

# Secondary Predication in Mongolian

Ryuichi Washio

University of Tsukuba / National Language Research Institute

## 1. Introduction

The goal of this paper is to answer the descriptive question of what semantic functions an Adjective Phrase (AP) may have in Mongolian when it appears in the preverbal slot in the following syntactic schema:

(1) (NP<sub>1</sub>) (NP<sub>2</sub>) — V

We will observe that a preverbal AP in Mongolian may function as a “secondary” predicate, much like the way a postverbal AP does in English, but Mongolian is restricted with respect to the possible types of secondary predication in a way English is not.

Since the discussion on Mongolian in the following sections assumes the notion “secondary predication,” let us briefly review what it means here.<sup>1)</sup>

Let  $\tau$  denote the time at which the primary predication holds in a given sentence. In *Jean cooked the chicken*, for example, the predicate *cook the chicken* is predicated of the grammatical subject *Jean*, and the sentence as a whole asserts that this predication holds at  $\tau$ . Because of the particular tense of this sentence,  $\tau$  is understood in this case to be prior to the moment of speech.

When a sentence contains another predication — the secondary predication — the secondary predicate can in principle be predicated either of the grammatical subject or of the grammatical object. Thus in *Jean cooked the chicken hot*, the secondary predicate *hot* may be associated either with *Jean*, leading to an interpretation in which Jean cooked the chicken when he was hot, or with *the chicken*, which would describe a situation in which Jean cooked the chicken when it was hot. Let  $t$  denote the time at which the secondary predication holds. Whether the secondary predicate *hot* is predicated of *Jean* or of *the chicken*, the time at which the secondary predication is claimed to hold is the same: namely,  $\tau$ . This is the so-called “depictive” interpretation of secondary predicates, where  $t$  coincides with  $\tau$ .

The example above permits still another interpretation, known as the “resultative” interpretation, where the secondary predicate *hot* is again predicated of *the chicken* but describes the state of the chicken which *resulted* from Jean’s cooking it (rather than the state of the chicken *at the time of* Jean’s cooking, as in the depictive interpretation). This resultative reading is often paraphrased along the lines of “Jean’s cooking the chicken caused it to become hot,” i.e., as a kind of causative expression. Because it describes a change of state in the chicken which was brought about by Jean’s acting on it, the time at which the secondary predication (*[the chicken [hot]]*) holds is necessarily subsequent to the time at which the primary predication (*[Jean [cook the chicken]]*) holds: that is to say, it is necessarily the case, under the resultative interpretation of the secondary predication, that  $\tau < t$ , where the sign “<” is being

used in an intuitively obvious way to indicate that  $\tau$  is prior to  $t$  (or  $t$  is subsequent to  $\tau$ ) in the time sequence.<sup>2)</sup>

In what follows, we will observe that a preverbal AP in Mongolian may function either as a depictive phrase or as a resultative phrase, but the semantic relations that Mongolian resultatives can express are restricted to certain well-defined types.

## 2. Middle Mongolian

The Mongolian language that we will examine here is that represented by the historical document known as the Secret History of the Mongols, one of the most important Mongolian texts from the 13th century.<sup>3)</sup> Although the text represents the Mongolian language, the original text (generally believed to have been in the Uigur script) has not survived to the present and we only have the Chinese transcription with the title “Yüan-ch’ao pi-shih” (YCPS).<sup>4)</sup>

Mongolian, whether Middle or Modern, is an agglutinative language with the “SOV” basic word order, with such implicationally associated typological properties as the use of postposition, much like Korean and Japanese. Grammatical descriptions of Mongolian usually recognize “word classes” like verbs, nouns, adjectives and adverbs,<sup>5)</sup> but they also never fail to mention that it is not always easy in Mongolian to differentiate nouns from adjectives or adjectives from adverbs. The following remarks in Street (1963) concisely summarize this situation in Mongolian:

Typically an adjective stem occurs freely as a pre-modifier of nouns, but may not occur alone as subject of a verbal. However, the functions of nouns and adjectives overlap to a great extent, so that it is not always easy to differentiate the two types of stems. In addition, some stems seem to function freely as both noun and adjective [...]. (p. 97)

Typically an adverb occurs as premodifier of a verb but not of a noun. It is sometimes difficult to distinguish an adverb from a dative noun or from an adjective functioning as a complement [...]. (p. 102)

Consider the morpheme **сайн** [sajn], which is most commonly cited in a context like this.<sup>6)</sup> It functions as an adjective meaning “good” in nominal modification structures such as **сайн үйл** [sajn үйл] ‘good deed’, but it also appears, with the same shape, in verbal modification structures such as **сайн амрах** [sajn amrax] ‘to rest well’, in which case it corresponds to the adverb “well” in English. Furthermore, the same shape can also function as a noun, expressing the notion of goodness. This kind of multiplicity in function is rather typical of Mongolian, and it can be illustrated with many other words. In (2), for example, one may clearly observe the multiple function of the word **өндөр** [öndöl] ‘high’:

- (2) i. өндөр газар [öndöl gazar] ‘highland’
- ii. өндөр болох [öndöl bolox] ‘to become high’
- iii. өндөр үнэлэх [öndöl үнэлэх] ‘to value highly’
- iv. өндөрт гарах [öndöl-t garax] ‘to climb up to a high place’

These illustrate the uses of **өндөр** [öndöl] (i) as a prenominal modifier, (ii) as a

complement to a verb, (iii) as a preverbal modifier, and (iv) as a cased-marked nominal, -**T** [-t] in (2iv) being the dative-marker.

