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Abstract

The present study investigates conditional constructions in the Manchu language (of the Tungusic language family) from several perspectives: semantics, morphosyntax, pragmatics and typology. The category “conditional constructions” is defined in terms of prototypes, which satisfy both semantic and morphosyntactic criteria. The semantic criterion states that a prototypical conditional construction relates two states of affairs such that one state of affairs is a cause of the other, while neither state of affairs can be inferred as realised. The morphosyntactic criterion states that a prototypical conditional construction frequently and primarily expresses the conditional meaning. Constructions that only partially satisfy these criteria are non-prototypes of this category. Both prototypes and non-prototypes are objects of the present study.

The data (example sentences) analysed in this study come from a corpus of Manchu that consists of a variety of written texts dating from the Qing Dynasty (1644 – 1911), during which Manchu was the most important official language. These sentences either express the conditional meaning, or in their subordinate clauses contain verb structures formed by the converb V-ci, which is the primary — but not the only — device for expressing conditionality. In accordance with the above definition, those satisfying both descriptions are candidates for the prototypes of conditionals. The rest are the non-prototypes of the category “conditional constructions”.

The present study identifies morphosyntactic patterns of prototypical conditionals based on actual language use in the corpus, as well as considering the conditional sentences recorded in “grammars” written by native Manchu speakers. The non-prototypes are discussed in relation to the prototypes. This discussion recognises multiple domains (including content, speech-act, epistemic and perceptual) where certain aspects of conditionality are presented.

The present study also compares Manchu conditionals with conditionals in other Altaic (and Altaic-like) languages, which are genetically or typologically close to Manchu. The comparison places Manchu within a larger typological picture and shed some light on future research in languages in which conditionality has not been systematically studied.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>first person</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
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<td>2</td>
<td>second person</td>
<td>INCH</td>
<td>inchoative</td>
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<td>3</td>
<td>third person</td>
<td>INCL</td>
<td>inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABIL</td>
<td>abilitative</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>ablative</td>
<td>IPFV</td>
<td>imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
<td>N-</td>
<td>non-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJ</td>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRH</td>
<td>apprehensive</td>
<td>NMLZ</td>
<td>nominaliser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX</td>
<td>auxiliary verb</td>
<td>OPT</td>
<td>optative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative</td>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONC</td>
<td>concessive</td>
<td>PFV</td>
<td>perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COND</td>
<td>conditional</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOP</td>
<td>cooperative</td>
<td>PN</td>
<td>proper noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>copula</td>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVB</td>
<td>converb</td>
<td>POT</td>
<td>potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
<td>PRED</td>
<td>predicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>diminutive</td>
<td>PRF</td>
<td>perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRN</td>
<td>directional</td>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>different-subject</td>
<td>PROL</td>
<td>prolate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUR</td>
<td>durative</td>
<td>PST</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPH</td>
<td>emphatic</td>
<td>PTCP</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPN</td>
<td>epenthesis</td>
<td>PTL</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVID</td>
<td>evidential</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>question particle/marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCL</td>
<td>exclusive</td>
<td>QUOT</td>
<td>quotative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXH</td>
<td>exhaustive</td>
<td>RECP</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
<td>TERM</td>
<td>terminative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HON</td>
<td>honorific</td>
<td>TOP</td>
<td>topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDR</td>
<td>indirect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 1  Introduction

The present study stems from an interest in the morphosyntactic structures of the counterfactual conditionals of Manchu. Employing verb forms expressing pastness, these conditionals bear a certain resemblance to counterfactual conditionals in European languages such as English and French. Later, this interest extended to Manchu conditional constructions as a whole, motivating a study aiming at the intersection between two fields: conditionality (in natural languages) and Manchu linguistics. The present study defines “conditional constructions” in Manchu using the prototype approach (see Chapter 2), and investigates them from multiple perspectives: semantics, morphosyntax, pragmatics and typology. It aims to answer the following research questions: What types of conditionals exist in Manchu in terms of reality status (factual, hypothetical or counterfactual) and how are they represented? What are the morphosyntactic characteristics of the prototypes of conditional constructions in Manchu? What functions do conditional constructions perform other than expressing a conditional relation? In what ways are the prototypes interrelated with the non-prototypes of conditional constructions?

This chapter is organised in the following way: Section 1.1 provides some basic facts about the Manchu language, Section 1.2 describes the Manchu materials that constitute the corpus of the present study, and Section 1.3 introduces the contents of the other chapters of this thesis.

1.1  The Manchu Language

The Manchu language (*manju gisun* in Manchu) is the native language of the Manchu people, an ethnic minority of the People’s Republic of China. A confederation of numerous tribes, the Manchus originally inhabited Northeast Asia, including today’s northeast Chinese provinces (Liaoning, Jilin and Heilongjiang), as well as Amur Oblast, Primorsky Krai and part of Khabarovsk Krai in Russia. After the Manchus conquered China and established the Qing Dynasty (1644 – 1911), Manchu naturally became the most
important of all the five languages (the other four being Chinese, Mongolian, Tibetan and Chagatai) used in government and enjoyed this status until the fall of the Qing Dynasty. However, the Manchu language has been in decline ever since the latter half of the Qing Dynasty due to assimilation with the Chinese people, who constituted the majority of the Qing population. In Manchuria today, only a handful of Manchu people, most of them over 70 years old, living in rural areas such as Ilanboo (Sanjiazi), Heilongjiang Province, still speak their ancestral language, along with Chinese. On the other hand, the Sibe, an ethnic minority living in the Ili Kazakh Autonomous Prefecture (on the northwestern Chinese border with Kazakhstan), speak a language descended from Qing Dynasty Manchu, which the Sibe troops brought to this area when they were stationed there by the Qing Emperor Qianlong (Aisin-Gioro Hongli, r. 1736 – 1795) in the 1760s after the conquest of Jungaria.

Manchu is a member of the Tungusic language family. The other languages of this family include Even, Evenki, Negidal, Solon, Nanai (Gold), Orok, Oroch, Udeghe and Ulcha. Although scholars hold different views regarding how to classify these languages, Manchu is generally thought to belong to a separate branch (together with Sibe) within the family. The Tungusic languages, together with the Mongolic languages (Mongolian, Kalmyk, Monguor, Khamnigan, Buryat, and so forth) and the Turkic languages (Turkish, Azerbaijani, Uzbek, Uyghur, Kazakh, and so forth), form the controversial Altaic language family (Janhunen 1996; Vovin 2005). Even more controversial is the inclusion of Korean and Japanese as members of the Altaic Family. Despite the uncertainty about the genetic relationship within the family, the so-called Altaic languages do share salient typological characteristics: they are agglutinative, they have a basic SOV word order, and they exhibit vowel harmony (to different degrees). As far as Manchu is concerned, it is moderately agglutinative. It has a number of cases that are expressed via postpositional markers,¹ which are applicable not only to nominals but also to participles. Manchu verbs (see Chapter 3) morphologically distinguish the categories of aspect-tense, mood, and voice, but in contrast to most other Tungusic languages (and many other Altaic languages, in particular the Turkic languages) do not exhibit agreement of person.

¹ The cases in Manchu and the corresponding markers are: nominative (ø), genitive-instrumental (i/ni), dative-locative (de), accusative (be), and ablative (ci, deri).
1.2 Manchu Materials Used in the Present Study

The present study draws data (i.e., example sentences) from a corpus of written Manchu that I have built myself. The Qing Dynasty (1644 – 1911) left an abundant legacy of Manchu texts of various genres. These include, but are not limited to: historical records (especially concerning the Manchus’ own history), official documents (both documents submitted by ministers and imperial mandates), original Manchu literary works, Manchu translations of works of other languages, Manchu conversation books for teaching, Manchu grammar books (in particular descriptions of the usages of functional words), and so forth. In theory, all such materials could qualify as the source of research data, but in practice only a relatively small proportion of them has been chosen. The reason is that not all the Manchu materials are accessible, especially the official documents, the majority of which still remain in storage. In addition, it would require an overwhelming amount of work to build a corpus out of the Manchu materials that are accessible. Nevertheless, the selection of materials is intended to include various genres.

The materials I have chosen for the corpus are available in different formats: some of them are annotated and published by contemporary editors, while others remain in their original Qing editions, stored in libraries and archives. I have purchased or photocopied some materials in modern publications, and have also managed to gain scanned copies (converted to PDF) of some library and archive materials. Since no ready-made research corpus was available, I have transcribed these Manchu texts into the Latin alphabet, following the transcription method devised by Von Möllendorff (1892). The following are the transcribed books that comprise my corpus (also see Bibliography):

(i) Manjui yargiyan kooli ‘Veritable Records of the Manchus’ (abbreviated as MYK).

This consists of eight volumes (MYK1, 2, …, 7 and 8) and is the first part of “Veritable Records of the Qing Dynasty” (Zhonghua Shuju 1985). The whole text was compiled in the 18th century during the reign of the Emperor Qianlong (1736 – 1796). MYK records the (mythical) origin of the Manchus and details the military events centring around the life and death of Nurhachi (1559 – 1626), the chieftain (later to assume the title “khan”) who forged the mutually warring tribes into a united, powerful Manchu state. The transcribed text
contains approximately 52,300 words.

(ii) Nišan saman-i bithe ‘the Tale of Nishan Shaman’ (abbreviated as NSB)

The Tale of Nishan Shaman is an original Manchu literary work that recounts the adventures of a powerful shaman (Nishan), who travelled to the underworld in order to revive a young man. There exist various versions of the NSB (for instance, Stary [1985] includes three unedited manuscripts); the version I have chosen is a PDF version of a manuscript that Russian scholar Alexander V. Grebenshchikov (1880 – 1941) obtained from an ethnic Manchu, Dekdengge, in 1913 (Gorelova 2002: xxiii). The transcribed text of NSB contains approximately 8,500 words.

(iii) Manju gisun i oyonggo jorin i bithe ‘Essentials of the Manchu Language’ (abbreviated as OJ1) and Sirame banjibuha nikan hergen kancibuha manju gisun i oyonggo jorin i bithe ‘Recompiled Essentials of the Manchu Language Supplemented with Chinese Translations’ (abbreviated as OJ2)

The two volumes comprise a single work, which was originally printed in 1809. It contains 101 excerpts of Manchu dialogues, covering various topics of Manchu life: schooling, archery, ethical values, trading, travelling, and so forth. It was used for teaching ethnic Manchus their native language, which at that time was starting to give way to Chinese. The version that I have adopted for research is a contemporary publication of the two books by Taiwanese scholar Chang Hwa-ker in 2005. The transcribed text of the whole volume contains approximately 17,400 words.

(iv) An i gisun de amtan be sara bithe ‘The Book for Knowing the Taste of the Ordinary Language’ (abbreviated as AGA)

This work, consisting of four volumes (AGA1, 2, 3 and 4), was printed in 1802, roughly at the same time as OJ (1809). In terms of content AGA is also similar to OJ, as it is intended to be used for teaching the Manchus to speak their own language proficiently. However, it is

---

2 The Manchu text of this version is translated into Russian by Volkova (1961), who gives an introduction in its publication. Other publications based on this version of Manchu text also exist.
larger in size, containing 319 dialogue excerpts altogether. AGA has no recently published version, and the version that has been used in the present study is a scanned copy of the original book (in PDF). The transcribed text (of all four books) contains approximately 21,400 words.

(v) Nikan gisun kamciha manjurara fiyelen i gisun ‘Passages of Spoken Manchu Supplemented with Chinese translation’ (abbreviated as MFG)

MFG is the second volume of cing wen ki mung bithe ‘The Manchu Language for Beginners’, which was printed in 1730. It contains 51 passages of Manchu dialogues. The version used for the present study is the scanned copy of the original book (as a PDF). The transcribed text contains approximately 6,800 words.

(vi) Qing yu laoqida ‘The Manchu Translation of Laoqida’ (abbreviated as LQD)

The book Laoqida, or No-geol-dae (in Korean), was originally written as a textbook of the Chinese language for Korean speakers. Consisting of eight chapters, it recounts the travels of a Korean businessman to China. It was later translated into other languages including Manchu, the text of which was published in 1765 in Korea. The Manchu version, which was given a new Chinese translation by Chuang Chifa, was republished in Taiwan in 1976 and 1984. The 1984 edition of LQD has been adopted for the present study. The transcription of the whole text has been made available on the Internet, and contains approximately 12,000 words (excluding the Chinese translation).


This book was composed in the 17th century (Ji 2002), and is a Manchu adaptation of ancient Indian Buddhist stories. As suggested by its Manchu name, it consists of 21 stories. One version of these stories is provided by Lebedeva and Gorelova (1994), which is based on an oral account of a native Sibe speaker, recorded by V. V. Radlov in the years 1868 and 1869. Though at the time the Sibes spoke a language almost identical to that of the Manchus, I have
decided not to adopt this version of the text in order to concentrate on written Manchu materials of Manchu in the present study. The version that I have adopted is a Chinese annotation and translation by Ji Yonghai (published in Beijing, 2002), which contains a photocopy of the original Manchu text, amounting to approximately 19,000 Manchu words.

Apart from the above transcribed materials which constitute the corpus, other types of materials are used as references and data sources, although they have not been transcribed. These mainly include some Qing Dynasty grammars and modern publications on Manchu. The Qing Dynasty Manchu grammars include *manju bithei gisun de aisilara mudan i hergen* ‘Functional Words in the Manchu Language’ (1730; abbreviated as AMH), which is Book Three of *cing wen ki mung bithe* ‘An Elementary Textbook of Manchu’; and *dasame foloho manju gisun i untuhen hergen i temgetu jorin bithe* ‘Essentials of the Functional Words in Manchu: A Reprint’ (1894; abbreviated as UH). The two books are quite similar to each other in terms of content, focusing on verb suffixes and functional words. It seems that during the Qing Dynasty the state never published a standard grammar of Manchu (though it did make efforts to standardise orthography and lexicon), which makes private publications such as UH and AMH valuable reference grammars. The general grammatical rules provided by these works are taken into consideration, and some example sentences are also included in the data for the present study.

As for the modern publications on Manchu, *ice manju nikan gisun kamcibuha buleku bithe* ‘A New Manchu-Chinese Dictionary’ (1994; abbreviated as IMN), is used to aid in glossing and translation (of the example sentences), and also provides example sentences. Another useful work, “A Concise Manchu-English Lexicon” (Norman 1978), also proves indispensable for glossing. Li (2010), a textbook of Manchu, provides a few sentences.

Also, one example sentence ([4.1 – 27]) is taken from the Manchu translation (Jakdan 1848) of a Chinese novel collection, *liaozhai zhiyi* ‘Strange Stories of Liaozhai’ (abbreviated as LJ). The whole Manchu text is not transcribed due to its large size, which would exceed that of all the transcribed texts mentioned above. In addition, its genre — a Manchu translation of a Chinese literary work — determines that it would not be ideal corpus material, since the Manchu translation may have been strongly influenced by the Chinese-language
original.

The example sentences of conditional constructions in Manchu all consist of a subordinate clause and a main clause. They are selected in accordance with at least one of two criteria: (i) the subordinate clause ends with a conditional-converb structure (V-cī), or (ii) there exists a conditional relation between the two clauses (Chapter 2 will elaborate on the definition of “conditional constructions”). Thus, in this process, I have excluded those very lengthy (and indeed supercomplex sometimes) sentences that do contain conditional-converb structures and express conditionality, in order to eliminate structural details irrelevant to my investigation of conditionals.

Table 1.1 summarises the information concerning the corpus texts and the number of example sentences from each source. These sentences are analysed in Chapter 4.

### Table 1.1 Information on Corpus Texts and Example Sentences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus Text</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Year (of Original Text)</th>
<th>Word Count</th>
<th>Number of Example Sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MYK</td>
<td>Historical record</td>
<td>The 18th century</td>
<td>52,300</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSB</td>
<td>Original literary work</td>
<td>The 19th century</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJ</td>
<td>Conversation book</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>17,400</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGA</td>
<td>Conversation book</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>21,400</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFG</td>
<td>Conversation book</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LQD</td>
<td>Manchu translation</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Manchu adaptation</td>
<td>The 17th century</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH</td>
<td>Qing Dynasty grammar</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMN</td>
<td>Modern dictionary</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li 2010</td>
<td>Modern textbook</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ</td>
<td>Manchu translation</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1 shows that the texts that make up my corpus cover a period of more than two centuries, during which the Manchu language may reasonably have undergone changes. This
means that in principle it would be inappropriate to treat the materials as representing a homogeneous language variety. However, it turns out that Manchu remained quite stable in general in terms of grammar: for instance, MFG (1730) and AGA (1802), which are of the same genre but are seventy years apart, do not appear to be distinguishable from each other in terms of language. In the case of conditional constructions in particular, there seems to be virtually no structural difference between example sentences from different periods. On the other hand, if the corpus were to include only texts from a relatively short period, there would not be sufficient data and the genres of the texts would also be restricted. Therefore, I have made a compromise between linguistic homogeneity and genre diversity by including the texts as described above.

1.3 Contents of the Thesis

Chapter 2 reviews previous studies on conditionality in the fields of logic and linguistics, as well as on Manchu linguistics. Specifically, this chapter discusses several issues essential to the present study. The first issue concerns the definition of “conditional”, both as a logical function and as a construction in natural language, but more so the latter. Since the object of study is a natural language, the present study regards “conditional” as a linguistic category that can be defined in terms of prototype versus non-prototype. The second issue concerns the nature of the conditional relation. The present study adopts the view that (prototypical) conditionality entails causality between two unrealised states of affairs. Following Sweetser (1990) and Dancygier (1998), it also holds that the conditional relation — or a certain aspect of it (temporality, causality) — can be presented in any of multiple domains, such as the content domain, the epistemic domain, or the speech-act domain. Another issue concerns the reality status of conditionals (or degree of hypotheticality) and how they are expressed in natural language. In accordance with Dahl (1997), and Van Linden and Verstraete (2008), the present study takes into account the aspect-tense forms and modal markers. In addition, contextual factors are also deemed relevant. Thus, through examining issues that have been previously discussed, this chapter outlines the theoretical framework of the study.
Chapter 3 deals with the verb system of Manchu due to the importance of verbs for the present study. This chapter describes the conjugation of Manchu verbs (mainly converbs and participles) and provides information concerning the categories of aspect-tense (imperfective, perfective, and so forth), modality (indicative, imperative, optative, and apprehensive) and voice (active, passive, causative, cooperative, and so forth). Also, the functions of three special verbs (bi- ‘to exist/be’, o- ‘to become/be’ and se- ‘to say’) are discussed. These verbs can function both as lexical verbs and as auxiliary verbs. In particular, the perfective participle of bi-, i.e. bi-he, which plays an important role in the morphosyntax of counterfactual conditionals, is discussed in detail (Section 3.2.2).

Chapter 4 is the core of this thesis, analysing the collected data (example sentences) from multiple perspectives: morphosyntactic pattern, interclausal relation, the domain of semantic representation and so forth. The example sentences are divided into ten categories (not necessarily mutually exclusive) in terms of semantics, syntax and pragmatics, each of which is analysed in one section. Section 4.1 concerns the basic patterns of conditional constructions in Manchu, i.e., the most common sentence patterns in which a conditional relation is evident. These include both factual and counterfactual conditionals. Section 4.2 analyses less common patterns of sentences which nonetheless express a conditional relation. Section 4.3 concerns itself with conditional-like sentences (that is, those containing conditional-converb [V-ci] structures in the subordinate clauses) that express a temporal relation. Section 4.4 discusses a group of conditionals whose use is determined by the pragmatic environment: the protasis in fact serves as a politeness strategy. Section 4.5 analyses conditional-like sentences that function as concessives (proper) or concessive conditionals. Section 4.6 concerns several types of conditional-like sentences that express contrast, comparison or disjunction. Section 4.7 discusses evaluative conditionals, while Section 4.8 analyses sentences in which conditional-converb structures serve as topics. Section 4.9 focuses on a group of frequently used conditional-like sentences that contain verbs denoting perception, obtaining of information or cognition. Section 4.10, the last section of this chapter, analyses two types of conditionals (i.e., inferential conditionals and performative conditionals) that do not fall neatly into the previous categories.

Chapter 5 discusses the issue of identifying the prototypes of Manchu conditionals (both
factual and counterfactual) and summarises the relation between the prototypes and the non-prototypical constructions analysed in Chapter 4. In discussing the prototypes, Section 5.1 also analyses the functions of two word forms, \textit{aika} and \textit{aikabade}, which can serve as conditional connectors and are considered in the present study as indispensable in the prototypes of factual conditionals. Section 5.2 serves as a review of the analysis of Chapter 4, specifying the aspects of prototypical conditionality shared by the non-prototypical constructions, and the domains in which these aspects are presented.

Chapter 6 concludes this thesis. Section 6.1 compares the functions of conditionals in other Altaic (or Altaic-like) languages with the functions of Manchu conditionals, viewing Manchu conditionals in a larger typological picture. Section 6.2 sums up the contribution of the present study from two perspectives — that of research on linguistic conditionality, and that of Manchu linguistics. From the former perspective, the present study investigates new linguistic data — conditionals of Manchu — in a similar way to previous studies (Dancygier 1998; Declerck and Reed 2001; Xrakovskij 2005). From the latter perspective, the present study makes use of a sizeable corpus and systematically looks at conditional constructions in Manchu, which constitute an important aspect of the language. Each section also discusses what possible future research can be conducted on the basis of the present study.
Chapter 2  Literature Review

This chapter first reviews previous studies on conditionality in the fields of formal logic and linguistics, with more emphasis on linguistic conditionality. Various issues involved in the research are discussed: the definition of “conditional”, the nature of the conditional relation, the morphosyntax of conditional constructions, and so forth. This is followed by a review of the (linguistic) studies and publications on the Manchu language since the 17th century. The chapter concludes by summarising the theoretical framework of the present study.

2.1  Review of Studies on Conditionals

This section starts with a general discussion of how to define “conditional” in natural language — the approach that the present study adopts. The section then reviews the research of conditionals as a logic function before coming to review the previous studies on conditional constructions in natural language.

2.1.1  Defining Conditional

Defining “conditional” is a prerequisite for any discussion of conditionals to proceed. One possible way is to give a definition in terms of what conditions should be satisfied. It seems to be the case that both logico-philosophical and linguistic studies on conditionals (in the English language) usually treat this concept as self-evident by identifying it with the if-construction. For example, Bennett (2003: 4) offers a preliminary account of conditionals, which he defines as “items expressible in a sentence of the form ‘If [sentence A], then [sentence C]’”, while Dancygier (1998: 1) confines her research primarily to “sentences so labelled\(^3\) by grammarians”, that is, a main clause and a subordinate clause with the latter having the conjunction if. Yet many other studies simply dispense with an explicit definition of conditional, while actually regarding the if-construction as the default form for conditionals.

\(^3\) labelled as “conditional”
On the other hand, even those who do attempt to define what a conditional is often concede that the definition is defective. For instance, Bennett (2003) points out that his preliminary definition would only address the matter of conditionals in English, and that defining such constructions in other languages would therefore depend on their translation into English. Besides, according to Bennett (2003), even in English, not all the sentences that meet the defining criterion can be properly qualified as conditionals, for structures of this kind may also give rise to other meanings.

Therefore, it does not appear to be an easy task to provide a clear-cut definition for conditional. The difficulty, however, does not necessarily amount to impossibility to conceive of it rationally. A different approach should be adopted. To start with, it is vital that the nature of a linguistic category should be clarified. According to Taylor (1995), any linguistic construction consists of a group of structures that are brought together under a category through “family resemblance” — a concept proposed by Wittgenstein (1958). In a category like this, each member shares a certain characteristic (or certain characteristics) with some, but not all, of the other members, so that considered as a whole the category has no single characteristic that is shared by all its members. Specifically, as Taylor (1995) argues, no linguistic construction as a category has a characteristic shared by all the instances of the construction. He further also argues that not every member of a category of linguistic constructions has the same status, with some of them being more prominent, and others less so. The former are considered central members, or, prototypes, while the latter, peripheral members. Thus, all the members of a category are connected in a network through its central members.

This line of thought is also reflected in Comrie (1986: 77), who proposes an approach to defining conditional constructions “in terms of a prototype rather than in terms of necessary-and-sufficient conditions”, which is adopted in the present study. This approach is simply justified by the precarious nature of linguistic constructions in general as stated above. The next step then is to establish the criteria for identifying the prototype of the conditional construction. The criteria should cover two aspects: meaning and form, described by semantics and morphosyntax, respectively. Specifically, a prototypical conditional necessarily expresses the conditional relation (see Section 2.1.3.1) on the one hand, and correspondingly
has a distinguishing morphosyntax on the other. Only when both meaning and form are considered can a prototype be identified. Take an English example, *If you go out without the umbrella, you’ll get wet* (Comrie 1986: 78). This sentence can be qualified as a prototype of conditional because first, the state of affairs expressed in the *if*-clause serves as a condition for the state of affairs expressed in the other clause, and second, the *if*(*-then*)-structure is accepted as a standard form for the expression of conditionality. When applying this method in practice, the descriptive grammar of a language (ideally authored by native speakers) can be used as a tool for identifying prototypical patterns of conditionals. The reason is that, if a grammar describes how to express the conditional relation at all, the examples provided would presumably be the most salient, prototypical ones in this language. One exception would be the case where in a language the conditional meaning is usually expressed by structures identical to those used for other meanings. In such cases it would not be possible to define conditional constructions as a distinct category within the language, even if it is still possible to discuss conditionality.

Once the prototype(s) of conditional constructions has (have) been identified, the next step will be to expand the category from the central members to peripheral ones through “family resemblance”. The process of expansion involves two dimensions, which are exactly the two aspects considered during the identification of prototypes — semantics and morphosyntax. On the one hand, constructions which (partly) share the morphosyntax with the prototypes may not express conditionality but some other relation, such as temporality, concession, etc. For instance, the sentence *If he came late, he was punished* (Comrie 1986: 77) has a temporal interpretation, and *If we give him the VIP treatment, he won’t be content* (König 1986: 237) is understood as a conditional concessive. On the other hand, constructions can express conditionality even when they are distinct from prototypes in terms of morphosyntax. For example, the sentence *Fix the car and I’ll give you $100* (Fillenbaum 1986: 186) has a conditional interpretation although it is a co-ordinate clause with an imperative and a statement. Thus, the category of conditionals is broadened to constitute a semantic-morphosyntactic network, with the prototypes in the centre, where meaning and form converge, and one set of constructions each of which respectively shares meaning or form with the prototypes. The meaning-form dichotomy determines that the different sets of non-prototypes of the category
defined share no common characteristic with each other, and share different characteristics with the prototypes, while also extending further to structures identifiable as constructions other than conditionals. Therefore, the category of conditional constructions (defined as above) as a whole does not have a common characteristic uniting all of its members, as is the case with any linguistic construction in general, as argued by Taylor (1995).

2.1.2 Conditional as Logic Function

An indispensable notion for human reasoning, conditionals have aroused great interest among logicians and philosophers, who, in general, regard conditional as a relation — a function — held between two propositions, that is, the proposition P expressed in the protasis (or, antecedent, which mostly begins with if in English) and the proposition Q in the apodosis (or, consequent, which sometimes contains then in English) (Jackson 1987; et al.). Particularly, in the view of some logicians, conditional, like other classical functions in mathematical logic — conjunction (“AND”/“∧”), disjunction (“OR”/“∨”) and negation (“NOT”/“~”) — should be described by means of how the truth value is calculated in accordance with the truth values of its component propositions P and Q. In order to do this, the truth-value table (Table 2.1) for “material implication” (or, “material conditional”) in logic is established, such that the conditional is false only when P is true and simultaneously Q is false, while in the other three cases the conditional remains true.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protasis</th>
<th>Apodosis</th>
<th>Conditional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, with some calculation, a (material) conditional consisting of P and Q can be interpreted as ‘It is not the case that P is true and Q is false’, or represented with logic symbols

![Table 2.1 Truth Value for Conditional](image-url)
as “~ (P ∧ ~Q)” (or its equivalent “~ P ∨ Q”). Its logic representation is a compound of other basic truth-functions, and it seems that the remaining problem for a conditional to be analysed in this fashion would be to discuss the circumstances under which a conditional can be equated with a material implication. It is with this line of thought that Jackson (1987) introduces the concept “robustness”: if one says that Q is robust with respect to P, it means that one “accord[s] Q a fairly (very) high probability on the supposition that P is true” (Bennett 2003: 34). By means of the mathematical notion “probability”, Jackson (1987) demonstrates what conditions should be satisfied for a conditional construction “If P then Q” to be effectively represented as a logic expression.

Despite the sophisticated theory attempted at describing conditionals, it should be noted that this approach is far from flawless. First, describing a conditional in the form of the material implication can in some cases fail to give a convincing account of what relation holds between the protasis and the apodosis of a conditional. As a matter of fact, it is indifferent to this issue. For example, a conditional like If Paris is the capital of France, two is an even number (Comrie 1986: 80) qualifies as a true statement by the criterion of material implication, since both the protasis and the apodosis are true. In real life, this sentence would make little sense — although admittedly a particular context can be constructed to make it sound meaningful (Sweetser 1990: 117) — but the truth-function approach is not concerned with the relation between them. On the other hand, even if this approach attempted to explain the relation between protasis and apodosis of a conditional, the precarious nature of conditionals in general would pose a serious challenge to the rigorous logic method. For instance, the conditional If Bismarck is the capital of North Dakota, then Pierre is the capital of South Dakota (Comrie 1986: 81) appears to consist of two irrelevant propositions, but Comrie (1986) gives a particular context for this conditional to make good sense: the speaker is first uncertain which city is the capital of which state, but he knows for sure that the two cities correspond to the two Dakotas, and when he is told by another person that Bismarck is the capital of North Dakota, he makes this conditional inference. However, this required context would be very difficult to explicate through logic formulations, for there may not exist a clear boundary that can be drawn between relevance and irrelevance in natural language.
One can also observe the defect of evaluating the conditional sentences against the truth table. That is to say, conditionals in natural language may not fill all the four columns with undisputable truth values, especially when the protasis is false while the apodosis is true. Psychological experiments have been conducted to test people’s judgement on truth values of given conditionals in different situations concerning whether proposition P or proposition Q is true, and the results have displayed variation in subjects’ responses (Johnson-Laird 1986). Therefore, from the perspective of humans as language users, conditionals do not match material implications well.

Another problem exists with attempting to fit conditionals of natural language into the model of material implication, even if the other problems discussed are neglected: a conditional sentence of natural language can very likely consist of only one proposition, e.g. P in the protasis, while the apodosis is not a statement. For example, the sentence *If you buy a house, will you decorate it yourself?* (Dancygier 1998: 89) has no truth value since the Q in the apodosis is missing. Still, constructions of this kind are quite common in natural language, which are not analysable as material implications.

To summarise, the truth-functional approach attempts to encapsulate the phenomenon of conditionals in a set of logical formulas (material implications), and is more concerned about truth-values in the ontological sense. To some extent it is an approximation — and an idealisation — of conditional constructions in natural language, particularly those with the prototypical form “If P then Q”. However, this approach fails to consider properly, or to address effectively, conditional sentences that require pragmatic or cognitive interpretation. As Xrakovskij (2005: 4) points out, logic and linguistics not only have different objects of research, but also different research goals. He argues that logic studies only “a portion of those language constructions that may be identified as conditional” and that, the goal of logic studies on conditionals is “to determine their role in generating new knowledge from old knowledge” (Xrakovskij 2005: 4–5), while linguistics deals with conditional constructions “as purely linguistic objects with inherent semantic and grammatical properties that are to be identified and described”.

In spite of the deficiency of the truth-functional approach, there are also noteworthy merits. Adopting the perspective of formal semantics, Stalnaker (1975) regards the conditional
relation as a function between two propositions, yet not as a function used to calculate truth values in the sense of material implication. He attempts, by means of the notion of “possible worlds”, to build a uniform theoretical framework to account for both indicative and counterfactual conditionals. Specifically, by selecting a “possible world”, in which the proposition of the protasis (or antecedent) is realised, yet a world that “differs minimally from the actual world”, one can evaluate the truth of a conditional according to whether the proposition of the apodosis (or consequent) is realised in the possible world thus selected. Therefore, since the protasis proposition is always presumed to be true, the problem concerning the truth value of a conditional with a false protasis is in some sense removed. This is an advantage in comparison with material implication, since according to the properties of material implication, a conditional with a false protasis would always produce the value “True” regardless of the truth value of the apodosis, which does not conform to people’s linguistic intuition. Stalnaker (1975) also exemplifies the differences in logic properties between the conditionals (by his definition) and material implications. Furthermore, Stalnaker (1975: 175) argues that the semantic theory of conditionals should “be viewed as…an explanation of a commonly used concept”. He is aware that pragmatic factors should be considered in dealing with conditionals semantically, admitting that “logic has not advanced beyond the propositional stage”.

However, Stalnaker’s (1975) theory of conditionals has limitations in that it still seems to be more concerned with the truth of conditionals, although in a way different from the approach of truth-functionalists. He argues that a theory of conditionals should not be “meant as a description of linguistic usage” (Stalnaker 1975: 175), which, while guaranteeing the theory as a semantic framework as opposed to grammar, might well exclude the possibility of finding various characteristics of conditionals. This limitation is also reflected in his preference for treating conditionality “as a univocal concept”, which, according to the previous discussion concerning the definition of “conditional” (Section 2.1.1), would be a seemingly convenient, but problematic, method. This limitation is due to the fact that Stalnaker (1975) does not provide a definition for conditional, but only chooses the prototypes of conditional as the starting point of his theory.
2.1.3 Conditional as Linguistic Construction

Comrie (1986) is one of the first linguists investigating conditionals to attach more importance to language itself than to such aspects as logical forms. He advocates, as previously mentioned, identifying conditionals through prototypes rather than sufficient and necessary conditions, since the object of study is a construction in natural language. In characterising conditionals, Comrie (1986) considers logical properties of material implications as well as the connection between the protasis and the apodosis of conditionals. The reason is that, on the one hand, prototypes of conditionals behave as predicted by material implications in terms of truth values and logic relations between protasis and apodosis, which Comrie hypothesises as a universal for any language that has a conditional construction. On the other hand, conditionals in natural language require “a stronger link” (Comrie 1986: 80), which is “in most cases causal”, between the protasis and the apodosis.

Comrie (1986) lays out various formal parameters with which to investigate conditional constructions: clause order, markers of protasis and apodosis, degree of hypotheticality and time reference, which also feature as important aspects in other studies on conditionals (Dancygier 1998; Xrakovskij 2005). Comrie employs examples from various languages to illustrate different situations concerning each parameter.

