ОБМЕН ИЛИ

Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher

Internationale Zeitschrift für uralische und altaische Forschung
International Journal of Uralic and Altaic Studies
Journal International des Études Ouraliennes et Altaïques
Международный журнал урало- и алтаеведения

Im Auftrage der Societas Uralo-Altaica
herausgegeben von
Hans-Hermann Bartens - Klaus Röhrborn
Klaus Sagaster - Eberhard Winkler

Neue Folge
Band 23

2009

In Kommission bei
HARRASSOWITZ VERLAG

Inhalt

AUFSÄTZE

HÄKKINEN, KAISA / KEINÄSTÖ, KARI: Zu Geschichte und Wandel der Wörterbücher des Sprachenpaares Deutsch-Finnisch mit einem Überblick über die historische Stellung des Deutschen in Finnland 1

KUZNECOVA, MARGARITA: Marisch am Anfang des 21. Jahrhunderts 20

DIETZ, SIGLINDE: Eine kurzgefaßte Darstellung des Heilswegs der Yogācāra-Schule in Zentralasien 39

WILKENS, JENS: Einige weitere Fragmente des altuigurischen Vimalakīrtinirdeśa 49

KNÜPPEL, MICHAEL / VAN TONGERLOO, ALOÏS: Die Briefe von H. Winkler an W. Bang-Kaup 70

SALK, GUNDULA: Sind kirgisische Identitätsmuster mit dem westlichen Demokratie-Begriff kompatibel? Die kirgisischen Nationalbewegungen zwischen 1985 und 1995 106

STREET, JOHN C.: On the three past-tense endings of early Middle Mongolian 126

MESERVE, RUTH I.: Central Eurasian Nomadic Technology: Hobbles 160

BERICHTE

LAUT, JENS-PETER: Bibliographie alttürkischer Studien: Nachträge und Neuzugänge (VII) 175

JÄRVENTAUSTA, MARJA: Drei Generationen finnische Großwörterbücher – einige vergleichende Beobachtungen 179

KNÜPPEL, MICHAEL: Die Arbeitstagung „Gattungsgeschichte des manichäischen Schrifttums" der Kommission für manichäische Studien der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen (4.–5. März 2010). 242

KIM, ALEXANDER: Archaeological Studies of the Jurchen in the USSR and Russia 247

BESPRECHUNGEN

HASSELBLATT, CORNELIUS: Geschichte der estnischen Literatur. Von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. Besprochen von AVE MATTHEUS 263

Váimmus čiegan sániid – I hjärtat gömmer jag orden. Samiskt symposium till minne av Annika Jansson den 4 – 5 februari 2005 [Im Herzen verberge ich die Worte. Lappisches Symposium zum Gedächtnis an Annika Jansson am 4.–5. Februar 2005]. Utg. [Hrsg.] LARS-GUNNAR LARSSON & TORBJÖRN SÖDER. Besprochen von HANS-HERMANN BARTENS 268

WILSON, KARIN: *Markusevangeliet i Lars Rangius samiska översättning från 1713* [Das Markusevangelium in der lappischen Übersetzung von Lars Rangius von 1713]. Besprochen von HANS-HERMANN BARTENS 271

Inhalt

KAHRS, ULRIKE: *Der Lebenszyklus bei den wolgafinnischen und permischen Völkern. Kontextfelder, Konzepte und Identität.* Besprochen von ILDIKÓ LEHTINEN 275

MAKSIMOV, SERGEJ / DANILOV, VADIM / SAARINEN, SIRKKA: *Udmurttilais-suomalainen sanakirja - Udmurt-finn kylsuz'et* [Wotjakisch-Finnisches Wörterbuch]. Besprochen von RAIJA BARTENS 279

KATZSCHMANN, MICHAEL: *Chrestomathia Nganasanica. Texte - Übersetzung - Glossar - Grammatik.* Besprochen von FLORIAN SIEGL 282

JOHANSON, LARS /ROBBEETS, MARTINE, Eds.: *Transeurasian verbal morphology in a comparative perspective: genealogy, contact, chance.* Besprochen von ROY ANDREW MILLER 290

ZIEME, PETER (Hrsg.): *Aspects of research into Central Asian Buddhism. In memoriam Kōgi Kudara.* Besprochen von MICHAEL KNÜPPEL 293

DWYER, ARIENNE M.: *Salar: A Study in Inner Asian Language Contact Processes. Part I: Phonology.* Besprochen von STEFAN GEORG 297

CHIODO, ELISABETTA: *The Mongolian Manuscripts on Birch Bark in the Collection of the Mongolian Academy of Sciences. Part II.* Besprochen von FRANÇOISE AUBIN 303

DORJ, ENHJARGAL: *Die denominalen und deverbalen Nominalbildungen des Khalkha-Mongolischen und ihre deutschen Entsprechungen.* Besprochen von STEFAN GEORG.. 306

HAUER, ERICH: *Handwörterbuch der Mandschusprache.* Besprochen von STEFAN GEORG 309

MITTEILUNGEN

Bericht über die Geschäftsführung der Societas Uralo-Altaica für die Zeit vom 18. November 2006 bis zum 20. November 2009 313

Bericht über die XVII. Ordentliche Mitgliederversammlung der Societas Uralo-Altaica am 20. November 2009 316

On the three past-tense endings of early Middle Mongolian

By John C. Street (The University of Wisconsin—Madison)

1. Introduction. Mongolian of the 13th and 14th centuries had no less than three indicative endings with past-tense meaning that could occur at the end of a main clause. We find, for example, three past tense forms of the verb-root *ügüle-* 'speak' in the *Secret History of the Mongols* (*Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih*), the lengthy and colloquial text which, though written probably in 1240, is known to us primarily through a version transcribed into Chinese characters around 1400. The following sentences are typical instances of such forms.

> *Arqay ire-jü e·de üge·s Ciŋgis qahan- -a ügüle-be.* 'Arqay came and spoke these words to Chinggis Qaan' (SH 6427–28).[1]
> *'Inanca Bilge qan ügüle-lee.'* "Inancha Bilge Qan [once] spoke [as follows]'" (7101).[2]
> *...tende Jamuqa nökö·d-te-en ügüle-jüü.* '...then Jamuqa spoke to his companions' (8123–24).

Despite considerable discussion over the years, scholars have never reached a firm consensus as to the semantic differences between these endings, either in Middle Mongolian or in somewhat later stages of the language.[3] The present article will review the pertinent data from early Middle Mongolian, in hopes of reaching a clearer understanding of the semantics of these endings at this earliest recorded stage of the language.

[1] Parenthetical four-digit numbers of this sort refer to lines of the *Secret History*; the first digit refers to a chapter number (with X, Y, and Z for chapters 10, 11, and 12), the second and third to a folded page number, and the last to one of the ten lines on such pages (with 1 the first line, 0 the tenth). The abbreviation *SH* before such numbers is usually omitted.

In transcribing Middle Mongolian, hyphens marks morpheme divisions before inflectional suffixes; a plural suffix is separated from its base by a raised dot. In transcribing the Mongol script, the hachek is generally omitted over *c* and *j*. Commas and semi-colons in SH transcriptions represent my interpretation of spacing between Chinese characters; see Street 1986.

[2] There is also a form *ügüle-lüe*, occurring, for example in *Daariŋqu üge bi ese ügüle-lüe* 'I did not speak the mocking words' (Z045). For such doublets see footnote 6 below.

[3] The opinions of various scholars were summarized in Orlovskaya 2000, esp. pp. 81–89.

The three endings will here be referred to simply as *-bA*,[4] *-lAA*, and *-JUU*, but each of these writings covers three or more actual phonological shapes, written in a variety of ways in the different writing systems employed for Middle Mongolian. Like the other indicative endings, these three show alternants conveniently referred to as SINGULAR, FEMININE, and PLURAL. The *b*-initial ending, for example, had a rare *-bi* = /-bi/ alternant that was used primarily with female human subjects; the other two alternants differed essentially in number, the *-bA* = /-ba/~/-be/ shape being used primarily with singular subjects, the *-bAy* = /-bay/~/-bey/ shape (= *-bai/-bei* in the Mongol script) more often with plural ones.[5] Seemingly exceptional uses of such forms, which are indeed numerous, mean merely (Street 2009b, §5.5) that

> speakers and writers of Middle Mongolian felt free — as in any living language — to use these alternants in novel ways to express other semantic nuances: metaphorically expanding the use of *-bAy* to show respect for an individual mentioned as a singular subject, for example, or to indicate that a leader acted together with his followers. Similarly, one might occasionally use the feminine alternant *-bi* of a non-female entity in order to imply its intimate connection with a woman or a feminine characteristic; or employ singular *-bA* after paired names in order to emphasize that two individuals or groups acted as one.

The *j*-initial ending had similar alternants: in the SH *-juu/-jüü/-cuu/-cüü* for the singular, *-jiay* for the feminine (SH 1013, 5228), and plural *-juuy/-jüüy/-cuuy/-cüüy* (and once *-ciüy*, 1482). The third ending is more complicated, not only in requiring a union vowel after a consonant, but also in having apparent doublets (with high vs. low vowel after the lateral) for two alternants: SH singular forms *-laa/-lee/-ulaa/-ulee* ~ *-lua/-lüe/-ulua/-ülüe*; feminine *-liyi/ligi* (1374, 2374; 2113, 5228); plural *-laay/-lāy/-leey/legey* ~ *-luay/-lüey*.[6] (Nowhere, apparently, is there any instance of the feminine or plural shapes after a consonant.) In the Mongol script, of course, we find *γ* ~ *g*

[4] Note that the arbitrary symbol ° sometimes placed after the sequence *-bA* in romanization of *Secret History* passages indicates that the Chinese transcription there fails to specify which alternant of this ending was intended. See Street 2009b for full discussion.

[5] It is because some alternative shapes of this sort clearly consist of two morphemes that the three elements with which this article is concerned are referred to here as ENDINGS rather than morphemes.

[6] Unfortunately, nothing significant can yet be said about the thirty occurrences of the doublet forms of *-lAA* that have *-lu-/-lü-* rather than the usual *-la-/-le-*. Ozawa once thought that the *-lU-* shapes were what he called 'unhonorific' forms (Ozawa 1961), but that solution does not seem defensible for the *Secret History* (or Middle Mongolian) as a whole.

between vowels, so *-juγu/-jügü*, *-laγa/-lege* etc.; and occasionally there are variant spellings as well.[7]

What follows here will say nothing about the sex- and number-marking of such alternants of indicative endings; for general discussion of uses of the singular, feminine, and plural shapes, as exemplified by alternants of the high-frequency ending *-bA*, see my earlier article on this specific ending (STREET 2009b). Instead, the present article will focus almost exclusively on semantic contrasts between the three plural endings, and primarily on the difference between *-lAA* and *-JUU*. Further, most of this article will deal specifically with the *Secret History*; for as shown in Table 1, this single text contains four times as many instances of the three past-tense endings as all other early Middle Mongolian texts combined: the texts included in volumes 2 and 3 of LOUIS LIGETI's series *Monumenta linguae mongolicae collecta*. More specifically, of the approximately 2285 instances of the past-tense endings in early Middle Mongolian,[8] 80% occur in the *Secret History*. Differences in the frequency of the three endings in various texts are quite dramatic, as shown in Table 1: the SH contains nearly 64% of all instances of the *-JUU* ending, over 83% of the *-bA* instances, and 91% of all instances of *-lAA*. Further, the ratio of *-bA* to *-lAA* to *-JUU* is about 19:5:6 in the SH, but roughly 14:2:17 in Mongol script documents.

