

himalayan linguistics

A free refereed web journal and archive devoted to the study of the
languages of the Himalayas

Himalayan Linguistics

Borrowing bound and free synonyms: How Mangghuer speakers enrich their speech and their lexicon by creating synonymy via Chinese borrowings

Keith W. Slater

SIL International and University of North Dakota

ABSTRACT

Natural Mangghuer texts exhibit a high rate of borrowing of lexical resources from Chinese. In this paper, I examine borrowings which are synonymous (or nearly so) with existing Mangghuer content words. I identify two different structural types of borrowings. *Bound synonyms* appear only as elements of compounds or fixed expressions, often in onomastic expressions or nouns that have a hyponymic relationship to an existing noun. *Free synonyms* are borrowed as independent words. Evidence from three disparate types of Mangghuer language data shows that any bound or free synonym may appear in nonce borrowings, idiosyncratic borrowings, or community-wide borrowings, a typology drawn from Poplack (2018). The data suggests that although nonce borrowing is probably common (resulting in *nonce synonymy*), many Chinese borrowings have become established to varying degrees in the speech community, with the result that Mangghuer has a greatly enriched vocabulary. In compiling an eventual lexicon of Mangghuer, speakers will have to make some difficult decisions about the formal documentation of borrowed synonyms whose use varies widely across the speech community.

KEYWORDS

Amdo Sprachbund, Mangghuer language, Language contact, bilingualism, linguistic borrowing, lexicography

This is a contribution from *Himalayan Linguistics*, Vol. 20(3): 82-122.

ISSN 1544-7502

© 2021. All rights reserved.

This Portable Document Format (PDF) file may not be altered in any way.

Tables of contents, abstracts, and submission guidelines are available at escholarship.org/uc/himalayanlinguistics

*Borrowing bound and free synonyms: How Mangghuer speakers enrich their speech and their lexicon by creating synonymy via Chinese borrowings**

Keith W. Slater

SIL International and University of North Dakota

1 Introduction

The current linguistic situation in China's Amdo Sprachbund has been shaped by several hundred years of intense language contact. In very broad strokes, the region can be seen to have hosted two major phases of linguistic influence. In its early period, the dominant communities of the region spoke SOV languages—especially Amdo Tibetan, and also Mongolic and Turkic varieties. As a result of this long period, many linguistic varieties in the region have been deeply influenced by the structure of those languages, with such results as SOV word order and case marking systems in the local varieties of Chinese, widespread borrowing of Tibetan lexical items, and Tibetan phonological influence in Mongolic varieties.

More recently, Chinese has become the dominant language in the region, first through the rise in prominence of the local varieties of Northwest Mandarin, and more recently through the influence of Modern Standard Mandarin, which has become pervasive in education and media.

In the present cultural context, minority languages throughout China are under heavy pressure, and many may be on their way to language death. What does this pressure look like in the context of the Amdo Sprachbund, where multilingualism has clearly been a widespread norm for generations? How does a small language like Mangghuer change when most of its speakers have developed a high degree of competence in the higher-status national language?

In this paper, I examine one aspect of language contact in Mangghuer by identifying Chinese borrowings that are synonymous with existing Mangghuer content words. These words can be found in natural texts, and I consider how well established the borrowings appear to be in the Mangghuer usage of storytellers and other language producers. In addition, I consult a couple of other types of

* Some of the material included here was presented at a 2001 Workshop on Mongolic Languages at Academia Sinica. Thanks are due to that most hospitable institution, as well as to a number of individuals who have commented on the various forms this material has taken over the years since then. These include Bryan Allen, Greg Aumann, Albert Bickford, Benjamin Brosig, Andy Eatough, Robb Fried, Juha Janhunen, Tom Pinson, Jae-mog Song, Jackson Sun, Julie Woodson, Zhu Yongzhong, and a couple of anonymous Mangghuer speakers. Erika Sandman has given extremely helpful input, as have other contributors to this volume and an anonymous reviewer. All of these individuals are hereby absolved of responsibility for what I have done with their advice.

data, in which speakers give their reflective assessment that a Chinese form should be considered a synonym of its Mangghuer semantic equivalent.

The overall picture that emerges is one of widespread borrowing, with speakers using Chinese words as synonyms for Mangghuer words for a variety of semantic and pragmatic purposes. One important discovery is that, in addition to borrowed *words*, Mangghuer also gives evidence for what I will call *bound synonyms*—Chinese forms that are synonymous with existing Mangghuer content words, but which appear only as elements of compounds and fixed expressions, and are never used as independent borrowings.

To be clear, I am concerned here not with morphology or grammatical forms such as adpositions. The *bound* forms we will see in this paper are *content* words, not *grammatical* ones.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In the remainder of this Section, I introduce the Mangghuer language (1.1), give an overview of the terms *codeswitching* and *borrowing* (1.2), draw on Poplack's (2018) study of borrowings to discuss variation in how established any given borrowing may be (1.3), clarify what I mean by *synonymy* (1.4), and finally describe the sources of data that I have used (1.5).

Section 2 presents eleven Chinese morphemes which I characterize as *bound synonyms* in the Mangghuer datasets. Section 3 presents fourteen Chinese morphemes which appear as *free synonyms* in the data. Section 4 discusses processes of borrowing which the data suggest, and considers a few implications of this study for Mangghuer lexicography.

1.1 The Mangghuer Language

Mangghuer is one of the Mongolic varieties spoken within the Amdo Sprachbund. It has a high degree of similarity to Mongghul, with which it shares the ISO 639-03 code *mjg* and the name *Monguor*—the two varieties may be compared via Georg (2003) and Slater (2003b). A fuller grammatical description of Mangghuer is found in Slater (2003a).

Mangghuer is clearly Mongolic in its basic vocabulary and morphosyntax. The most convincing historical account of the origins of the Mangghuer people, indeed, is that a major segment of their forebears were Mongolian-speaking garrison troops stationed in this region during the Yuan Dynasty (AD 1279-1368), when China was part of the Mongol empire (Slater 2003a: 16-19). There has clearly been massive intermarriage between groups in this region for many centuries (see for example Xu and Wen 2017:62-3), and presumably much language shift, but the linguistic features of Mangghuer are compatible with its having descended primarily via normal transmission from generation to generation, and thus the language belongs genetically to the Mongolic family.

Mangghuer has had intensive contact with Chinese for many generations. Currently there is a lot of exposure to Modern Standard Mandarin (MSM), but historically the most intense contact relationship would have been with the local Chinese dialects, which themselves have been deeply affected by contact with Mongolic, Turkic, and Bodic varieties. Thus, some Mangghuer borrowings from Chinese may look unfamiliar to those familiar with MSM.

The segmental phonology of Mangghuer is nearly identical to that of NW Mandarin dialects, making it convenient to use a slightly modified form of the *Hanyu Pinyin* Romanization system to write the language. The major difference is that Mangghuer has two uvular stops, symbolized as *gh* (unaspirated) and *kh* (aspirated). Another phonological difference is that Mangghuer is non-tonal, although Dwyer (2008) finds evidence that tonal distinctions may be emerging.

The picture given by this data is not that of a language on the verge of dying out. Rather, at least when my primary data was compiled, Mangghuer was a language that strongly preserved its inherited characteristics, while abundantly enriching its lexicon via the addition of a very large number of Chinese borrowings and loanwords.

1.2 *Codeswitching and Borrowing*

I accept these definitions from Poplack: “we operationally define *borrowing* as the *process* of transferring (Clyne 2003) or incorporating (Thomason and Kafuman 1988) lexical items originating from one language into discourse of another” (Poplack 2018: 6). “*Codeswitching*... refers to alternation (cf. also Muysken (2000)) of stretches of one language with stretches of another, each retaining the morphology, syntax, and optionally the phonology” characteristic of that language (Poplack 2018: 7).

As I have shown elsewhere (Slater 2003a: 315–20), the Mangghuer community is highly bilingual in the local variety of Mandarin Chinese, and Mangghuer narrators sometimes use codeswitching as a means of providing a voice for a character. This sometimes (or perhaps always) has social connotations. For example, one story character overcomes a reputation for stupidity by memorizing seemingly random sentences in Chinese and repeating them at fortuitous moments, causing those around him to conclude that he is a deep and philosophical thinker (Chen et al. 2005: 225–31). The fact that the “stupid boy” says surprisingly profound things *in Chinese* can be no accident—this is the language of education and of high culture.

In contrast, a collection of sentence-level texts (Dpal-Idan-bkra-shis et al. 1996; see below for description) include no clear instances of codeswitching. This data was not produced in interactive contexts, and it thus provides additional evidence that codeswitching carries stylistic or social meaning.

In both data sources, many Mangghuer sentences contain individual, isolated Chinese words. Are these examples of single-word codeswitches? It is sometimes claimed that it is in principle impossible to distinguish between borrowing and codeswitching when a single lexical item is involved. However, Poplack and her associates (Poplack 2018) have convincingly demonstrated that this is generally not true. Instead, linguistic structure shows that speakers most commonly *borrow* single lexical items, rather than *codeswitching* them, even when the item in question is not a loanword in general use by the community. The key to this analysis is Poplack’s careful investigation of the morphosyntactic behavior of single words which are superficially candidates for either *codeswitching* or *borrowing* status—such words, Poplack shows, nearly always have the morphosyntactic properties expected of borrowings, not of codeswitches. This argument is developed in great detail throughout Poplack (2018).

An example of this in Mangghuer may be seen in (1), where the Chinese word *sasheng* ‘lasso’ appears in a clause that is otherwise entirely native Mongolic in origin (Chen et al. 2005: 17):

- (1) *Ting ge gan sasheng=nang he gher-gha,*
that do 3.SG lasso=REFLPOSS take go.out-CAUSE
Then she took out her lasso,

It could be argued that *sasheng* represents a one-word codeswitch, rather than a borrowing, but in fact there is no evidence to suggest that it is. Instead, we have a purely Mangghuer environment, and even an enclitic postposition attached to the word in question. Poplack’s argument, based on bilingual

speech in many languages, seems to apply very nicely to Mangghuer. *Sasheng* is best treated as a borrowing, not an instance of codeswitching.

Speakers often employ a strategy that Poplack calls *nonce borrowing*—one-time use of a foreign word, which may very well never re-appear as a borrowing in anyone’s speech. Indeed, Poplack’s work shows that the vast majority of nonce borrowings in fact never do spread widely in the speech community to become loanwords (see especially Poplack 2018: 122-140 and also below).

A nonce borrowing, Poplack shows, is in fact typically a borrowing, not a one-word codeswitch. And as Thomason (2001: 68) points out, any word borrowed even once has the potential to become a community-accepted borrowing: “[T]he only difference between the temporary and the permanent importations is social, not strictly linguistic: once a feature occurs once in someone’s version of Japanese, even just once, it can and will turn into a borrowing if it becomes frequent and if it is also used by other speakers.” We might, in fact, see nonce borrowings as proposals made by an individual speaker to the language community: “Here is a word we could add to our lexicon, if others agree.”

The dataset employed here is much too small for us to evaluate whether such borrowing proposals have actually been accepted by the community or not. What we can see, however, is that even in a small corpus, there is evidence that borrowings have a range of statuses in the usage of individuals and the community. Some are quite restricted, some are used more consistently by an individual, and some appear to be more generally accepted.

1.3 *The Status of Borrowings*

One possible path for a borrowed word is that it could replace an inherited synonym. In fact, in some areas of the Mangghuer lexicon we do find Chinese loans that have replaced previous vocabulary. For example, the numeral system of Mangghuer is almost entirely Chinese; borrowings have replaced the inherited terms.¹ In this paper, though, I examine words which have not yet replaced existing vocabulary, but which instead are used alongside synonymous existing words.

Poplack (2018:43-4) suggests that borrowings can be located along a status continuum. I have already mentioned *nonce borrowings*, which are words borrowed by an individual speaker in a given speech situation, and which never recur in the speech of that person or others. These are “one off” borrowings, and as I have already noted, Poplack makes a convincing case that this is normally an activity of borrowing, not of codeswitching.

Beyond nonce borrowings, some words become more established in the receptor language, and Poplack has identified categories to describe their status. Because we are working here with a small corpus, we do not have enough tokens to enable fine-grained distinctions, but a couple of Poplack’s other categories are relevant to the evidence we will see here.