2.1.3.1 The Relation between the Protasis and the Apodosis

This is an essential issue for conditionals. As previously mentioned, the logico-semantic theories either are concerned with what factors are the most important in deciding whether a conditional can be regarded as material implication, or simply state that it does not matter very much whether any relation holds between protasis and apodosis, as long as the conditional as a whole can be evaluated in terms of truth. Moreover, these theories exhibit still less interest in other aspects of conditionals such as morphosyntax, and are thus inadequate in giving an account of conditionals in natural language. This necessitates a linguistic approach that puts more emphasis on language itself.

Comrie (1986) contends that a causal relation holds between the protasis and apodosis of a conditional. The relation, however, is not always straightforward, but is demonstrated in
different ways as well as on multiple levels. First, causality can be confirmed on the content level between two propositions as in the most common conditional pattern: *If you go out without the umbrella, you’ll get wet* (Comrie 1986: 78). Second, causality can be present on the epistemic level, as in the aforementioned conditional *If Bismarck is the capital of North Dakota, then Pierre is the capital of South Dakota* (Comrie 1986: 81). As Comrie (1986) points out, the causal relation does not lie between Bismarck being the capital of North Dakota and Pierre being the capital of South Dakota, but rather between the knowledge of the first fact and the realisation of the second fact. Third, causality is present on the speech-act level, as in the conditional *If you want to know, ten isn’t a prime number* (Comrie 1986: 81), in which the addressee’s intention of knowing does not cause the property of the number ten, but rather, the addressee’s intention of knowing causes the speaker’s speech act of uttering the fact that ten is not a prime number.

Then, in what sense and to what extent do protasis and apodosis have a causal relation between them? The explanation provided by Mackie (1975) concerning the essence of causality (as represented in natural language) may shed some light on this question. Mackie analyses the example of a fire “caused” by a short circuit in order to unveil the real status of this cause in terms of sufficiency and necessity. Specifically, the event of a short circuit, together with some other conditions, forms a set of conditions sufficient to cause the fire, while there also exist other possible sets of conditions equally sufficient to cause a fire. Thus, within the current set of conditions, which is *sufficient* (to cause the fire), the event of a short circuit is a *necessary* condition; on the other hand, the current set of conditions is no more than one of various possible sets, and is *not necessary* to cause a fire. Therefore, Mackie (1975: 16) argues that the event of short-circuit, commonly labelled as the “cause” of the fire, is actually a so-called *INUS* condition, i.e. an “*insufficient* but *necessary* part of a condition which is itself *unnecessary* but *sufficient* for the result”.

This explanation can also be applied to the causal relation between the protasis and the apodosis of a conditional. For example, in the conditional *If it rains, the match will be cancelled*, the falling of rain *per se* is *insufficient* for the match to be cancelled (for instance, one may also have to assume that the match cannot proceed while it is raining, or that the location for the match cannot be changed). However, it can definitely constitute a *necessary*
part of a circumstance that is *sufficient* to cause the cancellation of the match (one would only need to assume the very same conditions mentioned previously). On the other hand, this very circumstance is not *necessary* in the sense that an alternative circumstance (for example, the absence of one playing team, or some technical problem with the venue’s facilities) could also lead to the cancellation of the match. Following this line of thought, by means of being an *INUS* condition, the falling of rain can cause the cancelling of the match.

Affirmation of a causal relation in conditional constructions can also be found in other studies. Sweetser (1990) states that the causal relation is realised in three domains: the content domain, the epistemic domain and the speech-act domain, which is not unlike Comrie’s (1986) point of view. Dancygier (1998: 14) also points out that in a prototypical conditional “what is asserted is the causal connection between $p$ and $q$, not the clauses themselves”. Podlesskaja (2001: 1000) contends that “[o]rdinary conditionals usually presuppose that the processes, states or events denoted by protasis and apodosis are somehow related in the speaker’s mind”, which normally “can be interpreted as causal”. Podlesskaja (2001) further argues that the causal relation between the protasis and the apodosis is imposed by natural language “whenever it is possible”, even in a conditional that would otherwise seem unlikely to contain this relation. Akatsuka (1986: 334) gives an extreme example, which she names “indicative counterfactual”, one of the critics’ favourite examples used for refuting the assertion that certain connection holds between the protasis and apodosis of a conditional: *If you are the Pope, I am the Empress of China*. Akatsuka (1986) takes into account the speaker’s belief as well as the addressee’s, maintaining that in the paradoxical conditional, the protasis and the apodosis are related in that both of them are ridiculously false in the belief system of the speaker, and that the point of uttering this conditional is precisely to indicate the absurdity of the protasis.

Some scholars hold a different view of the relation between the two clauses of a conditional sentence. Wierzbicka (1997) argues that the conditional relation *IF* is a conceptual primitive that cannot be defined without resorting to more complex concepts, such as “hypothetical” or “inference”, or without avoiding circularity in definition. Thus, she argues that the conceptual primitive *IF* can only be *illustrated* by examples of usage. Also, Wierzbicka (1997) particularly rejects the idea that conditionality can be explained in terms
of causality, although she concedes that a causal relation is usually involved in a conditional sentence.

Wierzbicka’s (1997) argument that IF is a conceptual primitive which cannot be explained in terms of causality suffers from several weaknesses. First, the examples used by Wierzbicka in order to question the causality claim are not convincing. She argues that causality does not exist in *If he invites me to dinner, I will not go* (Wierzbicka 1997: 20) since it cannot be rewritten as a sentence using the conjunction *because*. This line of argument is problematic on account of the non-equivalence between the causal relation and the relation able to be expressed by *because*. Since *because* is a specific lexical item in English, its usage is constrained by grammar rules and may not represent causal relation of all kinds, especially when the cause in question is not a realised event. Besides, this example also invites a concessive interpretation, rather than a conditional one, despite the conjunction *if*: it could actually mean ‘*Even if* he invites me to dinner, I will not go’. This probability can be seen in a similar concessive sentence using *if*: *I won’t do it if you pay me*. Thus, discussing the example without specifying its context could lead to a mistaken conclusion.

On similar grounds (that is, inability to be paraphrased using *because*) Wierzbicka (1997: 20) also denies the existence of causality in another example *If he is asleep, I will not wake him up*. One can actually identify the causal relation between the two clauses if one follows Mackie’s (1975) line of thought in that the so-called “cause” represented in nature is only a link of a sophisticated chain. Thus, again, in the example, the person’s being asleep is one among a set of conditions (such as the person being asleep, the speaker’s awareness of his sleep, the speaker’s good manners, and so forth) that sufficiently *cause* the speaker not to wake the person up. It is the speaker who chooses to highlight the person’s being asleep by means of utterance. This analysis applies to the first example given above, when one treats it as a conditional rather than a concessive sentence: the person’s inviting the speaker (which the speaker expresses linguistically), together with other unuttered conditions, such as the speaker’s low opinion of the person, *causes* the speaker not to go to the dinner.

Furthermore, Wierzbicka’s (1997) argument that *IF* is a conceptual primitive is problematic in view of the diverse relations that can exist in conditional sentences. On the one hand, she attempts to argue against the existence of causality, while on the other hand,
failing to account for the apparent diversity of sentential relations, she provides no solution other than reducing them into a concept that refuses any analysis. This does not tackle the nature of conditionality but only evades the real problem: if a conceptual primitive could exhibit a variety of meanings, one may suspect that it is at least not an ideal primitive, or even that it is not a true primitive at all.

Xrakovskij (2005) also argues against the causal relation in conditionals. On the one hand, he admits, as does Comrie (1986), that a relation does exist between the two clauses of a conditional, which he regards as a character distinguishing conditionals in natural language from material implications. On the other hand, he thinks that the causal relation between protasis and apodosis, if it can exist at all, is confined to natural situations, as is shown in the conditional *If the river freezes over, navigation will stop* (Xrakovskij 2005: 23); otherwise, the speaker builds the relation “based on pragmatic reasons” (Xrakovskij 2005: 24), as is shown in conditionals like *If Johnson garners two-thirds of the vote, he will become president* (Xrakovskij 2005: 23) and *If I have time, I’ll call you*” (Xrakovskij 2005: 24). Additionally, Xrakovskij (2005: 24) notes that in some other conditionals, such as *If Helen buys a new dress, she will go to London*, the positions of the protasis and the apodosis are interchangeable “without compromising the semantic integrity”. From these different cases, Xrakovskij (2005) concludes that the causal relation is — at least in some conditionals — subjective, determined to a large extent by the speaker of the conditional, and that the protasis-apodosis relation can only be defined for its own sake, which Xrakovskij (2005: 24) names “the ‘IF relation’ concept”. Similar to Wierzbicka (1997), he asserts that this concept is fundamental, an irreducible conceptual primitive.

Despite Xrakovskij’s (2005) affirmation of the protasis-apodosis connection, his claim that “the ‘IF relation’ concept” is an indefinable primitive is open to question, in a similar way to Wierzbicka’s (1997) view discussed above. First, Xrakovskij (2005) has reached this conclusion as the result of his attempt to extract a homogeneous concept from the sophisticated connection between protasis and apodosis. This still reflects the Aristotelian approach of defining a concept in terms of sufficient-and-necessary conditions, which, as Taylor (1995) convincingly shows, is not an appropriate method. As Dancygier (1998: 185) puts it, “meaning is extended from concrete relations such as real-world causality to more abstract ‘subjective’
relations such as logical and speech act interaction ones”. It follows that the relations within a conditional may not necessarily be homogeneous, but the variety of relations are connected with one another in a cognitive network.

Second, Xrakovskij’s (2005) claim that some protasis-apodosis relations are subjective does not justify the rejection of the causal relation. The reason is that, conditionals in natural language are utterances by speakers, which, reflecting the speakers’ state of mind, more or less have a subjective nature themselves. There would be no ground for imposing purely objective relations on two parts of an utterance, which is but a product of subjective mentality. On the other hand, even if a causal relation can be rejected because of its subjectivity, the mere “natural” causal relation between protasis and apodosis by Xrakovskij’s (2005) standard could also be rejected for exactly the same reason that he uses to dismiss the conditional If I have time, I’ll call you as unqualified for indicating causality. In If the river freezes over, navigation will stop (Xrakovskij 2005: 23), the river’s freezing can be seen as an INUS condition of the cessation of navigation, according to Mackie (1975): other potential causes or conditions are simply not stated, such as the impossibility to break the river ice, or the decision made by the person in charge to stop navigation. In this example subjectivity is also involved, since navigation is a conscious activity of human beings. Then it would be just the same case with the previous example, where the speaker’s having time is an INUS condition of his calling the addressee. Therefore, in natural language there seems to be no real “natural” causal relation at all, since it is virtually impossible to describe the whole set of causes of an event.

Another important aspect is that Xrakovskij (2005) fails to observe the protasis-apodosis relation on multiple levels. The conditional If Helen buys a new dress, she will go to London (Xrakovskij 2005: 24) and its reversed counterpart If Helen goes to London, she will buy a new dress are considered by Xrakovskij to be semantically convergent in spite of the contrary clause order. This may be why he regards the protasis-apodosis relation as subjective and therefore intangible. However, if the protasis-apodosis relation is observed on the content level and the epistemic level respectively, causality will emerge in different forms. In the original conditional, the assumption of Helen’s buying a new dress causes the inference that she will go

---

4 In this sentence the purchase of a new dress is apparently understood as a preparation for the journey to London. Thus, an alternative interpretation that the purchase of a new dress is the aim of the journey to London is excluded.
to London (the epistemic level), while in the reversed conditional, Helen’s action of going to London causes her action of buying a new dress (the content level). A multi-levelled analysis can reveal the diverse forms in which the causal relation is presented. In this sense, the protasis-apodosis relation of a conditional is not an indefinable primitive.

2.1.3.2 Clause Order

Both Comrie (1986) and Xrakovskij (2005) quote Greenberg’s (1963: 84–85) Universal of Word Order 14 concerning the clause order of conditionals: “in conditional statements, the conditional clause precedes the conclusion as the normal order in all languages”. Comrie (1986) points out that on the one hand, no counterexample to this principle has been identified, that is, no language seems to forbid the protasis-apodosis clause order. On the other hand, some languages, like Turkish (and Manchu), only allow the protasis-apodosis order alone, while many other languages, including English, tolerate both the protasis-apodosis order and its reverse. Additionally, Xrakovskij (2005) indicates that in many languages the protasis-apodosis order is the unmarked clause order, and its reverse the marked one.

With respect to the motivation for the predominance of the protasis-apodosis clause order across languages, Comrie (1986: 84) provides several candidate explanations, which may all need more supportive evidence from further research. The first of these is that posing protasis before apodosis can prevent the latter from “being interpreted as a factual statement”. The example Comrie (1986: 84) gives is If you translate for me, I’ll give you $100. He explains that, if the protasis were posed after the apodosis, the addressee might well negligently focus only on the apodosis and come to misunderstand this statement as the speaker’s unconditional offer to give the money.

Comrie (1986) gives two other accounts which are similar in nature. One of them claims that the protasis-apodosis order reflects the temporal sequence of the two related events, while the other argues that this specific clause order is an indicator of the cause and effect relation. Also, just as Dancygier (1993) points out, causal relation is inseparable from the temporal

---

5 “The conditional clause” and “the conclusion” refer to protasis and apodosis respectively.
sequence. Both explanations take into consideration the iconicity of language constructions toward the event structure of the external world.

Another explanation provided by Comrie (1986) involves discourse structure. According to Lehman (1974) (who is quoted by Comrie [1986]), the protasis of a conditional is one of the means by which participants in a discourse can “gain common ground step by step” (Comrie 1986: 86). Similarly, Haiman (1978) (as Comrie notes), perceiving the sentence-initial position occupied by both protases and topics in various languages, proposes that the protases of conditionals are actually topics, because they indicate “givenness”. This view of Haiman’s (1978), however, is criticised by Akatsuka (1986), who argues that the participants of a conversation do not necessarily share the same knowledge at some point, and therefore the unshared knowledge cannot be regarded as “given”. Similarly, Sweetser (1990: 126) argues that the protasis is not presupposed, but “is given only relative to the apodosis”, there being a causal relation between the two.

2.1.3.3 Morphosyntax

Morphosyntax involves at least these aspects: first, what forms (lexical or morphological) are used in a language to mark conditional constructions; and second, in the case where verb inflections (or agglutination) are adopted, how the verbs in the language are inflected (or agglutinated) in different semantic and pragmatic situations, as regards the meanings intended.

Comrie (1986) points out that, while most languages mark either the protasis or the apodosis, or both, of conditionals, marking the protasis seems to be the more common case. Conjunctions are very commonly employed to mark the protasis, such as if in English and jesli in Russian, but in certain languages a particular (non-finite) form of the verb — usually called a “converb” (Ramstedt 1902; Haspelmath and König 1995) — exists which is used in the protasis of a conditional, and sometimes more complex structures derived from non-finite verbs also function to link the protasis and the apodosis of a conditional construction. Conjunctions and non-finite verbs can also be used in combination. Languages that contain particular (non-finite) conditional verb forms include, but are not confined to, Turkish (Göksel

The marking of the protasis or the apodosis can also be realised by means of syntax, especially in non-prototypical conditionals in languages where, apart from the prototypes, at least one alternative construction is available for the expression of conditionality. For instance, *Had he done that, I would have been happy* is a conditional expressed by the verb-subject word order. Alpatov and Podlesskaja (2005) investigate three constructions in Japanese in addition to the prototypical conditional, which are used under different semantic and pragmatic circumstances. The Manchu language also possesses multiple morphosyntactic methods capable of expressing conditionality, which are explored in the present study.

One question that may arise concerns the origin of certain markers of conditional clauses, or the motivation behind some morpho-syntactic structures. Haiman (1978), in arguing that conditionals express “givenness”, mentions in passing his concurrence with the hypothesis that *if* is somehow etymologically related to the verb *give*. Traugott (1985) identifies various origins for the emergence of conditional markers: words for modality, copula constructions, interrogatives, markers of givenness, and temporal words. Before getting into the explanation for the motivations of their function as conditional markers, Traugott (1985) contends that iconicity plays a role in conditional markers’ usually being grammatical words rather than concrete lexical items: the fact that the concept of conditionality is abstract is reflected in its lexical choice. Traugott’s explanation is reasonable, shedding some light on the heterogeneous collection of conditional markers.

According to Traugott (1985), modality words and copula constructions can probably develop into conditional markers because conditionals are related to possibilities or possible worlds rather than reality. This process involves, on the one hand, the selection of a certain modality, such as the optative, which is usually used to express desire or intention. On the other hand, it also involves the selection of copula constructions, which are often used to indicate existence (such as the existence of a possible world, as far as conditionality is concerned). When Traugott (1985) accounts for interrogatives as conditional markers, she agrees with Haiman’s (1978) analysis, and both quote Jespersen’s (1940) example: “*Is he coming? (Yes.*)
Well then, I will stay”. According to Haiman (1978: 571), in this “mini-conversation”, a silent assent (“yes”) is given as the background just in order for the communication to proceed. This can also be seen in the aforementioned example Had he done that, I would have been happy, which can be counted as a conditional but has the verb-subject word order typical of a question. Similarly, it is also worth mentioning that the Russian conditional conjunction jesli ‘if’ originated from the combination of the verb jest’ ‘there is/are’ and the interrogative particle li (Lavrov 1940: 65–67; Cherkasova 1973: 54–62; Vasmer 1986 [vol.2]: 28). According to Lavrov’s (1940) explanation, a conditional clause introduced by the conjunction jesli can, from a diachronic point of view, be regarded as a transformation from a question, approximately interpretable as ‘Is there [such a state of affairs that]...?’.

Traugott (1985) also notes that topic markers can evolve into conditional markers on account of the givenness usually indicated by the former. On the other hand, a structure with the conditional function can evolve into a topic marker: among other devices, the conditional converbs in the so-called Altaic languages (i.e., Turkic, Mongolic and Manchu-Tungusic languages) can serve as topic markers, especially the conditional converb of existential verbs (Gorelova 2006).

Concerning the relationship between interrogatives and conditionals, a word form in Manchu, aika (as well as aikabade, derived from aika), which was originally an indefinite determiner/pronoun meaning ‘some(thing)/any(thing)’, frequently occurs in conditional sentences. It can be regarded as a conditional connector, a semantic and functional analogue of if in English (see Section 5.1.1).

As regards another important origin of conditional markers, temporal constructions, Traugott (1985) points out that the notion “frame” can help clarify their emergence: the example she gives, When Bill came home, John left, has two readings — one temporal and the other conditional — the former of which depicts a specific occasion when Bill came home, while the latter covers all occasions when Bill came home. The frames set up in the two readings are different but interrelated, which can possibly account for the common phenomenon of temporal constructions serving as conditionals.
2.1.3.4 Degree of Hypotheticality and Classification of Conditionals

Conditional constructions vary in terms of the reality status of the states of affairs described. This variation involves the degree of hypotheticality. In his discussion, Comrie (1986) does not agree with the division of the whole range of conditionals into the dichotomy between “indicative” and “counterfactual” types, but favours a continuum of hypotheticality. According to Comrie, the conventional “indicative” and “counterfactual” conditionals are at the two extremes of this continuum, the former indicating the lowest degree, and the latter, the highest degree, of hypotheticality.

Being aware of an existing controversy, Comrie (1986: 80) argues that conditionals themselves express neither factuality nor counterfactuality, because they are not part of the meaning of conditionals, but are rather “derived by implicature or from context”. He provides examples with indicative and counterfactual forms, respectively, which, however, trigger alternative readings. For instance, in the sentence (Are we in Bolivia now?) If Brasilia is the capital of Bolivia, then we’re in Bolivia (Comrie 1986: 90), the indicative form cannot be interpreted as stating a truth. On the contrary, it can only be understood as counterfactual according to encyclopaedic knowledge. On the other hand, in the sentence If the butler had done it, we could have found just the clues that we did in fact find (Comrie 1986: 90), the counterfactual form actually suggests that the statement is true in the real world. Dancygier (1998: 35) gives even more peculiar examples to illustrate the indeterminacy of factuality or counterfactuality: If Mary were allergic to penicillin, she would have exactly the same symptoms she is showing (but in fact we know that Mary is not allergic to penicillin). It seems that one could infer from the conditional, in a similar way as Comrie (1986) suggests, that Mary is allergic to penicillin. However, this inference would prove erroneous in the face of the parenthesised information, which can be seen as a straight assertion. Dancygier (1998: 35) argues that such a conditional cannot be interpreted either as factual or as counterfactual, due to the “contradictory pieces of evidence”. These examples may appear idiosyncratic, but they evince the dependence of factual/counterfactual interpretation of conditionals on context, rather than solely on verbal morphology.

The view that hypotheticality of conditionals is a continuum is not shared by all researchers: Wierzbicka (1997) argues that (factual) conditionals and counterfactuals
counterfactual conditionals) are discrete semantic concepts. She argues that counterfactual conditionality, like (factual) conditionality, is also a conceptual primitive, which cannot be defined by means of more fundamental concepts — especially not to be defined via the (factual) conditional relation IF and other semantic components.

Questioning Comrie’s (1986) argument that there are no true counterfactual conditionals in English, Wierzbicka (1997: 51) argues that true counterfactual conditionals do exist, and the “hard core of the category” consists of those that have two negative clauses (with the syntactic structure IF NP HAD NOT V-PAST-PART, Y WOULD NOT HAVE V-PAST-PART). She demonstrates that such conditionals, unlike the problematic conditional sentences given by Comrie (1986), do not allow non-counterfactual interpretations. Wierzbicka (1997) also postulates that factual and counterfactual conditionals universally exist in all languages, while hypothetical conditionals, which are situated between the two in terms of reality status, are a language-specific phenomenon.

Wierzbicka’s (1997) argument about the authentic, prototypical counterfactual conditionals in English is convincing, and no doubt her hypothesis about the universal existence of factual and counterfactual conditionals is worthy of investigation. However, similarly to her view concerning the conditional relation, Wierzbicka’s (1997) treatment of counterfactual conditionality as a conceptual primitive is problematic. The reason is that counterfactual conditionality shares with factual conditionality the internal relation between two states of affairs. The two types of conditionality differ in their respective statuses in relation to the speaker’s reality. In fact, Wierzbicka (1997) is aware that they represent two types of states of affairs — one that the speaker thinks can happen, and the other that the speaker thinks cannot happen — but she nevertheless does not regard this analysis as a semantic decomposition of counterfactual conditionality.

In order to classify conditionals, Dancygier (1998: 61) proposes a new approach based on whether “predictive reasoning” is presented or not, so that conditionals with predictive reasoning are labelled as “predictive conditionals”, while those without are labelled as “non-predictive conditionals”. This way of classifying conditionals does not particularly stress whether the protasis or apodosis is factual or not, but rather regards all conditionals in general — when uttered — as statements to whose factuality the speaker is not committed with
certainty. The criterion of classification lies in the domain where the protasis-apodosis relation is presented: the propositional domain (the content domain) or other domains (“the epistemic domain” or “the speech-act domain”). In this manner, the “predictive conditionals” are those having the protasis-apodosis relation in the propositional domain, and the remainder are “non-predictive conditionals”. Dancygier’s (1998) classification is advantageous in that it avoids the notorious and controversial dilemma of distinguishing factuality and counterfactuality, leaving it to be decided by an interpretation that considers linguistic context.

2.1.3.5 Time Reference and Expression of Hypotheticality

When Comrie (1986) addresses the matter of time reference in conditionals, he explicates two important mechanisms: tense reduction and back-shifting of tense. For example, in the protasis of an English conditional, the difference in verb forms between the present and the future is neutralised, and both the present and the future are realised by the present verb form. Also, in the protasis of a counterfactual conditional, the tense of the verb is back-shifted, with the present/future (the two being reduced to one form) turning into the simple past, and the past into pluperfect; the apodosis also back-shifts its verb tense accordingly. However, Comrie (1986) has not provided an explanation for this phenomenon. Dancygier (1998) points out that in the protasis and the apodosis of the (predictive) conditionals, the verb forms exhibit certain compositionality. In quoting Fleischman’s (1989) idea, Dancygier explains that back-shifting of tense is a common metaphorical use, which, although usually expressing a “temporal distance”, is now applied to indicate “non-temporal distance”, such as non-factuality, social distance, and so forth.

Dancygier (1998: 62) also notes that, since back-shifting of tense only exists in predictive conditionals (by her definition), but not in non-predictive conditionals (e.g. If she is in the lobby, the plane arrived early), which allow much more flexibility in the choice of verb forms, it is a crucial distinction between the two kinds of conditionals. She further argues that the temporal reference of a conditional depends on various factors, of which back-shifting of time is only one; other factors include context, the semantic class of the verb, and the hypotheticality of the construction.
Some researchers question the view that irreality or counterfactuality is simply realised via back-shifted tenses. Dahl (1997: 100) points out that “marking of irreality/hypotheticality is rarely done by means of a past tense alone but normally by the combination of a past tense with something else”. For instance, in the English sentence *If I were younger, I would study Classical Greek* (Dahl 1997: 98), the verb form *were* in the protasis is not the present tense back-shifted to the past, but the (obsolescent) past subjunctive form of the verb *be*. Meanwhile, the complex verb structure *would study*, where *would* can be argued to be the past tense of the auxiliary *will*, occurs in the apodosis instead of the past tense *studied*. Dahl (1997) also explains that counterfactual conditionals are all essentially related to certain past temporal points, which proves to be a more complicated relation than the past-as-unreal hypothesis implies. Similarly to Dahl (1997), Van Linden and Verstraete (2008) point out that counterfactuality tends to be realised not by means of mere past tense, but via the *combination* of modal elements and tense/aspectual markers that denote pastness or perfectiveness.

### 2.1.3.6 Interpreting Conditionals and Conditionals in Use

The most common way of interpreting a conditional would be as it literally suggests, that is, the state of affairs of the apodosis is contingent on state of affairs of the protasis, which is exactly the case covered by “predictive conditionals” as Dancygier (1998) defines them. As regards “non-predictive conditionals”, the perspective of interpretation would have to shift to another domain, taking epistemic as well as speech-act factors into account.

Xrakovskij (2005) is aware of these factors and regards a conditional as the utterance of a potential speaker. He gives two explications for conditional constructions, “assertive” and “non-assertive” (Xrakovskij 2005: 18), which roughly correspond to “predictive” and “non-predictive” by Dancygier’s (1998) definition.\(^6\)

Explication I: ‘When producing a CC [Conditional Construction] the speaker indicates that the state of affairs \(p\), if realised, entails the state of affairs \(q\).’

\(^6\) More accurately, “non-assertive” conditionals defined by Xrakovskij (2005) may only correspond to the conditionals in the speech-act domain.
Explication II: ‘When producing a CC the speaker indicates that the state of affairs of $p$, if realised, validates the entailed speech act that represents the state of affairs $q$’.

(Xrakovskij 2005: 18)

In an elaborate analysis that follows, Xrakovskij (2005: 22) provides formulated explanations for a number of sentences. For example, *If John had got his salary yesterday, he would have bought his wife a present* is explained as “IF concept + I say: I know: this has not taken place”, where “this” refers to the events indicated by the conditional. It is noteworthy that in this explanation, the role of the speaker is salient (“I say”), and the cognitive state of the speaker is represented by “I know”. However, such explications may fail to account for the occasions in which the factuality of the conditional is indeterminate. Also, the protasis-apodosis relation is regarded as the “IF concept”, a “conceptual primitive”, which is deficient according to the previous analysis (Section 2.1.3.1) of the definition of conditionals. The formulaic explanation of such a kind would fail to apply to the conditional given by Dancygier (1998: 62), *If he won’t arrive before nine, there is no point in ordering for him*. The reason is that, according to Xrakovskij (2005), this conditional would be formulated as “IF concept + I say: I know: this is not taking place (or, this will not take place)”, which would also qualify as the interpretation for a different, more common conditional, *If he doesn’t arrive before nine, there is no point in ordering for him*. However, the two conditionals here are distinguished in meaning. The former implies that the information in the protasis (his arriving) is obtained from another conversational participant or inferred from the conversation by the speaker of the sentence and that the speaker accepts this as true. In contrast, the latter conditional only indicates that the speaker makes this assumption on his or her own, probably irrelevant to the conversation.

Since the interpretation of conditionals is largely dependent on context, conditionals are able to serve different uses accordingly. On the one hand, in the field of logic, conditionals are used for “generating new knowledge from old knowledge” (Xrakovskij 2005: 4–5), and on the other hand, in natural languages, conditionals usually function “as the basis for further discussion” (Haiman 1978: 571). There are also other specific uses, for example, highlighted by Fillenbaum (1986), who analyses the illocutionary effects of certain conditionals:
conditional promises and conditional threats. Fillenbaum associates conjunctive (and) and disjunctive (or) constructions with conditional promises and threats, pointing out that the speaker’s intention would require that the conditionals be interpreted in a particular way. For example, the sentence if you don’t give me your money I’ll kill you (given in Fillenbaum 1986: 184) would be interpreted as only if you give me your money, I won’t kill you, through which the addressee could understand what needs to be done to avoid the consequences that he or she finds undesirable. It should be noted that the conditional is actually interpreted in such a way as if the protasis were the sufficient-and-necessary condition for the apodosis, which stands in opposition to the material implication analysis (Section 2.1.2).

Van der Auwera (1986: 199) identifies one type of conditionals which he calls “conditional speech act” (e.g., where were you last night, if you wouldn’t mind telling me?). According to Van der Auwera, in such a conditional the protasis represents a sufficient condition for the speech act (the inquiry of the speaker) denoted by the apodosis. However, in quoting Sweetser (1990), Dancygier (1998: 90) points out that the speech act in question is actually carried out, regardless of the protasis (whether the addressee permits the speaker to inquire), and that the function of the protasis is “to make the utterance more polite or appropriate”.

2.2 **Review of Linguistic Studies on the Manchu Language**

The Manchu language interested the West as early as the late 17th century, during the first few decades of the Qing Dynasty (1644 – 1911). According to Meadows (1849), a Manchu grammar, *Elementa Linguae Tartaricae*, authored by Jean-François Gerbillion, was printed in 1696. The 18th and 19th centuries witnessed more Western publications on the Manchu language, including both dictionaries and descriptive grammars. Dictionaries from that time include *Dictionnaire Tartare Mantchou François* (Amiot 1789 – 1790) and *Polnyj man’čžursko-russkiij slovar’* [A Complete Manchu-Russian Dictionary] (Zakharov 1875). Descriptive grammars include *Grammaire tartare manchou* (Amiot 1788), *Eléments de la grammaire mandchoue* (Von der Gabelentz 1832), *Grammatika man’čžurskogo jazyka* [A Grammar of the Manchu Language] (Zakharov 1879) and Von Möllendorff (1892).
Apart from the Western works mentioned above, dictionaries and grammars of the Manchu language were also published in China during the Qing Dynasty. Such dictionaries include *daicing gurun i yooni bithe* [A Complete Lexicon of the Qing Empire] (1683; compiled by Shen Qiliang) and *han i araha nonggime toktobuha manju gisun i buleku bithe* [The Imperial Dictionary of the Manchu Language (a Supplemented Version)] (1771). Manchu grammars published in China include AMH (1730), UH (1894), among others. The grammars written by Qing intellectuals are quite different from the descriptive grammars of the Western linguistic tradition in that the former do not classify linguistic items into neat categories (e.g., parts of speech) as the latter do, but rather list them in a linear order, either alphabetically (according to the Manchu order) or in a way that may facilitate memorisation. They are barely concerned with grammatical concepts or origins of language structures, but provide examples of language usage with an intuitive explanation. This character of Qing Dynasty grammars may seem to be a demerit, but it is compensated for by the fact that constructions of similar or identical meaning are easily identifiable and the possible artificiality of categorising a certain construction is minimised. When Western linguistic works on Manchu are combined with the Qing Dynasty grammars, the description of conditional constructions can be carried out.

With the fall of the Qing Dynasty (1911), Manchu lost its status as the (most important) official language of an empire. However, researchers have not stopped publishing on the language up until the present (Sinor 1968; Avrorin 2000; Gorelova 2002; Li 2010). During the second half of the 20th century, and especially the final quarter, works on Manchu by authors based in China also appeared. They are based on classical written Manchu texts (Ji et al. 1986), or on the field work on spoken Manchu (Zhao 1989), or combine both of them (Aisin-Gioro 2004). What these works have in common is that they all employ concepts and terminology of modern (structuralist) linguistics, describing the Manchu language in terms of orthography, phonology, morphology and syntax, just as would be expected in a typical descriptive grammar.

Despite the relative abundance of research literature on the Manchu language in general, very few studies or works address the conditional constructions in particular. Mostly, conditional constructions are briefly mentioned and their discussion is usually scattered in
different sections. In his sketch grammar Von Möllendorff (1892: 9) mentions in passing that the suffix *-ci* “makes a Conditional Tense” — a confusing misnomer by the present-day linguistic standard — without much further explanation about its function. Sinor (1968) points out the suffix *-ci* mostly expresses the conditional relation. Avrorin (2000: 206–208) labels the verb form V-*ci* as “conditional adverbial participle” (or, “conditional converb”), and explains its semantics and syntactic functions not only on its own but also in combination with other lexical items. These functions include the expression of the conditional relation (via V-*ci* alone or via framed structures), the formation of the “compound predicate of an impersonal sentence”, and topicalisation. Gorelova (2006), in exploring information structures of Altaic languages, discusses the use of the verb form V-*ci* (conditional converb) of quotative and existential verbs as topic markers. This very function is also discussed in Migliorenza (2004).

Although Qing Dynasty grammars more or less touch upon conditionals in the description of functional words, the example sentences are few in number. One problem with this is that these example sentences are the most typical examples, while the non-typical ones, which are nonetheless numerous, are largely neglected. Moreover, the Qing Dynasty grammars do not give explanations beyond basic usage. It is these shortcomings that the present study aims to overcome, through exploring the whole range of functions of conditional constructions in the corpus, and explaining the internal motivations for these functions.

2.3 Summary: The Theoretical Framework of the Present Study

The review in the previous sections demonstrates the complexity of defining “conditional” as a category in natural language and the debate centring around the nature of conditionality as well as the reality statuses of different types of conditionals. With previous studies on conditionals and on the Manchu language in mind, the present study makes the following assumptions in investigating Manchu conditionals:

First, the prototypical conditional relation involves two states of affairs (P and Q), which, in the mind of the speaker, are both unrealised. This relation entails causality in the sense
defined by Mackie (1975): P is one insufficient but necessary state of affairs among a set of unnecessary but sufficient states of affairs that causes Q.

