Benjamin Brosig: The aspect-evidentiality system of Middle Mongol

In this paper I will discuss the aspectual system of Middle Mongol (MM), the language of the Mongol Empire of the 13th and 14th century. The scope to this paper is limited to indicative final verbal predicates. It excludes aspect marking in non-finite clauses (§200, 8144: *Öreele kilgün bol-ulca-ju a-asu* '[Now] that he have become to each other like the shafts of a cart'), clauses ending in non-indicative mood suffixes (§225, 9365: *minqa mede-jü a-tuqai* 'he be commanding a thousand!') and non-verbal predicates. As interrogative and most negated clauses are based on finite verbs, clauses with interrogative markers or a negation adverb are included.

The order of this paper is as follows: In section 1, the inventory of morphemes and morpheme combinations that constitute the aspectual system of MM is discussed. Section 2 introduces the corpus. Then, the imperfective and perfective domains are discussed in section 3 and 4, respectively. Conclusions are drawn in section 5.

1 Inventory

As in all Mongolic languages, verbs can be divided into non-finite converbs, factultatively finite participles, finite indicative and mood forms. Sentence-final predicates can consist of a verb stem followed by one of the converbal suffixes *-n* and *-jU* plus copula, another instance of a converbal or participial suffix plus copula, and a finite or participial suffix at the end. Finite declarative suffixes in MM are the following:

Table 1: Finite declarative suffixes in MM (adapted from Rybatzki 2003: 75)

	citation form	variants	U	Ch	P	A
progr.-habitual	*-mU*	*-m, -mU, -mUi*	X	X	X	X
generic	*-yU*	*-yU, -yi*	X	X	X	
?progressive	*-nAm*	*-nAm*				X
past factual	*-bA*	*-bA, -bi, -bAi*	X	X	X	X
past firsthand	*-lUGA*	*-lU'A, -lU'Ai, -li'i*		X	X	
past non-firsth.	*-jUGU*	*-JU'U, -JU'Ui, -Ji'i, -Ji'Ai*	X	X	X	

Table 1 shows the distribution of suffixes and their variants in different sources in the Uyghur, Phags-pa and Arabic scripts and in Chinese characters. The Chinese and Uyghur corpus include many different sources and styles, while Phags-pa documents mainly consist of edicts and Arabic documents of dictionaries with isolated example sentences. Except for *-m* which is restricted to 14th century dictionaries, different variants of suffixes are probably due to the categories male singular, female singular and plural. This has been established firmest for the past perfective forms, especially the factual past with male singular *-bA*, female singular *-bi* and plural *-bAi* (Ozawa 1961, Tümenceceg 1990, Street 2008: 408-420; Mandaqu et al. 1997: 491-494 make a claim about present forms).[1] There

[1] Reconstructing proto-forms for these suffixes is usually not an easy task. As Toγtambayar (2012: 171-185) suggests, *-mUi* probably goes back to *-n bu-yu* / *-n bu-i* where the locative meaning of the copula plus the ancient generic suffix *-yu* were reinterpreted into present tense. Note that this explanation seems to require that *-i* was reanalyzed as a plural marker at a later stage, possibly in analogy with pre-existing verbal or adjectival paradigms. Toγtambayar further suggests *-mUi* > *-m* / *-nAm* > *-nA*, but a sound change to directly convert *-mUi* into *-nam* seems unlikely. Rather, *-nAm* as an innovation of the Arabic texts and thus the westernmost dialects of MM can be analyzed as consisting of the converb *-n*, the reccent copula *a-* and the recent suffix *-mU* or *-m*. Its genesis would exactly parallel the genesis of *-mUi*, just using less bleached morphemes. The third form that allows reasonable guessing is *-jUGU*. Bese (1970: 29-30) reconstructs *-jU.GU* as [converbum] "imperfecti" and [participium] "futuri.potential". The morphemes are probably identified correctly, but no variety of Mongolic allows a converb and a participle to combine freely. Assuming *-JU a-QU(i)* would solve the problem, but requires the problematic assumption that the copula use of *a-* is older than *-jUGU* itself. Imperfective converb plus copula would be a strange source for non-firsthand perfective semantics, but the meaning of *-jU* plus copula was perfective in MM (see 4.1.2). This indicates a

are also the rare suffix *-d* and the fairly frequent, but distributionally restricted suffix *-i/u* (Rybatzki 2003: 76-77). Rybatzki classifies the latter as a participial suffix, but I am uncertain whether all copula forms classified as belonging here indeed show an attributive use and an attributive use of *-d* might also have existed.

MM had the participial suffixes *-GsAn* (*-GsAd*), *-Gci* (*-Gcin*, late MM *-Gcid*), *-QU* (*-QUi*, *-QUn*) and *-GA* (*-GAi*).[2] The variants can be accounted for as plural forms occasionally extended to exalt subjects or insult them with sarcasm. *-QU* vs. *-QUi* might be exceptional in drawing a distinction between future and present. According to Bayarmendü (1986), 86.3% of *-QU*-forms in the SH have future and 86.5% of *-QUi*-forms present-time reference.[3] *-QU* frequently occurs in sentence-final position and so does the much rarer *-GA*, while *-gsAn* and *-QUi* are only rarely used sentence-finally. *-Gci* already appears to refer to the agent and is basically absent from sentence-final predications.

The copulas used in MM were *a-* (< 'exist, be located' < 'live, be alive') and *bü-*[4] (< 'exist, be located', arguably also 'stop doing') (Nasunurtu 1989: 90-96). The copula *bayi-* (< 'exist, be located' < 'stop+stand') had not yet emerged (cf. Secen 1993: 39-40), and even the peripheral copula-like *bolai* based on the stem *bol-* 'become' and the suffix *-u/i* is not attested in a non-dynamic use in early MM texts (cf. Secen 1993: 46-48, Secen n.d.). Both *a-* and *bü-* have an incomplete paradigm, but while *a-* (as copula and as a full verb) is lacking only the zero imperative, the semantically bleached *bü-* is not attested with *-bA*, *-mU*, *-Gci* and *-GA*, the converbal suffixes *-n*, *-bAcU* and *-GsAGAr* and the moods *-yA*, *-dQUn*/*-GtUn* and *-sUGAi* (Ozawa 1965: 92-93, Nasunurtu 1989: 100).[5] However, *bü-* is much more common (60-100:1) with *-yU* and *-lUGA* and *a-* with *-jUGU* (Nasunurtu 1989: 99-100, 104), and it is *bol-* rather than *a-* (at 50:1) that combines with the most frequent past suffix *-bA* (Ozawa 1965: 94, Street 2009: 130).[6] *a-* tends to combine with *-QU*, while *bü-* is much more common with *-QUi* (Ozawa 1965: 95).

As in all of Mongolic studies, research into periphrastic constructions is underdeveloped. Matsuoka (2008) analyses these as combinations of converbs plus copulas without suffixes, assuming that aspect and tense[/evidentiality] can be strictly separated. For the SH, he gives the following form count for quoted and non-quoted sentences:

Table 2: Combinations of converbs/participles with auxiliary roots in the SH (Matsuoka 2008: 146)

	-n bü-	*-n a-*	*-jU bü-*	*-jU a-*	*-QU bü-*	*-QU a-*	*-GsAn bü-*	*-GsAn a-*	sum

resultative construction from which a secondhand marker could have emerged in a cross-linguistically common way (Aikhenvald 2004: 279-281).

[2] Rybatzki (2003: 76-77) also lists *-dAG*, but as Bayarmendü (1986: 50-51) pointed out, it behaves like a deverbal adjective in MM. *-dAG* was rare, didn't take direct objects and (as Matsuoka 2008: 126-128 notes) might have been a Turkic loan.

[3] Street (1957: 18) already noted that SH *-QU* expresses future, while *-QUi* is unmarked for time. Bayarmendü (1986) states that *-QU* for future is down to 60% in later MM sources.

[4] The nature of the vowel in *bü-* is highly problematic (see Nasunurtu 1989: 96-99), varying between *ü*, *ö*, *u*, *i*, but the distribution of these vowels is complementarily tied to particular suffixes, so this need not concern us here.

[5] *-Gci* and *-bAcU* are only listed by Ozawa, *-QtUn* is only listed by Nasunurtu. Following Ozawa, my listing assumes *bui* and *amu(i)* to paradigmatically correspond. The rare *-d* appears to be attested with neither form.

[6] While combinations of *a-* with uncommon suffixes mostly represent its use as a full verb, the letter of Argun to Nikolai IV of 1290 contains the following sentence where *a-ba* cannot mean 'lived sending', but 'was sending'. Yet, this combination cannot be considered part of the aspectual system of MM as represented in larger texts.

> *ta* *kiristan* *irgen-dür* *ada* *büü* *kür-tügei* *keme-jü* *kedün-te* *ba*
> 2PL Christian people-DAT3 evil NEG.IMP reach-3IMP say-PFV.C some-times FOC
> *dugul-ga-n* *ilci-n* *ile-ged* *[ü]g[ü]le-ci* *kü* ***ile-n***
> listen-CAUS-CVB messenger-PL send-CVB.then speak-V>N FOC send-CVB
> ***a-ba*** *je.*
> COP2-PST.FC IP
> 'vous avez aussi à plusieurs reprises, nous faisant des communications, envoyé des ambassadeurs et dépêché des porteurs de messages verbaux disant: "Que du mal ne soit pas fait aux peuples chrétiens!"' (Mostaert and Cleaves 1951: 451, cf. 461 for reconstructing *ügüleci* from the illegible deverbal substantive *[...]g[...]le-ci*)

spoken	44	37	30	45	57	4	10	5	232
other	29	14	23	6	9	1	1	8	91
sum	73	51	53	51	66	5	11	13	323
	124		104		71		24		

Yet, table 3 does not relate to the frequency of co-occurrence with suffixes:

Table 3: Combinations of converbs/participles with inflected auxiliaries in MM (cf. Nasunurtu 1989: 109-110)

	-GsAn	*-QU(i)*		*-n*	*-jU*
bülege	3	73	*buyu*	17	0
ajugu	68	4	*amu*	1	17
sum	71	77		18	17

Moreover, the SH does not contain a single combination of present copulas directly following participles. Apparently, it is combinations of forms that have to be investigated. The core inventory of contrasting aspect markers in sentence-final position in the sources evaluated consists of the following forms (plus plural and gender variants):

Table 4: TAME inventory of MM

Imperfecitve	Perfective
-mU	*-JU'U*
-yU	*-lU'A*
	-bA
-QU	*-GA*
-QUi	*-GsAn*
-d	
-QU bolba	
-QU(i) bülüge	*-GsAn ajugu / bülüge*
	-GA bülüge
-n buyu	*-jU amu*
-n bülege / ajugu	*-jU bülüge / ajugu*

The newer finite verb *-nam* that seems to have emerged in the west in the 14th century was excluded from analysis, as it did not reach the other MM areas and is thus only attested in lexicon entries. Due to the very limited material available for *-i/u* with non-copula verbs, this form was not included either, even though the copula form *bu-i* will be mentioned occasionally.

2 Corpus

For MM, surviving texts are relatively few, and with an electronically readable corpus containing texts, reading variants and translations it would have been feasible to analyze the entire corpus. Because such a corpus does not exist, a subset of materials had to be selected. Due to their formulaic nature, decrees in Phagspa script and dictionaries in Arabic script cannot contribute much, leaving me with the texts in Mongol and Han script. While some additional sources were used eclectically, texts that were fully analyzed are

- the Secret history of the Mongols (SH), by far the largest, stylistically most diverse and best-analyzed MM text, which mainly narrates the life of Cinggis Qan
- four of the Sino-Mongol inscriptions (SMI 1335, 1338, 1346, 1362) which are largely secondhand narratives about the lives of important vassals of the Yuan court embedded in firsthand notes by the authors and translators

- the Mongol version of the Xiao Jing (XJ), a Confucian writing about timeless social relations

3 Imperfective domain

The imperfective domain consists of the markers *-mU, -yU, -n buyu, -n bülege / ajugu, -QU, -QUi, -QU(i) bülüge* and *-QU bolba* which will be discussed in this order.

3.1.1 *-mU* and *-yU*

No specialized studies seem to exist for the finite verbal suffixes *-mU* and *-yU*. Street (1957: 17-18) and Manduqu et al. (1997: 491-494) just call both "non-past". Poppe (1954: 91-92) considers *-mU* to be a normal non-past and *-yU* to be a "deductive present" which "expresses actions considered a logical result of previous actions or antitheses to the latter", which is denied by Bosson (1969: 21) for all of MM. Toγtambayar (2012: 177-179) argues that *-yu* is used to represent actions and customs in a timeless, abstract way, while *-mU* is said to refer to present and future. Nasunurtu (1989, see already Ozawa 1965: 104) perceives *a-mU* and *bu-yu* as harmonious combinations of copula and suffix expressing a modal category of objectivity (without referring to one's own perception of the action, possibly implying suddenness) and subjectivity (reference to the subject's personal perception of the action), respectively, but he does not analyze *-mU* and *-yU* on their own or example clauses in detail.

The frequency of *-mU* and *-yU* in the SH is quite similar (109 vs. 86 tokens), but excluding copula verbs shows significant differences. The ratio of *a-mU* vs. *bu-yu* is 16 vs. 59 tokens, leaving a ratio of 93:27 for *-mU* vs. *-yU* with other verbs. *A priori* including *buyu* into the analysis of *-yu* would thus be inappropriate. In contrast, the ratio in the philosophical XJ (excluding *bu-yu* and *bu-i*, including *a-yu*, *a-mU* does not occur) is 18:4 in favor of *-yU*. Likewise, *-yu* predominates in the Subhâṣitaratnanidhi which consists of several hundred wise sayings in four stanzas each.

-yu occurs in main clauses of conditional sentences. The first clause marked with the conditional converbal suffix *-basu* specifies a generic condition from which a particular consequence follows *with necessity*. This use is especially frequent in the XJ, accounting for 30-32 of 41 total uses of *-yu*:[7]

(1) *ede=ger* *üile-s-i* *irgen-i* ***jasa-basu*** *irgen_organ*
DPROX.PL=FOC act-PL-ACC people-ACC order-COND.C people
cog *jali-d-aca* *ayu-ju* *agali_aburi* *in-**u*** ***tagala-yu**,*
sparkle flame-DAT2-ABL fear-PVF.C character 3SG-GEN love-GN
üligerle-jü ***enggesige-yü**.*
take.as.model-PVF.C imitate?-GN
'If he [can] manage these deeds and the people, the people will be awed by [his] glory and will love his virtue. They will take him as a model and imitate him.' (XJ 20b:6-21a:2, de Rachewiltz 1982: 46)

(2) *Qoyar* *gürdü-tey* *tergen* *nököe* *gürdü-ben* ***ququra-asu***
two wheel-POSS cart other wheel-RPOSS break-COND.C
newü-n ***yada-yu**.*
move-CVB can.NEG-GN
'If a two-wheel cart breaks *its* second wheel, it cannot move.' (§177, 6233-34, de Rachewiltz 2004: 97)[8]

[7] In the two unclear cases the conjunction *tula* 'because' is between *-basu* and *-yu*.

[8] The transcription of the SH used here is an unpublished one by John Street, version 23g. Morpheme boundaries differ in a few instances. I did not mark amendations of the transcriber. The first information given is the paragraph number necessary to locate the translation. The four-digit code following it consists of, first, the number of chapter (X, Y, Z representing chapter 10, 11, 12), second and third, leaf number and, forth, line number (0-4 recto, 5-9 verso). Thereafter, the source of the translation is mentioned, with slight modifications indicated by cursive letters. If a translation was modified substantially, no source is given.