Some borrowings are like nonce borrowings in that they occur only in the speech of one individual, but that individual uses them more often than just once. Poplack (2018: 43) refers to these as “idiosyncratic” borrowings.

Borrowings found in the speech of more than 10 speakers are referred to as “widespread” (Poplack 2018:43), and although my data represents fewer than 10 speakers in total, there is still evidence of something resembling widespread occurrence of certain borrowings.

¹ Mangghuer still uses forms of the Mongolic words for ‘one’ and ‘two’, mostly for grammatical functions.

Poplack, working with French-English bilinguals in Canada, also has access to extensive documentary evidence. She refers to borrowings that appear, for example, in published lexicons with the status “attested” or “bona fide loanwords” (Poplack 2018: 6); indeed, Poplack reserves the term *loanword* for items which are thus attested, or which show evidence of very widespread use across the community.

Documentation of Mangghuer is quite limited, but we have access to a glossary which does recognize a lot of synonymy (see Section 1.5, below). And in addition, the compilers of the folktales (Chen et al. 2005) sometimes commented metalinguistically on the status of borrowings. Therefore, I will also present some evidence of these various forms of attestation here, as clues to how established some borrowings are in the Mangghuer community.

1.4 Synonymy

When I use the term *synonymy* in this paper, I am generally not referring to an absolute identity of senses, in which two words correspond to precisely identical regions of semantic space. Rather, I typically refer to the situation in which words overlap to some considerable degree, so that in some cases they may be used interchangeably, but they most likely also have some non-shared senses.

I have previously discussed some aspects of the borrowing of Chinese words into Mangghuer, and in one passage (Slater 2003a: 315) I claimed “for the meaning ‘wolf’ a Mangghuer speaker can equally well use the Mongolic term *chuna* or the Chinese borrowing *lang*.” If only the situation were that simple! But it is not. In fact, as we will see in Section 2.4, *lang* is used only in one limited situation in my textual data, and when the speaker chooses to use it, more than pure semantic reference is clearly being communicated.

Another point to be made concerns the semantic relationship of synonymy when two different languages are under discussion. Murphy (2016: 440) points out that the term *synonymy* is not typically applied to words from different languages, but only to words within a single language: “[T]ranslational equivalents are not usually called *synonyms*.” But as I have already noted, Poplack (2018) has made a convincing case that the vast majority of occurrences of foreign words in the speech of bilinguals are instances of borrowing, not codeswitching. Therefore, we need to think in terms of synonymy when we see individual Chinese words appearing in the speech of Mangghuer bilinguals. We might be observing anything from *nonce synonymy* (to extend Poplack’s terminology) to something considerably less ephemeral—perhaps even exact synonymy with perfect substitutability—but we must grant speakers the right to introduce synonymy at whatever level of permanence they intend.

The English-Mangghuer glossary (Dpal-ldan-bkra-shis et al. 1996: 203-62) which provides part of the data for this study (see below) gives some insight into the view of several Mangghuer speakers about the status of Chinese borrowings, alongside semantically close Mongolic words. Of the 2108 total entries that include Mangghuer items, as many as 10% include both an inherited Mongolic and a Chinese-derived translation of the English headword.² In some cases these might be translations of two different senses of the headword, but it appears that many represent at least partial synonymy. For example, the entry for ‘breakfast’ includes both the Mongolic *shidiekuni* ‘things

² I do not give an exact number because I am not sure of the etymological origin of some of translations in the glossary.

of the morning' and *zaohuan*, from Chinese 早饭 'morning meal' (Standard Mandarin *zaofan*³). Similarly, for 'now' we find a Mongolic word *du* and a Mongolic + Chinese compound *nishijie*, where *ni* is Mongolic for 'this' and *shijie* 时节 is a Chinese expression for 'time'.

When reflecting on the vocabulary of Mangghuer, the collators of this glossary seem to have been quite open to recognizing various types of synonymy. We may accept this as one kind of attestation that a particular borrowed synonym has achieved some level of community acceptance.

1.5 Data

Data for this study comes primarily from two sources, both representing the Mangghuer language of the early 1990s. This paper therefore gives a picture of the language almost thirty years ago; a follow up study with contemporary data is clearly called for, in order to clarify the situation of the language today.

Chen et al. (2005) is a collection of 23 folktales told by several different speakers. Most stories were transcribed from oral performances, though a few were originally told in Chinese and then later produced as written texts in Mangghuer. The difference in production will be noted when it is relevant to the discussion here. I will refer to this collection as "the folktales".

Dpal-ldan-bkra-shis et al. (1996), a monograph entitled *Language Materials of China's Monguor Minority: Huzhu Mongghul and Minhe Mangghuer*, contains two types of data relevant to this study. First, it includes three collections of sentence-length Mangghuer data: "Simple conversation", "301 Useful Sentences" and "Minhe Mangghuer 900". These materials were largely inspired by language-learning resources which the compilers were familiar with. However, the content was not simply borrowed or translated from those teaching materials, but rather was significantly adapted to make it relevant to the Monguor community. Together, these three collections constitute forty-eight pages of Mangghuer data, often in the form of question-answer pairs, short dialogs, or mini-narrations. I will refer to these collections as "the *Language Materials* texts".

Second, the *Language Materials* monograph includes an English-Mangghuer glossary of 2108 items. The compilers of the glossary often include multiple Mangghuer equivalents for an English entry (see below for discussion). This represents a metalinguistic evaluation of the status of the many Chinese-origin forms which appear in the work. I will refer to this as "the glossary".⁴

The content of the folktales, on the one hand, and the *Language Materials* texts, on the other hand, is quite different in many ways. The folktales involve a lot of supernatural creatures, anthropomorphized animals as main characters, vocabulary for warfare, some religious language, and other features characteristic of their genre. They also include many instances of reported speech. In contrast, the *Language Materials* texts generally focus on daily events in modern life, such as daily greetings or describing going to school, getting a job, or learning English. They do not include long connected narratives, and contain little reported speech. However, there is quite a lot of overlap in vocabulary between the two sources.

³ Initial /f-/ alternates with /hu-/ in Mangghuer.

⁴ As the title of the monograph suggests, it also contains quite a lot of data from Mongghul. The glossary, for example, normally lists a Mongghul translation first, followed by a Mangghuer one, though for some entries one variety or the other is missing. I am concerned here only with the Mangghuer elements included in this work.

I need to say a few words about the way in which the materials were collected, because these two publications are in fact related. They were the efforts of a research team that worked together, with various configurations of collaborators, in the early 1990s in the Qinghai provincial capital Xining. This group included Mangghuer speakers Zhu Yongzhong, Wang Xianzhen, Hu Ping and Hu Jun. They collected many examples of natural Mangghuer language use, and during the same period also produced the Mangghuer sections of Dpal-ldan-bkra-shis et al. (1996). Although the folktales included in the Chen et al. (2005) volume were not published until a decade later, they were actually collected and transcribed during the same time period, by some of the same investigators. Therefore, it is probable that the patterns of language use which can be observed in the folktale texts helped to influence the choices of words that were included in the glossary, published earlier.

I also want to point out that, although I am listed among the authors of both Dpal-ldan-bkra-shis et al. (1996) and Chen et al. (2005), I was not involved in the selection of any textual materials or lexical items for inclusion in either work. My contribution was limited to linguistic analysis (helping to standardize the spelling system and providing interlinear glossing) and to helping to improve the English translations. The Mangghuer content selection was made entirely by the Mangghuer-speaking collaborators.

This corpus of Mangghuer materials is quite small; it has nothing like the scope of the datasets relied on by Poplack and her associates (Poplack 2018). Furthermore, I have not attempted an exhaustive compilation of Chinese morphemes in these texts which serve as synonyms for existing Mangghuer vocabulary. However, we will see that even across this relatively modest corpus, a selection of just over two dozen Chinese morphemes gives evidence that Mangghuer speakers are actively borrowing synonyms for several different purposes, and that quite a few such words give evidence that they are becoming, or have already become, well-established in the Mangghuer lexicon.

As I have said, the glossary of the *Language Materials* provides a window on some speakers' reflective evaluations of the status of various Chinese forms in the overall Mangghuer system. In addition to this, there are a few other bits of metalinguistic evaluation scattered throughout the data, and I will point those out when they are relevant.

Spelling practices were still in flux at the time that some of this data was published, with the result that many of the words I will discuss here are spelled inconsistently in the data sources. I will note this but the inconsistencies do not affect the analysis at any point.

There are of course many things which cannot be recovered from the printed data, which might in fact have influenced what is recorded. For example, might the high status of Chinese in the Mangghuer context have influenced choices made by the glossary compilers? Or might the compilers have underrepresented Chinese borrowings, in an effort to show Mangghuer in a particular light? We will confine ourselves here to things which do seem to be apparent in the data, leaving these other questions for future research.

2 Bound Synonyms

In this Section we look at eleven Chinese morphemes which appear as bound forms within borrowed words, compounds, or fixed expressions. Speakers often give clear evidence that these forms are synonymous with existing Mangghuer lexical items, but because these bound forms do not ever appear as independent words, they cannot be directly substituted for their non-borrowed

counterparts. Chinese makes extensive use of compounding, so the phenomena described in this Section are very common in Mangghuer.

Many of the examples we will consider are nouns, and typically the Chinese synonym appears in an expression which has a hyponymic relationship to an established word: for example, the inherited Mongolic word *suzu* is the basic term for ‘water’, and the Chinese borrowing *shui* sometimes appears within words for types or conditions of water, such as *baikaishui* (白开水) ‘boiled drinking water’ and *gongshui* (滚水) ‘boiling water’.

Another type of synonymy relationship can be found in onomastic practices. Many names include morphemes synonymous with existing Mangghuer ones: we will consider examples from the names of some folk story characters and (polite) forms of address, as well as examples involving toponyms, such as the place name *Shuimogou* ‘Water Mill Valley’, an entirely Chinese name which includes *shui* ‘water’, one of the morphemes we will examine.

In her study of English borrowings in the speech of Canadian French-English bilinguals, Poplack (2018:41-2) notes that she excluded place names because “it is unclear whether proper nouns participate in the same processes of integration as common nouns.” We will see here that, in fact, bound synonyms in forms of address, names of institutions, and toponyms do behave very similarly to bound synonyms in other types of compounds.

Personal names for humans also occur in my data sets (especially in the *Language Materials*), but for the most part I do not examine them here. The reason is that neither translations nor Chinese characters are provided for most names, so I do not have any way of recovering their internal semantic components.

In the remainder of this Section, we will examine individual Chinese forms to see how they function in discourse. Each morpheme is presented in a consistent format. I first illustrate the contexts in which the borrowed morpheme and an existing word of similar meaning appear (or do not appear). I then comment on whether the evidence in our corpus suggests that this particular morpheme has become established as a bound synonym in the Mangghuer lexicon. A form that appears only within nonce borrowings probably has quite a different status than one which appears widely, in multiple well-attested borrowings and in the speech of multiple speakers.

Each bound morpheme is discussed separately, except that in Section 2.4 I consider two morphemes together, because they appear together in the data.

In Section 2.11, the items treated in the various subsections are summarized in Table 1, along with some discussion of patterns that emerge across the data.

2.1 *Sheng* ‘rope, cord’

The Mongolic term *diesi* is a basic-level term for ‘rope’ or ‘cord’. The Chinese morpheme *sheng* 绳 appears in a number of compounds.

2.1.1 *Folktales*

The Mongolic term *diesi* appears twice, with the generic meaning ‘rope’ or ‘cord’.

When specification of the type of rope or cord is called for, narrators use Chinese borrowings: *tiesheng* 铁绳 ‘chain (lit. iron-rope)’; *sasheng* 撒绳 ‘lasso (lit. throw-rope)’ (see example (1), above); and *caosheng* 草绳 ‘grass rope’. *Sasheng* appears once. *Tiesheng* and *caosheng* are used by a different narrator

in contrast to one another in a single narrative episode (“bring a grass rope or an iron chain”), with *tiesheng* appearing once and *caosheng* appearing four times within the space of just five consecutive sentences (Chen et al. 2005: 111-12).

All three of these terms may therefore represent nonce borrowings, though since *caosheng* appears multiple times, albeit all in the same context, it might be considered to have idiosyncratic status.