Second, the three reality statuses of conditionals — factual, hypothetical and counterfactual — are conceptually distinct from each other, but in natural language their interpretations are closely related to context. Besides, there are also other types of reality status, such as that of the “problematic” conditional exemplified by Comrie (1986: 90) *If the butler had done it, we could have found just the clues that we did in fact find* (see Section 2.1.3.4). In this sentence the speaker makes an inference concerning one past state of affairs based on another, but does not express counterfactuality, since the latter state of affairs, represented by the apodosis, is a fact. Yet this sentence shares the same syntax as others that do have a counterfactual interpretation. Therefore, one cannot necessarily identify a one-to-one correspondence between reality statuses and morphosyntax.

Third, the “conditional constructions” in the general sense are defined in the present study as a semantic and morphosyntactic network. Basically, each of them consists of two clauses, one subordinate and the other main. In terms of verb morphology, the subordinate clause is non-finite and the main clause is finite. Furthermore, at least one of the following two criteria should be met: (i) semantically, a conditional relation exists between the states of affairs represented by the clauses; (ii) morphosyntactically, the predicate of the first (subordinate) clause should contain a conditional-converb (*V-ci*) structure (see Section 3.1.1 for the conditional converb *V-ci*). When both criteria are met, the constructions are considered as *candidates* for the prototypes. The prototypes of conditional constructions should meet a further criterion: the structures used are expected to be described by (Qing Dynasty) Manchu grammars (whose authors presumably described what they considered as the most prototypical examples) and to occur frequently in corpus.

Finally, shared morphosyntax (such as conditional-converb structures) implies certain shared aspects of meaning (such as conditionality). However, just as argued by Sweetser (1990) and Dancygier (1998), the conditional relation can be presented in any of multiple domains. Such domains include (but are not necessarily limited to) the following: the content domain, concerning propositional content, in which conditionality is literally understood between two states of affairs; the epistemic domain, which concerns epistemic activities such
as reasoning; the speech-act domain, which concerns speech acts (other than statement); and
the perceptual domain, concerning acts of perception (the last term is not used by Sweetser
1990 or Dancygier 1998). The multi-domain analysis is particularly useful for the
non-prototypes of conditional constructions.
Chapter 3  A Grammar of Manchu Verbs

This chapter provides a basic description of Manchu verbs in view of their essential role in the grammatical system of Manchu and their relevance to the present study. The description is generally based on contemporary Manchu studies (mainly Gorelova 2002; also Sinor 1968, Avrorin 2000, and Li 2010), but also takes into account the uses recorded in Qing Dynasty Manchu grammars. Section 3.1 describes the conjugations of Manchu verbs and the categories of aspect-tense, modality and voice. Section 3.2 is dedicated to several verbs of Manchu that can serve as lexical verbs as well as auxiliary verbs. In Section 3.2.2 the perfective participle of the verb bi- ‘to be’, bi-he, is given a particular analysis concerning its functions, since it is relevant to counterfactual conditionals.

3.1  The Manchu Verb System

Manchu verbs distinguish aspect-tenses, voices and moods, but do not indicate the category of either person or number by means of morphology.

In terms of syntactic function, Manchu verb forms can be divided into two types: finite forms and non-finite forms. The finite forms are those which can serve as main predicates: either the predicates of simple sentences or as the main predicates of complex sentences. In contrast, non-finite forms are those which cannot serve as main predicates. It is the finite forms that embody the categories of (absolute) aspect-tense and mood. Relative aspect-tenses are able to be expressed by non-finite forms: participles and converbs.

3.1.1  Converbs

As a special group of verb forms common to all Altaic languages, converbs primarily function to express the subordination of one verb to another. This property determines that, in contrast with the finite forms, converbs cannot serve as the main predicates in simple sentences or in the main clauses of complex sentences. However, they can serve as predicates in subordinate clauses.
Converbs are formed by attaching a converbal suffix to a verb stem. A converb can either have its own subject or take the same subject as the verb to which it is subordinate. This point is important especially because in languages like Manchu, in which the converbs do not indicate the category of person, thus leaving the identification of their subjects largely to the context in which they occur. There are eight main types of converbs in Manchu, expressing various semantic and grammatical relations, as shown in Table 3.1 (the capital letter A indicates a vowel that has more than one possible value in accordance with vowel harmony):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Converb</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Basic Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperfective</td>
<td>-me</td>
<td>‘while doing something…’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfective</td>
<td>-fi</td>
<td>‘after doing/having done something…’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>-ci</td>
<td>‘if [one] does something…’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessive</td>
<td>-cibe</td>
<td>‘although/even if [one] does something…’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durative</td>
<td>-hAi</td>
<td>‘having been doing something…’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminative</td>
<td>-tAlA</td>
<td>‘until [one] does something…’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipative</td>
<td>-nggAlA</td>
<td>‘before doing something…’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaustive</td>
<td>-tAi</td>
<td>‘to the extent of doing something’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six of these converbs can express a temporal relation of one kind or another: the durative, terminative and anticipative converbs (almost) exclusively express temporal relations; the imperfective and perfective converbs primarily express temporal relations, while also functioning in many cases to express the means by which (or the manners in which) the actions of their governing verbs take place: *tata-me* [hang-IPFV.CVB] *wa-* [kill] ‘to hang to death’ (lit.: ‘to kill by hanging’); *nende-fi* [be.in.front-PFV.CVB] *yabu-* [go] ‘to go in front’.

The conditional converb serves to express both conditional and temporal relations, depending on the specific context.

---

7 Not all these converbs have a widely used designation in previous studies, and I have made my own decision in this respect. For instance, Gorelova (2002: 282) labels the converb ending in -tAlA as “terminal converb”, while I prefer the term “terminative”. Some converbs do not even have any explicit designation at all, in spite of descriptions about their functions. For instance, I am responsible for coining the designations “anticipative” and “exhaustive”, though Gorelova (2002: 283–284) explains the usages of the two converbs.
The rest of the converbs seem to express non-temporal relations. The concessive converb admits the state of affairs that it represents while drawing attention to a state of affairs that is contrary to expectation, which is represented by the following predicate. The exhaustive converb, whose usage is mostly restricted to a handful of verbs, largely serves as an adverbial of degree: buce-tei [die-EXH] afa- [fight] ‘to fight desperately [with readiness to die]’.

The conditional converb is one of the research focuses of the present study. Apart from being used in subordinate clauses to express conditional or temporal meanings (discussed elaborately in Chapter 4), it can also build complex structures when combined with other verb forms or postpositional connectors. First, the conditional converb V-ci can combine with either o- ‘to become/be’ or aca- ‘to suit’ to express a modal meaning, as shown in Table 3.2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modal Verb</th>
<th>Grammatical Polarity</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o- ‘to become/be’</td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>V-ci o-</td>
<td>Possibility or permission</td>
<td>‘can/may/be allowed to do something’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>V-ci ojo-rakū</td>
<td>‘cannot/may not/not be allowed to do something’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aca- ‘to suit’</td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>V-ci aca-</td>
<td>Obligation</td>
<td>‘should/be supposed to do something’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>V-ci aca-rakū</td>
<td>‘should not/not be supposed to do something’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second, the conditional converb is used with the perfective participle (see Section 3.1.2 on participles) of the phase verb waji- ‘to finish’, forming the structure V-ci wajiha, which means ‘it suffices to do something’, for instance, uttu [like.this] gama-ci [deal.with] waji-ha [finish-PFV.PTCP] ‘it suffices to deal with it like this’. Furthermore, the conditional converb forms a structure with the postposition tetendere, which serves as a sentence connector.

---

While for the affirmative forms of the (modal) verbs, the verb stems (o-, aca-) are used, the negative forms are represented by the negative imperfective participles (ojo-rakū, aca-rakū), since negative participles are the only verb forms that express negation. Participles and their negative forms are discussed in Section 3.1.2.1.

It should be noted that other components can be inserted between the conditional converb and the auxiliary verb of the complex structures mentioned above, e.g. uthai ‘then’, teni ‘only then’, as in tuttu [in.that.manner] icishiya-ci [handle-COND] teni [only.then] aca-mbi [suit(AUX)-IPFV.FIN] ‘Only if [you] handle [it] in that manner will it be appropriate’, menggun [money] bu-ci [give-COND] uthai [then] waji-ha [finish-PFV.PTCP] ‘It just suffices to give [him] the money’.

### 3.1.2 Participles

According to Gorelova (2002), the term “participle”, when applied to Altaic languages (Manchu included), is in fact a “hyperform” that combines both verbal and nominal characteristics in realising different syntactic functions. There are three main such functions: attribute, main predication, and subordinate predication (all the functions are discussed in Section 3.1.2.2). The attributive function embodies the nominal characteristic of the participle, while the functions as predicates (governing nominals and exhibiting aspect-tense and mood/modality) demonstrate the verbal characteristics of the participle. Gorelova (2002: 254) states that when serving as attributes of nominals and subordinate predicates, Manchu participles “reveal an aspectual meaning”, while as main predicates they have “a certain temporal meaning”. Concurring with Avrorin (1949), Gorelova (2002) also points out that, when serving as main predicates, Manchu participles are in a transition from expressing aspectual meanings to expressing temporal meanings. On the other hand, Sinor (1968) argues that Manchu participles only concern aspect rather than tense. The present study, taking into account the multiple syntactic functions of participles discussed by Gorelova (2002), considers that participles (of most lexical verbs) express predominantly aspectual meanings, regardless of their syntactic function. However, the present study does agree with the opinion of Avrorin (1949) and Gorelova (2002) that Manchu participles are developing temporal meanings, and actually demonstrates this point with the usage of the perfective participle bi-he (see Section 3.2.2.1).
3.1.2.1 Morphology of Participles

There are two types of participles in terms of aspectuality: the imperfective participle and the perfective participle.

The imperfective participle, used to represent ongoing or habitual states of affairs, is formed by the verb stem and the suffix -ra, where the vowel A is determined by the stem-final vowel of the verb (in accordance with vowel harmony when the stem-final vowel is a, e or o; elsewhere the suffixal vowel A is e). Table 3.3 shows how vowel harmony operates in forming the imperfective participle.

Table 3.3 Vowel Harmony in the Imperfective Participle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Final Stem/Root Vowel</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Imperfective Participle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>ala- ‘to tell’</td>
<td>ala-ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>isa- ‘to gather’</td>
<td>isa-ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>bodo- ‘to consider’</td>
<td>bodo-ro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tolo- ‘count’</td>
<td>tolo-ro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e, i, u, ū, oo, etc.</td>
<td>gene- ‘to go’</td>
<td>gene-re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ali- ‘to accept’</td>
<td>ali-re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hendu- ‘to say’</td>
<td>hendu-re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kāthū- ‘to mingle’</td>
<td>kāthū-re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>too- ‘to swear’</td>
<td>too-re</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some verbs, mainly those having a monosyllabic or disyllabic root, have an irregular stem (which has one more syllable than the root) when forming the imperfective participle, as shown in Table 3.4.

The perfective participle, used to describe completed states of affairs, is formed by the verb stem and the suffix -ha, where the vowel is largely determined by a set of much more complex rules than that of the imperfective participle, with some exceptions (for example, buju-ha but guku-he; see Table 3.5). These rules are not discussed here, but a few examples
may serve to shed light on this matter. Table 3.5 shows the perfective participle of several verbs with a disyllabic stem/root.

Table 3.4 Irregular Imperfective Participles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Root</th>
<th>Imperfective Participle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bi- ‘to exist/be’</td>
<td>bisi-re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>je- ‘to eat’</td>
<td>jete-re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ji- ‘to come’</td>
<td>jide-re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gala- ‘(of sky) to clear up’</td>
<td>galanda-ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ba- ‘to be lazy’</td>
<td>banda-ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o- ‘to become/be’</td>
<td>ojo-ro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.5 Vowel Harmony in the Perfective Participle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem/Root Vowels</th>
<th>Verb Stem/Root</th>
<th>Perfective Participle</th>
<th>Suffixal Vowel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a-a-</td>
<td>ala- ‘to tell’</td>
<td>ala-ha</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-i-</td>
<td>banji- ‘to be born’</td>
<td>banji-ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-u-</td>
<td>sabu- ‘to see’</td>
<td>sabu-ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-i-</td>
<td>ili- ‘to stand up’</td>
<td>ili-ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-u-</td>
<td>iju- ‘to smear’</td>
<td>iju-ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-ū-</td>
<td>ikū- ‘to shrink’</td>
<td>ikū-ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u-u-</td>
<td>buju- ‘to boil’</td>
<td>buju-ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-e-</td>
<td>gene- ‘to go’</td>
<td>gene-he</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-i-</td>
<td>benji- ‘to send’</td>
<td>benji-he</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-u-</td>
<td>henu- ‘to say’</td>
<td>henu-he</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-e-</td>
<td>fide- ‘to dispatch’</td>
<td>fide-he</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u-i-</td>
<td>ulhi- ‘to understand’</td>
<td>ulhi-he</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u-u-</td>
<td>guku- ‘to perish’</td>
<td>guku-he</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.5 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem/Root Vowels</th>
<th>Verb Stem/Root</th>
<th>Perfective Participle</th>
<th>Suffixal Vowel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>o-o-</em></td>
<td><em>bodo-</em> ‘to consider’</td>
<td><em>bodo-ho</em></td>
<td><em>o</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>sonjo-</em> ‘to choose’</td>
<td><em>sonjo-ho</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>tokto-</em> ‘to decide’</td>
<td><em>tokto-ho</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some verbs have an irregular form for the perfective participle: instead of the suffix 
-hA, they contain the alternative suffix -kA. Furthermore, a few verbs (mostly those having a monosyllabic stem) even change their stem (by inserting the velar or uvular nasal ng [ŋ]/[N] between the bare stem and the suffix -kA). Table 3.6 shows the irregular perfective participles.

Table 3.6 Irregular Perfective Participles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Root</th>
<th>Perfective Participle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>je- ‘to eat’</td>
<td>je-ke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuhe- ‘to fall’</td>
<td>tuhe-ke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dosi- ‘to enter’</td>
<td>dosi-ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>okdo- ‘to welcome’</td>
<td>okdo-ko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guwe- ‘to tweet’</td>
<td>guweng-ke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jo- ‘to mention’</td>
<td>jong-ko</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both the imperfective and perfective participles have their negative counterparts. The negative participles are formed by attaching the negative particle akū to the participial suffixes, giving rise to forms such as -rakū (< -rA + akū) and -hAkū (< -hA + akū) respectively, for example, gene-rakū [go-IPFV.PTCP.NEG], sabu-hakū [see-PFV.PTCP.NEG], ji-hekū [come-PFV.PTCP.NEG], je-kekū [eat-PFV.PTCP.NEG].
3.1.2.2 Functions of Participles

As stated above, the first function of participles is serving as the predicate in a simple sentence or as the main predicate of a complex sentence. For instance, *bi* [1SG] \( j\!i\!-\!he \) [come-PFV.PTCP] ‘I came/I have come’, *bi sin-de* [2SG(si/sin)-DAT] \( b\!i\!t\!h\!e \) [book] *bene-bu-re* [send.thither-CAUS-IPFV.PTCP] ‘I’ll [make someone] send you the book’ (simple sentences); *tere* [that/3SG] *min-de* [1SG(bi/min)-DAT] *ala-fi* [tell-PFV.CVB] *bi u\!th\!a\!i* [then] \( g\!e\!n\!e\!-\!he \) [go-PFV.PTCP] ‘After he told me [that thing], I went [away]’ (complex sentence). In functioning as main predicates, the participles behave in the same way as finite forms. Second, participles function as attributes of nominal structures, in a way similar to participles or relative clauses in European languages: *ji\!-\!he* [come-PFV.PTCP] *ni\!y\!a\!l\!m\!a* [person] ‘the person who came’; *bu\!c\!e\!-\!he* [die-PFV.PTCP] *haha* [man] ‘a dead man’; *bi* [1SG] *sin-de* [2SG(si/sin)-DAT] *bene-bu-he* [send-CAUS-PFV.PTCP] \( b\!i\!t\!h\!e \) [book] ‘the book which I made someone send to you’; *sin-i* [2SG(si/sin)-GEN] *yalu-ha* [ride-PFV.PTCP] \( m\!o\!r\!i\!n \) [horse] ‘the horse you rode’.

Third, participles can serve as predicates in subordinate clauses by taking various case markers in accordance with the type of subordination. Specifically, participial structures in the dative-locative case express the temporal relation ‘at the time when’, for instance, *si* [2SG] *min-i* [1SG(bi/min)-GEN] *boo-de* [house-DAT] *ji\!-\!he-de* [come-PFV.PTCP-DAT], *muse* [1PL.INCL] *sain* [good] *gisure-ki* [speak-OPT] ‘Let’s have a good talk when you come to my house’. In the ablative case, particle structures can express the temporal relation ‘since’, for instance, *ban\!j\!i-ha-ci* [be.born-PFV.PTCP-ABL] *e\!b\!s\!i* [hitherto] *ere* [this] *gese* [like] *beikuwen* [cold] *be* [ACC] *we* [who] *dulem\!b\!u-he* [experience-PFV.PTCP] *bi-he* [be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP] ‘who has ever experienced such cold since [s/he] was born?’. Second, participle structures in the accusative case serve as object clauses of some perception verbs or phase verbs, such as *don\!j\!i*- ‘to hear’, *sabu*- ‘to see’, *naka*- ‘to stop’: *age* [sir] *ji\!-\!he* [come-PFV.PTCP] *be* [ACC] *don\!j\!i-hak\!u* [hear-PFV.PTCP.NEG] ‘[I] didn’t hear that you came, sir’; *š\!u\!n* [sun] *dosi-re* [enter-IPFV.PTCP] *hami-ka* [approach-PFV.PTCP] *be* *sabu-fi* [see-PFV.CVB], *tensi* [only.then] *amasi* [back] *ji\!-\!m\!b\!i* [come-IPFV.FIN] ‘only when [we] saw that the sun was close to setting did [we start to] come back’; and *su\!w\!e* [2PL] *bec\!e\!n\!d\!u-re* [quarrel-IPFV.PTCP] *be*
[ACC] *nak*-*ə* [stop-IMP] ‘you, stop quarrelling!’ In combination with case markers, participles exhibit nominal characteristics.

### 3.1.3 Finite Verb Forms

Finite verb forms serve as the predicates in simple sentences or as the main predicates of complex sentences. They display the properties of mood / modality, aspect-tense, and grammatical voice. In the following sections the marking of mood and modality of Manchu verbs is discussed first, followed by the marking of grammatical voice.

#### 3.1.3.1 Moods/Modalities

**3.1.3.1.1 The Indicative Forms**

The indicative forms are used by the speaker to describe states of affairs that happened, are happening or will happen. They subsume various aspect-tense verb forms, shown below.

The first is the imperfective finite form V-*mbi*, which consists of the verb stem (V) and the imperfective finite suffix (-*mbi*). Gorelova (2002: 286) points out that scholars have different opinions concerning the functions of this form. Some consider it to be a present tense form (Zakharov 1879: 173), or regard it as a form describing present or future states of affairs, while according to others this form describes a state of affairs that has already started but not yet completed. Sinor (1968: 268) argues that the form V-*mbi* does not *locate* in time the state of affairs it describes, that is, it is not a tense form, but only makes a general assertion about a state of affairs, regardless of whether it is completed or not, and is a *neutral aspect*. Based on corpus data, the present study agrees with Sinor (1968) that the form V-*mbi* is not a tense form but an aspectual form. Yet, when the reference time coincides with the time of speech — which is usually the case — the form V-*mbi* behaves like a non-past tense form: *bi* [1SG] *inenggidari* [every day] *yamun* [yamen] *de gene-*mbi* [go-IPV.FIN] ‘I go to the yamen every day’; *cimari* [tomorrow] *sinne-*mbi* [take.exams-IPV.FIN] ‘tomorrow there are exams’. In cases like these the form V-*mbi* also exhibits an imperfective aspectual feature, rather than a purely neutral one, contrary to what Sinor (1968) argues.
Another finite form is the perfective finite form \( V-h\text{Abi} \), which obviously originated from the combination of the perfective participle \( V-h\text{A} \) and the existential particle \( \text{bi} \). It also has a negative counterpart \( V-h\text{A}k\text{âbi} \), which is, however, used less frequently than the negative perfective participle \( V-h\text{A}k\text{û} \). Semantically similar to the perfective participle \( V-h\text{A} \), the perfective finite form serves to describe a state of affairs as completed, which is usually located in the past: \( \text{tere gene-hebi} \) ‘[she or he] has already gone’.

The progressive finite form \( (V-me \text{ bi}) \) is a combination of the imperfective converb \( (V-me) \) and the existential particle \( (\text{bi}) \), describing an “action or situation [that] is in progress” (Li 2010: 366):9 \( \text{bi\text{the} [letter] be [ACC] aliya-me [wait-IPFV.CVB] bi [EXS.PTL] ‘[he] is/was waiting for a letter} ^{10} \) (Li 2010: 93).

Furthermore, some complex finite forms are built by combining certain verb forms and \( \text{bi-he} \), the perfective participle of the verb \( \text{bi-} \). Such forms include: \( V-h\text{A} \text{ bi-he} \), \( V-me \text{ bihe}/V-mbihe \), and their negative counterparts \( V-h\text{A}k\text{û} \text{ bi-he} \), \( V-rak\text{û} \text{ bi-he} \). Their functions are discussed in Section 3.2.2.2, which focuses on the participle \( \text{bi-he} \).

### 3.1.3.1.2 The Imperative, Optative and Apprehensive Forms

The imperative forms are used to express commands or requests to the addressee. They have different forms in accordance with the degree of politeness or imposition. For the sake of convenience, they are labelled here as imperative (i), (ii) and (iii) respectively.

The most fundamental imperative form (imperative [i]) coincides with the bare verb stem: \( h\text{udun} \) [quick] \( \text{gene-ø [go-IMP(i)] ‘go quickly!’, min-de} \) [1SG(bi/min)-DAT] \( \text{ala-ø [tell-IMP(i)] ‘Tell me!’}, \text{muke [water] be [ACC] omi-ø [drink-IMP(i)] ‘Drink the water!’}. \)

Some basic verbs, however, have irregular forms for the imperative, as shown in Table 3.7.

---

9 The term “progressive finite form” is my own creation, whereas Li (2010) gives no term for this complex structure. The description given by Li (2010) seems to entail that the structure \( V-me \text{ bi} \) is used for the present tense, that is, the structure is actually the “present progressive (finite form)”. My term, in contrast, is meant to be exclusively aspectual, with no regard to tense.

10 Li (2010) only gives the translation “…is waiting”. I consider the past progressive interpretation (“…was waiting”) as equally possible.
Table 3.7 Irregular Imperative (i) Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Root</th>
<th>Imperative (i)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bi- ‘to be/stay’</td>
<td>bisu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bai- ‘to seek’</td>
<td>baisu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gai- ‘to take’</td>
<td>gaisu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>je- ‘to eat’</td>
<td>jefu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ji- ‘to come’</td>
<td>jio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o- ‘to become’</td>
<td>oso</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second imperative form (imperative [ii]) consists of the verb stem and the suffix -cina, also used to express commands: (si) gene-cina [go-IMP(ii)] ‘You just go!’. Its use is similar to that of the first stem-based imperative.

The third imperative form V-rAo (imperative [iii]) consists of the imperfective participle V-rA and the question particle o. It is the polite imperative form, expressing a request rather than an order, and is commonly used to address people of superior positions: majige [a.little] gisure-reo [say-IMP(iii)] ‘Would you please say a little bit [about it] to me?’, min-de [1SG(bi/min)-DAT] emu [one] bithe [book] bu-reo [give-IMP(iii)] ‘Would you please give me a book?’.

The imperative forms have a negative counterpart, which can be labelled as the prohibitive form. It consists of the negative particle ume ‘do not’ and the imperfective participle V-rA, while the latter can either immediately follow the former or be separated by other components: e.g. ume [do.not] gisure-re [speak-IPFV.PTCP] ‘Do not speak!’, ume [do.not] tere [that] yoro gisun [rumour] be [ACC] akda-ra [believe-IPFV.PTCP] ‘Do not believe that rumour!’.

3.1.3.1.3 The Optative Forms

There are two optative forms, V-ki and V-kini, both of which have more than one meaning. The first optative form V-ki can be used to express a polite request, which has a slightly lower degree of politeness than the imperative (iii), V-rAo, but a higher degree of
politeness than imperative (i) (V-ø) and imperative (ii) (V-cina): age [sir] cai [tea] omi-ki
[drink-OPT] ‘Sir, please have some tea!’). The optative form V-ki can also express the
[go-OPT] ‘I’ll go to school’. With this meaning it also carries an apparent future connotation
of this action. It can also form a complex modal structure with the quotative verb se– ‘to say’
(used as an auxiliary verb), V-ki se-, also expressing the speaker’s intention of doing
[say(AUX)-IPFV.FIN] ‘I want to learn the Manchu language’.

The second optative form V-kini is mainly used to express the speaker’s wish that some
state of affairs should take place. The verb is usually used in the 3rd person and is not
[handle-OPT] ‘Let the local officials handle it!’; tumen [ten.thousand] bai [matter] ijishūn
[smooth] o-kini ‘May everything (lit.: ‘ten thousand matters’) go smoothly!’. When the
subject is human, as in the first example, the form V-kini can express an indirect command.

3.1.3.1.4 The Apprehensive Forms

The apprehensive modality, expressing the speaker’s concern that something
might happen, has several forms, which usually combine with the quotative verb se-, but not
necessarily. The first form consists of the verb stem and the apprehensive suffix, V-rahū (se-),
for instance, tere [that] niyalma [person] jide-rahū [come-APRH] (se-mbi
[say(AUX)-IPFV.FIN]) ‘(I) fear that that man may come’. The second apprehensive form
consists of the imperfective participle (affirmative and negative) and the apprehensive
[say(AUX)-IPFV.FIN]) ‘(I) worry that that thing might be broken’, si [2SG] gene-rakū
[go-IPFV.PTCP.NEG] ayoo (se-mbi [say(AUX)-IPFV.FIN]) ‘I’m worried that you might not
go’.
3.1.3.2  Voices

The grammatical category of voice in Manchu can exhibit itself in both finite and non-finite verb forms. There are various voices in Manchu in terms of the argument structure of verbs: active, passive, causative, cooperative and reciprocal. Of all these voices, the active voice serves as the morphological base from which other voices are derived.

3.1.3.2.1  The Passive and Causative Voices

The passive and causative verb stems share the same form, both being derived from the active verb stem and the suffix -bu: wa-bu- [kill-PASS] ‘to be killed’; gene-bu-[go-CAUS] ‘to make [someone] go’. Despite the shared morphology, the passive and causative voices can be distinguished in specific sentences. First, semantically, only transitive verbs can have both the passive and causative voices, while intransitive verbs can only have the causative voice. For example, gene-bu- can only be understood as the causative ‘to make [someone] go’, since gene- ‘to go’ cannot take an object. On the other hand, the verb jafa- ‘to hold/grasp’ can have both the passive and causative voices jafa-bu- ‘to make [someone] hold/grasp’/‘to be held/caught’. Second, the passive and causative voices usually form different syntactic structures due to their internal semantic distinction. Specifically, the causee of the causative structure is generally governed by the accusative marker be, while the agent of the passive structure is — if indicated at all — governed by the dative-locative marker de: bi [1SG] im-be [3SG(i/in)-ACC] bithe [book] (be [ACC]) hūla-bu-mbi [read-CAUS-IPFV.FIN] ‘I make him read books’, hecen [city] bata [enemy] de [DAT] gai-bu-ha [take-PASS-PFV.PTCP] ‘The city has been/was taken by the enemy’.

3.1.3.2.2  The Cooperative and Reciprocal Voices

These two voices share the feature that the action in question involves more than one participant: the cooperative voice indicates that “the action is performed by several participants together” (Gorelova 2002: 250),11 while the reciprocal voice indicates “an action performed through a mutual interaction of one subject with another” (Gorelova 2002: 251).

---

11 Gorelova (2002) uses the term “associative” instead of “cooperative”. I regard “cooperative” as a more appropriate term.
The cooperative voice suffix \(-cA\) is attached to the basic active voice verb stem: *daha-ca-* [follow-COOP] ‘to follow together’; *inje-ce-* [laugh-COOP] ‘to laugh together’; *te-ce-* [sit-COOP] ‘to sit together’. Sometimes it is used with adverbials that indicate the joint nature of the action, for example, *gucu-i* [friend-GEN] *emgi* [together] *leole-ce-mbi* [chat-COOP-IPFV.FIN] ‘chat with one’s friends’. The reciprocal voice stem is formed by adding the suffix \(-nu/-ndu\) to the basic active voice verb stem, e.g. *aisila-ndu-* [help-RECP] ‘to help each other’, *tanta-nu-* [beat-RECP] ‘to beat one another’. There is also an adverb that is commonly used with the reciprocal voice, *ishunde* ‘mutually’, for example in *ishunde afa-ndu-mbi* [fight-RECP-IPFV.FIN] ‘wage wars against each other’.

### 3.2 Verbs that Can Function as Auxiliary Verbs

In Manchu there are no pure auxiliary verbs as such, but some verbs can function either as lexical verbs or as auxiliary verbs. These verbs mainly include the verbs *o-* ‘to become/be’, *bi-* ‘to exist/be’, and *se-* ‘to say’.

#### 3.2.1 The Verb *o-*

The verb *o-* can serve as a copular verb meaning ‘to become/be’ and occurs in every conjugated form. Table 3.8 shows some commonly used forms (it should be noted that the imperfective participle *ojoro* and the imperative [i] *oso* are irregular forms).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conjugation</th>
<th>Verb Form</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperfective Finite</td>
<td><em>o-mbi</em></td>
<td><em>sain</em> [good] <em>o-mbi</em> ‘[one] becomes/will become good’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfective</td>
<td><em>ojo-ro</em></td>
<td><em>han</em> [khan] <em>ojor-o niyalma</em> [person] ‘the man to become the khan’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfective Participle</td>
<td><em>o-ho</em></td>
<td><em>halhun</em> [hot] <em>o-ho</em> ‘[it] became/has become hot’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative (i)</td>
<td><em>oso</em></td>
<td><em>ekisaka</em> [quite] <em>oso</em> ‘Be quiet!’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Converb</td>
<td><em>o-ci</em></td>
<td><em>tere</em> [that] <em>haha</em> [man] <em>tondo</em> [honest] <em>o-ci</em> ‘If that man is honest…’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As an auxiliary verb, o- forms complex structures with other (lexical) verbs: it combines mainly with the imperfective converb V-me and the negative participles V-rakū/V-hAkū in different syntactic environments. First, with the converb V-me, the perfective participle o-ho takes the dative-locative marker de and serves to express the conditional meaning. Similarly the perfective converb o-fi expresses the causal meaning with a preceding imperfective converb V-me. Second, the negative participles can combine with various forms of the verb o-, forming negative counterparts of those V-me o- combinations. With the negative participles (especially the imperfective one), other forms of the verb o-, either finite or non-finite forms, can also build complex structures. Table 3.9 shows the complex structures discussed so far.

It should be noted in particular that when o- (as an auxiliary verb) follows a negative participle (such as V-rAkū), forming a complex structure that serves as the main predicate of a sentence, the original meaning of o- as a basic lexical verb indicating change of state is still perceivable. For instance, in saburakū o-ho ‘[People] can’t/couldn’t see [it] any more’ (see Table 3.9 for gloss), the verb o- marks the change from one state in which people can or could still see the thing to another state in which people can/could no longer see it, the latter state itself represented by the negative participle (sabu-rakū). Similarly in tere cimari generakū ombi ‘[Now] he won’t go tomorrow’ (see Table 3.9 for gloss), the verb o- marks the change from one state, in which he is probably expected to go tomorrow, to another state, in which it turns out that he will not go. The difference between the use of o- as an auxiliary verb and its use as a lexical verb lies in whether the state in question is represented by a negative participle or a nominal structure (such as han ‘khan’, halhūn ‘hot / heat’).
Table 3.9 Some Combinations of the Verb o- (as an Auxiliary Verb) and Lexical Verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Lexical Verb</th>
<th>Combination</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>V-me</strong></td>
<td><strong>V-me o-ho de</strong></td>
<td>(si) [2SG] (kice-me) [strive-IPFV.CVB] (taci-me) [study-IPFV.CVB] (o-ho-de) [become(AUX)-PFV.PTCP-DAT] ‘If you study hard’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V-me o-fi</strong></td>
<td><strong>tere</strong> [3SG/that] (ji-me) [come-IPFV.CVB] (o-fi) [become(AUX)-PFV.CVB] ‘Because he comes’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V-rA</strong></td>
<td><strong>V-rA o-ci</strong></td>
<td>(bithe) [book] (hula-ra) [read-IPFV.PTCP] (o-ci) [become(AUX)-COND] ‘If [one] reads books’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **V-rakū**           | **V-rakū o-ho de** | \(si\) [2SG] \(taci-rakū\) [study-IPFV.PTCP.NEG] \(o-ho-de\) [become(AUX)-PFV.PTCP-DAT] ‘If you don’t study’ |
| **V-rakū o-fi**      | **tere** [3SG/that] \(ji-de-rakū\) [come-IPFV.PTCP.NEG] \(o-fi\) [become(AUX)-PFV.CVB] ‘Because he won’t come’ |
| **V-rakū o-ci**      | **si** [2SG] \(taci-rakū\) [study-IPFV.PTCP.NEG] \(o-ci\) [become(AUX)-COND] ‘If you don’t study’ |
| **V-rakū o-mbi**     | **tere** [3SG/that] \(cimari\) [tomorrow] \(gene-rakū\) [go-IPFV.PTCP.NEG] \(o-mbi\) [become(AUX)-IPFV.FIN] ‘He won’t go tomorrow’ |
| **V-rakū o-ho**      | **sabu-rakū** [see-IPFV.PTCP.NEG] \(o-ho\) [become(AUX)-PFV.PTCP] ‘[People] cannot/could not see [it] any more’ |

3.2.2 The Verb bi- and the Functions of Its Perfective Participle bi-he

When functioning as a lexical verb, bi- mainly expresses the meaning of existence (or location). Table 3.10 demonstrates some commonly used conjugated forms of the verb bi- ‘to exist/be’ (it should be noted that the imperfective participle bisire and the imperative [i] bisu are irregular forms):

Table 3.10 Conjugated Forms of the Verb bi-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conjugation</th>
<th>Verb Form</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperfective Finite</td>
<td>bi-mbi</td>
<td>(bele) [grain] (kemuni) [still] (hecen) [city] de [DAT] (bi-mbi) [be-IPFV.FIN] ‘there is still grain in the city’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.10 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conjugation</th>
<th>Verb Form</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperfective Participle</td>
<td>bisi-re</td>
<td><em>ula-i</em> [river-GEN] <em>talga</em> [surface] <em>de</em> [DAT] <em>bisi-re</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[be-IPFV.PTCP] <em>jahūda</em> [boat] ‘the boat (being/existing) on the surface of the river’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfective Finite</td>
<td>bi-hebi</td>
<td><em>tere</em> [that] <em>gurun</em> [country] <em>de</em> [DAT] <em>emu</em> [one] <em>amba</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[great] <em>kan</em> [khan] <em>bi-hebi</em> [be-PFV.FIN] ‘in that country there was/lived a great khan’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfective Participle</td>
<td>bi-he</td>
<td><em>sain</em> [good] <em>ahūn deo</em> [brothers] <em>bi-he</em> [be-PFV.PTCP]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘[They] used to be good brothers’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative (i)</td>
<td>bisu</td>
<td><em>boo-de</em> [house-DAT] <em>bisu</em> [be.IMP] ‘stay at home!’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Converb</td>
<td>bi-ci</td>
<td><em>baita</em> [matter] <em>bi-ci</em> [be-COND] ‘if there are matters’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the imperfective finite form *bi-mbi* is not very frequently used, but the existential particle *bi* (which is most likely related to the verb *bi*- etymologically) is used instead in many contexts, for instance, *bira* [river] *de* [DAT] *nimaha* [fish] *bi* [EXS.PTL] ‘There are fish in the river’. The perfective participle of the verb *bi-, bi-he*, has multiple functions and is of particular relevance to the present study. These functions are discussed in the rest of Section 3.2.2.