Paradigms like (2) might give the impression, especially to those who are more familiar with Western languages, that syntactic categories in Mongolian are unbearably vague, but it is a mistake to regard this as something “non-Western.” If (2) strikes one as exotic, so must the following French paradigm:

- (3) i. ciel *clair* ‘clear sky’  
 ii. être *clair* ‘to be clear’ / Il fait *clair*. ‘It is daylight.’  
 iii. parler *clair* ‘to speak clearly’  
 iv. *clair* de lune ‘moonlight’

In *Il écrivait clair et solide*, for example, it is not immediately clear whether one should call *solide* an adjective or an adverb — perhaps “an adjective functioning as an adverb” is the answer.<sup>7)</sup> Similarly, in an example like *He tied his tie loose*, it is not self-evident whether *loose* should be called an adjective or an adverb.<sup>8)</sup> That adjectives can be used as nouns in Mongolian is not particularly surprising either, in view of the fact that both *clair* and *solide*, for example, have nominal uses in French as does *solid* in English (or consider the familiar case of “conversion” such as *rich* → *the rich* in English), although exactly how (2iv) should be treated in the grammar of Mongolian could be a matter of debate.<sup>9)</sup>

The following illustrates the various uses of the word meaning “good,” written as 撒因 [sayin] in YCPS, the modern descendant of which is **сайн** [sajɯ], which was cited above:

- (4) i. ... 撒因 那可兒 ... (§93)  
 ... sayin nökör ...  
 good friend  
 ii. ... 撒因 孛勒主為 ... (§177)  
 ... sayin bolju'ui ...  
 good became  
 iii. ... 沼兀敦 撒因 沼兀都列罷 ... (§63)  
 ... jewüdün sayin jewüdüleba<sup>10)</sup> ...  
 dream good dreamed  
 iv. ... 卯危 撒因 帖<sup>舌</sup>里兀 失亦<sup>舌</sup>刺... (§35)  
 ... mawui sayin teri'ü si'ira ...  
 bad good head hoof

These illustrate the uses of **sayin** (i) as a prenominal modifier, (ii) as a complement to a verb, (iii) as a preverbal modifier, and (iv) as a nominal coordinated with such pure nouns as “head” and “hoof”.<sup>11)</sup>

Thus, one also encounters the “uncertainty of analysis” in YCPS, but this is not a problem specific to Middle Mongolian as mentioned above, and one can proceed with one’s immediate research even without the final solution to the problems of category definition and identification, exactly as one can with regard to French or other languages.

### 3. The Preverbal ATP Schema

Let us first consider the following syntactic form in YCPS, which I shall call the “Preverbal ATP Schema”:<sup>12)</sup>

(5) (NP<sub>1</sub>) (NP<sub>2</sub>) ATP V

where NP<sub>1</sub> and NP<sub>2</sub> are the subject and the object (respectively) of the verb, V, when the V is transitive. The subject and object nominals may be missing from the surface string, as is common in a language like Mongolian. When the V is intransitive, NP<sub>2</sub> would not appear under normal circumstances. In English, however, examples such as *The joggers ran the pavement thin* are possible, which can apparently be analyzed as “NP<sub>1</sub>-V-NP<sub>2</sub>-AP,” where an intransitive (*run*) is followed by the so-called “fake object” (*the pavement*). It is therefore an empirical question whether or not Middle Mongolian has a construction like this.

The ATP in the Preverbal ATP Schema is realized in various shapes in Mongolian. As already mentioned, when an adjective is used nominally, it is “declined” (cf. Poppe (1970: 78)) and may appear with a case-ending. But even aside from this case, adjectives are sometimes accompanied with one of the case-endings. A well-known case in Modern Mongolian that is relevant to the present discussion is the instrumental case-ending **-(г)аар** [-(g)aar],<sup>13)</sup> of which Bosson (1964: 116) has the following description (romanization added):

Many adjectives can be used adverbially without any morphological change, e.g.: **сайн** [sajn] ‘good, well’, **чанга** [čanga] ‘firm, firmly’, but these and other adjectival words can be used specifically as adverbs with the addition of the instrumental suffix: **сайнаар** [sajnaar] ‘well’, **муугаар** [muugaar] ‘well’, **чангаар** [čangaar] ‘firmly’, **хурднаар** [xurднаar] ‘swiftly’.

This instrumental form appears in an example like **улаанаар будах** [ulaanaar budax] ‘to paint (something) red’.<sup>14)</sup>

The instrumental in YCPS takes the form **-bar<sup>2</sup>** or **-iyar<sup>2</sup>** (the superscript number here indicates that the vowel **a** alternates with **e** under vowel harmony). This suffix is used in the entire YCPS approximately 100 times, and in nearly all instances, it is attached to a nominal element. One finds only a few instances in which the instrumental suffix is attached to a non-nominal element, and they all have an adverb as the element preceding it, as in **qamtu-bar** ‘together’ (cf. §254, YCPS) and **sem-iyer** ‘silently’ (§118). The morphemes **qamtu** ‘together’ and **sem** ‘silently’, correspond to the modern words **хамт** [xamt] and **сэм** [sem] respectively, which are also adverbs in the modern language. I found no clear case in YCPS where an adjective appears in the instrumental form. As mentioned above, an adjective like **их** [ix] ‘big, great’ in the modern language may appear in the instrumental form **ихээр** [ixeer] ‘greatly’ and function as an adverbial, but in no instance is its older form **yeke** ‘big, great’ followed by the instrumental ending in YCPS. Apparently, this “instrument marking” on adjectives was not a common device in YCPS.<sup>15)</sup>

More common in YCPS is the “dative” marking on adjectives. The adjective **yeke**, for example, appears in the dative form **yeke-de** in YCPS and in this form it

premodifies a verbal element as in the following examples:

- (6) 也客迭 迭里周塔勒必阿速 ... (§195)  
yeke-de delijü qarbu'asu ...  
big-DAT draw-ING shoot-IF  
“If, drawing [his bow], in a great manner, he shoot, ...” [Cleaves]
- (7) ...也遂<sup>甲</sup>合敦 也客迭 嘯兀列勒畢 ... (§156)  
... yisüi-qadun yeke-de sewürelbi  
Yesüi Qadun big-DAT sighed  
“Yesüi Qadun sighed deeply” [Cleaves]

Although the bare form **yeke** almost always functions either as a prenominal modifier or as a nominal that expresses the idea of bigness or greatness (there are over 70 instances of such uses), there is one example in which it appears in the preverbal position:

- (8) 德薛禅 帖木只泥 兀者周 馬石 也客 巴牙思抽 ... (§94)  
dei-secen temüjin-i üjejü masi yeke bayascu ...  
Dei-Secen Temüjin-DEF see-ING very big rejoice-ING  
“Dei Secen, seeing Temüjin and rejoicing exceedingly, ...” [Cleaves]

The bare form **yeke** also appears with verbs like **bol-** ‘be/become’ to form expressions meaning “to be bad” etc. (see §70 of YCPS). It is not uncommon in YCPS (as in the modern language) for an adjective in the bare form to be complement to verbs like **bol-**.

