A Study of Some Reflexive-Accusative Suffixes in Middle Mongolian

Shigeo Ozawa

Foreword

In Written Mongolian there are three forms of the reflexive-accusative suffix: -ban/-ben; -iyan/-iyen and -yuγan/-yügen. Of these three suffixes, -ban and -iyan[1] have a different usage which is caused by the final sound of the nominal stem to which these suffixes are added. -yuγan is used independently of these restrictions. That is to say that -ban is suffixed to the stem ending in a vowel; -iyan is suffixed to the stem ending in a consonant and -yuγan is suffixed to the stem ending in either a vowel or a consonant[2].

The foregoing is a fundamental rule in classical Written Mongolian, and can also be applied to so called pre-classical Written Mongolian. But when I carefully examined the best record of Middle Mongolian Language, the *Secret History of Mongols*, the problem became more involved. We can see in the *Secret History* four forms -ba'an (巴安)/-beyen (別延); -yiyan [亦(宜)顔]; -yan (顔)/-yen (延) and -'an (安) which have not been attested in Written Mongolian as visible forms. These four forms apparently have the same meanings as -ban and -iyan, so I believe, it is important that we take these four forms into consideration. We will have to study what relations they have and under what circumstances they are used, including -ban, -iyan.

The first problem lies in this point mentioned above.

The second one concerns -yuγan. According to traditional descriptions this suffix has the reflexive-accusative function (and reflexive-genetive function as I will explain later) as well as -ban, -iyan and there is no difference in their

---

1) A masculine form is representative of declination forms to avoid complication. I do not use changed form by vowel harmony. Therefore, -ban is representative of -ban/-ben, -iyan is representative of -iyan/-iyen. Other suffixes follow this way.

2) This is said, for instance, by Professor Poppe.
N. N. Poppe: Grammar of Written Mongolian. Wiesbaden 1954.

meaning and function between -yuγan and -ban, -iyan. But if this suffix -yuγan was exactly the same to -ban, -iyan, there would be no "raison d'être". Pre-classical Written Mongolian records and the *Secret History*, however, do have -yuγan ~ -yu'an. I belive there is a difference between -yuγan and -ban, -iyan but until the time other Mongolian scholars discover this, my belief will have to stand alone.

The third problem concerns the three suffixes -ban, -iyan and -yuγan. According to many scholars of the Mongolian language, the suffixes are used as both reflexive-accusative suffixes and as reflexive-genetive suffixes. In this case, one suffix has two different functions at the same time. I do not quite agree with this theory. If one form has two or more different functions, I think there should be some reasons for it. My third problem considers these reasons.

§1. Problem 1. In the *Secret History* 班 (-ban)/辺 (-ben), i顔[3] (-iyan), and 余安 (-yu'an)/余延 (-yuyen) can be regarded as the reflexive-accusative suffixes. There is no doubt that they are respectively equivalent to -ban/-ben, -iyan/-iyen and -yuγan/-yügen in Written Mongolian. Furthermore, as I mentioned before, there are another four forms, 巴安 (-ba'an)/別延 (-beyen), 亦顔 (-yiyan), 顔 (-yan)/延 (-yen) and 安 (-'an). In this case 余安/余延 should be left out, but that still leaves no less than six forms which we can look upon as the reflexive-accusative suffixes. [顔 (-yan) and 安 (-'an) are not reflexive-**accusative** suffixes, as I will later show. With your acceptance I use the term reflexive-accusative suffixes here.]

Of these six forms, 班/辺 and i顔 follow the principle of Written Mongolian grammar. 班/辺 is attached without exceptions to the stem ending in a vowel and i顔 to the stem ending in a consonant. Accordingly, it may safely be said that these two suffixes have different usages through the last sound of the stem.

I am interested in the form of 巴安/別延 (-ba'an/-beyen). Judging from the form of this suffix, I have made the following assumption. In Old Mongolian, one of the reflexive-accusative suffixes was the *-baγan/*-begen.[4] And a group of the sounds -*aγa/-*ege in this suffix gradually turned into the long vowel in Middle Mongolian and this suffix was pronounced -bān/-bēn or near to that pronunciation in Middle Mongolian. It is recognized that 班/辺 stands

3) For example, we can devide 阿迷泥顔 aminiyan "one's own life" into the stem of *amin* and the suffix of *-iyan*. But we can not transcribe *-iyan* into one Chinese character. Therefore, I described -iyan i顔 here.