3.2.2.1 The Perfective Participle *bi-he*: When *bi*- is a Lexical Verb

The participle *bi-he* can express the following meanings: (i) existence ([3.2 – 1] and [3.2 – 2]); (ii) identification ([3.2 – 3]); and (iii) evaluation ([3.2 – 4]):

(3.2 – 1)  
*si-n i*  
2SG(si/sin)-GEN  
*dergi-de*  
top-DAT  
*emu*  
one  
*ahūn*  
elder.brother  
*bi-he*  
be-PFV.PTCP  
fifteen  
*tofohon*

‘You had an elder brother before you [were born] (lit.: ‘above you’). [He] died at the age of fifteen’ (NSB: 2)
(3.2 – 2) min-i eje-he-ngge, sin-de inu emke
1SG(bi/min)-GEN memorise-PFV.PTCP-NMLZ 2SG(si/sin)-DAT also one

bi-he
be-PFV.PTCP

min-i eje-he-ngge: ‘as I remember’, lit.: ‘what I have memorised’

‘As I remember, you also had one [of those]’ (OJ2: 46)

(3.2 – 3) ilan aniya-i onggolo, muse-i uba-de, tere
geli we bi-he?
three year-GEN before 1PL.INCL-GEN this.place-DAT that/3SG
again who be-PFV.PTCP impoverished poor PTL

fungsan yadahūn: ‘very poor’

‘And what was he like (lit.: ‘who was he’) in our neighbourhood three years ago? He was indeed very poor [back then]!’ (OJ1: 93)

(3.2 – 4) antaka senggime, antaka haji bi-he
how intimate how dear be-PFV.PTCP

‘How intimate and how dear [they] were [to each other]!’ (OJ1: 70)

All the examples above describe past states of affairs (prior to the time of speech, or to a certain state of affairs in the past), usually with a connotation that the states of affairs once existed but ceased to exist. In (3.2 – 1) the addressee had a brother who nevertheless had already died (before the addressee was born), and in (3.2 – 4) the people in question no longer feel intimate with each other.

The function of the participle bi-he of describing past states of affairs is worthy of detailed analysis. First, as mentioned at the beginning of Section 3.1.2, the Manchu perfective participle V-hA has a predominantly aspectual property, and mainly “expresses the state resulted from a completed process” (Sinor 1968: 270). This is generally true for most lexical verbs. One might assume, then, that in the case of the verb bi-, the perfective participle bi-he would be expected to mainly describe the state of existence as an ended state. However, as one can see from (3.2 – 1) – (3.2 – 4), despite the usual connotation that the state of affairs was indeed ended at a certain (past) time, the primary function of the participle bi-he is not to describe the state of affairs as ended (which is roughly interpretable as ‘the state of affairs ceased/has ceased to be’), but rather to describe the existence itself of the state of affairs at a certain past time or during a period of time in the past (which is roughly interpretable as ‘there existed such state of affairs at a past time or during the period of time’). In other words,
it seems that *bi-he* does not fit well with Sinor’s (1968) description of the perfective participle, but has transformed its predominantly aspectual feature (completedness) into a predominantly tense feature (pastness). This distinguishes *bi-he* from the perfective participle of other lexical verbs. As mentioned at the beginning of Section 3.1.2, Avrorin (1949) argues that at the time Manchu was established in its written form, its participles were in the process of transforming from expressing aspectual meanings to expressing meanings of grammatical tense. The analysis above corroborates that the transformation has indeed taken place in the case of the perfective participle *bi-he*.

### 3.2.2.2 The Perfective Participle *bi-he* in Complex Structures

As mentioned in Section 3.1.3.1.1, when *bi-* serves as an auxiliary verb, its participle *bi-he* builds complex structures with lexical verbs. Table 3.11 demonstrates some of these structures.

The meanings of the listed complex structures are discussed in the following passages. Since most attested examples in my corpus are those in which these structures serve as main predicates (rather than attributes or subordinate predicates), the following discussion will be restricted to their meanings under such syntactic circumstances.

**Table 3.11 Complex Structures Built by Lexical Verbs and the Participle *bi-he***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical Verb Form</th>
<th>Complex Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfective Participle V-hA</td>
<td>V-hA bi-he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfective Converb V-me</td>
<td>V-me bi-he/V-mbihe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfective Participle V-rA</td>
<td>V-rA bi-he (rather rare)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Negative) Perfective Participle V-hAkkū</td>
<td>V-hAkkū bi-he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Negative) Imperfective Participle V-rakkū</td>
<td>V-rakkū bi-he</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2.2.2.1 The Complex Structure *V-hA bi-he*

Scholars tend to consider the structure *V-hA bi-he* as the counterpart of the Indo-European pluperfect/past perfect, presumably due to its morphology, that is, the
perfective participle of a lexical verb (V-hA) combined with the perfective participle of an auxiliary verb (bi-he). Avrorin (2000: 192) points out that the structure V-hA bi-he has the meaning of “remote past”. Gorelova (2002: 292) labels it as “past perfect”, and translates it accordingly: gisure-he [say-PFV.PTCP] bi-he [be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP] ‘(one) had said’. Similar translations are also given by Li (2010: 72), for instance, harangga [subject] o-ho [become-PFV.PTCP] bi-he [be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP] ‘he had become a subject’. A number of example sentences from my corpus indeed appear to corroborate such an interpretation:

(3.2 – 5) bi   im-be         solina-ha      bi-he.        indahūn
1SG  3SG(i/in)-ACC invite-PFV.PTCP be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP  dog

(3.2 – 6) bi   cen-i         hala      be      fonji-ha
1SG  3PL(ce/cen)-GEN family.name  ACC  ask-PFV.PTCP

(3.2 – 7) jakan    sihin-i   fejile  sišana-ha  bi-he.        yasa
just.now  eave-GEN below hang.down  be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP  eye

(3.2 – 8) sucungga  bi   hono  cem-be        hūwaliyambu-me
initial  1SG still  3PL(ce/cen)-ACC reconcile-IPFV.CVB

The examples demonstrate the use of this structure in various contexts, including actions that occurred remotely in the past.
‘At first I was still wishing to reconcile them, [but] afterwards, looking [at the situation], [I told myself] “[just] give [it] up!”’ (AGA4: 70)

In (3.2 – 5) – (3.2 – 8), while the point of reference to which the structure $V-hA$ bi-he is anchored is another past state of affairs (represented by another verb), a temporal adverbial may also occur, such as amala ‘afterwards’ in (3.2 – 8). Similar to the cases where the participle bi-he has lexical meanings ([3.2 – 1] – [3.2 – 4]), some of the sentences above (3.2 – 5) – (3.2 – 8), where bi-he is an auxiliary verb, also tend to carry the connotation that the states of affairs represented by the structure $V-hA$ bi-he have ceased to exist (or are followed by states of affairs that are in a sense contrary to expectation). For instance, in (3.2 – 5) the speaker’s invitation was met with ingratitude; in (3.2 – 7), the icicles fell to the ground, and thus no longer hung down from the eaves.

However, it turns out that the “pluperfect/past perfect” meaning of the structure $V-hA$ bi-he is only part of the whole picture: it does not always describe a state of affairs as preceding another past state of affairs, nor does it have to be “remote” in the past. Thus, as a second usage, the structure $V-hA$ bi-he co-occurs with an explicit past time, without a (past) state of affairs following. In other words, the structure $V-hA$ bi-he can function like the past tense. The following are some examples (their past time references are expressed by sikse ‘yesterday’, cananggi ‘the day before yesterday’, duleke aniya ‘last year’ and julge ‘in ancient times’ respectively):

(3.2 – 9)  
\begin{verbatim}
si  sikse  juwan  ba  se-me  hendu-he  
2SG  yesterday  ten  mile say(AUX)-IPFV.CVB  speak-PFV.PTCP  
\end{verbatim}
\begin{verbatim}
bi-he.  enenggi  ainiu  gūsin  ba  se-mbi  
be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP  today  why  thirty  mile  say-IPFV.FIN  
\end{verbatim}
‘Yesterday you said [the distance was] ten miles. Why do you say thirty miles today?’ (LQD: 132)

(3.2 – 10)  
\begin{verbatim}
cananggi,  be  wargi  alin  de,  oihori  
day.before.yesterday  1PL.EXCL  west  hill  DAT  very  
\end{verbatim}
\begin{verbatim}
sebjele-he  bi-he  
enjoy-PFV.PTCP  be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP  
\end{verbatim}
‘The day before yesterday we enjoyed ourselves very much’ (OJ2: 16)
(3.2 – 11)  
\[ bi \text{ inu} \ dule-ke \ aniya \ tuba-de \ tata-ha \]
1SG also pass-PFV.PTCP year that.place-DAT lodge-PFV.PTCP
\[ bi-he, \ \text{umesi} \ sain \]
be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP very good
dule-ke aniya: ‘last year’, lit.: ‘the year that has passed’
‘Last year I also stayed at that place. It was very good’ (LQD1: 71)

(3.2 – 12)  
\[ muse-i \ gurun \ julge \ meni \ meni \ ba-de \ te-he \]
1PL.INCL people ancient separately place-DAT inhabit-PFV.PTCP
bi-he. \ \text{te manju monggo nikan gemu emu} \]
be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP now Manchu Mongol Chinese all one
\[ hecen \ de \ te-fi \ emu \ hūwa-i \ gese \ banji-mbi \]
city DAT inhabit-PFV.CVB one yard-GEN like live-IPFV.FIN
‘In ancient times our people used to inhabit our own places separately. Now Manchus, Mongols and Chinese, all having settled in one city, are living like one family’ (MYK8: 8)

Third, apart from what has been discussed, there still exists another type of sentence where the structure \( V-hA \) \( bi-he \) serves to express the meaning of the experiential perfect, indicating that “a given situation has held at least once during some time in the past leading up to the present” (Comrie 1976: 58). The following are examples:

(3.2 – 13)  
\[ banji-ha \ ci \ ebsi \ ere \ gese \ betkuwen \ be \ we \]
be.born-PFV.PTCP ABL hither this like cold ACC who
\[ dulembu-he \ bi-he \ ni \]
experience-PFV.PTCP be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP PTL
\[ banji-ha \ ci \ ebsi: \ ‘since \ [one] \ was born \ [up till the present]’ \]
‘Who has ever experienced cold [weather] like this since [he was] born!’ (OJ2: 12)

(3.2 – 14)  
\[ muse \ lingdan \ okto \ je-ke \ bi-he, \]
1PL.INCL elixir medicin eat-PFV.PTCP be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP
\[ buce-re \ kooli \ akū \]
die-IPFV.PTCP rule NEG
\[ lingdan okto: \ ‘elixir’ \]
\[ buce-re kooli: \ ‘possibility of dying’ \]
‘We have taken the elixir [before] (there is no possibility that we might die)’ (MYK1: 7)

(3.2 – 15)  
\[ bi \ aimaka \ ba-de \ yamaka \ baita \ de \ akdun \ be \]
1SG any place-DAT any matter DAT credibility ACC
‘Have I ever lost my credibility at any place on any matter? [If that’s the case] you point [it] out!’ (OJ2, p. 62)

In view of the different types of meanings encapsulated in a single structure V-hA bi-he, it is not appropriate to assign to it a conventional label of tense or aspect — be it past tense, pluperfect (past perfect) or experiential perfect. Rather, in order to categorise the structure V-hA bi-he properly, it is important to determine whether all these usages share a common meaning, a Gesamtsbedeutung, and if they do, what this shared meaning is. As a matter of fact, it can be seen from (3.2 – 5) – (3.2 – 15) that the states of affairs represented by the structure V-hA bi-he are described as (a) completed; and (b) situated in the past. On the other hand, however, the perfective participle V-hA (as well as the perfective finite V-hAbi, see Section 3.1.3.1.1) is usually used as the main predicate of a sentence to describe the completion of a state of affairs, for example, *emgeri* [already] *onggo-ho* [forget-PFV.PTCP] ‘[One] has already forgotten’ (UH: 56). Such completed states of affairs are mostly described as taking place in the past. Therefore, the two semantic components “completedness” and “pastness” are not unique to the structure V-hA bi-he, but can also be expressed by the structures V-hA/V-hAbi.

Nevertheless, despite the semantic components “completedness” and “pastness”, there are differences in meaning between the structures V-hA/V-hAbi on the one hand, and the structure V-hA bi-he on the other. First, when describing a past state of affairs, the structure V-hA bi-he seems to put emphasis on the very occurrence of the state of affairs. For instance, in (3.2 – 6) *fonji-ha bi-he* can be interpreted as ‘It did indeed occur that I asked (their family names)’. In contrast, the structures V-hA/V-hAbi do not have this emphasis. For instance, *fonji-ha/fonji-habi* would merely mean ‘[I] asked/have asked’. Second, for the same reason, the structure V-hA bi-he can function as the experiential perfect, which in essence concerns

---

12 The perfective participle V-hA and the perfective finite form V-hAbi are grouped together in the following discussion due to their insignificant difference in meaning.
the occurrence of a past state of affairs, while the structures $V-hA/V-hAbi$ cannot, since they primarily concern the completedness of a state of affairs.

In view of the contrast between the structures $V-hA\ bi-he$ and $V-hA/V-hAbi$, one can see that, through its emphasis on the occurrence of the state of affairs it represents, the structure $V-hA\ bi-he$ exhibits a tense feature that is more conspicuous than its aspectual feature, since the occurrence of a state of affairs is directly related to its location in time, while completedness is only an internal feature of a state of affairs, irrespective of its location in time. The particularity of the structure $V-hA\ bi-he$ can be accounted for by the property of the perfective participle $bi-he$ (when $bi-$ is used as a lexical verb): it describes a state of affairs in the past and has a predominant tense feature. Thus, when used as an auxiliary verb, it integrates its predominant tense feature into the complex structure $V-hA\ bi-he$ (the aspectual feature of which is indicated by the participle $V-hA$).

To sum up, the complex structure $V-hA\ bi-he$ is morphologically a marked structure in comparison with $V-hA/V-hAbi$. In terms of syntax, it mainly serves as the main predicate in a sentence. Semantically, the structure exhibits a predominant characteristic of past tense (along with an aspectual feature of completedness). Pragmatically it conveys special information, that is, the speaker’s emphasis on the occurrence of a past, completed state of affairs ([3.2 – 9], [3.2 – 10], [3.2 – 14], etc.), or the occurrence of a subsequent state of affairs that is contrary to expectation ([3.2 – 5], [3.2 – 7], [3.2 – 8], and [3.2 – 11]). With this special information, it does not qualify as an ordinary past tense, but can be regarded as a marked past perfective form.

### 3.2.2.2.2 The Complex Structure $V\-me\ bi-he$

The most important, but not the sole, syntactic function of the structure $V\-me\ bi-he$ is to serve as the main predicate of a sentence. Semantically, it expresses the meaning of “progressive (process) in the past” and “habitual past” (Li 2010: 365). A structure with similar functions is $V\-mbihe$. Some scholars suggest that $V\-mbihe$ originated from $V\-me\ bi-he$ (e.g., Zakharov 1879: 174), while others do not distinguish the two forms but consider them to be orthographic variants of the same structure (Avrorin 2000: 192; Li 2010: 365).
Meanwhile, in my corpus I observe that in actual usage the structures V-me bi-he and V-mbihe do not exhibit semantic distinction. Based on this observation and in view of the orthographic inconsistencies common in Manchu texts (especially concerning ligature), the present study considers the two verb forms as variants of one and the same structure, both of which consist of the imperfective converb (V-me) and the perfective participle bi-he. The following are examples:

(3.2 – 16)  

leose-i    dele  tafu-fi    afa-ra    be  
tower-GEN  top  ascend-PFV.CVB  fight-PFV.PTCP  ACC  
tuwa-me   bi-he-ngge,  hecen  gai-bu-ha  
watch-PFV.CVB  be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP-NMLZ  city  take-PASS-PFV.PTCP  
be  sa-fi    uthai  leose  be  tuwa  sinda-fi  
ACC  know-PFV.CVB  then  tower  ACC  fire  set-PFV.CVB  
buce-he  
die-PFV.PTCP  
‘[He] came to the top of the [city gate] tower and was watching the battle, [and then] knowing that the city was taken [by the enemy], [he] set the tower on fire and died’ (MYK7: 8)

(3.2 – 17)  

sucungga  tanta-ra    de  hono  too-me  
initial  beat-PFV.PTCP  DAT  still  swear-PFV.CVB  
sure-mbihe,  amala  kudeše-hei,  nidu-re  
shout-PST.IPFW  afterwards  beat.back.with.hands-DUR.CVB  groan-PFV.PTCP  
jilgan  gemu  akū  o-ho  
sounds  all  NEG  become-PFV.PTCP  
‘At first when [people] beat [him], [he] was still swearing and shouting. Afterwards, [while people kept] beating him on the back with both hands, all [his] groaning sounds were [heard] no more’ (OJ2: 78)

(3.2 – 18)  

bi  daruhai  sidere-mbihe,  enenggi  onggo-fi  
1SG  often  tie-PST.IPFW  today  forget-PFV.CVB  
sidere-hekū  
tie-PFV.PTCP.NEG  
‘Usually I would tie [the horse], [but] forgetting it today, [I] didn’t tie [the horse’] (LQD3: 60)

(3.2 – 19)  

duleke  aniya  ilan  jiha  menggun  de  emu  
pass-PFV.PTCP  year  three  tael  silver  DAT  one  
ginggin  baha-mbihe,  te  sunja  jiha  menggun  de  emu  
get-PST.IPFW  now  five  tael  silver  DAT  one
‘Last year [people] used to get one jin [of ginseng] for three taels of silver, [but] now [people] don’t get one jin even for five taels of silver’ (LQD: 164)

One can see from (3.2 – 16) – (3.2 – 20) that the structure V-\textit{mbihe}/V-\textit{me bi-he} is similar to the structure V-\textit{hA bi-he} in that the structure V-\textit{mbihe}/V-\textit{me bi-he} has a predominant tense feature and emphasises the occurrence of a past state of affairs. It is different from the structure V-\textit{hA bi-he} in that the state of affairs represented by V-\textit{mbihe}/V-\textit{me bi-he} is depicted as ongoing, repetitive or habitual (imperfective in terms of aspect) — rather than completed (perfective in terms of aspect). Thus, in parallel with the structure V-\textit{hA bi-he}, the structure V-\textit{mbihe}/V-\textit{me bi-he}, when serving as a main predicate, can be interpreted as follows: ‘It did indeed occur that a state of affairs was taking place/usually took place’.

3.2.2.2.3 The Complex Structures \textit{V-rak\-hA\-kū bi-he}

These structures consist of negative participles (imperfective \textit{V-rakū}, perfective \textit{V-hA\-kū}) and the form \textit{bi-he}, and mainly serve as main predicates. Semantically they do not exhibit new patterns except for the negation of their affirmative counterparts: V-\textit{hA\-kū bi-he} is the negation of the form V-\textit{hA bi-he}, and the structure V-\textit{rakū bi-he} is the negation of both V-\textit{mbihe} and V-\textit{rA bi-he} (however, it should be noted that the structure V-\textit{rA bi-he} is very rare in Manchu). The following are some examples: (3.2 – 21) and (3.2 – 22) express the meaning of the experiential perfect, (3.2 – 23) functions like the past perfect, and (3.2 – 24) expresses the meaning of habitual past:

\begin{verbatim}
(3.2 – 21)  bi seibeni niyalma-i muke tata-ra be
 1SG formerly people-GEN water pull-IPFV.PTCP ACC
\end{verbatim}
‘Though I have watched people drawing water [out of a well] before, I have never learnt [to do it myself]’ (LQD: 80)

‘Being friends for two months, [we] have never been angry with each other’ (LQD: 292)

‘[At first] He wouldn’t lend [it to me], [and then] unable to bear my nagging him again and again, [he finally] gave [it to me] reluctantly’ (LQD: 44)

‘I didn’t like soft stewed dishes [before], [but] nowadays [I] just love smooth, soft things in [my] mouth’ (AGA2: 115)

3.2.2.3 Non-temporal Meanings Expressed by Structures Containing bi-he

Apart from aspectual-temporal meanings, structures containing bi-he can also express a variety of non-temporal meanings, or at least contribute to expressing them. Such meanings are related to knowledge state, including uncertainty, mirativity, and counterfactuality.
First, the perfective participle *bi-he* can reflect the speaker’s uncertainty. When expressing this meaning, the participle *bi-he* appears in combination with interrogatives, which themselves also reflect the speaker’s uncertainty (about the situation). The following are examples:

(3.2 – 25) \(\text{agu-sa} \; \text{ere} \; \text{aiba} \; \text{bi-he}\)
\hspace{1cm} \text{sir-PL} \; \text{this} \; \text{what.place} \; \text{be-PFV.PTCP}

‘Sirs, what is this place?’ (NSB: 68)

(3.2 – 26) \(\text{si ai} \; \text{niyalma} \; \text{bi-he?} \; \text{bi} \; \text{ainu} \; \text{taka-rakū}\)
\hspace{1cm} \text{2SG} \; \text{what} \; \text{person} \; \text{be-PFV.PTCP} \; \text{1SG why} \; \text{know-IPFV.PTCP.NEG}

‘Who [on earth] are you? Why don’t I know you?’ (NSB: 72)

It is clear from the contexts that despite the presence of the participle *bi-he*, (3.2 – 25) and (3.2 – 26) do not describe past states of affairs (cf. [3.2 – 1] – [3.2 – 4]) but only concern the present (‘what this place is’ and ‘who the addressee is’). On the other hand, to describe present states of affairs, no verb or copula is necessary to express identification (or evaluation). Therefore, the participle *bi-he* would be expected to express a certain type of non-temporal meaning. Since it can be seen that in both (3.2 – 25) and (3.2 – 26) the speaker attempts to reason but is unable to find the answer, the participle *bi-he* would be expected to mark — or at least to contribute to marking — the speaker’s uncertainty.

Second, the participle *bi-he* is also used in some sentences where the speaker has come to a sudden realisation of certain state of affairs — expressing the mirative/admirative meaning (Friedman 1986; Jacobsen 1986; DeLancey 1997). The participle *bi-he* occurs in combination with a particle *ni*, and in some cases with the particle *dule* ‘in fact’ in addition. Examples (3.2 – 27) – (3.2 – 30) below can be seen as mirative constructions in Manchu (though there are also structures which can express mirativity without the participle *bi-he*):

---

13 Usually, Manchu can simply juxtapose two nominal structures, one as the subject, and the other as the predicate, e.g., *ere [this] min-i [1SG(si/sin)-GEN] fiyanggū [youngest.child] ‘this [is] my youngest child’ (OJ2: 40); *inenggi [day] šun [sun] foholen [short] ‘the days [are] short’ (OJ1: 27).

14 The particle *ni* does not have a conveniently glossable counterpart in English. Li (2010: 374) states that it is an “interrogative particle […] which is used in questions that are contrary to the speaker’s belief”. One can see that what Li (2010: 374) characterises as “contrary to the speaker’s belief” is close to the mirative meaning.

15 For instance: *dule* [in.fact] *teisu* [matching] *akū* [NEG] *nt* [PTL]. ‘[So] in fact there is no matching [between them]’ (I
(3.2 – 27) *si emu sain niyalma bi-he ni*
you one good person be-PFV.PTCP PTL
‘So you are a good person [and I didn’t know that]!’ (NSB: 51)

(3.2 – 28) *dule emu tondokon niyalma waka bihe ni*
in.fact one honest person not be-PFV.PTCP PTL
‘In fact [he] is not an honest man [which I have just realized]!’ (OJ1: 100)

(3.2 – 29) *ai buce-he yali geli bi-he ni*
what die-PFV.PTCP meat even be-PFV.PTCP PTL
*buce-he yali*: ‘garbage’ (as a swearing word), lit.: ‘dead meat’
‘[I have just realized that] There is even such garbage [in the world]!’
(OG3A: 91)

(3.2 – 30) *dule emu butu hūlha, jortai hutu ara-me*
in.fact one secret thief on.purpose ghost pretend-IPFV.CVB
*niyalma be gelebu-mbihe ni*
people ACC frighten-PST.IPV PTL
*buta hūlha*: ‘thief [who sneaks]’
‘[I have just realized that] it was a thief sneaking around and frightening people by pretending to be a ghost!’ (OJ2: 68)

It should be noted that the main predicate of (3.2 – 30) is a complex structure containing
*bi-he* — the past imperfective V-*mbihe* (see Section 3.2.2.2.2). It expresses the aspectual-temporal meaning of past progressive, apart from contributing the meaning of mirativity.

Third, when the verb *aca-* forms a complex structure (V-*ci aca-*) that expresses the modal meaning ‘to be obligated to’, takes the form -*mbihe* and serves as the predicate of a simple sentence, it functions to describe a counterfactual state of affairs in the past. The original modal meaning of obligation is also retained. Here are two examples:

(3.2 – 31) *sikse uthai ere emu jurgan emu hontoho be*
yesterday then this one line one half ACC
*wacihiyabu-ci aca-mbihe*
finish-COND suit(AUX)-PST.IPV

V-*ci aca-*: complex structure expressing obligation

have just realized this)’ (UH: 61) uses the particles *dule* and *ni*, but not the participle *bi-he*. Also, when a lexical verb serves as the main predicate, mirativity can be expressed by these two particles alone without a complex structure of *bi-he*: *si [2SG] dule [in.fact] taka-rakā [know-IPFV.PTCP.NEG] ni [PTL] kai [PTL] ‘So you actually don’t know [it] (which I have just realized)!’ (OJ2: 118).
‘[You] should have finished this one line and a half [of the text] yesterday’  
(AGA1: 66)

(3.2 – 32)  
\[
\text{sim-be} \quad \text{guile-ci} \quad \text{aca-mbihe.} \quad \text{sin-de}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{l}
2SG(si/si)-ACC \quad \text{invite-COND} \quad \text{suit(AUX)-PST.IPVF} \quad \text{2SG(si/si)-DAT} \\
mejige \quad \text{isibu-hak\text{"u}-ngge,} \quad \text{ere-i} \quad \text{dorgi-de} \\
\text{message} \quad \text{send-PFV.PTCP-NEG-NMLZ} \quad \text{this-GEN} \quad \text{inside-DAT} \\
\text{sin-de} \quad \text{aca-rak\text{"u}} \quad \text{niyalma} \quad \text{bi-fi} \quad \text{kai} \\
\text{2SG(si/si)-DAT} \quad \text{suit-PFV.PTCP.NEG} \quad \text{people} \quad \text{be-PFV.CVB} \quad \text{PTL} \\
\text{sinde acar\text{"u} nyalma: ‘people who do not get along with you’, lit.: ‘people not suiting you’} \\
\text{bi-fi kai: ‘indeed because there is/are/was/were’}
\end{array}
\]

‘[I] should have invited you. [That I] did not send you a message [is] because there were people among them who don’t get along well with you’ (OJ2: 92)

Furthermore, in conditional constructions of Manchu, the perfective participle bi-he and the structures it forms (e.g. V-mbihe) can also express a counterfactual meaning. These structures can be formed by lexical verbs, and are not limited to complex structures expressing modality as in (3.2 – 31) and (3.2 – 32). The structures containing bi-he occur at least in one clause of a conditional construction. Counterfactual conditionality is thus expressed by the combination of the conditional converb (V-ci) and structures containing bi-he. Here are two examples. The main predicate of (3.2 – 33) is a complex verb structure expressing a modal meaning, as in (3.2 – 31) and (3.2 – 32), while the main predicate of (3.2 – 34) is a lexical verb.16

(3.2 – 33)  
\[
\text{donji-mbihe} \quad \text{bi-ci,} \quad \text{urgun} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{doro-i}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{hear-PST.IPVF} \quad \text{be(AUX)-COND} \quad \text{happiness} \quad \text{GEN} \quad \text{rite-GEN} \\
\text{acana-me} \quad \text{gene-ci} \quad \text{aca-mbihe} \\
\text{go.to.meet-IPVF.CVB} \quad \text{go-COND} \quad \text{suit(AUX)-PST.IPVF} \\
\text{urgun i doro: ‘congratulations’, lit.: ‘the rite of happiness’} \\
\text{V-ci aca-: complex structure expressing obligation}
\end{array}
\]

‘If [I] had heard [about your good news], [I] should have gone to meet [you and offer my] congratulations’ (MFG: 7)

(3.2 – 34)  
\[
\text{tere} \quad \text{inenggi} \quad \text{baha} \quad \text{bi-ci,} \quad \text{sim-be}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{that} \quad \text{day} \quad \text{get.PFV.PTCP} \quad \text{be(AUX)-COND} \quad \text{2SG(si/si)-ACC} \\
\text{wa-mbihe} \quad \text{kill-PFV.PTCP}
\end{array}
\]

‘If [I] had captured [you] that day, [I] would have killed you’ (MYK2: 46)

---

16 See Section 4.1.2.1 for more examples of counterfactual conditionals.
To sum up, the meanings discussed above include the following: uncertainty ([3.2 – 25] and [3.2 – 26]); mirativity ([3.2 – 27] – [3.2 – 30]); counterfactuality in simple sentences ([3.2 – 31] and [3.2 – 32]); and counterfactuality in complex sentences — conditional constructions ([3.2 – 33] and [3.2 – 34]). All these meanings are (at least partly) realised by structures containing the perfective participle bi-he (either bi-he by itself or the complex structures it forms). One thing that these meanings share with the temporal meaning (i.e. past state of affairs) is their distinction from what the speaker always knows (for certain) as the present reality. It should also be noted that this is not to claim that these meanings are realised exclusively by the structures containing bi-he, nor even to claim that to express these meanings, structures containing bi-he are needed at all — in fact for each meaning there are alternative structures without the participle bi-he. Nevertheless, when the structures containing bi-he do occur, they undoubtedly play an important role in representing the cognitive distance between the state of affairs described and what the speaker knows as reality.

3.2.3 The Two Perfective Participles bi-he and o-ho: A Contrast in Meaning

As shown in Section 3.2.1 and Section 3.2.2.2.3, the perfective participles of the two verbs bi- and o-, i.e., bi-he and o-ho, are similar in terms of syntactic functions. For instance, in forming predicates, both can combine with nominal structures (N + bi-he; N + o-ho) when bi- and o- function as lexical verbs, or with the negative imperfective participle (V-rakū bi-he; V-rakū o-ho) when bi- and o- function as auxiliary verbs. However, they should be semantically distinguished from each other. First, when serving as the predicate of a sentence, the participle bi-he usually implies that the state which it represents (had) existed for a certain period of time but no longer existed or exists, or the state was somehow affected. For instance, tere [3SG/that] hafan [official] bi-he [be-PFV.PTCP] ‘He had been/used to be an official’ implies that he was or is no longer an official. In contrast, when serving as the (main) predicate of a sentence, the participle o-ho only indicates that the state in question was or has been realised, potentially implying that the realised state would afterwards exist for a certain period of time. For instance, tere [3SG/that] hafan [official] o-ho [become-PFV.PTCP] ‘He
became/has become an official’ indicates that his becoming an official was realised, and implies that he would remain an official afterwards for a certain period.

Second, one can also observe a similar difference between the complex structures V-rakū bi-he and V-rakū o-ho. In the case of bi-he, the state represented by the preceding negative participle (V-rAkū) usually ceased/ceases to exist. For instance, sabu-rakū [see-IPFV.PTCP.NEG] bi-he [be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP] ‘[People] couldn’t see [it]’ implies that the state of affairs that people were unable to see ceased or has ceased to exist, and therefore people became or have become able to see the thing after a certain temporal point (in the past). In the case of o-ho, by contrast, the state represented by the negative participle was realised at a certain temporal point (in the past). For instance, as explained in Section 4.2.1, sabu-rakū [see-IPFV.PTCP.NEG] o-ho [become(AUX)-PFV.PTCP] ‘[People] could not see any more’ indicates the change into a state in which people could not see the thing, and implies that this state would exist for a certain period.

3.2.4 The Verb se-

When used as a lexical verb, the verb se- is a quotative verb, serving to quote the content of speech (either direct speech or indirect speech). It may be used alone or together with other verbs of speech. For instance, tere [that/3SG] bi [1SG] ji-he [come-PFV.PTCP] se-he [say-PFV.PTCP] ‘He said, “I’ve come”’ (direct speech, se- used alone); tere [that/3SG] hendu-me [speak-IPFV.CVB], si [2SG] ebsi [hither] jio [come.IMP] se-he [say-PFV.PTCP] ‘He said, “You, come here!”’ (direct speech, se- combining with verb of speech hendu- ‘to speak’). In the course of time the quotative verb se- has also formed structures which, though related metaphorically to its original function, express other meanings such as intention, expectation or wish. In such structures the verb se- functions as an auxiliary verb. From the Section 3.1.3.1.3 (on optative forms) we can see that the complex structure V-ki se- expresses the modal meaning of intention, which presumably originated from a first-person direct-speech use and later on fossilised as a fixed structure. For instance, it is likely that at an earlier stage the modal sentence bi [1SG] yabu-ki [go-OPT] se-mbi [say(AUX)-IPFV.FIN] ‘I want to go’ literally meant ‘I’m saying, “[I] would like to go”’. As a matter of fact, such
direct-speech use of the structure V-ki se- exists in parallel with its modal use in Manchu, which can be contextually distinguished, for example, emu [one] gašan [village] de [DAT] aca-fi [get.together-PFV.CVB] te-ki [live-OPT] se-me [say-IPFV.CVB] gisure-me [discuss-IPFV.CVB] waji-ha [finish-PFV.PTCP] ‘saying “let’s live together in one village!”’, [they thus] finished discussing [the matter]’.