There are other possible forms that adjectives may take when they function as the ATP in the Preverbal ATP Schema. For example, the word **mawu** (transcribed as 卯兀 in YCPS) is an adjective meaning “bad.” This word has **mawui** (transcribed as 卯危 in YCPS) as an alternative form. The former shape appears four times in YCPS and, without exception, it is used as a prenominal modifier. On the other hand, the latter shape often appears preverbally, as in the following example:

- (9) ... 卯危 孛勒周 ... (§67)  
... mawui bolju ...  
bad become-ING  
“... he was bad” [Cleaves]

But the same shape also appears prenominally as in the following example:

- (10) ... 卯危 古温 ... (§112)  
... mawui gü'ün ...  
“... a bad man ...” [Cleaves]

So it is not clear what this formal alternation indicates. Ozawa (1983-1989) has a very interesting theory about this, which, however, I will not go into here. See his first note to §17.

In what follows, the term ATP will be used to cover all these forms (i.e., the bare form, the dative form and the alternating forms just mentioned) that an adjective can take when it appears as the the ATP in the Preverbal ATP Schema.

With this much background, let us now examine the syntactic and semantic

properties of the examples in YCPS that fit into the Preverbal ATP Schema.

#### 4. Functions of the ATP

##### 4.1. ATP as a Simple Adverbial

First of all, the ATP in the Preverbal ATP Schema may function as a simple adverb, modifying the time, location, manner, etc. of the activity expressed by the verb phrase. The following is such an example where the verb is transitive:

- (11) 扯<sup>舌</sup>里克 中合堂<sup>中</sup>忽 札撒周 ... (§256)  
altan jilo'a batu-da tataju ...  
gold rein strong-DAT pull-ING  
“...strongly pulling [in] the ‘golden reins, ...” [Cleaves]

It is not difficult to find similar examples with an intransitive verb. For instance:

- (12) ...也遂<sup>中</sup>合敦 也客迭 嘯兀列勒畢 ... (§156)  
... yisüi-qadun yeke-de sewürelbi  
Yesüi Qadun big-DAT sighed  
“Yesüi Qadun sighed deeply” [Cleaves]

##### 4.2. ATP as a Depictive Phrase

In many cases, the preverbal ATP functions as a depictive phrase. Here is an example, which appears immediately after the description that the Tatar people poisoned Yesügei Ba’atur, who is the unexpressed subject of this sentence:

- (13) ...札兀<sup>舌</sup>刺 卯危 翰楊抽 ... (§67)  
... ja'ura mawui otcu ...  
on the way bad go-ING  
“On the way, [being] bad, he went on and, ...” [Cleaves]

“He went on bad (sick)” would be the literal translation of this sentence, where the ATP cannot be a resultative phrase. Rather, it functions as a depictive phrase, describing the state in which he was in when he was moving. The ATP “thick” in the following example can also be interpreted in a similar manner:

- (14) ...帖<sup>舌</sup>列 中豁亦納察 主札阿納 阿亦速<sup>中</sup>渾 虔備由 ... (§195)  
... tere qoyinaca juja'an-a ayisuqun ken buyu ...  
that behind-FROM thick-DAT approach-ATTRIB.PL. who be  
“Who are they who thickly draw nigh behind him?” [Cleaves]

Literally, this sentence says something like “they are approaching thick,” which is rather vague. It may mean that they were fully equipped or thickly dressed. Rachewiltz interprets “thick” here as “in a compact mass.” But whatever it means, it cannot be a resultative phrase. If anything, it is a depictive phrase describing the state in which they were in when they were “drawing nigh.”

### 4. 3. Resultatives in YCPS

#### 4. 3. 1. Strong vs. Weak Resultatives

The notion “resultative interpretation” characterized in section one above applies to the following and many other examples of English that have been indiscriminately called “resultatives” in the literature:

- (15) a. The horses dragged the logs smooth.
- b. He pulled his tie tight.
- (16) a. She dyed the dress blue.
- b. He wiped the glass clean.

Languages do vary, however, with respect to the possible types of resultatives they permit. For example, resultatives like those given in (15) are possible in English, but their equivalents are unacceptable both in French and Japanese, as one can see from (17) for French and (18) for Japanese:

- (17) a. \* Les chevaux ont traîné les rondins lisses.  
      ‘The horses dragged the logs smooth.’
- b. \* Il a tiré sa cravate serrée.  
      ‘He pulled his tie tight.’
- (18) a. \* uma-ga maruta-o subesube-ni hikizut-ta.  
      horse-NOM log-ACC smooth drag-PAST  
      ‘The horses dragged the logs smooth.’
- b. \* kare-wa nekutai-o kataku hippat-ta.  
      he-TOP tie-ACC tight pull-PAST  
      ‘He pulled his tie tight.’

On the other hand, French and Japanese differ significantly as to whether they permit resultatives like those in (16). French does not, as one can observe from (19), but Japanese does, as is clear from (20):

- (19) a. \* Elle a teint la robe bleue. ‘She dyed the dress blue.’
- b. \* Il a essuyé le verre propre. ‘He wiped the glass clean.’
- (20) a. konozyo-wa doresu-o aoku some-ta.  
      she-TOP dress-ACC blue dye-PAST  
      ‘She dyed the dress blue.’
- b. kare-wa gurasu-o kirei-ni hui-ta.  
      he-TOP glass-ACC clean wipe-PAST  
      ‘He wiped the glass clean.’

Cross-linguistically, therefore, resultatives based on transitive verbs are classified into two types, namely, those like (15a, b), which are possible in English but not in French and Japanese, and those like (16a, b), which are possible both in English and Japanese but not in French.

This classification of resultatives in fact coincides with a fairly natural semantic distinction stated in (21):

- (21) STRONG and WEAK resultatives (An informal characterization)
- a. Resultatives are “strong” if the meaning of the V and the meaning of the AP are completely independent of each other.
  - b. Resultatives are “weak” if the meaning of the V and the meaning of the AP are NOT completely independent of each other.