2.1.2 *Language Materials: Texts*

I did not find any occurrences of either *diesi* or *sheng* in the *Language Materials* texts.

2.1.3 *Glossary*

The glossary has *diesi* for ‘cord’, but not *sheng*; however, the glossary entries for both ‘reins’ and ‘tether’ have *jiangsheng* 缰绳 ‘reins, (lit. bridle-cord)’.

2.1.4 *Discussion*

Both the glossary and the folktales suggest that *diesi* is the generic term, and *sheng* appears only as a bound element within compounds describing types of cords—that is, terms which have a hyponymic relationship to *diesi*. Because there are several such words attested in various contexts within the data, *sheng* can be treated as a bound synonym of *diesi*.

2.2 *Huang ‘house’*

Mongolic *ger* means ‘house’, ‘home’ or sometimes ‘room’. Chinese *huang* 房 (MSM *fang*) appears several times with similar meanings.

2.2.1 *Folktales*

Mongolic *ger* ‘house’ appears more than 90 times in the folktales.

Chinese *huang* ‘house’ appears once in the expression *dahuang* 大房 ‘large house’, referring to the main building of a household compound (Chen et al. 2005: 161-2). One page later, in the concluding moral of this story, the narrator refers again to this same part of the household compound, this time using the Mongolic translational equivalent *shuguo ger*. The two occurrences are given as (2a) and (2b):

(2)

- a *muni kelie=ni kerli [da-huang=ni di bosighuo] duoruo dari ge.*
1.SG.GEN tongue=ACC want big-house=GEN door threshold under bury do
(instead), ask for my tongue and bury (it) under the threshold of the big house door.

[13 lines omitted]

b *shuguai di ma [shuguo ger=ni di bosighuo]=du kong bai sao*
 big door and big house=GEN door threshold=DAT person NEG sit

ge-ku-ni yanyin ang=ji bang?
 QUOTE-IMPERF-NOMLZR reason where=DIR OBJ.COP

What is the reason that people are told not to sit on the thresholds of the gate and the big house door?

Notice that the bracketed noun phrase containing this expression is identical in lines (2a) and (2b), except for the bolded pair *dahuang* and *shuguo ger*. Clearly, the storyteller has borrowed *dahuang* as a synonym for *shuguo ger*.

Another expression, *banhuangzi* 板房子⁵ ‘jail (lit. board house)’ appears six times in the folktales. It is found in two stories, both by the same writer. These are the stories that were originally told in Chinese, and then produced in written format in Mangghuer. Therefore, it is possible that this word was used in the original Chinese version of the story, which could have motivated its borrowing for the Mangghuer retelling.

The word *zhang’huang* 战房 ‘battle tent’ appears twice in one of these same stories.

2.2.2 Language Materials: Texts

Ger appears dozens of times.

I did not find any instances of *huang* in the *Language Materials* texts.

2.2.3 Glossary

The entry for ‘house’ gives only the Mangghuer translation *ger*.

The glossary also contains an entry for ‘prison’, with the Mangghuer translation *banhuangzi*. This is the same word that appears in the folktales, and this suggests that word is not an idiosyncratic borrowing, used only by the narrator of that one story. Even if the glossary compilers included the word because of its appearance in the folktales that they were concurrently editing, their inclusion of it in the glossary probably constitutes their recognition of it as a borrowing acceptable to the community.

2.2.4 Discussion

Huang appears only a few times, and many of those occurrences may be nonce borrowings. On the other hand, its appearance in the word *dahuang* is significant in that it is a typically feature of household architecture that each countryside compound has a main or primary building, so this is a culturally salient term when it does appear. The word *banhuanzi* ‘prison’ seems to be well established, but we do not know if *huang* in this expression is transparently synonymous with *ger* in speakers’ minds. So although *huang* is a candidate for the status of bound synonym, this status is not certain.

⁵ Zhang and Zhu (1987:186) and Li and Zhang (1998) both give the characters 班房 for the word *banfang* ‘prison’ in Xining Chinese dialect. The glossary editors (Dpal-Idan-bkra-shis 1996:244) suggest 板 for the first character.

2.3 *Da* 'big'

The Mongolic word *shuguo* 'big' is common. Chinese *da* 大 'big' appears only as a bound form.

2.3.1 *Folktales*

Shuguo appears about 50 times in the folktales.

Da appears in only two specific contexts. One is the expression *dahuang*, cited just above, where it refers to the largest or most important building/room in a courtyard complex.

The other context in which *da* appears is the kinterm *dage* 大哥 'elder brother'. This appears in the name of the protagonist of one of the folktales, *Madage* 马大哥 'Elder Brother Horse', and also in another story when one animal addresses another animal of higher status, calling him *Hudage* 'Elder Brother Tiger'. The important social connotations of these terms are discussed in Sections 2.4 and 2.5.

2.3.2 *Language Materials: Texts*

Shuguo appears multiple times. I did not find any occurrences of *da*.

2.3.3 *Glossary*

The glossary entry for 'large' gives only the Mongolic form *shuguo*.

2.3.4 *Discussion*

The expression *dage* is important as a polite form of address (see the next two Sections), and this may give *da* some status as a bound synonym for *shuguo*. However, in all of our data it appears only in this borrowing and in the apparent nonce borrowing *dahuang* 'main house'.

2.4 *Lang* 'wolf' and *hu* 'tiger'

Mongolic *chuna* and Chinese *lang* 狼 are both used to mean 'wolf', but as I mentioned earlier, they are not simply interchangeable.

Chinese *hu* 虎 'tiger' exhibits the same behavior as does *lang* in my data, appearing as an alternative to Mongolic *bersi*.

Both *lang* and *hu* are only bound morphemes in my data—neither appears independently.

2.4.1 *Folktales*

Wolves are important creatures in our selections from the folktale genre, appearing in five of the stories, often as major characters. The vast majority of references are made with Mongolic *chuna*, which is used 34 times.

Tigers do not appear as frequently as wolves do, being found in only two stories, with the Mongolic form *bersi* appearing seven times in total.

In contrast, Chinese *lang* ‘wolf’ appears only twice, in one of the stories, and one of those instances is clearly codeswitching, not borrowing. Chinese *hu* ‘tiger’ appears only once, in the same episode of the same story. These occurrences are worthy of some attention, because they illustrate some sociolinguistic facts.

The following example gives the part of the story in which these forms appear (Chen et al. 2005: 176–8). This episode describes a conversation among the characters Wolf, Tiger, Rabbit and Fox. Irrelevant lines, mostly including the content of reported speech, are omitted, but I reproduce the original line numbering so that the position of the omitted lines is clear. The words for ‘wolf’ and ‘tiger’ are colored, with red indicating the Mongolic terms and blue indicating the Chinese terms.

- (3) 105 *Yi-tegher* *ber-ji* *bi-sa,*
 one-while become-IMPERF SUBJ.COP-COND
 After a little while,
- 106 *chuna* *ge* *ruo-ji* *ri-lang.*
 wolf SG.INDEF enter-IMPERF come-OBJ.IMPERF
 a wolf came in.
- 107 "*Langge* *lai-liao!*"
 Elder.Brother.Wolf come-PERF
 "Here comes (our) Elder Brother Wolf!" (Rabbit and Fox said).
- 109 *Yi-ge-tegher* *ber-sa,*
 one-CL-while become-COND
 After a while,
- 110 *bersi* *ge* *ruo-ji* *ri-jiang.*
 tiger SG.INDEF enter-IMPERF come-OBJ.PERF
 a tiger came in.
- 113 "*Hudage,*
 First.Brother.Tiger
 "First Brother Tiger,
- 114 *qi* *keli.*"
 2.SG say
 you speak.
- 116 *Bersi* *keli-ji* *ma,*
 tiger say-IMPERF PRT
 Tiger said,
- 117 "*Ai,*"
 EXCL
 "*Ai,*"

- 124 **Bersi** *keli hangbura-jiang.*
tiger say finish-OBJ.PERF
Tiger finished speaking.
- 126 “*Lang'erge,*
Second.Brother.Wolf
Second Brother Wolf,
- 127 *qi keli.*”
2.SG say
you speak," (Rabbit and Fox said).
- 128 **Chuna** *keli-ji,*
wolf say-IMPERF
Wolf said,

The clear pattern here is that the Mongolic terms *chuna* and *bersi* appear in narrative contexts, and the Chinese terms *lang* and *hu* are used as forms of address. Furthermore, the Chinese terms do not appear as independent words, but rather are combined with kinship terms, all of which include Chinese *ge* ‘elder brother’; these are all very polite forms of respect, which might be considered honorifics.

The first occurrence of *lang*, in line 107 of (3), is a clear instance of codeswitching. Here, the narrator uses the device of switching into the local Chinese dialect for an entire line. *Lang* in this sentence is not a borrowing.

The other two forms of address (lines 113 and 126) might also be codeswitching. Each occurs in a formula “Elder Brother X, you speak”, where “you speak” is entirely Mongolic, but the form of address is entirely Chinese and is minimally integrated into the Mongolic sentence, being set apart with a pause and not bearing any morphology such as case marking.

I said earlier that individual Chinese words should typically be treated as borrowings, rather than codeswitches. These examples may be exceptions to that principle. Perhaps forms of address in this kind of context could actually be single-word codeswitches. However, as we will see with some other onomastic expressions below, there do seem to be instances in which names like these are treated as borrowings.

2.4.2 *Language Materials: Texts*

Neither tigers nor wolves appear in the *Language Materials* texts.

2.4.3 *Glossary*

The entry for ‘wolf’ includes only Mongolic *chuna*, and the entry for ‘tiger’ includes only the Mongolic *bersi*.

2.4.4 Discussion

Lang ‘wolf’ and *hu* ‘tiger’ are used only by a single speaker, only as forms of address in reported speech. Although the context makes clear that they are synonymous with Mongolic *chuna* and *bersi*, there is no indication that either is in widespread use by the community, and in fact it is not even clear that the expressions they appear in are borrowings, rather than codeswitches. However, it is possible to consider these expressions nonce (or idiosyncratic) borrowings, which would qualify *lang* and *hu* as bound synonyms for *chuna* and *bersi*, employed for sociolinguistic purposes.

2.5 *Ma* ‘horse’

The Mongolic word *mori* is normally used for ‘horse’. The Chinese form *ma* 马 ‘horse’ appears within a number of different compounds.

2.5.1 Folktales

Horses appear in a number of the folktales, and 41 times the Mongolic word *mori* is used.

Like *lang* ‘wolf’ and *hu* ‘tiger’, *ma* ‘horse’ is a Chinese form that appears in a story character’s name. It also appears in the names of two different legendary horses, and in a number of other borrowings as well, most of which appear only a couple of times each.

One borrowed expression, *bin-ma-si* ‘soldiers-horses-PL’, appears twice in one story, referring collectively to the entire army of the story’s villain. *Bin* 兵 and *ma* 马 are both Chinese, but notice the Mongolic plural marker, the appearance of which suggests that this form is most likely being treated as a borrowing by the storyteller (but see note 12, below).

In another story, the Chinese expression *luomadengxiang* 骡马灯香 ‘mule-horse-lamp-incense’ is used twice to refer to copious offerings brought by a wealthy worshipper at a temple.

In the final episode of a third story, the villain, who is about to be punished, is asked if she would prefer a horse (the speaker uses “*mori*”) or a door. If she chooses the horse, we are told, she will experience *wumafengjiang*, (五马分 *jiang*),⁶ a Chinese expression meaning to be pulled apart by five horses (Chen et al. 2005:142). Here, *ma* appears only bound within a larger expression; *mori* is used alongside it as the synonymous generic word, showing that the meaning of *ma* in the borrowing is transparent.

Two other stories include supernatural horses which are referred to with Chinese expressions: the *Qianlima-er*⁷ 千里马儿 ‘thousand-li-horse-er’ and the *Beilongma* 白龙马 ‘white-dragon-horse’ (MSM *Bailongma*). Both of these horse names occur multiple times in their respective stories, which are among those originally told in Chinese and then re-told in written format in Mangghuer. In each story, though, the narrator also sometimes refers to the supernatural horse with the Mongolic translation equivalent *mori*. One such instance is shown in (4). Again, the original line numbering is retained:

⁶ The Standard Mandarin expression is *wumafenshi* (五马分尸). I am unsure why the Mangghuer expression differs from this, and do not know what character the syllable *jiang* corresponds to.

