Auxiliary verb a- and bü- in Middle Mongolian

—A study on the difference between their sememes—

Shigeo Ozawa

(***To the memory of my mother***)

§ 1. In Modern Mongolian[1], *a-* "to be, to exist" and *bü-* "to be, to exist" of Written Mongolian which keep their remains in a few conjugations are no more than irregular verbs — for instance аж, атал; бух, бөгөөд, бий etc. On the stage of Middle Mongolian these auxiliary verbs *a-* and *bü-* representing "existence" had many conjugations and yet were not the said irregular verbs. Above all we can see almost all the conjugational forms in *a-*. Therefore it seems certain that until at least the 14th or 15th century these two verbs (*a-* and *bü-*) were used widely.

Prof. Shiro Hattori says in his recent treatise on "Structure and Function of the Sememe"[2] that 'it is assumed and accepted that in one language (at least in one dialect) two or more than two words can not have exactly the same sememe'.

That is to say the sememe of *a-* and *bü-* of Mongolian can not be absolutely the same because of the two different forms of words. If the two words of *a-* and *bü-* have absolutely the same sememe from their very origin without any difference, how can we make out the reason for existence? Either *a-* or *bü-* should have existed. We did not need two. But in fact *a-* and *bü-* coexist and at present, though they are declining, they have some conjugational forms. So there must be some difference in the sememe of them. For example Modern Japanese (Tokyo dialect) has two words representing "to exist" (i.e. "iru" and "aru"), but there is much difference in the sememe between the two[3]. They are strictly different in usage. The Japanese in the street can use these two distinctly with ease.

Is there any sememal difference between the two Mongolian words (*a-* and *bü-*) like above example taken from Japanese?

It is an object of this paper to pursue this question. In the 13th and 14th century Mongolian may have used these two words *a-* and *bü-* with easy distinction as we do our "iru" and "aru". I will try to give the reason in what follows.

---

1) I call the new Cyrillic Written Mongolian used in the present Mongolian People's Republic, Modern Mongolian here. This written language is based on the Khalkha dialect centering in the capital of Ulan Bator. Different from traditional Written Mongolian it is organized to symbolize the oral sound as accurately as possible.

2) Shiro Hattori: Structure and Function of the Sememe. Gengokenkyu No. 45 Tokyo 1964 (The Journal of the Linguistic Society of Japan).

3) cf. Prof. Hattori's treatise above.

§ 2. I've been thinking for a considerable time, of this matter — that is the problem of the difference in sememe between *a-* and *bü-*. Then I arrived at some hypotheses and tried to explain them, only to fail. It was impossible for me to explain the difference between the two. I looked through some books on Mongolian grammar — from Prof. I. J. Schmidt's to Prof. N. N. Poppe's but I couldn't find the point I wanted to know. They only told me that *a-* and *bü-* had the same meanings "sein, être, быть, to be."[4] Prof. Poppe described almost all the conjugational forms but didn't make any reference[5] to the different meaning of the two words. I also consulted some dictionaries within my reach. They didn't have any good explanations, so the matter remained unsettled.

Now I have ceased to think of it as spare-time job and have been devoting myself to the subject. I have kept studying the above subject through the language of the *Secret History of Mongols*. As a result of that study, in these days I feel that I have come to a conclusion in a sense. In the following I'm going to tell the outline of my opinion. I'll have to say that I only use the *Secret History of Mongols* as a material, because no other record has so many conjugational forms of *a-* and *bü-* as the *Secret History of Mongols*. As I said before, it is impossible to find a great number of conjugational forms of the two words in some dialects of contemporary Mongolian or some records of Written Mongolian, and besides I am apt to fall into the pitfall of being unable to find the whole figures of these two words. It is an interesting and useful matter whether my conclusion which will be lead from the study of *a-* and *bü-* in *Secret History* is to be applied to Modern Mongolian or Written Mongolian. Would you please accept my apology that I haven't time nor space to pursue such subject thoroughly?

§ 3. Now I'll enter into the main discourse. First of all I'll give you all the conjugational forms of *a-* and *bü-* (in the language of *Secret History*, three roots of *bu-*, *bo-* and *bo'e-* are to be seen, but they should all be attributed to one radical element **bü-*. It was indicated by Prof. Hattori[6]).

The examples in the brackets are not to be found in the language of *Secret History*, but can be seen in other records of Pre-classical and Classical Written Mongolian.

a-	*bü-*
a-mu (阿木)	bui
a-mui (阿梅)	

4) Lately I was sent a book titled "Вспомогательные, или служебные глаголы в современном монгольском литературном языке" Улаанбаатар 1961, written by T. Пагба living in the Mongolian People's Republic. This book has a good general description on auxiliary verbs of Modern Mongolian in comparison with Written Mongolian and Middle Mongolian. But there's no reference in the book to the sememe of *a-* and *bü-* and their difference.

5) cf. N. N. Poppe: Grammar of Written Mongolian. 1954. Wiesbaden. at page 102, the paradigm of *a-*.

6) Shiro Hattori: The irregular verb bükü of Written Mongolian. Minzokugaku Kenkyu No. 6.

a-yu (阿由)	buiyu (備由), bu-yu (不由)
a-ba (阿罷)	
a-bai (阿伯)	
a-ǰu'u (阿主兀)	
a-ǰu'ui (阿主為)	bu-ǰu'ui (不主為)
a-ji'ai (阿只埃)	
[a-ǰigi]	
	bu-le'e (不列額)
a-la'ai (阿剌埃)	bu-le'ai (不列埃)
	bu-legai (不列該)
a-lu'a (阿魯阿)	
	bu-ligi (不里吉)
	bu-liyi (不里亦)
a-dqun (阿傷中渾)	
a-suqai (阿速中孩)	
a-tuqai (阿禿中孩)	bu-tugai (不禿該)
a-ya (阿牙)	
a-qu (阿中忽)	bu-gu (不古)
a-qui (阿中灰)	bu-kui (不恢)
[a-γči]	
[a-daγ]	
[a-γai]	
a-qsan (阿黑三)	bu-gsen (卜克先)
a-qsad	
a-ǰu	bu-ǰu (卜周)
[a-γad]	bo-'ed (孛額傷)
[a-n]	
a-'asu (阿阿速)～[abasu]	bo-'esu (孛額速)～[bögesu]
a-run (阿舌命)	bu-run (不舌命)
a-tala (阿塔剌)	bo'e-tele (孛額帖列)
[a-baču]	
[a-γsaγar]	

Judging from the examples above, *a-* has a great number of conjugational forms furthermore because I can demonstrate the causative of *a-'ul-*, the passive of *a-qda-*, the causative-passive of *a-'ul-da-* and the reciprocal of *a-ldu-*, we don't have to call it irregular or defective.

As compared with this *a-*, I can give you only half examples of *bü-*, but I can find the fact that the considerable conjugational forms of *bü-* were used in the language of *Secret History* in comparison with Classical Written Mongolian. The most frequently used forms of *a-* are *aǰu'u* (78 examples), *aǰu'ui* (15 examples) and forms of *bü-*

bule'e (146 examples), *bule'ai* (26 examples), and *bü-* has other remarkable examples of *bu(i)yu* (59 examples); *bukui*. The close examination of the forms above may be able to give me some interesting facts, but I'll take them in a later chapter (indeed in some data of the facts I can find a fundamental difference in the sememe between *a-* and *bü-*). Here I would like to be engaged in research work to discover what sort of conjugational forms of verbs *a-* and *bü-* connect with when they are used in auxiliary form. I want to know whether *a-* and *bü-* have some difference in the point of compound forms or not. I'll cite the case of aǰu'u (aǰu'ui) and bule'e (bule'ai). The case is the following:

aǰu'u(aǰu'ui)	bule'e(bule'ai)
——qu(gu) aǰu'u	——qu(gu) bule'e
——qun(gun) aǰu'ui	——qun(gun) bule'ai
——u aǰu'u	
	——'ai bule'e
——qsan(gsen) aǰu'u	——qsan(gsen) bule'e
——qsad(gsed) aǰu'u(i)	[——qsad(gsed) bule'ai]
——ǰu aǰu'u	——ǰu bule'e
——n aǰu'u	——n bule'e

In the point of compound forms this datum did not come up to my expectation that I might find some differences between the two verbs. However, there remained some interesting facts. Closely examined, the datum gave me the fact that the compound form of ——*qu(gu) bule'e* contained a very little, and that ——*qsan (-gsen) aǰu'u* had considerable examples. I can not tell, at present, whether this is attributed to a mere accident or the inevitable conclusion from the difference in the sememe between the two. Well I don't think I can get the key to finding some differences in the sememe between *a-* and *bü-* from the view point of the compound form (though it has some interesting facts).

