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HUI LOANWORDS IN DONGXIANG MONGOLIAN
Kenneth L. Field
University of California at Santa Barbara

1.0 Introduction
According to the Dongxiang Language Dictionary, 50% of the Dongxiang lexicon consists of Hui loans. In light of this situation, this paper seeks to answer the following questions:
1) What factors led Dongxiang to borrow so extensively from Hui?
2) Is there a predominant grammatical category to which Hui loans belong?
3) How reliable is the Dongxiang Language Dictionary with respect to Hui loans?
4) What are the percentages of Hui loans in natural language use and how do they function?

2.0 Background
The Dongxiang (or Santa) nationality, with a population of over 280,000, is one of the officially recognized national minorities of China. They live in southern Gansu province in the mountainous Dongxiang Autonomous County. As you can see in the map below, Dongxiang Autonomous County (located in the lower right hand portion of the map) is situated to the southwest of Lanzhou and east of the town of Linxia. Linxia has been an important trade and Islamic center for most of the minority nationalities of Gansu and Qinghai province since the Yuan dynasty (13th century A.D.). The Chinese name Dongxiang, literally ‘east villages’, was given to the people by the Hui and Han inhabitants of Linxia on account of the fact that the Dongxiang villages are located east of Linxia. However, the Dongxiang people call themselves ‘santa’ which is probably derived from the Middle Mongolian word referring to the Muslims of Central Asia. In this paper I will refer to the people and the language as Dongxiang.

The Dongxiang language is significantly different from and mutually unintelligible with any other member of the Mongolian language family. These include three Mongolian languages spoken in the Qinghai/Gansu border region. They are Eastern Yellow Uighur (not related to the Uighur spoken in western China), Mongour (or Tuzu), and Baonan (or Bao’an). The regions where both dialects of Baonan are spoken and one of the two dialects of Mongour is spoken are also indicated on the map below.

There is a great deal of ethnological and historical evidence suggesting that the Dongxiang people were Islamic artisans of Central Asia captured by the Mongolian Army on its western expeditions during the thirteenth century. They have been classified as se mu ren, ‘people with colored eyes’, belonging to different ethnic groups speaking different languages in Central Asia. After being
captured by the Mongols, they were forced to acquire the language of their masters and settle in their present home land. (See Ma & Ma, 1982). This evidence strongly suggests that the Dongxiang language was originally a Mongolian pidgin. Another piece of evidence that supports this hypothesis is that the Dongxiang people do not consider themselves to be of Mongolian descent. If Dongxiang was originally a pidgin (and therefore cannot be considered a direct genetic descendant of Middle Mongolian), then this fact may account for a number of striking differences between Dongxiang Mongolian and Khalkha Mongolian spoken in Mongolia. These differences include a lack of vowel harmony, a lack of phonemic vowel length, and a reduced aspectual system. Although the possibility of internal change should not be ignored, these differences are quite possibly results of imperfect learning by the Dongxiang speakers of their target language, which was probably some form of Middle Mongolian.

If we accept the fact that Dongxiang was originally a Mongolian pidgin, then it is safe to assume that at an earlier stage in the language, the lexicon was sparse. My hypothesis is that, due to an impoverished lexicon and the contributing sociological factors, the Dongxiang people subsequently incorporated large numbers of loanwords from the Hui people of Linxia. You can see on the map above that Linxia is situated just west of the region where the Dongxiang people live.
3.0 Language Contact and Borrowing

The Hui people of Linxia speak a northwestern Mandarin dialect. It differs from the Han Chinese dialect spoken in the same area, also a northwestern Mandarin dialect, in that it is SOV, not SVO; has only three tones as opposed to four; and exhibits a case system as well. (For more discussion of Hui see Li, 1984).

Linxia has been an important cultural, commercial, and Islamic center for the Hui and other national minorities in southern Gansu for centuries. Thus it is likely that the Hui and the Dongxiang people have been interacting with each other for an extended period of time.

A number of social factors contribute to language contact between the Hui and the Dongxiang. These include 1) Dongxiang Autonomous County’s close proximity to Linxia; 2) the Hui greatly outnumbering the Dongxiang (no exact figures are available for the Hui); 3) both the Hui and the Dongxiang people being Muslim and not ethnically identifying themselves as Han Chinese; and 4) the dominance of the Hui culture. The intensity of this contact is reflected in Dongxiang’s extensive borrowings from Hui in phonology, morphosyntax, and the lexicon.