In agreement with Toγtambayar's analysis, *-yu* occurs in individual-level (like (3)) and generic predications including necessary results of causes:

(3) *Ecige min-u Naqu_bayan* ***kee-gde-yü***
father 1SG-GEN N. say-PASS-GN
'My father is called Naqu Bayan.' (§90, 2298-99)

(4) *Tende Uruu:d Maŋqu:d kee-n irgen in-u bu-y.*
there U. M. say-CVB people 3SG-GEN COP1-i/u
Te:de irgen in-u qadqu-ldu-muy je. Toori-quy ***tutum***
DDIST.PL people 3SG-GEN stab-RECP-IPVF IP turn-FUT.P every.time
toyi ***joki-yu****. Derelgü-gü* ***tutum*** *dem* ***joki-yu****.*
battle.array fit-GN turn.around?-FUT.P every.time order? fit-GN
'(Ong Qan asked Jamuqa about those people on the enemy side who are likely to fight hard. Jamuqa answered:) There are his people called the Uru'ut and Mangqut; those people of his *will fight indeed*: Every time they turn about / Their battle array holds / Every time they wheel round, too / Their ranks hold.' (§170, 6032-6035, de Rachewiltz 2004: 90)

(5) ***tegü-ber*** *agali_aburi-ban soyül_surγal-i bütü-ge-ged*
DDIST-INS character-RPOSS teaching-ACC become.complete-CAUS-PFV.C
ulus-un üile-yi ba tunggaga-n ***cida-yu***
state-GEN action-ACC FOC promulgate-CVB can-GN
'Therefore, having perfected his virtue and teaching, he *[the sage ruler]* is also able to promulgate (-carry out) the affairs of state.' (XJ 21a:2-4, immediately after (1), de Rachewiltz 1982: 46)

(6) *bogda sayi-d öber-ün gem-iyen* ***üje-yü***
holy good-PL self-GEN fault-Refl see-GN
magu-i kümün busu-d-un gem-i ***eri-yü***
bad-PL person other-PL-GEN fault-ACC seek-GN
'The saintly see their own faults / The knaves seek the faults of others.' (Subhâṣitaratnanidhi §109, Bosson 1969: 224)

(7) *garudi sibagun qoro-tu mogai-yi* ***ala-yu /*** *turagun ülü*
garuda bird poison-POSS snake-ACC kill-GN jackdaw NEG.IPFV
cida-yu
can-GN
'The garuda bird kills the poisonous snake; the jackdaw cannot.'
(Subhâṣitaratnanidhi §4, Bosson 1969: 201)

Note that (4) employs a temporal construction with some similarities to conditionals and that (5) is a necessary consequence not within a conditional, but a causal sentence. On the other hand, *-yu* does not appear to be used in merely habitual, attitudinal and potential predications (see Bertinetto and Lenci 2012 for these categories). The use in rhetorical questions (5311~ Z318; Y238) seems to differ from the uses just described, but a detailed investigation requires additional material:

(8) *Jusurid-cu yeki-n teyin šiliu:n aqa*
flatter-PVF.C do.what-CVB so upright elder.brother
deü-yü-en ulki-n jiŋkü-n ***ügüle-yü***
younger.brother-ACC-RPOSS backbite-CVB slander-CVB speak-GN
'[At these words of Jamuqa, Gürin Ba'atur of the Ubciq said,] "How can you speak so deceitfully, backbiting and slandering of your upright brother?"' (§160, 5309-5311, de Rachewiltz 2004: 81)

The only instances of *-yU* in the SH outside of quoted speech are instances of *buyu*. One is a complement of the verb 'know' (2395-96), one is strictly *-n buyu* (1202). The last instance is given in (9). Two past uses in the XJ presented in (10) suggest that these past uses may not have been limited to

the copula,[9] but were also possible with verbs. But such uses are so rare that they are difficult to locate within the aspecto-temporal system of MM.

(9) *Üje-esü qaqca güün metü* ***bu-yu***.
see-COND.C single person like COP1-GN
'[Then, a moment later, another man approached. He advanced and drew closer, his feet dangling under him; yet,] when one looked, it *was* like a single person. [When he came up and drew to a halt, it was Boroqul mounted double behind Öködei] *[the latter being seriously wounded]*' (§173, 6136, de Rachewiltz 2004: 93)

(10) *ecige eke-dür in-u tabigla-n cida-jugui.* ***egün-ü***
father mother-DAT3 3SG-GEN serve-CVB can-PST.2H DPROX-GEN
siltaga-bar *esen bü-küi-dür ecige eke-yin sedkil*
reason-INS healthy COP1-FUT.P-DAT3 father mother-GEN mind
amu-yu *taqil taqi-basu sür-tür an-u* ***kür-te-yü***.
rest-GN sacrifice sacrifice-COND.C soul-DAT3 3PL-GEN arrive-PASS-GN
tegü-ber delekei ulus joqira-ju tübsigeridü-ged ada
DDIST-INS world people suit-PVF.C pacify?-CVB.then misfortune
tüligen ülü bolu-n todqor-tu samagu üile-s
adversity NEG.IPFV become-CVB calamity-POSS disturbance act-PL
ese kü edü-jügü.
NEG.PFV FOC start-PST.2H
'*... he [the servant in the days when the enlightened rulers of old were still governing the world by means of the norm of filiality] was* able to render service to his parents *[i.e. his masters]*. Because of this, when they were alive, the parents had peace of mind; [and when they were dead,] if one offered a sacrifice to them, *it* attained to their spirits. Therefore, the world was in harmony and peace, and as there were no calamities, noxious and troublesome affairs did not, indeed, arise.'(XJ 15a:3-15b:3, de Rachewiltz 1982: 45)

As noted by Matsuoka (2008: 118-122),[10] *-mU* can yield present reference with both states and activities. Reference both to activities as ongoing as in (11) and (12) or as stretching over a long period in time (either habitual as in (13) and (14) or attitudinal as in (15)) is quite frequent:

(11) *Eke eke öter bos-Ø. Qajar* ***derbelü-müy****; tübüriün*
mother mother quick rise-IMP ground tremble-IPVF sound.of.feet
sonos-ta-mU
hear-PASS-IPVF
'[Old Qoaqcin ... got up and said,] "Mother, mother, rise up quickly! The earth is shaking and one can hear the sound of trembling hoofs ..."' (§98, 2425-27, de Rachewiltz 2004: 31)

(12) *Edöe noqa:-n-u dawun idüre-küy qucal* ***quca-mUy***.
now dog-PL-GEN sound arrive.CAUS(<Turkic)-FUT.P bark bark-IPVF
'(You have cut off the dead [qan's] head and brought it here; the next [thing] you [do is to] crush it to pieces. This is not right. The sound of our dogs' barking has turned nasty. Inanca Bilge Qan [formerly] said: "...") Now the sound of the dogs are barking a [gloomy] bark of [what] you have [just] caused to arrive [in the future]' (§189, 7105-06, translation of text preceding example from de Rachewiltz 2004: 111)

(13) *Üdür büri man-tur ire-jü esügXcile-jü*
every day 1PL.EXCL-DAT3 come-PVF.C drink.kumis-PVF.C
od-umu. *Söni maqa qaa qono-[suffix missing]*
proceed-IPVF night actually? where spend.night-[?]
a-juu. Hörene ümere-ece key bol-uasu qarciqay-bar

[9] Sh. Choimaa (p.c., spring 2013) suggested that the translation of the XJ, in contrast to the SMI, contains formulations untypical for MM. If so, this could be due to imperfect skills of the translator. This would require additional caution when making generalizations about past-referring uses of *-yU* in MM.

[10] Matsuoka talks of "zero" as he contrasts *-mU* with analytic forms, but as he does not look at *-yU*, I take these statements as pertaining to *-mU*.

COP2-PST.2H west north-ABL air become-COND.C hawk-INS
bari-ul-uqsan noqu:-d qalawu-:d-un ödün hüsün an-u
grab-CAUS-PRF.P duck-PL goose-PL-GEN feather fluff 3PL-GEN
burqaliq casun metü ***butara-ju keyis-cü ire-mü****.*
swirling snow like scatter-PVF.C fly.with.wind-PVF.C come-IPVF
'Every day he comes to us, drinks kumis, then leaves. Where he spends the night no one really knows; but when the wind blows from the north-west, the fluff and feathers of the ducks and geese caught by his hawk are scattered and fly over here like swirling snow.' (§31, 1193-97, de Rachewiltz 2004: 6)

(14) *edüge-ki Monggol irgen bicig erdem ese ber*
today-ATTR M. people script science NEG.PFV FOC
sur-basu *nige-ken üge ügüle-kü dütüm üile üi[l]edü-kü*
learn-COND.C one-DIM word say-FUT.P each.time deed do-FUT.P
dütüm erten-ü sece-d sayi-d[-un] üile-dür toqiyaldu-n
each.time early-GEN wise-PL good-PL[-GEN] deed-DAT3 agree-CVB
neyil-mü
unite-IPVF
'Although the present Mongolian people do not study the [Chinese] classics, each time they speak [but] a single word or each time they perform an action, they are in accord with the actions of the wise and good of antiquity. (If one say, "What [is] the reason?" it must be that they have, indeed, been born by the destiny of Heaven.)' (SMI 1338:17-18, Cleaves 1951: 69)

(15) *Basa bida elci:-n haul-urun ulus bitü-ül-ün*
also 1PL.INCL messenger-PL haste-CVB.PRAEP people roam-CAUS-CVB
haul-qa-mUy*. Haul-qu:-n elci:-n-ü ba yabudal udaan bu-y.*
haste-CAUS-IPVF haste-FUT.P-PL messenger-PL-GEN FOC movement slow COP1-i/u
'Further, when the messengers ride in haste, we make them ride in haste making them roam about the people. The movement of these hasty messengers is slow.' (§279, Z489-90)

Individual-level or generic predications do not seem to be attested with *-mU* in the SH or the SMI. There are, however, 93 uses of *-mU* in the Subhâṣitaratnanidhi,[11] and some of these are used in sentences exactly parallel to sentences where *-yU* is used. This often happens in conditional clauses (e.g. §§127, 130, 132), but is not restricted to them:

(16) *magu-i ijagur-ta-n busu-d-un sayin-iyar bolu-gsan-i öber-ün*
bad-PL root-POSS-PL other-PL-GEN good-INS become-PRF.P-ACC self-GEN
erdem-e toga-yu luu-s-un kiciye-jü oro-gulu-gsan
merit-DAT1 count.as-GN dragon-PL-GEN strive-PVF.C enter-CAUS-PRF.P
qora-yi tariyacin öber-ün öljei keme-n ***sedki-müi***
rain-ACC farmer self-GEN fortune say-CVB think-IPVF
'Those of base origins consider what has come about through the goodness of others as their own attainment. The farmer thinks that the rain the nãgas have exerted themselves to bring is his own good fortune.' (Subhâṣitaratnanidhi §157, Bosson 1969: 235)

However, it is the general rule that takes *-yU* and the exemplary instance that takes *-mU*, thus preserving a semantic difference even here. Some of the exemplifications in the Subhâṣitaratnanidhi clearly refer to particular events or stories, and even the statement about the farmer can be constructed as specific.

Future uses are claimed by Toγtambayar (2012: 178) and Matsuoka (2008: 120-121). The latter specifies that future be the most conventional meaning of *-mU* with activities. However, this must be taken with a grain of salt. Future uses do occur, but only in a number of specifiable conditions, namely, preceding the particle *je* and in conditional sentences. The meaning of the particle *je* still requires a more detailed analysis: it might turn out to be either epistemic (high probability, necessity)

[11] Bosson does not give a count for *-yu*, but given that there are 457 stanzas apparently with zero to four instances of *-yU* each, *-yU* appears to be about ten times as frequent as *-mU*.

or illocutionary ('you can trust me that ...'). There are a few instances containing *-mU je* that might be analyzed as referring to either future or present (X216, Y314), but while there are a number of clear instances with future reference, no clear instances with present reference can be found. The use with conditional clauses differs from how *-yU* would be used in similar contexts. For instance, the condition-consequence relation in (18) appears to be meant to pertain to a specific general of Cinggis Qan during a specific campaign. In contrast to Confucius in (1), Cinggis is not raising the relation between condition and consequence to a law of nature. (19) is specific as well. It is worthwhile to point out that SH *-mU* cannot refer to the future in questions, see (20).

(17) *sayin agali_aburi urug-un urug-a barasi_ügei tusa*
good character kin-GEN kin-DAT1 without.stopping help
bolumu j-e
become-IPVF IP
'good character will be of unceasing help for generation upon generation' (SMI 1335:12-13)

(18) *Bidan-i ecine ber bö-esü ile metü qolo ber bö-esü*
1PL-ACC behind FOC be-COND.C clear like far FOC be-COND.C *oyira metü sedki-jü*
yabu-asu deere teŋgeri-de ber
near like feel-PVF.C go-COND.C above heaven-DAT2 FOC
***ihee-gde-müy je** ta*
protect-PASS-IPVF IP 2PL
'If you constantly think that even though We are out of sight it is as if visible, and even though We are far as if We were near, you will also be protected by Heaven Above.' (§199, 8107-10, de Rachewiltz 2004: 128)

(19) *Qahan soyurqa-asu nama-yi güün-e bodo-da*
Khan deign-COND.C 1SG-ACC person-DAT1 substance?-DAT2
*bol-qa-ju **asara-mU**.*
become-CAUS-PVF.C care-IPVF
'If the Khan shows favor to me, he will regard me as a human being and something of value and take care of me.' (§155, 5225-26)

(20) *"Yau **saara-mUy**. Nidün-ü ecine ge-dkün"*
what diminish/weaken-IPVF eye-GEN behind cast-IMP2
kee-be. Tedü gü mökörі-ül-bAy.
say-PST.FC similar FOC perish-CAUS-PST.FC.PL
'"Why hesitate? Cast him out of my sight!" He was cut down immediately.' (§154, 5264-65, de Rachewiltz 2004: 79)
'"What is weakening / restraining us? ...'

There are several examples potentially ambiguous between present imperfective and future reference that are neither preceded by conditional clauses nor followed by *je*, but all of them might have been imperfective. On the basis of this evidence, I tentatively conclude that *-mU* alone is incapable of expressing future.

(21) *Nayman-u Taya qan qor cin-u ab-ura*
N.-GEN T. qan quiver 2SG-GEN take-CVB.in.order
***ire-müy**. Nama-yi baraun qar bol-Ø kee-jü*
come-IPVF 1SG-ACC west hand become-IMP say-PVF.C
ire-jüü;[12] *bi ese bol-BA.*
come-PST.2H 1SG NEG.PFV become-PST.FC
'Tayang Qan of the Naiman is coming (arguably not: 'will come') to take your quivers. He approached me saying that I should be the right wing, but I refused.' (§190, 7145-47, de Rachewiltz 2004: 112)

[12] This instance of *-jUGU* might pose a problem for the evidential analysis outlined in 4.1.1 below. The solution might be interpreting *-jUGU* as pertaining to *kee-* instead of *ire-*. Tayang Khan did not make this request in person, but relied on a messenger (cf. §190), so it is not firsthand information that the words are his.

Another question is whether *-mU* can refer to the past (as claimed in passing by Aalto 1970: 14). There are three cases of *-mU* with apparent past reference in non-quoted sentences. Except for (22), these occur in prophetic visions (3385-92, X280-82), but these passages are too short and lack any other past-referring forms that could be taken as the basis for an analysis. There is one intriguing example from quoted speech in (23) for which I have not been able to come up with another explanation than a past imperfective one, but a better rendering of this example might be possible (note that both this example and 5360 contain a converbum praeparativum that might be part of the solution). The other, more numerous examples are instances of an extended reference time which both includes the time when the event took place and the here and now (Klein 1994: 138). Events in the more recent past are thus presented as part of the present. This use mostly pertains to events in the more recent past. It is especially frequent with verbs of saying ((24), 1213, 3306-09, 6047, X282), but there are some other instances ((25), X400) as well.