Thus I've come back to the table of all conjugations and have to scrutinize all of them.

§ 4. When I scrutinize the paradigm at the beginning of chapter three, I recognize some significant things, that is:— ① I can't find *bu-mu* and *bu-mui* corresponding to the indicative present form of *a-mu* and *a-mui*. These *bu-mu* and *bu-mui* are equivalent to *bui* in meaning. ② I can find only one example of *a-yu* but *bui-yu* and *bu-yu* have as many as 59 examples (though bu-yu has only one). ③ *A-ba* and *a-bai* have one example respectively. *Bu-ba* (*bü-be*) and *bu-bai* (*bü-bei*) have no example. In other words *a-* and *bü-* seldom have the most general forms of past tense *-ba* (*-be*) and *-bai* (*-bei*). ④ *A-ǰu'u* together with *a-ǰu'ui* has nearly a hundred examples, but *bu-ǰu'ui* has only one. In short the suffixes of *-ǰu'u* and *-ǰu'ui* almost always connect with *a-*. ⑤ On the other hand it's possible to say that the suffixes of *-la'a* and *~le'e* almost always connect with *bü-*. *Bu-le'e* has 146 examples

but *a-la'ai* and *a-lu'a* have no more than two examples. ⑥ The converbal suffix of *-ǰu* seldom connects with *bü-* but *aǰu* sometimes does.—(I can find about a dozen examples). ⑦ Both *atuqai* and *butugai* are to be seen as the *conjugational form* of the third personal imperative with *-tuqui*. And *atuqui* has more examples than *butugai*. *Butugai* has already been on the stage of a changing meaning into auxiliary verb of prohibition meaning 'quit'. One of the four examples of *butugai* shows the original meaning of 'wish'. ⑧ The verbal-nounal suffix of *-qu*(*-gu*) often connects with *a-* but seldom with *bü-*. ⑨ On the contrary the verbal-nounal suffix of *-qui*(*-kui*) rarely connects with *a-* but more often than not with *bü-*. The form of *aqui* is very rare, but *bukui* is very popular. ⑩ *Bu-run* has 22 examples but *a-run* has three examples. I recognize some diametrical facts in the ten items above. Is there any element of telling me the difference in the sememe between *a-* and *bü-* somewhere in the ten items? In the next chapter I'm going to think of it. (The frequency of each conjugational form is not shown here, but I look into it by myself).

§ 5. Of the ten items above mentioned the clues to the facing problems are ②, ④ and ⑤, I suppose. ② is the fact that the suffix of *-yu*(*-yü*) called "deductive present" by Prof. Poppe is rarely suffixed by *a-* but almost always by *bü-*[7]. Why? What's the reason? I suppose the sememe of *-yu* stands in exclusive relations with that of *a-*, while the sememe of *bü-* stands in mutually compatible relations with that of *-yu*. I have the same idea of the relations between ④ and ⑤. The sememe of *a-* has mutually compatible relations with that of perfect suffix of *-ǰu'u* class but exclusive relations with that of the suffix of *-la'a* class. It seems to me that I can say the sememe of *bü-* stands, literally opposite, in exclusive relations with that of the suffix of of *-ǰu'u* class and in mutually compatible relations with that of the suffix of *-la'a* class. From these things I can tell the sememe of *a-* substantially has something similar to that of the suffix of *-ǰu'u* class, and the sememe of *bü-* has something to the contrary similar to that of the suffix of -la'a class. Moreover I can assume in the sememe of the suffix of *-yu* there's something similar to that of the suffix of *-la'a* class. Thus the problems are brought to the focus of the following three points: What are the sememes of the suffix of *-ǰu'u* class and of that of *-la'a* class? What's the difference in the sememe between the two? And is it certain that there lies something similar between the sememe of

7) In the Mongolian of the Secret History the form equivalent to *buyu* of Written Mongolian is「備由」. This「備由」is to be transcribed by *buiyu*, so it isn't absolutely the same as *buyu*. This is attributed to the fact that the Chinese character has no proper form to transcribe this Mongolian syllable of bu. At least in the transcriptive characters in the Secret History of Mongol there's nothing proper. In the appendix of 'The study of Chinese character representing the Mongolian language of the Secret History of Mongol' by Prof. Hattori there are「卜, 不, 步, 捕, 錞, 僕」——considering the meaning of Mongolian buyu there's no proper character. As it has already been indicated, one of the characteristics of Chinese phonetic transcription of the Secret History of Mongol is somewhat representing the meaning of transcribed Mongolian. Well, I can see only one example that shows「不由」literally equivalent to *buyu*.

-yu and the sememe of the suffix of *-la'a* class? Then I'll have to step over the conclusion and to think of the sememes of *a-* and *bü-*, and furthermore I study the difference between the two. It's the process of this report.

§ 6. The sememe of A and B.

(A stands for the suffix of *-ǰu'u* class for example *-ǰu'u, -ǰu'ui, -ču'u, -ǰi'ai*, etc. B stands for the suffix of *-la'a* class for example *-la'a, -la'ai, -lu'a, -liyi* and so forth. Hereinafter referred to as mentioned above. About the difference in the suffix group between A and B, I would like you to refer to my treatise on 'the system of verbal suffix in Middle Mongolian' Gengokenkyu No. 41). It is no doubt that A is the suffix usually appears in the form of *-ǰuqui* or *-ǰükü̈i* except *-ǰuɾu* in *a-ǰuɾu* in Written Mongolian and is equivalent to the form of -жээ (-чээ) in Modern Mongolian. B is the suffix of *-luɾa* or *-lüge* in Written Mongolian and of лаа, -лээ, -лоо, or -лөө in Modern Mongolian. The description on the suffix in Written Mongolian and Khalkha Mongolian is perhaps useful to the sememal study of A and B in Mongolian of *Secret History*. However first I'll show my conclusion derived from all examples of A and B in the Secret History of Mongols and then I will tell the difference between the two in comparison with traditional description on these suffixes. In the Secret History there are about 350 examples of the suffixal groups belonging to A and about 260 of the groups belonging to B. Looking into these examples, I assume the following sememe of A and B respectively. The first part is B; I can set an assumption in the sememe that *a certain action was effected in the past connected directly with the present or the past under the circumstances that it was already dnown or naturally foreboded to the speaker (or the writer) and the hearer (or the reader).*

The second part is A; an assumption in sememe that *a certain action was effected in the past connected directly with the present or the past under the circumstances that it was unknown or unexpectedly accidental occurrence to the speaker (or the writer) and the hearer (or the reader).*

I'll give some examples in what follows. These examples are reduced for want of space.

(1) [二15～八] **§ 80.** Temuǰin šiqui dotora qurban qonoǰu qarsu keyen mori-yan kotolǰu ayisuqui-dur morin-ača eme'el inu multureǰu qočorču'u.

Qariǰu uǰe'esu eme'el komunldurgelegse'er olanglaqsa'ar multureǰu qočorču'u. Olangči boltuqai komunldurge basa ker multuregu bule'e. Tenggeri idqan aqu-yu ke'eǰu qariǰu basa qurban qonoba. Basa qarču ayisuquidur šiqui-yin amasar-a qoš·liq-un tedui čaqan guru amasar-a boglen unaǰu'u.

