then, can have multiple stressed syllables, or it can have no stressed syllables at all, depending on its original tone pattern. A similar stress pattern has been described for (Gansu) Bonan (Li). There are no distinctive tones in Mangghuer.

PARTS OF SPEECH

As many as seventeen lexical categories can be identified in Mangghuer, each of which has unique morphosyntactic behaviour. These are listed below, with some of the unique morphosyntactic features of each.

The two basic parts of speech, as known also from other Mongolic languages, are: (1) *nouns*, which serve as head of a noun phrase; and (2) *verbs*, which bear finite or non-finite inflexional morphology. There are two classes of pronominal words: (3) *pronouns* (proper), which substitute for a noun phrase; and (4) the *demonstratives* **ni** 'this' and **ti** 'that' (which also function as demonstrative pronouns), used to modify a noun. Nouns can also be modified by (5) *adjectives*, which can bear the comparative suffix **.her**; and (6) *numerals*, which are (usually) positioned after the determiner in a noun phrase. Verbs can be modified by (7) *adverbs* of time or place, which are characterized by some freedom of movement, but usually appear first in a clause.

Two further parts of speech with a Common Mongolic background are: (8) *postpositions*, which follow a noun phrase or postpositional phrase; and (9) *quotative markers*, which follow quoted direct or indirect speech to indicate the end of the quotation; the quotative markers are **ge-** 'to say' (Mongolic, bears verbal morphology) and **di** (invariant, from Chinese). On the other hand, more area-specific features of Mangghuer are: (10) the *copula* **shi** (invariant, from Chinese), which optionally stands between nouns in equational clause; and (11) the *adjective modifier* **hudu** 'very', which appears before the adjective it modifies.

Finally, there are several parts of speech which may be generally characterized as particles. These include: (12) the *negators* **lai** 'not' and **bao** 'do not!', which precede the clausal main verb they negate; the negator **sai** 'not' also appears, very infrequently, only in perfective contexts; (13) the *resultative marker* **zou** 'thus, so' (from Chinese), which usually appears in second position in its clause; and (14) a number of *final particles*, which appear at the end of an utterance, usually following a finite verb. The (15) *grammatical number markers* **ge** (singular) and **si** (plural), which follow the noun they modify, may also be classified as particles. There are two kinds of conjunctions: (16) the *nominal conjunction* **dai** 'and', which conjoins two noun phrases; and (17) the *clausal conjunctions* **danang** 'after' and **zhi** 'after', which conjoin a finite clause with the following clause; an additional conjunction, **ma** 'and', is used in both nominal and clausal conjunctive functions.

WORD FORMATION

There are not many productive derivative suffixes in Mangghuer. A few Common Mongolic suffixes are, nevertheless, preserved; additionally, there are suffixes borrowed from Chinese. The most important derivative suffixes may be listed and illustrated as follows:

Denominal verbs: **.la-** (< Common Mongolic **.lA-*), e.g. **burer** 'calf' : **burer.la-** 'to calve'; **.ra-**, e.g. **asi** 'herd animals' : **asi.ra-** 'to raise (herd animals)'; **.li-**, e.g. **qijighe** 'flower' : **qijighe.li-** 'to bloom'.

Deverbal verbs: **.gha-** [causative], e.g. **xi-** 'to go' : **xi.gha-** 'to cause to go'; **.ke-** and **.ge-** [with a diffuse function], e.g. **kai-** 'to open' : **kai.ke-** id., **xiaoshun-** 'to show filial piety' : **xiaoshun.ge-** id. Note that the suffixes **.ke-** and **.ge-** seem to appear only on borrowed verbs. The other suffixes deriving verbs can be used both on native and on borrowed items.

Deverbal nouns: **.qin** [actor noun], e.g. **kerli-** 'to want, to ask for' : **kerli.qin** 'beggar'. This is the Common Mongolic marker of the agentive participle (< **-gci/n*). In Mangghuer this form has no verbal functions, being used only as a derived noun.

Derivatives based on adjectives: **.tu-** [translative verbs], e.g. **shuguo** 'big' : transl. **shuguo.tu-** 'to become big'; **.her** [comparative], e.g. **gezai** 'good' : comp. **gezai.her** 'better'.

NOMINAL FORMS

There are two grammatical number markers, both of which are used postnominally: **ge** for the singular and **si** for the plural. The use of either marker is optional. The element **ge**, which indicates singular number and indefiniteness, may always be analysed as a phonologically independent word (particle), e.g. **beghe** 'tree/s' : sg. **beghe ge** 'a tree'. Historically, it probably originated as a reduction of either the Mongolic **nige** 'one' or the Chinese **yige** 'one'; possibly it is the syncretized reflex of both.

The element **si**, which indicates plural number, has a more complex phonological status. In most instances, it also appears as a separate word (particle), e.g. **kao** 'son' : pl. **kao si** 'children'. However, it is consistently bound when appearing with some nouns, including **aguer** 'daughter' : pl. **aguer.si**, and with third person pronoun **gan** 's/he' : **gan.si** 'they'. In the latter cases, it must be analysed as a derivative suffix. Historically, it seems to derive from the Proto-Mongolic plural suffix **.s*.