4) See the back note (1).

for the long vowel of -bān/-bēn and not for -ban/-ben[5]. And I can demonstrate this phenomenon in the fact that five out of six examples of 巴安/別延 gather in Volume I. From the fact that 巴安/別延 gathers in the earliest volume, we can easily recognize the change of -*baγan>-ba'an>-bān.

A hypothesis that the old form of 巴安/別延 is considered *-baγan/-*begen, holds good for "i顏 (-iyan)". The old forms of i顏 should be *-iγan/*-igen. It is quite natural that *iγan changed into -iyan. Therefore, no one disagrees with my opinion that i顏 can go back to *-iγan/*-igen. Next I analyze *-baγan and *-iγan into *-ba-γan and *-i-γan respectively. *-ba- in the former will be explained in a later chapter. It is easy to regard -i- in the latter as an accusative suffix -i. As the accusative suffix -i comes after the stem ending in a consonant in Written Mongolian and in the language of the *Secret History*, it is reasonable for -iyan and i顏 to be suffixes of the stem ending in a consonant. There is another accusative suffix of -yi which comes just after the stem ending in a vowel in addition -i. Seeing that there is *-i-γan>-iyan, there should also be *-yi-γan>*-yiyan. In my opinion 亦顏(宜顏) stands for -yiyan. There are a few examples of 亦顏(宜顏) throughout all the volumes of the *Secret History*. I can see the following examples: 亦舌魯該亦顏 (irugai-yiyan) "one's own lips", 安荅亦顏 (anda-yiyan) "one's own brother-in-law", 亦巴中合宜顏 (ibaqa-yiyan) "one's own Ibaqa", 款只列亦顏 (kunjile-yiyan) "one's own blanket". All these are suffixes of the stems ending in vowels. Thus I have made the following scheme:

① *-baγan/*-begen>-ba'an/-beyen [巴安/別延]>-bān/-bēn [班/辺]

②(a) *-iγan/*-igen>-iyan/-iyen [i顏]

②(b) *-yiγan/*-yigen>-yiyan/-yiyen [亦顏(宜顏)]

The next question concerns just what the element in the latter half of *-baγan/*-begen, *-i-γan/*-i-gen—(*-γan/*-gen) is. Looking through reflexive declensional suffixes of Written Mongolian, we can discover the refl.-dat.-loc. suffix -daγan/-degen and the refl.-abl. suffix -ačaγan/-ečegen. We know that 荅安/迭延 and 阿察安/額扯延 of the *Secret History* are equivalent to those two suffixes in Written Mongolian. So far, we recognize that *-γan/*-gen of *-baγan/*-begen

5) In the *Secret History* we can often see the case that one Chinese character represents the long vowel or the sound near to it. For example, in 兀兀中忽(六34十) u'uqu "to drink", 兀兀 shows ū sound or the sound near to it, but in 兀黑荅舌倫(六35一) uqarun "being drunken" and 兀周(四40七) uju "drinking", we should see that 兀 showes ū sound or the sound near to it. It is reasonable to think that 班/辺 represents the sound -bān/-bēn or near to it.

etc. is the same element as -γan/-gen in the above two suffixes. From even the similarity of the Chinese characters in the *Secret History*—安 and 延 in 巴安/別延, 荅安/迭延 and 額扯延—I came to the conclusion that *-γan/*-gen is equal to -γan/-gen in -daγan/-degen and -ačaγan/-ečegen. Reflexive declination consists fundamentally of this element *-γan/*-gen and it takes the form of all reflexive declinations in Mongolian.