((Temjin stayed in the woods for three days and when he started carrying his horse his saddle fell from horse to the ground (unexpectedly). Coming back, he found his saddle slipped off and fallen to the ground with belly-hood and saddle girth (surprisingly). The saddle girth had good reason to fall down but why on

earth did the belly-hood fall down to the ground? He said, "Heaven may prevent me". He came back and stayed there for another three days. He came out again, then a pretty large white rock stood in his way at the entrance of the forest (unexpectedly).))

This paragraph told me that Temǰin was suddenly attacked by the Tayičud tribes and hid himself in the thicket of Mt. Telgun in great haste. There he stayed for nine days in extreme hunger until at last he went out of the forest, when he was caught by Tayičud tribes. This is a very popular paragraph in the *Secret History of Mongols*. Now in this paragraph there are three suffixes of A we are talking of. They are *qočor-ču'u* (twice) and *una-ǰu'u* (-ču'u is used because qočor- ends with -r). This *multureǰu qočorču'u* (or to slip off and fall down) naturally means unexpectedly to slip off and to fall down in this context.

The second *multureǰu qočorču'u* shows more clearness of 'unexpectedness'. I can read between the lines that it had a belly-hood and a saddle girth on, but why were they slipped off and fallen down to the ground? It was quite surprising. The next *unaǰu'u* implies that when Temǰin came to the entrance of the woods, the rock near-by accidentally and unexpectedly fell down to stand in his way. In this sentence of *čaqan guru amasar-a boglen unaǰu'u, čaqua guru* (a white stone) should contextually connect with *amasar-a unaǰu'ui* (to fall down on the entrance). *Boglen* (to close) combines closely with *unaǰu'ui* and then *boglen una-*, so to speak, is looked upon as one verb. So it means a white stone fell down to the ground and barred the way. In diagram it is not *čaqan guru amsar-a boglen unaǰu'ui* but *čaqan guru amsar-a boglen unaǰu'ui*. If you think the sentence in the former way, *amsar-a* should be *amsar-i*.

The traditional explanation is not precise in this point and I can't agree to the conventional description of *unaǰu'u*. I'll give some translations of this sentence. According to the late Prof. P. Pelliot [il rencontra] à l'issue du fourré *un roc blanc pareil á une tente qui était tombé à l'issue et la bloquait*[8] and according to Prof. Takashiro Kobayashi "chōbō gurai no ōkisa no shiroi ishi ga mori no irikuchi ni *taore fusaide ita* node atta" and to the recent issue by Prof. Shinobu Iwamura "tento hodo no ōkina shiroi ishide *fusagarete ita*".

These translations tell me *boglen unaǰu'ui* was conditional as mentioned 'taore fusaide *ita*, fusagarete *ita*, qui *était* tombée à l'issue et la bloquait'. As I will tell in the later chapter I cannot assert that *-ǰu'u* has no sememe of continually conditional action[9].

But in this context it would be better to think that it means the action of

8) P. Pelliot: Historie Secrete des Mongols. Paris 1949 (P. 137).

9) In Mongolian una-(fall down) hasn't the sememe to be fallen down. If we think unaǰu'u "to be fallen down", we can't help assuming *-ǰu'u* has the sememe of continually conditional movement.

falling down and not the condition of doing so. But now I am digressing from the subject, so let's go back to the main topic. I will show the examples of B in what follows.

(2) [二36 九～37二] §94. Dei Sečen Temujin-i uǰeǰu maši yeke bayasču ugulerun Taiyiči'ud aqa de'u činu naitamu keyen medeǰu maši heruǰu čoko*le'ai*, aran uǰeba-je čimayi ke'ed.....

Dei Secen was very glad to see Temǰin and said, "I was told that your brother of the Tayičud was jealous of you, so I was very anxious about you. (but fortunately) At last I see you".

(3) [二34十～35一] §93. Bo'orcu ugulerun ya'un bolba sayin nokor mungtaniǰu ayisun aǰu'u nokočeǰu odu*la'a* bi edo'e ireba ke'ed.....

Bo'orču said, "What's the matter with you? My good friend comes through thick and thin. I went out as a supporter and have just come back".

(4) [土30 六～九] §255. Erte Altan Qučar qoyar ene metu uge baralduǰa ǰiči ugestur-iyan ulu gurgu-yin tula ker kigde*lu'ai* yambar bolqaqdalu'ai.

"In the former time both Altan and Qučar thus made a promise with each other. But what had become of them as they did not get to their words?"

Čoko-*le'ai*, odu-*la'a*, kigde-*lu'ai* and bolqaqda-*lu'ai* in the paragraph above mentioned have the suffix in B class. The sememe of B, I assumed above, can fully account for them. *Čoko-le'ai* (to despair) by no means has the meaning without any reason to despair incidentally. Dei Sečen (德薛禪) heard that the Tayičud brothers were jealous of Temǰin and he was desperate. He, as it were, "despaired" to be based on the *already known facts*. At that time the Tayičud were very powerful tribes. All was up with the Temǰins who had just begun to restore their fame after Yesugai's death, when they fell into disfavor with the Tayičud tribes. Therefore Dei Sečen was *naturally* "despaired" (*čoko-le'ai*) to hear that he fell into disfavour with the Tayičud. I can easier give an explanation of *odula'a* (to have gone) in (3). In this paragraph when Naqu bayan (納忽伯顔) — Bo'orču's (孛斡兒出) father — was shedding tears for Bo'orču being missing. Bo'orču returned home and explained to his father the reason of his missing. Bo'orču said, when "I was milking a cow, a brave young man came to me and asked if eight light-blue geldings passed by. He told me why it was necessary to search for the horses. It was that his eight horses were stolen. Thus a good friend (the young man or Temǰin) came through thick and thin. And naturally I went when I saw a poor young man". It was based on the already known fact that they became friends and went out. Like this odu-la'a hasn't the meaning of incidentally or unexpectedly having gone but the meaning of having gone on account of natural result mentioned before. In the same way *kigde-lu'ai* and *bolqaqda-lu'ai* in (4) can be described. In the Mongolian steppe society of the 13th century it was a great sin — just as it is to modern civilized society — to break a once-made promise. The breaker of a promise should be punished severely.

Altan and Qučar took an oath before Temjin that they were willing to work like slaves when Temjin became leader of khan supported by the people. (the first accession to the throne) Afterwards they betrayed their words and it served them right that they were killed. In the paragraph of (4) referring to the previous instance, Genghiskhan gave advice to his two sons of Joči (拙赤) and Ča'adai (察阿多) that they should be as good as their words. "Thus Altan and Qučar did not arrive at their words (*uges-tur-iyan ulu gurguyin tula*), naturally and reasonably how were they treated?", the father said to his sons.

I dwelt upon three examples above in too much detail, but it is inevitable in this case. Well, it would be safe to say that the sememe of A and B fundamentally such as mentioned above. I'll go on to the next chapter of referring to the difference between A and B.

§ 7. The difference in the sememe between A and B.

This difference would seem to be evident from the things mentioned in chapter six. In the long run the difference between the two is whether the action done in the past can be predicted naturally from the circumstances; in other words, — whether the action was done on account of the natural result of the previously various facts or not. The former is equivalent to the suffix of B class and the latter A class. The difference in the sememe between A and B in principle holds good to -juqui, ~jükü of written mongolian, -жээ(-чээ) of Khalkha and -luγa, -lüge of written mongolian, -лаа, -лээ, -лоо, -лөө of Khalkha. I'll give some conventional theories as compared with mine in what follows:

Prof. I. J. Schmidt says in his 'Grammar of the Mongolian language'[10] that

§ 101. Dieses hat als kennzeichen die angehängte Partikel -luγa oder -lüge whlche aber inder dritten Person beider Zahlen häufig durch die Partikel -juqui oder -jukui abgeändert wird, 2. B. bi γar-iyar bariluγa ich habe es mit der Hand ergriffen, qola γaǰar-ača ireǰukui es its von fernen Landen gekommen. Das Perfectum wird im Gebrauche öfters mit dem Imperfectum verwechselt.