The development of the original plural suffix into a (sometimes) independent word is an interesting phenomenon which contributes to a growing body of evidence that the grammaticalization process by which independent words become bound morphology is not unidirectional. The development was possibly due to the regular process which required that an epenthetic vowel be added in Mangghuer following an original syllable-final **s*, in order to conform to Sinitic phonology. Thus, the Mongolic plural ***.s*** became **.si**. The motivation for separating this morpheme off as an independent word is unclear, but it may have been part of a contact-induced tendency to reduce the role of suffixal morphology.

The original Mongolic case endings have also developed towards the status of independent words. They remain, however, phonologically bound to the preceding word, and synchronically they are best analysed as *enclitic postpositions*. A similar status is held by the possessive and reflexive markers. The enclitic postpositions contrast with *locational postpositions* (relational nouns), which are independent words.

The enclitic postpositions functioning as case markers in Mangghuer represent six cases (Table 15.3), four of which may be identified with the Common Mongolic dative,

TABLE 15.3 MANGGHUER CASE MARKERS

label	function	marker
conn.	genitive-accusative	**=ni**
dat.	dative-locative	**=du**
abl.	ablative	**=sa**
com.	comitative-instrumental	**=la**
poss.	comitative	**=tai**
dir.	directive	**=ji**

ablative, instrumental, and possessive cases, respectively. A fifth case, which may be labelled connective, involves a merger of the original genitive and accusative cases (genitive-accusative), while the sixth case, functioning as a directive, has no Common Mongolic counterpart. As elsewhere in Mongolic, the dative functions also as a locative (dative-locative). The original instrumental case being lost, the comitative functions as an instrumental (comitative-instrumental), while the possessive case functions as an additional comitative.

All of the enclitic case markers receive word-final stress, except that the connective marker, when functioning as a genitive, is sometimes unstressed. Since the connective case also functions as an accusative, in which function it always receives stress, there is a (potential) prosodic difference between the two grammatical functions of this marker.

The possessive and reflexive (possessive-reflexive) markers are **=ni** and **=nang**, respectively. The possessive marker refers to a third person possessor and derives from the Common Mongolic possessive suffix with a similar shape (px 3p. **-ni*). The reflexive marker likewise represents the corresponding Common Mongolic suffix (refl. **-xA/n*). Both markers receive word-final stress in Mangghuer.

All enclitic postpositions appear following the final word of a noun phrase, or following another postposition. Case markers can thus co-occur with the possessive and reflexive markers. In such combinations, variation is permitted in the relative order of the markers. This may be seen by comparing (1) and (2), two folktale examples:

(1) **Bieri=ni=du banhua guang ma,**
wife=PX=DAT method OBJ:NEG:COP PCLE
'(Now) his wife had no recourse'

(2) **Diao=du=ni han mula nughuai yi=ge bang,**
younger:sibling=DAT=PX also small dog one=CL OBJ:COP
'His younger brother also had a small dog.'

One important co-occurrence restriction is that the connective marker **=ni**, when functioning as an accusative, is never combined with either the possessive or the reflexive marker. However, the possessive and reflexive markers may appear on subjects, objects, or obliques. Both also have periphrastic equivalents, constructed with the reflexive pronoun **jie** 'self', and thus, both are optional.

While the enclitic postpositions functioning as case markers indicate basic grammatical relationships, the phonologically unbound postpositions have more complex semantic functions. They include: **duoruo** 'under', **cuduoruo** 'inside', **dunda** 'in', **diere** 'on', **khuonuo** 'behind, after', **tada** 'near', and **shige** 'like'. These postpositions appear in constructions like **ger diere** 'on the house', and **ger khuonuo** 'behind the house'. With the exception of **shige** 'like', it appears that postpositions of this type may all also be used as nouns. This indicates that they originally *were* nouns, and that their postpositional function is a later development. Postpositions of this set appear with syntactic obliques, usually locationals. However, they do not co-occur with the case markers.

NUMERALS AND CLASSIFIERS

The Mangghuer numerals are nearly all borrowed from Chinese. Additionally, Mangghuer has borrowed the system of Chinese numeral classifiers ('measure words'). The basic classifier is **=ge** 'piece', which can be seen in some of the sentence examples quoted in this chapter: **yi=ge** 'one' (2), **liang=ge** 'two' (3, 14). Other classifiers include **=mu** [measure of land] (16b) and **=zhuan** 'circle' (15b).

Only two Mongolic numeral roots remain in Mangghuer. The numeral **nige** 'one' still appears, and seems to have the same functions as the (nearly homophonous) Chinese borrowing **yi=ge**. The other Mongolic root is **ghu-** 'two', which is found only in the fossilized collective derivative form **ghu.la** 'two together; together with' (18b). The form **ghu.la** is also used as an instrumental and comitative (sociative) postposition.

Numeral quantifiers (numeral + classifier) normally precede their head noun within a Mangghuer noun phrase. However, they can be postposited, as well, as in the example **huguer liang=ge** 'bulls two' (3), where the expected order would be **liang=ge huguer** 'two bulls', cf. also **nughuai yi=ge** 'a dog' (2). Postpositing of quantifiers is optional; it is most common when a participant is being introduced for the first time in a discourse, and thus, it generally occurs with indefinite nouns. However, this is only a tendency, rather than a rule.

PRONOUNS

The most common Mangghuer personal pronouns are Mongolic in origin. An important morphological property of the singular pronouns 1p. **bi** (< **bi*) and 2p. **qi** (< **ci*) is that the first person preserves a separate stem variant for the genitive case, while both first and second person preserve separate stems in the oblique (including accusative) cases. The third person pronoun **gan** (< **irgen* 'people') has no stem variants (Table 15.4).