Now, assuming that this element of *-γan/*-gen was directly suffixed to the nominal stem in ancient time, I can easily explain 顏/延 (-yan/-yen) and 安 (-'an) as shown at the beginning of this paper. It may be assumed that *amiγān, *amaγān, *nilbusuγān, *biyegēn, *eregēn and *egudegēn by Middle Mongolian times changed into amiyān, ama'ān, nilbusu'ān, beyeyēn, ereyēn and e'ūdeyēn. These forms are seen in the *Secret History* in the forms of 阿米顏 (六23十 and the other six examples), 阿馬安 (二19七, 四39一), 你勒不速安 (十38二), 別耶延 (二50五, 四50三), 額舌列延 (四46三) and 額兀迭延 (二41九). From this idea I discovered that the different, literal forms of 顏 and 安 had the same origin *-γan/*-gen. The difference is caused by the last sound of the nominal stem to which *-γan/*-gen is added: of 顏 the stem ends in the -i, of 安 it ends in a vowel except the -i or a consonant. In fact 37 out of 48 examples of 顏 show the stem ending in the -i. Following are some examples.

秣舌驪顏 mori-yan "one's own horse" (二15一 and other 2)
斡乞顏 oki-yan "one's own daughter" (二37五 and other 2)
哈赤顏 hači-yan "one's own favor" (二49一 and other 2)
阿米顏 ami-yan "one's own life" (六23十 and other 6)
額勒赤顏 elči-yan "one's own messanger" (十33六 and other 3)
中豁斡来顏 qo'olai-yan "one's own throat" (十26五, 六)

Here I found one question. I saw the form of 阿中合顏 aqa-yan "one's own elder brother" (六45九, 十33六) in the *Secret History*. This form of aqa-yan is composed of the stem ending in the -a and the suffix of -yan. I could also see another seven examples of 顏 suffixed to the stem not ending in the -i. What is this 顏? I hope the example of 阿中合顏 as mentioned above will make matters.

If 阿中合顏 is derived from *aqaγan, I believe the form of aqa'an of Middle Mongolian to be equivalent to *aqaγan. In the *Secret History* we should have the form of 阿中合安. But in fact we have 阿中合顏, so it is impossible for *aqayan* to have been derived from *aqaγan. My opinion is that the -yan of *aqayan* stands for -yiyan 亦顏(宜顏). I look on 顏-yan as the imperfect form of

亦顔(宜顔). I think the reason there are so few examples of 亦顔(宜顔) is that the imperfect form is in place of some of them.

The following table demonstrates the things mentioned above.

[A] 班/辺 (-bān/-bēn)～巴安/別延 (-ba'an/-beyen)<*-baγan/*-begen
i顔 (-iyan]<*-iγan/*-igen～亦顔(宜顔) (-yiyan)<*-yiγan/*-yigen

[B] 安/(延) (-'an/-yen)<*-γan/*-gen
顔/延 (-yan/-yen)<the -i of the last sound of the stem+*-γan/-*gen

In this table [A] can be called a **reflexive-accusative**[6] suffix but [B] cannot, because 安 and 顔/延 are by no means accusative suffix in themselves. So I will call the group of [B] the reflexive suffixes. I will call 秣舌驢顔 mori-yan a **reflexive-indefinite** case. Having explained the relationship of the six suffixes to each other in the language of the *Secret History*, I will resolve what the element of -ba-/-be- in *-baγan/*-begen is.

§2. Problem 2. What is *-ba-/*-be-? The problem, in my opinion, is closely connected with that of -yuγan in the second question of the foreword. So the present problem will include that of -yuγan.

In the first place, I regard the form *-ba-/*-be- as an accusative suffix[7] which probably existed in Old Mongolian. And perhaps this -*ba-/*-be- has some etymological connection with the accusative suffix -be in Written Manchu. In Old Mongolian, *-ba/*-be was used as an accusative suffix like -i～-yi, but in Middle Mongolian times it only remained as an element of -ba'an/-beyen～-bān/-bēn with reflexive formative suffix. According to my assumption, there was another pair of accusative suffixes *-u/*-ü～*-yu/*-yü[8] in Old Mongolian and they too only remained as an element of -yu'an/-yuyen and -u'an/(-uyen) in Middle Mongolian times. I assume there were following accusative suffixes *-i～*-yi, *-u/*-ü～*-yu/*-yü and *-ba/*-be in Old Mongolian. This assumption of mine depends upon the following.

---

6) I have not yet anything about -ba-/-be- and it may be unfair here that -bān/-bēn～-ba'an/-beyen is called reflexive accusative. But I will explain my reasons in a later chapter. For the moment let us call -bān/-bēn～-ba'an/-beyen a refl-acc suffix.