According to Prof. A. Д. Рудневъ[11], ① *the decisive form has the following suffixes; lugā, luge; lā, lē (lay, ley) — in the bracket is colloquial use — meanings are* ① *representing perfect past* ② *it is used when speaking of the already known facts.* ② *the accidental from has the following suffixes;*

ǰuhuy, ǰühüy; ǰi (colloquial form)....[after the vowel or l]

čuhuy, čühüy; či (colloquial form)....[after the consonant except l]

Meaning: a sudden occurrence without expectation.

For instance abulugā (already) took, and abčuhuy (suddenly) took.

In the next place the famous Polish scholar of Mongolian — Prof. B. Л. Котовичъ

10) I. J. Schmidt: Grammatik der Mongolischen Sprache. St. -Petersburg 1831.

11) A. Д. Рудневъ: Лекций по Грамматике Монгольского письменного языка. С-Петерсбург. 1905. Here I use a Japanese translation by Mr. Shideichi Yamaguichi.

says in his 'Lectures on Written Mongolian'[12] that

2) Вторая форма (общеизвестная) с окончанием:

-luγa, -lüge луга (луге), В разговорном языке лā (лē) или лай (лей), употребляется при разсказе о событиях известных говорящему и слушающему (т. е. при напоминание о чем) или же событиях общеизвестных, о которых однако, по предположению говорящего, не знает слушающий:

3) Третья форма (неожиданная), оканчивающаяся после гласных и согласного л основы на *-ǰuqui, -ǰüküi*, цухуй (цўхўй), В разговорном *-ǰi* и после остальных согласных на *-čuqui, -čüküi*, в разговорном *-či* употребляется при разсказе о какой либо неожиданном происшествий или же о факте необычайном, на который говорящий желает обратить особенное внимание свойх слушателей.

And according to 'Grammaire de la Langue Mongole Écrite'[13] by French Prof. L. Hambis at page 49 and at page 50,

4° Le thème du passé indéfini exprimant une action passé dont on n'a pas été témoin ou dont on n'est pas certain, est formé avec le sffixe -lu'a ~ -lü'e:

78. Passé indéfini — Le thème -lu'a ~ lü'e est souvent remplacé à la troisième personne par le suffixe composé -ǰu'ui ~ -ǰü'üi:

—— The following is left out. ——

Le passé indéfini a parfois la valeur de l'imparfait; on peut comprendre: oi-ača otǰu'ui 《il est venu de la forêt》 ou 《il venait de la forêt》.

In the next place Prof. Hattori says in his "a Lecture on the Grammar of Written Mongolian[14]" that follows.

(11) The forms that have the suffixes of -lugā; -lug-ā ~ -lügē. They have connective vowels. The negatives of ülü and ese are in front of verbs. They can take the interrogative suffixes of uū ~ -üü. They stand for someone, for certain, acting in the present or having acted in the past. They are able to be translated into Japanese as, 'hora....shita', ...shiteshimatta', 'hora....suru'.

—— The following is left out. ——

(13) The forms that have -jukui ~ -jüküi ~ cukui ~ cüküi.

The stem ending in the vowel or -l has -jukui or -jüküi. They have no connective vowels. The negatives of ülü and ese come in front of verbs. Generally they haven't the interrogative suffixes of -uū and -üü. They mean assuredly that a certain action was conclusively performed in the past or that in spite of all a certain action was to be performed. In the last of a chapter where the form with the suffixes of -ba ~ -be is frequently used, the writer makes use of these suffixes and intends to represent more placid context. They can be translated into Japanese as '(sudeni)....shiteiru' '....shiteshimatteiru' '....shitanodearu' '....shiteshimatta' 'tsuini....shita' 'suruni itatta'.

12) В. Л. Котвич: Лекции по Грамматике Монгольского Языка. С-Петербургъ. 1902.
13) Louis Hambis: Grammaire de la Langue Mongole Écrite. Paris. 1946.
14) Shiro Hattori: Môko-bungo bunpô kôgi III. (Toyogo Kenkyu No. 4. 1948).

——The following is left out.——

Last of all I'll show you what Prof. N. Poppe says.

According to his 'Grammar of Written Mongolian'[15].

351. Another past form expresses actions which, without any doubt, have taken (or will take) place. The action is supposed to have been witnessed by the person speaking: at any rate, the latter owes his knowledge of the action to a reliable source. The suffix is -luɣa/-lüge in the classical language, with the union vowel -u/ü, added to stems ending in consonants. In the preclassical language the suffix is -luɣai/ -lügei or sometimes -laɣa/-lege.

——The following is left out.——

352. The third past tense form expresses actions which took place before other actions. In certain cases this is a pluperfect. The speaker claims to have witnessed the action and to have been surprised when making his discovery of the action as a fait accompli. This past tense is usually used with reference to the second and third persons. The suffix is ǰuqui/-ǰükü̈i; when addressed to stems ending in γ, b, s, d, g, and γ it is -čuquį̆/čü̈kü̈į̆.

——The following is left out.——

Those above are the grammatical descriptions within my reach. Besides them Prof. Hattori has treatises on -ǰuqui/-jüküi of Written Mongolian[16] and on the sememe of the indicative endings in Khalkha Mongolian[17]. I will describe it in a later chapter. In the descriptions by such seniority as mentioned above I can't agree with Prof. L. Hambis' opinion which is in marked contrast to others', that -lu'a and -lu'e are actions in the past without witness and are past uncertain actions. Prof. Hattori's report on that matter was that they represent an action someone, for certain, does in the present or did in the past. Prof. Schmidt says when -luɣa /-lüge is used in the third person, it is more often than not taking the place of by -ǰuqui/-jüküi. Prof. L. Hambis and Prof. Poppe follow in Schmidt's footsteps. And Prof. Poppe says -ǰuqui/-jüküi is only used in the second person and the third person. Though I have not yet scrutinized this matter, in Modern Mongolian, as far as I know, there are, I think, no examples of -жээ (-чээ) being used for the subject of the first person. I am intending to look into it hereafter. Prof. Котвич published his treatise about 60 years ago. His idea is the nearest to mine, though strictly there are some differences. At least there isn't much difference between his and mine, and it is fundamentally the same. I am struck with admiration for Prof. Котвич's insight of announcing such opinion as above. Prof. Hattori's view of -luɣa ～-lüge seems to be different from that of -lā ～lē ～-lō ～lō̄ in Khalkha Mongolian. He assumes[18] the sememe of -lā ～-lē ～-lō ～-lō̄ is to attract the atten-

15) N. N. Poppe: Grammar of Written Mongolian. Wiesbaden. 1954.

16) Shiro Hattori: Verbal suffixes of juxui (cuxui) ～jüküi (cüküi) in Written Mongolian. Tōhōgakuhō. No. 11. Showa 15.

17) Shiro Hattori: A Study of Meaning. Gengokenkyu No. 22, 23. 1953.

tion of a hearer about the action done in front of a speaker. Perhaps it may be the result caused by the difference between the written and spoken languages. You can apply my sememe derived from the examples in *the Secret History*[19] to Modern Mongolian sememe of -лаа[19].

Though my idea is in principle different from Prof. Hattori's, we are alike in the point that his Japanese translation to this suffix of 'hora....shita' is regarded as expectedly doing including a speaker and a hearer. In such a way there isn't much difference between his idea and mine. Then about -ǰuqui/-ǰüküi, Prof. Schmidt says -luγa/-lüge (in case of the third person it turns into -ǰuqui/-ǰüküi) sometimes gives arise to confusion with imperfect in usage. I think it's very significant. According to Prof. L. Hambis le passé indéfini is often worthy of imparfait. In short in the Japanese translation we have two cases. One is no more than '.... shita' and the other is '....shite ita'. Prof. Hattori shows in the first place the meaning that someone completed a certain action in the past and its result remains in the present. The Japanese translation for it is 'sudeni....shite iru'. He, as it were, insists upon an imparfait meaning. We can see such a view in his early work "About the verbal suffix of ǰuxui (čuxui) ~ ǰüküi (čüküi) in Written Mongolian".