(15a), for example, is a Strong resultative since the meaning of the verb “to drag” does not contain anything like the notion stated by the adjective “smooth” that appears in (15a) so they are semantically independent of each other. This contrasts with the function of the adjective “blue” in (16a). In this case, the verb “to dye” already contains the notion of “color” in its meaning, and the function of the adjective “blue” in (16a) is therefore simply to further specify this notion of “color,” which is predictable from the meaning of the verb. (16a) is therefore an example of Weak resultatives.

The most important aspect of this characterization of the Strong/Weak distinction is that it classifies “intransitive” resultatives like (22) as necessarily “strong”:

- (22) a. The joggers ran the pavement thin.  
 b. The planes flew the ozone layer thin.

This is so, since verbs like *run* and *fly*, being intransitive, cannot contain in their meaning anything like the notion “thin” denoted by the adjective. So intransitive resultatives are always Strong resultatives.

Notice that if intransitive resultatives are nothing but a special case of Strong resultatives, then one naturally expects that they are impossible in languages like French and Japanese. Facts like (23) and (24) demonstrate that this is in fact the case:

- (23) a. \* Il a marché les jambes raides.  
       ‘He walked his legs off (lit., stiff).’  
 b. \* Ils ont ri l’orateur silencieux.  
       ‘They laughed the speaker into silence.’
- (24) a. \* karera-wa kutu-no soko-o boroboro-ni hasit-ta.  
       they-TOP shoe-GEN sole-ACC threadbare run-PAST  
       ‘They ran the soles of their shoes threadbare.’  
 b. \* takusan-no hikooki-ga ozonsoo-o usuku ton-da.  
       many-GEN plane-NOM ozone layer-ACC thin fly-PAST  
       ‘Many planes flew the ozone layer thin.’

There are thus at least three types of languages, as summarized in (25):

(25)	English	Japanese	French
a. THE JOGGERS RAN THE PAVEMENT THIN.	+	-	-
b. THE HORSES DRAGGED THE LOGS SMOOTH.	+	-	-
c. SHE DYED THE DRESS BLUE.	+	+	-

This shows that resultatives must be classified into at least two types, and it seems that the way languages are distributed in (25) is what one naturally expects, given

the Strong/Weak distinction of resultatives, which would group (a) and (b) together as “strong” and classify (c) as “weak.”

Let us now consider what types of resultatives are attested in YCPS.

#### 4.3.2. Weak Resultatives in YCPS

Let us first consider the following passage from §156 of YCPS, which appears as a part of Cinggis Qahan’s order:

- (26) “You arrange all those people that have been assembled here in groups of related families, and *set apart from the rest any man who is with a group which is not his own.*” [Rachewiltz’s translation; emphasis added]

The italicized part corresponds to the following sentence in YCPS:

- (27) 斡額<sup>𑖀</sup>列徹 不速阿亦馬<sup>中</sup>渾 古兀泥 斡額<sup>𑖀</sup>列 孛勒迭亦惕客惕坤 (§156)  
 ö'er-ece busu ayimaqun gü'ün-i ö'ere böldeyitketkün  
 his own-FROM different tribe-OF person-acc separate isolate-IMP  
 “...set apart from the rest any man who is with a group which is not his own” [Rachewiltz]

This is an imperative sentence (so that the subject is missing). Syntactically, it has the following structure, with the preminally modified direct object (a person “who is with a group which is not his own”):

- (28) (NP<sub>1</sub>) NP<sub>2</sub> ATP V<sub>TRANSITIVE</sub>

The word **ö'ere** in (27) is the ATP in this schema. The Chinese gloss given to **ö'ere** in YCPS is 另 (líng), meaning “separate(ly)”. The verb **böldeyitketkün**, which is in the imperative form, means something like “to isolate.” The Chinese gloss for this is 教孤零 (jiāo gū líng) ‘to isolate, lit. to make ... isolated’. Both Rachewiltz and Cleaves use the expression “set apart” for the translation of the ATP-V string **ö'ere böldeyitketkün**. Unlike the English word *away*, however, **ö'ere** can be used as a prenominal modifier in YCPS, which is attested in the following example:

- (29) ... 斡額<sup>𑖀</sup>列 你兀<sup>𑖀</sup>兒 ... (§210)  
 ... ö'ere ni'ur ... (§210)  
 “a separate face” [Cleaves] or “a different face” [Rachewiltz]

Thus, **ö'ere** really is an adjective-type phrase, and this justifies analyzing (27) as (28).

Consider now the meaning expressed by (27). This can be schematized as follows, where SEPARATE corresponds to the ATP:

- (30) PERSON-ACC SEPARATE ISOLATE-IMP

Since the causative notion of “isolating” someone *x* naturally implies *x*’s state of being “separate” (from other people), the semantic relation between the ATP and V in (27) is very close, in much the same way as the semantic relation in “sharpen the pencil pointy” or “wipe the table clean.” (27) is therefore a Weak resultative, which suggests that YCPS represents a language which permits this class of resultatives.

### 4.3.3. Strong Resultatives Based on Transitive Verbs in YCPS

In no instance of the Preverbal ATP Schema with a transitive verb can the ATP be analyzed as a Strong resultative phrase in YCPS. Thus, I found no example in YCPS in which the preverbal ATP is semantically independent of the lexical meaning of the verb and expresses a state resulting from the activity described by that verb.

### 4.3.4. Strong Resultatives Based on Intransitive Verbs in YCPS

If intransitive resultatives are nothing but a special case of Strong resultatives, then one naturally expects that they are impossible in Middle Mongolian, exactly as they are in languages like French and Japanese, given the observation made in section 4.3.3. This expectation seems to be borne out since YCPS contains no example of intransitive resultatives.