Some of the pronominal forms are irregular: for instance, the original first person singular pronoun forms acc. **namei** (< **nama-i*) and dat. **nangda** (< **nan-da* < **nama-da*) have been partly confused, resulting in the secondary dative forms **namei=du** and **nangda=du**. By analogy, the second person form acc. **qimei** (< **cima-i*) can be used in the dative function without the dative marker. However, the rules of the distribution for the synchronic variants remain unexplained.

There do not appear to be any morphological irregularities in the plural personal pronouns, which are formally plural derivatives. Mangghuer does not have an inclusive/exclusive distinction, but the first person plural pronoun **da.si** derives from the original inclusive variant (< **bida* : **bida.s*). The second person plural pronoun **ta.si** contains a regular reflex of the original Common Mongolic pronoun (< **ta* : **ta.s*).

A few alternative personal pronouns appear, occasionally, in folktale material. These include: sg. 1p. **gulian**, sg. 1p. acc. **damei ~ dangda**, pl. 1p. **datang ~ danang ~ dasinang**, and pl. 3p. **nugu.si ~ ge.si**. All of these appear to be dialectal variants.

Other pronouns include: the interrogatives **ang** 'where' : **ayige** 'which'; **kan** 'who'; **ya** 'what; why' : **yaji** 'why' : **yang** 'what'; and **amerda** 'what kind of'; and the two

TABLE 15.4 MANGGHUER PERSONAL PRONOUNS

		1p.	2p.	3p.
sg.	nom.	**bi**	**qi**	**gan**
	gen.	**mu=ni**	**qi=ni**	**gan=ni**
	acc.	**namei** **nangda**	**qimei**	**gan=ni**
	dat.	**namei=du** **nangda(=du)**	**qimei(=du)**	**gan=du**
pl.	nom.	**da.si**	**ta.si**	**gan.si**

demonstratives **ni** 'this' (proximal) vs. **ti** 'that' (distal). The reflexive pronoun is **jie** 'self' (< **ejen* 'master'). The latter form does not seem to appear independently; rather, it is only found in combination with either the connective (genitive) or the reflexive marker: conn. **jie=ni** 'one's own', refl. **jie=nang** 'oneself'.

VERBAL FORMS

In spite of its general scarcity of morphology, Mangghuer has a number of suffixally marked verbal forms, which indicate the same type of categories as in the other Mongolic languages: mood (imperatives), tense and aspect (the temporal-aspectual paradigm of the finite indicative sphere), nominalization (participles), and non-nominal dependency (converbs). Additionally, there is a category of subjective/objective perspective, which is intimately intertwined with tense and aspect. Almost all of the verbal suffixes are inherited from Proto-Mongolic, which means that they can be identified with their Common Mongolic labels. Their functions, however, have undergone significant changes.

The imperative mood retains its status as a special category, which is not further inflected for tense and aspect or perspective. However, there is agreement with the clausal subject. Thus, there are three forms, which are used in reference to first, second, and third person subjects (both singular and plural), respectively. They are marked by the endings 1p. **-ya** (with the morphophonologically determined variants **-wa** and **-a**), 2p. -Ø (zero), and 3p. **-ge**, e.g. **xi-ya** 'let me/us go!' : **xi** '(you) go!' : **xi-ge** 'let him/her/them go!'. Imperatives of all three types are negated with the preverbal prohibitive **bao** 'do not!' which is used for only this function.

Diachronically, the first person imperative form can immediately be identified with the Common Mongolic voluntative (**-yA*). The origin of the third person form, which could perhaps most appropriately be termed (*ad*)*hortative*, may, however, be more complex. It is nevertheless likely to be connected with the Common Mongolic permissive (**-gV*), though it may also incorporate syncretized reflexes of other imperative forms, including the concessive (**-tUgAi*).

Mangghuer also preserves two Common Mongolic participle markers and six converb markers in inflexional use (Table 15.5). In addition, there is the agentive participle marker **.qin**, which has completely lost its inflexional status.

The actual use of the participle and converb markers involves a number of idiosyncracies (illustrated in more detail in the sentence examples given later). There are also

TABLE 15.5 MANGGHUER NON-FINITE VERBAL MARKERS

		function	marker
part.	perf.	perfective	**-sang**
	fut.	imperfective	**-ku**
conv.	imperf.	imperfective	**-ji**
	cond.	conditional	**-sa**
	term.	successive	**-tala**, **-tula**
	fin.	final	**-la**
	abtemp.	progressive	**-ser**
	deont.	deontic ('should')	**-der**

TABLE 15.6 MANGGHUER FINITE TENSE-ASPECT MARKERS

	perspective	perf.	imperf.	fut.
ind.	subj.	**-ba**	**-la bi**	**-ni**
	obj.	**-jiang**	**-lang**	**-kun(i)ang**
interr.	subj.	**-bu**	**-la biu**	**-nu**
	obj.	**-jinu**	**-leinu**	**-kuninu**

structures which recall the quasiconverbs of other Mongolic languages. Diachronically, the abtemporal converb in **-ser** (< part. perf. instr. *-*gsA-xAr*) belongs to this category.

