

Umetani Hiroyuki

## THE PROPRIETIVE SUFFIX *-TAJ* IN MONGOLIAN

This article aims to provide an overview of the proprietive suffix *-TAJ* in Khalkha Mongolian, and to reveal some aspects of the suffix. Firstly, we survey its characteristics and related expressions, with reference to descriptions provided in the literature. Secondly, it is claimed that the proprietive suffix, which has been classified as a derivational suffix, also shares some characteristics with inflectional suffixes. Thirdly, we explore the relationship between the proprietive and comitative suffixes, one topic that has long been under discussion in Mongolian studies because discrimination between (or the identification of) the two suffixes is not easy due to their identical phonological shape. Fourthly, some semantic characteristics of the derivatives formed by attaching *-TAJ* are pointed out, focusing in particular on the semantics of the base. Finally, a possible analysis of sentences is presented where derivatives using *-TAJ* such as *xereg-tej* “it is necessary that” and *jos-toj* “ought to” appear in the final position.

**Key words:** *derivation, inflection, possession, comitative, lexical integrity, auxiliary.*

### 1. Introduction

As mentioned in Section 1 of the overview article of the featured topic in this volume, “Proprietive affixes in the languages of North-Eastern Eurasia”, the five articles, including the present paper<sup>1</sup>, aim to examine morphosyntactic and semantic characteristics of the proprietive affixes in the languages under investigation. In line with this end, this article provides descriptions of the proprietive suffix *-TAJ* in Khalkha Mongolian. The outline of our discussion is as follows. In Section 2, we provide an overview of the suffix and its related expressions, referring to descriptions provided in the literature. In Section 3, it is shown that the Khalkha Mongolian proprietive suffix, which has been recognized as a derivational suffix in previous studies, also exhibits inflectional characteristics. In Section 4, we discuss the relationship between the proprietive and comitative suffixes. In Section 5, we describe the meanings of the derivative using *-TAJ*, by paying attention to the difference between two types of possessee: “everyone”-type possessee, and “not everyone”-type possessee. Finally, Section 6 provides a preliminary analysis of the structure of sentences where a derivative using *-TAJ* appears in the final position.

### 2. Grammatical sketches of Khalkha Mongolian and its proprietive suffix *-TAJ*

#### 2.1 Khalkha Mongolian

Khalkha Mongolian is one of the largest dialects of the Mongolian language (Mongolian proper). Khalkha Mongolian (hereafter, Mongolian) is spoken in a large area in Mongolia including Ulan Bator, and has more than two million speakers. It is an agglutinative language, employing suffixes rather than prefixes, and using postpositions, not prepositions. It is dependent-marking, and has the nominative-accusative case system. The basic word order is SOV, and a modifier usually precedes the head that it modifies. We employ the orthography used in Mongolia, with the Cyrillic characters transliterated into Latin ones: а=a, б=b, в=v [β], г=g, д=d, е=je/jö, ё=jo, ж=ž [dʒ~ts], з=z [dz~ts], и=i, й=j, к=k, л=l [ɮ], м=m, н=n, о=o [ɔ], ө=ö [ø], п=p, р=r, с=s, т=t, у=u [ʊ], ү=ü [ʉ], ф=f, х=x, ц=c [ts<sup>h</sup>], ч=č [tʃ<sup>h</sup>], ш=š [ʃ], ь=’’, ы=y [ɛ], ь=’, э=e, ю=ju/jü, я=ja. For the abbreviations used in the glosses, see the end of the paper. The discussions in this article are based on the data obtained from our language consultants (one male born in 1971, and two females born in 1976 and 1979; all born in Ulan Bator).

#### 2.2 Usages of the proprietive suffix

The proprietive suffix *-taj/-toj/-tej* in Mongolian is attached to a noun (or to a noun phrase, as will be mentioned in Section 3.1), and is used to form a word (or a phrase) with the meaning “with ...” or “possessing ...”. Selection from among the three allomorphs (*-taj*, *-toj*, and *-tej*) is determined by the rule of vowel harmony. In the present article, we represent the suffix as *-TAJ*, except when the actual form of the suffix in a specific example is in question.

A subgroup of nouns in Mongolian performs a wide range of functions: they can terminate sentences as non-verbal predicates, and can serve as nominal heads. In addition, they can function as adnominal or adverbial modifiers. The derivatives using *-TAJ* (hereafter, N-PROPS) are classified in this subgroup: they can occur as

<sup>1</sup> This article is a translated and modified version of Umetani (2012). Although our overall conclusions are unchanged, some explanations are added or deleted for the sake of comprehension and brevity. In addition, the discussion in Section 4.1.3 concerning the possibility to attach the reflexive suffix to words such as *zorig-toj* is considerably amended in order to reflect the result of additional research conducted after the publication of the former version. This research was supported by a grant from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (B) 22720150).

non-verbal predicates (*üne-tej* in (2)), and as nominal heads (*širxeg-tej* in (2)). They can also be employed as adnominal modifiers (*xüüxed-tej* in (1)), and as adverbial modifiers (*zorig-toj* in (3))<sup>2</sup>.

- (1) Tedniyx            olon                    **xüüxed-tej**            ajl                            baj-san.  
 theirs.NOM        many                    child-PROP        family.NOM            be-VN.PAST  
 ‘Their family had many children.’  
 Literal Translation (LT): ‘Theirs was a family with many children.’
- (2) Arvan                    **širxeg-tej=n**                    jamar                    **üne-tej**                    ve?  
 ten                    item-PROP=3POSS        what.kind.of        price-PROP            Q  
 ‘How much is the ten-pack?’  
 LT: ‘[The thing that is]<sup>3</sup> with ten items is with what kind of price?’
- (3) Či                    **zorig-toj**                            barild-aaraj.  
 2SG.NOM        bravery-TAJ<sup>4</sup>                    wrestle-TV.OPT  
 ‘Wrestle with bravery.’ (Luvsanvandan, 1968: 181; Romanization, hyphenation, emphasis in bold face, glosses, and translation are mine.)

To mention some distinctive properties of N-PROPs, they can denote containers (with content), and to the contrary, content (in containers). In the former case, *-TAJ* is attached to a noun for a container, and the derived N-PROP modifies a noun for content (4a). In the latter case, *-TAJ* is adjoined to a noun for content, and the derived N-PROP modifies a noun for a container (4b)<sup>5</sup>.

- (4) a.                    **šil-tej**                            arxi    b.                    **arxi-taj**                    šil  
                           bottle-PROP                    liquor    liquor-PROP        bottle  
                           ‘bottled liquor’    ‘a bottle with liquor’

In addition, some N-PROPs accompanying an adnominal clause appear in the sentence-final position, and constitute a kind of predicate (Bosson, 1964: 54, Kazama, 1999: 97). Among examples are *xereg-tej* ‘it is necessary that’ ← *xereg* ‘necessity’, and *jos-toj* ‘ought to’ ← *jos* ‘reason, principle, rule.’ See (5) for a sentence involving *jos-toj* ‘ought to.’

- (5) Ted                    ene                    ažl-yg                    önöödör-t-öö                    duusga-x  
 3PL.NOM            this                    work-ACC                    today-DAT-REFL                    finish-VN.NP

**jos-toj.**

reason-PROP

‘They ought to finish this work by today.’

LT: ‘They [are] with the reason [that they] will finish this work by today.’

**2.3 Characteristics of the proprietive suffix in common with derivational suffixes**

In the discussions to be developed in Sections 3 and 4.3, we will show that the proprietive suffix *-TAJ*, which has been considered a derivational suffix in the literature, also exhibits inflectional characteristics. Before that, we first confirm which derivational characteristics the proprietive suffix displays.

First, the proprietive suffix can derive new lexical items. (It should be repeated here that the proprietive suffix can be attached not only to a word base but also to a phrase, as will be seen in Section 3.1.) See (6) for examples.

- (6) a.                    tolgoj ‘head’                    →                    tolgoj-toj ‘clever’  
 b.                    nüd ‘eye’                    →                    nüd-tej ‘discerning, with an eye for’  
 c.                    xüč ‘power’                    →                    xüč-tej ‘strong’  
 d.                    čadal ‘ability’                    →                    čadal-taj ‘capable’

<sup>2</sup> Examples (1) and (2) are obtained from our consultants; (3) is offered in Luvsanvandan (1968) as an example involving an N-PROP used as an adverbial modifier. The examples without source information are those composed by our consultants.

<sup>3</sup> The square brackets in the literal translations indicate that no corresponding words appear in the original Mongolian sentences.

<sup>4</sup> As will be discussed in Section 4.1.3, it is sometimes difficult to differentiate between the proprietive and comitative suffixes, both of which have the same phonological shape *-TAJ*. This difficulty arises in particular when words involving *-TAJ* are employed as adverbial modifiers: we are sometimes uncertain whether a specific *-TAJ* in an adverbial modifier should be glossed as ‘PROP’ (proprietive suffix) or ‘COM’ (comitative suffix). In order to sidestep this problem, we uniformly place the gloss ‘-TAJ’ for the suffix *-TAJ* in adverbial modifiers.

<sup>5</sup> As a matter of course, the two variations have different usages. For example, in order to express the situation where someone broke a bottle with liquor, (4b) rather than (4a) is employed.

- e. amt ‘taste’ → amt-taj ‘tasty’  
 f. gerel ‘light’ → gerel-tej ‘bright, well-lit’  
 g. jaaral ‘haste’ → jaaral-taj ‘urgent, in haste’

Second, the proprietive suffix *-TAJ* can be followed by a derivational suffix<sup>6</sup>.