In (1) below is the ‘borrowing scale’ proposed by Thomason and Kaufman in their 1988 publication, ‘Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics’. The purpose of their scale is first, to show that there is a correlation between intensity of contact (from casual contact to very strong cultural pressure) and extent of borrowing (from lexical borrowing only to heavy structural borrowing); and secondly, to classify languages according to this scale.

(1) Borrowing Scale (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988)
Type 1 Casual contact: lexical borrowing only
Type 2 Slightly more intense contact: slight structural borrowing
Type 3 More intense contact: slightly more intense structural borrowing
Type 4 Strong cultural pressure: moderate structural borrowing
Type 5 Very strong cultural pressure: heavy structural borrowing

If we place Dongxiang on this scale, it falls somewhere between types 4 and 5. Evidence for this is summarized in (2) below.

(2) Dongxiang borrowings from Hui
Lexicon: Strong influence from Hui
50% Hui loan words (according to the Dongxiang Language Dictionary)
Phonology: Moderate influence from Hui
Ultimate stress, progression towards pitch
accent as in Baonan?

Morphosyntax: Moderate influence from Hui
Resultative construction
Optional use of copula shi in equi-constructions
Use of adverbs yijing ‘already’ and zheng ‘PROG’
to clarify aspctual relations

A type 4 language on Thomason & Kaufman’s borrowing scale has not
only experienced extensive lexical borrowing, but phonological and
morphosyntactic borrowing as well. Phonologically, stress in Dongxiang
Mongolian does not conform to the pattern of stress in Khalkha Mongolian.
According to Poppe (1970), when there are no phonemically long vowels or
diphthongs in the word, Khalkha Mongolian has initial stress. Dongxiang,
however, has ultimate stress and furthermore it is not affected by phonemic vowel
length (a moot point since there isn’t any) nor by diphthongs. This may be
related to the phenomenon documented by Charles N. Li in Baonan Mongolian
where tonal distinctions have developed on Hui loanwords. (For more discussion
on this topic see Li, 1986).

Structurally, Dongxiang exhibits a number of constructions borrowed from
Hui which include the resultative construction, the optional use of the copula shi
in equi-constructions, and a frequent use of adverbs such as yijing ‘already’ and
zheng ‘PROG’ to clarify aspctual relations. In this paper, I will concentrate
primarily on the lexicon.

4.0 The Lexicon

In this section I will discuss Hui loanwords in the Dongxiang lexicon and
more specifically borrowed nouns, verbs, and adverbs.

Example (3) below is a tabulation of all the primary entries in the
Dongxiangyuyu Cihui, the Dongxiang Language Dictionary (DLD henceforth),
published in the Mongolian Language and Dialect Series in 1983 by the
University of Inner Mongolia at Huhehot in the People’s Republic of China,
which is the most complete of its kind to date. For the purposes of the tabulation
below, I counted only primary entries as opposed to secondary entries because
secondary entries are generally composed of at least two primary entries and I
didn’t want to count an entry twice. The editors of the dictionary listed the part
of speech and the source language of each entry. Although I feel a number of the
categorizations are internally inconsistent, I have made no attempt to rectify this
situation. Therefore, the tabulation in (3) below reflects the editor’s
categorizations and not mine.

A few points about other categories. Adjectives rank as a commonly
borrowed category at 37%. This is not uncommon because adjectives are usually
more nominal in nature. All numerals above ten are borrowed from Hui. There is a Dongxiang word for twenty but it is not commonly used. Measure words are also a commonly borrowed category at 50%, but these should not be confused with classifiers which are not borrowed.

(3) Lexical items by category and source language. (According to the Dongxiang Language Dictionary, 1983)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Dongxiang</th>
<th>Hui Loans</th>
<th>Other Loans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>558 32%</td>
<td>1110 65%</td>
<td>51 3% = 1719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>556 62%</td>
<td>334 37%</td>
<td>3 .3% = 893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>146 63%</td>
<td>85 37%</td>
<td>0 0% = 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>72 96%</td>
<td>2 3%</td>
<td>1 1% = 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onomatopoeia</td>
<td>45 98%</td>
<td>1 2%</td>
<td>0 0% = 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerals</td>
<td>42 70%</td>
<td>18 30%</td>
<td>0 0% = 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td>29 60%</td>
<td>19 40%</td>
<td>0 0% = 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interjections</td>
<td>17 100%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0% = 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time/Place</td>
<td>16 100%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0% = 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Verbs</td>
<td>9 90%</td>
<td>1 10%</td>
<td>0 0% = 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Words</td>
<td>6 50%</td>
<td>6 50%</td>
<td>0 0% = 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffixes</td>
<td>6 86%</td>
<td>1 14%</td>
<td>0 0% = 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood Words</td>
<td>5 83%</td>
<td>1 17%</td>
<td>0 0% = 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctions</td>
<td>3 75%</td>
<td>1 25%</td>
<td>0 0% = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1510 48%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1579 50%</strong></td>
<td><strong>55 2% = 3144</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 Borrowed Nouns

The most striking fact about (3) is the number of borrowed nouns from Hui, 1110 or 65%. There are twice as many borrowed nouns as there are indigenous Dongxiang nouns. This fact seems to indicate the pervasiveness of Hui nouns in the Dongxiang lexicon, but these results may be biased on two accounts.