(22) *Naqu_bayan-u ger-tür gür-BA; Naqu_bayan köün-ben*
N.-GEN tent-DAT3 reach-PST.FC N. son-RPOSS
Boorcu-yi jabqa-ju nisun nilbusu-bar a-juu. Genete
B.-ACC lose-PVF.C mucus tear-INS COP2-PST.2H sudden
gür-te-jü köü-ben üje-jü niken-te ***uyila-mU***
arrive-PASS-PVF.C son-RPOSS see-PVF.C one-times cry-IPVF
niken-te ***doŋqod-umu****.*
one-times scold-IPVF
'They arrived at the tent of Naqu Bayan. Naqu Bayan, having lost his son Boorcu, was in tears. When he was suddenly arrived at [by them] and he saw his son, he both wailed and scolded.' (§93, 2346-48)

(23) *Qan qan bü-tügey. Ecine bü-gü köü eri-rün elbesün*
qan qan be-3IMP behind be-FUT.P son seek-CVB.PRAEP magic
jalama ki-jü ÇAbuy_babuy kee-n eri-n ***jalbari-mUy***
magic.strip make-PVF.C C. say-CVB seek-CVB pray-IPVF
bida. Edü:-n törü-n bara-qsan köü Seŋgüm-i
1PL.INCL that.much-PL be.born-CVB finish-PRF.P son S.-ACC
asara-ya.
take.care-VOL
'Qan, Qan, desist! Pleading for a son who was yet to come, we made magic strips and uttered [the prayer] Abui babui - we prayed, pleading for him. So at last [your] son Senggüm was born, let us take care of him!' (§174, 6166-68, de Rachewiltz 2004: 94) [This sentence introduces a plead to Ong Qan not to try to finish off Cinggis Qan's forces now, but to withdraw in order to be better able to take care of his wounded son Senggüm.]

(24) *köün-i ker tebci-sü* ***kee-müy*** *ta. Cida-n ele*
son-ACC how renounce-VOL say-IPVF 2PL can-CVB FOC
üyiled-üdkün ta. Mede-dkün
do-IMP2 2PL know-IMP2
'You say: "How shall we do away with the son?" Just do what you can - it is for you to decide.' (§167, 5446-48, de Rachewiltz 2004: 86) [Ong Qan is addressing his natural son Senggüm about how to kill his adopted son, namely, Cinggis Qan.]

(25) *Yeki-gse:-d Qoŋqota:n te:de. Öcigen Qasar-i*
do.what-PRF.P-PL Q. DDIST.PL yesterday Q.-ACC
ömöre-jü janci-ju gü bü-leey. Edöe basa ene
team.up-PVF.C beat-PVF.C FOC COP1-PST.1H now also DPROX
Odcigin-i yeki-n qoyina-ca-an ***sögöd-ge-müy****.*
O.-ACC do.what-CVB back-ABL-RPOSS kneel-CAUS-IPVF
'(Before Cinggis Qa'an could utter a sound, Lady Börte sat up her bed, covering her breasts with the edge of the blanket. Seeing Otcigin weep, she [herself] shed tears and said,) "What are those Qongqotan doing? They recently ganged up and beat Qasar. And now, why do they make this Otcigin kneel down behind them? ..."' (§245, X363-66, de Rachewiltz 2004: 171)

Following the (inconclusive) studies on *bü-* and *a-* quoted above, one might ask whether there is an evidential difference between *-mU* and *-yU*. Judging from the examples discussed so far, this seems unlikely. (13) refers to firsthand visual knowledge, and (23) is likewise firsthand, while (25) refers to hearsay. Thus, *-mU* is evidentially neutral. As for *-yU*: while (3) and (4) refer to firsthand knowledge, (5) and (10) refer to circumstances that Confucius himself only knew from hearsay. Other modal distinctions could still exist, but concepts like subjectivity and objectivity do not constitute a linguistic domain, but much higher-level pragmatic phenomena (Mushin 2001). Rather, the difference between a generic marker such as *-yU* and a progressive-habitual marker such as *-mU* may correspond to different epistemological nuances: generic statements are claimed to be very reliable by the speaker, while statements about activities in progress are less so.

3.1.2 *-n buyu*

-n buyu appears to refer to events in progress, but compared to *-mU* this form is quite rare. If we confine our attention to the SH, *-mU* is used 109 times, while *-n buyu* is used 8 times. However, only about 10 instances of *-mU* refer to actions clearly in progress, and there are only about 10 ambiguous cases, so *-n buyu* codes a significant percentage of progressive events. *-n buyu* / *bui* is frequent in some later documents such as the letter of Argun to Nicolas IV of 1290 or an undated poem (document no. 5) from Turfan.

(26) *J̲öb=üü tab=uu* ***ügüle-n bu-yu***
right=Q ?=Q speak-CVB COP1-GN
‘(When he was told this, Ong Qan said, “How can you think such [things] about my son Temüjin? Until now we had him as our support, and if now we harbour such evil intentions towards my son, we shall not be loved by Heaven. Jamuqa has a glib tongue.) Is he speaking rightly, correctly?’ (§167, 5426-31, de Rachewiltz 2004: 85)

(27) *“Y̲aun güün-ü eme teyin* ***qayila-n bu-yu****” kee-n*
what person-GEN woman like.that cry-CVB COP2-GN say-CVB
asa-ura güün ile-be; tere güün od-cu
ask-CVB.in.order person send-PST.FC DDIST person proceed-PVF.C
asaq-basu tere eme güün ügüle-rün “Sorqan_šira-yin
ask-COND.C DDIST woman person say-CVB.PRAEP S.-GEN
ökin bi; Qadaan nere-tey. E̲re-yi min-u ende ceri:-üd
daughter 1SG Q. name-POSS male-ACC 1SG-GEN here soldier-PL
bari-ju ***ala-n bu-yu****. E̲re-yü-en ala-qda-run*
grab-PVF.C kill-CVB COP2-GN male-ACC-RPOSS kill-PASS-CVB.PRAEP
Temüjin-i ere-yi min-u abura-tuqay kee-n uŋši-ju
T.-ACC male-ACC 1SG-GEN rescue-3IMP say-CVB call-PVF.C
qayila-ju uyila-BA bi´ kee-be.
cry-PVF.C cry-PST.FC 1SG say-PST.FC
‘(Cinggis Qa’an himself heard a woman in a red coat who, standing on tip of a ridge, was wailing loudly, crying “Temüjin!”) He sent a man to enquire whose wife was the woman who was crying like that. The man went and, having asked her, that woman said, “I am the daughter of Sorqan Sira and mz name is Qada’an. The soldiers here captured my husband and were *killing* him. As *I was getting my husband killed*, I cried and wailed and called on Temüjin to save my husband.”’ (§146, 4455-4464, de Rachewiltz 2004: 67-68)

(28) *[da]l[a]i-yin. busud ali be irgen öber-ün nom bicig-iyer*
ocean-GEN other who FOC people REFL-GEN scripture text-INS
jal[bari-qu-n] aran ***qudalciya-n jalbari-n bu-i****.*
[worship-FUT.P-PL] subjects be.deceived?-CVB worship-CVB COP1-i/u
‘Les autres peuples de l'univers, quels qu'ils soient, [étant des] gens qui prient selon leurs propres religion et écritures, prient mensongèrement.’ (Argun to Nicolas IV 1290, Mostaert and Cleaves 1951: 452)

3.1.3 *-n ajugu* / *-n bülüge*

-n ajugu / *-n bülüge* seem to express general past imperfective meaning including both past habitual contexts and activities in progress at a past point of reference. The two forms differ from each other evidentially, as discussed in 4.1.1.

(29) *irgen imayi ecige [me/si]tü* ***kündüle-n a-jugu*** *... mön nasu*
people 3SG.ACC father like honour-CVB COP2-PST.2H same year
büri ügüler-ün namayi irgen mede-gül-ün
every speak-CVB.PRAEP 1SG.ACC people have.authority.over-CAUS-CVB
tüsi-besü. mön ene kü jasa-n cida-qu
appoint-COND.C same DPROX FOC organize-CVB can-FUT.P1
bü-lüge bi ***keme-n a-jugu****.*
COP1-PST.1H 1SG say-CVB COP2-PST.2H
'The people were honoring him like a father. ... He used to say every year: "If one had appointed me to govern the people, I would also have been able to administer [them] in the very same manner."' (SMI 1338: 3-5)

(30) *Daidu balgasun-dur job ese bol-jugu. An-u ordu*
Peking town-DAT3 right NEG.PFV become-PST.2H 3PL-GEN ordu
dotur-a aqa degü-yü-gen alda-gsan metü
in-DAT1 elder.brother younger.brother-ACC-RPOSS lose-PRF.P like
med[el]-ün irgen in-u ecige eke-yü-gen
[authority]-GEN people 3SG-GEN father mother-ACC-RPOSS
keküdeglece-gsen sitü ***emgeni-n a-jugu****. kedün ödür-ün*
lose?-PRF.P like grieve-CVB COP2-PST.2H some day-GEN
qoyin-a an-u balgasun-u gadan-a emüne öröne jüg
after-DAT1 3PL-GEN town-GEN outside-DAT1 south east direction
Qon_si_ling dabagan-u ug-tur bugu-gsan a-jugu.
Q. pass-GEN foot-DAT3 lay.away-PRF.P COP2-PST.2H
'[When ...], he died in Beijing. Within their ordu they *were grieving* as if they had lost their elder or younger brother and the people of the district *were grieving* as if they had lost their father or mother. After several days, they buried [him] at the foot of Qon si ling, in the southwestern quarter outside of their city.' (SMI 1338: 9-10, Cleaves 1951: 68)

(31) *T̲ere qurim bidan-aca Belgütey jasa-ad Ciŋgis*
DDIST feast 1PL.INCL-ABL B. organize-PVF.C C.
qahan-u aqta bari-ju ***bayi-n bü-lee****; Jürki:n-ece*
Khan-GEN gelding grab-PVF.C stand-CVB COP1-PST.1H J.-ABL
Büri_ bökö tere qurim ***jasa-n bü-lee****. B̲idan-u*
B. DDIST feast organize-CVB COP1-PST.1H 1PL.INCL-GEN
kirüese-ece QadagiXday güün cilbur qulaq-uqsan-i qulaqay
horse.station-ABL Q. person tether steal-PRF.P-ACC thief
bari-juuy. Büri_ bökö tere güü-ben hoyimas-cu ...
grab-PST.2H B. DDIST person-RPOSS protect?-PVF.C
'The feast had been arranged on our [side] by Belgütei. He was standing [outside the camp] keeping Cinggis Qaan's geldings. From the Jürkin's side Büri Bökö *was organizing* the feast. A man of the Qadagin tribe stole a tether from our horse station. Belgütei caught the thief, but Büri Bökö took that man under his protection.' (§131, 4083-87, de Rachewiltz 2004: 56)

(29) presents repeated activities as general characteristics of the subject of the inscription. It is merely due to his death that they do not hold at the reference time. *emgenin ajugu* in (30) at least refers to the time span after the referent died, but before he was buried. In (31), the activity is even more temporary, pertaining to one particular person at one particular occasion. Moreover, even *-n aGsan ajugu* appears to be an imperfective form, as pointed out in the discussion of *-GsAn ajugu* below.[13]

[13] Matsuoka's (2008: 108-111) assumes that *-n bü-* can refer to resultant states, but this is doubtful: *ayisun (gu) ajuu* (§120, 3340-3341) might mean 'had even approached ~ had even come' at a point when Temüjin was mustering his people in the

3.1.4 -QU, -QUi, -n a-qu

In contrast to *-mU*, *-QU* clearly has the capacity to express future, if anything else (cf. Rybatzki 2003: 77). In the SH, it occurs at least 68 times in finite position, but only 14 of these uses are positive declaratives. 6 have passive morphology, but only 2 of these which are based on intransitive verbs denote the meaning 'one has to' (Poppe 1965: 371), i.e. necessity. 16 future uses are negated declaratives, and the remaining 38 are questions. As elsewhere in the SH, they are usually rhetorical.

(32) *MerkiXdey caqaan Aman caqaan keer qoyar-i bari-ju*
M. white mouth? white steppe? two-ACC catch-PVF.C
abcira-Ø. Huya-ju söni erte ***morila-qu***
bring-IMP tether-PVF.C night early ride-FUT.P
'(Having spoken thus, Narin Ke'en also told Kišiliq, his horse-herder,) "Fetch and bring the white Merkit [horse] and the bay with the white muzzle, and tether them: tonight, towards daybreak, we'll ride out"' (§169, 5493-95, de Rachewiltz 2004: 87-88, cf. 612)

(33) *Teb_teŋgeri edöe* ***ire-gü****. Cida-quy-aca ker ba üyiled-üesü*
T. now come-FUT.P can-FUT.P-ABL what FOC do-COND.C *ci mede-Ø*
2SG know-IMP
'Teb Tenggeri will come now. Know yourself what you do [to him] out of what you are able to do!' (§245, X379-80)

(34) *Delegey edöe belen bol-uqsan-tur nököce-jü yaun* ***tusa***
world now ready become-PRF.P-DAT3 befriend-PVF.C what help
bol-qu *bi. Munda anda-yin qara sönin-ü jewüdün-tür*
become-FUT.P 1SG however friend-GEN black night-GEN dream-DAT3
cin-u ***oro-qu*** *bi; gegeen üdür-ün sedkil cin-u*
2SG-GEN enter-FUT.P 1SG bright day-GEN mind 2SG-GEN
joba-a-qu *bi. Jaqa-yin cin-u böesün* ***ja****hi-un*
suffer-CAUS-FUT.P 1SG collar-GEN 2SG-GEN louse inner.lapel.of.coat?-GEN
cin-u örgesün ***bol-qu*** *bi.*
2SG-GEN thorn become-FUT.P 1SG
'Now that the world is at your disposal, of what use would I be as a companion of you? On the contrary, sworn friend, I *will* intrude into your dreams in the dark night / I *will* trouble your heart in the bright day, / I *will* be a louse in your collar, / *A* thorn in the inner lapel of your coat.' (§201, 8184-89, de Rachewiltz 2004: 131)

(32) either implicates an intention or a scheduled event, (33) implicates an underlying schedule. In (34), Jamuqa (in the fictual universe of the SH) makes a prediction about the future in a fictual world in which he would accept Cinggis Qan's offer to spare his life which he, however, is about to reject.

Negated instances of *-QU* can always be interpreted as future, but in contrast to the non-negated examples, a potential reading often seems possible, too. In rhetorical questions where it is suggested that the equivalent to the interrogative pro-word in the question would correspond to an indefinite pro-word plus negation in the anwer, e.g. that the question asks for an empty set of entities, the future marker can always be reinterpreted as implying lack of possibility, ability etc., but while this is one of its major uses, this modal nuance should not be seen as part of the meaning of *-QU*.

---

morning after his split from Jamuqa, but it is conceivable that even though both Temüjin with his people *and* his future vassals traveled through the night after his split, the future vassals were lagging behind. Having not been notified of Temüjin's split in advance, they might have started pursuing him only after his people had already departed, and only arrived in the morning when the proper subjects of Temüjin had already settled to rest. In the other example, *kituqay juqul-un bü-küy qar* ((§214, 9141) and *kituqay juqul-uqsan qar* (9156) (both 'the hand that held the dagger') might refer to the same time phase even if we do not assume a resultative meaning on the part of *-n bü-* provided that one reconstructs the verbal meaning as 'grab+hold' akin to a verb like *hide* 'go into hiding+be in hiding'. In this case, the progressive could refer to the second activity phase, while the perfect participle would refer to the situation obtaining after the dagger had been drawn. Because *-n bü-* might just be taken as referring to referring to a phase in the aktionsart of a verb (or a phase of multi-occasional events), if all other things are equal, Matsuoka's hypothesis would be disfavored by its avoidable complexity.