- (7) a. **dur-taj-jaa**  
 liking-PROP-DS  
 ‘willingly’ (*dur-taj* ‘fond of’)
- b. **tux-taj-jaa**  
 comfort-PROP-DS  
 ‘comfortably’ (*tux-taj* ‘comfortable’)
- (8) **nas-taj-vtar**  
 age-PROP-DS  
 ‘a little aged’ (*nas-taj* ‘aged’)
- (9) a. **ev-tej-xen**  
 concord-PROP-DS  
 ‘in concord’ (*ev-tej* ‘in concord’) (The suffix *-xan/-xon/-xen/-xön* can add the meaning ‘a little’ or ‘very.’ However, it is sometimes adjoined with little change of meaning, as in (9a) and (9b).)
- b. **ojlgomž-toj-xon**  
 comprehension-PROP-DS  
 ‘comprehensively’ (*ojlgomž-toj* ‘comprehensively’)

Thirdly, as is the case with other noun-deriving derivational suffixes, the proprietive suffix *-TAJ* can take a plural or case suffix after it (in so far as the combination of the two suffixes is semantically compatible). The proprietive suffix is followed by a plural suffix in Examples (11) – (13), and by a case suffix in (15). (The fact that the proprietive suffix can be followed by a case suffix has also been pointed out in Luvsanvandan, 1968: 180.) In (10) and (14), examples are provided in which a derivational suffix (other than the proprietive suffix) is followed by a plural or a case suffix, for the sake of reference.

<sup>6</sup> Inflectional suffixes are seldom followed by a derivational suffix. However, there are a few exceptions. For example, the derivational suffix *-x* or *-xan/-xon/-xen/-xön* can be attached after the genitive suffix. The former (*-x*) derives words expressing the possessee, and the latter (*-xan/-xon/-xen/-xön*) forms words denoting persons related to the referent of the genitive noun.

- (i) Dorž-ijn-x PSN-GEN-DS ‘Dorj’s’ (=Dorj’s possession)  
 (ii) tagnuul-yn-xan spy-GEN-DS ‘staff of Central Intelligence Agency’

Considering the position of these two suffixes inside a word, Kullmann and Tserenpil (1996: 101) perceive them as neither derivational nor inflectional suffixes.

In passing, Khurelbat (1998: 106) points out that no derivational suffix can be attached after the proprietive suffix *-TAJ*. However, as shown in (7)-(9), examples are attested where a derivational suffix appears after the proprietive suffix. Khurelbat (1998: 106) also notes derivational suffixes that can appear immediately BEFORE the proprietive suffix. Khurelbat claims that any derivational suffix can appear before it, except *-č*, *-čin* and *-aač/-ooč/-eeč/-ööč*. As far as the data available to us is concerned, however, examples are found where one of these three suffixes occurs before the proprietive suffix.

- (iii) sajn **em-č-tej** emneleg  
 good medicine-DS-PROP hospital  
 ‘a hospital with good doctors’ (*em* ‘medicines’ → *em-č* ‘doctor’ → *em-č-tej* ‘with doctors’)
- (iv) emegtej **duu-čin-taj** xamtlag  
 female song-DS-PROP group  
 ‘a band with a female vocalist’  
 (*duu* ‘song’ → *duu-čin* ‘singer’ → *duu-čin-taj* ‘with a singer’)
- (v) **mana-ač-taj** graš  
 guard-DS-PROP garage  
 ‘a garage with a guard’ (*mana-* ‘to guard’ → *mana-ač* ‘guard’ → *mana-ač-taj* ‘with a guard’; in Mongolian orthography, one of the vowels in *-aač* drops when it is attached to *mana-*)

- (10) **ažil-tn-uud**  
work-DS-PL  
'workers'
- (11) **onc dүн-tej-nүүд**  
excellent result-PROP-PL  
'those who got an A grade' (*onc дүн* 'A grade')
- (12) **xол ger-tej-nүүд**  
distant house-PROP-PL  
'those whose houses are far away', LT: '[those] with distant houses'
- (13) **exнер-tej-чүүд**  
wife-PROP-PL  
'married men', LT: '[those] with a wife'
- (14) **Minij чix-e-vч-ижг xар-san uu?**  
1SG.GEN ear-E-DS-ACC see-VN.PAST Q  
'Did you see my earphones?'
- (15) **Šар xавтас-taj-g-aas=n<sup>7</sup> neg-ижг av-”ja.**  
yellow cover-PROP-E-ABL=3POSS one-ACC get-TV.VOL  
'I will buy a yellow-covered one.'  
LT: 'I will get one from [the things] with a yellow cover.'

#### 2.4 Possessive and existential sentences involving an N-PROP, and those involving the existential verb *baj-* 'to be'

In Mongolian, possessive and existential sentences are composed by employing N-PROPs as the predicate. See the first sentence in Example (45). In addition, possessive and existential sentences are also formed by using the existential verb *baj-* 'to be', as in (16).

- (16) **Čamd арван мјangan тöгрөг baj-na uu?**  
2SG.DAT ten thousand tugrig.NOM be-TV.NP Q  
'Do you have ten thousand tugrig?' (tugrig = currency unit)  
LT: 'Is ten thousand tugrig at (=with) you?'

The differences between these two kinds of possessive (or existential) sentence are not dealt with in the present article because we do not have sufficient data to discuss these differences in detail. For some information on this topic, see the following two studies among others: Kazama (1999) has discussed the differences between the two kinds of possessive (or existential) sentences in terms of information structure; Hashimoto (2010) has described them with respect to their sentence structures, and the semantic characteristic of the possessee or the existing entity (namely, in terms of whether the possessee or the existing entity is a thing, person, or property).

#### 2.5 Abessive suffix *-güj*

Mongolian has the abessive suffix<sup>8</sup> *-güj*, which signifies the absence of someone or something, in contrast to the proprietive suffix *-TAJ*. In this paper, only examples involving *-güj* are provided because we have not yet conducted a thorough analysis of this suffix.

- (17) **xариуclаgа-gүј xүн**  
responsibility-ABES person  
'irresponsible person'

<sup>7</sup> In (15), the consonant *g* is inserted between the proprietive and ablative suffixes. In general, the insertion of *g* occurs when a morpheme ending in a diphthong or a long vowel is followed by a suffix beginning in a diphthong or a long vowel.

<sup>8</sup> Although we (tentatively) treat *-güj* as a suffix, *-güj* differs from the other suffixes in Mongolian in that it does not conform to vowel harmony. Further inquiries are needed as to whether *-güj* should be regarded as a suffix or another kind of morpheme (for example, a clitic, among possible analyses).

- (18) Bi                    margaaš                    **zav-güj.**  
 1SG.NOM            tomorrow                free.time-ABES  
 ‘I will be busy tomorrow.’  
 LT: ‘I [will be] without free time tomorrow.’

### 2.6 Comitative suffix *-TAJ*

The proprietive suffix *-TAJ* has the same phonological shape as the comitative suffix. The comitative suffix *-TAJ*, as with the proprietive suffix *-TAJ*, has the allomorphs *-taj/-toj/-tej*, in accordance with vowel harmony. An example involving the comitative suffix can be seen in (19).

- (19) Bi                    **aav-taj**                    ir-sen.  
 1SG.NOM            father-TAJ                come-VN.PAST  
 ‘I came with father.’

Some previous studies (Bosson, 1964: 53–54; Binnick, 1979: 27; Kazama, 1999: 96–102; Bittigau, 2003: 61–62, among others) do not distinguish between these two kinds of *-TAJ*, and treat them as one suffix (the comitative suffix)<sup>9</sup>. In contrast, Luvsanvandan (1968: 179–182), Kullmann and Tserenpil (1996: 98), and Önörbajan (2004: 214–215) claim that the two suffixes should be differentiated<sup>10</sup>. We tentatively consider the two kinds of *-TAJ* as different suffixes, until their distinction or identification is discussed in Section 4 of this paper.

### 3. Shared characteristics of the proprietive and inflectional suffixes

In Section 2.3, we listed derivational characteristics of the proprietive suffix. In addition, it behaves in the same manner as inflectional suffixes. In what follows, we will observe its inflectional characteristics.

#### 3.1 Unit to which the proprietive suffix is attached

In Section 2.3, we have confirmed that the proprietive suffix *-TAJ* can be attached to a word base. In addition to this characteristic, as has been mentioned by Kazama (1999: 97), the base of the proprietive suffix “often takes modifiers before it. On this occasion, from the viewpoint of semantics, the N2 [the base “N” in an N-PROP] and its modifiers cohere with each other, transcending the word boundaries, and then the meaning of *-TAJ* is added to that cohesion<sup>11</sup>.” Examples relevant to this statement by Kazama are: Example (1), where *-TAJ* is attached to *olon xüüxed* ‘many children’, and Example (2), where *-TAJ* is adjoined to *arvan širxeg* ‘ten pieces’, and to *jamar üne* ‘what price.’ In these examples, *-TAJ* is analyzed for its attachment not to a word base (that is, a morphological unit), but to a phrase (a syntactic unit), at least as regards semantics. The attachment of the proprietive suffix to a phrase is acceptable in so far as the combination of the phrase and *-TAJ* is semantically compatible.

In general, Mongolian has few derivational suffixes that can be attached to phrases<sup>12</sup>. By contrast, inflectional suffixes are often adjoined to phrases. This can be seen in (20), in which the accusative case suffix *-ijg* (an inflectional suffix) is (at least semantically) attached to the phrase *ene üzeg* ‘this pen.’

- (20) **Ene**            **üzg-ijg**            xaana-as            av-san            be?  
 this    pen-ACC            where-ABL            get-VN.PAST    Q  
 ‘Where did you buy this pen?’  
 LT: ‘ [You] got this pen from where?’

<sup>9</sup> The main interests of these four studies do NOT lie in discussing the identification of (or the differentiation between) the proprietive and comitative suffixes. In other words, it is not by carrying out procedures for determining whether the two kinds of *-TAJ* are identical or not, that the four studies have regarded the two kinds of *-TAJ* as one suffix. It might be the case that these studies have only tentatively regarded the two kinds of *-TAJ* as identical.