I face some examples in Modern Mongolian of -жээ (-чээ) which can not help being meant "to be done". Yet this meaning "to be done" seldom appears in the conversational sentence.

There are two sorts of the sememe in -ǰuqui ~ -ǰüküi. They are "to be ~ ed" and "unexpectedly to have done" explained by Руднев, Котвич and Poppe. But it is not generally admitted that one suffix has two quite different sememe.

We'll have to examine this point more precisely. Prof. Poppe says about the -dži, -džē of Khalkha Mongolian that 'in the past or in the near past, that is to say, the time in the past which seems to be very near to a speaker or in which the speaker, himself, was a witness or believed to be a witness'[20]. And Prof. Hattori gives a sememe of -dži, -džē that it is used for an emphatic explanation for an unexpected action in the considerably near past[21].

In these descriptions the two professors show a sememe different from the -ǰuqui/-ǰüküi of Written Mongolian. Prof. Hattori's sememe of an emphatic explanation for an unexpected action is rather similar to that of 'unexpectedly....have done' in Written Mongolian given by Prof. Руднев, Котвич and also by me. Therefore is that the characteristic sememe of 'already....have done' seen only in Written Mongolian? We can see this meaning in the -жээ (-чээ) of Modern Mongolian as I

18) See the footnote 17.

19) I referred to the difference in meaning between -лаа and -жээ of Modern Mongolian in the report presented to the 39th general meeting of the Linguistic Society of Japan. I, in substance, do not change the idea of that report.

20) N. N. Poppe: Khalkha-Mongolische Grammatik (Wiesbaden 1951).

21) Shiro Hattori: Shown before.

said before. In a sense Modern Mongolian based upon the Khalkha dialect is a sort of Written Mongolian and it's very interesting to find an overwhelming majority of -жээ(-чээ) in the descriptive part of a drama. I will show you some examples in what follows. I will take them from Жүжигүүд by Ч. Ойдов[22].

Гуравдугаар үзэгдэл (Act III)

Гэрийн гадаа том сайхан асар харагдана. Дотор нь хурим найрын юм бэлтгэсэн байна. Эргэн тойрныг зуны сайхан байгаль хүрээлжээ.

(Outside the house a large, beautiful tent is seen. There are some things prepared for the festival in the tent. Every side is surrounded by the beautiful nature of summer).

Дөрөвдугээр үзэгдэл (Act IV)

Балай их ой мод байна. Сэнгээг шуудайд хийж өндөр модоос дуужилжээ. Түүний зөвхөн толгой нь цухуйна. Дэргэд нь Галдан, Жалбуу нар байна.

(There is a thick forest. Сэнгээ was wrapped in the bag and is hung high up in the tree. Only his head comes out. Галдан and Жалбуу are beside the head).

Нэгдүгээр үзэгдэл (Act I)

Монгол нутгийн уулархаг газар давхарлан сүндэрлэсэн ханан хад байна. Энэ хад урт удаан хугацаанд улаан, шар, ногоон, элдэв өнгийг олжээ.

Хувхай модны хэдэн мөчир, юм гуйсан зовлонг гуйланчын гар мэт тэнгэр өөд ердойжээ.

(In Mongolian districts, there are rock piles. These rocks are presenting red, yellow, and green colors of exposure to the weather. Some rotten trees are expanding their boughs highly into the sky like the begging hand of a poor beggar).

The examples shown above are explanations for stages of each act. -Жээ used in those sentences are all representing "be～ed', be～ing". I can discover some more examples in the discriptive part of a drama, but I can not find out any in dialogues. There in the dialogues -жээ is used to stand for 'to have already done'. Thus the sememe of 'be～ed' is peculiar to written language, I think.

In the language of the Secret History I can not find out any certain instances in approximately 300 examples of A group suffix representing 'is～ed or was～ed'. Besides that, taking the above conditions into consideration, the sememe of this suffix must represent only "have already done" at least in the 13th or 14th century. And perhaps afterwards, only in the written language, for somewhat unknown reasons, the sememe of "to be～ed" was added. And its traces still survive in a emphatically literary use of Modern Mongolian. In this respect I will study closely the records of Written Mongolian, and intend to submit another report about it. In the above mentioned I told of the difference between my predecessor and me, referring to the traditional descriptions. In short I regard these two suffixes not as different sorts of suffixes but as, so to speak, a symmetrical pair of suffixes.

22) Ч. Ойдов: Жүжигүүд. Улаанбаатар. 1957.

This point is substantially different from the traditional one[23].

§ 8. The relations between the suffix of *-yu* and the B group suffix.

The last point, presented in chapter five—there might be some similarity between the sememe of -yu and that of B suffix—is examined in what follows.

About *-yu* I feel like introducing all the descriptions that were given in the past, but I want to save trouble. So here I can provide only two descriptions—they are Prof. Hattori's and Prof. Poppe's.

In the first place Prof. Hattori's description.

—(10) the form with the suffix of-yū ∼yǖ[24].

It has the union vowel. The negative postposition of ülü or ese comes before a verb. Someone emphatically explains some actions generally or actions done reasonably in the present or in the future, we may translate the form into....suru monoda or.... surunoda, yabuyū (ikumonoda) abuyū (toru monoda), maltan maltatala gajar-āca usungarku boluyū (Dig on and on, and we can have water from the earth).

In the next place Prof. Poppe's[25].

349. The deductive present expresses actions considered a logical result of previous actions or antitheses to tre latter ("Consequently he does" or "Consequently he will do"). The suffix is-yu/-yü; with the union vowel -u/-ü, it is added to stems ending in consonants.

These above are two descriptions by the two professors. I assume the sememe of this suffix that an action is done as a known fact or a reasonable fact. There are a great number of cases that are equivalent to '....surumono' in Japanese translation. We recognize immediately that the sememe of -yu is alike in comparison with that of *B* suffix. I think *-yu* is the present form of *B* group suffix. In the sememe of -yu ∼ -yü that an action is done as a known fact or a reasonable fact, if we change the underlined part into 'was done', the sememe is similar to B group suffix. I think it's rather significant. -Yu ∼ yü and B group suffix are equal in substance. Therefore these two suffixes may have the same aptitude when connected with a- or bü-.

In the above mentioned I can find an answer to the three questions presented in chapter five. In the next I'll have to try to assume the sememe of a- and bü- and to find the difference between the two.

§ 9. The sememe of *a-* and *bü-*, and the difference in the sememe between the two.

When I assume the sememe of *a-* and *bü-*, I take the following way, thinking of the sememe of A and B suffixes mentioned above.

23) In a sense Prof. Schmidt may have had the same idea as mine, but his descriptions are too succinct for me to grasp clearly.

24) Shiro Hattori: Môko-bungo bupô kôgi (Toyogo kenkyu 1∼4. 1948. Tokyo).

25) N. N. Poppe: Grammar of Written Mongolian Wiesbaden. 1954.

① First of all I start with a comparative study of *a-* and *bu-* when they are suffixed with the same suffixes like *aǰu'ui*; *buǰu'ui*, *aǰu*: *buǰu*, etc. Above all as an example of a pair which occurs only rarely in one part, I can quote the above. I think they can supply the key to the assumption of the sememe, so I start to scrutinize that sort of pair. I pick up the verbal use of *a-* and *bü-* as the first object of my study.

② The sememe assumed with the operation of the process ① is applied to every case of other examples and I decide whether they are suitable or not. On that occasion the auxiliary verbal use of *a-* and *bü-* is included.

③ Thus in the long run I can assume the sememe that covers all the examples of *a-* and *bü-*. I take the way shown above and will act on the assumption. I'll explain the process succinctly in what follows and I would like to have the advice or criticisms on it from other scholars. (Out of consideration for space I can give you only a few examples).

[A] *aǰu'ui* and *buǰu'ui*.