7) This *-ba-/*-be- appears in the instrumental suffix of -bar/-ber in Written Mongolian. For my parts, it seems to me that -bar goes back to *-baγar and -iyar goes back to *-iγar. This -i of *-iγar is nothing but the -i of accusative. I don't want to agree with Prof. Poppe's opinion that this -i is a connective vowel. (The Mongolian monuments in Hp'ags-pa Script. p. 36) Furthermore I assume that the *-γar of *-baγar and *-iγar is the *γar* meaning "a hand" in Mongolian.

8) See the back note (2).

When I examined some examples with 余安/余延 and some examples with 班/辺 in the *Secret History*, I discovered some interesting facts. Of all the 44 examples of 余安/余延, 額赤格余延 ečige-yuyen "one's own father" had 13 examples and 額客余延 eke-yuyen "one's own mother" had 11 examples. In total they reach to more than half of the examples of 余安/余延. While on the other hand I could not find any examples of 額赤格別延 and 額赤格辺 using -beyen, -bēn. This 額赤格 (ečige) ends in a vowel and thus should be included with -beyen, -bēn. But in fact there are no examples of it throughout the 12 volumes of the *Secret History*. There are two examples of 額客辺 (eke-bēn) but they are particular cases[9]. Usually was used 額客余延 (eke-yuyen) or eke-yügen in Middle Mongolian. Furthermore We can see five examples of 阿中合余安 (aqa-yu'an) "one's own brother" but no examples of 阿中合班～阿中合巴安 (aqa-bān～aqa-ba'an)[10]. As this 阿中合 is a stem ending in a vowel, it should have the form of 阿中合班～阿中合巴安. According to the rule of Written Mongolian—this generally holds good for the language of the *Secret History*—it is no wonder that such forms as mentioned above like **ecige-ben, eke-ben, aqa-ban** can be seen. But as it is we can not see such forms.

Then I studied the words with 班/辺～巴安/別延. I was interested in 16 examples of 可兀辺 (ko'u-ben) "one's own child". Besides these examples, I took one example of 可兀別延 (ko'u-beyen) and one of 可温別延 (ko'un-beyen) but I could not find any examples of 可兀余延 or 可温余延. Remarkably, in 68 examples using this suffix there are only four examples suffixed to the stems representing human relations except 可兀(可温). They are 斡乞辺 (oki-bēn) "one's own daughter", 迭兀辺 (de'u-bēn) "one's own younger brother", 堆亦辺 (duiyi-bēn) "one's own younger sister" and 額客辺 (eke-bēn) "one's own mother". The other 63 stems stand for non-human relations or material relations. On the other hand ten out of 13 stems suffixed with 余安/余延 stand for human relations.

On the basis of these facts I assumed the difference in usage between *-baγan

9) The two examples of this eke-ben are seen at [二23二] and [二25六] in the *Secret History*. These two "one's own mother" are different from other 12 example's "one's own mother". It is the difference that *eke* 'mother' of *eke-ben* at [二23二] and [二25六] means not Sorqan Sira's own mother but Temujin's own mother. It is seen in Sorqan Sira's words to Temujin that Temujin should go and look for his own mother and brothers. The other 12 examples of the *eke* of *eke-yuyen* mean, literally, "one's own mother". Therefore it is reasonable for Sorqan Sira to Temujin to order to look for eke-**ben** or Temujin's own mother.

10) We can see one example of 阿中合班 in reality but it is particular case.

and *-yuγan to be substantially caused by the meaning of the suffixed stems in Old Mongolian time. *-yuγan was generally suffixed to the stems representing one's seniority in the vocabulary of human relations for instance a father, a mother and a big brother[11]. And it was, so to speak, an honorific form of *-baγan and *-iγan～*-yiγan. On the contrary *-baγan was generally suffixed to the stems which stand for one's juniority. In this way the principle of using *-baγan and *-yuγan was caused by the meaning of the stems having these suffixes, that is to say, the vocabulary of human relations had at least two different suffixes concerning its meaning.