## 4.4. Some “Resultative” Expressions in YCPS

There are many sentences in YCPS that one may choose to translate by using the resultative construction in English. Consider first the following English sentences:

- (31) a. They danced themselves into the ground.<sup>16)</sup>  
b. (With an arrow) he shoots the enemies into a string of pearls.<sup>17)</sup>

The ideas these resultative-like sentences carry are similar to those expressed by the following examples from YCPS:<sup>18)</sup>

- (32) a. ... 中合必兒中合塔 合兀魯中合 ... 孛魯塔刺 迭卜薛罷 (§57)  
... qabirqa-ta ha'uluqa ... bolutala debseba  
ribs-UP TO ground be-UNTIL danced  
b. ... 那可舌里 ... 客勒乞帖列 ... 中合舌兒鑠由 (§195)  
... nökör-i ... kelkitele ... qarbuyu  
enemy-ACC transfix-UNTIL shoot  
c. ... 中豁脫刺 兀魯昔 亦訥 中豁幹孫 孛勒塔刺 好兀魯牙 (§105)  
... qotola ulus-i inu qo'osun boltala hau'uluya  
all people-ACC his empty be-UNTIL destroy

If the English sentences given in (31) are characterized as resultatives, then, to the extent that they are appropriate paraphrases of the sentences in (32), these Mongolian sentences can also be called “resultatives.” (32a), corresponding to (31a), could then be regarded as an instance of the “intransitive” resultative construction. In fact, however, there are good reasons to believe that these Mongolian sentences involve the adverbial construction headed by the morpheme **-tala/-tele**, which is the subordination marker roughly with the sense of “until” or “so that” in English. That is, (32a) more literally means “They danced until the ground was up to their ribs,” and should be analyzed abstractly as follows:

- (33) they [<sub>CLAUSE</sub> [the ground] [up to their ribs] be]-**tala** danced

A major support for this analysis comes from the fact that the morpheme **-tala** ‘until’

attaches only to a verbal stem. It is a “converbial” particle, to use the terminology of Mongolian studies. Poppe (1954: 97) calls it “Converbum Terminale.” The morpheme **kelki-** in (32b) is a verb meaning “to transfix”<sup>19)</sup> and **-tele** is directly attached to it. When the predicate is an adjective as in (32c), where **qo'osun** ‘empty’ is adjectival, **-tala** requires the presence of the verb **bol-** ‘be’, to which it attaches. Thus, examples such as those cited in (32) do not have the “S-V-O-AP/PP” syntax: they are more like the “-key/-tolok” constructions in Korean, which are sometimes falsely regarded in the literature as directly comparable to English resultative constructions.<sup>20)</sup> The actual translations of (32a) suggested by Rachewiltz (1971-1982) and Cleaves (1982) are as follows:

- (34) a. ... they danced so much ... that  
They made a path down to their waists ... [Rachewiltz]  
b. ... they danced ..., until there was  
A ditch up to [their] ribs; ... [Cleaves]

Similarly, (32b) can be analyzed in the following manner:

- (35) [he]<sub>1</sub> [the enemies]<sub>2</sub> [<sub>CLAUSE</sub> pro<sub>1</sub> pro<sub>2</sub> transfix]-**tele** shoots

Rachewiltz and Cleaves translate this sentence as follows:

- (36) a. He shoots and hits them ...  
Stringing them *like pearls*. [Rachewiltz]  
b. He shooteth so as to join and so as to piece  
The companies ...<sup>21)</sup> [Cleaves]

The ideas these sentences express *can* be paraphrased by using the S-V-O-AP/PP form. However, just because there are sentences in Middle Mongolian that can be translated into English resultatives does not necessarily mean that it has the resultative construction.

#### 4. 5. On the Rarity of Weak Resultatives in YCPS

Although there is no doubt that YCPS represents a language which permits Weak resultatives (cf. section 4.3.2 above), the preverbal ATP functioning as a weak resultative phrase is much less common than that functioning as a depictive phrase or a simple adverbial in YCPS. This rarity of Weak resultatives in YCPS may be due, in part, to the fact that YCPS has a grammatical device different from the Preverbal ATP Schema that also expresses some notions similar to Weak resultatives.

Consider first a passage in §105 of YCPS which reads as follows in Mostaert’s (1950-1952) translation (italics added):

“Attaquant [comme qui dirait] sur l’ouverture supérieure de la tente de ce peureux Toyto’a et *heurtant son importante charpente de tente de façon qu’elle croule*, nous exterminerons jusqu’au dernier ses femmes et ses fils. *Heurtant de façon qu’il se rompe son encadrement de porte* qui [lui] est une divinité conférant le bonheur, nous exterminerons tout son peuple de façon qu’il n’en reste plus rien.”

As we can see, the italicized portions here contain some ideas that are suspiciously “resultative.” This can perhaps be more clearly sensed from the following sentences in Cleaves’s (1982) translation, which more or less directly correspond to Mostaert’s sentences italicized in the above quote:

Smiting his weighty tent frame  
 In such a way that it shall fall down flat, ...  
 Smiting his door frame, ...,  
 In such a way that it shall break to pieces, ...

Although Mostaert’s “heurter ... de façon qu’elle croule/qu’il se rompe” and Cleaves’s “smite ... in such a way that it shall fall down flat/break to pieces” are all rather periphrastic in structure, and accordingly, the relation between the activity of “smiting *x*” and the resulting state of *x* being “flat” is expressed in a rather indirect manner, the original Mongolian sentences in YCPS cited in (37) below are not as periphrastic as these translations might suggest:

- (37) a. ... 額額迭 亦訥 唵不<sup>舌</sup>魯 荅阿<sup>舌</sup>里周  
 ... e'ede inu embürü da'ariju ... (§105)  
 ...tent frame his (ATP ??) smite-ING  
 “Smiting his tent frame flat ...” (cf. Cleaves’s translation)
- b. ... 額額迭 亦訥 中忽<sup>中</sup>忽<sup>舌</sup>魯 荅阿<sup>舌</sup>里周  
 ... e'ede inu ququru da'ariju ... (§105)  
 ... door frame his (ATP ??) smite-ING  
 “Smiting his door frame to pieces ...” (cf. Cleaves’s translation)

These sentences have a simple transitive structure, and if the words **embürü** and **ququru** can be analyzed as ATPs, then they would exactly fit in the Preverbal ATP Schema, being of the form “(NP-NOM) NP-ACC ATP V,” where V has such meaning as “strike,” “smash,” “smite,” etc. It is therefore conceivable that the relation between the activity of “smiting *x*” and the resulting state of *x* being “flat” expressed by the original sentences is iconically more direct than that which is expressed by their periphrastic paraphrases, i.e., the semantic force of the original may be more like “smite it flat” than “smite it so that it falls down flat.”