(**a**) [七 26 三 ～ 四] § 194. Qara'ul-un ene kele gurteǰu Tayang qan Qangqai-yin Qačir usun-a ***aǰu'ui.***

(When a scout reached this word, Tayangkhan was by the Qačir river in Qangqai).

(**b**) [三 15 四 ～ 九] § 110. Temuǰin durbeǰu ayisuqun irgen-dur Borte, Borte keyen ungsiǰu yabuqui-dur učiraǰu Borte Uǰin tede durbekun irgen-dur ***buǰu'ui.*** Temǰin-u dau'u sonosču taniǰu tergen-eče bau'u'ad guiyiǰu ireǰu Borte Uǰin Qo'aqčin ǰirin Temuǰin-u ǰilu'a čilbur soni taniǰu bariǰu'ui sara'ul bule'e.

(Temuǰin met with the routed people crying Borte, Borte. Mrs. Borte was among the routed people. Hearing Temǰin's call and recognizing him, she got off the carriage and ran to Temuǰin. Mrs. Borte and Qo'aqčin, both gathered Temuǰin's reins. At night they recognized the reins in the moonlight).

Aǰu'ui in (a) and *buǰu'ui* in (b) can easily be translated into Japanese 'ita'. With *-ǰu'ui* they imply an unexpectedness or an incidental happening. In fact we can clearly grasp the nuance of the two. Th re are about 100 frequent examples of *aǰu'u* and *aǰu'ui*, all told. I can find only one example of *buǰu'ui* through the twelve volumes. That is valuable. Why is *buǰu'ui* used here? Can we use aǰu'ui instead of using *buǰu'ui* here? I believe to answer this question is to set up a stable scaffolding to assume the sememe of *a-* and *bü-*. The example of (b) shows a dramatic scene written with a simple touch that Temujin (would-be-Genghis Khan) attacked the *Merkit* tribe to recapture the kidnapped wife, Borte. He defeated them and looked for his wife among the routed Merkit people, till he saw her. You can't make out the reason *buǰu'ui* is used here if you don't know those things previously. It was known to Temuǰin and other people that his wife Borte was caught and was shut up in the Merkit's village. *To exist is known previously or is caused by the previous event*, so you can use *bü-*. A- is to the contrary. For a certain thing includ-

ing man and nonhuman being to exist somewhere is unknown or isn't caused by the previous event. That is an unexpected existence. I assume the meanings of *a-* and *bü-* as mentioned above and I try to scrutinize this assumption. Thinking in that way, *aǰu'ui* in (a) and buǰu'ui in (b) are the right thing in the right place. You can understand it isn't permitted to use *aǰu'ui* in (b) instead of using *buǰu'ui*. '*Buǰu'ui*' may take the place of *aǰu'ui* in (a) but the implication is different as you know. Assuming the meaning of a- and bü- that way, we can easily imagine from their character that the case of *a-* with *-ǰu'u* suffix and *bü-* with *-la'a* suffix is an overwhelming majority. Now I'll apply the idea derived from (a) and (b) to every form of *a-* and *bü-* in what follows.

[B] *alu'a* and *bule'e*.

(**c**) [—26四] §**42.** Bodoncar ugai boluqsan-u qoyina tere ǰeu'uredai yi ger daru'a Atangqa Uriangqadai gu'un ***alu'a*** te'un-u'ai bui-ǰe ke'eǰu ǰugeli-deče qarqaǰu....

(After Bodoncar's death they took out the ǰeu'uredai from the feasting place, saying that Atangqa Uriangqadai used to be at their house and that it belonged to him).

(**d**) [四12—] §**133.** Činggis qahan ugulerun erte udur-eče Tatar irgen ebuges ečiges-i baraqsad ošiten irgen ***bule'e***, edo'e ene qanal-dur qamsaya bida ke'e'ed....

(Genghis khan said that from time immemorial the Tatar tribes were the enemy that killed their ancestors and that they should be annexed to them on that occasion).

In the next place I'll show you the opposite case of [A]. It is very rare that *a-* has B suffix. I can find only *a-la'ai* (十8六§249) besides *a-lu'a*. On the contrary *bü-* with B group's suffix has no less than 170 examples including *bule'e* and *bu-le'ai*.

First I am thinking of the meaning of *alu'a* 'to be'. The sentence of (c) tells that Bodoncar was the origin of the *Boljigins* (or the origin of the Genghis khans) and that they got rid of ǰeuledai who had been born of Bodoncar's concubine, taking him for Atangqa Uriangqadai's child. In that paragraph from *ger* to *alu'a* you may have quotes. I understand the part in this way, "As you know, (at that time) the Atangqa Uriangqadais used to be there accidentally. ǰeu'uredai must have been his". The Atangqa Uriangqadais was not the man who belonged to the Boljigins. Though he often stayed at their house, it was caused by the incident. It is different in substance from the tribe's "being". However, "used to be" is a certain thing. Therefore *a-* and *-lu'a*, which are difficult for them to tie together principally, become one word. In the Japanese translation it is 'shitte no tōri tama tama ita'. You may say *-lu'a* plays 'shitte no tōri....shita' (Someone did....as you know) and *a-* plays 'tama tama iru' (to happen to be). There is no need for me to dwell upon *bule'e* in (d). '*Bü-* and *-le'e*' tell their meaning clearly here. In this case I think bule'e is used for copula and not for "tobe". This paragraph is one of the scenes in which they sent their manifesto to their king, To'olir. The manifesto said that 王京丞相 of 金 was attacking megǰin of Tatar so that he might

annihilate the bitter enemy Tatar. Genghis Khan said. "From time immemorial the Tatars are the sworn enemy who killed our fathers and grandfathers, as you know". You can not use aǰu'u here instead of using bule'e.

[C] aǰu and buǰu.

(e) [八 14 三 ～ 八] §200. Činggis qahan Jamuqa-da ugule keyen ugulerun edo'e bida qoyar qamtudba, nokočeya ore'ele kilgun bolunlčaǰu ***a'asu*** o'ermičilen qaqačan sedkimu či, edo'e niken-e qamtu ***aju*** umartaqsan-iyan duradqalduǰu untaraqsan-iyan seri'ululčeǰu ***aya***....

(Genghis khan made him say, "We meet together now. We will make friends with each other and become a pair of axles, or we will never have different ideas respectively. Now that we are together, we will remember the out-of-mind things and rouse them from sleep).

(f) [七 11 八 ～ 12 三] §189. Te'un-dur eke inu Gurbesu ugulerun yeki'u-ǰe tede'eri Mangqol irgen hunur mau'utan qubčasu baratutan bule'ai, anggida qolo ***buju butugai***, sili'un berined okid-i anu maqa abčira'ulǰu qar köl anu ukiya'ulǰu uni'ed qonid-iyan maqa sa'a'ulgun ele ke'eǰu'ui.

(Then his mother Gurbesu said, "Somehow or other, the Mongolian people have a bad body odor and have dirty clothes so make them live in the distance. Their neat brides and doughters are taken here and they will wash their hands and will milk the cows".)

A-ǰu 'to be and....' has tens of examples in the *Secret History*, but *bu-ǰu* 'to be and....' has only one example. (f) shows the *buǰu*. It has *butugai* which means to hope to be. This is the only example that has the genuine meaning: to hope to be. Other three examples turn into the meaning of prohibition. Neither can you here use *aǰu atugai* instead of using *buju butugai*. Gurbesu, Tayan khan's mother said with a contempt for the Mongolian people, "As you know, the Mongolian people had a bad body odor and dirty clothes so I hope we make them live somewhere in the distance". Perhaps in those days it was awfully detestable to a highly civilized Naiman tribe that the Mongolian people had a bad body odor and dirty clothes. Therefore Gurbesu said that they made them live in the distance. To make the Mongolian people live in the distance is reasonably caused by the previous event. In this case they had a bad body odor and dirty clothes. Without some reason they can not make them live in the distance. '*Bu-ǰu*' and '*bu-tugai*' have such meaning as mentioned above. On the other hand *aǰu* of (e) has the meaning of an incidental existence. J̌amuqa was caught by a retainer and was taken before Genghis khan. Genghis khan and J̌amuqa met unexpectedly with incident. In (e) there are other two forms. They are *a-'asu* 'if....were～' a-ya 'would be....'. I will describe it in a later chapter.