First, researchers working on this project may have failed to elicit a large number of Dongxiang lexical items due to a lack of understanding of the Dongxiang culture. An analogous example (personal communication with Charles N. Li) is that Baonan Mongolian has numerous words for different types of horses. If one didn’t understand this aspect of their culture, one might overlook this and simply ask what was the Baonan word for ‘horse’ and fail to elicit a host of other words describing different types of horses.

Secondly, a large number of words may have been elicited that are not an inherent part of Dongxiang society and culture. Since a large portion of the Dongxiang population is bilingual, if a language consultant were asked what was the Dongxiang word for something that is not a part of his culture, he may simply
In (5), the Hui loan is *davyn* ‘agree, agreement’ and it co-occurs with the auxiliary *gie*- which in turn tales the aspectual marking. In (6), the Hui loan is *tiao* ‘jump’ (pronounced as *dzio* in Hui and Dongxiang) and it takes the derivational suffix *-yi*.

*-yi/-dzi* does not occur on indigenous Dongxiang verbs. *gie*- ‘do’, however, does occur with indigenous Dongxiang words and appears to be derivational in character, deriving verbs from nouns. Using an auxiliary ‘do’ to derive verbs from borrowed nouns is a common phenomenon and is attested in a number of typologically diverse languages. This may also suggest, by analogy, that the suffix *-yi/-dzi* also derives verbs from borrowed nouns (as opposed to simply marking borrowed verbs) and thus would conform to the already established tendency in Dongxiang to borrow nouns rather than verbs. Out of 334 verbal entries, 107 or 32% took *gie-, and 151 or 46% took *-yi/-dzi*. Thus 258 or 78% of all verbal entries were actually derived from nouns. If we count these as borrowed nouns, altogether 1368 of 1579 Hui borrowings or 87% are noun borrowings according to the DLD.

Another manner in which Hui loans are derived as verbs is to use one of many productive derivational suffixes in Dongxiang.

In (7) above, the Hui loan *dzzi* ‘to stick out’ takes the derivational suffix *-da*. 55 or 16% of the verbal entries are of this variety and take a number of different indigenous derivational suffixes. In some sense, these may be considered more marked. In my data, I found an instance where *dzio* ‘jump’ occurred with a suffix other than *-yi*. Compare (6) with (8) below.
substitute the respective Hui word in response. The nouns listed in (4) below are only a few examples from the DLD that illustrate this problem.

(4)  
\begin{tabular}{ll}
  \textbf{Hui} & \textbf{Chinese} \\
  daŋ & political party \\
  daŋyan & party member \\
  gōmin & revolution \\
  gōngše & commune \\
  dzucti & Chairman Mao \\
  fangtœmin & someone against the revolution \\
\end{tabular}

In order to alleviate this bias, one should avoid inclusion of borrowed words in a dictionary if they in fact do not occur in natural language use such as conversations and narratives. I will return to this point in section 5.0.

4.2 Borrowed Verbs

According to (3), 37% of verbs in the Dongxiang lexicon are Hui loans. This figure is significantly lower than the possibly inflated 65% for borrowed Hui nouns. Although nouns borrowed from Hui can, so to speak, fill the same slot as a Dongxiang noun, this is not the case for borrowed verbs. If the loan is disyllabic, then the auxiliary verb giα- ‘do’ used. If the loan is monosyllabic, then the derivational suffix -yi/-dzi is used (-yi for vowel finals, and -dzi for nasal finals). See examples (5) and (6)4 below:

(5)  
\begin{tabular}{ll}
  \textit{in} & giαse \\
  \textit{in} & gie-se \\
\end{tabular}  
\begin{tabular}{ll}
  caladzi & \textit{dayiŋ giadziwe} \\
  caladzi & \textit{dayiŋ giα-dziwe} \\
\end{tabular} 

\textit{like this do-COND pheasant agree do-ASP} 
\textit{And so the pheasant agreed.}

(6)  
\begin{tabular}{ll}
  nie & dzioviṣe \\
  nie & dzio-yi-se \\
\end{tabular}  
\begin{tabular}{ll}
  one kowan enda bo ire wo \\
  one kowan enda bo ire wo \\
\end{tabular} 

\begin{tabular}{ll}
  one jump-BWS-COND this boy fall down come ASP \\
  With one jump the boy fall down (from the horse). \\
\end{tabular}

In (5), the Hui loan is \textit{dayiŋ} ‘agree, agreement’ and it co-occurs with the auxiliary giα- which in turn tales the aspectual marking. In (6), the Hui loan is \textit{tiao} ‘jump’ (pronounced as dzio in Hui and Dongxiang) and it takes the derivational suffix -yi.