What, then, is the status of such morphemes as **embürü** and **ququru**? In his comments on the paragraph containing (37), Mostaert touches on the process of adverbialization in YCPS, which I quote here:

**Embürü** “de façon que [la charpente] croule”; **quyuru** “de façon que [l’encadrement de porte] se rompe”. Cf. mo. **embüri-**, **embüre-** “s’écrouler”; **quyura-** “se rompre”. Cette formation adverbiale se rencontre assez frèquemment dans l’*Hist. secr.* P. ex. §189 **kebkerü** “de façon que [la tête] se brisa en morceaux” (cf. mo. **kemkere-** “se briser”. Pour **m** ~ **b**, cf. mo. **molki** ~ **bolki** “stupide”; **molur** ~ **bolur** “cristal de roche”, etc.); §255 **kinggürü** “de façon à être tranché” (cf. *Hist. secr.* §124 **kinggüri-** “trancher”), etc.

The reason Mostaert speaks of the “formation adverbiale” in discussing such words as **embürü**, **quyuru**, **kebkerü** and **kinggürü** is that they all contain the same suffix, these words being analyzable as **embü-rü**, **quyu-ru**, **kebke-rü** and **kinggü-rü**, respectively, with the common suffix **-ru/-rü**. Thus, Mostaert is actually making two

claims here: first, these words are adverbials, and second, they are derived by the adverbializing suffix **-ru**/**-rü**. This suffix is discussed by Street (1957) and Ozawa (1959), for both of whom it is a “converbial” particle, which means that the stem it attaches to is a verb. For example, Street (1957: 38) writes:

- $rU_1$  (‘so that’) occurs in adverbials meaning ‘in such a way as to X, so that [something] Xs’ where X is the meaning of the verbal with  $-rU_1$  is in construction.

If this is correct, then the construction in question is different from the Preverbal ATP Schema since V is not a possible realization of the ATP in the latter schema.

It is not so obvious, however, that the stem X in the above quote should be regarded as a verb, since none of the stems to which **-ru**/**-rü** is attached is actually used in YCPS as an independent verb. And as Ozawa (1983-1989) more recently stressed, the descendents of these morphemes are not attested as verbs in the modern dialects.<sup>22)</sup> Rather, they are some kind of adverbs. Sanzheyev (1973) calls them “adverbs,” but for Street (1963) they are “preverbs”: what is common to these authors is the claim that they are not verbs in the modern language, and Ozawa’s (1983-1989) position is that they (or the stems they contain) were not verbs even in Middle Mongolian. Even so, this construction is still different from the Preverbal ATP Schema since the stem X is not known to have a use as an independent adjective, which is typical of the ATP in the Preverbal ATP Schema.

Now, what Ozawa (1983-1989) says about **embürü** and other similar words (call them “Adverbial Particles” or “AdP”) is very suggestive. Commenting on (37a), for example, Ozawa says that **embürü** describes some aspects of “destructive activities” and that “words like this always appear with a verb having such semantic contents” as carried by **embürü** and other similar words.<sup>23)</sup> Notice that this characterization is very close to our characterization of Weak resultatives. It appears, therefore, that YCPS has a grammatical device (based on Adverbial Particles such as **embürü**) which is different from the Preverbal ATP Schema, but which can also express some notions similar to Weak resultatives, as in (38):

- (38) a. (NP<sub>1</sub>) (NP<sub>2</sub>) AdP V  
 b. (NP<sub>1</sub>) (NP<sub>2</sub>) ATP V

Since this AdP construction “se rencontre assez frèquemment” in YCPS (cf. the quote above from Mostaert), it was apparently a rather common device in YCPS, and this may partly explain why one does not encounter the Preverbal ATP Schema expressing Weak resultatives in YCPS as frequently as one might perhaps expect.<sup>24)</sup>

## 5. Conclusions

It appears that Middle Mongolian (the language represented by YCPS) permits “weak” resultatives, but neither intransitive resultatives nor “strong” transitive resultatives are attested in YCPS. Since it is precisely the latter types of expressions that constitute the more general category of Strong Resultatives, these gaps found in YCPS will receive a principled explanation if we regard Middle Mongolian as a language like Japanese, Korean and Turkish,<sup>25)</sup> with respect to the possible types of

resultatives it permits, i.e., as a language which has Weak Resultatives but lacks Strong Resultatives. These observations give us another reason to believe that the Strong/Weak distinction captures cross-linguistically meaningful generalizations which must be explained by any theory of resultatives.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> The following three paragraphs are based on Washio (1997d: 4).

<sup>2</sup> These “temporal” characterizations of depictive and resultative interpretations are quite sufficient for our present purposes, but strictly speaking, it may be necessary to understand  $\tau$  to refer to the time at which the action denoted by the primary predicate begins. Under the depictive reading of the example cited in the text, the chicken is already hot when Jean’s action begins, but this is crucially not the case under the resultative reading.

<sup>3</sup> The exact dating of the original text is a matter of controversy. For discussion, see the Introduction to Cleaves (1982) and the references cited there.

<sup>4</sup> There are different editions of YCPS (cf. Hung (1951)), among which is the Commercial Press “Ssu-pu ts’ung-k’an” edition, which is most easily accessible. YCPS has been translated into several languages, including Chinese, Japanese, French, German and English, of which I have mainly consulted the Japanese translations by Naka (1907), Murakami (1970-1976) and Ozawa (1983-1989), the English translations by Rachewiltz (1971-1982) and Cleaves (1982), and the French translation of many passages by Mostaert (1950-1952). Commentaries and other scholarly works on YCPS and Middle Mongolian are numerous. The ones from which I have benefited most greatly for the purposes of the present work are: Mostaert (1950-1952), Poppe (1954), Street (1957), Murayama (1951) and Ozawa (1979; 1983-1989). The indexes to YCPS compiled by Rachewiltz (1972) and Ozawa (1983-1989) have also been essential to the present research. Different scholars have proposed different Roman transcription systems for YCPS. Street (1957) remarks that, of the then available systems of transcription, the one employed by Mostaert and Cleaves in their publications is “[b]y far the most satisfactory.” Since then, Ozawa has developed an elaborate system of his own, which is partly based on Shiro Hattori’s earlier work as well as on other works including those by Mostaert and Cleaves. Although any of these systems could have been chosen for the purposes of the present work (which is focused on syntax and semantics, not on phonetics or phonology), I have chosen to use Rachewiltz’s (1972) system, which is typographically simpler than other systems.