In the finite conjugation, Mangghuer distinguishes three temporal-aspectual categories, which may functionally be identified as perfective, imperfective, and futuritive. These are combined with two moods: indicative (declarative) and interrogative, as well as with two perspectives, subjective vs. objective (Table 15.6).

The suffixes of the finite conjugation seem to represent four original finite forms and one participle. The whole imperfective paradigm apparently derives from the Common Mongolic confirmative (*-*lUxA*) or its expanded variants (including copular constructions). The perfective paradigm, on the other hand, combines reflexes of the original terminative (*-*bA*) and resultative (*-*jixAi*) forms. The futuritive paradigm, finally, is built on the finite durative form (the variant in *-*nAi*) and an expanded variant of the futuritive participle (*-*kU*-). The interrogative mood is systematically marked by the presence of a suffixed reflex of the original interrogative particle (*=*U*).

An example of a complete finite paradigm is: **ri-** 'to come' : ind. subj. perf. **ri-ba** : imperf. **ri-la bi** : fut. **ri-ni**; ind. obj. perf. **ri-jiang** : imperf. **ri-lang** : fut. **ri-kuniang**; interr. subj. perf. **ri-bu** : imperf. **ri-la biu** : fut. **ri-nu**; interr. obj. perf. **ri-jinu** : imperf. **ri-leinu** : fut. **ri-kuninu**. The interrogative forms are used for polar (yes/no) questions. For non-polar (wh-) questions a single form identical with the imperfective converb is used, e.g. **ri-ji**, with no further distinction being made between the three temporal-aspectual categories.

THE CATEGORY OF PERSPECTIVE

Apart from imperatives, Mangghuer verbal forms are not differentiated according to the category of person. However, the category of perspective would at first glance seem to indicate a binary person distinction, differentiating first person from other persons. In fact, though, this binary distinction indicates the speaker's *perspective* on the event, rather than personal agreement.

Evidential systems similar to the Mangghuer perspective distinction are present in the Bodic languages (DeLancey), and it is likely that systems of this sort generally represent Tibetan influence on the other languages which have adopted them, especially in the Gansu-Qinghai region. In English-language publications, such systems have usually been labelled 'conjunct/disjunct' systems. Following the practice which seems to be standard among Mongolists in China, the distinction is here referred to as one between *subjective* and *objective* perspectives.

The basic distinction is illustrated as follows. In the indicative, subjective marking appears with first person subjects, while objective appears with second and third person subjects, as in these sentence examples (elicited): sg. 1p. + ind. subj. perf. **bi ri-ba**

'I came' : sg. 2p. + ind. obj. perf. **qi ri-jiang** 'you came' : sg. 3p. + ind. obj. perf. **gan ri-jiang** 's/he came'. In interrogatives, however, subjective marking appears with second person subjects, and objective with first and third person subjects, as in the following examples (elicited): sg. 1p. interr. obj. perf. **bi ri-jinu** 'did I come?' : sg. 2p. interr. subj. perf. **qi ri-bu** 'did you come?' : sg. 3p. + interr. obj. perf. **gan ri-jinu** 'did s/he come?'.

When a first person subject is not in control of the event expressed by a finite verb, objective marking is used. This is illustrated by the following example: sg. 1p. + ind. obj. imperf. **bi gan=ni tani-lang** 'I recognize him/her' (elicited); the clausal subject is not an agent here, and has no control over the action (event of recognizing). A speaker may similarly use objective verb marking to signify a lack of control over any event which normally would be expected to be under his/her control, as in sg. 1p. + ind. obj. fut. **bi ri-kunang** 'I will come (because somebody else decided that I would)' (elicited).

Conversely, a speaker may choose to use subjective marking with a non-first person subject. In this case, the speaker is asserting a high degree of personal involvement with the truth of the claim being made. In the following example (3), taken from a folktale, the use of subjective marking for **ri-** 'to come' (with a third person subject) means that the speaker is absolutely sure this is true, perhaps having seen the event himself:

(3) **taiting=du huguer liang=ge ri-ba,**
there=DAT cow two=CL come-SUBJ:PERF
'over there, two bulls have come'

Subjective and objective marking thus indicate pragmatic choices made by the speaker, signifying his/her degree of involvement with the event being reported, or his/her commitment to the truth of the claim being made.

SIMPLE SENTENCES

The most common order of constituents within a clause is: discourse connector – oblique (time, place) – subject – oblique (benefactive, ablative, instrumental) – direct object – oblique (length of time, amount) – negative – verb – auxiliary verb – final particle. Significant variation on this basic order is permitted, although the last four constituent types (negative – verb – auxiliary – final particle) are not permitted to move; nor can any other constituent be placed among or following these four.

Fronting of nominal constituents to clause-initial position is extremely frequent. It is thus quite common to find a direct object or benefactive, etc., which appears before a clausal subject, as in example (6) below. Mangghuer has no passive construction, and fronting of semantic patients is thus an important strategy for expressing the relative discourse importance of subject and object.

An intransitive clause requires just a single nominal argument for its verb. Thus:

(4) **gan=ni aguer=ni bieqin ber-jiang.**
3:SG=CONN daughter=CONN illness get:better-OBJ:PERF
'(and then) his daughter's illness got better.'

A transitive clause, as in (5), has two nominal arguments, while a ditransitive clause, as in (6), has three:

(5) **Ni muni aguer=ni ala ge-jiang.**
this 1:SG:GEN daughter=CONN kill do-OBJ:PERF
'This killed my daughter.'