The quotative verb is also used to “quote” the content of one’s thought or hearsay, e.g. aga-me [rain-IPFV.CVB] deribu-he [begin-PFV.PTCP] dere [PTL] se-me [say-IPFV.CVB] gūni-habi [think-PFV.FIN] ‘I thought, “it may have begun to rain”’, antaha-sa [guest-PL] gemu [all] isinji-ha [arrive-PFV.PTCP] se-re [say-IPFV.PTCP] be [ACC] donji-ha [hear-PFV.PTCP] ‘I heard that all the guests had arrived’. In particular, when the verb se-, in the form of the imperfective converb se-me or the participles se-re/se-he, is governed by cognition or perception verbs (such as gūni- ‘to think’, donji- ‘to hear’), it is comparable to the complementiser that in English as in I think that. It is also important to note that the verb se-, in its various forms, takes finite forms as its subordinate clauses, that is, these clauses can stand on their own as simple sentences: uyun [nine] hala-i [clan-GEN] gurun [tribe] aca-fi [get.together-PFV.CVB] ilan [three] jugūn-i [route-GEN] cooha [troops] ji-mbi [come-IPFV.FIN] se-me [say(AUX)-IPFV.CVB] donji-fi [hear-PFV.CVB] ‘hearing that [these] nine tribes had got together and [their] troops were coming in three routes,…’

The basic function of the verb se- enables it to form topic structures or cleft structures in various forms (Gorelova 2006: 157–159; also see Section 4.8), such as the nominalised participles se-re-ngge, se-he-ngge, and the conditional converb se-ci, for example, gurun-i [nation/state-GEN] gisun [language] se-re-ngge [say-IPFV.PTCP-NMLZ] muse-i [1PL.INCL-GEN] ba-i [place-GEN] gisun [language] ‘What is called the national language is our dialect’ (AGA1: 1); nure [wine] se-ci [say-COND], horon-i [poison-GEN] okto [medicine] geli [even] waka [not] ‘Speaking of wine, [it is] not even poison’ (MFG: 47).

The above is an outline of the grammar of Manchu verbs, which are most relevant to the present study. The next chapter is the core of this thesis, analysing the collected data, which are divided into distinct, yet related, categories.
Chapter 4  Data Analysis

This chapter categorises and analyses the example sentences from the corpus. The sentences are divided into ten groups, each of which is analysed in one section. The categorisation takes morphosyntax, semantics and pragmatics into consideration, and the categories are not meant to be mutually exclusive, particularly in terms of morphosyntax.

The example sentences are glossed on a morpheme-by-morpheme basis and translated. Extra glosses are provided after the sentences wherever I deem necessary, such as some set phrases as well as complex verb structures. Each section of data analysis first demonstrates the morphosyntactic properties of sentences, which are arranged in order of increasing complexity of the predicate. Then the meanings of the sentences are discussed in association with their morphosyntax.

4.1  Basic Patterns of Conditional Constructions

This section analyses the basic patterns of conditional constructions, which are the most common constructions and are uniform in morphosyntax — containing conditional-converb (V-ci) structures (both simple and complex). Therefore, they are the candidates for the prototypes of conditional constructions. The basic conditionals are analysed in two groups: factual conditionals and counterfactual conditionals (see Sections 4.1.1.2 and 4.1.2.2 respectively for the definition of each type of conditional), both of which exhibit distinctive morphosyntactic characteristics.

4.1.1  Basic Factual Conditionals

4.1.1.1  Morphosyntax

The simplest form of a factual conditional has the conditional converb of a

---

17 Conditional-converb (V-ci) structures frequently and primarily express conditionality. For instance, a rough count of conditional-converb structures in MYK (see Section 1.2) reveals that 289 of all 411 occurrences (excluding fixed expressions containing the conditional converb; see Section 3.1.1) express conditionality, while 122 express temporality (see Section 4.3). On the other hand, only 28 occurrences of dative-locative participial structures (V-hA de) express conditionality (see Section 4.2.1), an absolute minority in comparison with the 289 occurrences of conditional-converb structures expressing conditionality.
lexical verb \textit{V-ci} serving as the predicate of the subordinate clause (protasis). Other morphosyntactic patterns of conditionals can be regarded as derived from it. The following are some examples. The predicate of the main clause (apodosis) can be the imperfective finite form \textit{V-mbHi} ([4.1 – 1] and [4.1 – 2]), an imperative form ([4.1 – 3]), an optative form ([4.1 – 4]), or a nominal structure ([4.1 – 5] and [4.1 – 6]):

\begin{enumerate} \setcounter{enumi}{0} 
\item \texttt{inenggi-dari hūla-ci, gisun eje-mbi} \\
\quad \text{day-every read-COND words remember-IPFV.FIN} \\
\quad ‘If [one] reads every day, [one] will remember words’ (OJ1: 24)
\item \texttt{muse dobori farhūn de cooha jura-ci, gurun} \\
\quad \text{1PL.INCL night dark DAT troops set.out-COND people} \\
\quad \textit{duurge-mbHi} \\
\quad \text{be.disturbed-IPFV.FIN} \\
\quad ‘If we march the troops during the night, the people [in the city] will be disturbed’ (MYK2: 37)
\item \texttt{gene-ci, uthai hūdun jio} \\
\quad \text{go-COND then quick come.IMP} \\
\quad ‘If [you] go [there], then come [back] quickly!’ (UH: 17)
\item \texttt{suwe te-de acana-ci, mim-be guilefi} \\
\quad \text{2PL 3SG-DAT go.to.meet 1SG(bi/min)-ACC invite-PFV.CVb} \\
\quad \texttt{sasa yo-ki} \\
\quad \text{together go-OPT} \\
\quad ‘If you go to meet him, take me [and] let’s go together’ (MFG: 16)
\item \texttt{age si mim-be wakaša-ci, bi yala sui mangga} \\
\quad \text{sir 2SG 1SG(bi/min)-ACC blame-COND 1SG really wronged} \\
\quad \textit{sui mangga}: ‘wronged’, ‘done injustice to’; \textit{suī} ‘guilt, sin’, \textit{mangga} ‘difficult’ \\
\quad ‘Sir, if you blame me, I [will be] really wronged’ (OJ2: 116)
\item \texttt{ere juwe amban be wa-ci, min-i} \\
\quad \text{these two high.official ACC kill-COND 1SG(bi/min)-GEN} \\
\quad \textit{beye inu buce-he gese kai} \\
\quad \text{self also die-PFV.PTCP like PTL} \\
\quad ‘If [you] kill these two generals [of mine], [I will] also [be] as dead myself’ (MYK3: 24)
\end{enumerate}

When a factual conditional has a negative protasis, its subordinate predicate is a complex structure. When it contains a verb, the subordinate predicate consists of the negative
imperfective participle (V-rakū) and o-ci, the conditional converb (V-ci) of the verb o- ‘to become/be’, used as an auxiliary verb. When no verb is involved, the subordinate predicate consists of the negative particle, akū, and the conditional converb of the verb o-. Examples (4.1 – 7) – (4.1 – 10) below contain lexical verbs in the subordinate clauses, while (4.1 – 11) and (4.1 – 12) do not. The forms of the main predicates include the imperfective finite form ([4.1 – 7] and [4.1 – 11]), the imperfective participles (negative in [4.1 – 8], affirmative in [4.1 – 9]), and the imperatives ([4.1 – 10] and [4.1 – 12]).

(4.1 – 7)  
\[\text{daha-rakū} \quad \text{o-ci,} \quad \text{be} \quad \text{afa-mbi}\]  
surrender-IPFV.PTCP.NEG become(AUX)-COND 1PL.EXCL attack-IPFV.FIN  
‘If [you] do not surrender, we shall attack [you]’ (MYK6: 10)

(4.1 – 8)  
\[\text{min-i} \quad \text{ere uniyen} \quad \text{tukšan} \quad \text{banji-rakū}\]  
1SG(bi/min)-GEN this cow calf give.birth-IPFV.PTCP.NEG  
\[\text{o-ci,} \quad \text{ayara nimenggi} \quad \text{baha-rakū}\]  
be(AUX)-COND sour.milk fat obtain-IPFV.PTCP.NEG  
nimenggi: ‘fat’, here referring to ‘butter’.  
‘If this cow of mine does not give birth to calves, [I shall] not [be able to] obtain sour milk or butter’ (SG: 266)

(4.1 – 9)  
\[\text{turgun be} \quad \text{tucibu-me} \quad \text{ala-rakū} \quad \text{o-ci,}\]  
reason ACC reveal-IPFV.CVB tell-IPFV.PTCP.NEG become(AUX)-COND  
\[\text{ainambaha-fi sa-ra}\]  
how.can-PFV.CVB know-IPFV.PTCP  
‘If [you] do not reveal the reason [to me], how can [I] know [it]?’  
(OJ1: 104)

(4.1 – 10)  
\[\text{giyan de} \quad \text{acana-rakū} \quad \text{o-ci,} \quad \text{uthai}\]  
principle DAT suit-IPFV.PTCP.NEG become(AUX)-COND  
\[\text{naka-o}\]  
stop-IMP  
‘If [the matter] does not suit [our] principles, then stop [handling it]!’  
(MFG: 11)

(4.1 – 11)  
\[\text{jete-re} \quad \text{jeku} \quad \text{akū} \quad \text{o-ci,}\]  
eat-IPFV.PTCP provisions NEG become(AUX)-COND  
\[\text{muse-i} \quad \text{jušen} \quad \text{gemu} \quad \text{ubaša-mbi kai}\]  
1PL.INCL-GEN subjects all rebel-IPFV.FIN PTL  
‘If there are no provisions, our subjects will all rebel [against us]’  
(MYK1: 47)
Apart from the factual conditionals with negative protases discussed above, the subordinate predicate can also have a complex structure even when a factual conditional has an affirmative protasis. Semantically, there is no difference between such a conditional and a conditional with a simple predicate in the protasis. The complex subordinate predicate in question consists of the imperfective participle (\(V_{-rA}\)) and the conditional converb of the auxiliary verb \(o\). The following are examples:

(4.1 – 13)

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
jiha & menggun & i & uda-fi & etu-re & o-ci, \\
\text{money} & \text{silver} & \text{GEN} & \text{buy-PFV.CVB} & \text{wear-PFV.PTCP} & \text{become(AUX)-COND} \\
niyalma & oforo & deri & suk seme & & \\
\text{people} & \text{nose} & \text{ABL} & \text{snorting} & \\
\text{inje-mbi} & kai & & & & \\
\text{laugh-PFV.FIN} & \text{PTL} & & & & \\
\text{suk seme inje-} & \text{‘to laugh through the nose while trying to hold a straight face’} & \\
\end{array}
\]

‘If [you] buy [the clothes] with money and wear them, people will laugh at you (through the nose)’ (OJ2: 54)

(4.1 – 14)

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
ali-me & gaisu & manggi & geli & angga & aifu-re & o-ci, \\
\text{accept-IPFV.CVB} & \text{take.IMP} & \text{after} & \text{then} & \text{mouth} & \text{break.word-IPFV.PTCP} & \text{become(AUX)-COND} \\
niyalma & jai & adarame & sin-i & & & \\
\text{people} & \text{again} & \text{how} & \text{2SG(si/sin)-GEN} & & & \\
gisun & be & akda-mbi & & & & \\
\text{words} & \text{ACC} & \text{believe-IPFV.FIN} & & & & \\
\text{ali-me gai-} & \text{‘to accept’, ‘to make a promise’} & & & & & \\
\text{angga aifu-} & \text{‘to break one’s word’} & & & & & \\
\text{‘If [you], after making a promise, break [your] word, how can people believe your words again?’} & (OJ2: 60)
\end{array}
\]

Factual conditionals can also have another type of complex predicate in the subordinate clause, which consists of the verb \(se\) ‘to say’ (as an auxiliary verb) and a preceding verb structure that it governs (usually the optative form \(V_{-ki}\)), as shown in the following examples. The forms of the main predicate (the imperfective participle \(V_{-rA}\) in [4.1 – 15] and the
imperative in [4.1 – 16]) also occurred in previous examples ([4.1 – 9] and [4.1 – 10], respectively):

(4.1 – 15)  
\begin{align*}
\text{age} & \quad \text{tuwa-ki} & \quad \text{se-ci}, & \quad \text{bi} & \quad \text{bene-bu-re} \\
\text{sir} & \quad \text{look-OPT} & \quad \text{say(AUX)-COND} & \quad 1\text{SG} & \quad \text{send-CAUS-IPFV.PTCP}
\end{align*}

V-ki se-: complex structure expressing desire or intention
‘Sir, if you want to read [this book], I’ll have someone send [it to you]’
(OJ2: 110)

(4.1 – 16)  
\begin{align*}
\text{min-i} & \quad \text{emgi} & \quad \text{banji-ki} & \quad \text{se-ci}, & \quad \text{juwe} & \quad \text{juse} \\
1\text{SG(bi/min)-GEN} & \quad \text{together} & \quad \text{live-OPT} & \quad \text{say(AUX)-COND} & \quad 2\text{children} & \quad \text{expel-IMP}
\end{align*}

‘If [you] want to live together with me, expel [those] two children!’
(SG: 417)

Besides the syntactic patterns of factual conditionals shown by all the previous examples, there also exist numerous factual conditionals that contain the conditional connector aika/aikabade\(^{18}\) in the protases. It occurs before the conditional converb, either in sentence-initial position or following some other components (such as the subject or the object, the adverbial, and so forth). This connector, which approximately corresponds to the English conjunction if, forms a framed structure with the subordinate predicate. The following are some examples:

(4.1 – 17)  
\begin{align*}
\text{aikabade} & \quad \text{in-i} & \quad \text{baru} & \quad \text{emu} & \quad \text{gūnin mujilen-i} \\
\text{if} & \quad 3\text{SG(i/m)-GEN} & \quad \text{toward} & \quad \text{one} & \quad \text{thought mind-GEN}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{baita} & \quad \text{be} & \quad \text{hebdene-ci,} & \quad \text{damu} & \quad \text{oilori deleri} \\
\text{matter} & \quad \text{ACC} & \quad \text{go.to.discuss-COND} & \quad \text{only} & \quad \text{superficial}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{se-me} & \quad \text{fabu-mbi} \\
\text{say(AUX)-IPFVCVB} & \quad \text{reply-IPFV.FIN}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{oilori deleri se-me: ‘superficially’, ‘perfunctorily’}
\end{align*}

‘If [you] go to discuss something [that is] on your mind, [he] will only reply to you perfunctorily’ (MFG: 7)

(4.1 – 18)  
\begin{align*}
\text{age si} & \quad \text{enenggi} & \quad \text{aikabade} & \quad \text{min-i} & \quad \text{boo-de} \\
\text{sir} & \quad \text{2SG} & \quad \text{today} & \quad \text{if} & \quad 1\text{SG(bi/min)-GEN} & \quad \text{house-DAT}
\end{align*}

\(^{18}\) The conditional connector aika can also function as an indefinite determiner (‘some’, ‘(a) certain’) or pronoun (‘something’) and aikabade < aika + ba-de [place-DAT], can also function as an indefinite adverbial, literally meaning ‘at a certain place’. See Section 5.1.1.
‘Sir, if you don’t come into my house today, I will be really angry with you’ (MFG: 49)

‘If there is anything inappropriate [in my shooting posture], please point [it] out a little bit and correct [me]!’ (OJ1: 40)

‘If there is the meat of young pigs or of geese in your house, I would like to go in and eat’ (MFG: 49)

From a comparison of (4.1 – 1) – (4.1 – 16) with (4.1 – 17) – (4.1 – 20), one can see that in order to express the conditional meaning, the connector aika/aikabade is not indispensable in the protasis. However, the presence of aika/aikabade in the frame structures that contain the conditional converb V-ci reinforces the conditional interpretation of the sentences.

Factual conditionals containing aika/aikabade are in a sense similar to factual conditionals in European languages, though there are also important differences. First, the subordinate predicates of Manchu conditionals contain the conditional converb (V-ci) and are therefore not finite forms, while conditionals in European languages mostly contain finite verb forms in the protases. Second, the syntactic position of the conditional connector aika/aikabade within the protasis is rather flexible (see [4.1 – 17] – [4.1 – 20]), while the conditional conjunctions in European languages (English if, French si, and German wenn) are always clause-initial.

Table 4.1.1 is a summary of the morphosyntactic patterns of factual conditionals as shown in examples (4.1 – 1) – (4.1 – 20). “Subj1” and “Pred1” represent the subject and the predicate in the subordinate clause (protasis), while “Subj2” and “Pred2” stand for the subject
and the predicate in the main clause (apodosis). Despite different numbering, “Subj1” and “Subj2” do not necessarily refer to different entities. Both of them are put in parentheses since Manchu allows the omission of subjects. It should also be noted that these syntactic patterns do not necessarily exhaust all the possibilities of combination between the subordinate and the main clauses.

Table 4.1.1 Basic Morphosyntactic Patterns of Factual Conditionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinate Clause (Protasis)</th>
<th>Main Clause (Apodosis)</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{{(Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-ci]}}</td>
<td>{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-mbi]}</td>
<td>(4.1 – 1) and (4.1 – 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-IMP]}</td>
<td>(4.1 – 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-OPT]}</td>
<td>(4.1 – 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [N]}</td>
<td>(4.1 – 5) and (4.1 – 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{{(Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-rakū o-ci]}}</td>
<td>{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-mbi]}</td>
<td>(4.1 – 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-rakū]}</td>
<td>(4.1 – 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-rA]}</td>
<td>(4.1 – 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-IMP]}</td>
<td>(4.1 – 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{{(Subj1 +) Pred1 [akū o-ci]}}</td>
<td>{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-mbi]}</td>
<td>(4.1 – 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-IMP]}</td>
<td>(4.1 – 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{{(Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-rA o-ci]}}</td>
<td>{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-mbi] (+ kai)}</td>
<td>(4.1 – 13) and (4.1 – 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{{(Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-ki se-ci]}}</td>
<td>{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-rA]}</td>
<td>(4.1 – 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-IMP]}</td>
<td>(4.1 – 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{{(Subj1 +) aika / aikabade + Pred1 [V-ci]}}</td>
<td>{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-mbi]}</td>
<td>(4.1 – 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-IMP]}</td>
<td>(4.1 – 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-OPT]}</td>
<td>(4.1 – 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{{(Subj1 +) aika / aikabade + Pred1 [V-rakū o-ci]}}</td>
<td>{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-mbi]}</td>
<td>(4.1 – 18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.1.2 Interpretation

Despite the term, a factual conditional does not describe a fact known by the
speaker. Rather, the speaker of a factual conditional generally indicates that the states of affairs are not realised yet and suggests that the states of affairs are still realisable. What the speaker does confirm is the relation between two states of affairs, one of which serves as a precondition or cause for the other state of affairs. For instance, in (4.1 – 7), the protasis state of affairs — the addressee’s refusal to surrender — will be the cause for the apodosis state of affairs — the speaker’s launching an attack on the addressee.

While the protases always have propositional content, the apodoses do not necessarily constitute propositions, but are speech acts other than statements: the apodosis of (4.1 – 9) is a question, the apodosis of (4.1 – 20) expresses a wish, and the apodoses of (4.1 – 3), (4.1 – 4), (4.1 – 10), (4.1 – 12), (4.1 – 16) and (4.1 – 19) are requests. Nevertheless, the conditional relation is present in these cases as well. For instance, in (4.1 – 9), the protasis state of affairs — the addressee’s not revealing the reason — will be the cause for the speaker’s speech act of asking a question. In (4.1 – 10), the protasis state of affairs — the matter’s violation of principles — will be the cause for the speaker’s speech act of requesting the addressee to stop handling the matter.

The predicate structures of both clauses of all the constructions ([4.1 – 1] – [4.1 – 20]) — especially the structures of the main predicates, due to the relative nature and dependence of the subordinate predicates — contribute to their interpretation as factual conditionals. The structures of the main predicates tend to describe states of affairs that take place at present or in the future by default. Specifically, the imperfective finite form (V-\(mbi\)), the imperfective participles (affirmative V-\(rA\) as in [4.1 – 9], and negative V-\(rak\u{u}\) as in [4.1 – 8]) or imperative in the apodosis of a conditional would be expected to describe a general state of affairs or an ongoing action (in the case of the imperfective finite form), or a state of affairs that is yet to start (in the case of the imperative). On the other hand, in the case of an apodosis with a non-verbal — more exactly, nominal — main predicate (e.g., in [4.1 – 5]), the protasis would describe a state of affairs that does not trigger an interpretation about the past unless indicated by a past temporal adverbial.

However, it should be stressed that the morphosyntactic characteristics of predicate structures as discussed above do not necessarily guarantee a (factual) conditional interpretation. In Manchu there exist various constructions which share morphosyntactic
characteristics with factual conditionals, but express different meanings (such as temporality or concession) or realise different functions (such as comparison, topicalisation, and so forth). Therefore, although all of the examples analysed so far are the most common factual conditionals in Manchu, the identification of their prototypes requires more constraints from semantics as well as the context. In Section 5.1, I will point out that the conditional connector aika/aikabade is also important in establishing the morphosyntactic criteria for prototypes of factual conditionals.

4.1.2 Basic Counterfactual Conditionals

4.1.2.1 Morphosyntax

The protases of counterfactual conditionals always have complex predicates containing the conditional converb of the verb bi- ‘to exist/be’ (as an auxiliary verb), bi-ci, which can follow a variety of verb forms (as can be seen in the examples below). Such verb forms themselves vary in complexity, but in general they can be divided into two types according to their grammatical polarity: affirmative and negative. The least complex type of all subordinate predicates consists of the perfective participle of a lexical verb (V-hA) and bi-ci. The following are some examples ([4.1 – 22] was also discussed in Section 3.2.2.3):

(4.1 – 21) 

\[ \text{donji-ha} \quad \text{bi-ci}, \quad \text{inu} \quad \text{tuwanji-mbihe} \]

hear-PFV.PTCP be(AUX)-COND also come.to see-PST.IPFV
‘If [I] had heard [your news], [I] would also have come to see [you]’
(OJ1: 89)

(4.1 – 22) 

\[ \text{tere inenggi baha} \quad \text{bi-ci}, \quad \text{sim-be} \quad \text{wa-mbihe} \]

that day get.PFV.PTCP be(AUX)-COND 2SG(si/sin)-ACC kill-PST.IPFV
‘If [I] had captured [you] that day, I would have killed you’ (MYK2: 46)

(4.1 – 23) 

\[ \text{gūwa} \quad \text{niyalma} \quad \text{o-ho} \quad \text{bi-ci}, \quad \text{aina-ha} \]

other person become-PFV.PTCP be(AUX)-COND do.what-PFV.PTCP
\[ \text{se-me} \quad \text{tuwa-rakū} \quad \text{bi-he} \quad \text{say(AUX)-IPFV.CV8} \]

look-PFV.PTCP.NEG be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP

---

19 Such constructions are analysed in other sections of this chapter.
The main predicates of counterfactual conditionals, as shown by (4.1 – 21) – (4.1 – 25), have one type of structure each for either polarity. The predicate of an affirmative apodosis (see [4.1 – 21] and [4.1 – 22]) consists of the past imperfective form V-\textit{mbihe}, which, as argued in Section 3.2.2.2.2, is a complex form consisting of the imperfective converb (V-\textit{me}) and the perfective participle of the verb bi- (‘to exist/be’), bi-\textit{he}. The predicate of a negative apodosis (see [4.1 – 23] – [4.1 – 25])\textsuperscript{20} consists of the negative imperfective participle (V-\textit{rakū}) and bi-\textit{he}.

When the protases of counterfactual conditionals are affirmative, they can also use structures that are more complex, but are derived from the structure V-\textit{hA bi-ci}. One such type of predicate structure consists of the past imperfective form V-\textit{mbihe} (= V-\textit{me bi-he}) and bi-\textit{ci}. In the following example (also discussed in Section 3.2.2.3), the main predicate is a complex structure (V-\textit{ci aca-}) expressing modality ‘to be obligated to’, where the auxiliary verb aca- is in the past imperfective form V-\textit{mbihe}:

\textsuperscript{20} Though the main clause of (4.1 – 25) is a question, it is formed by attaching the sentence-final question particle \textit{o} directly to the main predicate — a negative verb structure, V-\textit{rakū bi-he}. Thus, the analysis here of negative apodosis also applies to (4.1 – 25).
Another such type of predicate structure consists of the imperfective participle (V-rA), followed by bi-he, which in turn is followed by bi-ci. Compared with the complex structure V-hA bi-ci, this structure is rarely used in protases. In the following example, the main predicate is a complex verb structure expressing the modal meaning ‘to be possible’, which is formed by the verb o- in the past imperfective form:

(4.1 – 27) aika muduri gurung ni amdun kako-ra
if dragon palace GEN glue obtain-IPFV:PTCP

V-ci: complex structure expressing permission or possibility
‘If [you] had obtained the glue of the Dragon Palace, and [using it] put together the joints of bones, [you] could have regenerated [your] flesh and skin’ (LJ11: 75)

It should be noted that (4.1 – 27) uses the conditional connector aika in its protasis, forming a framed structure with its subordinate predicate, just as in numerous factual conditionals discussed in Section 4.1.1.1. However, it seems that the connector aika occurs less frequently in counterfactual conditionals than in factual conditionals.

When counterfactual conditionals have negative protases, there are a variety of structures that are used for the subordinate predicates. First, the least complex structure consists of a negative participle (either imperfective V-rakū as in [4.1 – 28]; or the perfective V-hAkū, as in [4.1 – 29]) and bi-ci. The following are two examples. The main predicate of (4.1 – 28) consists of the negative imperfective participle of o- ‘to be/become’ (just as in [4.1 – 27]) and
bi-he. In (4.1 – 29), the main predicate is the past imperfective form V-me bi-he. Both structures of the main predicate also occurred in previous examples of counterfactual conditionals ([4.1 – 21] – [4.1 – 28]):

(4.1 – 28)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bi} &\quad \text{moo-i} &\quad \text{funghūwang} &\quad \text{ara-rakū} &\quad \text{bi-ci}, \\
1SG &\quad \text{wood-GEN} &\quad \text{phoenix} &\quad \text{make-IPFV.PTCP.NEG} &\quad \text{be(AUX)-COND} \\
\text{fujin} &\quad \text{be} &\quad \text{booo leose ci} &\quad \text{tucibu-ci} \\
\text{lady} &\quad \text{ACC} &\quad \text{house building ABL} &\quad \text{rescue-CAUS-COND} \\
\text{ojo-rakū} &\quad \text{bi-he} \\
\text{become(AUX)-IPFV.PTCP.NEG} &\quad \text{be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP} \\
\text{V-ci ojo-rakū: here meaning ‘not to be able to do something’, the negation of the} &\quad \text{structure V-ci o-}, \text{expressing permission/likelihood} \\
\text{‘If I had not made the wooden phoenix, [we] could not have rescued the} &\quad \text{lady out of the building’ (SG: 245–246)} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(4.1 – 29)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{min-i} &\quad \text{jui} &\quad \text{be} &\quad \text{dahūme} &\quad \text{aitu-hakū} \\
1SG(bi/min)-GEN &\quad \text{child} &\quad \text{ACC} &\quad \text{again} &\quad \text{save-PFV.PTCP.NEG} \\
\text{bi-ci}, &\quad \text{fulehe} &\quad \text{lakea-me} &\quad \text{bi-he} \\
\text{be(AUX)-COND} &\quad \text{root} &\quad \text{be.severed-IPFV.CVB} &\quad \text{be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP} \\
\text{dahūme aitu:} &\quad \text{‘to revive’, lit.: ‘to save [one to let one live] again’} \\
\text{‘If you had not revived my child, the root [of my family] would have} &\quad \text{been severed’ (NSB: 87)} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Second, other counterfactual conditionals with negative protases have predicate structures that are more complex, consisting of a negative participle (either imperfective as in [4.1 – 30] and [4.1 – 31], or perfective as in [4.1 – 32]), followed by bi-he, and then the conditional converb of bi-. Their main predicates, both affirmative ([4.1 – 30]) and negative ([4.1 – 31] and [4.1 – 32]), also repeat the structural patterns discussed in previous examples:

(4.1 – 30)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Nomina Naikada} &\quad \text{alana-rakū} &\quad \text{bi-he} \\
\text{PN} &\quad \text{PN} &\quad \text{go.to.tell-IPFV.PTCP.NEG} &\quad \text{be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP} \\
\text{bi-ci,} &\quad \text{Nikan Wailan} &\quad \text{be} &\quad \text{haha-mbihe} \\
\text{be(AUX)-COND} &\quad \text{PN} &\quad \text{ACC} &\quad \text{get-PST.IPFW} \\
\text{‘If Nomina and Naikada had not gone to inform [him], [we] would have} &\quad \text{caught Nikan Wailan’ (MYK1: 36)} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(4.1 – 31)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bi} &\quad \text{jakan giyalame giyalame sin-de} \\
1SG &\quad \text{just.now intermittently} &\quad 2SG(si/sin)-DAT \\
\text{jombu-rakū} &\quad \text{bi-he} &\quad \text{bi-ci,} &\quad \text{si} \\
\text{remind-IPFV.PTCP.NEG} &\quad \text{be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP} &\quad \text{be(AUX)-COND} &\quad 2SG \\
\end{align*}
\]
kemuni wacihiyame šejile-me  mute-rakū
still completely recite-IPFV.CVB be.able-IPFV.PTCP.NEG
bi-he
be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP
‘If I had not reminded you from time to time, you would still have been unable to recite [it] completely’ (ASA1: 54)

(4.1 – 32)
taci-hakū  bi-he  bi-ci,  inu
learn-PFV.PTCP.NEG be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP be(AUX)-COND also
ulhi-me  mute-rakū  bi-he
understand-IPFV.CVB be.able-PFV.PTCP.NEG be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP
‘If [I] hadn’t learnt it, [I] wouldn’t have been able to understand it’ (UH: 30)

Table 4.1.2 is a summary of the morphosyntactic patterns of counterfactual conditionals as shown in examples (4.1 – 21) – (4.1 – 32). Some complex structures expressing modal meanings, such as V-ci o- ‘to be likely to’, V-ci aca- ‘to be obligated to’, and V-me mute- ‘to be able to’, are indicated due to their frequent occurrence in the main clauses. Table 4.1.2 does not necessarily exhaust all the possibilities of combination between the subordinate and the main clauses.

Table 4.1.2 Basic Morphosyntactic Patterns of Counterfactual Conditionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinate Clause (Protasis)</th>
<th>Main Clause (Apodosis)</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>({Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-hA bi-ci]}</td>
<td>({Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-mbihe]}</td>
<td>(4.1 – 21) and (4.1 – 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>({Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-mbihe bi-ci]}</td>
<td>({Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-mbihe]}</td>
<td>(4.1 – 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>({(Subj +) (aika/aikabade +) Pred1 [V-rA bi-he bi-ci]}</td>
<td>({Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-ci o-mbihe]}</td>
<td>(4.1 – 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>({Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-rakū bi-ci]}</td>
<td>({(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-ci ojo-rakū bi-he]}</td>
<td>(4.1 – 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>({Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-hakū bi-ci]}</td>
<td>({(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-me bi-he]}</td>
<td>(4.1 – 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>({Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-rakū bi-he bi-ci]}</td>
<td>({Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-mbihe]}</td>
<td>(4.1 – 30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.1.2 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinate Clause (Protasis)</th>
<th>Main Clause (Apodosis)</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-rakū bi-he bi-ci]}</td>
<td>{Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-me mute-rakū bi-he]}</td>
<td>(4.1 – 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-hAkū bi-he bi-ci]}</td>
<td>{Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-me + Vmute-rakū bi-he]}</td>
<td>(4.1 – 32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.2.2 Interpretation

In each of sentences (4.1 – 21) – (4.1 – 32) the speaker imagines a world different from his or her own in that the states of affairs realised in his or her own world (the “real” world) were or are not realised in this imagined world, and vice versa. Such states of affairs can concern the past, the present or the future, depending on the specific context. For instance, (4.1 – 21), the (unreal) protasis state of affairs (that is, the speaker’s hearing about the news), and the (unreal) resulting apodosis state of affairs (that is, the speaker’s coming to visit the addressee), are both set in the past (of the imagined world). On the other hand, in (4.1 – 23), the (unreal) state of affairs in the protasis (that is, the addressee’s being someone else), is set in the present (of the imagined world), and the (unreal) apodosis state of affairs (that is, the speaker’s not prophesying for the addressee) is set in the present/near future (of the imagined world). In all the counterfactual conditionals, the conditional relation per se is no different from that in factual conditionals.

A question naturally arises as to how the counterfactual meaning emerges from these constructions. Since the apodoses of all the counterfactual conditionals, as well as the protases of some ([4.1 – 26], [4.1 – 27], [4.1 – 31] and [4.1 – 32]), contain bi-he in their complex predicates, it is important to shed light on the meaning of bi-he, and of the structures it forms. As stated in Section 3.2.2.1, bi-he is the perfective participle of the verb bi- ‘to exist/be’, and, in contrast to the perfective participle of most other lexical verbs, it has developed the temporal meaning ‘pastness’ from the aspectual meaning ‘completedness’. The complex structures formed by bi-he, such as V-mbihe (V-me bihe), V-rAkū bi-he, and V-hAkū bi-he, also integrate pastness into their meaning, when they serve as predicates in simple sentences. On the other hand, in conditionals (4.1 – 21) – (4.1 – 32), the counterfactual meaning is
expressed. It is then reasonable to assume that the combination of complex structures formed by *bi-he* and conditionality (represented by the conditional converb *V-ci*) gives rise to counterfactual conditionality.

Comrie (1986) notes that the back-shifting of tense is used to indicate hypotheticality in European languages. The English examples *If he came, I would run away* and *If he had come, I would have run away* (Comrie 1986: 94) suffice to illustrate this mechanism. Similarly in Manchu, the complex structures containing *bi-he* can also be seen as the back-shifting of tense, since *bi-he* is associated with past temporality. The phenomenon can be understood in a broader framework proposed by Fleischman (1989), who explores the cross-linguistic usage of temporal distance for indicating modality, social distance, evidentiality, and so on. Thus, the past marker *bi-he* in Manchu can be considered as an indicator of the modal distance of counterfactuality from reality.