	-bA	*-lAA*	*-JUU*	Total
Secret History	1163	301	360	1,824
Hua-i i-yü	24	7	10	41
Documents in 'Phags-pa script	35	0	11	46
Documents in Mongol script	168	22	184	374
Total	1390	330	565	2285

Table 1: Frequency and distribution of past-tense endings in different texts and writing systems used for early Middle Mongolian

[7] For the location of any such alternants in the SH and HY, see the suffix indexes in KURIBAYASHI 2001 and 2003 respectively. The HY has no feminine forms of these two endings; in other documents such forms are excessively rare. I have found only those listed below. (For text abbreviations, see the note to Table 4 in §6 below.) Phags 10.13 *bü-leyi* (LIGETI MLMC 3.71, POPPE 1957:55, 128a), DIlk 3.10 *bü-leyi* (LIGETI MLMC 2.248; MOSTAERT/CLEAVES 1952:450–51, 460 did not recognize this form as a feminine one), PSar 22a1 *keme-lei* (MLMC 2.283). SMI 1335.29 *a-jigi*; SMI 1335.29 and 34 *ög-cigi* (contrast *ög-cügü* in line 28); SMI 1338.21 *a-jiγai*.

[8] Many of the *indices verborum* produced for these texts by Ligeti and others fail to index these endings separately from the full words in which these occur, so my count here may have missed a few instances.

2. Frequency and semantics of the endings in the *Secret History*. A further statistical breakdown of the top line of Table 1 is presented in Table 2. There we see that in the SH the three endings differ notably in the frequency with which they occur in quoted speech, i.e., in sentences embedded within other sentences, typically followed by the verb *kee-* 'say' and usually preceded by an introductory *ügüle-rün* 'speaking' or some other converb in *-(U)rUn*. The ending *-lAA* occurs 71% of the time (214 of its 301 SH occurrences) in quoted speech. By contrast, only 32% (368) of the 1163 instances of *-bA* are in quoted sentences, and only 28% (100) of the 360 instances of *-JUU*. Such percentages are referred to below as quotability scores.

	-bA		*-lAA*		*-JUU*		
	In *bol-ba, -bi, -bay*	After other verbs	In *bü-lee, -leey, -liyi*	After other verbs	In *a-juu*, etc.	After other verbs	Total
In quoted sentences	45	323	126	88	53	47	
	368		214		100		682
In non-quoted sentences	116	679	79	8	42	218	
	795		87		260		1142
Totals	161	1002	205	96	95	265	
	1163		301		360		1824

Table 2: Occurrence of the past-tense endings in quoted and non-quoted sentences of the *Secret History*

In Table 2 we also see that of the 87 non-quoted SH instances of *-lAA*, 79, or nearly 91%, involve the verb *bü-*, in alternants *bü-lee*, *bü-leey*, *bü-liyi* that may be covered by the writing *bü-lAA* 'was'; only eight contain what may loosely be called FULL VERBS. Hence, if we ignored all instances of *bü-lAA*, the ending *-lAA* would occur only 96 times in the SH, 92% of them in quoted sentences.

The high frequency of *bü-lAA* here reminds us that Mongolian texts of virtually all periods has two other verbs with a surprising affinity for one of the three past-tense endings. Table 3 shows the frequency of the three quasi-copular verbs *bü-* 'be', *a-* 'live, be', and *bol-* 'become, happen' with each of our endings. It is striking that alternants of *a-lAA*, *bü-JUU* and *bol-lAA* are so extremely rare in the SH, and one wonders whether theoretically possible forms such as **bü-be*, **bü-bi*, **bü-bey/*bü-bei* have ever actually occurred in Mongolian. Unless each of our three endings each had some extraordinary semantic affinity for one of the three stems listed, the forms *a-JUU*, *bü-lAA*,

and *bol-bA* (in their various alternants) may have become, in at least some uses, frozen idiomatic sequences to which the ending's usual restrictions of occurrence (presumably correlating with semantic features) did not apply. This warns us that in attempting to pinpoint the distinctive meanings of *-lAA* and *-JUU*, we should at least temporarily ignore these high frequency collocations.

	-bA	*-lAA*	*-JUU*	Total
a- 'live, be'	5	2	97	104
bü- 'be'	0	205	1	206
bol- 'become'	161	1	9	171
Total:	166	208	107	481

Table 3: Frequency of the three past-tense endings with quasi-copular verbs in the *Secret History*

Before going to go discuss semantics in more detail, one last statistical fact should be mentioned. If we focus just on quoted sentences, it turns out that about 72% of those containing *-bA* and *-lAA* show some involvement of the speaker or hearer in the action or state specified — involvement in roles that could be expressed as subject, or direct or indirect object. But for *-JUU* the ratio is only about 23%. If we further restrict our attention just to those instances (still within quoted sentences) that have first- or second-person subjects, actual or implied, we find that only about 12% of the *-JUU* instances have such subjects, but around 52% of those with the other two endings.

These two measures, taken together, seem to indicate that our three endings represent points on a stylistic range from casual/conversational to formal. A high rate of personal involvement indicates an attempt on the part of a speaker or writer at closer rapport with his audience, while a high quotability score is itself indicative of a more casual, conversational style. The ending *-lAA* is high in both personal involvement and quotability, *-bA* is high in the first of these but low in the second, while *-JUU* is low in both. Given the data of Table 1, we can hardly avoid thinking that writers of Middle Mongolian must have considered the *-lAA* ending too casual or colloquial for general use in formal documents.

* * *

There is, however, a far more important aspect to these three endings: a semantic one whereby *-bA* is neutral to an opposition between the more clearly contrasting *-lAA* and *-JUU*. In §4 of Street 2009b I described the temporal/aspectual meanings of the *-bA* ending in the SH as follows.

In 85% of its occurrences, *-bA* is a simple past tense, referring to some activity as a single action that took place at some point in the past. It is most common in straightforward narrative passages, such as those reproducing the back-and-forth of conversation, or relating a sequence of historical events. *'Eke öter bos' kee-bi. Höelün eke ügüle-rün 'Köü·d-i öter seriül-üdkün' kē-ed Höelün eke öter gü bos-bi. Temüjin-te·n köü·d öterle-n gü bosuad mori·d-iyan bari-ju, Temüjin niken mori unu-bA°. Höelün eke niken mori unu-bA°. .... Temülün-i Höelün eke ebür-tür-iyen deür-be; niken mori kötöl jasa-bA°; Börte Üjin-e mori duta-bA°.* '[Old Qoaqchin said] "Mother, get up quick!" Höelün said "Get the boys up fast!", and rose in haste. After the sons including Temüjin had also got up, [they] grabbed their horses and Temüjin mounted one; 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; [so] there was no horse [left] for Lady Börte' (2428–39).

When such a sentence with *-bA* is embedded in another that ends with any of the past-tense endings, it represents a event that was already completed in the past, and hence requires a translation with 'had' plus a past participle: *Ciŋgis Qahan-i qan bol-qa-bay kee-n Kereyi·d-ün Tooril Qantur Daqay Sügegey qoyar-i elci ilē-bey.* '[He] sent Daqay and Sügegey as envoys to Tooril Qan of the Kereyi·d with the message that [they] had made Chinggis Qaan [their] qan' (3501-02; lit. 'sent...saying that...').

In most other cases, the *-bA* is better translated into English by what in traditional grammar was called the perfect tense: a form of *have* plus a past participle. Here the ending either refers either to an action that took place in the recent past, or to the present-time result of such an action. Such perfective use of *-bA*, in the clearest instances, is marked by occurrence of *edöe* 'now' in the main clause. E.g., *'Bi ber edöe ötöl-bA°.'* '"I have grown old'" (5361; lit. 'As for myself, now I got old'). ...[contrast between 'now' and 'then'] can [also] be stated...by use of a different past tense ending in the prior sentence: *'Soqor elci-yen ilē-esü, aǰgi-ju yabuqan ilē-jüü. Edöe bi irge-ben quyi-ra ire-be.'* '"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'" (X341-43).

Both *-lAA* and *-jUU* apparently have a range of temporal/aspectual meanings similar to those of *-bA*. The contrast between them is one of speaker certainty, which will be described in the sections below. Briefly, one may say that except in the case of *bü-lAA* (see below), a speaker using *-lAA* claims to have personal, first-hand knowledge of the situation described in the clause, and in effect assumes responsibility for the accuracy of his statement. Use of *-JUU*, by contrast, shows that the speaker's knowledge of a situation is based

merely on information received from others or on circumstantial evidence. I would suggest that for these two endings we use the terms ATTESTIVE PAST and PRESUMPTIVE PAST. The third ending, *-bA*, is a SIMPLE or FACTUAL PAST, and — like English *went* or *was* — implies nothing about the speaker's certainty or source of information. In translations below, brackets will occasionally be used to enclose words that in English are intentional overtranslations of this dimension of speaker certainty; thus *ügüle-be* 'said', *ügüle-lee* '{certainly} said', '{I'm sure he} said', and *ügüle-jüü* '{apparently} said', 'said {I'm told}', or the like.

3. The ending *-lAA* in the *Secret History*. The first three subsections below discuss attestive uses of *-lAA* after a full verb; the last considers instances of *bü-lee* 'was' and its alternants.

3.1 The ending *-lAA* as attestive past tense. The following are typical instances of *-lAA* in quoted statements, in the use I suggest be termed attestive. It may be noted that the subjects (overt or implied) of such sentences may be of any person and number.

(a) *'Bi ber ene eye-tür oro-ldu-laa gü.'* '"I too did take part in this scheme"' (5153; tr. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:75).

(b) *'Nököce-sü kee-n ire-lee. Bi ende yeki-n bayi-qu?'* '"[I] came [along with you] to be your companion; how could I [now] stay here [and let you try to do that alone]?"' (2306–37).

(c) *'Nidöni Burqan ci ügüle-rün "Ba Tayud irgen baraun qar cin-u bol-su" kee-lüe.'* '"In the past, you, Burqan, said 'We, the Tang'ut people, shall be your right wing'"' (Z034; tr. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:197).

(d) *'Nayaa ügüle-lee.'* '"Nayaa spoke [to my father, as follows]"' (7472). There immediately follows a quoted sequence ending: *'"Jaura ceri·üd samawura-qu" kee-n idqa-lua.'* '"[He] dissuaded [us from going], saying "The soldiers on the way will be troublesome'"' (7474–75).

(e) *'Moŋqol-un ceri·üd Saari Keer-i büte-tele bawu-lua.'* '"The Mongol troops have set up camp so as to cover the [whole] Saari Steppe"' (7251–52; tr. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:116).

(f) *'Öcigen niken-te biljiur qodolid-uqsan-i, teyin gü buli-ju ab-ulaa.'* '"Once earlier, in just that way, [they] snatched away [from us] a lark [we] had shot"' (2092–93).

In examples (a-b) and (f) the speaker overtly states that he was involved in a specific event in the recent past; even if he turns out to be lying or exaggerating, he is at least claiming first-hand knowledge. Example (c), where the speaker states what the hearer did in the past, likewise implies first-hand knowledge, though of course, the hearer could immediately deny the truth

of the statement. In this case we know from lines Y083–88 that statement (c) was, in fact, true: *Basa Burqan Qan ügüle-rün '...ba Tayud irgen "Baraun qar cin-u bol-ju gücü ög-sü" kee-bey.'* 'Burqan Qan [spoke] saying [to Chinggis Qaan], "...Being awed [by your majesty] we, the Tangut people have said 'We shall become your right wing and serve you.'"' The two endings in example (d) are shown to be attestive by a speech of Nayaa's in lines 7462–66, with similar intent though different wording. Example (e) is a message sent to Tayang Qan by some Nayman patrolmen; lines 7247–49 have told us that they had just witnessed the situation.

In all these instances, *-lAA* has overtones of assertiveness that cannot easily be represented in translation. In (a) 'did take' rather than simply 'took' is probably close to the original intent, but in English such forcefulness is usually expressed either by features of stress and intonation or by a different vocabulary item. In (b) and (f), for example, a speaker of American English would place extra stress and higher pitch on *companion* and *lark*. For (c) and (d), we could use some verb stronger than just *say*:[9] 'In the past, Burqan, you promised to be our right wing'; '[He] dissuaded [us from going], insisting that...'.