⁷ This word is pronounced *Qianlimer*. The common Northern Chinese nominal suffix *-er* carries no significant semantic value.

- (4) 30 *Shuangyang Gongzhu=ni Beilongma khaila-ji ai hangbura-lang.*
Shuangyang princess=GEN white.dragon.horse shout-IMPERF NEG finish-OBJ.IMPERF
Shuangyang Princess' White Dragon Horse neighed without stopping.

[four lines omitted]

- 35 *Shuangyang Gongzhu mali gher duoruo-ku kong=nang jiariji,*
Shuangyang princess quickly hand under-IMPERF person=REFLPOSS command
Shuangyang Princess quickly ordered her attendants,

- 36 *"Mali muni gongjian ma mori=ni jiula!"*
quickly 1.SG.GEN bow.and.arrow and horse=ACC be.ready
"Quickly prepare my bow and arrow and (my) horse!"

In this example, *Beilongma* and *mori* refer to the same horse, which shows that *ma* is treated as synonymous with *mori*.

The most interesting use of *ma* for ‘horse’ is in the story *Madage* 马大哥 ‘Elder Brother Horse’, in which the title character is named thus because his mother was a horse (*mori*), though he himself is a human.

Structurally, the name *Madage* is exactly like *Hudage* ‘First Brother Tiger’, which we saw above in a different story.⁸ In this story, however, there are no instances of direct address like the ones we saw for the Tiger and the Wolf. Instead, the narrator begins to refer to the character as *Madage* as soon as this person has discovered his equine origins. The narrator later also tells us that *Madage* and his two brothers (he is the leader among the three; see the next two Sections) “called themselves by these names”. So although this word is used like a proper name, its function as a polite form of address is obliquely referred to in the story.

2.5.2 Language Materials: Texts

The word *mori* appears three times in the *Language Materials* texts. *Ma* never appears.

2.5.3 Glossary

For the entry ‘horse’ only *mori* is given.

The bound form *ma* appears once in the glossary, under the word ‘horsefly’ (a subentry under ‘fly’), which is given as *dingmahur* 顶马 *hu* 儿⁹

⁸ Literally ‘X-big-elder.brother’, this form can be translated in a variety of ways, depending on whether there are additional elder brothers. In Chen et al. (2005) we did not translate it consistently.

⁹ I do not know what character *hu* represents.

2.5.4 Discussion

How well established is the bound borrowing *ma* in Mangghuer? Most of the expressions we have seen here seem very much like nonce borrowings, employed by a storyteller for one limited context, without much suggestion of permanence.

Two of the terms, though, do have wider currency than just the individual story in which they occur. One is *madage*: Characters very much like *Madage* ‘Elder Brother Horse’ occur in folk stories across the region. Stuart and Limusishiden (1994: 80-3) give an English translation of a similar story from Mongghul, in which the title character is “Black Horse Zhang”—also a young man whose mother was a horse. Similarly, Li and Luckert (1994: 111-18) give an English translation of a story collected among Hui people in Xinjiang, entitled “Horse Brother the Cultivator”. Here, too, the title character’s origin is associated with horses, and some episodes of this version are nearly identical to the Mangghuer story. The presence of such similar characters in different communities across the region suggests that variations on “Brother Horse” have currency in multiple communities, and that Mangghuer speakers quite likely encountered the story in Chinese originally.

The second well-known term is *Qianlima* ‘Thousand *Li* Horse’—this expression is lexicalized in Chinese and in fact appears in the standard Chinese dictionary on my desk.

Most of the specific examples of *ma* in borrowings seem unlikely to recur frequently, especially outside of folktale contexts. The glossary entry *dingmahur* ‘horsefly’, though, appears to be a term from daily life, and is likely to occur more broadly. And even though it is not clear that many of these specific borrowings are well established in the speech community, the overall picture we get of *ma* is that it appears in relatively large number of borrowed expressions, used by several different speakers. Therefore, it does seem that *ma* may be used fairly widely in the community as a bound synonym for *mori*.

2.6 *Shu* ‘tree’

The common word for ‘tree’ in Mangghuer is *beghe*, which is of uncertain origin, though its medial uvular stop probably rules out a Chinese origin.¹⁰ The Chinese morpheme *shu* 树 ‘tree’ appears as a bound form in two borrowings.

2.6.1 Folktales

Beghe appears 14 times in the folktales, and *shu* appears in only two expressions, one of which appears only once.

Madage ‘Elder Brother Horse’ has two younger brothers, also with fantastic origins: *Shu’erge* ‘Second Brother Tree’ and *Shitouge* ‘Brother Stone’ (see the next Section). Like their leader, the siblings also have Chinese names. *Shu’erge* 树二哥 ‘tree-second brother’ appears only in this single folktale, in which he is a major character, so the name is repeated several times in the story. He enters the story by emerging from beneath a tree (introduced as a *beghe*).

The other appearance of *shu* comes in a different story (by a different narrator), when one folktale character reveals to another that there is a *gushu* 古树 ‘ancient-tree’ in a particular location, which has mystical powers. The same tree is mentioned several times later in the story (when its

¹⁰ *Beghe* may be related to a word /bagan/ found in many Mongolian dialects, whose meaning is given by Sun (1990:132) as ‘column, pillar, pole, post’. Large tree trunks are used as beams in house construction.

powers are confirmed), and in all other instances it is referred to as a *beghe*. A very similar prediction and fulfillment occurs in a different story, and in that second story *beghe* is always used for the powerful tree.

2.6.2 *Language Materials: Texts*

Beghe appears a number of times in the Language Materials texts. *Shu* does not appear in these texts.

2.6.3 *Glossary*

For the meaning ‘tree’ the glossary lists only *beghe*.¹¹

2.6.4 *Discussion*

Shu appears in such limited contexts—only two borrowings, one of which appears only once—that it does not appear to have an established position as a synonym for *beghe*. However, it is used by two speakers, and the speaker who uses *gushu* ‘ancient tree’ does later use the translation equivalent *beghe*, showing that in this apparent nonce borrowing *shu* does clearly function as a nonce synonym of *beghe*.

Like Elder Brother Horse, the parallel accounts given by Stuart and Limusishiden (1994: 80–3) and Li and Luckert (1994: 111–118) also include a tree-related brother: in the Mongghul account it is ‘Second Brother Wood’; in the Xinjiang Hui account it is ‘Elm Brother’. Again, this suggests that *shu* may be familiar to the Mangghuer community as a character name, but the fantastic nature of the story and the character do not encourage us to imagine its frequent use in other contexts.

2.7 *Shi* ‘stone’

The common word for ‘stone’ in Mangghuer is *tashi*, a Turkic loanword.

Chinese *shi* 石 or *shitou* 石头 appear in some limited contexts. The two forms are synonymous in Chinese, with the difference being that the monosyllabic form generally appears only in compounds, while the bisyllabic form can be an independent word.

2.7.1 *Folktales*

Tashi appears in four different folktales, a total of six times.

There are two different expressions containing Chinese *shi* or *shitou* in the folktales, each occurring several times.

The youngest of *Madage*’s brothers is *Shitouge* 石头哥 ‘stone-elder brother’, with the bisyllabic *shitou* for ‘stone’. Just as the ‘tree’ character emerges from beneath a (Mongolic) *beghe* before

¹¹ The *Language Materials*, including the glossary, typically spell this word *beg* or *be*. The orthography was unsettled at the time the collection was assembled, but this variation might also represent dialectal differences. When I did fieldwork in the mid-1990s, I had the impression that for some speakers uvular *gb* was in the process of merging with velar *g*; but I have no systematic data to support this impression.

receiving a (Chinese) name ‘Brother *Shu*’, Brother Stone emerges from under a *tashi* and then is given the Chinese name ‘*Brother Shitou*’. This name is used several times in this story, but *shitou* never appears anywhere else in the folktales.

The other Chinese borrowing is *shiban* 石板 ‘stone-slab’, which refers only to large flat stones and thus has a hyponymic relationship to *tashi*, which represents the generic category. *Shiban* appears five times in one story and once in a different story. The two stories were told by the same speaker, but one was transcribed directly from a recording, while the other was recorded only by means of written notes and later retold by a different researcher. Therefore, we cannot tell if *shiban* is an idiosyncratic borrowing or one that is used by multiple speakers.

Although *shitou* is an independent word in Chinese, in our small dataset it appears only in combination with *ge* ‘elder brother’. So both *shi* and *shitou* seem to qualify as bound synonyms of *tashi*, based on these limited occurrences.

2.7.2 Language Materials: Texts

Only *tashi* appears in the Language Materials.

2.7.3 Glossary

The glossary gives only *tashi* for ‘stone’.

2.7.4 Discussion

Chinese *shi* or *shitou* appear in both onomastic and hyponymic contexts as synonyms of *tashi*. The limited occurrences of *shi* and *shitou* do not provide convincing evidence, but the data is consistent with the claim that they are not well established as bound synonyms for *tashi*; they could, however, be significantly more widespread.

2.8 Ren ‘person’ or ‘man’

Chinese *ren* 人 ‘person’ appears in many compounds and fixed expressions, including some that seem to function as names in individual stories. The Mongolic word *kong* is the generic term.

2.8.1 Folktales

Mongolic *kong* ‘person’ appears over 200 times in the folktales.

Zhurenjia 主人家 ‘master’ appears 5 times, and is used in three different stories by two different speakers.

Lieren 猎人 ‘hunter’ appears 15 times, all in the same story. The hunter is a character in the story, and *Lieren* sometimes is treated like a proper name.

Renxun 人熊 ‘human-bear’ (MSM *renxiong*) appears 4 times in one story; it refers to a character and sometimes behaves like a proper name.

Xianren 先人 ‘ancestor’ appears once. It refers to a character who was mentioned in the previous line of the story as *yige bayang kong* ‘a rich man’. Although these full expressions are not

translation equivalents, it does appear that the sense ‘man’ may be common between the two expressions.

Renyan 人员 ‘population’ (MSM *renyuan*) appears once.

Jiaren 家人 ‘servants’ (lit: ‘home-people’) appears once. This word is combined with three Mongolic morphemes, appearing in the form *jiaren-si=du=nang* ‘servants-PL=DAT=REFLPOSS’. (See footnote 13, just below, for a comment on the status of *-si*.)

Nianqingren 年青人 ‘young person’ (MSM *nianqingren*) appears once.

All seven of the examples of *ren* we have seen so far are noun compounds, referring to specific types of people. There is one other expression which occurs twice in the folktales, used by two different storytellers. This expression is *yiren* 一人 ‘one person’, which means ‘each person individually’, as we see in (5) (Chen et al. 2005:133):

- (5) *San-ge=la* *yi-ren* *diger* *ge* *di-jiang*.
 three-CL=COLL one-person little.bit SG.INDEF eat-OBJ.PERF
 The three of them each ate a little bit.

2.8.2 Language Materials: Texts

Twice we find an expression that we have already seen in the folktales: *nianqingren*. In both of these examples, though, this word appears with the Mongolic plural morpheme *si*, in the form *nianqingrensi* (Dpal-ldan-bkra-shis et al. 1996: 12, 56).¹²

Another expression which we have already seen is *xianren* ‘ancestor’, which appears once in the form *xianren-si=du=nang* ‘ancestor-PL=DAT=REFLPOSS’, meaning ‘for their own ancestors’ (Dpal-ldan-bkra-shis et al. 1996:54). (Compare *jiaren-si=du=nang*, just above, which bears the same string of Mongolic grammatical morphemes.)

Ren also appears in the compound *xinren* 新人 ‘newlyweds’ (lit. ‘new-person’).

Finally, there is one toponym that contains *ren*: *Renmin Gongyuan* 人民公园 ‘People’s Park’; this name appears twice in the *Language Materials*.