<sup>10</sup> Önörbajan (2004: 214) points out that the proprietive and comitative suffixes have a common diachronic origin.

<sup>11</sup> The translation and supplementary explanation enclosed by square brackets are mine. Kazama’s notation “-taj<sup>3</sup>”, a convention often used in the tradition of Mongolian linguistics to refer to the three allomorphs *-taj/-toj/-tej*, is replaced by “-TAJ”, for the sake of consistency in the present article.

<sup>12</sup> The abessive suffix *-güj*, which has been touched upon in Section 2.5, is among the few derivational suffixes which can be attached to a phrase.

jamar=č            **nemer-güj**            nōxōr  
 what.kind.of=FP    merit-ABES            fellow  
 ‘worthless fellow’, LT: ‘fellow without even any kind of merit’

Considering this general tendency in Mongolian, we can claim that the proprietive suffix *-TAJ* is similar to inflectional suffixes, at least in terms of the unit to which it is adjoined<sup>13</sup>.

### 3.2 Attachment of the proprietive suffix after a plural suffix

As has been shown in Section 2.3, the proprietive suffix *-TAJ* can appear BEFORE a plural suffix (Examples (11) – (13)). This fact indicates that the proprietive suffix exhibits a derivational characteristic. However, the proprietive suffix can also be attached AFTER a plural suffix, as in Examples (21) – (23).

- (21) xöörxön            xee#ugalzn-**uud-taj**            gutal  
pretty                pattern-PL-PROP            shoe  
'pretty patterned shoes'
- (22) Camc=n'            xar            tolbon-**uud-taj**            baj-san.  
shirt=3POSS    black    stain-PL-PROP    be-VN.PAST  
'The shirt had some black stains.'  
LT: 'The shirt was with black stains.'
- (23) Naad    tom            tovčn-**uud-taj**=č'in'            ix            xöörxön            jum            aa.  
this    big            button-PL-PROP=2POSS            very    pretty            MP            MP  
'That one of yours with big buttons is very pretty.' (talking about the addressee's coat)

This ability of the proprietive suffix (that is, the ability to appear after a plural suffix) is a characteristic shared with case suffixes (inflectional suffixes), rather than with derivational suffixes. See (24) for an example where the accusative suffix (an inflectional suffix) is attached after a plural suffix<sup>14</sup>, as is the case with the proprietive suffix.

- (24) Ene            **nomn-uud-yg**            unš-i-ž            üz-eerej.  
this            book-PL-ACC            read-E-CVB.IPFV            try-TV.OPT  
'Try reading these books.'

Besides the two features of the proprietive suffix pointed out in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 (the ability to attach to a phrase, and to appear after a plural suffix), it also exhibits another inflectional characteristic. This will be presented later in Section 4.3, because it also concerns the topic of that section.

We are of the view that the accurate identification of the Mongolian proprietive suffix as a derivational or as an inflectional suffix (or, perhaps, as neither of these) becomes possible when the characteristics of the Mongolian suffixes have been described at great length, and when the criteria for distinguishing between derivation and inflection have been established. We are still on the way to achieving this goal: thus, we remain undecided about the classification of the Mongolian proprietive suffix.

### 4. Differentiation between or identification of the proprietive and comitative suffixes

As has been remarked in Section 2.6, the proprietive suffix *-TAJ* has the same phonological shape as the comitative suffix. Some studies claim that the two suffixes should not be confused (Luvsanvandan, 1968: 179–182; Kullmann and Tserenpil, 1996: 98; Öñörbajan, 2004: 214–215). These studies point out that nouns in the comitative (comitative nouns) are used only to modify the predicate (that is, used only as adverbial modifiers), whereas N-PROPs are employed mainly as adnominal modifiers, and only in some cases as adverbial modifiers<sup>15</sup> (Luvsanvandan, 1968: 181; Kullmann and Tserenpil, 1996: 98; Öñörbajan, 2004: 214).

This section assesses the validity of the criteria proposed in these studies for distinguishing between the two kinds of *-TAJ*. In the following discussions, we first confirm that the claim in question is plausible as far as *-TAJ* in adnominal modifiers is concerned (Section 4.1.2). Then, we examine *-TAJ* in adverbial modifiers and point out that the demarcation is not obvious in some instances.

<sup>13</sup> As mentioned in Section 2.6, Kazama (1999: 97) does not differentiate between the proprietive and comitative suffixes. He notes that it is not surprising that the suffix *-TAJ* (that is, what is labeled as a "derivational" suffix in some previous works, but is called the "comitative" suffix by Kazama) can attach to a phrase because case suffixes can generally do so in Mongolian.

<sup>14</sup> Note, however, that the proprietive suffix differs from case suffixes in that it can also occur before a plural suffix, as in (11)-(13); case suffixes cannot do so.

<sup>15</sup> Among the works that differentiate between the proprietive and comitative suffixes, no study explicitly states that the proprietive suffix can appear in a sentence predicate (for example, *üne-tej* 'with price' in Example (2)). However, Kullmann and Tserenpil (1996: 98), one of the works that discriminate between the two suffixes, provide sentences involving the predicate with *-TAJ*, as examples of the proprietive suffix.

#### 4.1 Attachment of the reflexive possessive suffix

##### 4.1.1 Outline of the reflexive possessive suffix

Studies that treat the two kinds of *-TAJ* as distinct morphemes remark that they differ from one another in terms of the ability to take the reflexive possessive suffix (hereafter, reflexive suffix)<sup>16</sup>. Before proceeding to the main arguments to be developed in Sections 4.1.2 and 4.1.3, we first provide some explanation of the reflexive suffix.

The reflexive suffix *-AA* (its allomorphs in accordance with vowel harmony are *-aa/-oo/-ee/-öö*) “is attached to a noun in an oblique case (namely, a case other than the nominative) to express that [the referent of] the noun belongs to [the referent of] the sentence subject, and can be translated as ‘one’s own’ on many occasions” (Kuribayashi, 1992: 507; supplementary explanation in parentheses is Kuribayashi’s; translation and notes in square brackets are mine). As is explained in this quotation, the reflexive suffix is attached after a case suffix (and not after a derivational suffix) when the referent of the base is related (or “belongs,” according to Kuribayashi’s terminology) to the referent of the sentence subject. According to this criterion, *-TAJ* in (25) is judged as a case (in this case, the comitative) suffix.

- (25) Bi                    **aav-taj-g-aa**<sup>17</sup>                    ir-sen.  
1SG.NOM            father-TAJ-E-REFL            come-VN.PAST  
‘I came with my father.’

In Example (25), the reflexive suffix appears in an adverbial modifier *aav-taj-gaa* ‘with one’s own father.’ In (26), we provide another example, in which the reflexive suffix appears in an adnominal modifier, namely, an example where the reflexive suffix is attached after the genitive case.

- (26) Bi                    **aav-yn-xaa**<sup>18</sup>                    mašin-aar                    ir-sen.  
1SG.NOM            father-GEN-REFL            car-INS                    come-VN.PAST  
‘I came in my father’s car.’

In what follows, additional explanations are given concerning the reflexive suffix appearing after the genitive case, because they are relevant to the discussions to be developed in Section 4.1.2. Let us take the phrase (the idiom) *öglöön-ij caj* (morning-GEN + tea) ‘breakfast; literally, tea of morning’ as an example. This phrase is composed of a genitive noun, and a noun modified by it. Hereafter, this structure is labeled as “N1-GEN N2.” In (27a) and (27b), the phrase *öglöön-ij caj* ‘breakfast’ is used in the sentence ‘What did you eat for your breakfast yesterday?’

- (27) a.            Öčigdör            **öglöön-ij**            **cajn-d-aa**<sup>19</sup>                    juu  
yesterday            morning-GEN            tea-DAT-REFL                    what.NOM<sup>20</sup>  
  
id-sen                    be?  
eat-VN.PAST            Q  
‘What did you eat for your breakfast?’  
LT: ‘Yesterday, for [your] own morning tea, [you] ate what?’
- b.            Öčigdör            **öglöön-ij-xöö**            **cajn-d**                    juu  
yesterday            morning-GEN-REFL            tea-DAT                    what.NOM  
  
id-sen                    be?  
eat-VN.PAST            Q

In (27), what is semantically related to the sentence subject (*či* ‘you’, which is absent in the sentence) is not *öglöö* ‘morning’ (N1), but the head of the phrase *caj* ‘tea’ (N2). Accordingly, the reflexive suffix is expected to

<sup>16</sup> Although we utilize the reflexive suffix as a device for the distinction between (or the identification of) the two kinds of *-TAJ* in Sections 4.1.2 and 4.1.3, the same results can also be obtained by using a personal possessive particle. For the sake of brevity, however, we only provide discussion related to the reflexive suffix.

<sup>17</sup> The sentences remain acceptable even if the reflexive suffix in (25) and (26) is absent. However, the sentences without the reflexive suffix are used in different contexts. Let us compare (25) to its corresponding sentence (19). Example (25) is used when the speaker and the hearer are members of different families. In contrast, (19) is used when they are members of the same family.

<sup>18</sup> The reflexive suffix appears not in *-aa/-oo/-ee/-öö*, but in *-xaa/-xoo/-xee/-xöö* (including *x*), when it is attached after the genitive suffix.

<sup>19</sup> At the end of the stem, *n* appears when the dative-locative suffix *-d* is attached to *caj* ‘tea.’

<sup>20</sup> Roughly speaking, the direct object appears in the nominative when it is indefinite and in the accusative when it is definite.

appear not after N1-GEN (*öglöö-nij*) but after N2 (*caj*). In accordance with this expectation, the reflexive suffix can appear after N2 (accurately speaking, after the dative-locative suffix attached to N2). See (27a). In addition, examples are also attested where the reflexive suffix is attached after N1-GEN. That is, examples are also acceptable where the base of the reflexive suffix does not correspond to what is semantically related to the referent of the subject. See (27b)<sup>21</sup>.