Examples (a–f) come from the subset (shown in Table 2) of eighty-eight instances of *-lAA* in quoted sentences with verbs other than *bü-*. Three of those passages involve special problems; the residue contains twenty-two questions (for which see below), and sixty-three statements. All of the latter could well be attestive, though in only twenty-three of these can one definitely prove (from context or other SH passages) that the speaker did in fact have first-hand knowledge of the event described. Twenty-two other passages have first-person subjects (overt or implied), and three have second-person subjects, as *Qorci tere caq-tur ügüle-rün '...' kee-lee ci.* 'You, Qorchi, at that time said...' (8410–13). Including all such instances, it is fifty rather than merely twenty-three of the sixty-three statements that may be reasonably considered attestive. While there is no definitive proof, I believe all the other thirteen were attestive as well. In 7101-05, for example, Kögseü Sabraq quotes several sentences after the preliminary words *Inanca Bilge qan ügülelee* 'Inancha Bilge Qan spoke [as follows]'). We have no way of knowing

[9] The possibility of using a different verb in translating clauses with *-lAA* was suggested to me by Igor de Rachewiltz (personal communication, 10 February 2009). He wrote: "In some cases, e.g. in verba dicendi and declarandi, [the] 'corroborative' quality of [*-lAA*] helps, I think, also to fill lexical gaps in the old language. Preclassical Mongolian did not have verbs corresponding to our 'to exclaim' or 'to pledge' which are stronger than 'to say' and 'to declare'." He mentioned the *kemele(i)* of the Sarai poems (see Table 4 in §6 below), as '[she] said' = '[she] exclaimed', and also SH *kee-ldü-leey* (§116, 26a = line 3264) which "does obviously not mean simply 'said to each other'".

whether or not Kögseü was actually present to hear sentences such as these, but it is certainly possible. Similarly, one that seems implicitly attestive:

'Ger darua Adaŋgqa Uryaŋgqaday güün a-lua. Teün-ü-ey bu-y je.' '"{We know that} the Uryanqay man was constantly in [her] tent; [so this child of hers] is surely his"' (1262–63).

* * *

A further peculiarity of *-lAA* should be mentioned, since it supports the assumption that *-lAA* is used when a speaker claims to have personal, first-hand knowledge of the situation described. Whereas both *-JUU* and *-bA* are occasionally used (e.g. 1012–13) of events in the distant past — prior to the birth of the speaker or writer, say — this does not seem true of *-lAA*. The following seems to be the only instance where *-lAA* might be thought to be so used.

'Qutula qan-lu mede-n yabu-lua.' '"[At that time,] it was Qutula Qan who was ruling [the Mongols]"' (6357).

Here it could be argued that the speaker, Chinggis Qaan (born 1162), was probably too young to have met his great-uncle Qutula (who died sometime in the 1160s) or to remember his rule; but certainly he learned about this at a young age from his father Yisügey, who until his death, probably in 1170, apparently ruled the Mongols after Qutula.[10] It seems reasonable to assume that this childhood memory, though probably not constituting first-hand knowledge in the most rigorous sense, could be sufficient to trigger use of the *-lAA* form.

Lastly, it should be noted that *-lAA* occurs several times in interpolated sentences such as the following.[11]

'Caaday aqa-yi jöbšiye-esü – qahan ecige bidan-u Kita·d irgen-ü Altan qan-i dorqud talbi-lua – edöe bi Kitad irgen-tür morila-su.' '"If elder brother Caaday approves — our father the Qaan did leave [matters with] the Altan Qan of the Kitad unfinished — I will now move against the[se] Kitad people"' (Z197–99).

The ending *-JUU* also occurs in such interpolated sentences (e.g. 1350, 2265–66, 4400, 4356, 9425–26), but *-bA* does not. Whether this distributional gap is significant or accidental remains unclear.

[10] For the chronology see DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:304.

[11] Further examples occur in lines 2366, 4043–44, 6357, 9302-03, 9361–62, Z015–16, Z197–98.

3.2 Non-quoted sentences with *-lAA*. Table 2 shows that there are also eight instances of *-lAA* in non-quoted sentences. For these, since we don't know who wrote the *Secret History*, there is no evidence concerning the source or extent of the writer's personal knowledge of a specific event. But in no case was the pertinent event so far in the past that first-hand knowledge is impossible. Consider a lengthy sentence in lines 5283–87 which is not a quotation, and which is both preceeded and followed by sentences ending in *-bA*. The prior sentence says: 'Unable to engage in combat, Buyiruq Qan went off [*gödöl-be*], crossing the Altai [Mountains].' Then:

Soqoq usun-aca Buyiruq qan-i neke-jü Altay daba- -ul-un, Qum Šiŋgir- -un Ürüŋgü huruu hülde-jü yabu-quy-tur, Yedi Tubluq nere-tü noyan in-u, qaraul yabu-ju bidan-u qaraul-a hülde-gde-jü aula öede tutaa-qu bol-un olaŋ-niyan tasura-qda-ju, tende bari-qda-lua. 'They pursued Buyiruq Qan from Soqoq Usun and, forcing him to cross the Altai, they chased him along the Urünggü [River] downstream at Qum Šinggir. While this was going on, a chief called Yedi Tubluq, who was patrolling [for Buyiruq Qan], was pursued by our patrol. As he was about to flee up the mountain [side], his saddle-strap broke and he was captured on the spot' (tr. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:80).

The passage continues: '..they overtook him at Lake Kishil Bash, and there they finished him off [*muqudqa-bA°*].' The previous lengthy sentence here would also be expected to end in *-bA*, as is usual in sequential historical narration. But here the writer apparently lapsed unexpectedly into a more conversational style, as shown not only by the *-lAA* but also by the occurrence of *bidan-u* 'our [patrol]'. Such use of first-person pronouns in non-quoted sentences is found twenty-six times in the SH: *bidan-u* 'our' or *bidan-u-ay* 'ours' occur twenty-three times, *bidan-aca*, *bidan-i*, and *min-u* once each;[12] all seem inadvertent lapses from the usual, semi-formal narrative style of the author. Surely all eight instances of *-lAA* illustrate the same phenomenon, and need not be considered proof that the attestive hypothesis is incorrect or deficient.

3.3 Questions with *-lAA*. The SH contains, in all, forty-three questions with *-lAA*, all of them quoted sentences. Twenty-one of these contain *bü-lAA*, and will be discussed at the end of §3.4; the twenty-two that involve

[12] The phrase *qan ecige-yin min-u* 'of my father the Qan' appears in line Z145, and some have wanted to emend the pronoun to *in-u* 'his'; but see DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:897. The form *bidan-i* occurs outside of quoted speech in line 5394, *bidan-aca* in 4083, *bidan-u-ay* in 3329, 6099, 6100, 6115, 7232, *bidan-u* in 3151, 3240, 4025, 4085, 4171, 4185, 4338, 4347, 4468, 5204, 5236, 5285, 7228, 7229, 7327, 8048, Y071, Y507.

other verbs are included in the 88-member subset of quoted sentences shown in Table 2. Of these twenty-two, only two are actual requests for information, the rest rhetorical. The genuine questions are these:

(a) *'Yisügey quda, ken-tür jori-ju ayis-ulaa?'* '"Quda Yisügei, in whose direction are you going, coming this way?"' (1427; tr. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:14. Alternatively: 'Quda Yesügey, do tell me who you're travelling to visit as you pass this way'). The answer to this question ends in *ayis-ulua* (1430).

(b) *'...aman caqān qula-yin aman niriu in-u ququ ken qarbu-laa – aula deere-ce?'* '"Who, from the top of the mountain, shot an arrow so as to sever the neckbone of my tawny war horse with the white mouth?"' (4493–94; tr. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:69). The answer is *'Aula deere-ce bi qarbu-laa.'* '"It was I [who] shot from the top of the mountain."' (4495–96).

The use of *-lAA* here, and apparently in all questions with this ending after a full verb, tells the hearer that the speaker expects an answer also ending in *-lAA*: one based on the hearer's first-hand knowledge. Analogously, use of the factual past in a question such as *'Qada yau ög-bA°?'* '"What did Qada give [you]?"' (Y163), suggests a factual-past answer: eventually, in Y169, this is *'bi ese ab-ubA°.'* '"I didn't take [what he offered me]"'. And use of the presumptive past in the rhetorical question *'Edöe yau görü-re ire-jüü?'* '"What {do you suppose} he has come to spy out now?"' (5263; cf. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:79) presumably could have had an answer ending in *ire-jüü* 'he has {probably} come (to do so-and-so)'.[13]

Of the rhetorical questions in this subset, twelve are yes/no questions, eight (like the two above) what may conveniently be called *wh*-questions. The latter are the following.

(c) *'Erte üdür bida yau kee-ldü-leey?'* '"What did we agree upon in the old days?"' (4203-04; tr. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:59. Similar sequences in 5159–60, 5491 [see (k) below], 6219).

(d) *'Boorcu Muqali-ta·n ken-ece hüleü tusa ki-lee? Ken-ece hüleeü gücü ög-ülee? Soyurqal ög-de-güy-e bi yaun dutau tusa ese bol-ulaa; yaun dutau gücü ese ög-ülee bi.'* '"Have Bo'orču and Muqali been of greater assistance than others? Have they given better service than others? If you want to give rewards, surely I was not less useful, surely I did not give lesser service?"' (8281–84; tr. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:134, 767–68; despite the final question mark, he follows Mostaert in taking the two *yaun* sentences as statements rather than questions.) The second question is literally 'Than whom did [they] {to your knowledge} give better service?').

(e) *'Erte Altan Qucar qoyar ene metü üge bara-ldu-ju jici üge·s-tür-iyen ülü gür-gü-yin tula ker ki-gde-lüey? Yambar bol-qa-qda-luay?'* '"Formerly, Altan and Qučar had pledged their word like that, but because they failed to keep their word, how were they dealt with? What happened to them?"' (Y305-08; tr. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:187. Literally 'how were they caused to become'). The implication here is: 'You know very well how they were dealt with, and what happened to them'.

Most of the twelve rhetorical yes/no question are negative (as below); the sole exception is a rhetorical double-question, in which the occurrences of *-lAA* imply that these are the only two alternatives:

(f) *'Ta qoyar nama tebci-jü "Ile-üü gē-sü" kee-leey ta; "Juqa-ju-ū gē-sü" kee-leey ta?'* (6353–55). DE RACHEWILTZ (2004:101, 645) translates: '"When you rejected me, you two, did you say that you would leave me, [breaking with me] openly, or did you say that you would leave me after you had consulted [only] among yourselves?"'.

Negative questions are the following.

(g) *'"Eke-ben deü·ner-iyen eri-n od" ese-ū̄ kele-lüe bi?'* '"Didn't I tell [you] to go and find your mother and younger brothers?"' (2231; lit.'Didn't I say [to you] "Go find..."'). A similar passage in 3022; and with reciprocal *kee-ldü-leey* 3124, 6223, 6226; with *ügüle-lee* 3016–17, *ügüle-ldü-lüey* 6220–21.

(h) *'...nama-yi tende ese-ū̄ ayu-ul-ulaa?'* '"...You frightened me then, did you not?"' (8222; tr. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:132).

(i) *'/Büleen-ece /büled mün keeli-dece ese-ū̄ töre-leey ta?'* '"From the warm [womb, coming forth] /Suddenly, were you [two] / Not born from the same belly?"' (Y249–50; tr. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:184). Similarly *qar-ulaa ta* in Y251.

As is the case with real questions (a–b), hypothetical answers to all such rhetorical questions would presumably have ended with the same final verb found in the question, though some simpler response to yes/no questions may have been possible, such as the *je* which in some contexts can mean 'yes' (DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:420).

It is especially notable that most if not all of the above rhetorical questions occur in contexts where the speaker is somewhat annoyed or angry at the addressee or someone else, so that *-lAA* seems to add an implication of ill humor, annoyance, or anger. After example (c) the speaker executes the addressees (4209), while after the sentence in 5159–60 he spits in their faces.

[13] So with the non-past ending *-yu*: e.g., *'Ger kejie bu-yu?'* and its answer *'Ger ci oyira bu-yu.'* '"Where is the tent?"' and '"The tent is nearby of course, but..."' (2452–4).