2.8.3 Glossary

The glossary entry for ‘person’ includes only *kun*.¹³

2.8.4 Discussion

For the superordinate category ‘person’, we find only Mongolic *kong*, but there are many hyponyms which contain *ren*, and several of them are attested by multiple speakers or multiple

¹² In Slater (2003a:103) I argue that *si* is normally (but not always) a separate phonological word. Speakers, however, prefer to join it orthographically to the preceding word. This is relevant to the borrowing status of words which it occurs with; we cannot take the appearance of *si* with *nianqingren* as absolute proof that *nianqingren* is borrowed, because *si* is not a clear example of inflectional morphology. However, since *nianqingren* would not typically take a plural marker of any sort in Chinese, the fact *si* appears here does suggest that it is being treated as a borrowing, not as a single-word codeswitch. The same argument applies to *jiaren*, mentioned just above, and *xianren*, mentioned in the next paragraph.

¹³ The spelling of words with final nasals varies in the Mangghuer sources. *Kong* and *kun* are alternate spellings of the same word.

sources. The toponym *Renmin Gongyuan* ‘People’s Park’ is a standard feature of many Chinese cities and towns, and has widespread familiarity.

Therefore, it seems clear that *ren* is well-established as a bound synonym for *kong*, in widespread use across the community.

2.9 *Shui* ‘water’

The normal noun meaning ‘water’ is Mongolic *suzu*; Chinese *shui* 水 appears as a bound form in a few limited expressions.

2.9.1 *Folktales*

Suzu appears 60 times in the folktales.

Shui appears in four different expressions.

One speaker uses the compound *gongshui* 滚水 ‘boiled water (MSM *gunshui*)’ once each in two different stories. The same speaker uses *kaishui* 开水 ‘boiled water’ once in one of those same stories. Another speaker uses *baikashui* 白开水 ‘boiled water’ (a variant for *kaishui*) once.

A third speaker refers to a place *Shuimogou* 水磨沟 ‘Water Mill Valley’. This is in fact the name of a real place, a district of Urumqi in Xinjiang Province, but in the folktale context we cannot tell if that location is intended, or if the toponym is simply intended to evoke something exotic and far away. The name occurs only once and its meaning does not seem to have any significance in the story. It is not translated for us.

2.9.2 *Language Materials: Texts*

Suzu appears for the generic meaning ‘water’, which is present only twice in these texts. *Shui* appears only in the compound *shuihu* 水壶 ‘water pot, kettle’, which is used five times.

2.9.3 *Glossary*

The entry for ‘water’ lists *suzu*, and does not include any forms containing *shui*.

2.9.4 *Discussion*

Baikashui and its variant *kaishui* are very common terms in modern Chinese life, as is *shuihu*. It seems likely that these would be established in the community’s shared lexicon, and our data gives no evidence of competing Mongolic translation equivalents.

Shuimogou as a toponym could also be an item that has some familiarity in the community, as it refers to an actual place that Mangghuer speakers might have some experience with. But our data is so limited that this can only be a hypothesis to be confirmed or disconfirmed, based on the judgement of Mangghuer speakers.

2.10 *Lu* ‘road’

Mongolic *mer* is the typical word for ‘road’ or ‘way’. Chinese *lu* 路 appears as a bound form in just three instances.

2.10.1 *Folktales*

Mer is the normal word for ‘road’ or ‘way’, appearing 22 times.

Lu appears twice in the folktales, both times in lexicalized expressions: *banlu* 半路 ‘halfway there (lit. half-road)’; and *guolu* 过路 ‘pass by (lit. cross-road)’. These expressions are used by two different speakers.

Even where *banlu* appears, it is combined with *mer*:

- (6) *Gan zhibao ban-lu mer=di=sa pudera-ji wula=di*
 3.SG could.only half-road road=LOC=ABL run-IMPERF mountain=LOC
- bai=nang he-la xi-jiang.*
 shoe=REFLPOSS take-PURP go-OBJ.PERF
 Halfway (down) the road, he had to go back to get his shoes on the mountain.

This is not an example of a translation equivalent; rather, the two forms combine into a single expression. *Mer* has its full semantic meaning here, while *banlu* expresses an (approximate) measure of distance; it is not at all clear that this borrowing is functioning as a synonym for the existing word.

2.10.2 *Language Materials: Texts*

Mer appears a handful of times.

Lu appears only once, in a consecutive pair of sentences (Dpal-ldan-bkra-shis et al. 1996: 45) which show a contrast between *lu* and *mer*:

- (7) 526 *Yi-tian=du, bi Tongren-lu=sa baoji ri-kong=du,*
 One-day=DAT 1.SG Tongren-road=ABL go.down-IMPERF come-IMPERF=DAT
- sanser danang banla-ba.*
 slip after fall-SUBJ.PERF
 One day while I was coming down Tongren Road, I slipped and fell.
- 527 *Kuabao-ku dongxi-si mer chebie si-gha bura-jiang.*
 package-IMPERF thing-PL road bank spread-CAUSE finish-OBJ.PERF
 My packages spilled all over the sidewalk (lit. ‘road bank’).

Here we find *lu* as a bound element in the toponym *Tongren Lu* 同仁路 (a street named for the city of Tongren, located in Qinghai Province). In contrast, reference to the road as a physical location in line 527 uses *mer*.

2.10.3 Glossary

The glossary includes no entry for ‘road’, but ‘way’ is given only as *mar*.¹⁴

2.10.4 Discussion

Like many of the bound forms we have seen here, *lu* appears only a few times. Its folktale occurrences may qualify as nonce borrowings, and *lu* may not have its full semantic meaning in either case. In the toponym *Tongren Lu*, however, *lu* does clearly have its full meaning; and as road names containing *lu* are ubiquitous in Chinese towns and cities, *lu* almost certainly enjoys widespread usage in names of this sort. Therefore, *lu* should be considered a bound synonym of *mer*, even if it turns out to be limited to the context of names of roads.

2.11 Summary and Discussion

The bound items we have seen in this section are summarized in Table 1.

bound synonym	appears in multiple borrowings	appears in borrowings used by multiple speakers	appears in forms of address	appears in culturally important terms	translation equivalent given
<i>sheng</i> ‘rope’	y	y			
<i>huang</i> ‘house’	y	y		y	y
<i>da</i> ‘big’	y	y	y		y
<i>lang</i> ‘wolf’	y		y		y
<i>hu</i> ‘tiger’	y		y		
<i>ma</i> ‘horse’	y	y		(y?)	y
<i>shu</i> ‘tree’	y	y			y
<i>shi</i> ‘stone’	y	(y?)			y
<i>ren</i> ‘person’	y	y		y	y
<i>shui</i> ‘water’	y	y		y	
<i>lu</i> ‘road’	y	y		y	

Table 1. Bound Synonyms

Most of the examples we have seen in this Section may be nonce borrowings. If each of the Chinese morphemes considered here only appeared now and then as an element in a nonce borrowing, then there might be nothing to say about their status vis-à-vis existing vocabulary.

¹⁴ The *Language Materials* are inconsistent in the spelling of *mer*, which is sometimes given as *mar* or *mur*.

Further, in some expressions, *lu* 'road' does not seem to carry its full semantic content; again, this would disqualify it in those contexts for *synonym* status.

However, by surveying several Chinese morphemes, we have been able to observe some patterns of recurrence that seem to go beyond nonce borrowing, and which suggest that these morphemes do have some status as part of the lexical resources of the language.

First of all, note that all of these morphemes occur in multiple borrowed words, not simply once. Some are much more common than others, but none of them occurs only in a single borrowed word or phrase. The overall picture we get is that many Chinese morphemes recur with some frequency as bound elements in Mangghuer speech.

Most of the individual forms presented here appear in borrowings that are used by multiple speakers, or appear in more than one data collection. These include *sheng* 'rope', *huang* 'house', *da* 'big', *ma* 'horse', *shu* 'tree', *ren* 'person', *shui* 'water', *lu* 'road' (but see above for caveats), and possibly *shi* 'stone'. The overall pattern suggests that bound forms may recur in the context of many different borrowings, and that any single one has the potential to be in widespread use across the speech community.

The use of Chinese borrowings in forms of address is another important fact which emerges in the folktale data. Although this phenomenon may be very close to codeswitching, it shows that speakers sometimes make use of expressions from Chinese to construct polite ways of addressing other individuals. Polite forms of address such as *dage* 'elder brother' may be reasonably expected to appear in speech outside of the folktale contexts we have seen here.

Several of the bound forms appear in borrowings that represent culturally important entities, and we may reasonably expect that these expressions will be well-established loanwords in the community. This especially includes some morphemes that appear in toponyms, but also includes items common to daily life. In this category we may list *huang* 'house', *shui* 'water', *ren* 'person', and *lu* 'road', as well as possibly *ma* 'horse' (in *dingmabur* 'horsefly').

Another important fact is that speakers often use these terms alongside their translational equivalents, letting us know that the full semantic content of these morphemes is intended, even though we have observed them only as bound forms. In fact, this is true of seven of the eleven items we have considered here: We have seen existing synonyms alternate with *da* 'big', *huang* 'house', *lang* 'wolf', *ma* 'horse', *shi/shitou* 'stone', *shu* 'tree', and *ren* 'person'.

The evidence given in this Section thus suggests that a category of *bound synonyms* exists among Chinese borrowings in Mangghuer. I will discuss the implications of this for Mangghuer lexicography in Section 4.2.

3 Free synonyms

In this Section I present fourteen Chinese words which appear alongside Mongolic synonyms. Some may be only nonce borrowings which have not achieved any level of community acceptance. Others, however, show evidence of having become established parts of the Mangghuer lexicon; in some cases this may be idiosyncratic, while in other cases we have evidence that multiple speakers have adopted the same synonym. In some cases the evidence suggests that one or more speakers may actually have adopted the Chinese borrowing as a replacement for its Mongolic synonym. In some cases, too, there is metalinguistic evidence: speakers report a synonymy

relationship when reflecting on the status of the words in question. The best established of these words may be considered loanwords.

The items considered in this Section are free words, although several of them also appear in bound forms like those that we saw in Section 2. They are in some sense in direct competition with the existing vocabulary, but as we have already seen in the discussion of terms of direct address, speakers sometimes seem to be accomplishing things beyond strict semantics when they use Chinese borrowings, and thus “competition” may not be the most appropriate term. Some of the usage phenomena that we observed in Section 2 seem also to help to explain the use some free synonyms in this Section.

As I did in Section 2, for each word here I describe its appearances in each of the data sources, and then discuss the significance of the evidence. In Section 3.12 I summarize these words in Table 2, and discuss patterns that can be observed in the behavior of these borrowings.

3.1 *Jin* ‘gold’ and *yin* ‘silver’

Usually Mongolic *ertang* is used for the meaning ‘gold’ and *miangu* for the meaning ‘silver’. Chinese *jin* 金 ‘gold’ and *yin* 银 ‘silver’ can be used as synonyms for the inherited words.

3.1.1 *Folktales*

Mongolic *ertang* appears in three folktales, from three different storytellers: once each in two stories, and ten times in one story which features gold as a major plot device.

Similarly, *miangu* also appears in three different stories: two transcribed from oral retellings by two different storytellers, and one originally told by one of those same storytellers but written down later on by a different speaker.

The Chinese borrowings *jin* and *yin* appear together as bound forms in two expressions: *jin-yin-caibao* 金银财宝 ‘treasures (lit. gold-silver-treasure)’, which one storyteller uses three times; and *jinpan yinpan* 金盘银盘 ‘gold plates and silver plates’, used once by a different storyteller.

The story that contains *jinpan yinpan* also includes *jin* and *yin* as independent borrowings, again used together as a pair. This speaker clearly treats *jin* and *yin* as synonyms of *ertang* and *miangu*, because he uses the terms interchangeably when describing the same state of affairs twice. First, in (8) we have the words of the character Rabbit (which are being surreptitiously overheard), in which the Mongolic words *ertang* and *miangu* appear (Chen et al. 2005: 180-1):

- (8) 165 *Ti=ni ger=du han ertang=ni gang liang-ge=ni bula ge-ser bang.*
 that=GEN house=DAT also gold=GEN vat two-CL=ACC bury do-PROG OBJ.COP
 In that one's (i.e. the rich man's) house two vats of gold are also buried.

- 166 *Ti-si kan a lai maidie-lang.*
 that-PL who also NEG know-OBJ.IMPERF
 No one knows about those.

167 *Miangu=ni yanbao san-ge gang=ni dari ge-ser bang.*
 silver=GEN yanbao three-CL vat=ACC bury do-PROG OBJ.COP
 Three vats of silver *yanbao* (coins) are buried (there also).