Furthermore, Van Linden and Verstraete (2008), investigating simple counterfactual constructions in some 40 languages, note that counterfactuality is usually expressed by a combination of modal markers and tense or aspect markers, and that the counterfactual meaning itself is derived from a scalar implicature triggered by the comparison or contrast between modal and corresponding non-modal constructions. The mechanism works in the following way. When one utters a modal sentence, for example, *John should have come yesterday*, one usually implies that *John did not come*, where the implicature is triggered by the comparison or contrast between the modal sentence and the non-modal sentence *John came yesterday*. Van Linden and Verstraete (2008) argue that the speaker usually knows about the past with certainty; therefore, according to the Gricean maxim of quantity, if it were the speaker’s belief that John did come yesterday, the speaker would produce the non-modal sentence *John came yesterday* instead, which is epistemically stronger than the modal sentence *John should have come yesterday*. Assuming that the speaker has given enough information about the past state of affairs, and since he or she chooses the modal sentence, the speaker must have a reason for not uttering the non-modal (indicative) sentence. The implicature that John did not come is thus triggered.21

---

21 Van Linden and Verstraete (2008) also point out that there is an additional layer to the implicature in that when one says *John should have come*, the original (deontic) modal meaning of obligation is still present: one thinks that John was
Returning to the counterfactual conditionals in Manchu, one can see the same pattern as explained by Van Linden and Verstraete (2008) (since conditionality is a type of irrealis modality). First, the perfective participle bi-he, which is used primarily as a past marker when attached to a verb structure, occurs in the main clause of a conditional construction. With the subordinate clause expressing supposition (via structures of \(V\-ci\)), the whole construction would be expected to exhibit weaker certainty than does a simple sentence not expressing supposition. Second, in some constructions, complex verb structures expressing obligation ([4.1 – 26]) or possibility ([4.1 – 27] and [4.1 – 28]) are used in the main clauses, further weakening the certainty of the utterances. Therefore, these constructions tend to imply the counterfactual conditional meaning.

In addition, the morphosyntactic contrast between the complex structures of the subordinate predicates \(V\-hA\ bi-ci\) (in [4.1 – 21] – [4.1 – 25]), \(V\-rakū/hAkū\ bi-ci\) (in [4.1 – 28] and [4.1 – 29]), \(V\-rakū/hAkū\ bi-he bi-ci\) (in [4.1 – 30] – [4.1 – 32]) and so forth on the one hand, and the structures of subordinate predicates such as \(V\-ci\) or \(V\-rakū\ o-ci\), on the other, also contributes to expressing the counterfactual meaning. The reason is that the latter type of predicate structures is common among factual conditionals, and the morphosyntactic contrast would be expected to bring about a contrast in meaning. Thus, the conditionals using the former type of predicate structures would be distinct from factual conditionals; in Manchu, they present themselves as counterfactual conditionals.

This morphosyntactic dichotomy seems to exclude the existence of hypothetical conditionals from Manchu, which are located between factual and counterfactual conditions on the axis of the speaker’s belief about reality. In fact, however, Manchu is able to conceptualise a low possibility of future states of affairs occurring, which is typical of hypothetical conditionals. Yet, such constructions are indistinguishable from factual conditionals in terms of morphosyntax, but are only interpretable as expressing hypothetical conditions via the context. For instance, in its context, (4.1 – 6) also allows a hypothetical interpretation, which can be translated as ‘If [you] killed these two generals [of mine], [I would] also [be] as dead myself.’ The following are sentence (4.1 – 6) repeated here and supposed to come, though he actually did not. However, this additional meaning is less related to the current discussion of counterfactuality.
another example that allows the hypothetical interpretation:

(4.1 – 6)

*ere juwe amban be wa-ci, min-i*

these two high.official ACC kill-COND 1SG(bi/min)-GEN

*beye inu buce-he gese kai*

self also die-PFV.PTCP like PTL

‘If [you] kill these two generals [of mine], [I will] also [be] as dead myself’  
(MYK3: 24)

(4.1 – 33)

*niyalma gemu sin-i adali o-me*

people all 2SG(si/sin)-GEN like become-IPFV.CVB

*mute-ci, ai bai-re*

be.able-COND what request-IPFV.PTCP

‘If people can/could all become [excellent] like you, what [else will/would one] request [of them]?’ (OJ1: 40)

However, examples such as (4.1 – 6) and (4.1 – 33) are not numerous in Manchu, and as pointed out, their interpretation is always dependent on the context. Therefore, hypothetical conditionals in Manchu do not constitute a distinctive morphosyntactic category, and are therefore unlikely to have identifiable prototypes.

Returning to the morphosyntax of counterfactual conditionals, both complex structures of the subordinate predicate containing *bi-ci* and those containing *bi-he* prove to have distinctive characteristics. However, in Section 4.3 it will be shown that the complex structure V-hA *bi-ci* also occurs commonly in temporal constructions. On the other hand, the occurrence of the structures formed by *bi-he* in conditionals qualifies as a morphosyntactically sufficient (but not necessary; see Section 4.2) condition for the counterfactual interpretation. This naturally leads to the identification of the prototypes for counterfactual conditionals. As pointed out in Section 4.1.2.1, in counterfactual conditionals the conditional connector *aika/aikabade* is not used as frequently as in factual conditionals. Identifying the prototypes for counterfactual conditionals would require the occurrence of complex structures containing *bi-ci* in the subordinate clauses and those of *bi-he* in the main clauses. This issue will be addressed in Section 5.1 along with the prototypes of factual conditionals.
4.2 Non-prototypical Conditional Constructions

Apart from the basic patterns of conditional constructions analysed in Section 4.1, various other constructions serve to express the conditional relation. These constructions differ morphosyntactically from the basic patterns in one respect or another and occur less frequently in comparison to the basic patterns. They are regarded as “non-prototypical conditional constructions”, although the very prototypes of conditionals are yet to be identified (see Section 4.1). The reason is that the prototypes are selected from the basic “candidate” patterns as shown in Section 4.1; since the conditional constructions in question are distinct from those basic patterns, they are not likely to be considered to be prototypes of conditionals. This section analyses these constructions in two groups — factual and counterfactual conditionals — according to their meanings.

4.2.1 Factual Conditionals

4.2.1.1 Morphosyntax

Generally speaking, the factual conditionals grouped here all use structures formed with the perfective participle in dative-locative (V-hA de) in the protases, instead of structures containing the conditional converb (V-ci). The following are some examples in which V is a lexical verb. Note that (4.2 – 4) has the conditional connector aikabade, highlighting the conditional meaning.

(4.2 – 1) da sekiye be tucibu-he-de, geli mim-be
root source ACC reveal-PFV.PTCP-DAT again 1SG(hi-/min)-ACC
fetereku se-mbi
fastidious say-IPFV.FIN
da sekiye: ‘fundamental things’, lit.: ‘root and source’
‘If [I] reveal everything [about him], [he] will think I am fastidious [about him]’ (OJ2: 138)

(4.2 – 2) beise-i bye emke juwe tuhe-ke de, tere cooha
leaders-GEN self one two fall-PFV.PTCP DAT those troops
uthai burula-mbi kai
then flee-IPFV.FIN PTL
‘If one or two of [their] leaders fall, then those troops will surely flee’ (MYK2: 43)
While in (4.2 – 1) and (4.2 – 2) the lexical verbs in the structure V-hA de are used in the subordinate clauses and serve as affirmative predicates, the verb o- (as an auxiliary verb) can also be used in the structure o-ho-de to constitute complex predicates. They can be either affirmative or negative, depending on the verb form preceding the auxiliary o-: the imperfective converb (V-me) is used in an affirmative protasis ([4.2 – 5]), while the negative imperfective participle (V-rakū) is used in a negative protasis ([4.2 – 6] and [4.2 – 7]) as shown below. Similarly to (4.2 – 4), (4.2 – 5) also uses a conditional connector (aikabade in [4.2 – 4], aika in [4.2 – 5]):

(4.2 – 5)  
bi aika sin-de  emu baita fonji-me  
1SG if 2SG(si/sin)-DAT one matter ask-IPFV.CVB  
o-ho-de,  si  uthai sa-rkū  
become(AUX)-PFV.PTCP-DAT 2SG then know-IPFV.PTCP.NEG  
se-re,  donji-hakū  se-re  
say-IPFV.PTCP hear-IPFV.PTCP.NEG say-IPFV.PTCP  
sarkū < sa-rakū < sa-ra [know-IPFV.PTCP] + akū [NEG]  
‘If I ask you [about] something, then you will say you don’t know or you haven’t heard [about that]’ (MFG: 6)

(4.2 – 6)  
bi eici gene-rakū o-ho-de,  
1SG or go-IPFV.PTCP.NEG become(AUX)-PFV.PTCP-DAT  
si geli mim-be wakala-mbi-o  
2SG still 1SG(bi/min)-ACC blame-IPFV.FIN-Q  
‘Or if I do not go, will you then blame me?’ (MFG: 39)

(4.2 – 7)  
ere cooha be gidarakū o-ho-de,  
this army ACC defeat become(AUX)-PFV.PTCP-DAT  
mim-be wa  
1SG(bi/min)-ACC kill-IMP
'If [I] can’t defeat this army, kill me!' (MYK2: 41)

In some other constructions expressing the conditional meaning, the quotative verb *se-* 'to say' (as an auxiliary verb; see Section 3.2.4) also occurs in the structure *V-hA-de*. The verb *se-* (in the form *se-he-de*) in turn takes a finite clause as its complement, whose predicate is in the form of the perfective participle (of a lexical verb). The following are some examples:

(4.2 – 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tere-i</th>
<th>hūbin</th>
<th>de</th>
<th>dosi-ka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>that/3SG-GEN</td>
<td>trap</td>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>enter-PFV.PTCP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*se-he-de*,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sarba-tala</th>
<th>o-mbi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>say(AUX)-PFV.PTCP-DAT</td>
<td>writhe-TERM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*hūbin de dosi-*: 'to fall into a trap'

*sarba-tala o-*: 'to end up writhing [with pain]'

‘If [you], say, fall into his trap, [you] will end up writhing [in pain]’

(OJ1: 101)

(4.2 – 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ere-ci</th>
<th>tara afara</th>
<th>manggašacuka</th>
<th>baita</th>
<th>teisulebu-he</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>this-ABL</td>
<td>troublesome</td>
<td>difficult</td>
<td>matter</td>
<td>encounter-PFV.PTCP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*se-he-de*,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adarame</th>
<th>elehun</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>gama-me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>say(AUX)-PFV.PTCP-DAT</td>
<td>how</td>
<td>ease</td>
<td>GEN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*hoo hio se-mbi?*

decisively

*hoo hio se-*: 'to act decisively'

‘If [you], say, are faced with a matter [more] troublesome and difficult than this one, how [will you] handle [it] with ease and act decisively?’

(AGA1: 69–70)

(4.2 – 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>talude</th>
<th>ufara-ha</th>
<th>se-he-de,</th>
<th>aliya-ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>by.chance</td>
<td>lose-PFV.PTCP</td>
<td>say(AUX)-PFV.PTCP-DAT</td>
<td>regret-PFV.PTCP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*se-me*,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>amcabu-rakū</th>
<th>kai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>say(AUX)-IPFV.CVB</td>
<td>chase-IPFV.PTCP.NEG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V-*ha sene*: complex structure expressing concession, meaning ‘even if/though one does something’

*amcabu-*: ‘to chase’, ‘to [be able to] catch up’

‘If [you], say, by any chance lose [it], [you] won’t [be able to] catch up [to get it back], even if [you] feel regretful [for losing it]’

(UH: 51)

(4.2 – 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>talude</th>
<th>baita</th>
<th>be</th>
<th>sartabu-ha</th>
<th>se-he-de,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>by.chance</td>
<td>matter</td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>delay-PFV.PTCP</td>
<td>say(AUX)-PFV.PTCP-DAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
‘If [I], say, by any chance delay the [important] matter, how can [I] take [responsibility]?’ (AGA3: 81)

Throughout (4.2 – 1) – (4.2 – 11), although the subordinate predicates vary in terms of components or complexity, the main predicates invariably have structures that represent uncompleted states of affairs. Such structures include the imperfective finite form V-\textit{mbi} ([4.2 – 1] – [4.2 – 4], [4.2 – 6], [4.2 – 8] and [4.2 – 9]), the affirmative and negative imperfective participles V-\textit{rA} ([4.2 – 5] and [4.2 – 11]) and V-\textit{rakū} ([4.2 – 10]), and the imperative ([4.2 – 7]). It was shown in Section 4.1 that these predicate structures also occur frequently in factual conditionals that contain the conditional converb V-\textit{ci} in the protases. Table 4.2.1 below summarises the morphosyntactic patterns of the non-prototypical factual conditionals (4.2 – 1) – (4.2 – 11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinate Clause (Protasis)</th>
<th>Main Clause (Apodosis)</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{{Subj1 +} Pred1 [V-\textit{hA de}]}</td>
<td>{{Subj2 +} Pred2 [V-\textit{mbi}]}</td>
<td>(4.2 – 1) – (4.2 – 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{{Subj1 +} aika + Pred1 [V-\textit{hA de}]}</td>
<td>{{Subj2 +} Pred2 [V-\textit{mbi}]}</td>
<td>(4.2 – 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{{Subj1 +} aika + Pred1 [V-\textit{me o-ho de}]}</td>
<td>{{Subj2 +} Pred2 [V-\textit{rA}]}</td>
<td>(4.2 – 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{{Subj1 +} Pred1 [V-\textit{rakū o-ho de}]}</td>
<td>{{Subj2 +} Pred2 [V-\textit{mbi}]}</td>
<td>(4.2 – 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{{Subj2 +} Pred2 [V-\textit{IMP}]}</td>
<td>(4.2 – 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{{Subj1 +} Pred1 [V-\textit{hA se-he de}]}</td>
<td>{{Subj2 +} Pred2 [V-\textit{mbi}]}</td>
<td>(4.2 – 8) and (4.2 – 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{{Subj2 +} Pred2 [V-\textit{rakū}]}</td>
<td>(4.2 – 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{{Subj2 +} Pred2 [V-\textit{rA}]}</td>
<td>(4.2 – 11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.1.2 Interpretation

The structure of the participle in dative-locative (V-\textit{rA/-hA-de}) usually serves to express temporal relations, and such usage is common in Manchu. The following are some
examples (imperfective participle in [4.2 – 12] and [4.2 – 13], perfective participle in [4.2 – 14] and [4.2 – 15]).

(4.2 – 12)

\[\text{ecimari} \quad \text{ebsi} \quad \text{jide-re-de,} \quad \text{jugün} \quad \text{giyai} \quad \text{de}\]
\text{this.morning} \quad \text{hither} \quad \text{come-IPFV.PTCP-DAT} \quad \text{road} \quad \text{street} \quad \text{DAT}

\[\text{yabu-re} \quad \text{urse} \quad \text{gemu} \quad \text{ili-me}\]
\text{go-IPFV.PTCP} \quad \text{people} \quad \text{all} \quad \text{stand-IPFV.CVB}

\[\text{mute-rakū}\]
\text{be.able-IPFV.PTCP.NEG}

‘When [I] was coming here this morning, [I saw that] people going along the street were all unable to stand [upright]’ (OJ2: 10)

(4.2 – 13)

\[\text{teike} \quad \text{min-i} \quad \text{emhun} \quad \text{ubade} \quad \text{tere-de,}\]
\text{just.now} \quad \text{1SG(bi/min)-GEN} \quad \text{alone} \quad \text{that.place-DAT} \quad \text{sit-IPFV.PTCP-DAT}

\[\text{fa-i} \quad \text{duthe} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{emu} \quad \text{cecike} \quad \text{do-habi}\]
\text{window-GEN} \quad \text{wooden.lattice DAT} \quad \text{one} \quad \text{small.bird} \quad \text{alight-PFV.FIN}

‘When I was sitting there by myself just now, a small bird alighted by the wooden lattice of the window’ (OJ2: 96)

(4.2 – 14)

\[\text{tuktan} \quad \text{bi} \quad \text{abala-me} \quad \text{gene-he-de,} \quad \text{emu} \quad \text{suru} \quad \text{morin}\]
\text{at.first} \quad \text{1SG} \quad \text{hunt-IPFV.CVB} \quad \text{go-PFV.PTCP-DAT} \quad \text{one} \quad \text{white horse}

\[\text{yalu-mbihebi}\]
\text{ride-PST.IPV.FIN}

‘At first, when I went to hunt, [I] was riding a white horse’ (OJ2: 2)

(4.2 – 15)

\[\text{ecimari} \quad \text{ili-fi} \quad \text{tuci-ke-de,} \quad \text{waburu sa} \quad \text{gemu}\]
\text{this.morning} \quad \text{get.up-IPFV.CVB} \quad \text{go.out-IPFV.PTCP-DAT} \quad \text{damned PL all}

\[\text{ji-he}\]
\text{come-PFV.PTCP}

‘This morning when [I] got up and was going out, all [those] damned [servants of mine] came [to see me]’ (OJ2: 166)

However, under some circumstances the temporal meaning is weakened, which gives rise to a conditional interpretation, as shown by (4.2 – 1) – (4.2 – 11). In fact, the semantic — and sometimes morphosyntactic — overlap between temporality and conditionality is also observed in many other languages. For instance, the German conjunction \textit{wenn} can be used in either conditional or temporal constructions, corresponding to the English conjunctions \textit{if} (conditional) and \textit{when} (temporal), respectively. In the case of these Manchu examples, it seems that the temporal relation is not conspicuous and that there exists a causal relation.
between the states of affairs represented in both clauses, while the temporal plane of states of affairs is non-past. All of these factors induce the conditional interpretation, which automatically fills the semantic space caused by the rarefaction of the temporal meaning. However, the temporal interpretation is still compatible in some of these examples: the conditional meaning is not absolute and in a sense it constitutes an equilibrium with the temporal meaning.

Apart from the general features, more explanation needs to be provided for sentences that contain the quotative verb *se-* ‘to say’ (which takes as its complement a clause that can stand as a simple sentence; see Section 3.2.4). Sentence (4.2 – 8) is used for illustration: literally, either by conditionality or by temporality, it can be paraphrased as ‘If [you] say/When [you] say that [one] has fallen into his trap, [one] will end up writhing in pain’. However, this lengthy, even though more faithful, interpretation can actually be re-paraphrased in a way that dispenses with the verb *se-*, as is seen from the translation of (4.2 – 8). The translation can be justified by the Qing Dynasty grammars, which clearly state that the structure *se-he-de* has the function of expressing supposition (UH: 17; AMH: 13). Furthermore, even if one puts aside the description (or prescription) of these grammars and focuses on the semantic relation between the two clauses of the sentence, it can be concluded that the subordinate predicate represented by the verb *se-* ‘to say’ hardly bears any logical relation to the main predicate represented by *sarba-tala o-* ‘to end up writhing [with pains]’. Rather, it is the predicate of the complement clause of the quotative verb *se-*, i.e., *terei hūbin de dosi-* ‘to fall into his trap’ that can be conceived of as the cause or condition of the apodosis state of affairs. In light of the twofold evidence (the description of Qing Dynasty grammars and semantic analysis), it is reasonable to conclude that in (4.2 – 8) – (4.2 – 11) the quotative verb *se-*, in the form *se-he-de*, is grammaticalised in a way that it can be interpreted as a marker of supposition, and it is not part of the conditional relation. Specifically, it embodies a speech act on the part of the speaker of asking the addressee to make a supposition. Thus (4.2 – 8) can be represented by the following pseudo-formula: ‘Let’s suppose: IF [one] falls into his trap, [one]...

---

22 The causal relation in (4.2 – 8) and (4.2 – 11) is not straightforward in the content domain but is present between the complement clause within the subordinate clause and the main clause. See discussion below.

23 “You” here is used to refer to people in general, not particularly the addressee of the utterance.
will end up writhing [in pain].

On a final note, the analysis and representation of conditionals containing the structure se-he-de clearly demonstrate that conditionals like (4.2 – 8) – (4.2 – 11), though bearing some apparent similarity to conditional constructions containing the structure o-ho-de ([4.2 – 5] – [4.2 – 7]) are of a morphosyntactic type that is distinct from the latter. The reason is that in the latter constructions, the auxiliary o- comprises part of a complex predicate (Section 3.2.1), and referentially shares a subject with the verb (regardless of its specific form) that precedes the auxiliary o-. By contrast, in the former constructions, the quotative verb se- does not necessarily share a subject with the preceding verbs — it can have its own subject, though implicit — and the preceding verb form is actually the predicate of its complement clause, as pointed out in the previous paragraph. However, it should be noted that the predicate structure in the complement clause of the verb se- is not arbitrary in these examples. In fact, it can be observed in (4.2 – 8) – (4.2 – 11) that the predicate of this complement clause seems to be invariably the perfective participle.

4.2.2 Counterfactual Conditionals

4.2.2.1 Morphosyntax

The counterfactual conditionals that differ in morphosyntax from the basic patterns can be divided into three types, according to how they differ from the basic pattern. The first type is defined as including constructions in which the protasis has a complex predicate formed by the conditional converb bi-ci, but the apodosis does not contain complex structures formed with the perfective participle bi-he. The second type includes constructions in which the protasis is different from those of the basic pattern, but the apodosis appears to be characteristic of the basic pattern. The third and final type consists of constructions that might otherwise not be considered as counterfactual conditionals in all respects, except for having a counterfactual meaning inferred from the context in which they occur.

The following are constructions of the first type as defined above (see “Type I” in Table 4.2.2). While (4.2 – 18) contains the conditional connector aika in the protasis, which forms a framed structure together with the subordinate predicate, the predicate structure is analysed in
the same way as the other two constructions:

(4.2 – 16) \[
\begin{align*}
\text{sin-}i & \quad \text{tere nionio waliya-rakū} \\
& \quad \begin{array}{ll}
2\text{SG(si/sin)-GEN} & \text{that/3SG} \text{ child} \\
& \text{abandon-IPFV.PTCP.NEG}
\end{array} \\
\text{bi-he} & \quad \text{bi-ci, inu uyun juwan se} \\
& \quad \begin{array}{lllll}
\text{be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP} & \text{be(AUX)-COND} & \text{also} & \text{nine} & \text{ten} \text{ year(old)}
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

\text{o-hobi}
\begin{align*}
\text{become-PFV.FIN}
\end{align*}

\text{nionio: ‘pupil of the eye’, here an endearment for ‘child’}

\text{waliya-: ‘to abandon’, here an euphemism for ‘to die’}

‘If that adorable child of yours weren’t dead, [he] would also be nine or ten years old [by now]’ (OJ2: 42)

(4.2 – 17) \[
\begin{align*}
gosi-rakū & \quad \text{bi-ci, aina-ha se-me} \\
& \quad \begin{array}{llll}
\text{love-IPFV.PTCP.NEG} & \text{be(AUX)-COND} & \text{do.what-PFV.PTCP} & \text{say(AUX)-IPFV.CVB}
\end{array} \\
\text{ere gese gosihon gisun i tafula-rakū} \\
& \quad \begin{array}{llll}
\text{this like bitter words GEN} & \text{advise-IPFV.PTCP.NEG}
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

\text{aina-ha se-me: ‘absolutely’, ‘by any means’ always used with negation, lit.: ‘no matter doing what’}

\text{gosihon gisun i tafula-: ‘to advise someone in bitter words’, ‘to take the trouble to give someone good advice’}

‘If [you] didn’t love [me as your good friend], [you] absolutely wouldn’t have taken the trouble to give [me] good advice’ (MFG: 53)

(4.2 – 18) \[
\begin{align*}
\text{bi} & \quad \text{aika ere lengseki šabtu-ngga mahala be} \\
& \quad \begin{array}{ll}
1\text{SG} & \text{if this clumsy ear.flap-ADJ hat}
\end{array} \\
\text{bucile-} & \quad \text{cak seme hūwaita-hakū bi-he} \\
& \quad \begin{array}{llll}
\text{put.down-PFV.CVB} & \text{neatly} & \text{tie-PFV.PTCP.NEG} & \text{be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP}
\end{array} \\
\text{bi-ci, min-i} & \quad \text{šan i hešen haribu-hai, te} \\
& \quad \begin{array}{lllll}
\text{be(AUX)-COND} & \text{1SG(bi/min)-GEN} & \text{ear GEN margin} & \text{freeze-DUR now}
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

\text{kemuni funce-mbi-o}
\begin{align*}
\text{still remain-IPFV.FIN-Q}
\end{align*}

\text{šabtuungga mahala: ‘a hat with protective ear flaps’}

\text{cak seme: ‘neatly’}

‘If I hadn’t put down the ear flaps of this clumsy hat and tied it up neatly, would my ears, suffering from frostbite, still remain now?’ (AGA2: 90–91)

As seen from the above, in the protasis of (4.2 – 16), the subordinate predicate consists of the negative imperfective participle gosi-rakū ‘not loving’ and the conditional converb bi-ci, whereas (4.2 – 16) and (4.2 – 18) have more complex predicates in the protasis, formed with bi-he, just as in (4.1 – 30) – (4.1 – 32) of Section 4.1. On the other hand, the structure of the
main predicate is a perfective finite form, *a-hobi* ‘became/has become’ in (4.2 – 16), while the other constructions contain imperfective forms in the main clause, either the imperfective form *V-mbi* in (4.2 – 18) or the negative imperfective participle *V-rakū* in (4.2 – 17), which are common in the apodosis of factual conditionals.

Since the structure of the main predicate is distinct from what would be expected of a counterfactual conditional, it is reasonable to assume that the counterfactual meaning of the constructions arises — partly at least — from the structure of the subordinate predicate: the verb *bi*- (as an auxiliary verb) in the form of the conditional converb *bi-ci* as part of a complex structure in the protasis is conducive to a counterfactual interpretation. The reason is that, if the subordinate predicate contained a simple lexical verb in the form *V-ci*, or a complex structure formed by the conditional converb *o-ci*, then, all else being equal, one would interpret the uttered conditional as a factual one. In particular, the perfective participle *bi-he*, which carries with it a strong past or irrealis connotation, adds to the probability of a counterfactual interpretation.

In counterfactual conditionals of the second type (see “Type II” in Table 4.2.2), the predicate structures in the protases are practically the same as those found in the basic patterns of factual conditionals (either simple as *V-ci* or compound as *V-rakū o-ci*), while the main predicates invariably consist of a variety of structures containing the perfective participle *bi-he*:

(4.2 – 19)  
*emu niyalma-i baita o-ci, kemuni ja bi-he*

one person matter become-COND still easy be-PFV.PTCP

‘If [it] were one person’s matter, it would still be easy’ (MFG: 8)

(4.2 – 20)  
*min-i jili majige hahi o-ci, sin-i

1SG(bi/min)-GEN temper a.little fierce be-COND 2SG(si/sin)-GEN

*baita faijuma bi-he

matter tricky be-PFV.PTCP

‘If my temper had been [even] a little fierce, your matter would have been tricky’ (OJ1: 48)

(4.2 – 21)  
*unenggi sa-ci, yala onggolo ji-ci

really know-COND indeed previously come-COND

96
**aca-mbihe**
suit(AUX)-PST.IPFV

V-ci aca-: complex structure expressing obligation

‘If [I] had really known, [I] indeed should have come at an earlier time’

(OJ1: 78)

(4.2 – 22)

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{age} & \text{si} & \text{ere} & \text{baili} & \text{cashúla-ha} & \text{niyalma} & \text{be} & \\
\text{２SG} & \text{this} & \text{kindness} & \text{be.ungrateful-PFV.PTCP} & \text{person} & \text{ACC} & \\
\text{jono-rakū} & \text{o-ci}, & \text{bi} & \text{ini} & \\
\text{mention-IPFV.PTCP.NEG} & \text{be(AUX)-COND} & \text{１SG} & \text{also} & \\
\text{fanca-rakū} & \text{bi-he} & \\
\text{get.angry-IPFV.PTCP.NEG} & \text{be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP} & \\
\end{array}
\]

*baili be cashúla-ha nyalma*: ‘an ungrateful person who fails to show appreciation for other people’s kindness’

‘Sir, if you didn’t mention that ungrateful man, I wouldn’t get angry [at thinking of him]’ (MFG: 54)

(4.2 – 23)

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{majige} & \text{niyalma-i} & \text{gūnin} & \text{bi-ci}, & \text{ini} & \text{sere-ci} & \\
\text{a.little} & \text{human-GEN} & \text{mind} & \text{be-COND} & \text{also} & \text{feel-COND} & \\
\text{aca-mbihe} & \\
\text{suit(AUX)-PST.IPFV} & \\
\text{V-ci aca-: complex structure expressing obligation} & \\
\end{array}
\]

‘If there were even a little bit [of a normal] human mind [in him], [he] should have felt [that], too’ (OJ1: 103)

(4.2 – 24)

\[
\begin{array}{lllllllllll}
\text{i} & \text{aika} & \text{emu} & \text{usun} & \text{seshun} & \text{niyalma} & \text{o-ci}, & \\
\text{３SG} & \text{if} & \text{one} & \text{bothersome} & \text{disgusting} & \text{person} & \text{be-COND} & \\
\text{bi} & \text{ini} & \text{gisure-rakū} & \text{bi-he} & \\
\text{１SG} & \text{also} & \text{speak-IPFV.PTCP.NEG} & \text{be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP} & \\
\end{array}
\]

‘If he were someone bothersome and disgusting, I wouldn’t make any [further] remark’ (OJ2: 112)

It should be noted that (4.2 – 24) contains the conditional connector *aika*, forming a framed structure. Additionally, in (4.2 – 21) and (4.2 – 23) the verb *aca-* , expressing a modal meaning ‘to be obligated to’ in a complex verb structure, takes the past imperfective (V-mbihe) in forming the main predicate with the preceding verb.

The second type of construction reflects a similar situation to that of the first type in that one clause of the construction determines the counterfactual meaning. Differently from the first type, though, in the second type it is the structure of the main — rather than the subordinate — predicate that contributes to expressing the counterfactual meaning.
The third type of counterfactual conditional (see “Type III” in Table 4.2.2), as pointed out at the beginning of Section 4.2.2.1, has the same morphosyntax as factual conditionals. The following are some examples:

(4.2 – 25) \textit{gele-ci, bi ainu amga-mbi}
\text{fear-COND 1SG why sleep-IPFV.FIN}
‘If [I] were afraid, why would I sleep?’ (MYK2: 38)

(4.2 – 26) \textit{bi dosi-ki se-ci, aifini uthai dosi-mbi}
\text{1SG enter-OPT say(AUX)-COND long.ago then enter-IPFV.FIN}
\textit{kai PTL}
\text{V-ki se-: complex structure expressing desire or intention}
‘If I [really] wanted to enter [your house], then indeed [I] would have entered a long time ago’ (MFG: 48)

Table 4.2.2 summarises the morphosyntactic patterns of the non-prototypical counterfactual conditionals (4.2 – 16) – (4.2 – 26).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.2.2 Morphosyntax of Non-prototypical Counterfactual Conditionals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Clause (Protasis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type I</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{(Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-rakū bi-he bi-ci]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{(Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-rakū bi-ci]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{(Subj1 +) aika + P [V-hAkū bi-he bi-ci]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type II</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{(Subj1 +) Pred1 [N + o-ci]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{(Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-ci]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{(Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-rakū o-ci]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{(Subj1 +) aika + Pred1 [N + o-ci]}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.2.2 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Subordinate Clause (Protasis)</th>
<th>Main Clause (Apodosis)</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>{ (Subj1 +) Pred1 \ [V-ci] }</td>
<td>{ (Subj2 +) Pred2 \ [V-mbi] }</td>
<td>(4.2 – 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{ (Subj1 +) Pred1 \ [V-ki se-ci] }</td>
<td>{ (Subj2 +) Pred2 \ [V-mbi] } (+ kai)</td>
<td>(4.2 – 26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The shaded areas represent the morphosyntactic characteristics shared with the basic patterns of counterfactual conditionals

#### 4.2.2.2 Interpretation

Although the counterfactual reading (rather than the factual reading) is inferred from the context, lexical items can also contribute to the meaning. For instance, in (4.2 – 26), *aifini* ‘long ago’, which is usually used with perfective verb forms (participle *V-hA* or finite *V-hAbi*), explicitly refers to a state of affairs prior to the time of utterance. Thus, the speaker makes a supposition about the past.

The counterfactual conditionals of all three types above ([4.2 – 16] – [4.2 – 27]) differ in the extent to which they deviate morphosyntactically from the basic patterns of counterfactual conditionals. The first type ([4.2 – 16] – [4.2 – 18]) and the second type ([4.2 – 19] – [4.2 – 24]) share some features with the basic patterns, while the third type is the most distinct, and is indistinguishable from factual conditionals. Even within the first group, (4.2 – 16) is morphosyntactically closer to the basic patterns than (4.2 – 17) and (4.2 – 18) are, due to the presence of a perfective finite form, *V-hAbi*, as the main predicate, since it describes completed states of affairs and is usually suggestive of pastness. In contrast, (4.2 – 17) and (4.2 – 18) use imperfective forms in the main predicates.

The analysis of the counterfactual conditionals (4.2 – 15) – (4.2 – 26) seems to suggest that the presence of a structure formed with *bi-he* in a conditional construction — either in the protasis ([4.2 – 16] and [4.2 – 18]) or in the apodosis ([4.2 – 19] – [4.2 – 24]) — is a morphosyntactically sufficient condition for the counterfactual meaning. However, it is not a necessary condition, as seen in (4.2 – 17), (4.2 – 25) and (4.2 – 26). This condition is a less strict version of the morphosyntax of the basic patterns of counterfactual conditionals, which
all contain the structures formed with bi-he in the apodosis.

4.3 Constructions Expressing Temporal Meanings

A great number of constructions that contain conditional-converb structures in the subordinate clause receive a temporal interpretation instead of a conditional one. In particular, most such constructions seem to describe past states of affairs, while very few of them are used in a context related to the present or future. In the analysis that follows, the term “temporal constructions” is used to refer to this type of construction, unless otherwise specified.