-yi/-dzi does not occur on indigenous Dongxiang verbs. giα- ‘do’, however, does occur with indigenous Dongxiang words and appears to be derivational in character, deriving verbs from nouns. Using an auxiliary ‘do’ to
derive verbs from borrowed nouns is a common phenomenon and is attested in a number of typologically diverse languages. This may also suggest, by analogy, that the suffix -yi/-dzi also derives verbs from borrowed nouns (as opposed to simply marking borrowed verbs) and thus would conform to the already established tendency in Dongxiang to borrow nouns rather than verbs. Out of 334 verbal entries, 107 or 32% took giæ-, and 151 or 46% took -yi/-dzi. Thus 258 or 78% of all verbal entries were actually derived from nouns. If we count these as borrowed nouns, altogether 1368 of 1579 Hui borrowings or 87% are noun borrowings according to the DLD.

Another manner in which Hui loans are derived as verbs is to use one of many productive derivational suffixes in Dongxiang.

(7) sadziwi oMZunni dzidaka suwu, sadziwi oMZun-ni dz1-da-wa suwu magpie neck-GEN stick-BWS-CAUS after, After the magpie had stuck his neck out (with pride),

In (7), the Hui loan dz1 ‘to stick out’ takes the derivational suffix -da. 55 or 16% of the verbal entries are of this variety and take a number of different indigenous derivational suffixes. In some sense, these may be considered more marked. In my data, I found an instance where dzio ‘jump’ occurred with a suffix other than -yi. Compare (6) with (8) below.

(8) dzis gi tsatsadzi dziolie toi wo. dz1- gi ts-a-ts-a-dzi dzio- lie toi wo. only-COP magpie.chatter-REDP-SUF jump-BWS begin ASP He could only begin to jump around chattering like a magpie.

In (8), the loan dzio ‘jump’ takes the suffix -lie and not -yi. As it turns out, toi ‘begin’ in example (8) is also a borrowing. (toi is one of the few examples of a verb apparently borrowed as a verb and it is not morphologically marked as a borrowing). When toi occurs in the V2 position of a V1 V2 serial verb construction, V1 must take the suffix -lie. From this we can see that in certain circumstances the unmarked suffix -yi/-dzi is overridden by grammatical considerations. This interplay has not been fully investigated at this time but certainly merits further consideration.

 Altogether, 99% of the verbal entries in the DLD were marked by a suffix or an auxiliary verb. This supports the assumption that nouns are more easily borrowed and that verbs are rarely borrowed as such.
4.3 Borrowed Adverbs

Although the DLD only lists 19 borrowed adverbs, my data (see 5.0 below) reveals that adverbs are one of the most commonly borrowed grammatical categories which occur in natural language use. Example (8) above has an adverb, *dzisa* 'only' in second position (the subject has been dropped because it is understood). This position is the same position adverbs usually occupy in Hui. In (9) below, there are two borrowed adverbs, *dzwn* 'PROG' which lexically marks the progressive aspect and *ixo* 'after' which subordinates this clause to the next.

(9)  
bi  sida  dzwn  yawu-iz  etsi  ixo,  
bi  sida  dzwn  yawu-dzi  etsi  ixo  
1SGNOM close.to  PROG  walk-SUBD  go  after,  
After walking up closer,  
ene  kewan  fuyi  bws1  ire-wa  wo.  
ene  kewan-ni  fu-yi  bws1  ire=wa  wo  
this boy-GEN  help-BWS  stand.up  come-CAUS  ASP  
(I) helped this boy to stand up.

Although it is not clear to me at this point why borrowed adverbs occur so frequently, I postulate that their function is to clarify the aspectual relations present in the proposition. One reason why this might be so is that the Dongxiang aspectual system is depleted when compared to the neighboring Mongolian languages Baonan and Mongour and also when compared to Khalkha Mongolian. This depletion may be a direct result of its origin as a pidgin.