The character who overhears this speech makes use of the knowledge: 130 lines later, he is in the location that Rabbit was describing, and now muses on what he heard earlier (Chen et al. 2005: 190):

(9) 295 *"Taolai keli-sang-ni ni ger=du jin liang-gang,*
 rabbit say-PERF-NOMLZR this house=DAT gold two-vat
 "What Rabbit said (was that) in this house (there are) two vats of gold,

296 *yin san-gang bang ge-ji,"*
 silver three-vat OBJ.COP QUOTE-IMPERF
 (and) three vats of silver, like this,

Here, the speaker has substituted the Chinese borrowings *jin* and *yin*.

We can imagine multiple possible explanations for the variation here. For one thing, the expression *jinpan yinpan* (discussed just above) appears between these two events in the story, so it is possible that this has affected the form of the second reference to 'gold' and 'silver' here. It is also possible that the use of Chinese here is related to the fact that the second reference occurs in reported speech ("Rabbit said X"); perhaps the speaker is making use of an increased rate of borrowing as a quotative device similar to codeswitching. Another point is that these lines are so far apart in the story that the speaker may well have forgotten which words he used earlier.

Whatever the explanation, though, we see this individual speaker using *jin* as an exact synonym for *ertang*, and *yin* as an exact synonym for *miangu*. This happens only once, so we may consider this to be a case of nonce synonymy. But this speaker could make use of this synonymy in other contexts, as well, and perhaps he does.

3.1.2 Language Materials: Texts

Neither 'gold' nor 'silver' appear in any of the texts.

3.1.3 Glossary

The glossary gives only *artang*¹⁵ for 'gold'. *Jin* appears only in the entry for 'goldfish', which is the Chinese borrowing *jinyur* (see the next Section).

The entry for 'silver' lists only *miangu*.

¹⁵ *Ertang* and *artang* are simply spelling variants.

3.1.4 Discussion

Both *jin* and *yin* appear as bound synonyms in borrowed expressions, and one speaker uses them, once, as nonce synonyms. There is no evidence that either form is established in the speech of the community.

3.2 Yuer ‘fish’

For ‘fish’ we almost always find the Chinese borrowing *yuer* 鱼儿, but the Mongolic form *jiarghasi* is still present as an option for at least some speakers.

3.2.1 Folktales

Yuer appears only twice, in one folktale, for the meaning ‘fish’. *Jiarghasi* does not appear at all.

3.2.2 Language Materials: Texts

No words for ‘fish’ appear in the texts.

3.2.3 Glossary

The glossary entry for ‘fish’ includes only *yuer*.¹⁶ As I mentioned in the last Section, ‘goldfish’ also has an entry containing this form: *jinyuer*.

3.2.4 Discussion

Although the primary data sources do not include any variation for these terms, I include ‘fish’ here because I have seen synonymy attested in two other contexts.

In the very first elicitation session I did for Mangghuer, in July of 1994, the speaker (who was not involved in any of the publications cited here) gave me two different words for ‘fish’. Conducting the elicitation in Chinese, I asked for a Mangghuer word for *yu* 鱼. The speaker first gave *yuer*, which is a Northwest Mandarin dialectal version of the word I had used as my prompt. He then very quickly added a second word, *jiarghasi*.¹⁷

Recently I asked a different Mangghuer speaker about this word, and was told that the form *jiarghasi* is still recognized by many Mangghuer speakers, but that it is actively used only in one small area.

Therefore, some evidence suggests that these terms are both current in Mangghuer, and should be thought of as synonyms when speech of the entire language community is considered.

¹⁶ The glossary spelling is *yuri*.

¹⁷ My original transcription would suggest the spelling *zbuerghasi*, but transcription from the first day of elicitation is not to be given much more credence than a footnote’s worth.

3.3 Yanzi 'yard'

Mongolic *khuorang* typically occurs as a general term for 'yard'. Chinese *yan* 园 or *yanzi* 院子 (MSM: *yuan* and *yuanzi*) also has this meaning in some contexts.

Note that in Chinese, the monosyllabic form *yuan* is used in compounds and does not generally occur independently. As an independent word, the bisyllabic form *yuanzi* appears.

3.3.1 Folktales

Khuorang appears three times, all in one episode of a single story.

Yan appears as a bound synonym in borrowed terms for specific types of yards. *Huayan* 'garden' (lit. 'flower-yard') appears three times in one story and once in a story by a different storyteller. *Houyan* 'backyard' appears three times, in two different stories told by the same narrator.

The free form *yanzi* appears 5 times. Four of these are in the expression *cai yanzi* 菜园子 'vegetable garden', all in the same story.

The fifth occurrence of *yanzi* is produced by a different speaker in the expression *khuonuo yanzi*, which is a partial calque of *houyan*, and in fact occurs next to that expression in consecutive lines of one story, with identical reference:

(10) 83 *Du qi ti khuonuo yanzi=du wuji-la xi.*"
now 2.SG that back yard=DAT take.note-PURP go
"Now you go look in that backyard."

84 *Houyan=du xi-sa gan yi-ge hazi aguer yangmughang*
back.courtyard=DAT go-COND 3.SG one-CL blind daughter mill

harge-lang,

turn-OBJ.IMPERF

When (he) went to the backyard, (he saw) a blind girl turning a millstone, (Chen et al. 2005:128)

Here, Mongolic *khuonuo* and Chinese *hou* are synonyms with the meaning 'back' (this is one of the pairs that I do not discuss in this paper). We also see that bound *yan* in *houyan* is clearly semantically equivalent to free *yanzi* in the periphrastic expression.

3.3.2 Language Materials: Texts

*Khuoruang*¹⁸ appears twice in the texts, once translated 'yard' and once translated 'courtyard'.

Two compounds containing *yuan* appear. One of these, *huayuan*, is translated 'flower garden' and appears three times in one conversational exchange. The second appears in the toponym *Renmin Gongyuan* 'People's Park', which is mentioned twice in different parts of the texts.

¹⁸ The spelling in the *Language Materials* represents the etymology of this word, which is a compound of *khuori* 'enclosure' and *ruang* 'place'. Its original meaning, therefore, would have been very close to 'courtyard', and it may still indicate primarily enclosed spaces.

3.3.3 Glossary

The glossary editors make a sense distinction between *khuoruang* and *yanzi*.

The entry for ‘yard’ includes only *khuorang*.

The entry for ‘garden’ includes only *yanzi*.

There is also an entry for one special type of yard, ‘orchard’, which is *amula yanzi*, combining Mangghuer *amula* ‘fruit’¹⁹ with Chinese *yanzi*.

3.3.4 Discussion

In our limited data, *khuorang* and *yanzi* appear to be equally frequent. Alongside these free forms, the bound synonym *yan* appears in several compounds designating specific types of yards. These various forms seem to have significant overlap in meaning, but their senses may not be entirely coterminous.

The multiple uses by one speaker of *yanzi* in the expression *cai yanzi* ‘vegetable garden’ could be evidence that this form has been idiosyncratically borrowed by the speaker, but since all of the occurrences are in the same story it could just as well be that this is effectively a nonce borrowing, used only in this one narration. However, the fact that another storyteller also uses *yanzi* indicates that we should consider it to have some degree of community acceptance.

3.4 *Zuo* ‘left’, *you* ‘right’, and *jiazi* ‘shoulder’

The Mongolic words for ‘left’ and ‘right’ are *serghai* and *barang*, respectively. For ‘shoulder’, Mangghuer has the Mongolic word *dalū*.

The Chinese words *zuo* 左 ‘left’, *you* 右 ‘right’, and *jiazi* 胛子 ‘shoulder’ also appear once. I discuss these three words together because they appear together in the relevant folktale passage.²⁰

3.4.1 Folktales

In one folktale episode, a man is confronting a small bird, believing that one of his two wives may have magically transformed into this creature. He gives instructions to the bird, containing the Chinese words for ‘left’, ‘right’, and ‘shoulder’ (in blue). The immediately following narration uses Mongolic synonyms for ‘left’ and ‘shoulder’ (in red):

- (11) 81 “*qi muni mieshi-ku bieri bi-sa,*
 2.SG 1.SG.GEN first-IMPERF wife SUBJ.COP-COND
 if you are my former wife,

¹⁹ For ‘fruit’ the glossary gives both *alima* and *amula*.

²⁰ A couple of notes are in order here. Chinese *jia* (胛) and Mongolic *dalū* are both given in dictionaries as ‘shoulder blade,’ but both were translated simply as ‘shoulder’ by the *Language Materials* compilers. I am not certain that *serghai* is Mongolic (though it clearly is not Chinese), but tentatively I suggest that it is related to a form meaning ‘to be on one’s guard;’ see for example, Alashan Mongolian *sergel:lek* (Sun 1990:601). The connection is that one’s left arm is the defensive one. The borrowing *jiazi* might possibly derive, not from 胛子, but from an alternate pronunciation (or spelling) of 肩子, MSM *jianzi* ‘shoulder’.

82 *muni* *zuo* *jiazi=du* *bao;* *muni* *niebie-ku* *bieri*
1.SG.GEN left shoulder=DAT go.down 1.SG.GEN current-IMPERF wife

bi-sa,
SUBJ.COP-COND
land on my left shoulder; if (you) are my current wife,

83 *qi* *muni* *you* *jiazi=du* *bao."*
2.SG 1.SG.GEN right shoulder=DAT go.down
you land on my right shoulder."

84 *Dandan-di* *serghai* *dalu=du* *bao-jiang.*
precise-ADV left shoulder=DAT go.down-OBJ.PERF
(The bird) landed precisely on (his) left shoulder. (Chen et al. 2003:150)

None of these words appears anywhere else in the folktales. This is an example of nonce synonymy, and by use of translation equivalents the storyteller makes it very clear that *zuo jiazi* has a meaning identical to *serghai dalu*.

3.4.2 Language Materials: Texts

Dalu appears once for the meaning 'shoulder'.
Sergbai 'left' appears five times. *Barang* 'right' appears twice.

3.4.3 Glossary

The entry for 'shoulder' gives only *dalu*.
The entry for 'left (directional)' gives only *sarghai*.²¹ There is no entry for 'right'.

3.4.4 Discussion

It is interesting to note that the nonce borrowings for 'left', 'right', and 'shoulder' appear in reported speech, similarly to what we saw with borrowings for 'gold' and 'silver' (Section 3.1). This story is told by a different speaker than that one, and it is possible that both of them are making use of a strategy of increased borrowing when portraying the speech of a character.

3.5 Ge'er 'song'

Mongolic *dao* is often used for the meaning 'song' (it can also mean 'voice'). Alongside it, we also find Chinese *ge'er* 歌儿 'song'.

²¹ This is another instance of spelling variation involving the strings *-ar* and *-er*.

3.5.1 Folktales

The verb *daola* means ‘sing’, and it most often appears intransitively. Twice it appears with a direct object meaning ‘song’; once this object is *dao*, and once it is *ge'er*. These two instances are found in stories told by two different speakers; in neither case is any particular type of song indicated.

3.5.2 Language Materials: Texts

Here, too, *daola* usually appears intransitively, but there are two instances in which it has an object, with *dao* and *ge'er* each appearing once. In one example, *dao daola* is translated ‘sing wedding songs’. In another example, *ge'er daola* describes a grandmother ‘singing songs’ (unspecified for genre) for her grandchild. This may indicate that *dao* and *ge'er* are developing different senses, with *dao* specializing to indicate wedding songs.

3.5.3 Glossary

There is no entry for ‘song’ in the glossary. ‘Sing’ is glossed only with *daola*.

3.5.4 Discussion

Although the *Language Materials* texts might suggest that *dao* and *ge'er* have different senses, the folktale examples show that they are not systematically differentiated; *dao daola* in the folktale example refers to waiters in a restaurant singing songs for a customer, not to wedding songs.

Since *ge'er* ‘song’ appears in a folktale and also in the *Language Materials*, albeit only once each, it appears to have some level of community acceptance.

3.6 *Daibu* ‘doctor’

Two words for ‘doctor’ appear. *Manba*, a borrowing from Tibetan, is probably the older of the two. Alongside it we find Chinese *daibu* 大夫 ‘doctor (MSM *daifu*)’.