#### 4.1.2 -TAJ in adnominal modifiers

As has already been mentioned, some previous studies argue that the two kinds of -TAJ should be distinguished on the basis of their ability to take the reflexive suffix. However, they have done no more than simply note this criterion, or provide an unacceptable example involving -TAJ. Among the former studies are Luvsanvandan (1968: 180–181), and Önörbajan (2004: 215); among the latter, Kullmann and Tserenpil (1996: 98). The unacceptable example adduced by Kullmann and Tserenpil is *\*ceceg-tej-g-ee daavuu* (flower-PROP-E-REFL + cloth; the intended meaning of which is ‘floral-printed cloth’).

These works have not provided the premises for discussion, and their explanations are too brief to be comprehensive to those who are not familiar with Mongolian grammar. For the sake of comprehension, we provide supplementary explanations in what follows, by comparing two kinds of example: an acceptable example involving the reflexive suffix appearing after the genitive suffix in “N1-GEN N2” on the one hand (Example (27b)), and an unacceptable example involving the reflexive suffix occurring after -TAJ in an adnominal modifier on the other (28b). (Explanations of -TAJ in ADVERBIAL modifiers will be provided later in Section 4.1.3.) Now, take (28a) and (28b) as examples.

(28) a.	<b>Nogoo-toj</b> vegetable-PROP	<b>šölön-d-öö</b> soup-DAT-REFL	ene this	xool#amtlagč-ijg seasoning-ACC
	xij-vel put-CVB.CON	ilüü more	amt-taj taste-PROP	bol-no. become-TV.NP
	‘If you put this seasoning into your vegetable soup, it will become tastier.’			
	LT: ‘If [you] put this seasoning into [your] own soup with vegetable, [it] will become with more taste.’			
b.*	<b>Nogoo-toj-g-oo</b> vegetable-PROP-E-REFL	<b>šölön-d</b> soup-DAT	ene this	xool#amtlagč-ijg seasoning-ACC
	xij-vel put-CVB.CON	ilüü more	amt-taj taste-PROP	bol-no. become-TV.NP

In (28a), what is semantically related to the referent of the subject (*či* ‘you’, which is covert in the sentence) is N2 in “N1-TAJ N2,” that is, *šöl* ‘soup.’ Accordingly, Example (28a) is acceptable because the base of the reflexive suffix corresponds to what is semantically related to the subject. Then, if -toj in *nogoo-toj šöl* ‘soup with vegetable’ is a case suffix (the comitative suffix, judging from its phonological shape), the reflexive suffix is also expected to appear after -toj, as is the case with “N1-GEN N2” in (27b), even though the referent of N1 *nogoo* ‘vegetable’ is not semantically related to the referent of the subject. The fact is that the reflexive suffix cannot be present after -toj, as displayed in (28b). It follows from what has been mentioned above that -toj in (28a) is not considered as a case suffix (the comitative suffix), but as another kind of suffix (a derivational suffix). The claim laid by preceding studies (that is, the claim that the proprietive and comitative suffixes should be differentiated with respect to their ability to take the reflexive suffix) is reasonable as far as adnominal modifiers are concerned.

#### 4.1.3 -TAJ in adverbial modifiers

As seen in Section 4.1.2, and as mentioned in some previous studies, the proprietive and comitative suffixes are discerned in terms of their ability to take the reflexive suffix, as far as -TAJ in adnominal modifiers are concerned.

As for the distinction between the two kinds of -TAJ in ADVERBIAL modifiers, in contrast, the literature presents no explicit argument or unacceptable examples involving -TAJ that support their assertion. What makes the situation more complicated is that the previous studies that emphasize the necessity to distinguish between

<sup>21</sup> Semantic or pragmatic differences between (27a) and (27b) are not obvious so far.





- (32) a. **gutał-taj** xün  
 shoe-TAJ person  
 ‘a person wearing shoes’ (adnominal usage)
- b. **Gutał-taj** or-ž bol-o-x-güj.  
 shoe-TAJ enter-CVB.IPFV may-E-VN.NP-ABES/NEG  
 ‘You may not go in with the shoes on.’
- c. **Gutał-taj-g-aa** or-ž bol-o-x-güj.  
 shoe-TAJ-E-REFL enter-CVB.IPFV may-E-VN.NP-ABES/NEG  
 ‘You may not go in with your shoes on.’

The word *cünx-tej* ‘with a bag’ appearing in the adnominal modifier in (29a) on the one hand, and that in the adverbial modifier in (29b) on the other, can be recognized as the same N-PROP in terms of semantics: they denote almost the same meaning. However, *-TAJ* in (29a) is regarded as the proprietive suffix, whereas that in (29b) is analyzed as the comitative suffix with respect to the ability to attach the reflexive suffix. The same applies to (32a) and (32b). (As to the fact that the reflexive suffix cannot occur after *-TAJ* in (29a) and (32a), recall the discussion in Section 4.1.2.)

There are several possibilities in dealing with *-TAJ* in adverbial modifiers seen in (29b) and (32b). One possible analysis is to put weight on semantics, and regard the *-TAJ* in question as the same (namely, as the proprietive) suffix as the *-TAJ* in adnominal modifiers (although *cünx-tej* and *gutał-taj* in adnominal modifiers and those in adverbial modifiers behave differently in terms of the ability to take the reflexive suffix). On the other hand, it is also possible to take *-TAJ* in (29b) and (32b) as the comitative suffix because it is followed by the reflexive suffix, and to consider *-TAJ* in (29a) and (32a) to be the proprietive suffix. On this occasion, what can be considered semantically identical is classified into two different kinds of words. (In addition, there are other possible analyses than those mentioned above.) We have not reached a specific conclusion as to what analysis is the most appropriate. However, we can understand from what has been mentioned in this section that the distinction between the proprietive and comitative suffixes is not an easy matter, and cannot be determined only in terms of the ability to accompany the reflexive suffix<sup>24</sup>.

#### 4.2 Co-occurrence with the postposition *xamt* or *cug* ‘together’

Kullmann and Tserenpil (1996: 98) remark that the proprietive and comitative suffixes are differentiated by the ability to co-occur with the postposition *xamt* ‘together’ or *cug* ‘together’<sup>25</sup>. They adduce Example (33) in

<sup>24</sup> As remarked in Section 4.1.1, the reflexive suffix is attached after a case suffix. However, this is a simplification for the sake of brevity. The reflexive suffix can also be attached to a converbal suffix (inflectional suffix attached to the verb stem to form an adverbial clause), postposition, and adverb. What concerns us here is when the reflexive suffix is attached to an adverb. For example, the reflexive suffix can be attached to the adverb *ödör-žin* ‘all day long’, a derivative formed from *ödör* ‘day’ by the attachment of the derivational suffix *-žin*.

Bi	<b>ödör-žing-öö</b>	nom	unš-i-ž	baj-san.
1SG.NOM	day-DS-REFL	book.NOM	read-E-CVB.IPFV	be-VN.PAST
‘I was reading books all day long.’ ( <i>g</i> appears at the end of <i>-žin</i> when the reflexive suffix is attached after it.)				

Hereupon, in terms of the ability to take the reflexive suffix, we find no difference between derived adverbs and comitative nouns: the reflexive suffix can be attached both after a derivational suffix (as in *ödör-žing-öö*) and after a case suffix (as in *aav-taj-g-aa* in (25)). This leads to the conclusion that we cannot distinguish between the proprietive and comitative suffixes in adverbial modifiers, by observing the ability to accompany the reflexive suffix: it can be attached to *cünx-tej* ‘with a bag’ in (29b) and *gutał-taj* ‘with shoes’ in (32b), irrespective of whether *-TAJ* in these words is the proprietive or comitative suffix. At the current moment, however, we have only limited information on instances where the reflexive suffix is attached to adverbs. We need to consider this topic further by collecting and analyzing more data.

<sup>25</sup> A similar statement to Kullmann and Tserenpil’s is offered by Önörbajan (2004: 214). (Önörbajan also points out that comitative nouns can co-occur with *adil* ‘similar’, *ižil* ‘same’, and *töstej* ‘similar’, as well as with *xamt* and *cug*.) However, his remark differs from Kullmann and Tserenpil’s in the following respect.

Kullmann and Tserenpil (1996: 98) state that “[t]here are a **few guidelines** in order to discern whether the ‘TAJ’ is a CS [=case suffix] or a derivational [=proprietive] suffix,” and list four criteria. (Explanations in square brackets are mine; emphasis in bold face is Kullmann and Tserenpil’s; they provide five guidelines, but one of them concerns not Modern but Classical Mongolian.) As a first guideline, they mention that the comitative suffix is used to form adverbial modifiers. As a second guideline, they point out that the proprietive suffix is usually employed to form adnominal modifiers. A third one is that the comitative suffix can accompany the reflexive suffix. A fourth guideline, which concerns us here, is that “[y]ou can usually add the **postpositions** ‘cug’ or ‘xamt’ to a CS [=case suffix]” (emphasis in bold face is Kullmann and Tserenpil’s; Romanization of *cug* and *xamt*, and supplementary explanations in square brackets are mine). It can be seen from these two citations from Kullmann and Tserenpil (1996: 98) that they try to utilize the ability to appear with the postposition *cug* or *xamt*, as a criterion for differentiating the two kinds of *-TAJ*.

order to show that comitative nouns can co-occur with the postposition *xamt* ‘together’, and give (34) to illustrate that N-PROPs cannot appear with *xamt* (Romanization, hyphenation, emphasis in bold face, glosses, translation, and intended meaning of (34) are mine).