4.3.1 Morphosyntax

Both the subordinate and the main clauses of these temporal constructions exhibit various forms of the predicate. Specifically, on the one hand, the subordinate clause can have either a simple predicate or a complex predicate. In the former case, the subordinate predicate consists of the conditional converb of a lexical verb, V-ći. In the examples below (using different main predicates, (4.3 – 1) and (4.3 – 2) describe past states of affairs, while (4.3 – 3) describes a non-past state of affairs that takes place habitually:

(4.3 – 1) beri dara-fi emgeri gabta-ci, majige
bow draw.taut-PFV.CVB once shoot-COND a.little
amari-ha
fall.backwards-PFV.PTCP
‘As [I] drew the bow taut and shot [the arrow], [I] fell backwards a little’
(OJ2: 2)

(4.3 – 2) tere hintendent be gana-ci, dere de
that/3SG mug ACC go.to.get-COND table DAT
gece-me tokto-hobi
freeze-IPFV.CVB fix-PFV.FIN
gece-me tokto-: ‘to get stuck because of freezing’, lit.: ‘fix [by] freezing’
‘When [I] went to get that mug, [it] was frozen and had gotten stuck to the table’ (AGA2: 84)
When the subordinate predicate is complex, there are several possibilities. The first is the complex structure expressing desire or intention, consisting of the verb *se*- ‘to say’ (as an auxiliary verb) and a preceding verb in the optative form *V-ki*:

(4.3 – 4)  
\[
\text{bi} \quad \text{okdo-me} \quad \text{gene-ki} \quad \text{se-ci}, \quad \text{uksa}
\]

1SG  go.to.meet-IPFV.CVB  go-OPT  say(AUX)-COND  suddenly  
\[
\text{julergi} \quad \text{ergi} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{emu} \quad \text{amba} \quad \text{yohoron} \quad \text{heture-hebi}
\]

front  side  DAT  one  big  canal  block-PFV.FIN  
\[
\text{okdo-me gene-}: \text{‘to go to meet'}
\]
\[
\text{V-ki se-}: \text{complex structure expressing desire or intention}
\]

‘As I wanted to go to meet [the wild sheep], a big canal in front [of me] suddenly blocked [my way]’ (AGA1: 102)

The second possibility is a complex structure composed of the verb *bi-* ‘to exist/be’ (as an auxiliary verb) in the form of the conditional converb *bi-ci* and a preceding perfective participle *V-hA*:

(4.3 – 5)  
\[
\text{emu} \quad \text{moro} \quad \text{šahūrun} \quad \text{muke} \quad \text{omih-a} \quad \text{bi-ci}.
\]

one  bowl  cold  water  drink-PVF.PTCP  be(AUX)-COND  
\[
\text{ilihai andan-de} \quad \text{uthai} \quad \text{uju} \quad \text{nime-me} \quad \text{deribu-he}
\]
immediate  instant-DAT  then  head  hurt-IPFV.CVB  begin-PFV.PTCP  

\[
\text{ilihai andande}: \text{‘immediately’, ‘in an instant’}
\]

‘When [I] had [just] drunk a bowl of cold water, [my] head began to hurt immediately’ (OJ2: 22)

(4.3 – 6)  
\[
\text{morin} \quad \text{be} \quad \text{dabki-me} \quad \text{tafa-ka} \quad \text{bi-ci}.
\]

horse  ACC  whip-IPFV.CVB  go.up-PVF.PTCP  be(AUX)-COND  
\[
\text{lo la} \quad \text{ucara-ha}
\]
unexpectedly  encounter-PFV.PTCP  

‘As [I] whipped the horse and rode up [the slope], [I] ran unexpectedly into
‘As [I] went to chase [the gazelle], following its tail, [the gazelle] went past the hill’ (OJ2: 2)

Additionally, a yet more complex structure is possible, combining the morphosyntactic features of the first two types of structures: it consists of the complex modal structure V-ki se-, as is seen in the first type, while the auxiliary takes the form of the perfective participle, se-he, which combines with the conditional converb bi-ci, as is seen in the second type:

(4.3 – 8) sikse šolo baha-fi ji-ki se-he
yesterday free.time get-PFV.CVB come-OPT say(AUX)-PFV.PTCP
bi-ci, geli aga-me deribu-he
be(AUX)-COND again rain-IPFV.CVB begin-PFV.PTCP
V-ki se-: complex structure expressing desire or intention
‘Yesterday when [I], having some free time, wanted to come [to your house], it started to rain’ (MFG: 43)

Concerning the form of the main predicate, the temporal constructions above contain either the perfective participle V-hA ([4.3 – 1], [4.3 – 5], [4.3 – 6] and [4.3 – 8]) or the perfective finite form V-hAbi ([4.3 – 2], [4.3 – 3], [4.3 – 4] and [4.3 – 7]). Actually, as shown in the data, temporal constructions allow a greater variety of forms for the main predicate. In the following examples, one can also find the imperfective finite form V-mbi ([4.3 – 9]), the negative imperfective participle V-rakū ([4.3 – 10]), the progressive finite form V-me bi ([4.3 – 11]), the mirative construction dule...bi-he ni ([4.3 – 12]), existential structures containing the existential particle bi ([4.3 – 13]) or the negative particle akū ([4.3 – 14]), as well as a nominal predicate ([4.3 – 15]):

(4.3 – 9) emu dabagan be daba-me gene-ci, emu
one mountain ACC pass-IPFV.CVB go-COND one
boo-de emu hehe emu sarganjui arki unca-mbi
house-DAT one woman one girl wine sell-IPFV.FIN
‘As [he] went past a mountain, [he saw that] a woman and a girl were
selling wine at a house’ (SG: 251)

(4.3 – 10)  

*hunio* makta-fi *waida-ci, muke* eye-me  
bucket toss-PFV.CVBScoop-COND water flow-PFV.CVBScoop-NEG  
toko-rakū  

‘As [she] tossed the bucket to scoop [water], the water wouldn’t stop flowing [out of the bucket]’ (SG: 272)

(4.3 – 11)  

*yafan* be *tuwana-me* gene-ci, ilan uju-ngga  
garden ACC go.to.look-PFV.CVBScoop-COND three headed  
hutu yafan i dolo tubihe je-me bi  
ghost garden GEN inside fruit eat-PFV.CVBEXS.PTL  

‘As/At the time [he] went to look at the garden, the three-headed ghost was eating fruit inside the garden’ (SG: 406)

(4.3 – 12)  

*elhei* waliya-me tucibu-fi tuwa-ci, *dule* jeren  
slowly spit-PFV.CVBTake.out-PFV.CVBLook-COND gazelle  
yali i dorgi emu sele-i muhaliyan bi-he ni  
meat GEN inside one iron-GEN bullet be-PFV.PTCPPTL  

‘As [I] spat [it] out and took a look, [I found to my surprise that] it was an iron bullet in the gazelle’s meat!’ (AGA2: 114)

(4.3 – 13)  

*emu* bira de isina-ci, sakda mafa mama bi  
one river DAT arrive-COND old grandpa grandma EXS.PTL  

‘When [he] arrived at a river, [he saw that] there was an old man and an old woman’ (SG: 237)

(4.3 – 14)  

*duka* nei-ki se-me hūla-ci, umai  
gate open-OPT say(AUX)-PFV.CVBCall-COND at.all  
jabu-re nivalma akū  
answer-PFV.PTCP person NEG  

‘When [I] called out, “Open the gate, please!” no one answered at all’ (OJ1: 60)

(4.3 – 15)  

*ecimari* cen-i bithe šejile-bu-ci, emke  
this.morning 3PL.ce/cen)-GEN book recite-CAUS-COND one  
emkèn ci eshun  
one ABL unfamiliar  

‘When [I] made [them] recite the text this morning, [I found that] everyone
was unfamiliar [with the text]’ (lit.: ‘one [was] more unfamiliar than [another] one’) (OJ1: 51)

4.3.2 Interpretation

4.3.2.1 The Temporal Meaning Expressed

It is obvious from the constructions above that a variety of temporal relations is expressed by conditional-converb (V-çi) structures, which in a sense realise the semantic and syntactic functions exemplified by English conjunctions or phrases such as after, while, or at the time when.

It has been mentioned that in the subordinate clause of these temporal constructions both the simple form of the conditional converb V-çi and the complex structure V-hA bi-çi can be used, where V is a lexical verb or an auxiliary verb. Between these two forms, however, no significant semantic difference is observed in that in both cases the state of affairs represented in the subordinate clause has (just) been realised. For instance, in (4.3 – 1), the action of shooting an arrow has been completed; similarly, in (4.3 – 6), the action of going upward has also been completed. However, the structure V-hA bi-çi, with the perfective participle in it, would presumably express a perfective aspectual meaning: the completeness of the action. Thus the morphosyntactic difference between V-çi and V-hA bi-çi in the temporal constructions would be comparable to that between two temporal adverbials in English such as after doing something and after having done something.

4.3.2.2 The Temporal Meaning: Contrast with Conditionality

A question arises concerning how the temporal interpretation emerges. Before attempting to provide an answer to this question, it should be noted that the pastness of these constructions largely originates from the context. Although perfective verb forms (both participial, V-hA, and finite, V-hAbi), which are usually associated with completed acts (see Chapter 3), are used in the main clauses of some constructions, they cannot account for the past meaning, at least not directly. There are two reasons: first, the perfective verb forms employed as main predicates do not necessarily describe past states of affairs. This is clearly
shown by (4.3 – 3), which describes a non-past, habitual state of affairs. The second reason is that other temporal constructions employ imperfective verb forms ([4.3 – 9] – [4.3 – 11]), or nominal structures ([4.3 – 15]), which are common to factual conditionals, as discussed previously (Section 4.1.1.1). Therefore it seems that in main clauses, verb forms or predicate forms in general indicate the progress of the states of affairs rather than their temporal reference in relation to the moment of utterance.

Returning to the question, the temporal — as opposed to the conditional — relation between two clauses of a construction emerges from the meanings of the component clauses. For instance, in (4.3 – 2), the act represented in the subordinate clause, that is, (the speaker’s) going to get the mug, given the context, by no means functions as the condition for the realisation of the state of affairs represented in the main clause, that is, (the mug’s) being frozen and stuck to the table. It is obvious that the temporal relation is a reasonable interpretation in the context.

Furthermore, from the perspective of morphosyntax, the temporal constructions with main predicates similar to those of factual conditionals would otherwise yield the conditional interpretation; but the conditional relation is prevented for semantic reasons. On the other hand, it is obvious that the temporal constructions with perfective verb forms in the main clause distinguish themselves morphosyntactically from both factual and counterfactual conditionals that were analysed in Section 4.1. Specifically, these constructions differ from factual conditionals in that the latter do not have perfective forms in the main clauses; and the temporal constructions differ from the basic patterns of counterfactual conditionals in that the latter contain complex structures using the perfective participle bi-he (as an auxiliary verb), while the former do not have such complex structures. One apparent counterexample to this claim is (4.3 – 12), which, having the structure containing bi-he in the main clause, appears on the surface to be a counterfactual conditional. However, closer scrutiny reveals that the perfective participle bi-he is part of a mirative construction, dule ... bi-he ni. Thus, the structure of bi-he in (4.3 – 12) should be distinguished from those structures without the mirative meaning. Apart from (4.3 – 12) and similar cases, the constructions with perfective forms in the predicate are clearly distinguished from counterfactual conditionals.

It seems, therefore, that the conspicuous morphosyntactic distinction between the
temporal constructions containing perfective forms in the main clauses ([4.3 – 1] – [4.3 – 8]) on the one hand, and conditional constructions proper on the other, can in a sense give rise to a distinct semantic status for the former, that by means of contrast it “imposes” a non-conditional interpretation — indeed a temporal one — on them. Nonetheless, it should be noted that the temporal constructions without perfective forms in either the subordinate or main clauses ([4.3 – 9] – [4.3 – 11], [4.3 – 13] – [4.3 – 15]) do not exhibit obvious morphosyntactic features that distinguish themselves from (factual) conditional constructions. They are only to be distinguished semantically.

4.3.2.3 Conditional-converb Structures and Dative-Locative Participial Structures: Semantic Overlapping

Since conditional-converb structures — both simple and complex — used in the subordinate clause of a construction can express temporal relations in a past context between clauses, while on the other hand, the dative-locative participial structures, V-hA/rA-de, which are commonly used in temporal constructions, can in many cases express the conditional relation between clauses in a non-past context, one may wonder what connection possibly exists between these two mechanisms. In order to address this question, it is necessary, first, to examine the semantic composition of conditionality and temporality, respectively. The prototypical temporality represents the location in time of one state of affairs relative to another state of affairs. On the other hand, in a prototypical conditional relation, the realisation of one state of affairs A serves as the condition or cause for the realisation of another state of affairs B, and it is natural to assume that the time of state of affairs A is earlier or at least no later than the time of state of affairs B. Therefore, prototypical conditionality entails a causal relation as well as a temporal relation between states of affairs A and B, in that state of affairs A precedes state of affairs B both logically and temporally. Additionally, prototypical conditionality also implies — though it does not assert — that state of affairs A is not (yet) realised.

Secondly, though temporality and conditionality in Manchu are typically (and primarily) represented by dative-locative participial structures (V-hA/rA-de) and by conditional-converb structures, respectively, the correspondence between the semantics and
the morphosyntax is not strictly one-to-one, and the divergence enables alternative representations of a given meaning. Specifically, in a non-past context, (i) dative-locative participial structures (V-ха/ра-de) represent the temporal relation required in conditionality; and (ii) the non-pastness of the context usually indicates that the states of affairs in question (of both clauses) are yet to take place. When the states of affairs are likely to be causally related, the conditional meaning can be yielded by such structures. It should be noted that, as stated in the discussion on non-prototypical conditional constructions (Section 4.2.1), the temporal meaning is compatible with the conditional meaning. On the other hand, in a past context, (i) conditional-converb structures maintain the temporal relation24 of one state of affairs to the other; (ii) given the context, apparent causal relation usually does not exist between the states of affairs in question;25 and (iii) in a past context, the state of affairs represented in the main clause is realised, according to the structure of the predicate — otherwise different structures (such as those containing the perfective participle bi-he) would be used to indicate the non-realisation of the state of affairs.26 Therefore, the main clause is not a supposition but an assertion of the state of affairs, and consequently the state of affairs represented in the subordinate clause in a conditional-converb structure is not likely to express an unrealised state of affairs. Thus, while a temporal relation remains, the conditional meaning is not yielded, because it would not be compatible with the temporal meaning.

To summarise, dative-locative participial structures (V-ха/ра-de), typically (and primarily) expressing temporality, and conditional-converb structures, typically (and primarily) expressing conditionality, can shift from their respective core semantic functions to expressing alternative meanings under certain lexical, morphosyntactic, or contextual

24 Here it suffices to say that the temporal relation in general is maintained. It is argued in Section 4.3.2.4 that the conditional-converb structures iconically reflect the temporal sequence, that is, the states of affairs represented by such structures precede the state of affairs of the main clause. However, such relations should be considered to belong to different domains. See Section 4.3.2.4.

25 Actually a causal relation can exist in some constructions such as (4.3 – 5), where the act of drinking cold water (in the subordinate clause) does serve as a cause of the state of affairs of beginning to have a headache (in the main clause). However, the structure of the main predicate decides that this construction describes a factual state of affairs. See the Note 26 (below) for further information.

26 While a non-past context can usually indicate that the states of affairs involved are not realised, a past context cannot necessarily guarantee that the states of affairs involved have been realised, due to the existence of counterfactual states of affairs. This is the reason why the structure of the main predicate is considered in order to decide whether the state of affairs is realised or not: the analysis of (prototypical) counterfactual conditionals makes it possible to do so.
circumstances. It should be pointed out, however, that the two types of structures undergo different processes: dative-locative participial structures obtain causality (from the whole construction and even the context) in expressing conditionality, while conditional-converb structures lose causality or hypotheticality — both of which are vital to typical conditionality — in expressing temporality.

### 4.3.2.4 Temporal Constructions and Perception Verbs: The Temporal Meaning Revisited

Some of the temporal constructions containing perception verbs, such as *tuwa-* ‘to look’,

\[27\] *donji-* ‘to listen/hear’, *amtala-* ‘to taste’ are worthy of detailed analysis due to the particularity of the temporal meanings they express. Here are some examples ([4.3 – 12] is also of such type):

(4.3 – 16)  
\[uce\] tuci-fi \[tuwa-ci,\] dule ambarame  
door go.out-PFV.CVBR look-COND in.fact greatly  
labsa-me deribu-he  
snow.heavily-IPFV.CVBR begin-PFV.PTCP  
‘When [I] opened the door and looked [out], [I suddenly realised that] it had begun to snow heavily!’ (AGA2: 82)

(4.3 – 17)  
fujin gene-fi \[tuwa-ci,\] uyun ursu sele-i hoton  
lady go-PFV.CVBR look-COND nine layer iron-GEN city  
bir  
EXS.PTL  
‘When the lady went and looked, [she found that] there was a nine-layered iron city’ (SG: 324)

(4.3 – 18)  
\[šan\] waliya-fi \[donji-ci,\] cib se-me  
ear throw-PFV.CVBR listen-COND quiet say(AUX)-IPFV.CVBR  
heni jilgan wei ak̄̄  
little sound tiny NEG  
cib seme: ‘quietly’  
wei ak̄̄: ‘not a bit’  
‘When [I] pushed (lit.: ‘threw’) my ear [against the window] to listen, [I

---

27 Strictly speaking the verb *tuwa-* ‘to look’ cannot qualify as a perception verb proper, since it denotes the act of observation rather than perception, while the visual perception is expressed by another verb, *sabu-* ‘to see’. On the other hand, both the act of listening and the aural perception are expressed by the verb *donji-* ‘to listen/hear’. Due to their syntactic similarity and their relationship to perception, verbs such as *tuwa-* and *donji-* are all considered as perception verbs here.
heard] it was very quiet and there was no sound’ (AGA1: 149)

(4.3 – 19) saifila-fi amtala-ci, šuwe ede-kebi
use.a.spoon-PFV.CVBM taste-COND completely go.bad-PFV.FIN
‘When [I] tasted [the food] using a spoon, [I found/realised that] it had
gone completely bad’ (AGA1: 97–98)

In these constructions, the states of affairs involved are located in a past context, and the
states of affairs represented in the subordinate clauses — specifically acts of perception —
have (just) been completed. However, the states of affairs represented in the main clauses do
not necessarily follow the acts of perception temporally. For instance, in (4.3 – 17) the state of
affairs of the main clause, that is, the existence of a nine-layered city, has in fact been true for
a period of time. Certainly, the beginning of the existence is located at some temporal point
anterior to the act of perception (represented by tuwa- ‘to look’). In (4.3 – 18) the state of
affairs of the main clause, that is, there being no sound, may well have existed for a while
before the act of perception donji- ‘to listen’. On the other hand, it is clear that in each of
these cases, the state of affairs of the main clause indicates the object of the realised
perception. For instance, in (4.3 – 16) the state of affairs of the main clause that it has begun
to snow is the object of the realised perception represented by tuwa- ‘to look’ of the
subordinate clause. Also, in (4.3 – 19) the state of affairs of the main clause that the going
bad of the food is the object of the perception represented by amtala- ‘to taste’ of the
subordinate clause.

Furthermore, the main clause of such a construction can in a sense be regarded as falling
within the semantic scope of an implied predicate that is part of a proposition that represents
the realised state of affairs of perception. Such an implied predicate can be exemplified by the
English verbs see and hear, which serve to represent the realised states of affairs of
perception of looking and listening respectively. In fact, such predicates are explicit in the
following two temporal sentences:

(4.3 – 20) emu dobori lefu mederi baru tuwa-ci, emu amba
one night bear sea toward look-COND one big
elden be sabu-mbi
light ACC see-IPFV.FIN
‘One night when the bear looked toward the sea, [he] saw a strong ray of light’ (SG: 375)

(4.3 – 21)

Urikan karun gene-fi yamji tuwa-ci, bata-i cooha
PN sentry go-PFV.CVB evening look-COND enemy-GEN troops

Hunehe bira-i amargi de isinji-fi ing
PN river-GEN north DAT arrive-PFV.CVB camp

ili-fi, geren cooha buda ara-me
set.up-PFV.CVB all troops meal make-IPFV.CVB

dabu-ha tuwa-i elden abka-i usiha-i adali
light.up-PFV.PTCP fire-GEN light sky-GEN star-GEN like

sabu-mbi
see-IPFV.FIN

caran gene-: ‘to go on sentry’
ing ili-: ‘to make camp’

‘When Urikan went on sentry in the evening to reconnoitre (lit.: ‘to look’), [he could] see that the enemy had arrived at the north bank of the Hunehe River, and, as all the troops had made camp and were now preparing their meal, the light of the [camp] fire [was shining] like stars in the sky’
(MYK2: 37)

In (5.9 – 20) and (5.9 – 21), the main predicate sabu- ‘to see’ exactly represents the realised act of perception. A predicate of such type can reflect the intrinsic relation between the two clauses, both temporally and logically: the act of perception of the subordinate clause is anterior in time to the state of affairs represented by the predicate in question, and the latter is the object of the perception.

One can add implied predicates such as SEE or HEAR into the previous sentences28 (4.3 – 16) – (4.3 – 19) without changing the meaning of the original construction more than revealing what is left unuttered and unspecified. Furthermore, as mentioned above, if the state of affairs represented by the implied predicate — implicit (as in the first few constructions) or explicit (in the last one) — is also considered in terms of temporal relation with the act (of perception) represented in the subordinate clause, the former is located posterior to the latter.

Such implied predicates can also be supplemented (semantically) to “embed” the main clause of some constructions such as (4.3 – 9) and (4.3 – 13) within their scope. In such constructions, the subordinate predicate is not a perception verb, and the state of affairs in the

28 In the cases where tuwa- ‘to look’ occurs in the subordinate clause, the verb sabu- ‘to see’ can be supplemented to embed the main clause within its scope, while in other cases, different perception verbs are also possible.
main clause does not appear to be posterior to the state of affairs of the subordinate clause. For instance, in (4.3 – 9) the state of affairs of the main clause *per se*, that is, the woman and the girl’s selling wine, is not posterior to the state of affairs of the subordinate clause, i.e., going past the mountain. When the implied predicate, such as SEE, FIND or OBSERVE, is supplemented (semantically) to “embed” the original main clause within its scope, it becomes clear that the state of affairs represented by the implied predicate is posterior to the state of affairs in the subordinate clause.

Now it is argued that the conditional-converb structures represent the temporal anteriority of the state of affairs of the subordinate clause to the state of affairs of the main clause. It is important to note that, however, such temporal anteriority is represented in either of two different domains. First, it can exist in the content domain, as shown by temporal constructions in which the clause order (subordinate – main) iconically reflects the temporal sequence of the states of affairs involved (e.g., [4.3 – 1], [4.3 – 2], and [4.3 – 4] – [4.3 – 7]). Secondly, the temporal anteriority can exist in the perceptual domain, where the main clause represents an act of perception that is related to the state of affairs of the subordinate clause. This case applies to the constructions discussed above that allow implied predicates in the main clause, where the act of (implied) perception is posterior to the state of affairs of the subordinate clause, be it an act of perception (*tuwa-* ‘to look’, *donji-* ‘to listen’, *amtala-* ‘to taste’) or of other types (*isina-* ‘to arrive’, *gene-* ‘to go’). In some cases the boundary between the two levels may not be very clear, allowing both interpretations. For instance, in (4.3 – 8) the temporal anteriority can be present in the content domain, that is, the desire to come is anterior to the beginning of the rain, while it can also exist in the perceptual domain, that is, the desire to come is anterior to the perception (such as awareness or sight) that it has started raining. Except for a few cases like this one, other temporal constructions tend to fall either into one category (temporal anteriority in the content domain) or into the other (temporal anteriority in the perceptual domain).

Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that the conditional-converb structures V-,*ci* (in all possible forms) reflect temporal anteriority of the state of affairs of the subordinate clause in relation to the state of affairs of the main clause, either in a straightforward way (in the content domain) or metaphorically (in the perceptual domain). Thus, various temporal
relations are unified in the morphosyntax of constructions containing the conditional converb \( V-ci \).

### 4.4 Speech Act Conditionals

Some factual conditionals whose main clauses consist of imperative verb forms (rather than indicative verb forms) serve to perform the speech act of request. Here are some examples:

(4.4 – 1) \( gosi-ci, \ min-de \ ala-me \ bu-reo \)

have.mercy-COND 1SG(bi/min)-DAT tell-IPFV.CVb give-IMP

‘If [you] have mercy [on me], please tell me’ (NSB: 25)

(4.4 – 2) \( gosi-ci, \ min-i \ funde \ gisure-reo \)

have.mercy-COND 1SG(bi/min)-GEN instead speak-IMP

\( min-i \ funde \): ‘instead of me’, ‘on my behalf’

‘If [you] have mercy [on me], please speak on my behalf’ (OJ1: 76)

(4.4 – 3) \( muse-i \ fe \ gucule-he \ be \ gůni-ci, \)

1PL.INCL-GEN old befriend-PFV.PTCP ACC consider-COND

\( min-i \ ere \ baita \ be \ urunakū \ tere \ looye \)

1SG(bi/min)-GEN this matter ACC surely that/3SG lord

\( de \ ula-me \ gisure-reo \)

DAT tell-IPFV.CVb speak-IMP

‘If [you] consider that we are old friends, please speak to that lord about this matter of mine’ (MFG: 33)

(4.4 – 4) \( han \ onco \ be \ gůni-ci, \ emu \ gisun \ be \)

khán generosity ACC think-COND one word ACC

\( toktobu-fi \ gene-re \ bi-he-o \)

decide-PFV.CVb go-IPFV.PTCP be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP-Q

\( onco \ be \ gůni-:- \) ‘to be generous/kind’, lit.: ‘to think of generosity’

\( gisun \ be \ toktobu-:- \) ‘to give a promise’, lit.: ‘to decide on a word’

\( V-ra \ bi-he-o: \) a structure used to address someone superior to the speaker, which seems to have been replaced by the polite imperative \( V-rao \) in the course of time, meaning ‘could/would you please [do something]’

‘Khan, if you are generous [to us], please give us a promise and then go [on your way]’ (MYK3: 46)

(4.4 – 5) \( hata-me \ gůni-rakū \ o-ci, \ emu \)

loath-IPFV.CVb think-IPFV.PTCP.NEG become(AUX)-COND one
If [you] do not consider [him] as loathsome, please give [me your] kind words [about him]’ (OJ2: 70)

Sir, if you do not despise [me], please drop by at my house sometimes (lit.: ‘a little bit’)’ (MFG: 4)

Sentences (4.4 – 1) – (4.4 – 6) are quite uniform in terms of morphosyntax. First, the verb in the subordinate clause is either *gosi*– ‘to have mercy/to be kind’ or *gūni*– ‘to consider’, both verbs that reflect mental activities. The (unspecified) subject of the verbs is the second person, that is, the addressee of these utterances. Second, the predicate of the main clause takes the imperative form V-*rAo* (see Section 3.1.3.1.2) or a historically earlier form V-*rA bi-he-o*, which are used to express (polite) requests.

A conditional relation can be observed between the two clauses within each sentence. For instance, in (4.4 – 1), the addressee’s having mercy serves as the condition for the intended act of the addressee’s telling the speaker some information. However, on closer examination these constructions are different from ordinary conditionals with an imperative in the main clause such as the following:

‘Sir, if you have Manchu books, could you please lend [me] some volumes [of them]?’ (MFG: 41)
In sentences (4.4 – 7) and (4.4 – 8), the subordinate clauses also serve to provide the conditions for the intended acts expressed by the main clauses. However, what differentiates (4.4 – 1) – (4.4 – 6) from (4.4 – 7) and (4.4 – 8) is that the “conditions” as shown in (4.4 – 1) – (4.4 – 6) are not authentic conditions. The reason is that, when the speaker utters a sentence like (4.4 – 1) – (4.4 – 6), he or she cannot really expect the addressee to negate the condition provided, such as the addressee’s having mercy/being kind. In other words, the speaker already presupposes the condition to be true when she or he says this sentence: naturally, the addressee is expected to have mercy on the speaker, or to be kind, out of the socio-pragmatic consideration for maintaining a good interpersonal relationship or personal prestige.\(^{29}\) Otherwise, negating this condition would invite the understanding that the addressee does not really care about the speaker, or the addressee’s own prestige, which is inappropriate and undesirable. Thus, it seems that this condition itself suffices to justify the request. In this sense, this kind of condition is used by the speaker as a politeness strategy.

The utterances in (4.4 – 7) and (4.4 – 8), on the other hand, do not make such presupposition and consequently the conditions in (4.4 – 7) and (4.4 – 8) can be denied without (verbally) damaging the interpersonal relationship or the personal prestige. This is determined by the nature of the conditions: they do not concern the interpersonal relationship but only refer to matters irrelevant in this regard. For instance, in (4.4 – 7), the speaker is not sure whether the addressee has Manchu books or not, and the speaker’s intention is to borrow such books in the circumstances that the addressee does have some. Similarly in (4.4 – 8), the speaker requests the addressee to explain some matter to him in the circumstances that the addressee knows the matter clearly. In both (4.4 – 7) and (4.4 – 8) the addressee can reasonably negate this condition without damaging his relationship with the speaker. In fact, in their respective contexts, both (4.4 – 7) and (4.4 – 8) are indeed replied by the addressees’ negation: sentence (4.4 – 7) is followed by the utterance min-de [1SG(bi/min)-DAT] bithe

---

\(^{29}\) in (4.4 – 4) the addressee, a khan, is supposed to have the prestige of being generous

The analysis above is inspired by previous studies of similar phenomena in English. Van der Auwera (1986: 198–199) distinguishes two kinds of conditional sentences, “conditional speech acts” (Open the window, if I may ask you to) and “speech act[s] about a conditional” (If you inherit, will you invest?). Sweetser (1990) labels the former kind as “speech act conditionals”, in which the relation between clauses does not exist in the content domain but in the speech-act domain. Dancygier (1998: 89) notes that expressions such as If I may ask in the sentence If I may ask, where were you last night — a “speech act conditional” according to Sweetser (1990) — are usually formulaic and idiomatic forms. Dancygier (1998: 91) argues that the expression If I may ask in the sentence above is used to “ensure the appropriateness of what is communicated in their main clause”, and that the speaker of such a sentence believes what he or she says is appropriate but uses the condition to allow the addressee to disagree, since the speaker is uncertain about the addressee’s opinion concerning whether the speech act is appropriate or not. Dancygier (1998) further points out that the speech act expressed by such a conditional is performed, and the performance is actually independent of the apparent condition (for instance, the condition that the speaker has the right to ask expressed by If I may ask).

There are a variety of speech acts that may be expressed by the English conditionals, such as asking a question (If I may ask, where were you last night); requests (such as the “conditional speech act” above given by Van der Auwera 1986); expressing an opinion (If I can speak frankly, he doesn’t have a chance, Van der Auwera 1986: 199); or offering a favour (I’ll help you with the dishes, if it’s all right with you, Dancygier 1998: 89). In contrast, however, it seems that in Manchu the conditionals that adopt the “politeness strategy” are mainly used for asking favours from the addressee. One can observe this in (4.4 – 1) – (4.4 – 6). First, the verbs in the form of the conditional converb carry the connotation that the addressee is in a somewhat dignified position: the verb gosi- ‘to have mercy’ and the complex

30 In ensuing discussion I will adopt Sweetser’s (1990) term “speech act conditionals” to refer to the conditionals such as (4.4 – 1) – (4.4 – 6), since the term “conditional speech acts” coined by Van der Auwera (1986) seems to focus on speech acts.
verb phrases *hatame gūni/-waliyame gūni*- ‘to dislike’/‘to despise’ all raise the position of the addressee in relation to the speaker. Second, from the verb forms used in the main clause, V-*rA* or V-*rA bi-he-o*, one can also infer that the speaker is inferior to the addressee — a stance taken by the speaker at least at the moment of speech.

It seems reasonable to refer to Manchu conditionals such as (4.4 – 1) – (4.4 – 6) as “speech act conditionals” by analogy with the English examples. The category “speech act conditionals” in Manchu is thus defined: the condition stated in the subordinate clause serves as a politeness strategy on the part of the speaker to carry out a speech act, which is represented in the main clause. To clarify this definition it is necessary to state the distinguishing character of the politeness strategy (apart from “politeness”) that the condition in the subordinate clause cannot be negated without verbally damaging the personal relationship between the speaker and the addressee or the addressee’s prestige. In the specific cases of (4.4 – 1) – (4.4 – 6), the politeness strategy has yet another imposing aspect: since the politeness condition in each example cannot be properly negated and is presupposed by the speaker to be true, it is as a consequence imposed on the addressee, who seems to be obligated to admit it. Failure to admit this condition — and thus the request itself — would be interpreted as not showing kindness or goodwill towards the speaker. Thus, the politeness condition can be understood in this manner: “I (the speaker) assume that you are kind/merciful/considerate/generous… to me, and therefore it is reasonable that you, who are expected to behave accordingly, should accept my request”.

The definition provided above automatically excludes such conditionals as (4.4 – 7) and (4.4 – 8), as previously discussed, but in principle still leaves open the possibility of other conditionals that do not necessarily express a request but rather a different kind of speech act — offering to help, asking for information, or giving remarks — in the main clause. Nevertheless, it just so happens that Manchu seems to be a language in which the so-defined speech act conditionals are mainly used for requests. On the other hand, various speech acts other than request may not be expressed by any conditional construction at all. Even if the speech acts (other than requests) are expressed by conditionals, these conditionals would turn out to be “ordinary” constructions in which the protasis is able to be negated, such as (4.4 – 7)

31 If the condition itself is expressed in a negative form, as (4.4 – 6), it cannot be made affirmative via another negation.
and (4.4 – 8). This linguistic fact of Manchu is probably determined by its ways of expressing politeness.

### 4.5 Concessive Constructions

In general there are two types of concessive constructions: concessives (that is, concessives proper) and concessive conditionals. Both types of sentences consist of two clauses, and that the state of affairs represented in the second clause is contrary to what one expects given the state of affairs represented in the first clause. However, they are distinct from each other as to whether the state of affairs represented in the subordinate clause is entailed (that is, inferable as true) or not. Specifically, when the state of affairs of the first clause is entailed, the whole sentence is a “concessive (proper)”, such as sentences containing the conjunction *although* in English (for example, *Although everyone played well, we lost the game*). When the state of affairs of the first clause is not entailed, the whole sentence is a “concessive conditional”.32 There are three types of concessive conditionals:33 (a) scalar concessive conditionals, such as the constructions introduced by *even if* in English (for example, *Even if I have to walk all the way, I will get there*); (b) alternative concessive conditionals, such as the constructions containing *whether…or…* in English (for example, *Whether it rains or not, we are playing football on Saturday, or Whether she wins or whether she loses, this is her last tournament*); (c) universal concessive conditionals, such as the constructions introduced by *whatever/whoever/…* or *no matter what/who/…* in English (for example, *Whatever decision he made, I would support him*).