3.6.1 Folktales

Daibu and *manba* both appear only in one folktale. In this story, *daibu* appears four times, and *manba* appears only once. The storyteller clearly uses the two terms as exact synonyms, because they appear in nearly identical sentences, 28 lines apart (Chen et al. 2005: 206, 208):

- (12) 67 *Bayang jiaoduer manba ma lama-si=la bieqin ju-gha-lang.*
rich every.day doctor and lama-PL=INST illness see-CAUSE-OBJ.IMPERF
(and) every day Richman has doctors and lamas treat (her) illness.

[28 lines omitted]

95 Bayang jiaoduer *daihu* ma lama-si=la bieqin ju-lang ma,
rich every.day doctor and lama-PL=INST illness see-OBJ.IMPERF PRT
Richman daily has doctors and lamas treat (her) illness,

3.6.2 *Language Materials: Texts*

Here, the relative frequency of *daifu* and *manba* is reversed: *daifu* appears six times, while *manba* appears only once. Again, the two terms are located in close proximity to one another: *daifu* appears four times on the page immediately following the page that includes *manba* (Dpal-ldan-bkra-shis et al. 1996:23-4).

3.6.3 *Glossary*

The glossary gives only *manba* for ‘doctor’.²²

3.6.4 *Discussion*

Although the glossary compilers give only *manba*, the alternation of the two terms in our two different text collections would suggest that both terms are accepted in the Mangghuer speech community.

3.7 *Gongzuo* ‘work’

Mongolic *weilie* means ‘work’, and the verbal meaning ‘to work’ is constructed with the verb *ge* ‘do’: *Weilie ge*. Chinese *gongzuo* 工作 ‘work/job’ is used as a noun, and can also be combined with *ge* for the verbal meaning ‘to work’.

3.7.1 *Folktales*

Weilie is used six times, by five different storytellers, always with *ge* in the construction meaning ‘to work’. *Gongzuo* never appears.

3.7.2 *Language Materials: Texts*

Gongzuo appears 31 times, while *weilie* appears 14 times. Both words appear in nominal and verbal expressions.

The examples in (13) illustrate the two words in nominal usage, appearing only one page apart and both as objects of the verb *lu* ‘receive/get’ (Dpal-ldan-bkra-shis et al. 1996:41-2):

²² The glossary entry spells this word *mamba*; the occurrence in the text materials is spelled *manba*.

- (13) 421 *Qi hanshi shu=nang gezai-her mushi,*
 2.SG either book=REFLPOSS good-COMP read

puzhi=sa gezai gongzuo daige lu da-ni.
 other=ABL good work ever receive cannot-SUBJ.FUT
 Either you study harder or else you'll never be able to find a good job.

- 444 *Bi nin=du zhang ri danang, daiguo weilie ge*
 1.SG here=LOC just come after immediately work SG.INDEF

lu-ba.
 receive-SUBJ.PERF
 When I came here, I got a job right away.

Similarly, these examples of verbal usage occur in nearly identical expressions, only a few pages apart (Dpal-ldan-bkra-shis et al. 1996:37, 41):

- (14) 312 *Liweng=du weilie ge-sa mada bang, dui-lang sha?*
 Liweng=DAT work do-COND difficult OBJ.COP right-OBJ.IMPERF PRT
 Liweng is difficult to work for, right?

- 418 *Qi xue=du xi-ser gongzuo ge-sa mada bi a.*
 2.SG school=LOC go-PROG work do-COND difficult SUBJ.PERF PRT
 It must be difficult to work while you're going to school.

3.7.3 Glossary

The entries for 'work' and 'job' give only *weilie*, and this word also appears in several semantically related entries, such as 'labor', 'agriculture', 'service', and 'worker'.

Gongzuo does not appear in any glossary entries.

3.7.4 Discussion

Gongzuo does not appear in folktale literature, but is quite common in texts discussing modern culture. In contrast, *weilie* is found both in fictional contexts and in modern culture ones. The glossary compilers certainly favored *weilie*, and this is very interesting, in light of the fact that *gongzuo* is so common in the *Language Materials* texts.

This evidence makes clear that *gongzuo* has widespread community acceptance for inclusion in the Mangghuer lexicon as a synonym of *weilie*, even though it appears more frequently in some communicative situations than in others.

3.8 *Yehu* ‘fox’

Mongolic *hundughai* means ‘fox’, and we also find the Chinese borrowing *yehu* 野狐 ‘wild-fox’ as a synonym.

3.8.1 Folktales

Foxes are referred to in three stories. Two of the storytellers always use *hundughai*, which appears a total of 41 times. The third storyteller always uses *yehu*, which appears eight times.

3.8.2 Language Materials: Texts

No foxes are mentioned in these texts.

3.8.3 Glossary

The entry for ‘fox’ gives only *hundughai*.

3.8.4 Discussion

The storyteller who uses *yehu* does so very consistently, so this individual seems to have replaced *hundughai* with *yehu*—this appears to be an idiosyncratic borrowing. The two words are synonyms when we compare across the speech of different individuals.

3.9 *Laiguaguer* ‘frog’

Mongolic *mangdeghai* means ‘frog’. Two Chinese borrowings also appear: *laihama* 癞蛤蟆 and *laiguaguer* 癞呱呱儿. *Laihama* means ‘toad’ in Modern Standard Mandarin, but is used as a synonym for ‘frog’ in our Mangghuer texts. *Laiguaguer* is composed of the first syllable of *laihama*, plus an onomatopoeic expression *guagua-er*, which imitates a frog’s croaking.

3.9.1 Folktales

In one story, a frog is referred to once as *laihama*, and then later once as *mangdeghai*.

In a story by a different speaker, a frog character is referred to once as *laihama* and then twice, later, as *laiguaguer*.

The folktale compilers were aware of this variation. At one point when *laiguaguer* appears in the text, they provide a footnote informing us that this word, *laihama*, and *mangdeghai* are “dialect variants” (Chen et al. 2005:115).

3.9.2 Language Materials: Texts

There are no mentions of frogs in these texts.

3.9.3 Glossary

The glossary entry for ‘frog’ lists two translations: *mangdeghai*²³ and *laiguaguer*.

3.9.4 Discussion

Although there are few examples of any of these terms in the texts, we have two forms of attestation that the Chinese borrowings have widespread acceptance as synonyms of the Mongolic word: a footnote in the folktales and the inclusion of one of the borrowings alongside the Mongolic word in the glossary. In addition, the borrowings are used by two different storytellers. They thus appear to qualify as community-wide loanwords.

3.10 *Zhuo* ‘wear’

Chinese 着 ‘wear (clothes)’ appears a few times, alongside the Mongolic synonym *musi*. Both can have the inceptive sense ‘to put on’.

3.10.1 Folktales

Musi appears 13 times, with the objects ‘shoes’, ‘boots’, ‘pants’, and ‘clothes’.

Zhuo appears three times, once with the object ‘ring’, and twice in which semi-magical creatures have trouble ‘wearing’ or ‘putting on’ their outer layers: ‘skin’ and ‘feathers’. These three examples were produced by two different storytellers.

3.10.2 Language Materials: Texts

Musi appears 11 times. *Zhuo* appears only once, in reference to wearing a hat.

3.10.3 Glossary

The entry for ‘wear’ includes both *musi* and *zhuo*.²⁴

3.10.4 Discussion

Musi is much more common in the data than is *zhuo*, but both are used by multiple speakers. Furthermore, the glossary compilers considered *zhuo* well-established enough to attest it as a synonym for *musi*. It is possible, though, that the two words have different senses, as we do not have any clear examples of them referring to wearing the same item.

²³ This item is spelled *mandeghai* in the glossary.

²⁴ *Zhuo* is spelled *zho* in the glossary.

3.11 *Yichuer* ‘together’

The Chinese borrowing *yichuer* 一处儿²⁵ ‘together’ sometimes appears as an alternative to Mongolic *hangtu*. Both function adverbially.

3.11.1 *Folktales*

Hangtu appears three times, all in stories told by the same storyteller.

Yichuer also appears three times: twice in one story and once in a story by a different storyteller. These two users of *yichuer* are not the same person as the user of *hangtu*.

One of the occurrences of *yichuer* is marked with a footnote telling us that *hangtu* is a “dialect variant” of *yichuer* (Chen et al. 2005:110).

3.11.2 *Language Materials: Texts*

Hangtu appears 11 times.

Yichuer does not appear in these materials.

3.11.3 *Glossary*

The entry ‘together’ gives only the translation *hangtu*.

Two variant spellings of *yichuer* are found in the glossary: *yichur* appears as a translation for ‘along’, with no usage explanation, and *yichuar* is given as a translation for ‘link’ with a verbal sense.

3.11.4 *Discussion*

Hangtu and *yichuer* are present in equal numbers in the folktales, and the folktale compilers explicitly tell us that they consider these to be semantically equivalent, as well. Even with only a few examples, the evidence points to widespread community acceptance of *yichuer* in the Mangghuer lexicon.

3.12 *Summary and Discussion*

The independent Chinese borrowings that we have seen in this Section are summarized in Table 2.

²⁵ This expression comes from NW Chinese; Li and Zhang (1998:17) give the Xining Chinese version with the traditional characters 一處兒.

free synonym	also bound	nonce	some community acceptance	widespread acceptance	partial replacement	metalinguistic attestation
<i>jin</i> 'gold'	y	y				
<i>yin</i> 'silver'	y	y				
<i>yuer</i> 'fish'	y			y	in texts only	elicitation
<i>yanzi</i> 'yard'	y		y			
<i>zuo</i> 'left'		y				
<i>you</i> 'right'		y				
<i>jiazi</i> 'shoulder'		y				
<i>ge'er</i> 'song'			y			
<i>daihu</i> 'doctor'				y		
<i>gongzuo</i> 'work'				y		
<i>yehu</i> 'fox'					idiosyncratic	
<i>laiguaguer</i> 'frog'				y		text footnote, glossary
<i>zhuo</i> 'wear'				y		glossary
<i>yichuer</i> 'together'				y		text footnote

Table 2. Free Synonyms

As the Table shows, these fourteen borrowings exemplify a number of different statuses in terms of their acceptance by the speech community.

Four of the words that appear as independent borrowings also appear as bound forms: *jin* 'gold', *yin* 'silver', *yuer* 'fish' and *yan(zi)* 'yard' can all be found both bound and independently.

Some of the independent Chinese words may be nonce borrowings, used only once by one speaker, quite possibly never to recur in anyone's speech again. *Jin* 'gold' and *yin* 'silver' fit this profile, appearing only once as independent words. Similarly, *zuo jiazi* 'left shoulder' and *you jiazi* 'right shoulder' appear as a contrasting pair, again used only in one instance.

Other words seem to have a more established place in the lexicon.

Some words occur more than one time, and cannot be called nonce borrowings, but are still infrequent in our texts, so that we cannot determine from the texts alone how broadly they are used by individuals or the community. Among these, *yanzi* 'yard', and *ge'er* 'song' can only be considered to have limited community acceptance as borrowings, because we have no additional data about them.

Alongside the textual data, though, three of these rarely-appearing borrowings are also metalinguistically attested in various ways; reflective speakers inform us that these words are synonymous to their Mongolic counterparts. These include *laiguaguer/laihama* 'frog', *zhuo* 'wear', and *yichuer* 'together'. Each of these thus qualifies as a loanword which exists alongside its synonymous Mongolic counterpart.

A somewhat similar situation is presented by *yuer* ‘fish’, which appears in the texts to have completely replaced its Mongolic synonym, but which metalinguistic evidence shows is actually a synonym recognized by the entire community.

Yebu ‘fox’ presents a different situation: it has replaced its Mongolic counterpart entirely, but idiosyncratically in the speech of only one individual in our database.

Finally, two words appear so many times, or are used by enough different speakers, that it seems clear that they are quite well established as synonymous alternatives to their Mongolic counterparts. These are *daihu* ‘doctor’ and *gongzuo* ‘work’.

The overall picture here is that Mangghuer speakers employ Chinese synonyms for their existing vocabulary in a number of different situations. Nonce borrowing of synonyms seems fairly common, but many borrowed synonyms have clearly become established to varying degrees as part of the overall vocabulary of the language. Indeed, six of the fourteen words we have examined here give evidence, or one type or another, that they have achieved widespread community acceptance as loanwords.