5.0 Two Dongxiang Narrative Texts

Returning to the issue of looking at Hui loanwords from the perspective of natural language use, I counted Hui loanwords for types and tokens\(^5\) in two Dongxiang narrative texts from two different speakers. The first, "The magpie and the pheasant", is a folktale and the second, "A boy and his horse" is the retelling of an incident that actually occurred involving the speaker. The results of "The magpie and the pheasant" and "A boy and his horse" are tabulated below in (10) and (11) respectively.
### Hui Borrowings in "The magpie and the pheasant"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. yadzi</td>
<td>duck</td>
<td>noun</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. kuši</td>
<td>story</td>
<td>noun</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. dadzia</td>
<td>everybody</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. xon</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. dz1</td>
<td>only</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. dz1s1</td>
<td>only</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ye</td>
<td>also</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. idziņ</td>
<td>already</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. tšatsadzi</td>
<td>magpie.chatter</td>
<td>onomat.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. dziolia-</td>
<td>jump</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. dodzia gie-</td>
<td>reach a high level</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. daiņ gie-</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. dzuda-</td>
<td>stick out</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. tči-</td>
<td>begin</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hui Borrowings in "A boy and his horse"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ātčiņ</td>
<td>matter</td>
<td>noun</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. idzi</td>
<td>all the way</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ixo</td>
<td>after</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. dzun</td>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. yayi-</td>
<td>frightened</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. tšayi-</td>
<td>surprised</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. dziyoi-</td>
<td>jump</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. layi-</td>
<td>pull</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. pundzi-</td>
<td>meet</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. fuyi-</td>
<td>help</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In "The magpie and the pheasant", there are 14 borrowed types out of a total of 87 and there are 22 borrowed tokens out of a total of 186. Thus, 16% of the types and 12% of the tokens are borrowed. In "A boy and his horse", there are 10 borrowed types out of a total of 66 and there are 14 borrowed tokens out of a total of 135. Thus, 15% of the types and 10% of the tokens are borrowed. Even though one of these texts is a folktale and one is a narrative, the results are similar: 1) borrowed nouns are infrequent for both types and tokens; 2) borrowed verb types are the most frequent followed by adverbs - 10 and 8 respectively for both texts; 3) borrowed adverb tokens are the most frequent followed by verbs - 16 and 14 respectively for both texts.

This distribution is in striking contrast to the impression given by the DLD where nouns are the most predominantly borrowed grammatical category. This study reveals that the distribution of borrowed words in the lexicon and the distribution of borrowed words in natural language use is quite different and merits further study.
6.0 Conclusion

The ethnological and historical evidence suggests that Dongxiang was originally a pidgin. Subsequently, sociological factors contributed to the incorporation of large numbers of Hui loanwords into the previously impoverished lexicon. Although the Dongxiang Language Dictionary indicates that 50% of the Dongxiang lexicon consists of Hui loans, this figure is misleading because only 10 to 12 percent of tokens and 15 to 16 percent of types used in Dongxiang conversations and narratives are of Hui origin. Therefore the previously accepted notion of the extent to which Dongxiang has been sinicized with respect to its vocabulary must be re-examined in the light of natural language use.

Furthermore, even though the Dongxiang Language Dictionary is probably slanted to some extent due to poor elicitation techniques, nouns are still the most predominantly borrowed grammatical category. Borrowed nouns may fill the same slot as indigenous Dongxiang nouns. Conversely, 99% of all loans functioning as verbs in Dongxiang carry some sort of morphological marking. This suggests that verbs are rarely borrowed as verbs, but rather are derived from borrowed nouns. Thus the overall pattern still conforms to the borrowing of nouns.

Finally, two Dongxiang narrative texts revealed that although nouns are the most predominantly borrowed grammatical category, verbs and adverbs occur more frequently in natural language use. The frequency of borrowed nouns is most likely subject dependant while the frequency of borrowed verbs is less so. Adverbs are likely to occur more frequently in natural language use because their frequency is not subject dependant and because their function is to clarify the aspectual relations present in the proposition.
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3. ‘Other Loans’ includes borrowings from Arabic, Uighur, Persian, Tibetan, and some Middle Mongolian literary terms. A majority of these are Islamic religious terms.
4. This data was collected by the author in Linxia, Gansu Province during the summer of 1990. I would like to thank my language consultants, Ma Kexiong and Ma Jun, for their contribution.

Abbreviations:
ASP = aspect
BWS = derivational borrowed word suffix
CAUS = causative
COND = conditional
COP = copula
GEN = genitive
PROG = progressive
REDP = reduplication
SUBD = subordinator
SUF = suffix

5. Types are calculated according to the first instantiation of a word. Tokens are the number of occurrences of the type.
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