(6) **kebeghe=nang bi mori=du=nang tiejie-ni.**
wheat:bran=REFL 1:SG horse=DAT=REFL feed-SUBJ:FUT
'My wheat bran I will feed to my horses (the brother said).'

Nominal arguments which are clearly identifiable from discourse context are often omitted. A semantically transitive verb may appear with only a single argument, and many clauses contain no overt arguments at all. Some individual verbs allow multiple argument structures. Thus, in (6), **tiejie-** 'to feed' appears in a ditransitive usage; in (7), however, this same verb is used transitively. In (6), the semantic patient **mori** 'horses' is an oblique (dat. refl.), while in (7) the semantic patient **asi** 'herd animals' is the direct object (pl. refl.).

(7) **Bi asi.si=nang tiejie-ni,**
1:SG livestock.PL=REFL feed-SUBJ:FUT
'I will feed my livestock.'

An intransitive or a transitive clause can be given an additional argument by the use of the causative morpheme **.gha-**. In (4), above, **ber-** 'get better' is intransitive; with the causative suffix, it becomes transitive, as in (8), where **aguerni** 'daughter' is the direct object; cf. also example (10) further below:

(8) **qi gan=ni aguer=ni ber.gha-lang.**
2:SG 3:SG=CONN daughter=CONN get:better.CAUS-OBJ:IMPERF
'You (can) make his daughter become well.'

Copular clauses involve a subject and a predication about that subject. There are two different paradigms of the copulas: equational and attributive, though the difference is signalled only in the negative forms. Copulas are semantically imperfective and do not have perfective or futuritive forms. The forms of the copulas (Table 15.7) derive from Common Mongolic sources (**bUi*, **bisi*, **ügei*), with suffixal variations added in analogy to the finite conjugation of regular verbs.

The equational copula appears (in final position) in clauses which equate two noun phrases. There is an additional non-verbal copula, **shi**, which is borrowed from Chinese, and which may optionally appear (in medial position) in equational constructions, as in **bi** (**shi**) **laoshi bi** 'I am a teacher' (elicited). The borrowed copula has no inflexional variants.

The attributive copula appears with predicative adjectives, as in **gan saihang bang** 'she is beautiful' (elicited), and in possessive, locational and existential clauses, which all have the form of the locational example **muni shu zhuozi diere bang** 'my book is on the table' (elicited). Locational clauses like this differ from possessives like (1) and (2) only in animacy: in a possessive clause, the location of an object is an animate being (the possessor, in dative case), while a locational asserts an object's existence in some

TABLE 15.7 MANGGHUER COPULAS

	perspective	ind.	interr.	neg.
equational	subj.	**bi**	**biu**	**puzhi**
	obj.	**bang**	**beinu**	**puzhang**
attributive	subj.	**bi**	**biu**	**(u)gui**
	obj.	**bang**	**beinu**	**(u)guang**

(inanimate) place. Existentials simply assert the existence of an object, without reference to any location.

AUXILIARY VERBS

Mangghuer has nine auxiliary verbs, all of which are native Mongolic lexemes. The auxiliary verbs are: **da-** 'cannot', **ge-** 'to do', **sao-** 'to sit; to stay', **ri-** 'to come', **xi-** 'to go', **bao-** 'to go down', **gher-** 'to go out', **hu-** 'to give', and the copula **bi** (with variants). The negative auxiliary **da**- 'cannot' (< **yada*-) is never used as a main verb, but all of the others listed here may be used as main verbs.

An auxiliary verb follows the main verb, and bears finite or non-finite morphology appropriate for the clause. The main verb is non-finite. The auxiliaries **da-**, **ge-** and **sao-** appear with main verbs which bear non-finite zero marking, as in (5), above, where **ge-** appears with the suffixless main verb **ala**-Ø 'to kill'. Used as an auxiliary, **ge-** (< **ki*-) functions to indicate a high degree of transitivity in its clause: a highly agentive actor, a highly affected patient, and/or a thoroughly carried-out action tend to call for the use of this auxiliary. Conversely, **sao-** (< **saxu*-) may be used to indicate a sort of low transitivity, when an experiencer subject is highly affected by the event expressed by the verb; **sao-** can also function to indicate that an event continues for a period of time.

Four auxiliaries indicate motion: **ri-** (< **ire*-) indicates motion towards the speaker; **xi-** (< **oci*-) indicates motion away; **gher-** (< **gar*-) indicates motion in an upward or outward direction; and **bao-** (< **baxu*-) indicates motion downward. When motion is involved, multiple auxiliaries sometimes appear in a single clause, as in (9). Here, the main verb is **deghela-** 'to fall', followed by the auxiliaries **bao-** and **ri-**; finite morphology appears only on the final auxiliary **ri-**.

(9) **dong+guo** **ge** **deghela-ji** **bao-ji** **ri-ni.**
winter+fruit SG:INDEF fall-IMPERF go:down-IMPERF come-SUBJ:FUT
'A winter pear will fall down.'

The motion auxiliaries all allow their main verbs to be marked with either the imperfective converb suffix **-ji**, or else with zero marking. In this context, there is no semantic difference between these two types of non-finite marking. The same is true of the auxiliary **hu-** (< **ög*-), which gives a benefactive sense to its clause (10), although it does not add a benefactive argument to the clause.