(35) *Ciŋgis qaan-u ed_aurasu ecineXün yeki-n qulaq-cu*
C. Khan-GEN possessions stealthily do.what-CVB steal-PVF.C
abcira-ju ög-ümü ci. Bi ***ülü*** ***ab-qu***
bring-PVF.C give-IPVF 2SG 1SG NEG.IPFV take-FUT.P
[The city of Jungdu has just surrendered to the forces of Cinggis Qan. The former steward of the city has taken satins with him to give them as presents to the new stewards sent by Cinggis Qan. But upon his offering, one of these stewards says: 'Formerly, the goods of Jungdu, and the very [city of] Jungdu, did belong to the Altan qan. Now Jungdu surely belongs to Cinggis Qa'an.] How can you give us the goods and satins of Cinggis Qa'an, stealing them and bringing them [here] behind his back? I shall not take them.' (§252, Y158-59, de Rachewiltz 2004: 180)

(36) *Edöe* ***oy****i in-u* ***o****ro-ju a-mU;* ***se****dkil in-u*
now reason 3SG-GEN enter-PVF.C COP2-IPVF mind 3SG-GEN
seŋ*tere-jü a-mU kee-gde-müy. Temüjin nama-yi* ***ülü***
open-PVF.C COP2-IPVF say-PASS-IPVF T. 1SG-ACC NEG.IPFV
ükü-ül-gü*.*
die-CAUS-FUT.P
'They say that now his reason has set in, and that his mind is opened. Temüjin won't make me die.' [sic!] (§149, 5044-45)

(37) *Edöe min-u emüne ken teyin* ***ölümle-jü*** ***ög-gü****.*
now 1SG-GEN before who so fight.to.death-PVF.C give-FUT.P
'(To secretly injure [=?kill by poisoning] Doqolqu was also a fault [of mine]. And why was it a fault? [Because] to secretly injure Doqolqu who strove fiercely in the service of his rightful [lord], my father the Qan, was a fault and a mistake.) Who will now strive so fiercely in my service?' (§281, Z570-71, de Rachewiltz 2004: 218)

While impossible in the intentional (35), the incorrect prediction in (36) would allow for an alternative (but probably incorrect) reading 'is not likely to kill me', and the translation 'Who could now strive so fiercely in my service?' for (37) might, due to a conventionalized implicature, even be correct. Likewise, the passive of intransitive verbs with *-QU* yield obligation (i.e. a state of socially imposed necessity) instead of future in the SH. This does not yet hold for transitive verbs (see (40) below), but in the XJ (which might have been translated only a decade or as much as 130 years later than the original version of the SH) the combination of passive with *-QU*(*i*) marks an obligation of the subject even with transitive verbs, *siguud-qui-ban* in (39) being the direct object of *emige-*.

(38) *Bedüün-ü mojirqaq-un tula bi mawuyla-ju yabu-ju*
B.-GEN stubbornness?-GEN because 1SG speak.bad-PVF.C go-PVF.C
minqan ese ög-be. Ci ima-da jöb bu-y je. Cima-lua
1000 NEG.PFV give-PST.FC 2SG 3SG-DAT2 right COP1-i/u IP 2SG-COM
minqala-ju ***eyetü-ldü-jü*** ***yabu-qda-qu***
command.thousand-PVF.C be.harmonious-RECP-PVF.C go-PASS-FUT.P
'Because of Bedü'ün's stubbornness, I was displeased with him and did not give him a unit of a thousand. You are the right [person to manage] him! You shall be the commander of a thousand together with him and you will proceed in consultation with each other.' (§209, 9026-28, de Rachewiltz 2004: 142-3)

(39) *öber-ün ecige eke-yü-gen tagala-basu busu kümün-i*
own-GEN father mother-ACC-RPOSS love-COND.C other person-ACC
siguud-qui-ban ***emige-gde-küi***
despise-FUT.P-RPOSS be.afraid.of-PASS-FUT.P2
'If one loves his own parents, one should be afraid lest other people hate him.' (XJ 3b:3-4, de Rachewiltz 1982: 41)

Matsuoka's (2008: 143-144) assumption that *-QU* can express habituality next to future is probably based on the impression of the related potential meaning that it sometimes implies. However, the only example that he provides, in a footnote, is the following:

(40) *OlonX-ta-wu quyu-ul-ju ög-besü* ***deejile-gde-gü****.*
many-times-? ask-CAUS-PVF.C give-COND.C honor-PASS-FUT.P

CöenX-te-wü quyu-ul-ju ög-besü ***doromjila-qda-qu***.
few-times-? ask-CAUS-PVF.C give-COND.C despise-PASS-FUT.P
何回も求められて与えれば尊敬されるのです。数回か求められて与えれば軽蔑されるのです。(Matsuoka 2008: 143)
'If I gave her away after much asking [on your part], you would respect me; if I gave her away without much asking, you would despise me.' (§66, 1465-1467, de Rachewiltz 2004: 15)

De Rachewiltz assumes a specific reference which is compatible with the specific situation of the subject of this sentence who is being asked to affiance his daughter to the son of Yesügei, but which is not contextually required. Matsuoka obviously assumes an unspecific reference to a general principle of social interaction in MM society, but funnily enough, his Japanese translation allows for both readings. Except for (40), I have not found any declarative examples of *-QU* that might be interpreted as habitual, so Matsuoka's claim should be rejected.

While Rybatzki's (2003: 77) noted that the absence of the copula is the normal case, Matsuoka (2008: 143) claims that sentence-final *-QU* is elliptic, and Street (2010: 57-58) makes the more general claim that the copula may be truncated in quoted and thus colloquial speech when preceded by any nominal or adjectival element. While *-QU* as a participial suffix certainly qualifies as a nominal element, it does not seem to be the case that there are any sentences where *-QU* is followed by the copula *bu-i* (or any other imperfective form of *a-*/*bü-*) *without* an interrogative particle in-between. Therefore, the interrogative particle is a necessary (while not sufficient) condition for the presence of an imperfective copula, and unless one believes in such a thing as obligatory deletion, this cannot be a case of ellipsis.

(41) *Ayi torluq qan* ***joki-quy=u bu-y***.
oh foolish? qan fit-FUT.P=Q COP2-i/u
'Oh foolish qan, is [that] proper?' (§190, 7136, Street 2010: 57)

There are only 7 finite instances of *-QUi* in the SH. 5 are questions, one (§64, 1452) appears to refer to an attitudinal activity, and one (§181, 6422) seems to refer to a future situation. No conclusion can be drawn from such data. *-QUn* is very clearly the plural form of *-QU* (Bayarmendü 1986: 63), so no careful analysis of instances of this form has been undertaken.

The form *-n a-qu* in finite usage is attested in the SH trice, and another example is cited from a letter. Compositionally, one would expect a future progressive meaning. Such an interpretation is conceivable in §189, 7113 and (42). Both examples also allow for a present progressive interpretation. In §277, Z344-Z346 and (43) only the latter reading seems to be possible, thus a future meaning of the suffix *-QU* in *-n a-qu* cannot be established with any confidence.

(42) *edüge nama-yi silam-dur ese ora-juɣu keme-n*
now 1SG-ACC Christianity-DAT NEG enter-PST.2H say-CVB
maɣuila-n ba ***sedki-n a-qu*** *ci*
blame-CVB FOC think-CVB COP-FUT.P 2SG
'Now, you [=Pope Nicholas IV] will be offended and think ill [of me] because I have not become a Christian. (letter from Il-khan Argun to Pope Nicholas IV, 1290, Street 2013: 48)

(43) *Teŋgeri idqa-n a-qu=ů?*
heaven warn-CVB COP-FUT.P=Q
'[the saddle had loosened and remained behind even though the breast-strap was still attached and the saddle girth was still fastened. He said, "The saddle-girth could of course [have loosened up,] but how could the breast-strap also have worked itself loose?] Is Heaven warning me / holding me back?"' [He turned back and spent three more [days and] nights there.]' (§80, 2157, translation of preceding and following sentences de Rachewiltz 2004: 22)

3.1.5 *-QU bülüge*, *-QU ajugu* and *-QU bolba*

-QU bülüge is assigned four different meanings by Matsuoka (2008: 140-144):[14] habituality, "Invisibility form" ("未発性") =? counterfactual, estimation, and intention. On the face of it, the first of these meanings seems quite easy to establish:

(44) *S̲öni:d büri cewgen šira güün ger-ün erüge*
night every resplendent yellow person tent-GEN smoke_hole
dotoqa-yin gege-er oro-ju keeli min-u bili-jü gegeen
lintel-GEN light-INS enter-PVF.C belly? 1SG-GEN caress-PVF.C light
in-u keeli-tür min-u ***šiŋge-gü bü-lee****.*
3SG-GEN belly?-DAT3 1SG-GEN seep.in-FUT.P COP1-PST.1H
'Every night, a resplendent yellow man entered by the light of the smoke-hole or the door top of the tent, he rubbed my belly and his radiance penetrated my womb.' (§21, 1130-32, de Rachewiltz 2004: 4)

(45) *E̲:de üge:-s eyin ügüle-gde-jü Seŋgüm ügüle-rün*
DPROX.PL word-PL so speak-PASS-PVF.C S. speak-CVB.PRAEP
"K̲eli `Q̲an ecige'* ***kee-gü bü-lee****. `K̲iduaci ebügen'
when qan father say-FUT.P COP1-PST.1H murderer old.man
ese=ü ***kee-gü bü-lee****. N̲ama keli `A̲nda'*
NEG.PFV=Q say-FUT.P COP1-PST.1H 1SG.Obl when sworn.friend
kee-n bü-lee. `Toqtoa böe sartaqcin qonin-u seül
say-CVB COP1-PST.1H T. shaman S. sheep-GEN tail
jübci-jü yabu-yu' ese=ü ***kee-gü bü-lee****."*
attach-PVF.C go-GN NEG.PFV=Q say-FUT.P COP1-PST.1H
'Having been told these words in this way, Senggüm said, "When did he call [you] "[our] father the Qan"? Wouldn't he [rather] say "the old murderer"? When was he calling me "sworn friend"? Wouldn't he [rather] say "Toqto'a the shaman walks about wearing the tail of a Sartaq sheep"? (§181, 6415-20)

(46) *Duwa_soqor maŋlay dumda qaqca nidü-tü qurban neüri:d*
D. forehead middle single eye-POSS three stretch.of.way
qajar-a ***qara-qu bü-lee****.*
distance-DAT1 see-FUT.P COP1-PST.1H
'Du'a Soqor had a single eye in the middle of his forehead: with it he could see for a distance of three stages.' (§4, 1033-34, de Rachewiltz 2004: 1)

In (44), Alanguua admits to having had sex habitually, and the second and third instance of *-QU bülüge* in (45) refer to the way in which Temüjin regularly used to talk about Senggüm and Ong Qan. In (46), an ability of Duwa Soqor is mentioned using this form. Judging from Matsuoka's examples given below, the counterfactual (?) and estimation meaning might be treated as one:

(47) *Edöe Nayaa-d-aca busu:-d ceri:-üd-tür ucira-asu*
now N.-DAT2-ABL other-PL soldier-PL-DAT3 come.upon-COND.C *samawu-tur tüyid-küy-tür* ***oro-quy=u a-juu***
disturbance-DAT3 be.hindered-FUT.P2-DAT3 enter-FUT.P2=Q COP2-PST.2H
'Now, if we had met with other soldiers than those with Naya, wouldn't we (conceibably) have got into an interception and into trouble?' (§197, 7476-77)

(48) *N̲amayi ünen bol-qa-ju qubcasun nada ög-cü*
1SG.ACC true become-CAUS-PVF.C clothes 1SG.DAT give-PVF.C
asara-qu bü-lee*; bi morin unu-ad üje-tele*
care-FUT.P1 COP1-PST.1H 1SG horse mount+ride?-PFV.C see-CVB.until
edüy jaura ülü=ü ***ire-gü bü-lee***
such moment NEG.IPFV=Q come-FUT.P1 COP1-PST.1H
'They would have regarded me as sincere, they would have given me clothes and looked after me. Then, I would have jumped on a horse and while they were [astonished] watching me

[14] Matsuoka discusses *-QU bü-* instead of *-QU bülüge*, but the latter is a special case of the former, so Matsuoka's claims pertain to it as well.

[flee], in that brief moment I would have surely come back!' (§145, 4426-28, de Rachewiltz 2004: 67)

In both cases, the high likeliness of an event that did not actually occur is evaluated from a reference point in the past. For intention, Matsuoka gives an example without copula (§92, 2336-41). Even here, this interpretation is only due to a first person subject. It is obvious to Matsuoka, too, that these meanings are at variance. So he tries to come up not with a gesamtbedeutung, but at least with the smallest common nominator of the forms with *-QU bu-/a-*: これから（も）起こる動作. 'an action occurring from here [and now] onwards (, too)'. Temporal location of the reference time is then done by a suffix, which in our examples is always a past marker, i.e.: an action occurring from there and then onwards without indication as to whether it was occurring before.[15] In accordance with the morphological markers to be described, I tried to paraphrase its meaning in the following manner: "[the situation] was [so that] it would *VERB*". So this form expresses an inherent disposition of a past situation to develop in a certain way, whether or not the situation ever came about or not. If it came about, the interpretation is habitual past. If it did not (as can be indicated by a conditional converb or by context), it is to be interpreted as an estimation about what was to happen in every possible world if another condition had obtained.

The form *-QU bol-ba* occurs 6 times in the SH, and there is one instance of *-QU-n bol-ba*. It apparently refers to entering a situation where something is destined to happen, whether it actually has come about or not.

(49) *Qara kerie qarambay_noqosu* ***bari-qu*** ***bol-BA***.
black crow black_duck grab-FUT.P become-PST.FC
Qaracu bool qan-tur-iyan qar ***gür-ge-gü*** ***bol-BA***.
commoner slave qan-DAT3-RPOSS hand reach-CAUS-FUT.P become-PST.FC
'Black crows have gone so far / As to catch a Mandarin duck. / Black skins and slaves have gone so far / As to raise their hands against their lord.' (§200, 8129-8131, de Rachewiltz 2004: 129)

(50) *Qaracu mawu Cilger qara teriün-dür-iyen* ***gür-te-gü***
commoner bad C. black head-DAT3-RPOSS reach-PASS-FUT.P ***bol-BA***
become-PST.FC
'Lowly, base Cilger / I have come to the point / [That I shall lose] my black [=non-noble] head.' (§111, 3185, de Rachewiltz 2004: 41)

In (49), Jamuqa has already been delivered to his enemy Cinggis Qan by his own subjects. In (50), the wrath of the Mongols is upon the Merkit and their subject Cilger, but in contrast to many others Cilger actually was not cut down during the routing and managed to make his escape into historical oblivion. A single parallel form with *-GsAn bol-ba* is attested in (51) where the speaker addresses a sensible issue with utmost care and then justifies why she dared to mention it.

(51) *Köü:-d-te deü:-ner-e olon qaracu:-s-a*
son-PL-DAT2 younger.brother-PL-DAT1 many commoner-PL-DAT1
man-a ber mawu:n-a uqa-ju a-quy-a
1PL.EXCL-DAT1 FOC bad-DAT1 understand-PVF.C COP2-FUT.P-DAT1
uqa-qsan-iyan ***duradqa-qsan*** ***bol-ba***
understand-PRF.P-RPOSS remind-PRF.P become-PST.FC
'[That is why] it has come about that [I] told [you] what [I] have understood about what is understood at [=?by] your sons, younger brothers, the many common people and the bad one [=I].' (§254, Y214-16)

[15] De Rachewiltz translates *Ögödey-in urug-i ... töre-esü min-u uruq-tur nikeṅ=üü sayin ülü töre=gü a=juu?* Ö.-GEN offspring-ACC ... be.born-COND.C 1SG-GEN offspring-DAT3 one=Q good NEG.IPFV be.born-FUT.P COP-2H.PST 'Supposing that the descendants of Ögödei are [all] born [so worthless that] ... is it [possible] that among my descendants not [even] a single one will be born who is good?' (§255, Y334-Y337, de Rachewiltz 2004: 188) as future, but a past interpretation 'wouldn't [at that time] one have been born who is good' is conceivable (and actually suggested by Street 2009) if the deictic center of this sentence is understood to be shifted to a future time.