(33) ax-taj            **xamt**            java-  
brother-TAJ    together           go  
‘to go with Brother’ (Kullmann and Tserenpil, 1996: 98)

(34) \* malgaj-taj        **xamt**            xün  
hat-PROP        together           person  
(Intended meaning: ‘person wearing a hat’) (Kullmann and Tserenpil, 1996: 98)

These two examples illustrate that we can distinguish the proprietive suffix in ADNOMINAL modifiers from the comitative suffix. This observation is consistent with the conclusion obtained in Section 4.1.

As for *-TAJ* in ADVERBIAL modifiers, however, Kullmann and Tserenpil neither explain whether the two kinds of *-TAJ* can be differentiated through the same procedure, nor give examples to illustrate it. When we observe adverbial modifiers accompanying *-TAJ*, they can sometimes co-occur with *xamt* or *cug* (Examples (33) and (35)), while they sometimes cannot (36).

(35) Bi                **aav-taj**            **xamt**            ir-sen.  
1SG.NOM        father-TAJ        together        come-VN.PAST  
‘I came together with father.’

(36) \*Bi                **cünx-tej**            **xamt**            ir-sen.  
1SG.NOM        bag-TAJ            together        come-VN.PAST  
(Intended meaning: ‘I came with a bag.’)

The suffix *-TAJ* in (33) and (35) is (what the literature has regarded as) the comitative suffix. In contrast, *-TAJ* in (36) is (what is possibly analyzed as) the proprietive suffix<sup>26</sup>. At first glance, it appears that we can distinguish between the two kinds of *-TAJ* in adverbial modifiers as well, by applying the criterion proposed by Kullmann and Tserenpil.

However, we have a question here. It is true that we can divide adverbial modifiers including *-TAJ* into two types: those that can appear before the postposition *xamt* or *cug* on the one hand (Example (35)), and those that cannot on the other (36). In that case, does the demarcation obtained by this procedure really reflect the distinction between the proprietive and comitative suffixes?

At the current moment, the author is uncertain as to whether the criterion presented by Kullmann and Tserenpil really serves to distinguish between them. The reasons are as follows. First, the fact that *cünx-tej* in (36) cannot appear before the postposition *xamt* ‘together’ might be relevant not to the distinction between the two kinds of *-TAJ*, but to other factors such as the semantic compatibility of *xamt* and the base to which *-TAJ* is attached (*cünx* in (36)). Second, even if we can discriminate between the proprietive and comitative suffixes by observing the ability to co-occur with *xamt* or *cug*<sup>27</sup>, we can apply this criterion to only a limited number of adverbial modifiers involving *-TAJ*. Let us illustrate this by examining the two sentences in (37). *Dulmaa-taj* ‘with Dulmaa’ in (37a) is what is counted as a comitative noun in the literature<sup>28</sup>.

On the other hand, Önröbajan (2004: 214) reports that “comitative nouns are often connected with words such as *xamt*, *cug*, *adil*, *ižil*, and *töstej*” (translation from Mongolian is mine). His statement differs from Kullmann and Tserenpil’s because he provides not a criterion but a mere observation.

<sup>26</sup> As has been argued in Section 4.1.3, we are uncertain whether *-TAJ* in adverbial modifiers referring to “possession at that very moment” is the proprietive or the comitative suffix. We develop the argument in Section 4.2 with the proviso that *-TAJ* included in *cünx-tej* ‘with a bag’ in (36) is the proprietive suffix. In passing, in case that *-TAJ* in (36) is the comitative suffix, we need not assess the appropriateness of the criterion proposed by Kullmann and Tserenpil right from the start, because it is relevant not to the distinction between the proprietive and comitative suffixes, but to the phenomenon whereby comitative nouns are classified into two kinds: comitative nouns that can co-occur with the postposition *xamt* or *cug* on the one hand (as in (35)), and those that cannot on the other (as in (36)).

<sup>27</sup> If observing the ability to co-occur with *xamt* or *cug* is a valid method (for determining whether a specific *-TAJ* in an adverbial modifier is the proprietive or the comitative suffix), the ground would be as follows. Some postpositions govern the case of their preceding noun, and require it to accompany a specific case suffix. On the contrary, no postposition demands its preceding noun to include a specific derivational suffix. Consequently, if a word before the postposition *xamt* or *cug* must include *-TAJ*, it is a case (the comitative) suffix. This explanation seems reasonable to some extent, but we are not able to go further into this argument because more careful considerations are needed before reaching a conclusion.

<sup>28</sup> Luvsanvandan (1968: 181) and Kullmann and Tserenpil (1996: 98) adduce examples involving *bagš-taj uulz-* (teacher-TAJ + meet) ‘to meet a teacher’, and analyze *bagš-taj* ‘with a teacher’ here as a comitative noun. Therefore, it would be reasonable to consider *Dulmaa-taj* ‘with Dulmaa’ before *uulz-* ‘to meet’ in (37), as what is regarded as a comitative noun in the studies that distinguish between the two kinds of *-TAJ*.

- (37) a. Bi Dulmaa-taj uulz-san.  
 1SG.NOM PSN-TAJ meet-VN.PAST  
 ‘I met Dulmaa.’
- b. Bi Dulmaa-taj **xamt** uulz-san.  
 1SG.NOM PSN-TAJ together meet-VN.PAST  
 ‘I met [a person] together with Dulmaa.’

If Kullmann and Tserenpil’s argument is applicable to all adverbial modifiers involving *-TAJ*, we should be able to place the postposition *xamt* or *cug* after *Dulmaa-taj* ‘with Dulmaa’ in (37a), with little change of meaning. However, we cannot do so without changing the meaning of the sentence, as seen from the translation of (37b). Although (37b) is not unacceptable, it does not express the same meaning as (37a); (37b) indicates that ‘I met a person (who is covert in the sentence), accompanied by Dulmaa.’ Although it may be plausible to analyze *Dulmaa-taj* in (37b) as a comitative noun based on the criterion put forward by Kullmann and Tserenpil, this does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that *Dulmaa-taj* in (37a) is also a comitative noun.

As shown above, we cannot always distinguish between the proprietive and comitative suffixes by observing the ability to co-occur with the postposition *xamt* or *cug*, even if this method is proved valid for discriminating between them<sup>29</sup>.

#### 4.3 Attachment of the proprietive suffix to juxtaposed words

In the context of discussing differences between the proprietive and comitative suffixes, Önorbajan (2004: 215) reports that the comitative suffix is attached only to the last member of juxtaposed words. (The other case suffixes than the comitative also exhibit this characteristic.) As displayed in Example (38a), when the comitative case suffix is attached to each member of juxtaposed words, the sentence usually has a low acceptability<sup>30</sup>.

- (38) a.? Bi Boldoo-**toj**, Bajaraa-**taj**, Dulmaa-**taj** jav-san.  
 1SG.NOM PSN-TAJ PSN-TAJ PSN-TAJ go-VN.PAST
- b. Bi Boldoo, Bajaraa, Dulmaa **gurav-taj**<sup>31</sup> jav-san.  
 1SG.NOM PSN PSN PSN three-TAJ go-VN.PAST  
 ‘I went with Boldoo, Bajaraa, and Dulmaa.’

Judging from the flow of discussion in Önorbajan (2004), he may possibly have claimed that this characteristic is not exhibited by the proprietive suffix<sup>32</sup>. In our data, examples are attested where it is attached to each member of juxtaposed words ((39a) and (40a); accurately speaking, *-TAJ* in (42) is a “candidate” for the proprietive suffix because we are uncertain whether *-TAJ* in adverbial modifiers denoting “possession at that very moment” is the proprietive or the comitative suffix, as discussed in Section 4.1.3). Examples (39b) and (40b), where the proprietive suffix is adjoined only to the last member, are unacceptable.

- (39) a. Dorž maš **uxaan-taj**, **av’jaas-taj** xün bajna.  
 PSN.NOM very cleverness-PROP talent-PROP person.NOM MP  
 ‘Dorj is a very clever and talented man.’

<sup>29</sup> Kullmann and Tserenpil seem to be aware that their guideline is not always applicable. This can be surmised from the use of “usually” in their statement “[y]ou can **usually** add the postpositions ‘cug’ or ‘xamt’ to a CS [=case suffix]” (Kullmann and Tserenpil, 1996: 98; emphasis in bold face, Romanization of *cug* and *xamt*, and supplementary explanations in square brackets are mine).

<sup>30</sup> When the speaker slowly recites each person’s name recalling whom he/she went with, (38a) is acceptable.

<sup>31</sup> In Example (38b), the numeral *gurav* ‘three’ is placed after the juxtaposed words. In Mongolian, the numeral indicating the number of the referent of the juxtaposed words often appears after the last member. In chatty conversations, however, it is also possible to attach the comitative suffix to the last member (*Dulmaa* in (38b)), without employing a numeral.

<sup>32</sup> Önorbajan (2004) adduces this fact (that is, the fact that the comitative suffix is attached to the last member of juxtaposed words) in the same phrase discussing the distinction between the proprietive and comitative suffixes. Therefore, it would be reasonable to assume that he presents this phenomenon as a criterion for distinguishing between them. In contrast, however, he does not mention where in juxtaposed words the proprietive suffix appears. Therefore, it is also possible to surmise that Önorbajan (2004) provides the phenomenon (that is, the fact that the comitative suffix is attached to the last member of juxtaposed words) not as a criterion for discriminating the comitative suffix from the derivational suffix, but as a mere observation on the comitative suffix. To put it differently, in Önorbajan (2004), the two discussions that should be offered in different paragraphs are unintentionally placed in one paragraph, with no space between them. Even so, it is still of considerable concern which member of juxtaposed words takes the proprietive suffix. For this reason, the discussion in Section 4.3 still has significance.

b. *	Dorž PSN.NOM	maš very	<b>uxaan</b> , cleverness	<b>av'jaas-taj</b> talent-PROP	xün person.NOM	bajna. MP
(40) a.	Jum thing	büxen-d every-DAT	<b>xariuclaga-taj</b> , responsibility-TAJ	<b>idevx-tej</b> activeness-TAJ		
	xand-a-x turn-E-VN.NP		jos-toj. reason-PROP			
	'You should work on everything responsibly and actively.'					
	LT: 'You [are] with the reason to face everything with responsibility and activeness.'					
b. *	Jum thing	büxen-d every-DAT	<b>xariuclaga</b> , responsibility	<b>idevx-tej</b> activeness-TAJ		
	xand-a-x turn-E-VN.NP		jos-toj. reason-PROP			

In contrast to the two pairs of sentences above, examples are also found where the proprietive suffix is attached only to the last member of juxtaposed words, as is the case with the comitative suffix. (Some speakers judge the variations (41a) and (42a), where the proprietive suffix is attached to every member of juxtaposed words, as less acceptable than (41b) and (42b).)