In other cases the emotion seems more like suppressed annoyance (example [g]), or gives voice to rueful second thoughts about oneself:

(k) *'Tuqar bida yau kee-ldü-leey? Kele-ben ab-da-qu·n. Ken-ü ama idqa-qu·n?'* '"What[ever] were we talking about a short while ago? We should have our tongues taken out! Whose mouth can we [now] stop [from repeating it?]"' (5491–92; tr. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:87)

It seems probable that *-lAA* in questions, except between close friends (as in example [a]), had always a potentially peremptory interpretation, being in effect a demand that the hearer produce a true and explicit answer. Quite possibly intonation or tone of voice distinguished genuine questions like (a–b) from the more confrontational sort of rhetorical question.

3.4 Passages with *bü-lAA*. As shown in Table 2, the form *bü-lee*, together with its related feminine and plural shapes, occurs 205 times in the SH: for locations, see KURIBAYASHI 2001:662–63. The occurrences fall into three subsets. (i) In 93 instances such forms act alone as past-tense copula: 6 times with existential meaning, 87 with predicative. (ii) In 42 passages such a form is combined with a prior converb, *-JU* or *-(U)n* in equal numbers, and generally represents durative or habitual/frequentative meaning. (iii) In the remaining 70 instances such a verb occurs after a participial form: the *-Ay* imperfective participle (5 times), the past participle *-(U)QsAn* (twice), or nomen futuri *-QU* (61) or *-QUy* (2).[14]

Of these three subsets, (i) is the most aberrant, statistically, vis-à-vis the examples discussed in §3.1–2 involving *-lAA* after full verbs. Just under 38% of the *bü-lAA* forms of (i) are in quoted sentences, vs. nearly 92% of the full-verb plus *-lAA* forms; and subjects of this *bü-lAA* subset are about 8% first person, 3% second, and 89% third person, vs. 52%, 9%, and 39% for the non-*bü* forms. Further, while most instances of existential and predicative *bü-lAA* in quoted sentences might, in fact, be attestive, this is definitely not the case in the non-quoted instances discussed in the paragraph below, simply because the events involved took place in the distant past, prior to the birth of the speaker. And even in a few quoted passages attestive meaning is unlikely or impossible for the same reason. For example, when discussing the genealogy of a family of hereditary slaves (*bool*), Chinggis Qaan mentions at least two facts that date back to the time of his own great-great-great grandfather and the latter's son Tumbinay Sechen:[15]

[14] Twice an ablative case-ending intervenes, in *ilaq-da-qu-aca bü-lee* (X276) and *büle-ül-küy-ece bü-leey* (7370).

[15] For the genealogical facts here and below see DE RACHEWILTZ 2004, Table 1 (following p. 1347). But note that the genealogies presented in the SH differ considerably from those in Arabic sources; cf. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:283–84, 645–46, et passim.

'Tumbinay Caraqay Liŋqu qoyar-un Oqda bool-iar bila-ju ire-be je. Oqda bool-un köün Sübegey bool bü-lee. Sübegey bool-un köün Kököcü Kirsaan bü-lee. Kököcü Kirsaan-u köün Yegey Qoŋtaqar bü-lee. Yegey Qoŋtaqar-un köün Tooril ci.' '"Oqda Bool was brought as captive by Tumbinay and Charaqai Lingqu. Oqda Bool's son was Sübegey Bool; Sübegey Bool's son was Kököchu Kirsaan; Kököchu Kirsaan's son was Yegey Qongtaqar. [And] you, Tooril, [are] son of Yegey Qongtaqar"' (6383–87; cf. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:101).

The Sübegey Bool mentioned here must surely have lived and died before the speaker was born.

Near the beginning of the SH we find in straightforward, non-quoted narrative no less than twenty-six instances of predicative genealogical statements much like that in the last example, all involving people long dead; the writer could not possibly have had personal knowledge of such events. Here are two instances involving individuals who were respectively in the eighth and eleventh generation of Chinggis Qaan's ancestry:

Qabici Baatur-un köün Menen Tudun bü-lee. 'The son of Qabichi Baatur was Menen Tudun' (1268).

Duwa Soqor aqa in-u dörben köü-tü bü-lee. 'Duwa Soqor, his elder brother, had four sons' (1074; lit. 'was having').

It is significant that many such SH passages involve the pairing of two sentences, one ending in *-lAA*, the next in *-bA*: e.g., *Nacin Baatur-un köü·d Uruuday Maŋqutay nere-te·n bü-lee. Uruu·d Maŋqu·d oboq-ta·n te·de bol-bA°*. 'The sons of Način Ba'atur were named Uru'udai and Mangqutai; they took the clan names Uru'ut and Mangqut' (1283–84; tr. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:9). The *bü-lee* here cannot be attestive, and one wonders why there is a shift from *-lAA* to *-bA* here. The following longer passage (with obtrusive instances of non-attestive *-lAA* marked by an asterisk in translation) further illustrates the use of *bü-lAA* in passages of sequential narrative that might be expected to utilize only the *-bA* ending.

Tere dumda keeli-tey eme Bodoncar-tur ire-jü köüle-bi. 'Jad irgen-ü köün bü-lee' kee-n Jajiraday nereyid-bA°. Jadaran-u ebüge tere bol-bA°. Tere Jadara-day-in köün Tügüüdey nere-tü bü-lee; Tügüüdey-in köün Büri Bulciru bü-lee. Büri Bulciru-yin köün Qara Qadaan bü-lee. Qara Qadaan-u köün Jamuqa bü-lee. Jadaran oboq-ta·n, te·de bol-bA°. 'That woman who was half-way through pregnancy came to Bodonchar and bore a son. Saying 'He was the son of strangers', they named him Jajiraday. It was he who became ancestor of the Jadaran. The son of that Jadaraday (= man of the Jadaran) was* named Tügüüdey; his son was* Büri Bulchiru. The son of Büri Bulchiru son was* Qara Qadaan; [and] his son was* Jamuqa. It was [they] who took the clan name Jadaran' (1235–40).

Here we might well expect a *-bA* form of *bü-* rather than *bü-lee*, but apparently no such form occurs anywhere in Middle Mongolian: no **bü-be*, **bü-bi*, **bü-bey* (or **bö-be*, **bö-bi*, **bö-bey*).[16] Instead, it seems that alternants of *bü-lAA* have taken over the role of **bü-bA*, at least in existential and predicative usage, and that *-lAA* has thus lost its dependably attestive meaning.

* * *

Subsets (ii) and (iii) are less aberrant than (i) with respect to the quoted/non-quoted dichotomy: 74% of the instances in (ii) and 84% of those in (iii) are in quoted sentences. But both subsets are more similar to (i) than to the group with *-lAA* after a full verb when it comes to person: (ii) is 28% first-person, 13% second, and 59% third, while (iii) is 14%, 14%, and 71%. Closer examination of members of subsets (ii) and (iii) indicates the same loss of attestive meaning as in group (i). In both (ii) and (iii) at least two-thirds of the instances might be attestive in the strict sense, but a few in non-quoted passages could not. So, from (ii):

Tere Qabici Baatur-un eke-yin inje ire-g[se]n-i, Bodoncar tata-ju bü-lee. Niken köün töre-bA°. Jewüredey nere-tü bü-lee. Jewüredey urida jügeli-tü oro-n bü-lee. 'Bodončar [also] took as concubine a housemaid of Qabiči Ba'atur's mother, who had come as dowry. She had a son by him named Je'üredei. At first Je'üredei could take part in the *Jügeli* [sacrifice in which meat is hung on a pole and offered to Heaven]' (1257–59; tr. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:8.) Bodonchar was Chinggis Qaan's ancestor in the 10th generation.

And, from subset (iii), two passages referring to Chinggis Qaan's relatives 6–11 generations back:

Duwa Soqor maylay dumda qaqca nidü-tü, qurban neüri·d qajar-a qara-qu bü-lee. 'Duwa Soqor had a single eye in the middle of his forehead, and could see to [a distance of] three stages' (1033–34).
Qaci Külüg-ün köün Qaydu. Nomolun eke-dece töre-gsen bü-lee. Qacin-u köün Noyagiday nere-tey bü-lee. Noyamšig aburi-tu tula, Noyaki·n oboq-tan bol-bA°. 'Qachi Külüg's son [was] Qaydu; [he] was born of Mother Nomolun. The son of the Qachin was named Noyagiday. Because by nature he liked to act as a chief, [his descendants] became those with the clan [name] Noyakin' (1273–75; cf. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:9).

* * *

[16] No such form occurs in the SH, and none is listed in the indices verborum of other Middle Mongolian texts; nor do I recall ever having seen such a form in later varieties of Mongolian. Such a gap is indeed surprising.

On a separate matter, there are twenty-one questions with *bü-lee*, and all but one are rhetorical. The sole genuine question receives an answer with *-lAA* after a full verb:

'Bari-qda-asu, nama-yi eyimü-yi ülü-ü jia-qu bü-lee ci?' '"If you'd been caught would you really not have revealed I was in this condition?"' (4419–20). The lengthy answer (4420–30) ends with *...eyin sedki-jü od-ulua bi.* 'I went [out there] thinking like this'.

Most of the rhetorical questions contain a nomen futuri:

'Nökör bi cima-daca aygi-da e·de mori·d-iyan ab-qu-ü bü-lee? Qubiya-ldu-ya; kedüy-i ab-qu kee-mü?' '"Friend, would I have gotten these horses [back] without you? Let's share them; how many do you say you'll take?"' (2334–35).

Others include the following.

'Ci "Moŋqol-un hünir mawuy" kee-jü ese-ü bü-lee?' '"Didn't [you] use to say 'The Mongols smell bad'?"' (7442–43).
'Moŋqol-i cöeken ese-ü kee-n bü-leey?' '"Weren't [we] saying that the Mongols were few [in number]?"' (7248–49).
'Yeki-gse·d Qoŋqotan bü-lee tede?' '"What have they done, those Qongqotan?"' (X375–76).

4. The ending *-JUU* as presumptive past tense in the *Secret History*. In contrast to *-lAA*, use of *-JUU* shows that the speaker or writer's knowledge of a situation is based either on second-hand information acquired after the fact, or on circumstantial evidence. Sometimes there is a clear implication that such a statement may be less than fully reliable; occasionally it may imply some surprise on the part of someone involved in the situation. Translations such as 'they say', 'apparently', 'it seems that' or 'it turned out that' are often appropriate. By statistical measures, too, there are marked differences between these endings: unlike attestive *-lAA*, presumptive *-JUU* is much less common in quoted sentences than otherwise (100 vs. 260 instances), as shown in Table 2. Further, the quasi-copular *a-JUU* is less than half as common as *-JUU* after other verbs (95 vs. 265 instances) — whereas the reverse is true for *bü-lAA* vs. other forms with *-lAA*.

In general, it turns out that quoted and non-quoted sentences show no significant difference in their use of *-JUU*; hence these categories are not distinguished in the examples below. Examples of *a-JUU* will be listed separately, but only to show that the ending has the same meaning after *a-* as after other verbs.

Here are a few instances clearly involving second-hand information, received from a specific source or through cultural tradition. The first is particularly noteworthy.

'Köü·d min-u qa·d bol-juu kee-gde-müy bi.' '"I'm told that my sons have become Qans"' (3208-09, with indirect discourse). Note here the rather rare occurrence of *-JUU* after *bol-* (see Table 3).[17]

Oŋgiŋ ciŋsaŋ 'Megüjin Seültü-yi ala-juuy' kee-n mede-ed maši bayas-cu, Ciŋgis qahan-a jaud quri nere ög-be. 'Ongging Chingsang was very glad when he learned that Megüjin Seültü had been killed, and gave Chinggis Qaan the title *Jaud Quri*' (4152-54; very lit. 'being much pleased after knowing saying "{It's said that} [they] have killed Megüjin Seültü"').

Similarly X184-85.