3.1.6 *-d*

-d occurs at least 25 times in the SH. All but two of these have plural reference,[16] and in all but three instances[17] their subject is an overt pronoun. In 13 instances, *-d* is combined with the particle *je* and then expresses what the speaker intends to happen. In 10 of these including (52), the first person subject commits himself and his associates to an action and in three of these the speaker makes statements about what ought to happen with other third-person entities. Two (§21, 1136; §176, 6201) are in conditional clauses and could in principle also be interpreted as mere predictions with high probability deriving from *je*, and one is an indirect order by Cinggis Qan where he indicates to one of his generals that his addressee's troops are to set camp as well (§259, Y433). The two forms used by Kökseü Sabraq in (53) have past time reference and the third in (54) should probably be interpreted in the same vein. Four forms occur in the words that the SH has Jamuqa tell Tayang Qan about Cinggis Qan's army. Of these (55) is clearly generic, while the other three forms in (56) allow either for habitual and attitudinal readings. Either commitment or attitudinal readings are conceivable for the two parallel forms in §64, and either habitual or past readings for the plain two parallel forms in §21. One form seems to be used attributively (§248, Y068). All three occurences in the Subhâṣitaratnanidhi (§130, §333, §358) are based on verbs of saying that are either habitual or past habitual. Given this data, I am not able to propose a common meaning for these multiple uses beyond the obvious statement that *-d* is a plural agreement marker.[18]

(52) *M̲ökör-ül-kü:-n yosu-ta:n bö-esü bida*
perish-CAUS-FUT.P-PL custom-POSS.PL COP1-COND.C 1PL.INCL
mökör-ül-üd je. N̲iši-qda-qu:n yosu-ta:n bö-esü
perish-CAUS-*d* IP hit-PASS-FUT.P-PL custom-POSS.PL COP1-COND.C
kebte-ül-jü ***niši-d*** ***je.***
lie-CAUS-PVF.C hit-*d* IP
'(Elders of the companies, do not reprimand my guards ... without my permission ... If [any of them] breaks the law report it to me.) Those liable to execution We shall certainly cut down. Those liable to be beaten We shall certainly compel to lie down and have them beaten.' (§227, 9435-37, de Rachewiltz 2004: 156-7)

(53) *T̲ende Kögseü_sabraq ügüle-jüü. "Ü̲kü-gsen qan güün-ü*
there K.. speak-PST.2H die-PRF.P qan person-GEN
teriün in-u ta gü hoqtol-ju ***abcira-d****. N̲ököe-te ta gü*
head 3SG-GEN 2PL FOC cut.off-PVF.C bring-*d* other-times 2PL FOC ***kemgeri-d****. Y̲aun joki-quy."*
crush-*d* what fit-FUT.P
'Thereupon Kökse'ü Sabraq said, "You have cut off the dead qan's head and brought it here; next you crush it to pieces! This is not right.' (§189, 7098-7100, cf. de Rachewiltz 2004: 111)

(54) *A̲yi yeke üge* ***ügüle-d*** *ta.*
alas big word speak-*d* 2PL
'Alas! You speak a great boast....' (§190, 7135-36, Street 1957: 14)

(55) *T̲e:de jida-tu ere-yi jiu-ju cisu-tu tonoq*
3PL.DDIST spear-POSS male-ACC ?-PVF.C blood-POSS clothes
tono-qci:-n üldü-tü ere-yi hülde-jü una-qa-ju
strip-ACTOR.P-PL sword-POSS male-ACC chase-PVF.C fall-CAUS-PVF.C
ala-ju üb tonaq ab-uqci:-n Uruu:d Maŋqu:d
kill-PVF.C property clothes take-ACTOR.P-PL U. M.

[16] In the two exceptional sentences, it is still the plural form *ta* that is used by Kögseü Sabraq to address his overlord Tayang Qan in a context where he expresses his distain at Tayang's foolish and dangerous actions. Here, *ta* seems to emphasize distancing rather then deference.

[17] I am including *müd* (§176, 6201) here amongst the pronouns. Its anaphoric use in MM is quite common and is preserved in south-eastern dialects of modern Mongolian (Bayancogtu 2002: 232-236). Furthermore I assume that the two *-d*-forms in §278 are under the direct scope of the same pronoun *bida* even though they belong to two (adjacent) sentences.

[18] As noted by Rybatzki (2003: 76), it has the exact shape of the plural marker that words ending in *-n* take; within the aspect system *-n* is a converb which never occurs in finite position like *-d*, Aalto (1970:11)'s statement to the contrary being based on material that does in fact allow for an adverbial reading. While the Perfect Participle *-GsAn* ends in /n/ which in the plural form is replaced by *-d*, a parallel analysis of *-n*/*-d* following the structure of *-GsAn*/*-GsAd* is hard to sustain functionally or distributionally.

kee-gde-d *te:de.*
say-PASS-*d* 3PL.DDIST
'Those who / Driving [before themselves] the men with spears / Are strippers of their bloody clothes / Pushing [before themselves] the men with swords / Causing [them] to fall and killing [them] / Are takers of their treasure and clothes / Are called the Uruut and Manggut.' (§195, 7353-56)

(56) *Te:de dörben noqa:-s ... key* ***unu-ju yabu-d*** *te:de.*
3PL.DDIST four dog-PL air ride-PVF.C go-*d* 3PL.DDIST *Ala-ldu-quy üdür haran-u miqa* ***ide-d*** *te:de.*
kill-recp-FUT.P day people-GEN meat eat-*d* 3PL.DDIST
Gür-ülce-gü üdür güün-ü miqa ***günesüle-d*** *te:de.*
reach-RECP-FUT.P day person-GEN meat feed.on-*d* 3PL.DDIST
'Those "four dogs" ... advance ... riding on the wind. On days of mutual killing, they eat human meat. On days of mutual encountering, they feed on human meat.' (§195, 7337-41)

4 Perfective domain

Forms within the perfective domain of MM are the simple past markers *-bA*, *-lUGA* and *-jUGU*, the perfect *-GsAn ajugu* and the resultative *-jU amu* / *ajugu* / *bülüge*.

4.1.1 *-bA*, *-lUGA* and *-jUGU*

The best-understood part of the tense-aspect-evidentiality system of MM is the simple past forms which have been discussed in considerable detail by Street (2008, 2009). Aspectually, the three forms do not seem to differ (Street 2009: 131).[19] All can be used in the storyline, as exemplified for *-bA* with (57) below; a good example for *-jUGU* is the poem summarizing the life of Ying Šui in SMI 1335.

(57) *"Eke öter bos"* ***kee-bi****.* *Höelün eke ügüle-rün*
mother quick get.up-IMP say-PST.FC.f H. mother tell-CVB.PRAEP
"Köü:-d-i öter seri-ül-üdkün" *ke-ed Höelün*
son-PL-ACC quick wake(intr)-CAUS-HON.IMP say-PFV.C H.
eke öter gü ***bos-bi****.* *Temüjin-tE:n köü:-d*
mother quick FOC get.up-PST.FC.f T.-POSS.PL son-PL
öterle-n gü bos-uad mori:-d-iyan bari-ju Temüjin
make.haste-CVB FOC get.up-PFV.C horse-PL-RPOSS grab-PVF.C T.
niken mori ***unu-ba****.* *Höelün eke niken mori* ***unu-ba****.*
one horse ride-PST.FC H. mother one horse ride-PST.FC
... Temülün-i Höelün eke ebür-tür-iyen ***deür-be****; niken*
T.-ACC H. mother lab-DAT3-RPOSS ?-PST.FC one
mori kötöl ***jasa-ba****; Börte üjin-e mori* ***duta-ba****.*
horse spare.horse organize.PST.FC B. lady-DAT1 horse lack-PST.FC
'[Old Qoaqchin said] "Mother, get up quick!" *Mother* Höelün said "Get the boys up fast!," and rose in haste. After the sons including Temüjin had also got up *hastily*, [they] grabbed their horses and Temüjin mounted *a horse*; *Mother* Höelün mounted a horse. . . . [Six others *unu-bA*° 'mounted a horse'.] As for [young] Temülün, Höelün had her ride in front of her. [They] prepared one horse as a spare. There was no horse [left] for Lady Börte' (§98-99, 2428-39, Street 2008: 407)

-bA is regularly used for editorial information on any kind of official documents:

(58) *jarliq manu morin jil jun-u teri'ün zara-yin*
decree 1PL.excl.POSS horse-/n year summer-GEN first month-GEN

[19] Rybatzki's (2003: 75-76) opinion that *-bA* usually functions as a perfective recent past, *-lUGA* as a marker of certainty and *-jUGU* as a pluperfect lacks a factual basis, as does the account of Manduqu et al. (1997: 494-500) who agree that *-bA* is past perfective, but consider *-lUGA* to be a recent past and *-jUGU* as a past continuous.

qorin qurban-a Taydu-da bü-küi-dür ***bici-bei***
twenty three-DAT1 Peking-DAT2 be-FUT.P write-PST.FC.PL
'[We] wrote our decree in the year of the horse at the 23rd of the first month of summer while we were in Peking.' (Buyan-tu qagan-u jarlig, 1318, transcription Tömörtogoo 2002: 32)

There are 11 instances in the SH where *-bA* is combined with *edöe* 'now' which refers to a time after the terminal point of telic predications has just been reached. A few clear instances where the present-time reference is not made explicit by an adverb are also attested. Thus, *-bA* is used like a perfect:

(59) *Soqor elci-yen ile-esü asgi-ju yabu-qa-n*
S. messenger-RPOSS send-COND.C beat-PVF.C go-CAUS-CVB
ile-jüü. Edöe bi irge-ben quyi-ra ***ire-be***
send-PST.2H now 1SG people-RPOSS beg-CVB.in.order come-PST.FC
'When I sent my messenger Soqor [to you], you beat him and sent him back on foot; now I have come [myself] to request the return of my people' (§245, X341-43, Street 2008: 407)

In a few instances, *-bA* marks the beginning of a particular action, as in the example below:

(60) *Ciŋgis qaan-u nere aldar sonos-cu ayu-ju*
Gh. Khan-GEN name fame hear-PVF.C get.afraid-PVF.C
a-laay ba. Edöe sülder-tü beye cin-u gür-cü
live-PST.1H.PL IP now majesty-POSS body 2SG-GEN arrive-PVF.C
ire-gde-jü sülder-ece ***ayu-ba.***
come-PASS-PVF.C majesty-ABL get.afraid-PST.FC
'Hearing of Cinggis Qa'an's fame we *lived* in awe [of you]. Now your august person has arrived, you have come to us, and we are [indeed] awed by your majesty' (§249, Y084-86, Street 2008: 408)

It is clear that these examples are not to be subsumed under the label perfect, but rather of those of a past perfective. The perfect-like uses can then be explained by an unmarked perfective interpretation (in the sense of Johanson 2000's -INTRA -POST).

Instead, the difference between the three suffixes is evidential. Ozawa (1961, cf. 1965: 96-99) already described *-lUGA* as "already known or naturally foreboded" to the speaker/writer OR hearer/reader [when it happened], while the *-jUGU* was either unknown or unexpected for them. Nasunurtu (1989) drew a distinction between objective *ajugu* and subjective *bülüge*. But Ozawa, Nasunurtu and Secen (1993) focused more on establishing the copula forms *a-* and *bü-* as modal rather than on the verbal suffixes themselves. Street (2009) suggests differentiating *-lUGA*, *-jUGU* and *-bA* as "attestive", "presumptual" and "factual" past, respectively:

(61) *Moŋqol-un ceri-üd Saari keer-i büte-tele* ***bawu-lua***
M.-GEN soldier-PL S. steppe-ACC fill.up-until.C encamp-PST.1H
'The Mongol troops have set up camp so as to cover the [whole] Saari Steppe' (§193, 7251-52, de Rachewiltz 2004: 116)

(62) *Üdür geyi-n bara-asu šitüldü-jü qono-qsa-d*
day dawn-CVB expire-COND.C resist.REPR-PVF.C spend.night-PRF.P-PL
ceri-üd söni bö-ed ***budara-juuy****; güreele-gse-d irgen*
soldier-PL night COP1-PFV.C disperse-PST.2H encircle-PRF.P-PL people
'küŋke-n ülü coda-qu-n' kee-n güreele-gse-d
get.free-CVB NEG.IPFV can-FUT.P-PL say-CVB encircle-PRF.P-PL
qajar-aca ese ***gödöl-jüüy***
place-ABL NEG.PFV move-PST.2H
'When the day had dawned, it turned out that the soldiers who had stayed the night in opposition to us had dispersed during the night; the people who were encircled, saying "We cannot get away", had not moved from the place where they were encircled.' (§146, 4450-53)

(63) *Köü-d minu qa-d* ***bol-juu*** *kee-gde-müy*
son-PL 1SG.POSS qan-PL become-PST.2H say-PASS-IPVF
'My sons are said to have become Qans' (SH 3208-09, Street 2013: 59)

(61) with *-lUGA* is a message sent by a patrol to their Qan that tells of events that the patrolmen have attestedly (SH 7247-49) witnessed. (62) with *-jUGU* is a clear instance of inference, while (63) with the same marker is hearsay used in combination with the quotative verb. Hearsay examples without this combination are attested as well. These examples are quite representative.

-lUGA is extremely frequent in quoted speech (9:1 among ca. 100 examples, contrasting with 1:2 among ca. 1000 instances of *-bA* and somewhat more than 1:5 among 250 instances of *-jUGU*). Discounting its apparently anomalous use in the copula *bülüge*, there are 63 spoken instances of *-lUGA* in declaratives in the SH. In all instances, the speaker could have witnessed the event. In 23 instances, the witnessing is directly confirmed by the SH, while 22 instances have overt or implied first-person subjects. The non-quoted examples are not so clear, as the author of the SH is unknown, but none is about events that a contemporary of Cinggis Qan could not have witnessed, and the examples in other MM texts fit well into the analysis (Street 2009). If we concentrate on quoted sentences without the copula verbs *ajugu*, *bülüge* and *bolba*, the speaker is a participant in 77% (n=313) and 80% (n=88) of quoted sentences with *-bA* and *-lUGA*, respectively, while this only holds true for 13% (n=47) of the quoted sentences with *-jUGU* (John Street, p.c., 2011-04-01).

A peculiarity of *-jUGU* is that the inferred fact can be denoted by a subordinate verb (Street 2009: 143):

(64) *Erte üdür kē-esü Qurcaqus Buyiruq qan ecige-yü-en*
early day say-COND.C Q. B. Qan father-ACC-RPOSS
qoyin-a "Döcin köü-d-ün aqa" kee-jü qan
after-DAT1 40 son-PL-GEN older.brother say-PVF.C Qan
bol-juu *je ci.*
become-PST.2H IP 2SG
'"If we speak of former days, after your father Qurchaqus Buyiruq Qan, it must surely have been because [you] were the eldest of forty sons that you became qan"' (§177, 6235-37, Street 2009: 143)

Ozawa (1965) and, less convincingly, Street (2009) argued that *-jUGU* can be used to mark an action as surprising in some cases, as in the following example:

(65) *B̲asa qar-cu ayisu-quy-tur šiquy-in amasar-a*
also exit-PVF.C approach-FUT.P2-DAT3 thicket-GEN opening-DAT1
qošiliq-un tedüy caqan gürü amasar-a bögle-n
tent-GEN so.much white rock opening-DAT1 block-CVB
una-juu. *Teŋgeri idqa-n a-quy=u kee-jü*
fall-PST.2H heaven warn-CVB COP2-FUT.P=Q say-PVF.C
qari-ju basa qurban ***qono-BA***.
return-PVF.C also three spend.night-PST.FC
'When he [-Temüjin] started out again, a white rock the size of a tent fell at the opening of the thicket, blocking the opening. He said, "Is this a warning of Heaven?" He turned back and spent three more nights there. (§80, 2155-58, de Rachewiltz 2004: 23)

Ozawa (1965: 97-98, also cf. 111-112) persuasively argued that if (65) was to be understood in a resultative way, i.e. Temüjin finding that a rock has already blocked the exit of the thicket upon his arrival at the entrance, we should expect an accusative suffix on *amasar* 'entrance' as would correspond to *bögle-* 'block' yielding 'had fallen down blocking the entrance', not a locative one as corresponds to *una-* 'fall' yielding 'fell down on the entrance blocking it'. Moreover, a resultative form like **unugsan ajuu* might have been chosen instead of the aspectually neutral *-jUGU*. So the

more likely reading of this sentence seems to indicate that the rock unexpectedly fell down before Temüjin's eyes, sending him a celestial warning that he should not leave the thicket. An alternative explanation might be that the narrator does not take Temüjin's, but his own perspective - Temüjin had no company at that time. Still, as *-bA* is used in the sentence immediately following (65) when Temüjin still was alone, this approach is insufficient. However, if we assume that the length of Temüjin's stay in the thicket is easier to objectively assess e.g. based on the duration of how long his many enemies stood watch, while the falling-down of the rock is not, the narrator might make a difference between what he considered facts and that what he consciously relates as having heard from others.