[D] arun and burun.

(g) (イ) [— 16 七 ～ 八] §26. Idekui ideyen ugai ***arun*** čino-yin qun-dur qorqaqsan

goro'esun mariyaǰu qarbuǰu alaju ideıdu'ed čino-yin idegsen-i temguldu ǰu ide'ed....

(When there was no food, he shot and killed the animal which a wolf ran down to the edge of a cliff. he shared it with the wolf.)

(g) (ロ) [八 35 三 ～ 六] §205. Či tende ugulerun bangleniǰu ayisuqui nokor-dur nokočeldusu keyen ger-dur ečige-dur-iyen ber kelen ugai'u ge'u-ben sa'an ***arun*** nambuqa sa'uluqa-ban ke'ere burguǰu....

(There you said, "To the troubled friend, I am milking a mare without telling his family or his father and put the cover on the leather bag and the leather pail in the field".)

(h) [— 40 六 ～ 八] §57. Tende Ho'elun Uǰin ke'elitai ***burun*** Onan-u Deli'un Boldaqa bukui-dur ǰob tende Činggis qahan toreǰu'ui.

(There when Mrs. Ho'elun was pregnant and stayed on Deli'un Boldaq in Onan, Genghis khan was born.)

Generally speaking, the *-run* of Middle Mongolian has three meanings. They are 'when....do', 'to do and....' and 'to do and say....'. As it is difficult to understand that one suffix has different meanings, the sememe of this suffix should be examined closely in future[26]. The -run mentioned above seems to mean 'when.... do'. I think *a-* of *a-run* in (g)-(イ) (ロ) need not have any explanation. You can understand vely well in the context that (イ) is there's no food by accident and that (ロ) is to milk the mare by chance. Thus you can not change these two into *burun*. To be pregnant in (h) is not to be pregnant unexpectedly but to be so caused by the previous facts. Therefore you can not use *a-run* here.

[E] aqsan and bugsen.

(i) [三 29 六] §118. Temuǰin J̌amuqa qoyar amaraldurun nikan hon noko'e hon-u ǰarim amaralduǰu tere ***aqsan*** nuntuq-ača nikan udur neu'uye ke'elduǰu....

(Temuǰin and J̌amuqa made friends with each other. For a year and a half they were on good terms. One day they said they would remove from their camp).

(j) [五 22 六 ～ 23 三] §155. Yesugan qatun ugulerun—the following is left out—nadača egeči Yesui neretei nadača de'ere qan gu'un-e ǰokiqui aǰi'ai-je saiyi guregelen buligi edo'e maqa ene bodulqan-dur qa'aqsi yorčibi ke'ebi. Ene üge-dur Činggis qahan ugulerun egeči cinu čimadača sayin ***bugsen*** bo'esu eri'uluye egeči-yan ire'esu ǰaiyilaǰu ogguyu či ke'eba.

(Empress Yesugan "said my sister Yesui might have been more proper for a khan than I. Recently she got a bridegroom. Now where can she be in the confusion?" To this word Genghis khan said, "If your sister is prettier than you, I'll send my man to look for her. Will you give up your rank to her when your sister comes?)

I can find only one example of *bu-gsen* 'to have been'. From the previous

26) About ten years ago, I presented a paper titled "About -run converbal suffix in the language of the *Secret History*".

There I only dwell upon the usage of -run and can not deal with the subject above. I would like to treat it in future.

paragraph not given here, *a-qsan* 'to have been' in (i) means to be at the camp '*nuntung*' by chance. Perhaps you have no doubt in that respect. You can not use *bugsen* here. On the contrary in case of (i) it was known at least to empress Yesgen that her sister Yesui was pretty. This is the previously known fact. Accordingly you should use *bngsen* here. In the above mentioned I dwelt upon the meanings of *a-* and *bü-* divided into five groups from [A] to [E]. The assumption given in [A] increase its certainty.. Then I will apply this assumption to the most frequently used forms of *a-ǰu'u(i)* and *bule'e* (*bule'ai*). And I'll discriminate whether it is right or wrong. At last I will examine the case of *-ǰu aqui*; *-ǰu bukui*. Finally I assume the sememe of a- and bü-.

§ 9_2. *aǰu'u(i)* and *bule'e* (*bule'ai*).

(k) [三 33 六 ～ 34 二] § 120. Tere soni duliǰu udur geyi'esu uǰe'esu Jalayir-un Qači'untoqura'un Qaraqaitoqura'un Haranldaitoqura'un ede qurban toqura'un aqa-nar de'u-ner soni dulilduǰu ayisun ***aju'u***. Basa Tarqud-un Qada'an Daldurqan aqa-nar de'u-ner tabun Tarqud ayisun ***aju'u***. Basa Munggetu kiyan-u ko'un Unggur-tan Čangši'ud Baya'ud-iyar-an ayisun gu ***aju'u***.

(After sitting up all night, at daybreak, they saw Jalayir-un Qači'untoqura'un. Qaraqaitoqura'un and Haraldaitoqura'un's brothers come without any stop all the night. Five brothers of Tarqud (Qada'an, Daldurqan, etc) came. Unggur, a son of Munggetu kiyan with Čangši'ud Baya'ud came.)

We can understand the *aǰu'u* in this paragraph in the following way. That is 'at daybreak unexpectedly, the Toqura'un brothers and the Tarqud brothers came. If we use *bule'e* here, their arrival is known previously by some reasons: they came as had been expected. Their arrival in a sense is diametrically different in the two explanations. The assumption given above holds good in this case. **That is when an existence of a certain thing or a phenomenon is previously known to a speaker (or a writer) and a hearer (or a reader) or is caused by the previous factors, you should use *bü-* representing *the existence* while an existence isn't known previously, you should use *a-* representing *the existence*.** (I can not give you an example of bule'e out of space consideration.) From here on this assumption is called *big principle*. You can derive a *little principle* from this principle that **generally *a-* is used for the first appearance of a thing's existence or a phenomenon in the given context and *bü-* is seldom used.** You can see an example in the English language. 'There is(was) a(n)....'. In such cases you should use *a-* for the "to be" verb in English, and *bü-* is seldom used. There are a great number of *a-* and *bü-* examples you can give an explanation by an application of the rule. For instance *aǰu'u* [— 1 六] and *aǰi'ai* [— 5 五] at the beginning of the *Secret History* representing 'there was a blue wolf and a white hind', *aǰu'u* [— 6 五] and *bule'e* [— 23 七] [— 24 六], etc. There are more examples I can discover. If you can apply a *little principle* to a case, you also can apply a big principle to it without hesitation. In a sense this

little principle is unnecessary. But I can treat a great number of cases of *a-* and *bü-* mechanically by an application of the *little principle*. First I try to apply the *little principle*, then I will apply the *big one* one only when it's hard to get satisfactory results. In this respect, I find much use of the *little principle*.

I find the following remarkable thing.

① "Someone's child was someone"[27] or you can say 'someone's child, someone was'. In these cases you should use *bule'e* without exception. And *aǰu'u* is never used. Though there isn't much difference, I show you the following example. "There *were* some in somebody's family."[27] In this case bule'e is used without exception for representing "were".