'Moŋqol maši gücü-tey-e ire-jü bidan-u...ceri·üd-i daru-ju bürel-tele kidu-juuy. Itegel-tü Cabciyal-i ber buli-ju ab-cuuy.' '"{Apparently} the Mongols came in great strength and killed and utterly destroyed our...troops. {It seems} they have even taken Chabchiyal Pass that we were relying on"' (Y044-48). The sentences are addressed to the Altan Qan by his Right Chancellor Ongging (DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:896), who must have been relying on reports from the field.

'– bidan-i tus qan-iyan qarda-ju ire-jüüy kee-n –' '"saying that we've come [here after] {apparently} laying hands on our rightful qan"' (5056-57; an interpolated clause).

...tende Höelün Üjin keeli-tey bü-rün, Onan-u Deliün Boldaq-a bü-küy-tür, jöb tende Ciŋgis qahan töre-jüüy; töre-küy-tür baraun qar-tur-iyan, šia-yin tedüy nödün hadqu-n töre-jüüy. 'At that time Lady Hö'elün was pregnant, and as she was [staying] at Deli'ün Boldaq by the Onan, it was{, they say,} right there that Činggis Qa'an was born. At the time of his birth he was born clutching in his right hand a clot of blood the size of a knucklebone' (1405-08; tr. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:13, with bracketed addition. Here one instance of {*they say*} might be acceptable in English translation, but two would seem excessive.)

The next four examples show use of circumstantial evidence:

'Temüjin anda min-u urida-ca, Nayman-tur elci-tü bü-lee. Edöe ese ire-bey. .... Nayman-tur od-cuuy je. Oro-qu bol-un qocor-bA°.' '"My sworn friend Temüjin for a long time has been sending envoys to the Nayman. Now he hasn't come [to join us]. .... Surely he must have gone over to the Nayman. He stayed behind intending to submit to them"' (5305-09). Note that here what was a somewhat tentative conclusion in the third sentence becomes a simple fact in the fourth. (The omission here involves two lines of poetry.)

[17] The other SH instances of *bol-juu* and *bol-juuy* occur in 4358, 4411, 6211, 6237, 8158, X337, Z175, Z579.

Tedüy a-tala, Tayiciu·d-un Tarqutay Kiriltuq turqa·ud-iyan udurid-cu '/Qoluqa·d qooji-juu; /šilüge·d šiberi-jüü' kee-n ire-jüüy. 'Soon after this, Tarqutai Kiriltuq of the Tayiči'ut came at the head of his bodyguard and said /"The [little] rascals have shed their down, /The snotty ones have grown up!"' (2134-35; tr. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:22, 372). The youngsters referred to are Temüjin and his siblings, whom Tarqutay had met a few years earlier. The implication in both poetic lines is 'by now they must have grown up', and that therefore Temüjin has become a threat.

'Erte üdür kē-esü Qurcaqus Buyiruq qan ecige-yü-en qoyina "Döcin köü·d-ün aqa" kee-jü qan bol-juu je ci.' '"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"' (6235-37).

Here, as often, any uncertainty implied by *-JUU* really pertains to a prior converb or other modifier rather than to the main verb. So 4128:

'Köün min-u jöb kelele-jü ilē-jüü.' '"The word my son has sent must be right"' (4127-28; cf. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:56. Lit. 'My son has {apparently} sent speaking correctly').

The following probably implies some surprise on the part of a participant.

Üdür geyi-n bara-asu šitü-ldü-jü qono-qsa·d ceri·üd söni bö-ed budara-juuy; güreele-gse·d irgen 'Küŋke-n ülü cida-qu·n' kee-n güreele-gse·d qajar-aca ese gödöl-jüüy. 'When it had grown light, it turned out that the [enemy] troops who were bivouacking right next to us had dispersed during the night; [only] the people who had set up the circular camp had not moved from the place where they had encamped because they would not have been able to get away' (4450-53; tr. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:67, with 'turned out' included).

Note that the certainty particle *je* is not prohibited from occurrence after *-JUU*:

'Ene ba köü·d-ün aqa-yi ayala-ul-qu yosun, Caaday aqa-aca bol-juu je.' '"This custom of having the oldest of one's sons go on a campaign certainly seems to have originated from elder brother Chaaday"' (Z173-75).

4.1 Similar uses of *a-JUU*. Unlike *bü-lAA*, where the ending lacks the meaning it has after other verbs (§3.4), *-JUU* maintains its presumptive meaning after *a-* 'live, be', as shown in the following passages. The first two involve second-hand information, the others circumstantial evidence.

'Moŋqol-un aqta·s turuqa·d a-juuy.' '"We are told that the geldings of the Mongols are lean..."' (7264-65; tr. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:116). Here the

speaker has just received a message from patrolmen who reported this fact, and who had seen at least one of the geldings (line 7231).

Deere teŋgeri-ece jayaa-tu, töre-gsen börte cinō a-juu. Gergey in-u qoay maral a-jiay. '[Once, long ago,] there was a blue-grey wolf, born with a destiny from Heaven above. His wife was a fallow doe' (1012–13). These initial sentences of the *Secret History* must have been passed down from one generation to another for a very long time.

'Sayin güün-ü köün a-juu je. Hujaur sayi-tu güün-ü uruq bu-yu je.' '"He must be the son of a man of rank; surely he is the offspring of a man of noble origins!"' (4175–76; tr. de Rachewiltz 2004:58. Lit. 'he must surely have been son of a good man...'). This conclusion is based on the fact that the little boy involved had "a golden loop as [nose]-ring, and wore a gold-stitched silken waistcoat lined with sable" (4171–73).

'Nökör ci bü-rün maši muŋtani-ju ayis-u[n] a-juu.' '"Friend, you've come here in great trouble, it seems"' (2297–98). This is the speaker's conclusion based on a brief conversation with the hearer.

Nayaa-yin üge·s adali bol-da-ju, jöbšiye-jü 'Ünen üge-tü a-juu' kee-n, 'Yeke üyile tüši-sü' kee-n soyurqa-bA°. '[Matters] turned out to be as Nayaa had said, [so Chinggis Qaan] approved [of him]; saying "He was apparently telling the truth", he showed favor to him [too], saying "I shall entrust him with an important task"' (7489–91; cf. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:124, 728).

'Jöb ele eyimü arqa-tu-yin tula...Tayiciu·d aqa deü-de-en teyin ele nayta-qda-n a-juu.' '"It is just because you are so clever...that your Tayiči'ut kinsmen are so jealous"' (2188–90; tr. de Rachewiltz 2004:24. Or: 'It must be just because you are so clever...that you are so [greatly] envied by your Tayyichiud kinsmen.' (Two poetic lines are here omitted.)

– dürbe-rün geü·d-iyen ülü saa-n talbi-qsa·d a-juu – '[Someone], as [they] fled, had {apparently} let the mares loose without milking them' (4399–440). This is a sentence interpolated into a longer one ending in *ire-be.*

'Ene cerig nama-yi jasa kee-müy. Oŋ Qan düled na-daca cinaru a-juu.' '"[Ong Qan] tells me to set these troops in battle array; [so] apparently he feels less capable than me"' (6048–49; cf. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:90, 621, whose translation combines these two sentences into one, and uses 'means that' for the *-JUU*).

Sometimes the ending implies an element of surprise:

Bayi-ju qono-ju üdür geyi-ül-ün bügüd-ge-esü, Öködey Boroqul Boorcu qurban ügey a-juu. '[They] spent the night standing [in battle order]. At daybreak, when they held a roll-call, {it turned out that} Ögödei, Boroqul and Bo'orču were not there' (6111–12; tr. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:92, with bracketed addition).

Üdür gegeen bol-qa-ju, üje-esü qoyina-ca niken güün ayis-u; gür-cü ire-esü Boorcu a-juu. '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' (6118–19).

Qaliudar-un morin qurdun a-juu. 'Qaliudar's horse turned out to be fast[er]' (6488).

When used by a speaker of himself, *-JUU* can sometimes indicate that the statement is meant metaphorically:

'Degel-tü dörö-gsen köün bi a-juu je; nicügün dörö-gsen köün ci a-juu je.' '"I was indeed {like} a son born clothed; and you {like} a son born naked"' (6398–99). This means (DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:103) 'I am the adopted son and you the natural son (of Ong Qan)'.

Similarly in the following instance, where *kē-jüü* — which stands out because it is between sentences ending in *-bA* — may mean either 'said something like' or 'must have said':

Dobun Mergen ügüle-rün 'Nökör širolqa-da' kē-jüü. 'Ög-sü' kee-jü...miqa gübcin-i, Dobun Mergen-e ög-bA°. 'Dobun Mergen said, "Friend, [share] the roast"; [the man] said "I will", and...gave all of the meat to Dobun Mergen' (1086–88; cf. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:3, 256)

See also the next-to-last example in §4.2, where 'as it were' seems appropriate in translation.

4.2 Questions with *-JUU*. There are ten questions formed with this ending, all quoted sentences, and all, it happens, rhetorical in nature. Of these, seven contain *a-JUU*, three have other verbs. Five of the seven, and one of the three, are yes/no questions, the others are *wh*-questions containing an interrogative word. In some cases the presumptive ending seems to have a probabilistic meaning: not just 'Who did it? (as with the *-bA* ending), or 'Who {are you sure} did it?' (as with *-lAA*), but something like 'who is likely to have done it?', or 'who would/might have done it?'.

Consider first the *wh*-questions:

'Moŋqol-un olon qaa-ca ire-jüüy?' '"Where would this vast number of Mongols come from?"' (7278; tr. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:117; 'have come from' is more literal.)

'Mün gü dayisu sedki-jü oorcaq bol-ju yabu-juu. Edöe yau görü-re ire-jüü?' '"All the same, he has been living as an outcast, with hostile intentions; what might he have come to spy upon now?"' (5262–63; cf. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:79, 579).

'...öljey-tü qutuq-tu ci, tusa iheyel cin-u, kedü·n ber a-juu je?' '"You fortu-

nate and blessed [man]..., how many times have you helped and protected me?"' (8334–35; tr. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:136). Or: 'how many times might it be that you have...?'.

* * *

In one passage, after Chinggis Qaan is seriously wounded at a vein on his neck, Jelme for a long time sucks the wound to prevent clotting and remove any poison that might have been introduced by the arrow (DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:528); when Chinggis comes to, he sees the resultant pool of blood and asks:

'Ene yaun bol-umu? Qolo asqa-asu yambar a-juu?' '"What is this? Couldn't you have spat farther away?"' (4411–12; tr. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:66). More literally, 'How would it have been if [you'd] spat [the blood] far[ther away]?'.

Five of the yes/no questions involve *-JUU* in the apodosis of a conditional sentence, after an 'if' clause formed with the conditional converb *-(U)AsU*.

'Bida ene an-u yeke üge-tür šiqa-n morila-ju od-cu an-u qor ab-uasu berke-tü-ǖ a-juu?' '"If [now], grasping the chance their boasts [afford us], we set out on a campaign and removed their quivers, would [this] be [so] difficult?"' (7163–65; tr. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:113). More literally: 'If we...took their quivers, would [that turn out to] have been so difficult?'.

'Edöe Nayaa-daca busu·d ceri·üd-tür ucira-asu samawu-tur tü[yi]d-küy-tür oro-quy-ǖ a-juu?' '"Now, had we met with other troops but Naya'a's, no doubt we would have been intercepted and would have got into difficulties"' (7475–77; tr. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:123–24). More literally: 'Now, if we had met with soldiers other than [those of] Nayaa, would[n't it] have been likely that [we] would be intercepted and get into difficulties'. (Here, as often, a *not* is needed in translation to imply expectation of an affirmative answer.)

'Ögödey-in urug-i...töre-esü min-u uruq-tur niken-üü sayin ülü töre-gü a-juu?' '"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?"' (Y334–37; tr. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:188, with omission of four poetic lines). I would prefer a somewhat more optimistic interpretation: '[Even] if [most] descendants of [me], Ögödey, are born [so worthless that]..., mightn't there be born [at least] one [who is] good?'; lit. 'mightn't there {turn out to} have been born among my descendants [at least] one [who is] good?'