(10) **Bi** **huguer=du=nang** **di.gha** **hu-ku**
1:SG cow=DAT=REFL eat.CAUS give-IMPERF
'After I let my own cow eat (them)'

Attributive copulas function as auxiliaries in two types of constructions. The first of these is illustrated in (11), where the main verb is **chaoke-** 'to fry', marked with the progressive (conv. abtemp.) **-ser**, and the auxiliary is the copula **bang**. The subjective imperfective forms in ind. **-la bi** and interr. **-la biu** are originally similar constructions, with the copula **bi** as a auxiliary.

(11) **Mang'huzi** **Aguer** **cai=nang** **chaoke-ser** **bang,**
monster daughter food=REFL fry-PROGR OBJ:COP
'Monster Girl was cooking her food.'

Constructions of this same type are also formed with conv. deont. **-der** 'should', such as (elicited) **tindu xi-der bang** 'one should go there; there is reason to go there', and

(neg.) **tindu xi-der guang** ‘one should not go there; there is no reason to go there’. Of the three non-finite forms used in this first type of construction (**-la**, **-ser**, **-der)**, it is worth noting that only **-ser** can also be used in clause-combining constructions; **-la** and **-der** may be considered to function as a special type of nonfinite marker, which we can label ‘auxiliary linker’.

Second, attributive copulas also appear as auxiliaries in a common negation strategy, constructed with a nominalized clause marked with the perfective participle marker **-sang**, as in **bi hai=nang musi-sang gui** ‘I haven’t put on my shoes’.

COMPLEX SENTENCES

There are three types of dependent clause in Mangghuer. The first type involves *nominalized clauses*, formed with the two participle markers **-ku** (imperfective) and **-sang** (perfective). These clauses are clearly embedded within another clause, since they function as arguments of predicates, or as relative clauses within a noun phrase. In either case, an additional nominalizing element **=ni** (identical with the possessive suffix) is optionally added.

In (12), the bracketed perfective nominalized clause is a relative clause, modifying the head noun **aguer** ‘daughter’, while (13) shows an imperfective nominalized clause, in which the nominalization serves as the subject of another clause.

(12) **[bieqiere-sang=ni] aguer=ni dawenla-jiang.**
be:ill-PERF=NOMLZ daughter=CONN ask:about-OBJ:PERF
‘(He) asked about (the rich man’s) daughter, who had become ill.’

(13) **[Bang&bang di duoke-ku=ni] hangbura-ku,**
ONOM QUOTE chop-IMPERF=NOMLZ finish-IMPERF
‘When the chopping with the banging sound stops.’

The second type of dependent clause is *verbal complement clauses*. A specialized construction of this type is purpose complements, formed only with the final converb marker **-la**, as illustrated in (14). Constructions of this sort seem to be in the process of grammaticalizing into verb + auxiliary constructions. Only the motion verbs **ri-** ‘to come’, **xi-** ‘to go’ and **yao-** id. (< **yabu-*) may appear following **-la**, and the two verbs obligatorily share a subject. However, **yao-** (unlike its synonym **xi-**) does not function as an auxiliary in any other context, and the motion verbs in purpose clauses usually, though not always, do express independent events of motion.

(14) **Bersi liang=ge ti kong=ni beila-la ri-jiang gelang.**
tiger two=CL that person=CONN carry-FIN come-OBJ:PERF HEARSAY
‘Two tigers came to carry that person (away), they say.’

The main verbs **hangbura** ‘finish’ and **kai.ke** ‘begin’ (< Chinese **kai**) can also take verbal complement clauses whose main verb is non-finite, marked with **-ji** or zero (-Ø). A construction of this sort is illustrated in (15a), where the complement clause consists only of the verb **di-** ‘to eat’.

(15)(a) **Di-Ø hangbura-Ø,**
eat-SEQ finish-SEQ
‘After (she) finished eating,

(b) **“Du bi yi=zhuan langla-ya,” ge-ji**
now 1:SG one=circle walk:around-VOL QUOTE-IMPERF
“Now I’ll go walk around,” saying (this),

(c) **zaohang=du xi-sa,**
kitchen=DAT go-COND
after (she) went into the kitchen,

(d) **gan=ni bulai=ni di khuonuo guala ge-ser bang bai.**
3:SG=CONN child=CONN door back hang do-PROGR OBJ:COP EMPH
(she found that they) had hung her son behind the door.’

The third type of dependent clause is also illustrated by (15), where each of the lines (15a–c) ends with a different non-finite marker, connecting the dependent clauses in a sequence which ends with the finite construction **guala ge-ser bang** of line (15d). Dependent clauses in chain-like constructions of this third type may be called *non-final clauses*.

Line (15a) ends with a zero-marked verb; this zero morpheme (functioning as a non-finite marker) is glossed as the *sequential* converb (conv. seq.) marker. This marker indicates that two events occur after one another in a temporal sequence. Thus, it is ‘after finishing’ the action of (15a) that the event of line (15b) occurs. The zero-marked sequential converb is also used to form resultative constructions of the Mandarin type **chi-wan** ‘eat-finish’; in Mangghuer, the first verb of such resultative sequences is zero-marked (-Ø), though the two predicates remain phonologically independent words.