<sup>5</sup> In addition to several other classes such as postpositions. Poppe (1970: 76), for example, distinguishes the following ten classes of stems: nouns, adjectives, numerals, prouns, adverbs, postpositions, verbs, conjunctions, particles, and interjections.

<sup>6</sup> Whenever I quote Mongolian words and example sentences written with Cyrillic letters in the original sources, Roman transliteration will be provided in square brackets.

<sup>7</sup> As stated in Grevisse (1980: 408) (cf. “Un bon nombre d’adjectifs neutres s’emploient adverbialement après certains verbes ...”). French dictionaries generally list *clair* as either an adjective or an adverb, but they rarely, if ever, list *solide* as an adverb. Probably, therefore, expressions like *voir clair* ‘to see clearly / distinctly’ would be regarded by many as containing *clair* as an adverb, but when it appears with *solide* as in the example cited in the text, people might begin to hesitate, *solide* generally being recognized only as an adjective.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. the discussion of “superious” resultatives in Washio (1997a).

<sup>9</sup> Poppe (1970), for example, speaks of “substantivization” in cases like this: “All adjectives can be substantivized, i.e., function as nouns. As such, they can take the plural suffix, occur in all case forms, and take the possessive suffixes” (p. 77). According to this view, (2iv) would be analyzed as a case of category conversion. Street (1963), on the other hand, suggests a process called “truncation” which deletes a noun stem under certain circumstances: “A noun stem may be omitted if it occurs before a particle and is premodified by an adjectival...” (p. 184). The following sentence, for example, contains the adjective stem **бара-** (baga-) ‘small’, which is directly followed by the ablative-marker **-аас** (-aas) ‘from’ (which is further followed by the reflexive marker **-аа** (-aa)):

- (i) Монгол хүүхэд багаасаа барилдаж сурна .  
Mongol children small-ABL-REFL wrestle-IMPF learn-PRES  
‘Mongol children learn to wrestle from childhood.’

Poppe (1970) would regard this occurrence of **бара-** (baga-) as a substantivized adjective, but Street (1963) analyzes the complex **багаасаа** (bagaasaa) as a “truncated nominal” derived from the full string **бага наснасаа** (baga nasn-aas-aa) ‘small age-abl-refl’ with the deletion of the noun stem **насан** (nasan) ‘age’. Examining and comparing the consequences of these two analyses is an interesting topic of research. For the purposes of the following discussion, however, we may adopt either of the two analyses, perhaps with an additional assumption that some stems are inherently ambiguous in functioning either as a noun or as an adjective (cf. Street (1963: 97)).

<sup>10</sup> Concerning the transliteration of the Chinese character 罷 as **-ba**, let me just quote the following passage from Rachewiltz (12972: 3):

In a number of instances the Chinese transcription appears to violate the law of vowel harmony. [...] The case of the perfect tense suffix *-ba* deserves special comment. This ending is regularly used in the *Yüan-ch’ao pi-shih* with both front and back vocalic words. However, from the notes of the *Yüan-ch’ao pi-shih* we know that *-ba* (罷) is a later substitution for *-be* (別) and *-bai/-bei* (伯), as well as for two characters used earlier to transcribe *-ba* (巴 and 八). In the text I have retained the *-ba* ending throughout ...

<sup>11</sup> Analyzing (iii) as a case of preverbal modification may be controversial since **sayin** here could be regarded as a noun, put in juxtaposition with the direct object, which might be the analysis underlying Cleaves’s (1982) translation “I dreamed a

dream — [a] good [one].”

<sup>12</sup> This is meant to subsume other possible word orders such as (NP<sub>1</sub>) ATP (NP<sub>2</sub>) V.

<sup>13</sup> With its variants **-(r)əəp**, **-(r)oop**, **-(r)өөp**, the choice among which is determined by the rules of vowel harmony.

<sup>14</sup> This is a “Weak resultative” in the sense of Washio (1997a). See § 4.3.1 below.

<sup>15</sup> The following may be an example containing an adjective followed by the instrumental suffix:

- (i) ... 撒亦巴<sup>舌</sup>兒 ... (§150)  
... sayi-bar ...  
good-INST ‘happily’

<sup>16</sup> The phrase “into the ground” here must be interpreted in the literal sense, not as a metaphorical expression as in “He ran the horse to the ground.” Thanks to Roger Martin for pointing this out to me.

<sup>17</sup> I.e., he strings them on an arrow.

<sup>18</sup> The Chinese transcription given in (32a) is as in the original “Ssu-pu ts’ung-k’an” edition, which might involve some mistakes. Ozawa (1983-1989) therefore ignores the first two phonetic marks (𠵼) in the original and inserts a new one at the initial position of the second word. The transcriptions **ha'uluqa** and **bolutala** are **ha'ul<u>qa** and **bol<u>tala**, respectively, in Rachewiltz (1972). The last word **debseba**, with the final **-ba**, apparently violates vowel harmony. See note 10 above.

<sup>19</sup> The modern descendent of this word is **ХЭЛХЭХ** [xelxex], which is also a verb and still has a similar range of meaning.

<sup>20</sup> See Kim (1993) and the discussion of this work in Washio (1997b, c). For some general discussion of these Korean constructions, see Chang (1996), Choi (1980), Im (1976), Shim (1982) and Suh (1990).

<sup>21</sup> In his notes to this translation, Cleaves says that the word “join” here means “to transfix, as on a spit,” and the word “companies” means “enemies.”

<sup>22</sup> See his note 4 to §79, note 17 to §105 and note 10 to §131. Ozawa thus replaced his earlier analysis with a new one, regarding the stem X now as an adverbial, not as a verb.

<sup>23</sup> See his note 17 to §105. The quote in the text is translated from the Japanese original by the present author.