Of the 22 questions with *-lUGA* in the SH, two are information-seeking questions answered by the addressee relying on firsthand knowledge marked with *-lUGA*, while the others are (usually angry) rhetorical questions to which both speaker and addressee know the answer. Less frequent rhetorical questions in *-jUGU* have a more probabilistic meaning: even though the speaker is not asking for information, an answer on this question would have to be based on estimation, not firsthand knowledge (Street 2009: 135-138, 145-147). For instance, Cinggis Khan uttered (67) shortly after the referent of his sentence has been interrogated, making sense of his answers.[20] This is followed by his execution, which is, naturally, also the case for the addressees of (66).

(66) *Erte üdür bida yau* ***kee-ldü-leey****?*
early day 1PL.INCL what say-RECP-PST.1H
'What did we agree upon in the old days?' (§136, 4203-04, de Rachewiltz 2004: 59)

(67) *Mün gü dayisu sedki-jü oorcaq bol-ju* ***yabu-juu****.*
same FOC enemy think-PVF.C outcast become-PVF.C go-PST.2H
Edöe yau görü-re ***ire-jüü****?*
now what ?-CVB.in.order come-PST.2H
'"All the same, he has been living as an outcast, with hostile intentions; what has he come to spy upon now?'" (§156, 5262-63, de Rachewiltz 2004: 79)

The copula *bülüge* is used in genealogical contexts that are too remote for the author of the SH to have firsthand experience of them. Street speculates that the absence of **bü-be* might have led to a use where *bülüge* has lost its peculiar firsthand semantics (Street 2009: 138-141). This, one might add, is the more probable as *a-ba* is very rare and *bol-ba* dynamic in nature. The use of *bülüge* after converbs and participles is more in accord with the normal semantics of *-lUGA*, but the number of deviating instances is still too great to claim that the semantics are the same. On the other hand, *-jUGU* in *a-jugu* seems to have the same semantics as in other contexts (cf. Street 2009: 143-145). (68) exemplifies a normal use, (69) an estimation about a situation that has not (yet) come about, and (70) deferred realization:

(68) *Bayi-ju qono-ju üdür geyi-ül-ün*
stand-PVF.C spend.night-PVF.C day dawn-CAUS-CVB
bügüdge-esü, Öködey Boroqul Boorcu qurban ügey ***a-juu****.*
muster-COND.C Ö. B. B. 3 absent COP2-PST.2H
'[They] spent the night standing [in battle order]. At daybreak, when they held a roll-call, *it turned out that* Ögödei, Boroqul and Bo'orcu were not there' (§172, 6111-12, de Rachewiltz 2004: 92 modified by Street 2009: 144)

(69) *Bida ene an-u yeke üge-tür šoqa-n*
1PL.INCL DPROX 3PL-GEN big word-DAT3 lean.against-CVB
morila-ju od-cu an-u qor ab-uasu
set.out-PVF.C proceed-PVF.C 3PL-GEN quiver take-COND.C
berke-tü=ū ***a-juu****?*
difficulty-POSS=Q COP2-PST.2H

[20] Alternatively, the non-firsthand marking in (67) might indicate that the referent came unnoticed.

‘“If [now], grasping the chance their boasts [afford us], we set out on a campaign and removed their quivers, would [this] be [so] difficult?”’ (§190, SH 7163-65, de Rachewiltz)
“If we ... took their quivers, would [that turn out to] have been so difficult?” (Street 2009: 146)

(70) *Üdür gegeen bol-qa-ju, üje-esü qoyin-a-ca niken*
day bright become-CAUS-PVF.C see-COND.C behind-DAT1-ABL one
güün ayis-u; gür-cü ire-esü Boorcu ***a-juu****.*
person approach-i/u arrive-PVF.C come-COND.C B. COP2-PST.2H
‘Waiting for day to dawn, when they looked [out], [they saw] a man approaching from the rear; as he came closer, it turned out to be Boorchu.’ (§172, 6118-19)

The expression of speech acts in MM is not entirely clear, but *-bA* in (71) might be an instance. Here, either de Rachewiltz’ conservative translation is right and Cinggis who has just been declared qan merely reminds his vassals of favors he bestowed upon them earlier, or he is immediately following up his promotion by the promotion of two of his vassals.

(71) *Jüg jüg tüši=bAy tan-i.*
direction direction appoint-PST.FC 2PL-ACC
‘[Further, Cinggis Qa’an said, ‘When Heaven and Earth increased my strength and took me into their protection, you, the senior ones, who for my sake came [over] from sworn friend Jamuqa wishing to become companions, will you not be my lucky companions?] I have appointed each of your to your respective office.’ (§125, 3497, de Rachewiltz 1004: 52)

Unfortunately, the evidence for the evidential properties of *-bA* that Street presents are not as detailed. It dominates in edicts and is the only form used to convey editorial information. It is both applicable to events in times of yore and to events that the speaker witnessed. In the SMI of 1335, 1338, 1346, 1362 where great care is exerted to attribute each and every information, it appears to function like a firsthand marker. Let’s take a sequence that puzzled Street (2009: 157) as an example. SMI 1362 has different forms of the verb *ög-* ‘give’ concerning the granting of titles, 4 times taking *-bA* and two times *-jUGU*. Line 10, 18 refer to titles conveyed at the occasion correlated to the erection of this stele, which is contextually clear for 10 and made clear by the adverbial *ene ayan* (‘[on] this journey’ → ‘[on] this occasion’) in 18, 35 and the second example in line 25. So the author of the stele had firsthand knowledge of these events and might (as somebody who resided in Beijing at that time and even had personal access to the emperor, cf. Chan 1976) well have been present at the ceremony in question. The first title in line 25 was conveyed before the author was given the task of composing the stele, and he thus was not aware of this event when it happened. It is not obvious when the title in line 33 was granted, but it is followed by another title granted *ülü udan darui-dur* ‘not long afterwards’, so it seems to be another event that the author had no occasion to witness personally, even though he has no reason to doubt either event.

-lUGA, on the other hand, is a firsthand marker alright, but it seems to be restricted to contexts where the speaker deems it appropriate to refer to his personal perception of the events and thus avoids presenting them as objective facts:

(72) *bi urida imayi kümün bolu-mU je keme-n* ***sedki-lege****.*
1SG former 3SG.ACC person become-IPVF IP say-CVB think-PST.1H
sedki-gse-ber min-u bol-ba
think.PRF.P-INS 1SG.GEN become-PST.FC
‘Formerly I thought that he will surely become a man. It happened as I had thought.’ (SMI 1335: 42)

This is similar in a passage in the Twelve deeds of the Buddha mentioned where the Buddhas remind the Bodhisattva to bring forth his task and to remember his former lives, thus focusing on what they clearly remember (and want him to remember) rather than what is clearly the fact. In the light of such material, it is time to revise Street’s labelling. The term “attestive” for *-lUGA*, pertaining to an action

that was directly witnessed visually or auditively,[21] may be replaced by the more common "firsthand", while the term "presumptual" for *-jUGU* which refers to inference, deferred realization and hearsay would be a "non-firsthand" in Aikhenvald's (2004: 65) terminology.

The label "factual" for *-bA* is more problematic, as the conditions under which an evidentially neutral marker can be used have not been investigated in detail either by Street for MM nor by linguistics in general for the languages of the world. Following Mushin (2001: 74-79), one may assume different epistemic stances that can guide how a speaker chooses e.g. evidential forms. These range from subjective, conceptualizer-evoking stances like private experience over perceptual experience, inferential, reportative, imaginative (relating something as made up) to the factual stance that disassociates the speaker and her source of information from the statement, which thus becomes perfectly objective, implying "that the source of information is unimportant to the establishment of the validity of the information", e.g. because it is common knowledge anyway or not likely to be challenged, the exact circumstances being culturally defined. In the SH, the narrative might simply be presumed to be factual by the authority of the narrator who only sometimes takes recourse to evidential forms to relativize his authority for certain events like the divine warning in the cave. Historians in the SMI, on the other hand, don't adapt a factual stance from anything they might have reconstructed from documents at their disposal. Yet, they don't feel the need to provide editorial information from a subjective perspective either. Non-factual evidential markers might thus imply the presence of epistemic modality, as suggested by Mushin (2001: 32, contra Aikhenvald 2004) for small evidential systems.

4.1.2 *-jU ajugu*, *-jU bülüge* and *-jU amu*

As observed by Matsuoka (2008: 104-112), *-ju a-* / *bü-* refer to ongoing activities with activities and states, while they refer to results with telic predications:

(73) *Tuma:d irgen-ü noyan Dayduqul soqor-i ükü=esü eme*
T. people-GEN lord D. blind-ACC die-COND.C woman *in-u Botoquy tarqun Tuma:d irgen-i* ***mede=jü a=juu***.
3SG-GEN B. fat T. people-ACC command-PVF.C COP1-PST.2H
'When Daiduqul the Blind, leader of the Tumed, died, his wife Botoqui the Fat was governing the Tumed.' (§240, X178-80)

(74) *junu teriün sara-yin harban jirwaan-a hulaan tergel*
summer-GEN first month-GEN ten six-DAT1 red circle
üdür Tayiciu:d Onan-u ergi deer-e qurimla-ldu-ju naran
day T. O.-GEN shore on feast-RECP-PVF.C sun
šiŋge-esü tarqa-BA. Temüjin-i tere qurim-tur gelbüre köün
set-COND.C disperse-PST.FC T.-ACC DDIST feast-DAT3 weakling boy
güün ***abcira-ju bü-lee***. *Qurim-un haran-i*
person bring-PVF.C COP1-PST.FC feast-GEN people-ACC
tarqa-ul-un tere gelbüre köün-ece buqau tata-ju
disperse-CAUS-CVB DDIST weakling boy-ABL cangue draw-PVF.C
ab-cu heki in-u niken-te deled-üed güyi-jü
take-PVF.C head 3SG-GEN one-times strike-PFV.C run-PVF.C
'on the sixteenth of the first month of summer, the day of the Red Circle, the Tayiciut held a feast on the bank of the Onan. At sunset they dispersed. Temüjin had been brought to this feast by a weak young man. After the people of the feast had dispersed, [Temüjin] pulled [the leash of his] cangue away from that weakling, hit him once on the head and ran away.' (§81, 2171-76, de Rachewiltz 2004: 23)

(73) can obviously not refer to a result or repetition, but must refer to an ongoing state. While *mede-* 'come to know+know' is an inceptive state verb in its basic meaning, its meaning 'be in command'

[21] The following example might or might not be taken as evidence for the marking of auditive perception: XJ 29a:2 has *soyül surgal-i sonus-ta-luga* teaching-ACC hear-PASS-PST.1H 'I was affected by hearing your teachings about ...'

does not seem to have an inceptive component like ‘assume command’. Part of (74), an accomplishment, was cited by Matsuoka as well, but I cite it in full here to demonstrate that no progressive interpretation is conceivable. As it is first mentioned that the people dispersed at sunset, it is impossible to state that he was being brought to this feast by a young man at this point. Rather, he must have been already there. Such a translation is also very suitably applied to (75) where *-jU a-mu* indicates present time reference:

(75) *Ki_yem kiged ögüle-rün Jang_Ying_šui-a ... wungsing*
K. et.al say-CVB.PRAEP J.-DAT1 posthumous.name
nere ***ög-te-jü*** ***a-mU****.* *Jang_Ying_šui keme-besü ...*
name give-PASS-PVF.C COP2-IPVF J. say-COND.C
‘when Ki yem and others spoke, [they said]: “The posthumous title ... is [now] granted to Jang Ying šui. As for Jang Ying šui, he was ...”’ (SMI 1335: 10, Cleaves 1950: 95)

This passage would be very surprising if Cleaves’ translation was correct. Both the context and the Chinese parallel text (cf. Cleaves 1950: 22) indicate that the title had already been granted, and this is why Ki yem et al. were ordered to compose an inscription in Jang Ying šui’s memory. So the translation should rather read “... has been granted ...”.[22]

4.1.3 *-GsAn ajugu*, *-GsAn bülüge* and *-GsAn*

While *-jU ajugu* etc. seem to express a resultative meaning, *-GsAn a-jugu* / *bülüge* has a morphological structure suggesting a perfect in the past (i.e., past relevance) or pluperfect (i.e., past in the past). A pluperfect use might have existed, but is doubtful:

(76) *teün-i ösö-n hacira-n* ***od-cuuy****.* *Temüjin-i*
DDIST-ACC revenge-CVB reciprocate-CVB proceed-PST.2H T.-ACC
Burqan_ qaldun-i qurban-ta quci-ul-quy-tur Börte üjin-i
B.-ACC three-times circle-CAUS-FUT.P-DAT3 B. lady-ACC
tende erüs-cü Ciledü-yin deü Cilger_bökö-de ***asara-ul-uqsan***
there catch-PVF.C C.-GEN younger.brother C.-DAT2 care-CAUS-PRF.P
a-juu*; tere asara-qsa-ar a-ju Cilger_bökö dayiji-ju*
COP2-PST.2H DDIST care-PRF.P-INS COP2-PVF.C C. desert-PVF.C
qar-urun ügüle-rün ... kee-ed dayji-n ***dutaa-juu****.*
exit-CVB.PRAEP say-CVB.PRAEP ... say-PFV.C desert-CVB escape-PST.2H
‘and they [[the Three Merkit tribe]] set out to take revenge for that. It was at the time when Temüjin circled Burqan Qaldun three times that they captured Lady Börte. They entrusted her to Cilger Bökö, the younger brother of Ciledü. As Cilger Bökö had been looking for her ever since, when he fled, deserting his own companions, he said. ... Thus he said and escaped, deserting his own companions.’ (§111: 3177-95, de Rachewiltz 2004: 41-42)

In (76), there are three events in a row and in temporal sequence. The first and third event take simple past marking in *-jUGU*, but the second is marked by *-GsAn ajugu*. This event of entrusting had the effect explicitly mentioned by a non-finite form in the next clause that she was taken care of by him ever since until shortly before these words were said. On the other hand, the rescue of Börte by Temüjin after the defeat of the Merkit had been described in §110 followed by this paragraph which first recollects past events and mentions the flight of one of the main “culprits”, thus setting the stage for the physical extermination of the Merkit in §112. The possible reference made here to §110 is the closest thing to a past in the past that can be found in the SH. On the other hand, most uses clearly show past relevance:

(77) *Erde üdür-ece Tatar irgen ebüge:-s ecige:-s-i* ***bara-qsan***
early day-ABL T. people ancestor-PL father-PL-ACC use.up-PRF.P

[22] Cleaves (1950: 100) translated the same grammatical construction correctly in line [35-36]: *edüge kui jing ön-ü önsi bolgan tüsigdejü amu* ’Now he has been appointed as önsi of the kui jing ön.’

bü-lee. *E̲büge:s ecige:s-ün ösöl ösö-jü kisal*
COP1-PST.1H ancestor-PL father-PL-GEN revenge revenge-PVF.C revenge
kisa-ju ciün-tür üli-jü kidu-ju ala-ju ög-üyE.
revenge-PVF.C linchpin-DAT3 compare-PVF.C slay-Cv2 kill-PVF.C give-VOL
'From olden days the Tatar people have destroyed our fathers and forefathers. To avenge our fathers and forefathers, and requite the wrong, for them we shall measure [the Tatars] against the linchpin of a cart, and kill them to the last one.' (§154, 5194-97, de Rachewiltz 2004: 77)