A single non-finite marker may appear multiple times within a sequence, or several markers may be used on successive clauses. Line (15b) ends with the imperfective converb marker **-ji**. This marker is used in Mangghuer to indicate an imperfective event in a sequence of clauses: the woman speaks (15b) while going (15c). However, the imperfective converb is also sometimes used with telic verbs such as ‘to kill’, rather than atelic ones like ‘to say’, and in such cases, **-ji** may link a *series* of events. This marker thus allows for an extremely wide range of semantic interpretations, and seems to be broadening in function, diachronically, to become a default marker of non-finite clauses.

Line (15c) ends with the conditional converb marker **-sa**. This marker has two clause-combining functions in Mangghuer: on the one hand, it marks the protasis of a conditional construction (‘if’), and, on the other, it marks an event which precedes some state (‘after’). The line (15c) illustrates this latter function: after the woman goes into the kitchen, she finds that the state of (15d) exists. A similar function is filled by the terminative converb in **-tala** ~ **-tula**, which appears on non-final clauses to mark an event which occurs prior to the event reported in the following clause. By semantic extension, X**-tala** Y may also mean ‘X rather than Y’.

All of the non-final clauses share the syntactic property of being ambiguous with respect to embedding. That is, a non-final clause may be considered an adverbial modifier of the following verb, in which case it is embedded in that verb’s clause, or it may simply be positioned so as to precede the next clause, as in prototypical clause chaining constructions. There appear to be no syntactic arguments in favour of either analysis, when non-final clauses appear in constructions such as (15). This is, then, a structurally ambiguous construction type.

The abtemporal converb (originally quasiconverb) in **-ser** indicates a progressive action which takes place in parallel with the action of the following clause, as in (16):

(16)(a) **Jiaoduer yila-ser**
every:day cry-PROG
‘Crying every day,

(b) **yi=mu ghazher=du=nang naramu tari-jiang.**
one=*mu* ground=DAT=REFL millet plant-OBJ:PERF
(she) planted millet in her one-*mu* field.'

In contrast to the non-final clauses which we have seen so far, a non-finite verb marked with **-ser** can sometimes be clearly embedded as a clausal adverb, although such clauses tend not to be very clause-like, often consisting of only the verb itself. Sequences of clauses like (16), however, are ambiguous with respect to embedding. The dependent clause (16a) might be seen as an adverbial modifier of the finite verb **tari-jiang** '(she) planted', embedded within the matrix clause (16b), but it could simply be a clause which precedes it.

Apart from the regular converbs (and quasiconverbs), the participle marker **-ku**, which basically forms nominalized constructions, can also be used converbially in non-final clauses, indicating imperfective aspect. Thus, in (13), the form part. fut. **hangbura-ku** refers to a *future* event, and its clause is a non-final clause. In (10), the speaker refers to a *repetitive* act (of feeding the cow every day); here, too, **-ku** marks an imperfective event in a non-final clause.

Perfective events in non-final clauses may be indicated by the quasiconverbial construction **-sang zhi**. This complex consists of the perfective participle plus the clausal conjunction **zhi**, which probably originated in Chinese. Another quasiconverbial clausal conjunction used in non-final clauses is **da=nang**, which appears with the suffixless verbal stem, and indicates a prior event, as in (17):

(17)(a) **Gan.si ji=ge=la durasi.si=ni suer-Ø danang**
3:SG.PL several=CL=COM liquor.PL=CONN buy-Ø after
'After the several of them had bought liquors,

(b) **gan=ni qinla-Ø ti ruang=du kuer-jiang.**
3:SG=CONN welcome-SEQ that place=DAT arrive-OBJ:PERF
(they) took him along and went to that place.'

There seems to be no mention of **da**[=]**nang** in comparative works, though cognates appear in Qinghai Bonan and Santa. Diachronically, this conjunction would seem to represent the dative case ending of the reflexive declension (**-dA-xA/n*), which is used quasiconverbially in combination with participle suffixes in many Mongolic languages. A rare alternative form in Mangghuer is **-da**, used as a suffix.

Non-final dependent clauses most often precede the non-dependent clause, as in the examples we have seen. In some cases, however, they can also be postposited, as in (18):

(18)(a) **Qi yaji ni=ge bieri=nang shini-lang**
2:SG why this=CL wife=REFL laugh-OBJ:IMPERF
'Why did you laugh at this wife of yours

(b) **kao ghula jielie-a ge-sa?**
son two:together meet-VOL QUOTE-COND
when (she) said (that she planned) to greet (you) with a son?'

Not only conditional clauses formed with **-sa**, as in (18), but also non-final clauses with **-ku**, **-tala** and **danang** may be postposited. Speakers judge postposited clauses of this sort to be afterthoughts, but they are spontaneously produced in natural speech with

some regularity, and listeners have no trouble interpreting them. Less frequently, a speaker may choose to embed a non-finite clause, as in (19):

(19) **Bi qimai=du [mula=ni kao ge ri-ku] jielie-a,**
1:SG 2:SG:ACC=DAT small=CONN son SG:INDEF come-IMPERF welcome-VOL
'I will welcome you (with the son) if a little son comes',

The bracketed clause here is not a nominalization, but it is clearly embedded, since it interrupts another clause, appearing between the verb **jielie-** 'to meet' and its arguments. The only other non-finite marker which seems to be used in this way is the other imperfective form (conv. imperf.) in **-ji**, which can be used to unambiguously embed reported speech with the quotative verb **ge-** 'to say'.