A larger corpus would certainly help to clarify our questions regarding those words which appear to be used by only one speaker, or by just a handful, but this dataset suggests that individual words may be accepted for a variety of purposes, with different speakers making use of them to differing degrees and in differing situations.

4 Implications

In Section 2 we saw that Chinese morphemes which appear only as bound forms within compounds and fixed expressions can function as synonyms of existing Mangghuer lexical items. In Section 3 we saw that Mangghuer speakers also borrow independent words and employ them as synonyms for existing vocabulary.

In this final Section I suggest some implications of the borrowing patterns we have seen.

4.1 Processes of Borrowing

What is the relationship between the phenomena of bound and free borrowings? It is tempting to imagine that a morpheme that occurs very frequently as a bound form is a strong candidate to be borrowed as an independent word. In principle, a bilingual speaker in a bilingual community could borrow just about any Chinese word, but perhaps those Chinese morphemes that occur frequently as an element within borrowed compounds thereby receive extra prominence, and as a result tend to be borrowed as independent words, as well.

It seems to me, however, that the Mangghuer text data does not support this hypothesis. A couple of lines of reasoning can be drawn.

By far the most “productive” among the bound synonyms is *ren* ‘person’, which appears in a large number of borrowed expressions. But there is no evidence at all of this form appearing as a separate word to compete with Mongolic *kong*. If frequency were a significant contributing factor, *ren* ought perhaps to be borrowed independently alongside its many bound appearances.

Beyond the behavior of one individual morpheme, though, we can look for patterns across the data. If bound synonym frequency were a factor promoting independent borrowing, we would expect that the independent borrowings which we do observe should also tend to appear as bound

forms in borrowed compounds. In fact, we might expect to find that these forms tend to appear in a relatively large number of such compounds, and furthermore, that they would tend to appear in compounds which are full loanwords, or which are well-attested across the data. Such behavior would suggest that these forms were prominent in speakers' experience of Chinese borrowings *before* they became independent borrowings.

In fact, though, the data does not seem to support this idea. Of the fourteen total free borrowings included in this study, only four also appear as bound forms: *jin* 'gold', *yin* 'silver', *yuer* 'fish', and *yan* 'yard'. The first two of these seem to be only nonce borrowings, leaving only two that seem to have community acceptance as free borrowings and that also appear as bound forms. Furthermore, only one of those two (*yuer* 'fish') seems to have widespread acceptance, the other (*yanzi* 'yard') being used by only two speakers.

On the whole, then, it does not appear that frequent appearance as a bound synonym is typically a significant step on the path towards being borrowed as an independent synonym.

Another question we might consider is this: How does the integration of borrowed synonyms into the lexicon proceed over time? Although we have examined a small data set, representing one point in the history of Mangghuer, the borrowings we have seen do seem to suggest some possible patterns.

We have seen that speakers sometimes use a Chinese borrowing as an exact synonym for a Mangghuer word—for example, *jin* for *ertang* 'gold' and *yanzi* for *khuorang* 'yard'. We have also seen that different speakers may treat borrowed synonyms in idiosyncratic ways; one seems to have replaced *hundugbai* with *yebu* 'fox', while no single speaker uses both *hangtu* and *yichuer* 'together'. The free borrowings that are emerging as competitors for their native synonyms exhibit different patterns in the usage of different speakers. We cannot predict whether these synonyms will continue to coexist over the long term, or if one of each pair will disappear. If they do co-exist, they may undergo semantic differentiation, and so become not "competitors" but perhaps "collaborators" or "complementors". Our data suggests that whatever happens, it will probably involve a process of community negotiation, as the usage proposals made by various speakers compete when people interact with one another.

A much larger corpus is certainly required, along with extensive native speaker judgements, to capture such a process. Because the data reported here was gathered nearly three decades ago, a good first step would be to attempt to capture the present-day situation of the borrowings we have observed here. This would be the beginning of a longitudinal study of how such synonym pairs can develop over time in a situation like the Mangghuer one.

4.2 Mangghuer Lexicography

I mentioned in Section 1.4 that a large number of the entries in Dpal-ldan-bkra-shis et al.'s (1996) glossary—as many as 10% of the total—include a Chinese borrowing alongside an existing word. Interestingly, only two of the textually-occurring synonyms that we observed in this study are included in that number: *zhuo* 'wear' and *laibama/laiguaguer* 'frog'. One other, *yanzi* 'yard' appears to have a fairly generic sense of 'yard' in the texts, but in the glossary has only the more limited meaning of 'cultivated garden'.

We also saw reflective attestation of synonym status of three words: *Laibama/laiguaguer* 'frog' and *yichuer* 'together' are attested in textual footnotes, and *yuer* 'fish' was attested in elicitation.

Five of the free forms that we observed (*jin* ‘gold’, *yin* ‘silver’, *zuo* ‘left’, *you* ‘right’, *jiazi* ‘shoulder’) seem only to qualify as nonce borrowings. One further item, *yebu* ‘fox’, is idiosyncratically used by only one speaker. This leaves eight items that have some degree of community acceptance.

As I have just shown, four of the free borrowings that we observed in our corpus are attested in some metalinguistic way as synonyms. This is exactly half of the relatively established borrowings. Since no one ever asked the speakers about synonymy, these metalinguistic attestations quite likely represent only the most salient cases of synonymous pairs, and we might reasonably expect that additional such pairs exist, which the speakers did not think to mention. Thus, we might be justified in suspecting that at least some of the other free synonyms which we have uncovered in our texts are also realistic candidates for inclusion in a Mangghuer lexicon.

Ultimately, the recognition of synonym status for a borrowed word, and its inclusion in a lexicon, is a decision which native speakers of the language should make. This study suggests, though, that even dictionary compilers who are relatively receptive to including borrowed words as synonymous alternatives to long-standing ones may benefit from examining natural texts. In such texts, they may discover even more borrowed synonyms than they would when simply reflecting on the language.

The bound synonyms which I presented in Section 2 present a potential problem for Mangghuer lexicography. Because none of them appear as independent words, the lexicographer’s default assumption would probably be that they should not be included in a Mangghuer dictionary. However, I would be astonished if my account of these forms as “bound” were convincing to the average Mangghuer speaker. Any fluent reader of Modern Chinese—as most Mangghuer speakers are—is nearly certain to consider *ren* ‘person’ an independent *word*, no matter how many compounds it appears in, and whether or not it appears “alone”. The same will be true for all the “bound” forms I have described; the writing system and the system of linguistic education both point to each *character* corresponding to a *word*, for all but the most linguistically-trained.

Therefore, a Mangghuer lexicographer who took a text-based approach to identifying Chinese borrowings would be quite likely to identify all of the bound synonyms of Section 2 as *words* which should be included in a Mangghuer dictionary. This could potentially lead to the inclusion of hundreds of “borrowings” which the linguist might consider to have marginal status. Further, it might give the false impression that Mangghuer is borrowing itself out of existence, replacing its inherited vocabulary at an inordinately high rate with Chinese loanwords. It might even encourage speakers who use the dictionary to make more such replacements, by seeming to endorse these “words” as full borrowings.

On the other hand, there are some potential advantages to including even marginal borrowings in a Mangghuer lexicon. One could be the communication of the undeniable fact that when Mangghuer speakers use Chinese borrowings, they are not in fact abandoning their language and switching to Chinese, but rather are speaking an enriched form of Mangghuer. Mangghuer has a rich vocabulary, and its speakers have access to many ways to further augment that richness—perhaps acknowledging this truth could contribute to a sense of pride in a language that is able to handle the wide variety of life situations, and thereby help to stave off the all-too-common phenomenon of language death in the face of a dominant language.

In the end, decisions about Mangghuer lexicography are best left to native speakers of the language. I believe the data presented here could justify inclusion of bound synonyms in a Mangghuer lexicon, but Mangghuer lexicographers must make that decision themselves.

ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

=	clitic boundary	IMPERF	imperfective
-	morpheme boundary	INDEF	indefinite
1	first person	INST	instrumental
2	second person	LOC	locative
3	third person	MSM	Modern Standard Mandarin
ABL	ablative	NEG	negative
ACC	accusative	NOMLZR	nominalizer
ADV	adverbializer	OBJ	objective perspective
CAUSE	causative	PERF	perfective
CL	classifier	PL	plural
COLL	collective	PROG	progressive
COMP	comparative	PRT	particle
COND	conditional	PURP	purpose
COP	copula	QUOTE	quotative
DAT	dative	REFLPOSS	reflexive possessive
DIR	directive case	SG	singular
FUT	future	SUBJ	subjective perspective
GEN	genitive		

REFERENCES

- Chen, Zhaojun; Li, Xingzhong; Lü, Jinliang; Slater, Keith W.; Stuart, Kevin; Wang, Xianzhen; Wang, Yongwei; Wang, Zhenlin; Xin, Huaizhi; Zhu, Meilan; Zhu, Shanzhong; Zhu, Wenhui; & Zhu, Yongzhong. 2005. *Folktales of China's Minhe Mangghuer*. München: Lincom Europa.
- Clyne, Michael. 2003. *Dynamics of language contact*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511606526>
- Dpal-ldan-bkra-shis; Hu, Jun; Hu, Ping; Limusishiden; Slater, Keith; Stuart, Kevin; Wang, Xianzheng; & Zhu, Yongzhong. 1996. *Language materials of China's Monguor minority: Huzhu Mongghul and Minhe Mangghuer*. Philadelphia: Department of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies, University of Pennsylvania [Sino-Platonic Papers 69]. http://sino-platonic.org/complete/spp069_monguor_language.pdf (Accessed 19 March 2020)
- Dwyer, Arienne. 2008. "Tonogenesis in Southeastern Monguor". In: Harrison, K. David; Rood, David S; & Dwyer, Arienne (eds.), *Lessons from Documented Endangered Languages*, 111-28. Amsterdam: John Benjamins [Typological Studies in Language 78]. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.78>
- Georg, Stefan. 2003. "Mongghul". In: Janhunen, Juha (ed.), *The Mongolic languages*, 286-306. London and New York: Routledge.
- Li, Rong 李荣; & Zhang, Chengcai 张成材 (eds.). 1998. 西宁方言词典 (A dictionary of Xining dialect). Nanjing: Jiangsu Jiaoyu Chubanshe.
- Li, Shujiang; & Luckert, Karl W. 1994. *Mythology and folklore of the Hui, a Muslim Chinese people*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

- Murphy, M. Lynne. 2016. "Meaning relations in dictionaries: hyponymy, meronymy, synonymy, antonymy, and contrast". In: Durkin, Philip (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of lexicography*, 439-56. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199691630.001.0001>
- Muysken, Pieter. 2000. *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Poplack, Shana. 2018. *Borrowing: Loanwords in the speech community and in the grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190256388.001.0001>
- Slater, Keith W. 2003a. *A grammar of Mangghuer: A Mongolic language of China's Qinghai-Gansu sprachbund*. London: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Slater, Keith W. 2003b. "Mangghuer". In: Janhunen, Juha (ed.), *The Mongolic languages*, 307-24. London and New York: Routledge.
- Stuart, Kevin; & Limusishiden (eds.). 1994. *China's Monguor minority: Ethnography and folktales*. Philadelphia: Department of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies, University of Pennsylvania [Sino-Platonic Papers 59]. http://sino-platonic.org/complete/spp059_monguor_folktales.pdf (Accessed 31 March 2020)
- Sun, Zhu 孙竹 (ed.). 1990. *蒙古语族语言词典 (A dictionary of Mongolic languages)*. Xining: Qinghai Renmin Chubanshe.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 2001. *Language contact: An introduction*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey; & Kaufman, Terrance. 1988. *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Xu, Dan; & Wen, Shaoqing. 2017. "The silk road: Language and population admixture and replacement". In: Xu, Dan; & Li, Hui (eds.), *Languages and genes in Northwestern China and adjacent regions*, 55-78. Singapore: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-4169-3>
- Zhang, Chengcai 张成材; & Zhu, Shikui 朱世奎. 1987. *西宁方言支 (Xining dialect)*. Xining: Qinghai Minzu Chubanshe.

Keith W. Slater
keith.w.slater@gmail.com