In one passage we find two instances of *-JUU* indicating metaphorical use; in the following 'as it were' could be twice substituted for de Rachewiltz's seemingly otiose '[also]':

'Qoyar kilgü-tey tergen nököe kilgü-ben ququra-asu hüker in-u jigdü-n yada-yu. Tere metü nököe kilgün cin-u bi ese-ǖ a-juu? Qoyar gürdü-tey tergen nököe gürdü-ben ququra-asu newü-n yada-yu. Tere metü nököe gürdün cin-u bi ese-ǖ a-juu?' '"If a two-shaft cart breaks its second shaft, the ox cannot pull it. Like that, was I not [also] your other shaft? If a two-wheeled cart breaks its second wheel, it cannot move. Like that, was I not [also] your other wheel?"' (6230–35; tr. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:97).

Finally, the one last yes/no question, in an extremely sarcastic sentence referring to Tayang Qan, who suddenly advocates retreat in the face of a seemingly massive Mongol army:

'.../eme Tayaŋg jirüge yada-run /ese-ǖ ede üge·s ügüle-jü ilē-jüüy.' '"[That] woman Tayang...has probably sent us this message [as a result of] losing courage, hasn't he?"' (7281–82).[18]

Here the uncertainty marked by *-JUU*, as mentioned earlier, applies to a prior converb rather than to the main verb.

5. Switching between past-tense endings in the *Secret History*. Perhaps the most persuasive evidence for the semantic differences between the past-tense endings comes from passages in which a speaker shifts from one to another in successive sentences. Several such passages are presented below, with translations which, though often exaggerating the meanings of *-lAA* and *-JUU* somewhat, may clarify the reason for specific shifts between endings. The pertinent endings are underlined.

It will be noted that many of these passages end with a full verb plus *-bA*, in a usage that came to my attention only after completion of STREET 2009b. Such a sequence, it turns out, often has the effect of marking the end of an episode in the text: a chapter- or paragraph-like section of text, or something even shorter, such as a quoted passage several sentences in length. When Chinese editors prepared the SH text for publication around 1400, for example, they divided it into 282 sections, each of which was followed by a free, summary-translation in Chinese. Of these 282 sections, two-thirds (195) end with verb plus *-bA*.[19] We will encounter more instances of this

[18] The *ese-ǖ* here, since not immediately before the main verb, adds emphasis to the following element. (See STREET 2009a.67; but on p. 70 there one sentence needs correction, and my translation of the present passage must be altered in light of clearer understanding of the uses of *-JUU*.)

[19] Another 29 end in *-JUU*, 16 in *bü-lee* and 4 in *-lAA* after a full verb; 3 end in *buy*. 19

CONCLUSIVE *-bA* in §6.2 below, for it is virtually required in the colophon of a letter, edict, or inscription written in the 'Phags-pa or Mongol script, and in some occurrences seems to mark at the end of a shorter, paragraph-like episode.

Here are some of the clearest instances of switching between our three endings.

(1) In SH §93, Boorchu returns home after having precipitously left several days earlier without telling his parents that he was going. His father, distraught at the apparent loss of his son, starts alternately to wail and to scold when he suddenly sees his son appear out of nowhere. Boorchu says:
'Yaun bol-bA°? Sayin nökör muŋtani-ju ayis-un a-juu; nököce-jü od-ulaa bi. Edöe ire-bA°.' '"What happened? A good friend came along this way, {apparently} in trouble. [So] what I did was to go along with him as his companion. [And] now I'm back"' (2349–50).

Here we have fact, presumption, personal attestation, concluding fact — where by *fact* I mean simple past-tense statement of what is presented as historical fact.

(2) In §155, Chinggis Qaan takes a new wife, Yisügen, who speaks as follows, with presumption, attestation, and concluding fact.
Taala-qda-run Yisügen qadun ügüle-rün 'Qahan soyurqa-asu nama-yi güün-e bodo-da bol-qa-ju asara-mu. Na-daca egeci Yisüy nere-tey na-daca deere qan güün-e joki-quy a-jiaŋ je. Sayi güregen güregele-n bü-ligi. Edöe maqa ene bodulqan-tur qaaqši yorci-bi' kee-bi. 'Being loved by him, Yisügen Qatun spoke, saying "If it pleases the Qaan, he will take care of me, regarding me as a human being and a person [worth keeping]. [But] my elder sister, named Yisüy, has [always] been {considered} superior to me, [and] indeed [more] suitable for a ruler. {I know that} recently a bridegroom [for her] was taken [into our family] as son-in-law. One wonders where she has gone in [all] this confusion" (5225–29; cf. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:78, with bracketed additions).

(3) In §85 young Temüjin, having just escaped from the Tayichiud, returns to Sorqan Shira and his sons, who had helped him escape. Then we find the passage here, with attestation, fact, and presumption, followed by a factual present tense and conclusive *-bA*:
Sorqan Šira, 'Eke-ben deü·ner-iyen eri-n od' ese-ū kele-lüe bi? Yeki-n ire-bA° ci?', kee-bA°. Cimbay Cilawun qoyar köü·d in-u ügüle-rün, 'Šibawu-qan-i turumtay buta-tur qorqo-basu buta abura-juuy. Edöe bidan-tur ire–

section breaks occur after a converb, and so split a sentence in two; 11 of the terminal sentences are verbless, and there are 6 miscellaneous leftovers.

gsen-i, yeki-n teyin kee-mü ci?' kee-n, ecige-yü-en üge ülü taala-n, buqau in-u cucal-ju,...Qadaan nere-tey döyi-ben...asara-ul-bA°. 'Sorqan Shira spoke {angrily}: "Didn't I tell you to go find your mother and brothers? Why did you come [back here]?". [But] his sons, Chimbay and Chilawun, said: "{They say that} when the sparrow-hawk made the little bird take shelter in a bush, the bush saved him. How can you speak this way [to someone who] has now come to us [for help]?" Displeased at their father's words, they smashed open [Temüjin's] cangue, ...and entrusted him to the care of their younger sister named Qadaan' (2231–38; cf. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:25, 380). For the implication of annoyance in *kele-lüe* see the end of §3.3 above.

(4) In a passage from §252 we have attestation, presumption, and concluding fact.
Šigi Qutuqu ügüle-rün 'Alta-tay har-tay aurasu abcira-ju ög-ülüe. Bi ügüle-rün 'Urida ene Juŋdu altan qan-u-ay a-juu je; edöe Ciŋgis qaan-u-ay bol-bA° je. ...kee-be. 'Shigi Qutuqu spoke, saying: "He {indeed} brought and gave us gold-[embroidered] and patterned satins. [But] I said [to him], 'This [city of] Jungdu {apparently} belonged to the Altan Qan before; [but] now it has certainly become [the property] of Chinggis Qaan'"' (Y164–70; cf. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:180).

(5) From §177: fact, presumption, concluding fact.
'"Tüŋge Qorqan-u dorona bawu-baŋ. Ebesün ber in-u sayin bol-juuŋ. Aqta·s man-u üyele-baŋ" qan ecige-de min-u ügüle.' '"Tell this to my father the Qan: 'We have pitched camp east of Tüngge Stream. The grass here seems good: [for] our geldings have gained strength'"' (6210–12).

(6) Similarly, from §201, where there is a longer sequence of *-bA* forms:
'.../urtu sedkil-tü anda-yi-yan /ünen ciray üje-n yada-ju yabu-bA° je bi. Edöe qan anda min-u soyurqa-ju nama-yi nököce-ye kee-jüüŋ. Nököce-küy caq-tur ese nököce-ldü-bA° bi. Edöe anda /tögörigey ulus-i tübšidke-baŋ. /Qari tutum-i qamtud-qa-bA° ci. /Qan oro cima-dur jori-bA°.' '"...And so I have been living /Unable to see the true face /Of my sworn friend with a long memory. Now my sworn friend the Qan seems to show favour to me and says "Let us be companions!" But when it was the time for being companions, I was not one. Now, sworn friend, /You have pacified all [our] people, /You have unified all other peoples, /And the *qan*'s throne has been assigned to you"' (8178–83; cf. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:130). The two overtly plural endings here are respect forms.

(7) One of the faults admitted by Ögödey Qaan in §281 relates to fencing in the animals of his hunting grounds:
'...qaramla-ju, qurua yourqa nödü-ül-jü jedgü-jü a-qu bol-un, aqa deü-

dece cimaliqay üge sonos-bA° bi. Buruu gü bol-bA°. Qahan ecige-yü-en qoyina dörben üyile·s neme-be je bi. Dörben üyile·s buruu bol-juuy je' kee-be. 'Being greedy..., I had fences and wall of [pounded] earth built [to prevent the animals from straying], and as I was starting to confine [the wild animals], I heard resentful words [coming] from my brothers. [That] too was a fault. After my father the Qaan, I indeed added four [good] deeds [to his]; [but these] four deeds [of mine] have surely been {seen as} faults' (Z575-79; cf. DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:218, 1037-38).

* * *

There are, of course, fairly long passages where all past tenses are marked by the same ending: *-bA* in §§99-101 (2431-2475; see §2 above), for example, and *-JUU* in §184 (6480-98; DE RACHEWILTZ 2004:105-06).[20] The former has twenty-three instances of alternants of *-bA* in sequential narrative; the latter seven occurrences of *-JUU* (presumably of events not witnessed by the writer) before shifting to *-bA* for events that took place in the presence of Chinggis Qaan and presumably seemed to the writer somewhat more factual.

It should also be noted that a switch between *-JUU* and *-bA* may perhaps sometimes occur simply for stylistic variation. In the following, for example, the terminal *-bA*, if not conclusive, may have been introduced just to avoid a sequence of short sentences ending in *-JUU*:

Deere tenggeri- -ece jayaa-tu, töre-gsen börte cinō a-juu. Gergey in-u qoay maral a-jiay. Tenggis ketül-jü ire-bA°. Onan müren-ü teriün-e Burqan Qaldun-a nuntuqla-ju, töre-gsen Bataciqan a-juu. '[Once, long ago,] there was a blue-grey wolf that was born with a destiny from Heaven Above. His wife was a fallow doe. [They] came across Lake Tenggis. [They] settled at [Mount] Burqan Qaldun at the head of the Onan [River], and born [to them] was [a son named] Batichiqan' (1012-15).

6. The three endings in other early Middle Mongolian texts.

6.1 The *-lAA* ending. Given what we now know about the use of *-lAA* in the *Secret History*, the twenty-nine instances of that ending in other early Middle Mongolian texts offer no surprises. As shown in Table 4, twenty-one of these (fifteen in Script documents) involve *bü-lAA*, only eight (seven in

[20] Lengthy series of sentences with attestive *-lAA* (with a full verb) are less probable, since they would be likely only in extended quotation; the SH seems to contain no more than four in sequence (lines 8282-84).

the Script) have verbs other than the copula. At least two of the eight involve first-person subjects, the others reflect events or situations with which the speaker had, or could well have had, first-hand experience. The pertinent passages are the following.

Documents	*-bA*	*-lAA*		*-JUU*		Total
		bü-lee etc.	other	*a-juu* etc.	other	
Hua-i-i-yü (HY)	24	6	1	5	5	41
'Phags-pa documents (Phags)	35			9	2	46
Script texts in IVLMMT 1-2:						
1. Stele of Yisüngge (SY)			1			1
5. Sino-Mongolian Inscription 1346	1	1		5	6	13
6. Bodhicaryāvatāra of 1312 (BCA)	6	1		2		9
7. Sino-Mongolian Inscription 1335	7	1	1	23	25	57
8. Sino-Mongolian Inscription 1338	2	3		21	8	34
9. Sino-Mongolian Inscription 1340	12	1				13
11. Monuments from Tun-huang	1					1
13. Sino-Mongolian Inscription 1362	18			22	5	45
14. Hsiao-ching (HC)	2		1	6	39	48
16. Contract from Qara Qoto	3					3
17. Buddhist fragments	3				1	4
19. Alexander Romance	44	4		10	2	60
20. Documents from Turkestan (DT)	35	2		2	2	41
21. Documents of the Ilkhans (DIlk)	14	2	1		1	18
22. Fragments at Musée de Téhéran	5			1		6
24. Docs. from Syria and Anatolia	6			1		7
25. Poetry from Sarai (PSar)	9		3		2	14
Subtotal in Mongol Script texts:	168	15	7	93	91	
			22		184	374
Total in all the above:	227	21	8	107	98	461
			29		205	

TABLE 4: Occurrences of the past-tense endings in texts other than the *Secret History* [a]
(Numbers at the left refer to the order of texts as shown by roman-numerals in LIGETI's IVLMMT vols. 1-2)

[a] In the table, (a) zeros are omitted (in the blank boxes) to reduce visual clutter. (b) The name in the left column is not always exactly that used by Ligeti. (c) The texts in MLMC 2 are sometimes numbered differently than in the corresponding Index volumes; e.g. the Hsiao-ching is number XIII in the former, XIV in the latter. Detailed discussion of the documents listed in the Table may be most conveniently found in the following sources.