(78) *A̲ltan qan Juŋdu-da-ca qar-urun Juŋdu dotor-a Qada-yi*
Altan Qan J.-DAT2-ABL exit-CVB.PRAEP J. in-DAT1 Q.-ACC
lyušyu ***bol-qa-n tüši-jü od-uqsan a-juu***.
留守 become-CAUS-CVB appoint-PVF.C proceed-PRF.P COP2-PST.2H
Ciŋgis qahan Juŋdu-yin altan möŋgün ed aurasun yau ke
Gh. Khan J.-GEN gold silver goods satin what FOC?
in-u toola-ul-urun Öŋgür bawurci Arqay_qasar
3SG-GEN count-CAUS-CVB.PRAEP Ö. steward A.
Šigi_qutuqu qurban-i ***ile-bAy***. *E̲:de qurban-i*
Š. three-ACC send-PST.FC.PL DPROX.PL three-ACC
ayis-ay kee-n Qada esergü uqdu-n alta-tay
approach-RES.P say-CVB Q. against greet-CVB gold-POSS.PL
har-tay aurasu bari-ad Juŋdu dotor-a-ca qar-cu
satin-POSS.PL satin grab-PFV.C J. in-DAT1-ABL exit-PVF.C
esergü ***ire-bAy***.
against come-PST.FC.PL
'When the Altan Qan moved out of Jungdu, he appointed Qada as liušiu in Jungdu before leaving [the city]. When Cinggis Qa'an had the inventory taken of the gold, silver, goods, satin and [other] things [gathered] in Jungdu, he sent the steward Öndgür, Arqai Qasar and Sigi Qutuqu [to do it]. As these three were approaching, Qada went ahead to greet them, taking with him gold[-embroidered] and patterned satins.' (§252, Y148-55, de Rachewiltz 2004: 179-180)

(79) *nayan qoyar nasula-ju. job ese bolu-gsan-u*
eighty two reach.age-PVF.C right NEG.PFV become-PRF.P-GEN
qoyin-a türün A nere ***ög-cü*** [... destroyed ...] *[wun]gsingla-ju*
after-DAT1 first A name give-PVF.C award.PT-PVF.C
C nere ***ög-cügü***. *gergei in-u D wusin nere ög-cigi.*
C name give-PST.2H wife 3SG-GEN D PT name give-PST.2H.f
qoyin -a basa E wusin nere ***wungsingla-gsan a-jigi***.
after-DAT1 also E PT name award.PT-PRF.P COP2-PST.2H.f
Ying_šui-yin ecige Bai_sang-a türün F nögüge-te G nere
Y.-GEN father B.-DAT1 first F other.additional-times G name
neme-n mön kü uridu yosu-gar H nere-ber ***wungsingla-gsan***
add-CVB same FOC former custom-INS H name-INS award.PT-PRF.P
a-jugu. *Bai_sang-un gergei Ong_si-da J nere* ***wungsingla-jigi***.
COP2-PST.2H B.-GEN wife O.-DAT2 J name award.PT-PST.2H.f
'[Ying Šui] lived 82 years, and after he died, [the Emperor] gave him first the title A, then posthumously awarded [B], then gave the title C (*-cügü*). To his wife, he gave the posthumous title (*-cigi*) D. Afterwards, he had also posthumously awarded her the title (*-GsAn ajigi*) E. To Ying Šui's father Bai Sang, he first gave the title F, then moreover adding the title G (*-n*), in the very former manner he had posthumously awarded him with the title (*-GsAn ajigi*) H. The wife of the father he posthumously awarded with the title (*-jigi*) J.' (SMI 1335: 28-30)

In (77), the deeds of the Tatars in days of yore have resulted in a state that justifies slaying them all. In (78), Qada beckons Cinggis Qan's emissaries because he was left as Altan Qan's representative after the latter left Beijing. Note the difference in evidentiality: in the first case, the speaker has personal knowledge of the deeds of the Tatars in days of yore, as his father was poisoned by Tatar people, while the second sentence relates to what happened during a military campaign on the enemy side, well beyond what the author of the SH could have had firsthand knowledge about. In (79), the titles

conveyed with *-GsAn ajugu* appear to have been conveyed at later occasions, which is conceivable given the adverbials such as 'afterwards', while the titles marked with *-jUGU* were conveyed at the occasion of Ying Šui's death and thus at a definite point in time. *-GsAn ajugu*, on the other hand, appears to refer to the fact that these people held those titles at a reference time.

While space prevents me from discussing all problematic cases, most uses that I saw in several MM documents can be fitted into this analysis and be read as perfects. After all, relevance at a reference point in the past is a somewhat wage notion. But there is another use found in at least one text, the SMI 1362. In this text, there are basically three narrative forms, *-bA* being used for witnessed events and *-jUGU* for non-witnessed, but fairly certain events like the emperor conveying titles. The perspective is that of the Yuan scientist and politician Su Wei (not of his translator) who in the Mongolian version of the text bases his knowledge on tradition (11: *ulam-aca bolgabasu*) and in the Chinese version (Cleaves 1949: 31) even more explicitly on what he has heard. There are a number of events clearly located in a complex narrative sequence that is not just the prelude to some later events. I quote a part from it:

(80) (SMI 1362: 18-24, Cleaves 1949: 86-87)

1. *ebüge inu Ataibuqa qatagu jorig-tu bagatur jirüke-tü bökü-yin siltaga-bar ada-tu üile-dur ucira-basu ber qatagu jorig-iyan ülü* ***qarigulu-n a-gsan a-jugu***.
2. *qoyin-a elincüg inu Qara yiucing ebedcin kürte-jü aljanggu bolugsan-dur köbegü-d-iyen ire-gül-jü geriyes üge talbi-run* [put-PRAEP.C] ... *keme-gde-gsen-ü tula* [say-PASS-PRF.P-GEN because] *mön Ataibuqa bingjang üiledde-kü ken üiles-i inu ülede-n cida-qui-ca güicege-n* [execute-CVB] ***üiledü-gsen a-jugu***.
3. *qoyin-a Duua Busma-tan köbegü-d bulga bol-basu* [revolt become-COND.C] *mön Ataibuqa .... Duua-tan köbegü-d arban qoyar tüme-d cerig-üd-iyer qoton-u cagada kür-cü* [reach-PFV.C] *bürin qadqu-ldu-qui-dur mön Ataibuqa ... beyenggedün sitügeleldü-n qadqu-ldu-gad* [resist.RECP-CVB stab-RECP-CVB.then] *olan-ca urugsi yabu-ju* [go-PFV.C] *temdegtei-e kücü öggü-gsen-ü siltaga-bar* [give-PRF.P-GEN reason-INS] *ima-yi itegel-tü tug-tu cerig-üd-ün noyan bolga-n tüsi-ged darqan nere ber* ***öggü-gsen a-jugu***.
4. *qoyin-a idug_qud deger-e agulja-n gar-cu ire-besü* [set.out-PFV.C come-COND.C] *mön Ataibuqa agrug-iyan abu-gad daga-n ire-küi-dür* [come-FUT.P-DAT3] *jobalang-ud-i ülü talga-n jagur-a berke cöl-nugud-i tugulu-gad Yungcang-dur kür-besü* [arrive-COND.C]

(1) 'Because his grandfather, Atai Buqa, had a firm will and a valiant heart, whenever he encountered a dangerous affair, he ***was not letting his courage sink***.

(2) Afterwards, when his great-grandfather, Qara, the yiucing, fell sick and became feeble, he had his sons come [to him] and he uttered his final recommendations. Because he *was told* "(...)", the same bingjang, Atai Buqa, without leaving aside whatever matters he had to perform, **performed** [them], accomplishing [them] to the best of his ability.

(3) Afterwards, when the princes Duua and Busma revolted, (...) the same Atai Buqa ... *[tried to throw down the rebellion and, when failing, retreated to Qara Qoco and raised troops and fortified it. Then]*(...) the princes Duua and others arrived in the vicinity of the town with 120,000 troops and, when they all engaged in battle with one another, the same Atai Buqa was mindful of the Empire, without considering that he might die, and engaged in battle, participating personally in the resistance. Because he went more in advance than the multitude and rendered service pre-eminently, [the Emperor] appointed him an officer of the trustworthy troops with banners and also **granted [him] the title darqan**.

(4) Afterwards, when the idug qud *[i.e., his people]* came for an audience with the Emperor, when the same Atai Buqa came with [him] with his camp and when he arrived at Yungcang, having traversed the difficult deserts in between, without

gajar usun-u nayir jogis-tu amun künesün elbeg-tü-yin tula dotura-gan oyisiya-ju [like?-PFV.C] *orusi-n Yungcang-a* ***nuntugla-gsan a-jugu***.

considering his sufferings, because the harmony of land and water was suitable and millet and provisions were abundant, inwardly he delighted in it and **encamped permanently** in Yungcang.

5. *mön Ataibuqa jöb ese bolu-gsan-u qoyin-a* [become-PRF.P-GEN after-DAT1]

(5) After the same Atai Buqa passed away ...'

As we can observe, forms in *-GsAn ajugu* form the storyline and are thus perfective, while *ülü qarigulun agsan ajugu* is an instance of a general behavior attributed to Ataibuqa and is thus to be understood as simply past imperfective. (A second instance of this form, *kündülen agsan ajugu* 'were venerating him', can be found in line 30.) So these forms are not to be interpreted as perfects, but are applied to those events that Su Wei has reconstructed from his sources. They therefore indicate an additional layer of evidential marking. As *-jUGU* is already used for other non-witnessed hearsay events, *-GsAn ajugu* might probably be specified as reconstruction from a source and thus as inferential.

-GsAn on its own is very rarely used in sentence-final position. The 8 or 9 instances in 2 or 3 passages quoted below is everything contained in my corpus; the first two end poetic lines, while the third is prose.

(81) *ene Qunan / qara söni gendü_cino / gegeen üdür qara kerie*
DPROX Q black night male_wolf bright day black crow
bol-ju / newü-qüy-tür ese ***ünji-gsen*** */ ünji-küy-tür*
become-PVF.C move-FUT.P2-DAT3 NEG.PFV rest-PRF.P rest-FUT.P2-DAT3
ese ***newü-gsen****; / busu güün-lüe / buši niur ese*
NEG move-PRF.P different person-COM different face NEG.PFV
jübci-gsen */ öš-tü güün-lüe / öere niur ese* ***jübci-gsen***.
?-PRF.P vengeance-POSS person-COM other face NEG.PFV ?-PRF.P
'This Qunan was A male wolf in the dark / A black crow in the bright day / When we were on the move he did not stop, / When we halted he did not move on. / With a stranger / He did not put on another face, / With a mortal enemy / He did not put on a different face.'
(§210, 9038-42, de Rachewiltz 2004: 143)

(82) *galigu dayisun-i qalqala-ju oyira ese* ***qalga-gsan***,
hot enemy-ACC ward.off-PVF.C near NEG.PFV let.approach-PRF.P
qaltaril ügei qadqu-ldu-ju sayi-ban ***ol-da-gsan***,
dodging NEG pierce-RECP-PVF.C good-RPOSS find-PASS-PRF.P
qadagala-gsan minggan-iyan abu-gad Qamil-a ***talbi-gsan***,
supervise-PRF.P thousand-RPOSS take-PFV.C Q.-DAT1 put-PRF.P
qagan-a kücü öggü-n negü-jü Yungcang-a ***nuntugla-gsan***.
Khan-DAT1 strength give-CVB move-PVF.C Y.-DAT1 camp-PRF.P
'He warded off evil enemies and let them not come near. / He battled without shirking and his success was found. / Having taken the thousand of which he was in charge, he put them in Qamil. / Rendering service to the Qagan he removed and encamped at Yungcang.' (SMI 1362: 49-50, Cleaves 1949: 92)

(83) *Qorci ire-jü ügüle-rün Bodoncar boqdo-yin bari-ju*
Q. come-PVF.C say-CVB.PRAEP B. august-GEN grab-PVF.C
ab-uqsan eme-de-ce ***töre-gsen*** *ba Jamuqa-lua*
take-PRF.P woman-DAT2-ABL be.born-PRF.P 1PL.EXCL J.-COM
keeli nike-te:n keke qaqca-ta:n bü-leey
womb one-POSS.PL amniotic.fluid single-POSS.PL COP1-PST.1H
ba; Jamuqa-da-ca ülü qaqaca-qu:-n bü-lee ba
1PL.excl J.-DAT2-ABL NEG.IPFV separate-FUT.P-PL COP1-PST.1H 1PL.EXCL

> ‘Having come, Qorci said, “We have been born from a woman that the august Bodoncar captured for himself. We had the same womb [to have originated from] with Jamuqa and one single amniotic fluid. [Normally,] we would not have separated from Jamuqa.’ (§121, 3376-79)

Given the intervening personal pronoun, it is difficult to assume that *bülee* has *törügsen* in its scope, but one might speculate whether it was possible for a relative clause to modify a pronoun as was assumed by Haenisch (1948: 32) here; *ba* would then be present in this sentence two times, but given the general tendency to occur sentence-finally and the impossibility to put it there when modified by a relative clause, this alternative explanation cannot be ruled out entirely. In spite of the small number of examples, it seems possible to come up with a congruent analysis here, even if it cannot be conclusively proven. In (81) Cinggis Qan discusses the merits of Qunan in order to assign a position to him, i.e. the past deeds of his subordinate have great present relevance. In (82), the great deeds of Atai Buqa already narrated in (80) are remembered. All have as much present relevance as they, in contrast to the other considerations and events narrated in the poem, constitute the reasons why Atai Buqa is now to be venerated. Note that at least the third sentence probably cannot have a resultative meaning: the defence of Qara Qoco ~ Qamil is an event successfully completed in the past, and the troops mentioned were stationed there for that event and have certainly left since. Finally, in (83) Qorci is naming a past event that renders the split from Jamuqa that he is just in the course of undertaking as treason under normal circumstances, so present relevance cannot be denied. Now while each of these instances could be explained as a simple past, there are already three simple pasts in MM, but there is no present perfect and the form of the past perfect is the marker *-GsAn* in the past. So the assumption that the meaning of *-GsAn* is indeed present perfect seems plausible. The absence of **-GsAn buyu / amu* then corresponds to the absence of **-QU buyu / amu*.[23]

4.1.4 *-GA, -GA bülüge*

-GA appears to be attested 15 times in finite position in the SH, but one instance (6044) has to be amended to a voluntative plural, and another instance (X040) is preceded by something that might be an irregular form of the passive suffix (cf. Street, footnotes to transcription) and might have to be amended as well. This leaves 13 instances, but these are based on only three verbs. Bayarmendü (1986: 72-74), also mentioning the Mandarin glossing 了, characterizes *-GA* as a simple past marker when used in finite position, but notes that its meaning is evasive when followed by a copula. The latter is the case only 5 times in the SH, four of these being parallel sentences with the auxiliary *ög-* ‘give’ in a benefactive auxiliary construction and four different main verbs. But asking how it might have turned into a resultative (with very restricted application) in Khalkha (see Song 1997: 243-285 and my critical assessment of it in Brosig 2009: 91-94) if it started out as a perfective, one may attempt to ascribe a resultative meaning to *-GA*.[24] This approach explains the use with a negative particle as ‘not yet’ as in (84) which is preserved in Khalkha and can offer a common semantics for the sentence-final uses in (85) and (86) and the periphrastic use in (87).

(84) *Širgüetü nama-yi ala-n bu-yu. Ala-n bara-asu ükü-gsen*
Š. 1SG-ACC kill-CVB COP2-GN kill-CVB finish-COND.C die-PRF.P
amin ügey beye min-u ab-cu od-cu yeki-üjey
life NEG body 1SG-GEN take-PVF.C proceed-PVF.C do.what-PREV
ta. Nama-yi ala-ay üdüüy-e öter qari-dqun. Temüjin
2PL 1SG-ACC kill-RES NEG?-DAT1 quick return-IMP2 T.
nama-yi ülü ala-qu.
1SG-ACC NEG.IPFV kill-FUT.P

[23] Cleaves (1949: 129) assumed that the forms in (82) are shortened variants of *-GsAn ajugu*. But this text passage is no longer part of a narrative, so the past level to which past perfect forms (as used elsewhere in the same inscription) could have referred to does not exist any longer.

[24] Something in this vain is also assumed by Rybatzki (2003: 77) who translates *-GA* with the English present perfect, but does not discuss its meaning. It is not significant that he labeled *-GA* as “Imperfective particle” because this was not his, but the editor’s, Juha Janhunen’s, choice.