It is significant that an overwhelming majority of the stems with the suffixes -ba'an～-bān represents non-human relations. I should not neglect this fact. In my opinion *-baγan had a double function in Old Mongolian. One was to come after the stems standing for juniority in the vocabulary of human. Another was to come after the stems representing non-human relations. In other words, *-baγan was used to both the word groups representing human relations or [A] group and the word groups representing non-human relations or [B] group[12]. It is natural that the [B] group has more examples than the [A] group. Probably all the languages in the world have the same general proportions. Therefore the example of -ba'an～-bān suffixed to the stems of [B] is an overwhelming majority. Thus the system of the reflexive-accusative suffix in Old Mongolian was what follows.

To the stems of the [A] group

1. *-uγan/*-ügen～*-yuγan/*-yügen (to superior)
2. *-iγan/*-igen～*-yiγan/*-yigen (to equal)
3. *-baγan/*-begen (to inferior)

To the stems of the [B] group

1. *-baγan/*-begen (to the stems ending in a vowel)
2. *-iγan/*-igen (to the stems ending in a consonant)

Supposing the system of the reflexive accusative suffix is that mentioned above, it would be safe to say that *-u/*-ü～*-yu/*-yü, *-i～*-yi and *-ba/*-be which came by omitting *-γan/*-gen from the suffixes in the table were accusative suffixes in Old Mongolian. The usage of these three pair of acc. suffixes depend

11) There is not any difference between pre-classical Written Mongolian and the language of the *Secret History* in the usage of-yuγan/-yügen, that is, we find ecige-yügen, aga-yuγan, ejen-yügen, eke-yügen etc. in pre-classical Written Mongolian.

12) See the back note (3)

on the two principles—One distinguished by the meaning of the stem in the group of [A], the other distinguished by the last sound to the stem in the group of [B].

Up to this place, I believe, I could give a solution to what *-ba-/*-be- is and what -yuγan has to do with other suffixes (-iyan, -ban).

§ 3. Problem 3. This problem concerns the fact that -ban, -iyan, and -yuγan are used in Written Mongolian as reflexive genitive suffixes in addition to reflexive-accusative suffixal use, and asks the question that why one form has two different functions. Up to this time Mongolian scholars have made no reference to the question. I will explain my opinion in what follows.

In the beginning I discovered some interesting facts when I studied all the examples of these three suffixes in the *Secret History*. In the first place 班/辺 (-bān/-bĕn) and 巴安/別延 (-ba'an/-beyen) were only used as reflexive-accusative and never as reflexive-genitive. And there were a few reflexive-genitive examples of -i顔. Certain examples of reflexive-genitives are the -i顔 (-iyan) in the phrase of [二11九] 孛脱中合你顔 孛児必 中合札中忽 不兀舌剌 篾図 (botoqan-**iyan** borbi qaǰaqu bu'ura metu) "like a camel biting himself in the tendon (literally, biting his own tendon) and the -i顔 (-iyan) in the phrase of [一33七] 塔奔 中忽舌魯兀的顔 乞門勒 塔木塔剌 (tabun quru'ud-**iyan** kimunl tamutala) "until the five finger nails of one's own were worn down". But about 余安/余延, things are different. Twelve out of 44 examples of this suffix are genitive use. When I looked into the records of pre-classical Written Mongolian, I had the same result as that mentioned above. Therefore, it may be said that these three suffixes were not in general used as genitive case during Middle Mongolian times. I could however discover examples of genitive use, though only a few, in Middle Mongolian, so I should seek for a reason for this.

Upon reading the *Secret History* precisely I found out the following forms: [二11二] §78 格児圖児 亦舌列周 斡舌羅恢魯阿 兀真額客 豁牙児 可兀客都延 赤舌来 兀中合周 鳴詁列舌論 (ger-tur ireǰu oroqui-lu'a Uǰin eke qoyar ko'uked-**uyen** čirai uqaǰu ugulerun) "when (they) arrived at the house and entered, she saw her (own) children and recognized them and said...": [十43九] §246 成吉思中合罕 蒙力克 額赤格宜 田迭 董中豁都舌侖 可兀都延 阿不舌里 兀禄 亦惕中罕 ...(Činggis qahan Munglig ečige-yi tende dongqodurun ko'ud-**uyen** aburi ulu idqan) 〈There Genghiskhan scolded the old Munlig and said "you won't blame your (own) children for their character but"...〉; [八45二] §208 篾舌児乞惕 乃馬泥 不桑中灰 莎斡舌児途舌児 客舌列亦敦 札中合敢不 只舌鄰 斡乞都延 申勒塔吉