② In the expression of 'somebody's name was....', they say somebody~*neretu* [*nere-tei, nere-tan(ten)*] *bule'e(bule'ai)*. It is the most popular form. 'Neretu aju'u' is seldom used. What do you think of that? In the first place, it is natural that bule'e is generally used in ②. That is to say that to have a name is very common, so to speak, a known fact. It is abnormal to have no name. Therefore it is quite natural, from the big rule, that bule'e is used for the case of ②. The only example of ~*nere-tu aǰu'u* [四 50 六] § 147 can easily be imagined in the context. It is a great pity that I can not show you out of space consideration. '~*nasutu(tai) bule'e* (....years old) with the same pattern to ~neretu bule'e is a common form, while ~*nasatu(tai) aǰu'u* is rare. In short as man has a name 'nere' and a age 'nasu', as a matter of course, it is natural that *bule'e* (with-tu) should be used, and *aǰu'u* is seldom used. In fact *Temuǰin-eče nikan nasun yeke harbantai aju'u Borte neretai.* A woman, whose name is Borte, is one year older than Temuǰin. This harban-tai aǰu'u is the only example throughout the *Secret History*. Borte, Temuǰin's prospective wife, is one year older than Temuǰin. This expression was given with a sort of surprise. I quite agree with the use of aju'u here. (Borte is a woman so there is a possibility that feminine *aǰi'ai* should be used here. I don't agree with it. I think it would be better to use *aǰu'u* here. I should give a reason, but it has nothing to do with the sememe of *a-* and *bü-* in question so I omit it.) 'Bule'e' in ② can easily be given an explanation.

I'll go back to ①. You might think it would be better to use *aǰu'u* here instead of using bule'e. 'Someone's child was *someone* (someone was)'. In this sentence the latter someone appeared for the first time in the context. From the *little principle* given above *aǰu'u* should be used here. Now let's go back to the *big principle*. For "to be" in the following sentences: there *were* a couple of children *in the family* or there *were* a couple of children *in his family*, I think it would be better to use bule'e than to use aǰu'u. Because it's normal for a common couple

27) For instance [—26九~27—] § 43. Qabici Ba'atur-un ko'un Menen Tudun *bule'e*. Menen Tudun-nu ko'un Qaci Kulung....the following is left out....dolo'an *bule'e*.
(Qabici Ba'latur's child was Menen Tudun. Menen Tudun's children were Qaci Kulung, —the following is left out— seven.)

to have children and it's abnormal to have none. It would be better to use aǰu'u representing 'to have' in the expression that the couple *had* no children. Thinking that way, in such sentences as 'someone's child was someone or someone was as someone's child' or 'he had two children', there isn't much difference between 'was' and 'had'. For instance in [—7 五] § 11 *Duwa-Soqor aqa inu dorben ko'utu bule'e* (His brother Duwa-Soqor *had* four children.) you see the form of *bule'e* as you expected. If you change this sentence into '*Duwa-Soqor-un ko'un dorben bule'e*', it turns into the following style you can often see in the *Secret History*; [— 2 ⊕] § 3. *Toroqolǰin-u ko'un Duwa-Soqor Dobun-Mergen qoyar bule'e.*

(Toroqolǰin had two children. They were Duwa-Soqor and Dobun-Mergen.)

Accordingly it is rather natural to use *bule'e* in ①. I took, as an object of my study, the two forms which are the most frequently used of all the conjugations of a- and bü- and decided whether my *big principle* held good in them in the above mentioned. As a result of my study, I feel sure that '*the big principle*' holds good in the two forms. In the long run I'll study the compound form of the most frequently used converb and '*a-* or *bü-*'.

§ 9_3. *-ǰu a-* and *-ǰu bü-*.

The combination shown above is most easily discovered, but I can give you only two or three examples owing to limited space.

(**L**) [二 46 八] § **101.** Ene tergen dotora ya'un **te'eju amu** ke'eba.

(....said, "What have you in your arriage?")

(**M**) [二 30 四] § **90.** Tere yeke guriyen-u kija'ar-a ebesulen **bayiju bukui**-yi uǰeba.

(He saw that (the horses) stood eating the grass beside the big guriyen.)

It is necessary to (L) and (M) to give contexts. (L) is one of the scenes where the Temuǰins were attacked by the Gurban Merkids. They hadn't enough horses for his wife Borte and an old woman Qoaqčin so Qoaqčin concealed Borte in a cattle cart. On their journey of escape, they were caught by Merkids. They succeeded in avoiding detection in their first search, but Merkids came again and asked (L) 'what have you in your cart?' What there was in the cart wasn't known to the soldiers. Thus **a-mu** is used here. On the other hand, **bayiju bukui** 'to be standing' in (M) is previously known. Therefore you should use bü- there. The scene of (M) is that on the way to search for the thief of his horses, he found them with the aid of Bo'orču and that he saw his horses eating the grass beside guriyen (of the thief) as he had expected.

(**N**) [二 16 四] § 80. ....mori-yan qaltari'ulu'ad qarquilu'a Taiyiči'ud **sakiju aju'u** Bariǰu abču odba.

(....let slip his horse and went out, when the Taiyiči'ud looked out for him. Then they caught him and took him away.)

(**P**) [二 17 五] § 81. Temuǰin-i tere qurim-dur gelbure ko'un gu'un abčira***ju bule'e.***

(At the feast Temujin was accompanied by a weak youth.)

The *-ǰu aǰu'u* in (N) and the *-ǰu bule'e* in (P) are translated into Japanese '....shiteita'. There is a good reason for *aǰu'u* used in (N) and *bule'e* used in (P). '*Aǰu'u*' and '*bule'e*' are never used without distinction. (N) tells that Temujin was attacked by the Tayičud and that he hid himself in the forest of Onan. He spent nine days there with little food. Then he was without food and went out of the forest hoping that the Tayičud had gone back, but unexpectedly the Tayičud looked about for him there. (P) tells that Temujin was caught by the Tayičud but that he watched for an opportunity to escape gloatingly. Just at that time the Tayičud held a feast by the Onan river for sixteen days in early summer. Temujin did not miss this chance. All the soldiers of the Tayičud gathered to the feast so the guard of the prisoner was a young fellow or a lad treated like a child. That is to say at the banquet Temujin was guarded by a weak fellow (as *had been expected*). It *is expected* in the context that Temujin *was* guarded by a weak fellow. Because it can not be expected that at the banquet a brave man acted as guard of a prisoner. You can imagine with no doubt that a good-for-nothing fellow or a young and inexperienced fellow took the part. The *bule'e* in (P) has the implication as mentioned above. From the four examples of a compound form in (L), (M), (N) and (P) it isn't necessary for my big rule to make a change. Thus I assume, finally, the sememe of *a-* and *bü-* in what follows.

§ 9_4. On the sememe of *a-* and *bü-*. In the first, the sememe of *a-*.

"A thing exists, in a given context, without any relation to the subject (or the recognition) of the core of speech (including a speaker, a listener and a third person), so to speak, an objective existence." This is the sememe of *a-*.

In the second, the sememe of *bü-*.

"A thing exists, in a given context, with a relation to the subject (or the recognition) of the core of speech, so to speak, a subjective existence." This is the sememe of *bü-*. Here is an evident difference between *a-* and *bü-*. In short, the existence of a thing in a context depends upon whether it related to the subjective core of speech in some way. Thus owing to the sememic similarity it is natural that we have a great number of examples of *a-* + *A suffix* and *bü-* + *B suffix*. I can not tell in the above, for want of space, the meaning of *a-* and *bü-* in *a-'asu*; *bo-'esu* and *a-tala*; *bo-'etele*. But they have a self-evident explanation by applying the sememe assumed above. I have told you almost all that I wanted to, but I'd like to add one thing more before I conclude my paper.

§ 10. The side-translation of *a-* in the *Secret History* has 有, 住 and 活, but that of *bu-* has only 有. From this point I can hold the idea that *a-* shows an existence with the length of time. That is to say *a-* is the existence of a line and *bü-* is the existence of a spot. If you study the examples of *a-* and *bü-* from this view-point, you do not treat them successfully, above all you are at a loss in the case of bule'e.

Accordingly as to the sememe of *a-* and *bü-*, I believe it is the best way to assume it in the way I have done. The view-point that *a-* is an existence of a line and *bü-* is an existence of a spot is mingled somewhere in the sememe with my idea and will be given a satisfactory explanation without any contradiction. That is the question which remains for future study. I am looking foward to a solution of this.