‘Sirgü’etü is killing me. Once he has killed me, what will you achieve by taking away my dead and lifeless body? Draw back *while he has not yet killed me*! Temüjin will not kill me.’ (§149, 5034-37, de Rachewiltz 2004: 71) (Sirgü’etü has taken Taqutai Kiriltuq as prisoner and is to deliver him to Temüjin. His relatives are trying to free him, but his capturer is using him as a hostage. Hoping in vain that his life might be spared by Temüjin, he convinces his relatives not to attack his capturer.)

(85) *te:de* *Tatar* *tani-n* *a-juu.* *Yisügey* *Kiyan* *ire-ey*
DDIST.PL T. recognize-CVB COP2-PST.2H Y. K. come-RES
ke-ed *... qoro* *qoli-ju* *ög-ciüy.*
say-PFV.C ... poison mix-PVF.C give-PST.2H
‘*[*But*]* those Tatars recognized him. “Yisügei the Kiyan has come,” they said, and (...) they gave him poison mixing it [with his food].’ (§67, 1480-82, de Rachewiltz 2004: 16)

(86) *Öci-n* *melje-n* *a-qsa:-d* *SartaXul* *irgen-ü* *soltan-i*
report-CVB bet-CVB COP2-PRF.P-PL S. people-GEN sultan-ACC
doroyida-ul-ju *balaqa:-d* *irge* *an-u* *ab-uay* *bida.*
submit-CAUS-PVF.C town-PL people 3PL-GEN take-RES 1SG.INCL
‘We *have* caused the Soltan of the Sarta’ul people, who had refused to submit, to abase himself and we conquered his cities and people.’ (§260, Y448-50, de Rachewiltz 2004: 192)

(87) *Möŋlig* *ecige ci* *ese* *idqa-asu* *huyil-un* *bü-küy*
M. father 2SG NEG.PFV dissuade-COND.C whirl-CVB COP1-FUT.P
usun-tur *hulal-un* *bü-küy* *qal-tur* *oro-qda-ay*
water-DAT3 glow.red?-CVB COP1-FUT.P fire-DAT3 enter-PASS-RES
bü-leey *je.*
COP1-PST.1H IP
‘Had you, Father Mönglik, not dissuaded me, I would to my distress have entered whirling waters, a blazing fire.’ (§204, 8338-40)

In (84), Taqutai Kiriltuq urges his relatives to withdraw at a time when the result of the action of killing him does not yet obtain. In (85), the being there of Yisügei can be taken as an opportunity to poison him. In (86), some generals of Cinggis Qan are putting forward a petition to him, starting with detailing the current situation by stating this sentence. They stress that the enemy people are conquered and now under their command. In (87), without the warning of Mönglig, the result of Temüjin’s having entered whirling waters (by which he means a trap in which the enemy would have caught him) would have had obtained at the time of speech. The other instances where this construction is used also refer to irreal results that would have obtained given a precondition that did not materialize.

This approach comes at a cost, however. One might try to explain the attributive use with the verb *yabu-* ‘go’ in the Phags-pa edicts as exemplified in (88) as based on a verb semtantics ‘set.out+go’ or might content oneself with the observation that *yavaa* in Khalkha is the only form next to *baigaa* (historically deriving from ‘having stopped and still standing’) that lacks a synchronic resultative meaning in that dialect. It might also be possible to explain all instances of *ayis-ay* (4040, 7317, 7334, 7343, 7352, 7357, Y153, Z042) as ‘having approached’, ‘having come close’ being a rather relative notion, but a translation as ‘approaching’ appears more natural.[25] Even so, (89), where the verb *ab-* ‘give’ is used as an auxiliary, seems to pose insurmountable difficulties for a resultative account.

(88) *Sun* *jin[ž]in* *bari-ju* *yabu-ayi* *jarliq* *ög-bei*
S. holy.person grab-PVF.C go-RES edict give-PST.FC
‘Darüber gebe ich (hiermit) einen Erlass, den Sun, der Heilige, bei sich behalten soll.’ (Buyantu qagan-u jarlig, 1314, Haenisch 1940: 62)

(89) *Basa* *bida* *... Buyiruq* *qan-i* *...* *hülde-jü* *...* *Kicil_baš* *naur-a*
also 1PL B. Qan-ACC pursue-PVF.C K. lake-DAT1
muqudqa-ju *ab-uay* *je bida.*

[25] An aktionsart-based explanation is logically possible, but ‘set.out+approach’ appears like an unnatural meaning for a verb to have.

finish.off-PVF.C take-RES IP 1PL
'Then we pursued Buyiruq Qan (...) and (...) *[finally]* finished him off at [Lake] Kicil Baš.'
(§177, 6284-87, de Rachewiltz 2004: 99)

(89) is part of a sequence of events that Temüjin sends as a message to Ong Qan, bemoaning his treason in the face of these past events of cooperation. The fact that Buyiruq Qan is dead is irrelevant here, and emphasis is rather put on the fact that they killed him jointly. So a simple past form would have been the expected choice. An experiential perfect would still be conceivable, but a resultative does not fit the bill.

5 Conclusion

MM had a verbal system that apart from the marking of number and gender also marked aspect and, depending on subsystem, tense and evidentiality. It seems most feasible to divide the aspectual system into two domains: imperfective and perfective. The imperfective domain is made up as follows:

Table 5: Imperfective domain in MM

<table>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="2">progressive</td><td>habitual</td><td>generic</td></tr>
<tr><td>future</td><td colspan="3">*-QU*
(*-mU je*, *-d je*)</td><td rowspan="3">*-yU*</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">present</td><td colspan="3">*-mU*</td></tr>
<tr><td>*-n bu-yu*</td><td colspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td>past</td><td colspan="2">*-n bü-lüge*
/ *-n a-jugu*</td><td>*-QU bü-lüge*
/ *-QU ajugu*</td></tr>
</table>

On the present level, MM differentiated between the generic marker *-yU*, the progressive-habitual *-mU* and the old progressive *-n bu-yu* / *-n bu-i*. Late western MM dialects must have had the progressive marker *-nam* < *-n a-mu*, the only of these markers to survive into modern Mongolian. While *-d* occurs in some present habitual contexts, it is questionable that such a meaning can be assigned to it. On the past level, the simple past imperfective *-n bülüge* / *-n ajugu* (with evidential distinction) dominated. While *-mU* was sometimes used for ongoing events in the recent past, this use is understood here as an extended present. The rare use of *-yU* in past contexts might have linked some entity to some behavior irrespective of whether it still existed or not, but conclusions are hard to draw from two attested past usages. *-QU bülüge* expressed past habitual or counterfactual epistemic certainty. One might derive these two meanings from a future in the past. Actual future was expressed by lone *-QU*, but both *-mU je* (in contexts of strong prediction) and *-d je* (in contexts of intention) could (through the epistemic or illocutionary meaning of *je*) refer to future events as well. The perfecctive domain, in turn, might be sketched as follows:

Table 6: Perfective domain in MM

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>perfective</td><td>perfect</td><td colspan="2">resultative</td></tr>
<tr><td>factual</td><td>*-bA*</td><td>*-GsAn*</td><td>*-jU a-mU*</td><td>*-GA*</td></tr>
<tr><td>past firsthand</td><td>*-lUGA*</td><td>*-GsAn bü-lüge*</td><td>*-jU bü-lüge*</td><td>*-GA bü-lüge*</td></tr>
<tr><td>past non-firsthand</td><td>*-jUGU*</td><td>*-GsAn a-jugu*</td><td colspan="2">*-jU a-jugu*</td></tr>
</table>

There were three perfective and thus necessarily non-present suffixes *-bA*, *-lUGA* and *-jUGU* that differentiated between a non-evidentially factual perspective, and evidentially between witnessed and inferred / second-hand events. Except for the perfective events, factuality in MM is associated with the present, thus all perfect or resultative past events are either marked as firsthand or secondhand. *bülüge* might have included a past factual perspective. *-GsAn* that on its own could plausibly have expressed present relevance, while the forms *-GsAn bülüge* and *-GsAn ajugu* referred to an event relevant at a past level. The rarity of the firsthand past perfect (3:68) could possibly hail from textual bias within the

corpus of surviving texts; the textually very diverse SH has a somewhat more balanced ratio of 2:7. The resultative perspective is somewhat more complex as it contains two markers, *-jU* and *-GA*. As *-jU* is a converbal suffix, it has to be followed by a copula in all finite positions, which for present reference is always *amu*. With atelic aktionsarten, *-jU* highlights a non-resultant phase inherent to the predication. On the other hand, all finite predications with which *-GA* is attested appear to be telic. Given its low frequency, both this and the absence of **-GA ajugu* might be coincidence. Morevoer, there are only two attestations of *-GA bülüge* in the SH and both counterfactual, precluding any speculations about whether reference to factual events would have been possible or not, but it appears that *-jU bülüge* was not capable of expressing counterfactual meaning. So the markers with which counterfactual meaning is expressed (*-GA bü-lüge*, *-QU bülüge* / *-QU ajugu*, but not *-GsAn bülüge* / *-GsAn ajugu*) are all based on participle plus copula constructions that have some referential overlap with converb plus copula constructions (*-jU bülüge* / *-jU ajugu*, *-n bülüge* / *-n ajugu*).

The source text SMI 1362 appears to show a more refined evidential system on the simple past and past imperfective system that is related to the use of forms that look like non-firsthand perfect and non-firsthand perfect progressive forms, but actually refer to events reconstructed from historical sources by a historian.

There are a substantial number of questions meriting future research. *-QUi* in the SH is only rarely used in finite position, but its aspectual meaning is not clear at all. Likewise, the meaning of rare morphemes like *-GA* and *-d* might benefit from research based on the entire MM corpus, always being mindful of the spatial and diachronic diversity of MM.

The contrast between the three perfective markers requires further research inasfar as the conditions have to be determined under which the factual can or must be used. My impression is that evidential forms are only used if the speaker or writer feels a need to emphasize the conscious perception (cf. Lazard 1999, Johanson 2006) of the information in question, and this means usually distancing oneself from it even in firsthand cases (cf. (61) which is what the patrol, being deceived by the additional Mongolian camp fires at night, has observed, referring explicitly to having seen these fires as the source of their evidence two sentences later).[26] Any entirely reliable information would have been marked by the Factual. Such research would also have to explore the ambivalent status of *bülüge*.

Finally, more detailed accounts of the Perfect (which is a form that is very hard to pin down cross-linguistically and the particularities of which have not been carefully elaborated in this account) even in relation to perfect-like uses of *-bA* and of the contrast between the periphrastic past resultative, the simple past imperfective and the morphological resultative forms are desirable.

6 Bibliography

Aalto, Pentti. 1970. Zum Periodenbau im Mongolischen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Mongqol-un niuca tobca'an. *Mongolian studies XIV*: 9-22.

Bayarmendü. 1986. Dumdadu jagun-u monggul kelen-ü temdeg üile üge-yin kelberi-nügüd ba tegün-ü ularil kögjil. *Öbür monggul-un yeke surgaguli 1986/1*: 49-81.

Bertinetto, Pier Marco and Alessandro Lenci. Iterativity vs. habituality (and gnomic imperfectivity). http://linguistica.sns.it/QLL/QLL10/Bertinetto-Lenci.pdf, retrieved 2011.

Bese, L. 1970. Remarks on Middle Mongolian conjugation. AO 32: 21-35.

Bosson, James. 1969. *A treasury of aphoristic jewels*. Bloomington: Indiana University.

Brosig, Benjamin. 2009. *Die satzfiniten Aspektmarker des modernen Khalkha-Mongolischen*. Bonn: University of Bonn. Unpublished magister thesis.

[26] There is evidence that excludes such a distancing hypothesis for parts of the Twelve deeds of the Buddha mentioned above, but as this source was modified by later copyists, it can usually only provide supporting evidence, but not establish any phenomenon on its own.

Chan, Hok-Lam. 1976. Wei Su. In: L. Goodrich and Chaoying Fang (eds. *Dictionary of Ming biography 1368-1644*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Cleaves, Francis. 1949. The Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1362 in memory of Prince Hindu. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, 12*: 1-133.

Cleaves, Francis. 1950. The Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1335 in memory of Chang Ying-Jui. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, 13*: 1-131.

Cleaves, Francis. 1951. The Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1338 in Memory of Jiguntei. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, 14*: 1-104.

de Rachewiltz, Igor. 1982. The preclassical Mongolian version of the Hsiao-Ching. *Zentralasiatische Studien 16*: 7-109.

de Rachewiltz, Igor. 2004. *The Secret history of the Mongols*. Brill: Leiden.

Haenisch, Erich. 1940. *Steuergerechtsame der chinesischen Klöster unter der Mongolenherrschaft*. Berichte über die Verhandlungen der sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Band 92, Heft 2. Leipzig: Hirzel.

Johanson, Lars. 2000. Viewpoint operators in European languages. In: Dahl, Östen (Hrsg. *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter: 27-187.

Johanson, Lars. 2006. Indirective sentence types. *Turkic Languages 10*: 73-89.

Lazard, Gilbert. 1999. Mirativity, evidentiality, mediativity, or other? *Linguistic Typology 3.1*: 91-110.

Manduqu, Ü.; Garudi; Yuvan cuu. 1997. *Dumdadu erten-ü monggul kele*. Liyuuning: Liyuuning-un ündüsüten-ü keblel-ün qoriy-a.

Matsuoka, Yūta. 2008. *Mongorugo-no asupekuto-ni kan-suru kenkyū*. Unpublished dissertation.

Mostaert, Antoine and Francis Cleaves. 1951. Trois documents mongols des Archives secretes vaticanes. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, 15*: 419-506.

Mushin, Ilana. 2001. *Evidentiality and Epistemological Stance - Narrative Retelling.* Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Nasunurtu. 1989. Dumdadu jagun-u monggul kelen-ü “a-”, “bü-” ijagurtu üile üge jici tedeger-ün ularil kögjil. *Öbür monggul-un yeke surgaguli 1989/3*: 89-135.

Ozawa, Shigeo. 1961. Chūsei mōkogo no dōshigobi no taikei. *Gengo kenkyū 40*: 33-80.

Ozawa, Shigeo. 1965. Auxiliary verb *a-* and *bü-* in Middle Mongolian. *Tōkyō gaikokugo daigaku renshū 12*: 91-113.

Poppe, Nicholas. 1954. *Grammar of Written Mongolian*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Poppe, Nicholas. 1965. The passive constructions in the language of the Secret history. *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher 36*: 365-377.

Rybatzki, Volker. 2003. Middle Mongol. In: Juha Janhunen (ed.). 2003. *The Mongolic languages*. London: Routledge.: 47-82.

Secen, C. n.d. Monggul bicig-ün kelen-ü “bolai” gedeg üge-yin bütüce irel-ün asagudal-du. Monggul kele bicig n.d.: 32-39.[27]

Secen, C. 1993. Dumdadu üy-e-yin monggul kelen-ü „a, bü”, “bai, bol” kiged tedeger-ün orulaju orulagdagsan ucir siltagan. *Monggul kele udq-a jokiyal 1993/6*: 35-48.

Street, John. 1957. *The language of the Secret History of the Mongols*. New Haven: American Oriental Society.

Street, John. 2008. Middle Mongolian Past-tense -BA in the Secret History. *JAOS.128/3*: 399-422.

Street, John. 2009. On the three past tense endings of early Middle Mongolian. *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher 23*: 126-159.

Street, John. 2010. The interrogative particle in Early Middle Mongolian. *Mongolian Studies 30*: 43-82.

Street, John. 2013. *On quotation in Middle Mongolian - The verb* ke(m)e- *‘to say’*. Occasional publications, 27. Bloomington, Indiana: The Mongolia society.

Toγtambayar, L. 2012. *Mongγul kelen-ü kele jüijil kiged jokicamji*. Šenyang: Liyuuning-un ündüsüten-ü keblel-ün qoriy-a.

Tömörtogoo, D. 2002. *Mongol dörvöljin bichigiin duras.haliin sudalgaa*. Ulaanbaatar: International organization of Mongol studies.

[27] I cannot retrieve the year and issue from my copy of the paper. It must be from the late 80s or early 90s.

Tümenceceg. 1990. Dumdadu jagun-u monggul kelen-ü togacin ögülekü tölüb-ün kelberi-nügüd ba tegün-ü ularil kögjil. *Öbür monggul-un yeke surgaguli*, 3: 102-120.