(41) a.	Ter that	xün person.NOM	<b>malgaj-taj</b> , hat-PROP	<b>beelij-tej</b> glove-PROP	xün person.NOM	baj-san. be-VN.PAST
	'That person was one who was wearing a hat and gloves.'					
b.	Ter that	xün person.NOM	<b>malgaj</b> , hat	<b>beelij-tej</b> glove-PROP	xün person.NOM	baj-san. be-VN.PAST
(42) a.	<b>Malgaj-taj</b> , hat-TAJ	<b>beelij-tej</b> glove-TAJ	gar-aaraj. go.out-TV.OPT			
	'Go out wearing a hat and gloves.'					
b.	<b>Malgaj</b> , hat	<b>beelij-tej</b> glove-TAJ	gar-aaraj. go.out-TV.OPT			

The difference of the position of the proprietive suffix in (39) and (40) on the one hand, and in (41) and (42) on the other, can be explained as follows. As for *uxaan-taj* 'clever' in (39), and *xariuclaga-taj* 'responsibly' in (40), the base to which the proprietive suffix is attached has a relatively low degree of autonomy (that is, the base and the proprietive suffix are tightly bound together), whereas in the case of *malgaj-taj* in (41) and (42), the base exhibits a relatively high degree of autonomy (that is, the base and the proprietive suffix are loosely tied up). In other words, the difference observed in (39) and (40) on the one hand, and in (41) and (42) on the other, reflects different degrees of "lexical integrity" of the N-PROPS<sup>33</sup>.

As displayed in (38), (41), and (42), the comitative suffix, and the proprietive suffix in some examples are attached to the last member of juxtaposed words. In contrast, as seen in (39) and (40), the proprietive suffix involved in the other examples appears in every member of juxtaposed words. That means, by observing the position of *-TAJ* in juxtaposed words, we can distinguish the proprietive suffix TIGHTLY cohering to the base from the comitative suffix. However, we cannot tell the proprietive suffix LOOSELY attached to the base from the comitative suffix.

In Section 3, we have shown inflectional characteristics of the proprietive suffix. To these, we can add the feature revealed in this subsection (that is, the fact that the proprietive suffix is attached to the last member of juxtaposed words at least in some instances).

<sup>33</sup> Hashimoto (2010: 119-120, 125) points out that the inner structure of N-PROPS (that is, semantic analyzability into the proprietive suffix and its base) becomes obscure, particularly when the proprietive suffix is attached to bases denoting properties. This statement suggests that degree of lexical integrity of N-PROPS is associated with the meaning of the bases.

#### 4.4 Summary of Section 4

We summarize the discussions in Section 4 as follows<sup>34</sup>. First, *-TAJ* in adnominal modifiers is considered not as the comitative, but as the proprietive suffix, in terms of the ability to take the reflexive suffix. As for *-TAJ* in adverbial modifiers, in contrast, it is sometimes difficult to determine if it is the proprietive or comitative suffix (Section 4.1).

Second, we have discussed whether we can differentiate between the two kinds of *-TAJ* by observing their ability to co-occur with the postposition *xamt* or *cug* ‘together.’ This procedure is valid for distinguishing between them in ADNOMINAL modifiers. However, we are uncertain whether this method is also applicable to *-TAJ* in ADVERBIAL modifiers, in particular, in those referring to “possession at that very moment.” Even if this criterion is proved valid for discriminating between the proprietive and comitative suffixes, we cannot always rely on it (Section 4.2).

Third, we have investigated the possibility of distinguishing the two kinds of *-TAJ* by examining their positions in juxtaposed words. By employing this method, we can distinguish the proprietive suffix that is tightly bound to its base, from the comitative suffix. However, we still cannot distinguish the proprietive suffix that loosely coheres to its base, from the comitative suffix (Section 4.3).

#### 5. Meanings of N-PROPs

As mentioned in Sections 2.1 and 3.1 in the overview article by Ebata (this volume), the following general tendency is observed in the languages examined in the featured topic.

(43) When a proprietive suffix is attached to the base referring to “not everyone”-type possessee (what not everyone possesses), or to the base indicating “everyone”-type possessee (what everyone possesses) accompanying modifiers, then the derived N-PROP denotes simple possession. In contrast, when a proprietive suffix is attached to the base referring to “everyone”-type possessee accompanying no modifiers, the derived N-PROP often denotes ‘special N’ (the possessor has a special kind of possessee) or ‘plenty of N’ (the possessor possesses the referent of the base in abundance).

<sup>34</sup> As to differences between the proprietive and comitative suffixes, Luvsanvandan (1968: 181) reports that N-PROPs and comitative nouns correspond to different interrogative words. According to him, N-PROPs correspond to the interrogative word *jamar* ‘what kind of’ and *jaaž* ‘how’, whereas comitative nouns correspond to *xen-tej* ‘with whom.’ For instance, he notes that *zorig-toj* ‘bravely’ in (i) corresponds to *jaaž* ‘how’, while *Zorig-toj* ‘with Zorig (personal name)’ in (ii), correspond to *xen-tej* ‘with whom’ ((i) and (ii) are cited from Luvsanvandan (1968: 181); Romanization, hyphenation, emphasis in bold face, glosses, and translation are mine).

(i) Bat                    **zorig-toj**                    barild-laa.  
PSN.NOM            bravery-TAJ            wrestle-TV.PAST  
‘Bat wrestled bravely.’ (Luvsanvandan, 1968: 181)

(ii) Bat                    **Zorig-toj**                    barild-laa.  
PSN.NOM            PSN-TAJ                    wrestle-TV.PAST  
‘Bat wrestled with Zorig.’ (Luvsanvandan, 1968: 181)

It is true that this criterion is applicable to (i) and (ii). However, the situation is not so straightforward. Let us observe what interrogative word *ulaan cūnx-tej* ‘with a red bag’ in (iii) corresponds to.

(iii) Ter            xūn                    **ulaan**            **cūnx-tej**            baj-san.  
that            person.NOM            red            bag-PROP            be-VN.PAST  
‘That person was carrying a red bag.’            LT: ‘That person was with a red bag.’

(iv) Ter            xūn                    **juu-taj**            baj-san            be?  
that            person.NOM            what-PROP            be-VN.PAST            Q  
‘What was that person carrying?’            LT: ‘That person was with what?’

As seen in (iv), *ulaan cūnx-tej* ‘with a red bag’ corresponds to neither *jamar* ‘what kind of’, *jaaž* ‘how’, nor *xen-tej* ‘with whom’, but to *juu-taj* ‘with what.’ If we rigidly apply the criterion proposed by Luvsanvandan, we cannot identify whether *-TAJ* in *ulaan cūnx-tej* in (iii) is the proprietive or the comitative suffix.

If we interpret Luvsanvandan’s statement broadly, there are at least two possible analyses. First, if Luvsanvandan’s point is that comitative nouns correspond to interrogative words involving the form *-taj/-toj/-tej*, then it follows that *-TAJ* in *ulaan cūnx-tej* ‘with a red bag’ in (iii) is the comitative suffix because *ulaan cūnx-tej* corresponds to *juu-taj*, which includes the form *-taj*. However, it should be noted that what we can know through this procedure (that is, by observing if *-TAJ* is included in the corresponding interrogative word) might not be whether *-TAJ* in question is the proprietive or the comitative suffix, but how tightly *-TAJ* coheres to its base. (Refer to the discussion concerning “lexical integrity” in Section 4.3.)

Second, if Luvsanvandan’s point is that comitative nouns correspond to interrogative words involving *xen* ‘who’, then *-TAJ* included in *cūnx-tej* ‘with a bag’ in (iii) is recognized not as the comitative suffix but as the proprietive suffix *-TAJ* because *cūnx-tej* corresponds not to *xen-tej* ‘with whom’ but to *juu-taj* ‘with what.’ (If this is Luvsanvandan’s point, it follows that he maintains the comitative suffix is attached to nouns referring to people.)

At any rate, we are uncertain whether Luvsanvandan considers *-TAJ* in (iii) as the proprietive or comitative suffix, hence we limit ourselves to introducing his statement in this footnote, not in the body text of the article.

This tendency is also recognized in Mongolian. For instance, *saxal-taj* ‘wearing a mustache’, an N-PROP formed from *saxal* ‘mustache’ for “not everyone”-type possessee, denotes simple possession of ‘mustache’ (that is, *saxal-taj* does not necessarily mean that the possessor has plenty of, or a special kind of mustache). In the same fashion, *cenxer nüd-tej* ‘blue-eyed’, which is formed from *nüd* ‘eye’ (a noun for “everyone”-type possessee) modified by *cenxer* ‘blue’, expresses that the possessor “simply” possesses blue eyes. On the contrary, when the proprietive suffix is attached to the base for “everyone”-type possessee accompanying no modifiers, it is expressed that the possessor has the possessee in abundance (*xüč-tej* ‘powerful’ ← *xüč* ‘power’ in (6)), or that the possessor has a special kind of possessee (*tolgoj-toj* ‘clever’ ← *tolgoj* ‘head’ in (6a); a sentence involving *tolgoj-toj* is provided in (44) below).