牙児 斡額舌侖 中合舌里牙塩 兀魯昔牙舌闌 土木塔中合 阿黒三 阿主兀者 (Merkid Naiman-i busangqui so'or-tur Kereyid-un Jaqagambu jirin okid-uyen šiltag-iyar o'ero-un qariyatan ulus-iyar-an tumtaqa aqsan aju'u-je.) "In the War to break Merkid, Naiman Jakagambu of Kereyid with his people was safe owing to his (own) two daughterers."

In the examples above, 可兀客都延 (ko'uked-uyen), 可兀都延 (ko'ud-uyen) and 斡乞都延 (okid-uyen) are traditionally given reflexive-genitive translations by the scholars of the *Secret History*. The fact itself is not wrong. But it is different from the -u'an/-uyen of 秤舌驪訥安 (五 34 三) morin-u'an and of 可兀訥延 (五 34 八) ko'un-uyen in the *Secret History*. The latter of -u'an/-uyen is made up of the -u suffixed to the stem ending in -n like morin or ko'un and the reflexive-formative particle -'an/-yen<*-γan/*-gen. It is not an exception to the grammatical rule. The former of -uyen consists of the stem ending in -d and the suffix of -u, but the stem ending in -d cannot have a genitive suffix of -u/ü. Therefore it is impossible to say that they are the same.

Up to now there is not any reference to them. I think this **-uyen** is the key to the third question. It is clear ko'ud-**uyen**, etc. should be looked upon as reflexive-genitive in their contexts, as they are given reflexive-genitive translation by the scholars. Reflexive declensions are essentially composed of general declensional form and the reflexive formative particle of *-γan/*-gen, so it is to be assumed that the ko'ud-uyen shown above goes back to ***kögŭd-ün-gēn*** in Old Mongolian. We can easily assume *kögŭd-ün-gēn>kö'ŭd-üyēn (in the *Secret History*, it is written ko'ud-uyen), thinking that -un/-ün is a genitive suffix which comes after the stem ending in a consonant except -n and the examples of *morin-u-γān>morin-u'an, *kögŭn-u-gēn>kö'ŭn-uyēn (in the *Secret History* it is written ko'un-uyen). The *kögŭd-ün-gēn, the -n- of which was left out before the consonant of -g-, turned into *kö'ŭdügēn firstly and underwent another change of kö'ŭdüyēn on the stage of Middle Mongolian. This form is just transcribed into the 可兀都延 of the *Secret History*.

When I come to this point of thinking, it is easy to imagine the following scheme concerning the rest genitive suffix of -yin. That is *-yīn-γan/*-yin-gen> *-yīγan/*-yigen>*-yiyan/*-yiyen>-yian/-yien. Accordingly this -yian/-yien became exactly the same to -iyan/-iyen<*-i-γan/*-i-gen of reflexive-accusative suffix in literal form. (In pre-classical Written Mongolian, -yian and -iyan had the same form in writing.) Like this example, on the stage of Middle Mongolian the two forms having different origins (*-yīn-γan/*-yin-gen and *-i-γan/*-i-gen)

mixed with each other and became one form which had phonetically little difference between the two and the same form in writing. As a result of that the form was regarded as if one form had two different functions. It is reasonable not to find out any examples of 班/辺 (-bān/-bēn)～巴安/別延 (-ba'an/-beyen) used as a reflexive-genitive case in the language of the *Secret History*, because we don't know the genitive suffix of *-ba/*-be in Mongolian. In classical Written Mongolian -ban/-ben has rare reflexive-genitive use in comparison with -iyan/-iyen and probably it is due to the analogy of -iyan/-iyen.