What can account for the ability of some, but not all, non-final clauses to be postposited or embedded? We could assign the various non-finite suffixes to different classes, with different syntactic behaviours. However, it can be observed that this syntactic freedom is dependent on semantic content: non-final clauses which can be postposited are just those marked with non-finite markers (such as conv. cond.) whose semantic content is sufficient to ensure interpretability, while those which can be embedded are just those whose suffixes (such as conv. imperf.) provide meanings which could modify another event.

Similarly, note that **-ji** and **-Ø**, which make a relatively minimal semantic contribution, are the markers which participate not only in non-final clause formation, but also in the marking of verbal complement clauses and also in the grammaticalization of auxiliary verb constructions. Here again, semantic contribution seems intimately linked to the range of functions of any individual non-finite marker.

FINAL PARTICLES

Mangghuer has several final particles, used for pragmatic functions such as emphasis, inviting listener response, and indicating speaker attitude or the source of information. These particles almost always follow a finite verb, although they may occasionally follow a non-finite verb, or a non-clausal utterance such as a noun phrase.

The final particle **bai**, which seems to be of Common Mongolic origin (cf. **bai-* 'to be'), indicates emphasis, as in example (15d) above.

The final particle **ma**, as in example (1), has a highly interactive function, appearing frequently in quoted speech. This particle generally indicates that the event of its clause and that of the following clause are closely linked (often by causation). The particle **ma** can be used as a coordinating conjunction for noun phrases, and it seems to be in the process of becoming a coordinating conjunction for clauses, as well.

The final particle **a** also has an interactive function similar to that of **ma**. It often appears when the speaker is expressing strong emotion, but it also seems to have a wide range of pragmatic uses.

The final particle **sha** expresses deliberation or dissatisfaction by the speaker.

The final particle **ge**[-]**lang**, as in example (14), is hearsay evidential marker. Formally, it is the imperfective objective form of the verb **ge-** 'to say', and it may therefore literally be translated as 'they say' or 'it is said'. However, it has become semantically bleached, and often functions simply as a marker of emphasis, like **bai**. Many languages of the Gansu-Qinghai region use a form of 'to say' to indicate this same evidential function.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READING

Chen Zhaojun, Li Xingzhong, Lü Jinliang, Keith W. Slater, Kevin Stuart, Wang Xianzhen, Wang Yongwei, Wang Zhenlin, Xin Huaizhi, Zhu Meilan, Zhu Shanzhong, Zhu Wenhui, and Zhu Yongzhong (forthcoming) *Folktales of China's Minhe Mangghuer*, Munich: Lincom Europa.

Chingeltei [Cavggaldai] and Li Keyu [Li Kex vIui] (1988) [published 1991] *Muvgqhur Gala bae Mungqhul Gala* (*Tuzuyu he Mengguyu*) [= Muvgqhul Tuirul uv Gala vAyalqhuv u Sudulul uv Cuburil / Menggu Yuzu Yuyan Fangyan Yanjiu Congshu 013], Guigaquda.

DeLancey, Scott (1992) 'The Historical Status of the Conjunct/Disjunct Pattern in Tibeto-Burman', *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 25: 39–62.

Dpal-ldan-bkra-shis, Hu Jun, Hu Ping, Limusishiden, Keith Slater, Kevin Stuart, Wang Xianzheng, and Zhu Yongzhong (1996) *Language Materials of China's Monguor Minority: Huzhu Mongghul and Minhe Mangghuer* [= Sino-Platonic Papers 69], Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Junast [Zhaonasitu] (1981) *Tuzu Yu Jianzhi* [Zhongguo Shaoshu Minzu Yuyan Jianzhi Congshu], Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.

Li, Charles N. (1986) 'The Rise and Fall of Tones Through Diffusion', in *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society,* pp. 173–85.

Schram, Louis M. J. (1954–61) *The Monguors of the Kansu-Tibetan Frontier: Their Origin, History, and Social Organization*, vols 1–3 [= Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, New Series 44/1, 47/1, 51/3], Philadelphia.

Slater, Keith W. (2003) *A Grammar of Mangghuer: A Mongolic Language of China's Qinghai-Gansu Sprachbund* [= Curzon Asian Linguistic Series 2], London: Curzon.

Todaeva, B. X. (1973) *Mongorskii yazyk: Issledovanie, teksty, slovar'*, Moskva: Nauka (AN SSSR: Institut vostokovedeniya).

Wang Xianzhen (2001) with Zhu Yongzhong and Kevin Stuart (eds), *Mangghuerla Bihuang Keli* (*Mangghuer Folktale Reader*) [Chengdu: China-Chengdu Audio Press].

Zhu Yongzhong, Üjiyediin Chuluu, and Kevin Stuart (1995) 'The Frog Boy: An Example of Minhe Monguor', *Orientalia Suecana* 43–4: 197–207.

Zhu Yongzhong, Üjiyediin Chuluu, and Kevin Stuart (1999) '*Ni* in Minhe Mangghuer and Other Mongol Languages', *Archív orientální* 67: 323–38.

Zhu Yongzhong, Üjiyediin Chuluu, Keith Slater, and Kevin Stuart (1997) 'Gangou Chinese Dialect: A Comparative Survey of a Strongly Altaicized Chinese Dialect and its Mongolic Neighbor', *Anthropos* 92: 433–50.