- (44) Dorž                    bol                    **tolgoj-toj.**  
 PSN.NOM            FP                    head-PROP  
 ‘Dorj is clever.’                    LT: ‘Dorj has a head.’

Although the above-mentioned tendency does exist in Mongolian, it is not that unmodified N-PROPs formed from the base for “everyone”-type possessee by no means denote simple possession. For instance, *tolgoj-toj* can express simple possession in certain contexts, even when it accompanies no modifier. In (45) below, *tolgoj-toj* does not signify that the possessor has a special kind of head (or plenty of heads), but that he/she simply possesses a “normal” head (a container for a brain).

- (45) Xün                    бүр                    **tolgoj-toj.**            Tijm                    učraas  
 person                    every.NOM            head-PROP            like.that                    because
- jum                    болгон-yg                    өөр-ijn-xöö                    tolgoj-g-oor  
 thing                    every-ACC                    self-GEN-REFL                    head-E-INS
- sajn                    дүгнe-x                    xereg-tej.  
 well                    evaluate-VN.NP                    necessity-PROP  
 ‘Everyone has a head. Therefore, we have to judge everything with our own head.’  
 LT: ‘Every person [is] with a head. Because of that, [we are] with the necessity to evaluate everything with our own head.’

The same applies to *nüd-tej*, the N-PROP formed from *nüd* ‘eye.’ When occurring without modifiers, *nüd-tej* usually expresses ‘special N’, namely, ‘discerning, with an eye for.’

- (46) Dulmaa                    мал-д                    **nüd-tej.**  
 PSN.NOM                    livestock-DAT                    eye-PROP  
 ‘Dulmaa has an eye for livestock.’                    LT: ‘Dulmaa [is] with an eye for livestock.’

However, in certain contexts, unmodified *nüd-tej* can also denote that the possessor “simply” possesses eyes (that is, that the possessor has eyes as an organ of vision).

- (47) Dulmaa=č                    **nüd-tej.**                    Tijm                    učraas  
 PSN.NOM=FP                    eye-PROP                    like.that                    because
- өөр-ijn-xöö                    нүд-eer                    sajn                    муу-g=n’  
 self-GEN-REFL                    eye-INS                    good                    bad-ACC=3POSS
- jalga-ž                                       čад-na                    biz.  
 distinguish-CVB.IPFV                    be.able.to-TV.NP                    MP  
 ‘Dulmaa, too, has eyes. Therefore, she will be able to distinguish between right and wrong with her own eyes.’  
 LT: ‘Dulmaa, too, [is] with eyes. Because of that, [she] will be able to distinguish good and bad with her own eyes.’

To give another example, *xamar-taj* ‘with a nose’, the N-PROP formed from *xamar* ‘nose’, is usually used with modifiers and expresses simple possession (*tom xamar-taj* ‘with a **big** nose’); *xamar-taj* seldom occurs without modifiers (Example (48)).

- (48) ? Njalx            xüüded            **xamar-taj.**  
 infant            child.NOM        nose-PROP  
 (Intended meaning: ‘Babies have a nose.’)

However, when it matters that the possessor has a nose as everyone does, *xamar-taj* ‘with a nose’ can be used for simple possession, accompanying no modifiers.

- (49) Njalx    xüüded=č            **xamar-taj.**        Tijm            učraas  
 infant    child.NOM=FP        nose-PROP        like.that        because

njalx    xüüxed            č gesen            cecg-ijn            sajxan  
 infant    child.NOM        even                flower-GEN        nice

üner-ijg            meder-č            čad-dag            jum.  
 smell-ACC        feel-CVB.IPFV    be.able.to-VN.HAB    MP

‘Babies, too, have a nose. Therefore, they are able to perceive the sweet smell of flowers.’

Adducing examples from Djaru, Warrungu, Japanese, and English, Tsunoda (1995: 617–623; 2009: 163–165) points out that (i) unmodified nouns for “everyone”-type possessee can be employed in possessive expressions when they “describe something special/unusual/marked” (that is, what is called ‘special N’ and ‘plenty of N’, according to the terminology in the articles on our featured topic). In addition, he argues that (ii) when put in adequate contexts, unmodified nouns for “everyone”-type possessee can denote simple possession (Tsunoda, 1995: 619; 2009: 163).

Examples (45), (47), and (49), where unmodified N-PROPs formed from the base for “everyone”-type possessee express simple possession, are recognized as instances of (ii) in Tsunoda’s statement. To put it concretely, we seldom concern ourselves with the fact that someone has a head, eyes, or a nose (“everyone”-type possessee), hence examples are also rarely found where unmodified N-PROPs such as *tolgoj-toj* ‘with a head’, *nüü-tej* ‘with eyes’, and *xamar-taj* ‘with a nose’ are employed. However, when it is worth expressing “commonplace” simple possession of “everyone”-type possessee, such N-PROPs can also be used, as seen in (45), (47), and (49).

More broadly, we find similar instances in other expressions than possession as well. Certain words are almost always employed with modifiers because the information denoted by the sentences involving the unmodified words in question is unworthy to take the trouble of conveying; however, the same unmodified words can be used with no trouble when they are put in appropriate contexts (or when they accompany modifiers). Take the noun *xün* ‘person’ as an example. It can appear as the predicate in non-verbal predication when accompanying modifiers, as in (50) below.

- (50) Dorž            bol            **sajn**    **xün.**  
 PSN.NOM        FP            good    person.NOM  
 ‘Dorj is a good man.’

In contrast, examples involving the predicate *xün* accompanying no modifiers usually sound awkward, as shown in (51) and (52).

- (51) ? Dorž            bol            **xün.**  
 PSN.NOM        FP            person.NOM  
 (Intended meaning: ‘Dorj is a man.’)

- (52) ? Bi            **xün.**  
 1SG.NOM        person.NOM  
 (Intended meaning: ‘I am a man.’)

When the unmodified predicate *xün* ‘person’ is placed in an appropriate context, however, the sentence becomes acceptable, as in (53) and (54).

- (53) Dorž            bol            **xün.**            Araatan            šig            бүдүүлег  
 PSN.NOM        FP            person.NOM        beast            as            brutish  
 am’tan            biš.  
 animal.NOM        NEG  
 ‘Dorj is a man. He is not as barbaric a fellow as a beast.’



(54) Bi=č            **xün.**            Tijm            boloxoor  
 1SG.NOM=FP   person.NOM   like.that       because

burxan            šig            tögs#tögöldör    biš            šüü.  
 Buddha            as            complete        NEG        MP

‘I, too, am a human. So, I am not as perfect as Buddha.’

LT: ‘Even I [am] a human. Because of that, [I am] not [as] perfect as Buddha.’

In (45), (47), and (49), we have seen that unmodified N-PROPs formed from the base for “everyone”-type possessee can also express simple possession when placed in appropriate contexts. When we observe this phenomenon from a broader perspective (that is, when we bring Examples (50) – (54) into view as well), we find it a mere reflection of the general tendency in our language activity to seldom bother to utter what is in the natural order of things.

Section 5 can be summarized as follows: As stated in (43), when the proprietive suffix is attached to unmodified bases for “everyone”-type possessee, the derived N-PROPs often denote ‘special N’ (the possessor has a special kind of possessee) or ‘plenty of N’ (the possessor possesses the referent of the base in abundance). This phenomenon is a reflection of the general tendency in our language activity that we are seldom bothered to utter what is taken for granted. However, such N-PROPs can also express simple possession when put in appropriate contexts.

### 6. Structure of sentences involving an N-PROP in the final position

As remarked in Section 2.2, N-PROPs such as *xereg-tej* ‘it is necessary that’ (← *xereg* ‘necessity’) and *jos-toj* ‘ought to’ (← *jos* ‘reason, principle, rule’), are often preceded by an adnominal clause, and appear in the sentence-final position. See (45) and (55) for examples involving *xereg-tej* ‘it is necessary that’, and (5) and (40a) for ones including *jos-toj* ‘ought to.’

(55) Bid            ene            muu            zuršl-yg            tasla-n  
 1PL.NOM        this            bad            habit-ACC        cut-CVB.ASS

zogs00-x            **xereg-tej.**  
 stop-VN.NP        necessity-PROP

‘We have to let go of this bad habit.’

LT: ‘We [are] with the necessity to cut off this bad habit.’

If we take into account the literal translation ‘we are with the necessity to cut off this bad habit’, (55) is estimated to have the following structure:

(56) [[Bid] [[[ene muu zuršlyg taslan zogs00x] xereg] -tej]]

To put it differently, in the first place, *xereg* ‘necessity’ is modified by the adnominal clause *ene muu zuršlyg taslan zogs00x* ‘to cut off this bad habit.’ Second, *-TAJ* is attached to *ene muu zuršlyg taslan zogs00x xereg* ‘the necessity to cut off this bad habit.’ Third, *ene muu zuršlyg taslan zogs00x xeregtej* as a whole functions as the predicate of non-verbal predication. Finally, *bid* ‘we’ occurs as the sentence subject before this predicate. However, we notice that this analysis should be discarded when we encounter Example (57), where *bid* is placed in a different position.

(57) Ene            muu            zuršl-yg            **bid**            tasla-n  
 this            bad            habit-ACC        1PL.NOM        cut-CVB.ASS

zogs00-x            **xereg-tej.**  
 stop-VN.NP        necessity-PROP

‘We have to let go of this bad habit.’