Hua-i i-yü: for the Chinese transcription and romanized Mongolian text, see KURIBAYA-

Nacin noyan ügüle-rün, 'Bi urida ima-yi kümün bol-umu je keme-n sedki-lege. Sedki-gse-ber minu bol-ba' keme-gsen a-juγu. 'When Način Noyan spoke, he said: "Formerly I thought that he would become a man and it happened as I had thought"' (SMI 1335.42; tr. CLEAVES 1950:102, with *had* added). For the *sedki-lege* one might prefer 'was convinced' to emphasize the attestive statement prior to the factual one.

Qariγu inu ber Kökodei küregen, Bisqarun, Tümen γurban-iyar, jrlγ ile-legei. 'In response [to your letter] [we] have sent [this] our word by son-in-law Kökedey, Bisqarun, and Tümen' (DIlk 4.4-6, LIGETI MLMC 2.250, MOSTAERT/CLEAVES 1952:470-71).

Nidöni hon-naca ebecin nemenggü bol-ju, yabu-n yada-qu šiltān-iyan öcigen ber deere öci-ül-jü ilē-lüe. '[Shiremün's] illness has worsened since last year, [so] recently [I] did send to the Emperor my explanation [as to why he] will be unable to travel to [an audience]' (HY 3:07b4-08a2; see KURIBAYASHI 2003:98). HAENISCH 1952.15 translates with first-person subject, MOSTAERT/DE RACHEWILTZ 1977:10, 26 with third-person subject.

...Yisüngge ontudu-run γurban jaγu·d γucin tabun alda·s-tur ontuda-laγa. '... Yisünge, at a long-distance shooting [contest], {actually} shot an arrow to [a distance of] 315 aldas' (SY; cf. DE RACHEWILTZ 1976:487-88). The subject here, in theory, could be taken as first-person: '[I] Yisüngge...' (de Rachewiltz, personal communication of 9/21/2008).

SHI 2003. Translation and commentary in MOSTAERT/DE RACHEWILTZ 1977, 1995, and HAENISCH 1952.

'Phags-pa documents: POPPE 1957, and see LIGETI MLMC 3.7-127, IVLMMT 3.5-112.

#1. This is the stele usually referred to, misleadingly, as the Stone of Chinggis Qaan: see de Rachewiltz 1976.

#5. SMI 1346: CLEAVES 1952.

#6. The *Bodistw-a Cari-a Awatar-un Tayilbur* of 1321: CLEAVES 1954.

##7-9. SMIs of 1335, 1338, 1340: Cleaves 1950, 1951, 1965 respectively.

#11. Monuments from Tun-huang: see Ligeti MLMC 2.33-35, IVLMMT 2.13-15.

#13. SMI 1362: CLEAVES 1949.

#14. Hsiao-ching: DE RACHEWILTZ 1982.

#16. Contract of Qara Qoto: CLEAVES 1955.

#17. Buddhist fragments: see LIGETI MLMC 2.135-183 (and sources there cited), IVLMMT 2.160-220.

#19. The Alexander Romance: CLEAVES 1959.

#20. Documents from Turkestan: see LIGETI MLMC 2.208-237, IVLMMT 2.264-301.

#21. Documents of the Ilkhans: for LIGETI's items 2 and 5 see MOSTAERT/CLEAVES 1962; for the others, MOSTAERT/CLEAVES 1952.

#22. Documents in the Musée de Téhéran: CLEAVES 1953.

#24. Documents from Syria and Anatolia: see LIGETI MLMC 2.268-274 (and sources there cited), IVLMMT 2.350-362.

#25. Poetry from Sarai: see LIGETI MLMC 2.279-283 (and sources there cited), IVLMMT 2.363-372.

The remaining full-verb passages with *-lAA* may be found in HC 29a2 (*sonos-ta-luγa*; DE RACHEWILTZ 1982:37, 49), PSar 23b4, 22a5, 22a1 (twice *keme-le*, once *keme-lei*, the feminine alternant; MLMC 2.282-3).

The twenty-one instances of *bü-lAA* likewise show the same patterns as in the SH. That form has existential meaning in four cases, predicative in three; and occurs five times after a nomen futuri, six times after a *-JU* converb, and twice after one ending in *-N*. (One instance involves a lacuna.) The only slight oddity is the lack of even one occurrence in 'Phags-pa texts. In most cases the *-lAA* might be attestive, but not in all. E.g., a sentence in HY 3.03b3-04a (MOSTAERT/DE RACHEWILTZ 1977:9, 25) relating to the Mongol people who had been "allotted to Chaaday by order of Chinggis Qaan" concludes:

...uridu·s-tur man-u tüši-jü mede-ül-jü bü-lee. '...[he] entrusted [them] to our ancestors and allowed [the latter] to rule [them]'.

Since these events predated the death of Chaaday in 1242, they could not have been witnessed by Namun, who wrote this letter of 1388.

One attestive instance may also be cited here, since it includes the extremely rare feminine alternant of *-lAA*:

Sayin ecige man-u – Mišiqa-in nom ünen-ü tula – sayin emege-yi ba silam-tai kü bü-leyi keme-n... 'Saying that our good father — because the religion of the Messiah is true — and even our good grandmother was a Christian...' (DIlk 3.10; cf. MOSTAERT/CLEAVES 1952:450-51; LIGETI MLMC 2.248).

6.2 The *-bA* and *-JUU* endings. Usage of these two endings in the Hua-i i-yü and 'Phags-pa documents seems virtually identical to that in the *Secret History*: *-JUU* is regularly used in circumstances where presumptive meaning seems appropriate, while *-bA* is a simple, factual past tense. For example:

...tenggiri Ta Iuen mongqol qahan-ni songqu-ju,...mongqol ba kita·d ilqal ügei neyi-de a-bai. 'Heaven chose the Mongol Ta Yüan emperor...and [after he united the northern and southern states] Mongols and Chinese lived together without distinction' (HY 2:03a4-3b4; KURIBAYASHI 2003:66, MOSTAERT/DE RACHEWILTZ 1977:1, 1995:17).

But then:

...tende-ce tenggiri Ta Iuen mongqol qahan-nu jayān-i yeüd-ke-jü, man-i Ta Ming-i qamug-i mede-ül-ün jayaa-juu je. 'Thereafter Heaven {apparently} altered the destiny of the Mongol Yüan emperor[s] and destined us, the Ta Ming, to rule the whole' (HY 2:04a2-3; KURIBAYASHI 2003:66, MOSTAERT/DE RACHEWILTZ 1977:1, 16).

In 'Phags-pa script, we find on the west side of the Chü-yung-kuan inscription the following contrasting sentences; the translation of POPPE 1957.65 is here modified slightly to make the second sentence a bit more literal.

> '"Finding in every rebirth a golden elephant vehicle, he attained (*kür-te-bei*) to become at the end of time the one called *Nakabali*. (And) he attained, {it seems} (*kür-te-jüüi*), immeasurably great peace."'

Most but not all of the texts written in the Mongol script seem likewise to follow the SH patterns of use, though — as discussed below — the relative frequencies of the two endings (and occurrences of specific uses of each) vary greatly from one text to another, depending at least partly on subject matter.

The conclusive use of *-bA* mentioned in §5 above is more obvious in Mongol script documents than in the *Secret History*. Many of the Script texts listed in Table 4 have at least one such form in one of its last lines, often in a colophon. We find *üjü-güle-bei* in HC 38a5, *bayi-γul-bai* 'erected [this stele]' in SMI 1338.37, 1362.54, *joγiyal-γa-bai* 'had [the text] composed' and *bici-bei* 'did the calligraphy' in SMI 1335.56–57. Likewise *bici-bei* 'wrote' as the final word of colophons in SMI 1340.20, all five letters of the Ilkhans (DIlk), and twelve of the Documents from Turkestan (DT).

6.21 Relative frequency of the two endings. In the *Secret History* the ratio of occurrences of *-bA* to *-JUU* is just over 3:1; put another way, of non-*lAA* past-tense forms in that text about 76% are alternants of *-bA*. In the different Middle Mongolian text-groups listed in Table 4 (ignoring those with fewer than nine past-tenses), what may be called the *bA*-percentage ranges from 4.3% in the *Hsiao-ching* to 93.8% in the documents written by the Ilkhans between about 1270 and 1305, and to 100% in the Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1340. Viewed from this point of view, the *Hsiao-ching* (of perhaps 1307) and the Sino-Mongolian inscriptions of 1335, 1338, and 1346 form one group, with *bA*-percentages less than 13%, as opposed to all but one of the other texts where percentages are over 70%. The sole intermediate frequency, exactly 40%, is found in the SMI of 1362. Texts in the high-frequency group (which includes the SH, HY, and 'Phags-pa texts) date from at least 1272 through the entire 14th century, so one cannot here suggest change of usage over time as a cause for this division.

Closer scrutiny, however, shows that the differences in frequency of the two endings relates more to the nature of the texts and their contents than to any independent, overarching linguistic difference. Consider usage in the *Hsiao-ching*, for example. One of only two *-bA* forms (in line 38a5) is the final word of this text, and clearly a conclusive usage. The other is an undeniable general fact:

> *Beye belder üsün mariyan bol-ju [ecige ek]e-ece törö-gül-de-bei.* '[Our] bodi[es], which are [made of] hair and flesh, were begotten by our parents' (HC2a5–6; cf. DE RACHEWILTZ 1982:41).

Of the forty-five instance of *-JUU*, exactly one-third occur in the word *keme-jügü* '{apparently} said', in one specific use: e.g.,

> *Mauši bicig-tür 'Uridu·s-iyan ülü durad-qu busu; uridu·s-un yabudal-iyar aγali aburi-ban tegüske-gde-küi' keme-jügü.* 'In the Mao-shih book it is said: "One should not fail to think [always] of one's ancestors, and through [the example of their] conduct, perfect one's own virtue' (HC 3a4–6; cf. DE RACHEWILTZ 1982:28, 41, 58).

This usage of *-jUU* in quoting written documents seems to mean 'according to such-and-such a work, [the author] said so-and-so'; and hence is quite reasonably assigned the presumptive ending. (English usage chooses rather to personify the book or document: 'such-and-such a work says so-and-so'.) Most other instances of *-JUU* in the HC involve philosophical generalities, cause-and-effect statements, or quasi-historical remarks about the 'enlightened rulers of old' (HC 13b4: *erten-ü gegegen qa·d*) which by their very nature remain somewhat hypothetical.

> *Erten-ü qa·d-un derge-de doloγan jala-n idqa-γci·n noγa·d bü-kü-yin tula yosun-aca eteged üiled-besü ber delekei ulus-iyan ese alda-juγu.* 'It was {presumably} because there were at the side of the former rulers seven officials who corrected and admonished [them], that they did not lose their realm, even though they acted other than from [correct] principles' (29b1–4; cf. DE RACHEWILTZ 1982:39, 49, 80).