In the next place, I will think of -yuγan/-yügen—it is -yu'an/-yuyen (余安/余延) in the *Secret History*. I create the sheme of *-yun-γan/*-yün-gen>-yuγan/-yügen (the form of Written Mongolian)>-yu'an/-yuyen (the form of the *Secret History*) in parallel with that of *-u-γan/*-ü-gen, *-un-γan/*-ün-gen and *-yīn-γan/*-yin-gen. This idea needs the assumption of *-yun/*-yün as a genitive suffix in Old Mongolian. I assumed *-yu/*-yü as an accusative suffix in Old Mongolian in § 2. Here I would like to assume *-yun/*-yün, as a genitive suffix. I can get an explanation that in Middle Mongolian -yuγan～-yu'an played two functional parts of *-yun-γan and *-yu-γan of Old Mongolian.

Thus, I think I have been able to explain the reason why the reflexive-accusative suffix, -iyan/-iyen, -ban/-ben and -yuγan/-yügen have a reflexive-genitive function as well chiefly in classical Written Mongolian.

I studied some questions of the reflexive-accusative suffixes in the mentioned above. But there are still a few problems left. I am going to dwell upon them on another opportunity.

NOTE:

(1) The *-baγan/*-begen in Old Mongolian can go back to *-baβan/*-beβen. According to Prof. Poppe, the intervocalic *-γ-(-g-) and *-β- of pre-Mongolian, having already converged on the stage of Common Mongolian, were represented in the only *γ(*g) of Old Mongolian. As I'm going to tell it later, the -daγan/-degen of dative-locative can go back to *-daβan/-deβen and so can the -ačaγan/-ečegen of ablative to -ačaβan/-ečeβen. They (*-daβan/-*deβen and -ačaβan/-ečeβen) have the same particle of *-βan/-βen. In my assumption the -ban/-ben of Written Mongolian represents both -*baβan>*-baγan>-bān and *-βan>-ban. As to this reflexive particle of *-βan/*-βen I'll have to refer to the following Prof. Poppe's description.

172. The reflexive-possessive suffix was a pronoun in Pre-Mongolian. There it was *öβen. In Common Mongolian it was already a suffix. There it was *-βen after final vowels of the stem and *-iβen after final consonants. (N. Poppe: Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies. Helsinki, 1955) I don't quite agree with his idea, yet I pay much attention to the point that -βan/-βen was derived from the reflexive pronoun of *öβen.

(2) In the *Secret History* [土22六], I discovered only one accusative example of -yu. In Hua-yi yi-yü (華夷訳語) [19五] I could only discover reflexive-accusative example of -u-an. I shall show them in what follows.

[土22四] §254. 拙赤宜 董中豁傷中忽因 兀舌里答 察阿歹 鳴詰列舌論 拙赤宜
Joči-yi dungqodqu-yin urida Ča'adai ugulerun Joči-yi

客列列 客額舌俞 拙赤余兀 土申 鳴詰列梅...
kelele ke'erun Joči-**yu**'u tusin ugulemui

[Cha'adai says before Joči's utterance, "when you say Joči to tell, you say it believing Joči..."]

[Hua-yi yi-yü 19五].....許列克先 也客思土失篾傷阿訥 中合**訥安** 阿不阿傷
.....hulegsen yekes tušimed anu qan-**u-an** abu'ad

兀篾克石 斡都阿速...
umegši odu'asu...

[When the rest of the ministers went north taking with their emperor...]

From these two examples I think it is not difficult to assume the accusative suffix of *-u/*-ü～*-yu/*-yü in Old Mongolian.

(3) I do not think it is very difficult to explain the reason of the double function of *-baγan. In my opinion ancient Mongolians devided our world into two sections. One was the natural world and the other the world of mortals. This outlook on the world naturally reflected upon the language—especially on the grammatical system. As to the accusative suffix, *-γï(*-gi)～*-ïγï(*-igi)>-yi～-i and *-ba/*-be were original. *-γï～*-ïγï supposed to be suffixed to the words representing the world of mortals and *-ba/*-be supposed to the words representing the natural world. With the differentiation of classification in human society the form of *-γu(*-gü)～*-ïγu(*-igü)>*-u～*-yu representing seniority was created, that is, an honorific form of *-γï～*-ïγï. The *-ba/*-be of juniority was originally used to the words representing the natural world. Later on *-ba/*-be was not used as an accusative suffix itself. Since *-γï～*-ïγï was suffixed to the words representing the things in the natural world. Therefore -yi～-i of accusative was suffixed to the words representing the world of mortals and to those of the natural world even in the oldest materials we can see today.