In (57), *bid* ‘we’ cuts into *ene muu zuršlyg taslan zogs00x*, which we have analyzed as an adnominal clause modifying *xereg* ‘necessity.’ Considering the position of *bid* ‘we’ in (57), it would be inappropriate to recognize *ene muu zuršlyg taslan zogs00x* as an adnominal clause as a whole; we should rather look for another interpretation. One option would be as follows:

(58) [[bid] [ene muu zuršlyg] [[taslan zogs00x] [xereg-tej]]]

In (58), *xereg* in *xereg-tej* is not modified by an adnominal clause. Rather, *xereg-tej* behaves as a kind of auxiliary constituent that composes the predicate with *taslan zogsoox*<sup>35</sup>. In addition to *xereg-tej* and *jos-toj*, we often encounter examples where an N-PROP accompanying a “superficial” adnominal clause appears in the sentence-final position. To list some candidates of the N-PROPs used thus:

- (59) a. *janz-taj* ‘it seems that’ ← *janz* ‘appearance’  
 b. *šinž-tej* ‘it seems that’ ← *šinž* ‘sign, indication’  
 c. *sanaa-taj* ‘intend to’ ← *sanaa* ‘thought’  
 d. *žišee-tej* ‘there exists a case where’ ← *žišee* ‘example’  
 e. *udaa-taj* ‘there exists a case where’ ← *udaa* ‘time, occasion’

We have not yet examined whether the sentence subject can be cut into the “adnominal clause” in sentences involving N-PROPs adduced in (59). We need detailed descriptions of N-PROPs other than *xereg-tej* ‘it is necessary’, and *jos-toj* ‘ought to’ in future research.

### 7. Summary and future issues

We can present the conclusions of this article as follows: In Section 2, we have provided an overview of the characteristics of the Mongolian proprietive suffix *-TAJ*, with reference to descriptions offered in the literature. First, we have noted the functions N-PROPs can perform. They can be employed as non-verbal predicates, nominal heads, adnominal modifiers, and adverbial modifiers. They sometimes accompany an “apparent” adnominal clause and appear in the sentence-final position to function as a kind of auxiliary constituent. It has also been confirmed that N-PROPs can denote containers (with something), and content (in containers). Third, we have listed which derivational characteristics the proprietive suffix exhibits. Fourth, we have adduced some expressions related to it (the abessive suffix *-güj*, and possessive and existential expressions involving the verb *baj-* ‘to be’).

In Section 3, we have observed that the proprietive suffix also exhibits characteristics that are shared with inflectional suffixes.

Section 4 has exemplified that it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between the proprietive and comitative suffixes in adverbial modifiers, with special reference to those denoting “possession at that very moment.” In addition, we are uncertain of the validity of some of the criteria provided in the literature for differentiating between the two kinds of *-TAJ*. Furthermore, some of the criteria advocated in the literature are capable of narrow application.

Section 5 has described N-PROPs with reference to two kinds of possessee: “everyone”-type possessee, and “not everyone”-type possessee. Unmodified N-PROPs formed from the base for “not everyone”-type possessee, and modified N-PROPs formed from the base for “everyone”-type possessee, tend to express simple possession. In contrast, unmodified N-PROPs formed from the base for “everyone”-type possessee often denote ‘special N’ (the possessor has a special kind of possessee) or ‘plenty of N’ (the possessor possesses the referent of the base in abundance). Nonetheless, they can also refer to simple possession when put in appropriate contexts. We have observed that the reason for this phenomenon lies in the general tendency seen in our language activity, i.e., that we are seldom bothered to utter what is in the natural order of things.

Lastly in Section 6, we have discussed the structure of the sentences where an N-PROP accompanying an “apparent” adnominal clause occurs in the final position. It has been concluded that the base of *-TAJ* is not modified by an adnominal clause; rather, the N-PROPs in question function as a kind of auxiliary constituent.

This article has investigated the characteristics of the Mongolian proprietive suffix in terms of morphology (Sections 3 and 4), syntax (Section 6), and semantics (Section 5). Although we have been able to reveal some of its unknown features, much is still unknown and more detailed research is needed. Furthermore, we have provided only a few statements concerning the abessive suffix *-güj*, and other related expressions. These topics should also be dealt with in future research.

<sup>35</sup> As to N-PROPs listed in Bosson (1964: 54), such as *xereg-tej*, *jos-toj*, and *üüreg-tej* ‘be obliged to’ (← *üüreg* ‘duty’), Kazama (1999: 97) notes that they “function as auxiliary verbs.” Although Kazama does not explain on what bases these N-PROPs are considered auxiliary verbs, his statement is of importance because he suggests that N-PROPs appearing in the sentence-final position perform a different function from those occurring in other positions.

## Abbreviations

# – boundary in a compound	DS – derivational suffix	PAST – past
- – suffix boundary	E – epenthesis	PL – plural
= – clitic boundary	FP – focus particle	POSS – possessive
1 – first person	GEN – genitive	PROP – proprietive
2 – second person	HAB – habitual	PSN – personal name
3 – third person	INS – instrumental	Q – question particle
ABES – abessive	IPFV – imperfective	REFL – reflexive possessive
ABL – ablative	LT – literal translation	SG – singular
ACC – accusative	MP – modal particle	TV – terminating verbal
ASS – associative	NEG – negative	VN – verbal nominal
CON – conditional	NOM – nominative	VOL – volutive
CVB – converb	NP – non-past	
DAT – dative-locative	OPT – optative	

## References

- Binnick, Robert I. (1979) *Modern Mongolian: A transformational syntax*. Toronto/Buffalo/London: University of Toronto Press.
- Bittigau, Karl Rudolf (2003) *Mongolische Grammatik: Entwurf einer Funktionalen Grammatik (FG) des modernen, literarischen Chalchamongolischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Bosson, James E. (1964) *Modern Mongolian: A primer and reader*. Uralic and Altaic Series, vol. 38. Bloomington: Indiana University Publications.
- Hashimoto, Kunihiko (2010) Sonzai to shoyuu no aida: Mongorugo no sonzaibun to shoyuubun no imiron [Between existence and possession: The semantics of existential sentences and possessive sentences in Mongolian]. *Hokkaido Gengo Bunka Kenkyuu* [Journal of Language and Culture of Hokkaido] 8: 105–127.
- Kazama, Shinjiro (1999) Arutai shogengo no ikutsuka ni mirareru shoyuu/sonzai o arawasu ichikeishiki ni tsuite [On a form indicating 'possession/existence' found in the Altaic languages]. *Altai Hakpo* [Journal of the Altaic Society of Korea] 9: 93–124.
- Khurelbat, B. (1998) *Mongolian word formation*. Ulaanbaatar: Publisher information unavailable.
- Kullmann, Rita and D. Tserenpil (1996) *Mongolian grammar*. Hong Kong: Jenco.
- Kuribayashi, Hitoshi (1992) Mongorugo [Mongolian]. In: Takashi Kamei, Rokurō Kōno and Eiichi Chino (eds.) *Gengogaku daijiten* [The Sanseido encyclopaedia of linguistics], vol. 4, 501–517. Tokyo: Sanseido.
- Luvsanvandan, Š. (1968) *Orčin cagijn mongol xelnij būtec: Mongol xelnij üg, nōxcöl xojor n'* [Structure of Modern Mongolian: Words and inflectional suffixes in Mongolian]. Ulaanbaatar: B.N.M.A.U. Šinžlex Uxaany Akademi.
- Önörbajan, C. (2004) *Orčin cagijn mongol xelnij üg zūj: Mongol xelnij mergežlijn angijn ojuutan, mergežlijn bagš nar, xel sudlaačdad zoriulav* [Morphology in Modern Mongolian: For Mongolian language students, teachers, and linguists]. Ulaanbaatar: Mongol Sudlalyn Surguul', Mongol Ulsyn Bolovsrolyn Ix Surguul.'
- Tsunoda, Tasaku (1995) The possession cline in Japanese and other languages. In: Hilary Chappell and William McGregor (eds.) *The grammar of inalienability: A typological perspective on body part terms and the part-whole relation* (Empirical approaches to language typology 14), 566–630. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Tsunoda, Tasaku (2009) *Sekai no gengo to nihongo: Gengo ruikeiron kara mita nihongo* [Languages of the world and Japanese: Japanese from the perspective of language typology]. Revised edition. Tokyo: Kurosio.
- Umetani, Hiroyuki (2012) Mongorugo no shoyuu o arawasu setsuji [Proprietive suffix in Mongolian]. *Hoppoo Gengo Kenkyuu* [Northern Language Studies] 2: 47–72.

Umetani Hiroyuki, Ph. D.  
Research associate.  
**Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa**  
Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.  
Asahi-cho 3–11–1, Fuchu-shi, Tokyo 183–8534, Japan.  
E-mail: humetani@tufs.ac.jp

Материал поступил в редакцию 07.01.2014.

*Уметани Хироюки*

## ПРОПРИЕТИВНЫЙ СУФФИКС В МОНГОЛЬСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

Целью данной статьи является описание проприетивного суффикса *-TAJ* в халха-монгольском языке. Во-первых, исследуются характеристики и способы его употребления в сравнении с имеющимися в литературе описаниями. Во-вторых, в статье утверждается, что проприетивный суффикс, который относят к деривационным суффиксам, также обладает некоторыми чертами словоизменительного суффикса. В-третьих, описываются особенности проприетивного суффикса в сравнении с комитативным падежом – тема, которая широко обсуждается последнее время в исследованиях по монгольским языкам, поскольку выделение данных суффиксов проблематично вследствие омонимичности их форм. В-четвертых, выделяются характерные семантические черты образованных с помощью суффикса *-TAJ* форм с учетом семантики основы. Наконец, в статье представлен анализ предложений, в которых образованные с помощью суффикса *-TAJ* такие формы, как *xereg-tej* «необходимо» и *jos-toj* «должен», занимают позицию в конце предложения.

**Ключевые слова:** *деривация, словоизменение, посессивность, комитатив, лексическая целостность, вспомогательные слова.*

Уметани Хироюки, доктор лингвистики.

**Институт языков и культур Азии и Африки.**

Токийский университет международных исследований.

Asahi-cho 3-11-1, Fuchu-shi, Tokyo 183-8534, Japan.

E-mail: humetani@tufs.ac.jp