Near the other end of the *ba*-percentage scale are the five extant documents written by the Ilkhans. There all fourteen instances of *-bA* are factual statements about the writer or addressee, which in informal spoken style might well have been expressed by *-lAA*.[21] The single instance of *-JUU* in these documents is found in a 1290 letter from Aryun to Pope Nicholas IV:

> '.... *Edüge Il qan Mišiqa-in nom-tur ora-tuγai' keme-jü ile-jügü ci.* 'You have sent [a letter] saying {, it seems,} that..., and {suggesting} that now the Il Qan should become a Christian' (DIlk 3.6–7; MOSTAERT/CLEAVES 1952:450–51).

Here the presumptive ending may serve to make the sentence somewhat

[21] If we assume that this attestive-past *-lAA* was for some reason considered too colloquial or informal for use in written documents, then for past-tense verbs a writer had only a choice between *-bA* and *-JUU*; hence any instance of the former might well assume a slight, though unreliable, attestive implication.

more polite: English 'suggest' seems a reasonable translation for combination *-tuγai keme...jügü* (lit. 'apparently said "let him [do so and so]"'. But perhaps this sentence simply exemplifies the quotative use of *-JUU* mentioned above, whereby this ending is used in citing written documents.

6.22 The *-bA* and *-JUU* endings in the Sino-Mongolian inscriptions. These inscriptions, with the possible exception of that of 1340, should probably be treated separately from other Middle Mongolian texts, for they seem aberrant in their expression of past-tense meanings.

Of the five SMIs, that of 1340 most closely matches usage elsewhere in Middle Mongolian; it is surprising in that it is written mostly in the first person (with subject *bi* 'I' before the first verb, then quotation of a hypothetical speech of others, then repetition of *bi* as subject), and also in its total lack of *-JUU* as well as *-lAA*. The first of these might perhaps have been expected in this metaphorical sentence:

> *Edüge keme-besü ükü-gse·d ber man-u edege-gsen metü bol-ba.* 'As for the present, those of us who had died have become as if reanimated' (SMI 1340.5–6; tr. CLEAVES in HJAS 25.48).

By contrast, those who translated the SMIs of 1335, 1338, and 1346 would seem to have had a strong preference for the *-JUU* ending. These texts are rather stiffer and more formal than the inscriptions of 1340 and 1362, and each seems purposely to avoid *-bA* except for facts relating to preparation of the stele involved (1335.56, 57; 1338, 36, 37),[22] or in first-person statements in quoted speech (1335.17, 18, 42; all with personal involvement), or as the verb concluding a section of discourse (1335.49, 53).[23] For a present-day reader who is used to the more relaxed and conversational SH usage, this extensive use of *-JUU* gives a curiously tentative or hypothetical flavor to these documents. On the 1338 stele, erected to honor the memory of Jigüntei, it is noted that this man died on 15 April 1323; but why should the fairly rare form *bol-juγu*[24] be used in line 9 rather than *bol-ba*, in the phrase *jöb ese bol-juγu* 'he died'? And why should the same *bol-juγu* be used (line 16) in the sentence 'Now the Qaγan... has ordered (*jrlγ bol-juγu*) that one should erect a stele..., and that I, Ge *qioši*..., should compose the text of the stele' (tr. CLEAVES in HJAS 14.69)? Similar use of *-JUU* rather than *-bA* is found in other of these documents, e.g., several times in SMI 1362.36–38,

[22] Similarly in the SMI of 1362.51, 53, 54, and three times in line 2.

[23] A residual instance in 1346.23 lacks context because of lacunae.

[24] The *-jUU* forms of *bol-* 'become' occur only nine times in the SH; but at least nine and perhaps as many as twelve times in the much briefer Sino-Mongolian inscriptions of 1335 (lines 65, 57), 1338 (9, 16, 35), and 1346 (3, 9, 10, 29; and perhaps three more).

including one instance with a precise death-date (*ügei bol-juγu*), just as above.[25]

That there was considerable leeway in the use of the two endings is proved by the SMI of 1362. There it seems that the translator, Esen Buqa, switched from one ending to the other simply for stylistic variation, for we find the following at sentence-end in various lines that note the granting of a title by someone in authority:

...nere soyurqa-ju ög-bei 'granted [him] the title...' (lines 10, 18)
...nere neme-jü ög-cügü 'gave [him] the additional title...' (24–25)
...nere neme-jü ög-bei (25)
...nere neme-jü ög-cügü (33)
...nere soyurqa-ju ög-bei (35)

There seems nothing in the local context that explains the use of different endings here.

Two other characteristics distinguish the SMIs from our other documents. Firstly: their clauses with *-bA* show less personal involvement of subjects than most other documents. In §2 we saw that in the *Secret History* about 52% of verbs with *-bA* have first- or second-person subjects. The percentage for the totality of other MM texts turns out to be almost precisely the same; but it is only 30% in the SMIs, and 60% in the remaining MM texts. And if one excludes the SMI of 1340, the figure for the remaining SMIs is a low 11%. Clearly these inscriptions are couched in a style much more formal than even that of the 'Phags-pa documents or those in the Hua-i i-yü.

Secondly, the inscriptions (other than that of 1340) are notable in their frequent use of the unbroken sequence *-(U)QsAn a-JUU* after a main verb. The SMI of 1335 has twelve instances of this sequence, as does that of 1338; the 1362 inscription has thirteen, that of 1346 five. By contrast, the *Hsiao-ching* contains only three occurrences of this sequence, and even the *Secret History* shows only ten, nine of which clearly have pluperfect meaning. More crucially: many or most SMI instances of this sequence — and some of *-(U)QsAn* alone in SMI 1362.49–50 — seem to represent the sort of 3rd-person simple past action that would normally be expressed by *-bA*.

As stated above, these inscriptions clearly differ from other early Middle Mongolian texts in their use of *-JUU* (and *-[U]QsAn a-JUU*, and simple *-[U]QsAn*) as opposed to *-bA*. Stylistic considerations and perhaps personal

[25] One theoretically possible (though entirely speculative) explanation for the preponderance of *-JUU* forms in such documents is that these represent the quotative use of this ending, a translator treating the Chinese originals as documents to be quoted rather than translated in a more straightforward way.

preference must somehow have played a role in the choice between these, but just what factors influenced a writer's choice between endings at particular points in a passage we cannot now determine. The Chinese originals of these inscriptions offer no help, unfortunately. For as de Rachewiltz has put it (personal communication of 14 March 2009) "the style [of these originals] is high literary Chinese, concise and formulary (in the best epigraphical tradition), and devoid of any grammatical modifiers", so that "present and past tenses [must be] deduced solely from the context". This matter thus remains problematic for the modern grammarian.

Fortunately, the usage of the various past-tense formations is much clearer in the *Secret History*, and most other early Middle Mongolian texts. Perhaps more detailed study of the contrasting *-bA* and *-JUU* endings in texts of this and later periods may eventually enlighten us as to the uses of these in the Sino-Mongolian inscriptions.

WORKS CITED

(For text abbreviations see note to Table 4;
HJAS = *Harvard Journal of Oriental Studies*)

CLEAVES, FRANCIS WOODMAN. 1949. "The Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1362 in memory of Prince Hindu", HJAS 12.1-133.

— 1950. "The Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1335 in memory of Chang Ying-jüi", HJAS 13.1-131.

— 1951. "The Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1338 in memory of Jigüntei", HJAS 14.1-104.

— 1952. "The Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1346", HJAS 15.1-123.

— 1953. "The Mongolian documents in the Musée de Téhéran", HJAS 16.1-107.

— 1954. "The *Bodistw-a Čari-a Awatar-un Tayilbur* of 1321 by Čosgi Odsir, HJAS 17.1-129.

— 1955. "An early Mongolian loan contract from Qara Qoto", HJAS 18.1-49.

— 1959. "An early Mongolian version of the Alexander Romance", HJAS 22.1-99.

— 1965. "The *lingǰi* of Aruγ of 1340", HJAS 25.31-79 (1964-65).

DE RACHEWILTZ, IGOR. 1976. "Some remarks on the stele of Yisüngge", pp. 487-508 in *Tractata Altaica* (Sinor Festschrift). Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

— 1982. "The Preclassical Mongolian version of the *Hsiao-ching*"; *Zentralasiatische Studien* 16.7-109. Note also: "More about the Preclassical Mongolian version of the *Hsiao-ching*"; *Zentralasiatische Studien* 19.27-37 (1986).

— 2004. *The Secret History of the Mongols: A Mongolian epic chronicle of the thirteenth century. Translated with a historical and philological commentary.* Two volumes. Brill's Inner Asian Library, vols. 7/1 and 7/2. Leiden: Brill.

HAENISCH, ERICH. 1952. *Sino-Mongolische Dokumente vom Ende des 14. Jahrhunderts.* Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin: Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst. Jahrgang 1950 Nr. 4. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

KURIBAYASHI HITOSHI & CHOIJINJAB. 2001. *Word- and suffix-index to the Secret History of the Mongols; based on the romanized transcription of L. Ligeti.* CNEAS Monograph Series 4. Sendai, Japan: Center for Northeast Asian Studies, Tohoku University.

— 2003. *Word and suffix-index to Hua-yi Yi-yü based on the romanzed transcription of L. Ligeti.* CNEAS Monograph Series 10. Sendai, Japan: Center for Northeast Asian Studies, Tohoku University.

LIGETI, LOUIS. IVLMMT = *Indices verborum linguae mongolicae monumentis traditorum.* Budapest; Akadémiai Kiadó.

Vol. 1: *Monuments préclassiques. 1. XIIIe et XIVe siècles.* [Première partie]. 1970.

Vol. 2: *Monuments préclassiques. 1. XIIIe et XIVe siècles.* [Deuxième partie]. 1972.

Vol. 3: *Monuments en écriture 'phags-pa. Pièces de chancellerie en transcription chinoise.* 1973.

— 1972a. *Monuments préclassiques 1: XIIIe et XIVe siècles.* Monumenta Linguae Mongolicae Collecta 2. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. Indexed in IVLMMT 1 and 2.

— 1972b. *Monuments in écriture 'phags-pa [et] Pièces de chancellerie en transcription chinoise.* Monumenta Linguae Mongolicae Collecta 3. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. Indexed in IVLMMT 3.

MOSTAERT, ANTOINE & FRANCIS W. CLEAVES. 1952. "Trois documents Mongols des Archives secrètes vaticanes", HJAS 15.419-506.

MOSTAERT, ANTOINE & FRANCIS W. CLEAVES. 1962. *Les Lettres de 1289 et 1305 des ilkhan Aryun et Öljeitü à Philippe le Bel*; Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts.

MOSTAERT, ANTOINE (& IGOR DE RACHEWILTZ). 1977, 1995. *Le matériel mongol du Houa i i iu...de Houng-ou (1389).* Vol. 1, Edité par Igor DE RACHEWILTZ, avec l'assistance de ANTHONY SCHÖNBAUM, 1977. Vol. 2 (Commentaires), par ANTOINE MOSTAERT et Igor DE RACHEWILTZ, 1995. Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques 18, 27. Bruxelles: Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises.

ORLOVSKAYA, MARIJA NIKOLAEVNA. 2000. *Jazyk mongol'skich tekstov XIII-XIV vekov.* Moskva: Institut Vostokovedenija.

OZAWA SHIGEO. 1961. "The system of the indicative endings in Middle Mongolian", *Gengo Kenkyū* 40.33-80.

POPPE, NICHOLAS. 1957. *The Mongolian monuments in ḥP'ags-pa script.* (Second edition translated and edited by John R. Krueger.) Göttinger Asiatische Forschungen 8. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

STREET, JOHN C. 1986. *On the 14th century punctuation of Mongolian in the Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih.* Mongolia Society Occasional Papers 12. Bloomington, Indiana: The Mongolia Society.

— 2009a. "The interrogative particle in early Middle Mongolian"; to appear in *Mongolian Studies* 30.43-82.

— 2009b. "Middle Mongolian past-tense -BA in the *Secret History*"; *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 128:3. 399-422 (2008).

VIETZE, HANS-PETER, and GENDENG LUBSANG. 1992. *Altan Tobči: Eine mongolische Chronik des XVII. Jahrhunderts von Blo bzaṅ bstan 'jin.* Text and Index. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.