<sup>24</sup> The following examples and descriptions from Sanzheyev (1973, 96-97) show that the same device based on AdPs is still in active use in the modern language:

- (i) a. **хага** 'in two' (**хага цавчих** 'to cut (into pieces)' with **цавчих** 'to cut', **хага цохих** 'to break in two' with **цохих** 'to break');
- b. **бут** 'into pieces' (mostly of objects which can be broken into small pieces: **бут цохих** 'to break into pieces', **бут унах** 'to break after falling down' with **унах** 'to fall', **бут ниргэх** 'to rout' with **ниргэх** 'to thunder');
- c. **дэлбэ** 'into pieces' (mostly of objects which burst or break with a certain noise: **дэлбэ татах** 'to break up', 'to break over' with **татах** 'to drag', 'to draw', **дэлбэ дайрах** 'to make one's way through', 'to put asunder' (as of a crowd, heap of things, etc.) with **дайрах** 'to touch', 'to push', 'to attack', **дэлбэ үсэргэх** 'to tear up', 'to burst' with **үсэргэх** 'to sprinkle');
- d. **зад** 'open' (mainly of objects which while opening up or falling down disclose something: **зад татах** 'to break open' (as of a fence or door), **зад цохих** 'to strike, damaging or uncovering' (as of a wall or a chain of enemy troops));
- e. **хэмх** 'into small pieces' (mostly of things which may be scattered or strewn into small particles like sand, etc.: **хэмх цохих** 'to break', 'to disintegrate into particles', **хэмх унах** 'to fall down (scattering into small particles)');
- f. **суга** cannot be translated by itself (of a sharp movement: **суга татах** 'to pull out', 'to draw out', 'to snatch out' with **татах** 'to draw', **суга цохих** 'to knock down', with **цохих** 'to beat');
- g. **хуга** 'breaking down' – cannot be translated by itself (mostly of things breaking under pressure: **хуга дарах** 'to break down under pressure' with **дарах** 'to press', **хуга цохих** 'to break down under impact', **хуга татах** 'to break down while snatching');
- h. **цоо** 'piercing through' (of sharp objects and firearms: **цоо буудах** 'to shoot through' with **буудах** 'to shoot', **хэмх хатгах** 'to pierce through' with **хатгах** 'to prick');
- i. **нэвт** 'through' (of things which penetrate the entire surface of other things, or the entire environment, e.g., : **ой нэвт гарах** 'to go through the entire forest', **нэвт хорох** 'to be soaked through' with **норох** 'to be wet', **нэвт мэдэх** 'to know everything thoroughly', sometimes similar in meaning to **цоо нэвт харвах** 'to shoot someone or something through with a bow');
- j. **шувт** – this adverb is close to **нэвт**, but denotes such a degree of penetration of some things by others when they pass further (**шувт хорох** 'to be so thoroughly soaked that water streams down' whereas **нэвт хорох** means that 'the water does not stream down');
- k. **мулт** cannot be translated by itself and is used of objects which are snatched away or torn out (**мулт татах** 'to snatch away', 'to tear out', **мулт цохих** 'to knock out').

Some of these examples (such as (i-g)) seem to express ideas more like strong resultative than weak resultatives.

<sup>25</sup> For Turkish, see Washio (1998). For Korean, see the references cited in note 20 above.

## References

- Bosson, James E. (1964) *Modern Mongolian*. Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Cleaves, Francis Woodman (1982) trans. *The Secret History of the Mongols*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Grevisse, Maurice (1980) *Le bon usage* (11<sup>e</sup> édition). Paris: Duculot.
- Hung, William (1951) "The Transmission of the Book Known as The Secret History of the Mongols," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* **14**, 433-92.
- Im, Hong-Bin (イムホンビン) (1976) 「コルサケルハコト」 『7ヶ』 **4**, 39-60.
- Kim, Jong-Bok (1993) "Syntax and Semantics of Korean Resultatives," *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics* **V**, 471-482.
- Mostaert, Antoine (1950-1952) "Sur quelques passages de l'Histoire secrète des Mongols," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* **13** (1950), 285-361; **14** (1951), 329-403; **15** (1952), 289-407.
- Murakami, Masatsugu (村上正二) (1970-1976) 『モンゴル秘史(1~3)』 平凡社.
- Murayama, Shichiro (村山七郎) (1951) 「元朝秘史蒙古語に於ける -s に終る converbum」 『言語研究』 vol. **19-20**, 51-67.
- Naka, Michiyo (那珂通世) (1907) 『成吉思汗実録』 大日本図書出版.
- Ozawa, Shigeo (小沢重男) (1959) 「元朝秘史蒙古語に於ける副動詞語尾 -<sup>手</sup>魯 (-ru) について」 Ozawa (1979) に再録.
- Ozawa, Shigeo (1979) 『中世蒙古語諸形態の研究』 開明書院.
- Ozawa, Shigeo (1983) 『現代モンゴル語辞典』 大学書林.
- Ozawa, Shigeo (1983-1989) 『元朝秘史全釈(上~下), 全釈続攷(上~下)』 風間書房.
- Poppe, Nicholas (1954) *Grammar of Written Mongolian*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Poppe, Nicholas (1970) *Mongolian Language Handbook*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Rachewiltz, Igor de (1971-1982) "The Secret History of the Mongols," *Papers on Far Eastern History* **4**, 115-63; **5**, 149-75; **10**, 55-82; **13**, 41-75; **16**, 27-65; **18**, 43-80; **21**, 17-57; **23**, 111-46; **26**, 39-84.
- Rachewiltz, Igor de (1972) *Index to The Secret History of the Mongols*. Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Shim, Jae-Gi (イムダキ) (1982) 『7ヶ』 **4**, 39-60.
- Street, John (1957) *The Language of The Secret History of the Mongols*. New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society.
- Street, John (1963) *Khalkha Structure*. Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Suh, Cheong-Soo (シュチシ) (1990)。「ケ-ヤツハ「オオキマ」ケ。コアケケ ケヨケ◎タヌツヤク・7。サヌム7ケケヨネカ」
- Washio, Ryuichi (鷲尾龍一) (1997a) "Resultatives, Compositionality and Language Variation," *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* **6**, 1-49.
- Washio, Ryuichi (1997b) "Remarks on Korean Resultatives," *Researching and Verifying an Advanced Theory of Human Language: COE Research Report* **1**, 221-254.
- Washio, Ryuichi (1997c) 「-綴」 「<sup>手</sup>魯」 『7ヶ』 **33**, 435-462.
- Washio, Ryuichi (1997d) "A Note on Time and Location in French," *ICU English Studies* **6**, 1-12.
- Washio, Ryuichi (1998) "Some Comparative Notes on Resultatives," to appear in *Festschrift for Kazuko Inoue*.
- Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih 『元朝秘史』(四部叢刊三編(八)) 上海書店.