Both concessives proper and all three types of concessive conditionals are found in Manchu. In particular, all of them can be realised by the constructions in which the subordinate clause has a conditional-converb (*V-ci*) structure. This section analyses these constructions. However, since there also exist alternative morphosyntactic patterns in Manchu that can function as concessives proper or concessive conditionals, the analysis here

---

32 Xrakovskij (2012: 4) refers to what I call “concessives proper” here as “concessive causal constructions”, as opposed to “concessive conditional constructions”.

33 The labels for these types, i.e. “scalar”, “alternative”, and “universal”, are borrowed from a questionnaire on concessive conditional clauses developed by Martin Haspelmath and Ekkehard König (available online at [http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/tools-at-lingboard/pdf/ET_5_6_Haspelmath_concessive_conditional_clauses.pdf](http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/tools-at-lingboard/pdf/ET_5_6_Haspelmath_concessive_conditional_clauses.pdf))
only describes one part of the whole range of possibilities, namely that which concerns the conditional converb.

### 4.5.1 Concessives Proper

The following are some Manchu examples of the concessives (proper) that contain conditional-converb structures in the subordinate clauses:

(4.5 – 1) *cananggi* *bu-mbi* *se-ci*, *bu-hekū*

day.before.yesterday give-IPFV.FIN say-COND give-PFV.PTCP.NEG

‘Though [he] said “[I’ll] give [it to you]” the day before yesterday, [he] didn’t give [it to me in the end]’ (MFG: 15)

(4.5 – 2) *age de* *emu* *baita* *vandu-ci*, *baibi* *angga* *juwa-ra*

sir DAT one matter request-COND merely mouth open-IPFV.PTCP

de *manggaša-mbi*

DAT be.hesitant-IPFV.FIN

*angga juwa-*: ‘to open [one’s] mouth’, i.e. ‘to utter’

‘Sir, although [I have] something [for which] to request your favour, [I am] just hesitant [about whether I should] speak [my request]’ (OJ1: 85)

(4.5 – 3) *bi* *ekše-me* *niyalma* *takūra-fi* *amca-bu-ci*,

1SG hurry-IPFV.CVB person send-PFV.CVB pursue-CAUS-COND

*amcabu-hakū*[^34]

catch.up-PFV.PTCP.NEG

‘Although I hurriedly sent someone to run after [you], [the one I sent] didn’t catch up [with you]’ (OJ1: 105)

(4.5 – 4) *elhe* *be* *fonji-me* *jasi-ki* *se-ci*,

well-being ACC ask-IPFV.CVB send-OPT say(AUX)-COND

*ildun* *i* *niyalma* *be* *baha-rakū*

convenience GEN person ACC get-IPFV.PTCP.NEG

V-ki se-: complex structure expressing desire or intention

*ildun i niyalma*: ‘a suitable person’, l.t.: ‘man of convenience’

‘Although [I] wanted to send [someone] to ask [your] well-being, [I] couldn’t find anyone available’ (MFG: 27)

In terms of morphosyntax, one can see that the predicate in the subordinate clause of the concessives above is the conditional converb V-*ci*, where V is either a lexical verb ([4.5 – 1]

[^34]: In (4.5 – 3) the verb forms *amca-bu-* and *amcabu-* are distinguished, as shown in the gloss.
– [4.5 – 3]) or an auxiliary verb ([4.5 – 4]). The main predicate can be in an imperfective ([4.5 – 2] and [4.5 – 4]) or perfective form ([4.5 – 1] and [4.5 – 3]). All of these predicate structures have been observed either in the basic patterns of conditional constructions (see Section 4.1) or in the temporal constructions (see Section 4.3). In terms of meaning, the states of affairs in the subordinate clauses are entailed, and can be located in the past ([4.5 – 1], [4.5 – 3] and [4.5 – 4]) or in the present ([4.5 – 2]).

Distinct from sentences (4.5 – 1) – (4.5 – 4), however, the more common patterns of Manchu concessives use the concessive converb V-cibe or the frame structure udu...V-cibe in the subordinate clauses. The following are some examples:

(4.5 – 5)  

{niyalma-i sukū nere-cibe, ulha i duha kai
human-GEN skin cover-CONC livestock GEN intestine PTL
ulhai duha: ‘cruel heart’, lit.: ‘intestines of a domestic animal’
‘Although [he] is a human being (lit.: ‘covered with human skin’), [he has] a cruel heart [like a beast]’ (OJ2: 168)

(4.5 – 6)  

{bi udu sain ningge etu-rakū bi-cibe,
1SG though good NMLZ wear-IPFV.PTCP.NEG be(AUX)-CONC
gūnin dolo elehun
mind inside satisfied
‘Although I don’t wear good things (i.e. good clothes), [I am] satisfied inside [my] mind’ (OJ1: 82)

4.5.2 Concessive Conditionals

As said above, concessive conditionals can be classified into three basic types, all of which can be found in Manchu, realised as constructions in which the subordinate clause contains a conditional-converb structure. The analysis in this subsection is arranged in the following order: (i) scalar concessive conditionals; (ii) alternative concessive conditionals; and finally, (iii) universal concessive conditionals.

4.5.2.1 Scalar Concessive Conditionals

One type of scalar concessive conditionals in Manchu is characterised by the morphosyntactic pattern “{(Subj1 +) (uthai +) Pred1 [V-ći]} ↔ {(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-kini]}”,
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as in the following are three examples (4.5 – 7) – (4.5 – 9). The verbs in the two clauses can either be the same ([4.5 – 7] and [4.5 – 9]) or different ([4.5 – 8]). When the main predicate is the optative of a verb that is different from that of the subordinate clause, it is usually the verb o- ‘to become/be’, as in (4.5 – 8).

(4.5 – 7) enenggi min-i batta be uthai tookabu-ci.
    today 1SG(bi/min)-GEN matter ACC even delay-COND

tookabu-kini! (bi gene-re be naka-fi, age-i
    delay-OPT 1SG go-IPFV.PTCP ACC stop-PFV.CVB sir-GEN

boo-de darina-ki)

‘Even if [I should] delay my matter today, let me so delay it! (I’ll quit going [where I planned to] and drop by at your house)’ (MFG: 39)

(4.5 – 8) ere ilan hūntahan nure de uthai sokto-me
    this three mug wine DAT even be.drunk-IPFV.CVB

buce-ci, inu o-kini! (bi omi-ki)
    die-COND also become-OPT 1SG drink-OPT

‘Even if [I should] die drunk after drinking these three mugs of wine, so be it! (I’ll drink [them anyway])!’ (MFG: 47)

(4.5 – 9) usha-ci hūi usha-kinī dabala
    be.angry-COND any.how be.angry-OPT PTL

‘Even if [he] is angry [with me], let [him] be angry then [as he pleases]!’
    (OJ1: 104)

However, although examples (4.5 – 7) – (4.5 – 9) all have a complete, subordinate–main clause structure (here excluding the parenthesised parts in [4.5 – 7] and [4.5 – 8], which constitute ensuing independent sentences), the main clauses do not contain new information. Rather, they only restate what is stated in the subordinate clauses. For instance, in the main clause of (4.5 – 7), the speaker does not say anything beyond supposing that he would delay his matter. On the other hand, if one considers the text following each of the constructions, one can better understand what state of affairs is relevant to the supposition made. For instance, in (4.5 – 7) the speaker will go to the addressee’s house even if he delays his matter, and in (4.5 – 8) the speaker will drink with the addressee even if he will die drunk.

On the other hand, in Manchu there are some verb structures containing uthai ‘then’ that can express the concessive meaning when used in the subordinate clauses. Such structures
include uthai...V-kini, uthai...V-hA se-me, and uthai...V-cibe, as shown in the following examples. It should be noted that the sentences in which the structures in question occur are often complex, consisting of more than one clause.

(4.5 – 10) aika tere gese gete-rakū juse banji-ha
if that/3SG like wake-PFV.PTCP.NEG children give.birth-PFV.PTCP
se-he-de, in-i beye uthai yafan de
say-PFV.PTCP-DAT 3SG(i/in)-GEN body even grave.yard DAT
te-kini, hono ainahai emu afaha hoošan jiha
live-OPT still not.necessarily one piece paper money
deijji-mbi-ni
burn-PFV.FIN-PTL
gererakū juse: ‘good-for-nothing children’
hoošan jiha deijji-: ‘to burn paper money offerings [to the deceased]’
‘If, say, [one] raises good-for-nothing children like that, even if his body were buried in the graveyard [after his death], [his children] still [might] not necessarily burn even a piece of paper money [as offering for him]’ (OJ1: 107)

(4.5 – 11) uthai baha-fi wesi-rakū venderakū
even get-PFV.CVB get.promoted-PFV.PTCP prosper-PFV.PTCP
o-kini, beye bisi-re-de, niyalma mahala
become(AUX)-OPT body be-PFV.PTCP-DAT people hat
tuhe-me kundule-me tuva-mbi
fall-PFV.CVB respect-PFV.CVB regard-PFV.FIN
mahala tuhe-me: here meaning ‘taking off one’s hat [to show respect]’, lit.: ‘hat falling’
‘Even if [he] doesn’t get promoted or get rich, as long as [he] is alive, people will regard [him] with respect’ (AGA1: 118)

(4.5 – 12) uthai muse-i kadala-ra niyalma
even 1PL.INCL-GEN manage-PFV.PTCP person
baicanji-ha se-me, muse inu
come.to.investigate-PFV.PTCP say(AUX)-IPFV.CVB 1PL.INCL also
mujilen niyaman šoforo-bu-rakū o-mbi
mind heart scratch-PASS-PFV.PTCP.NEG become(AUX)-IPFV.FIN
kadala-ra niyalma: ‘manager’, ‘administrator’
niyaman šoforobu-: ‘to be worried’, lit.: ‘heart to be scratched’
‘Even if our manager comes to investigate us, we won’t be worried at all’ (AGA3: 79)

(4.5 – 13) uthai ici aca-rakū o-cibe, inu
even direction suit-PFV.PTCP.NEG become(AUX)-CONC also
nikede-me baiatala-ci aca-mbi
make.do-PFV.CVB use-COND suit(AUX)-IPFV.FIN
ici aca-: ‘to suit’, ‘to conform’

V-ci aca-: complex structure expressing obligation

‘Even if [it] doesn’t suit [the needs], [we] still should make do with [it]’
(UH: 26)

The second type of scalar concessive conditionals share morphosyntax with the basic patterns of factual conditionals. The following are some examples:

(4.5 – 14)  
\[\text{wesi-ki mukde-ki se-ci, ainahai mute-re}\]
\text{advance-OPT go.up-OPT say(AUX)-COND how be.able-IPFV.PTCP}
\text{wesi-/mukde-: here both meaning ‘to advance in rank’, ‘to get promoted’}
\text{V-ki se-: complex structure expressing desire or intention}

‘Even if [he] wants to get promoted, how can [he succeed]?’ (OJ1: 103)

(4.5 – 15)  
\[\text{sin-i tacibu-re sain gisun be min-i}\]
\text{2SG(si/sin)-GEN teach-IPFV.PTCP good words ACC 1SG(hi/min)-GEN}
\text{dolo buce-ci inu ongo-rakū}
\text{inside die-COND still forget-IPFV.PTCP.NEG}
\text{mini dolo: ‘in my heart’, lit.: ‘inside me’}

‘Even if [I] die, [I] will not forget the kind words you teach me’ (MYK7: 10)

(4.5 – 16)  
\[\text{majige tathūnia-ci, inu haha waka}\]
\text{a.little hesitate-COND still man not}

‘Even if [I] hesitate a little, [I will not] be [counted as] a real man!’ (OJ2: 140)

(4.5 – 17)  
\[\text{buce-rakū o-ci, sukū inu emu jergi}\]
\text{die-IPFV.PTCP.NEG become(AUX)-COND skin still one layer}
\text{kobci-mbi}
\text{fall.of-IPFV.FIN}

‘Even if [you] don’t die, one layer of [your] skin will fall off’ (AGA3: 35–36)

(4.5 – 18)  
\[\text{yaya niyalma belge-i gese erdemu bi-ci, beye}\]
\text{any person grain.of.rice-GEN like talent be-COND self}
\text{de tusangga}
\text{DAT beneficial}

‘[It will be] beneficial to anyone, even if [he or she] has a talent the size of a grain of rice’ (MFG: 4)

In the sentences (4.5. – 14) – (4.5 – 18), the concessive meaning can arise from specific lexical items or from the context. For instance, the concessive meaning of (4.5 – 14) is not obvious, and is inferred from the context. On the other hand, the adverb inu ‘also, still’ in the
main clauses of (4.5 – 15) – (4.5 – 17), the adverb of degree majige ‘a little’ in the subordinate clause of (4.5 – 16), and the phrase belgei gese ‘[as small] as a grain of rice’ in the subordinate clause of (4.5 – 18) all contribute to expressing the concessive meaning.

König (1986: 231) points out that, in general, concessive conditionals “relate a set of antecedent conditions to a consequent”, and in the case of scalar concessive conditionals (that is, sentences introduced by even if), the set of antecedent conditionals is specified by “a focus marker” (that is, even). According to König (1986), the even if clause represents the least likely situation for bringing about the given consequent, and since the most unlikely situation can bring about this consequent, the other states of affairs can certainly bring it about also. A similar thought is expressed by Sweetser (1990: 136–137), who notes that even “is an explicitly scalar expression”, and that even if “represents a relatively extreme possibility from among the possible conditions which can be expected to occur” to impede the consequent. These statements can shed light on how the Manchu expressions mentioned above, such as majige ‘a little’ and belgei gese ‘[as small] as a grain of rice’, contribute the concessive conditional meaning.

The concessive converb V-cibe seems to be a natural substitute for the conditional converb in the subordinate clause of a scalar concessive conditional. The following is an example, which nevertheless allows the interpretation as a concessive proper:

(4.5 – 19)  
udu tere ten de isina-me mute-rakū  
even that/3SG extreme DAT reach-IPFV.CVB be.able-IPFV.PTCP.NEG  
bicbe, inu urunikū hamimbi dere  
be(AUX)-CONC still definitely be.close-IPFV.FIN PTL  
‘Even if/Even though [we] can’t reach his level [of excellence], [we] will definitely still be able to be close [enough]’ (OJ1: 20)

4.5.2.2 Alternative Concessive Conditionals

The alternative concessive conditionals in Manchu juxtapose two conditional converbs in the subordinate clause. The following is an example:

(4.5 – 20)  
je-ci omi-ci amtan baha-rakū  
eat-COND drink-COND taste get-IPFV.PTCP.NEG  
‘Whether [I] eat or whether [I] drink, [I] can’t enjoy [any] taste [out of it]’ (lit.:
‘…I don’t get [any] taste’) (MFG: 30)

Sentences such as (4.5 – 20) are rather few in number, but they are salient in morphosyntax, having two coordinate conditional converbs. There is also a similar type of construction in which two conditional converbs are juxtaposed in the first part of the sentence. However, the predicates of the main clauses, usually implicit, do not refer to entities in the outside world, but denote states of affairs represented by the subordinate clauses. The following sentence (4.5 – 21) contains two such sentences ([4.5 – 21a] and [4.5 – 21b], each of which is independent of the other). This example will also be analysed in Section 4.7.

(4.5 – 21a)  
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{lici-c} & \text{dosi-c} & \text{gemu} & \text{waka;}
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{go.out-COND} & \text{come.in-COND} & \text{all} & \text{not.right}
\end{array}
\]

(4.5 – 21b)  
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{te-ci} & \text{ili-ci} & \text{gemu} & \text{mangga} & \text{kai}
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{sit-COND} & \text{stand-COND} & \text{all} & \text{difficult PTL}
\end{array}
\]

‘It is not appropriate either to go out or to come in; it is difficult whether one sits down or stands up’  (OJ2: 124)

Despite sentences such as (4.5 – 20), the predominant pattern of alternative concessive sentences in Manchu juxtaposes the concessive converb (V-cibe) of two verbs (lexical or auxiliary) — instead of the conditional converb — in the subordinate clauses. In the following examples, sentence (4.5 – 22) comes from the same passage as (4.5 – 20), and demonstrates that the structures used respectively in the two sentences share the same syntactic function:

(4.5 – 22)  
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{te-cibe} & \text{ili-cibe} & \text{elhe} & \text{akū}
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{sit-CONC} & \text{stand-CONC} & \text{peace} & \text{NEG}
\end{array}
\]

‘Whether [I] sit down or whether [I] stand up, there is no peace [inside me]’  (MFG: 29–30)

(4.5 – 23)  
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{menggun} & \text{o-cibe,} & \text{damtun} & \text{o-cibe,}
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{silver} & \text{become-CONC} & \text{pawn} & \text{become-CONC} & \text{1SG(bi/min)-DAT}
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{l}
majige  
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{l}
aisila-rao
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{l}
a.little help-IMP
\end{array}
\]

‘Be it silver, or be it something that can be pawned, would you please help me a little [by giving me a loan]?’  (OJ1: 87)
‘Whether [he] buys [it] or whether he doesn’t buy [it], let him handle [it] according to his own will’ (OJ2: 26)

### 4.5.2.3 Universal Concessive Conditionals

The universal concessive conditionals in Manchu contain interrogative words such as *ai* ‘what’, *absi* ‘how’ or *ya* ‘which’ in the subordinate clause and in many cases in the main clause as well. Here are some examples:

(4.5 – 25)  
\[
\begin{align*}
muse-i & \quad ai \quad se-ci, \quad uthai \quad ai \quad gese \ gese \\
1PL.INCL-GEN & \quad what \quad say-COND \quad then \quad what \quad likewise \\
daha-me & \quad yabu-mbi \\
o\quad obey-IPFV.CVB \quad act-IPFV.FIN \\
gese \ gese: & \quad ‘likewise’ \quad ‘accordingly’ \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘Whatever we say, [he] will act accordingly in obedience [to us]’ (lit.: ‘What we say, that he acts accordingly in obedience’) (OJ2: 110)

(4.5 – 26)  
\[
\begin{align*}
ai \quad bi-ci, & \quad ai \quad be \quad tukiye-fi \quad ulebu-mbi \\
what \quad be-COND \quad what \quad ACC \quad hold.up-PFV.CVB \quad feed-IPFV.FIN \\
tukiye-: & \quad ‘to offer with both hands’, ‘to hold up’ \\
ulebu-: & \quad ‘to feed’, ‘to treat someone to food’ \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘Whatever [food] [he] has, [he] will offer it with both hands and treat [his guests to it]’ (lit.: ‘What there is [at his house], that [he] will offer…’) (AGA1: 141)

(4.5 – 27)  
\[
\begin{align*}
absi \quad tuwa-ci, & \quad absi \quad ubiyada \\
how \quad look-COND \quad how \quad disgusting \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘No matter how [you] look [at him], [you’ll find him] so disgusting’ (OJ2: 134)

(4.5 – 28)  
\[
\begin{align*}
te \quad ci \quad aika \quad mim-be & \quad cooha-i \quad dain \quad de \\
now \quad ABL \quad if \quad 1SG(bi/min)-ACC \quad troops-GEN \quad battle \quad DAT \\
absi \quad gene-ø & \quad se-ci, \quad bi \quad absi \quad daha-mbi \\
how \quad go-IMP \quad say-COND \quad 1SG \quad how \quad obey-IPFV.FIN \\
cooha-i \quad dain: & \quad ‘battle, war’ \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘From now on no matter how [you] order me to join the army, I will definitely obey [your order]’ (lit.: ‘...in what manner you tell me to go to battles, I’ll obey in that manner’) (AGA4: 41)
The co-occurrence of interrogative words with the conditional converb in the subordinate clause and the usual repetition of the same interrogative words in the main clause can well explain how the universal concessive conditionals relate to ordinary conditional constructions. Example (4.5 – 26) is used for illustration. First, let a sentence be constructed such that it is identical to (4.5 – 26) except that the interrogative word ai ‘what’ in both clauses of (4.5 – 26) are replaced by X, which stands for an unidentified nominal structure:

(4.5 – 32)  
X bi-ci, X be tukiyefi ulebumbi  
‘If [he] has X, [he] will offer X with both hands and treat [his guests to X]’

One can see that (4.5 – 32) qualifies as a factual conditional in terms of morphosyntax and meaning. Then let S be the set of entities \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_N\}, which, in the speaker’s mind, X can refer to. Thus, exhausting all the possible choices of X (within S), one can have a series of conditionals as (4.5 – 32), only with different lexical content for X, as shown by formula (4.5 – 33):
Then, the series of conditionals one obtains can be further represented by the following formula:

\[(4.5 - 34) \quad \forall X \in S: \text{he has } X \rightarrow \text{he offers } X \text{ with both hands and treats his guests to } X\]

This formula can be translated into natural language as ‘Whatever [food] he has, he will offer it with both hands and treat his guests to it’. Manchu has no lexical items that conveniently correspond to words such as *whatever* or *whoever*, but relies on complex structures to express similar meanings. Specifically, by directly putting the interrogative word \(ai\) ‘what’ in the positions of \(X\) in the conditional (4.5 – 32) and transforming this construction into (4.5 – 26), Manchu expresses the meaning of formula (4.5 – 34), which contains a universal quantifier. In terms of syntax, formula (4.5 – 34) embodies both the interrogative word \(ai\) ‘what’ (through the universal quantifier, the symbol \(X\) and the recurring positions of \(X\)) and the conditional relationship (through the inter-clausal connection).

It should be mentioned that the formulaic analysis above is inspired by König’s (1986) approach to scalar concessive conditionals. For instance, to analyse *Even if you drink a little, your boss will fire you*, König (1986: 244) uses a series of ordinary conditionals which differ from each other (and from the concessive conditional) in terms of scale, such as *If you drink only a drop of alcohol, your boss will fire you*, *If you drink a glass of alcohol, your boss will fire you*,…, 35 and so forth.

The constructions that do not have recurring interrogative words ([4.5 – 30] and [4.5 – 31]) need some clarification here. In (4.5 – 30), only the subordinate clause contains the interrogative word, but functionally it is the same as sentences (4.5 – 25) – (4.5 – 29). The

\[ (4.5 - 33) \quad x_1 \ bi-ci, \ x_1 \ be \ tukiyefi \ ulebumbi; \]
\[ x_2 \ bi-ci, \ x_2 \ be \ tukiyefi \ ulebumbi; \]
\[ \ldots \]
\[ x_N \ bi-ci, \ x_N \ be \ tukiyefi \ ulebumbi. \]
structure *yaya we* (literally, ‘every who’) in the subordinate clause of (4.5 – 30) seems to perform the same function as *whoever* does in English, thus making it unnecessary to repeat the interrogative word *we* ‘who’ in the main clause. As for (4.5 – 31), where the interrogative word *ai* ‘what’ also occurs only in the subordinate clause, the phrase *sini gūnin de acabume* ‘according to your intention’ in the main clause has the same semantic content as the interrogative word in the main clause, as would a repeated interrogative word in the main clause.

In Manchu, the mechanism of expressing universal concessive meaning via interrogative words combined with the conditional converb exhibits the interrelation between the universal concessive meaning and the conditional meaning. This is all the more evident in (4.5 – 28), in which the conditional connector *aika* ‘if’ also occurs in the subordinate clause, in addition to the interrogative word *ai* ‘what’. This construction clearly combines the characteristic of a basic type of factual conditional and a universal concessive conditional.

It is worth mentioning that a number of universal concessive sentences in Manchu do not use the conditional converb in the subordinate clause, but instead use the concessive converb (*V-cibe*) or the structure *V-hA se-me*. The interrogative words also occur, but only in the subordinate clause. The following are three examples:

(4.5 – 35)  
\[a\textit{bsi} \  \textit{gisure-cibe} \ \textit{gisun} \ \textit{banjina-rakū-ngge} \ \textit{akū}\]  
how speak-CONC words produce-IPFV.PTCP.NEG-NMLZ NEG  
\textit{gisun banjina-}: ‘to [manage to] utter words’  
‘No matter how [one] speaks, there will be no [such] situation that [one] cannot utter words [fluently]’ (OJ1: 4)

(4.5 – 36)  
\[\textit{ai} \ \textit{hacin} \ i \ \textit{taci-ha} \ \textit{se-me} \ \textit{inu} \ \textit{ere}\]  
what kind GEN learn-PFV.PTCP say(AUX)-IPFV.CV say still this  
\textit{hūman} \ \textit{dabala} \ capability only  
‘No matter what kind of [method I use to] learn [Manchu], [my] capability [will] only [be like] this’ (OJ1: 24)

(4.5 – 37)  
\[\textit{yaya} \ \textit{ba-de} \ \textit{isinji-cibe}, \ \textit{derengge} \ \textit{etenggi sukdun inu}\]  
whichever place-DAT arrive-CONC honourable powerful air also  
\textit{gaihuśa-rakū} \ lose-IPFV.PTCP.NEG
‘Wherever [he] goes, [he will] not lose [his] manners as an honourable and powerful man’ (AGA1: 119)

4.6 Parallel Constructions

This section analyses several types of constructions that use the conditional converb in the subordinate clauses. They all share the same morphosyntax as the basic factual conditionals, but do not necessarily express the conditional meaning (though in a few cases they do). What the constructions to be analysed also have in common is the parallel relation between the two clauses within the whole sentence. It should be noted that since the syntactic status of the two clauses is not equal, their parallelism mostly concerns the semantic content. In the following analysis the constructions are divided into four groups according to the inter-clausal semantic relation: (i) contrastive conditionals; (ii) comparison conditionals; (iii) disjunction conditionals; and (iv) degree conditionals.

4.6.1. Contrastive Conditionals

Sentences containing the conditional converb in the subordinate clause can express contrast between the two component clauses. Here are examples:

(4.6 – 1)  
\[
\text{si adasun be } \text{ufi-ci,} \quad \text{bi uthai jurgan goci-mbi}
\]
2SG lapel ACC sew-COND 1SG then line draw-IPFV.FIN

\text{jurgan goci-}: ‘to mark the lines [on cloth]’

‘While you sew the lapel, I’ll mark the lines [of the clothes]’ (lit.: ‘If you sew the lapel, then I’ll mark the lines’) (OJ2: 52)

(4.6 – 2)  
\[
\text{ere ogo be } \text{jafa-ci,} \quad \text{tere monggon haya-mbi}
\]
this hole ACC hold-COND that/3SG collar trim-IPFV.FIN

\text{ogo}: ‘a particular hole in a helmet’

‘While this [person] holds the hole of the helmet, that [person] trims the collar [of the coat]’ (OJ2: 54)

(4.6 – 3)  
\[
\text{julergi alin de emu dobori dedu-ci,} \quad \text{amargi alin}
\]
south mountain DAT one night stay-COND north mountain

\[
de \text{emu dobori dedu-ø}
\]
DAT one night stay-IMP

‘While [you should] stay one night in the south mountain, stay one night in the
north mountain [as well]!’ (MYK5: 6)

(4.6 – 4)  
\[ \text{emu} \quad \text{jui} \quad \text{tuba-de} \quad \text{bisi-re} \quad \text{jušen} \quad \text{irgen} \quad \text{adun} \]  
one son that.place-DAT be-IPFV.PTCP serf people herd
\[ \text{ulha} \quad \text{be} \quad \text{tuwa-me} \quad \text{gene-ci} \quad \text{emu} \quad \text{jui} \quad \text{uba-de} \]  
livestock ACC look-IPFV.CVB go-COND one son this.place-DAT
\[ \text{bisi-re} \quad \text{ama} \quad \text{be} \quad \text{tuwa-me} \quad \text{bi-kini} \]  
be-IPFV.PTCP father ACC look-IPFV.CVB be-OPT

‘Let one son take care of the serfs, people, herd and livestock, which are staying in that place, and let the other son take care of the father, who is staying in this place’ (MYK6: 23)

(4.6 – 5)  
\[ \text{erin} \quad \text{ forgon} \quad \text{oyonggo} \quad \text{se-ci}, \quad \text{fašša-ra-ngge} \]  
time season important say-COND exert.effort-IPFV.PTCP-NMLZ
\[ \text{inu} \quad \text{oyonggo} \]  
also important
\[ \text{erin forgon}: \text{‘the right moment’, ‘opportunity’} \]

‘If [one] says opportunities are important, [one should likewise say that] exerting effort is also important’ (MFG: 25)

(4.6 – 6)  
\[ \text{ji-he} \quad \text{cooha} \quad \text{geren} \quad \text{se-ci}, \quad \text{muse-i} \quad \text{cooha} \]  
come-PFV.PTCP troops many say-COND 1PL.INCL-GEN troops
\[ \text{inu} \quad \text{geren} \]  
also many

‘If [you] say the troops that have come are many, [I would likewise say that] our troops are also many’ (MYK2: 41)

The contrast of clauses describes two states of affairs, which are realised by either different agents ([4.6 – 1], [4.6 – 2] and [4.6 – 4]) or the same agent ([4.6 – 3]). It may imply that the two states of affairs involved are taking place or are expected to take place simultaneously, as shown in (4.6 – 1), (4.6 – 2) and (4.6 – 4). For instance in (4.6 – 1), one’s sewing the lapel is simultaneous with the other’s marking the lines. In (4.6 – 4), one son’s taking care of the serfs and the herd, and so on, is expected to take place at the same time as the other son’s taking care of their father. In (4.6 – 3) two similar — and related — states of affairs are mentioned, though they do not take place at the same time: it expresses the command by the speaker that the troops should stay in different places on different nights.

Furthermore, the contrast can exist between two views or statements, as shown in (4.6 – 5) and (4.6 – 6). In (4.6 – 5), one view is that opportunities are important and the other view
is that exerting effort is also important. An implied predicate se- ‘to say’ is omitted in the main clauses of (4.6 – 5) and (4.6 – 6), which can correspond to the same predicate in the subordinate clauses.

The function of the conditional converb in sentences (4.6 – 1) – (4.6 – 6) needs explanation here. Judging by the meaning of the sentences as a whole, the relation between the two clauses is contrast. Yet, the prototypically conditional relation does not seem to be expressed. Nevertheless, closer examination reveals that conditionality is demonstrated in domains other than the content domain: the perceptual domain, the speech-act domain or the epistemic domain. Specifically, in (4.6 – 1) – (4.6 – 3), where one can perceive (see or hear) the two states of affairs described, it is reasonable to assume that the perception of one event enables or causes the perception of the other event, since both of them take place simultaneously. Here the conditional relation is presented in the perceptual domain. In (4.6 – 3) and (4.6 – 4), which express the speakers’ commands, the issuing of one command enables or causes the issuing of the other, since in each sentence the two commands are inseparable from each other. In these two sentences, the conditional relation is present in the speech-act domain. In (4.6 – 5) and (4.6 – 6), each of which expresses two views, the acceptance of one view necessarily enables or causes the acceptance of the other view, since the two views are based on the same principle (that is, the importance of matters, and the number of troops, respectively). Thus the conditional relation is present implicitly in the epistemic domain, functioning between acts of reasoning.

### 4.6.2. Comparison Conditionals

Some sentences containing the conditional converb can express comparison between states of affairs represented in the component clauses. The states of affairs being compared are similar but differ in a certain aspect in terms of degree. Here are some examples:

\[ (4.6 – 7) \quad \text{age si sim-be banji-re de mangga} \]

\[
\begin{array}{lllll}
\text{sir} & 2SG & 2SG(si/sin)-ACC & \text{live-IPFV.PTCP} & \text{DAT} & \text{difficult} \\
\text{se-ci,} & \text{min-i} & \text{ere} & \text{beye-re} & \text{omiholo-ro} \\
\text{say-COND} & 1SG(bi/min)-GEN & \text{this freeze-IPFV.PTCP} & \text{starve-IPFV.PTCP}
\end{array}
\]
‘Sir, if you think that it is difficult for YOU to make a living, [then] who should I go to tell about MY bitter suffering from cold and hunger?’ (MFG: 31)

(4.6 – 8)
si sim-be ali-me mute-rakū se-ci,
i sin-ci geli ali-me mute-rakū kai
2SG 2SG(si/sin)-ACC take-IPFV.CVBe.able-IPFV.PTCP.NEG say-COND
3SG 2SG(si/sin)-ABL still take-IPFV.CVBe.able-IPFV.PTCP.NEG PTL
‘If you say you cannot take [the responsibility], [then you should know that] he, even more [so] than you, cannot take [the responsibility, either]’ (MFG: 25)

(4.6 – 9)
si ere se-de uthai uttu oibo-ko
2SG this age-DAT already so become.decrepit-PFV.PTCP
o-ci, se baru o-ho manggi adarame
become(AUX)-COND age toward become-PFV.PTCP after how
house family ACC hold-IPFV.CVBe.able-IPFV.PTCP.NEG PTL
boo boigon be jafa-me baita be ichiya-ci
V-Ci: complex structure expressing possibility/permission
‘If you are already so decrepit at this age, how could you manage your household and handle matters after you get [really] old?’ (MFG: 59)

(4.6 – 10)
ere gese fijire-me goi-ha be, si
this like scrape.along.ground-IPFV.CVBe.able-IPFV.PTCP.NMLZ 2SG
aika dabu-ci, tere ca-fi jorin
if take.into.account-COND that/3SG miss-IPFV.CVBe.able-IPFV.PTCP.NMLZ 2SG
goi-ha-ngge be, aika colgoroko mangga
hit.mark-PFV.PTCP.NMLZ hit.mark-PFV.PTCP.NMLZ 2SG
se-me kundule-ci aca-mbi-o
say(AUX)-IPFVCVBe.able-IPFV.PTCP.NMLZ respect-COND suit(AUX)-IPFV.PTCP.NMLZ 2SG
fijire-me goi-: ‘(of arrows) to scrape long the ground and hit the mark’
ca-fi jorin goi-: ‘(of arrows) to hit the mark by missing [a little]’
V- Ci aca-: complex structure expressing obligation
‘If you think that scraping along the ground and hitting the mark like this can be taken into account [as satisfactory], should [you also] respect those as outstanding experts, whose arrows miss the target [by a few inches] like that?’ (AGA1: 83 – 84)

(4.6 – 11)
si untuhun beye ji-me šada-ci, wehe
2SG empty body come-IPFV.CVB feel.tired-COND stone
While you, coming [here] empty-handed, feel tired, do those people not feel tired who, carrying stone materials, are building a city? (MYK6: 42)

As shown above, in (4.6 – 7) the comparison concerns the hardship of living; in (4.6 – 8) the comparison concerns the inability to take responsibility; in (4.6 – 9) the comparison is about decrepitude; in (4.6 – 10) the comparison is about skilfulness in archery; and (4.6 – 11) concerns tiredness. Such comparison can serve to draw the addressee’s attention to the latter state of affairs ([4.6 – 9] and [4.6 – 11]), or express the speaker’s doubt about the state of affairs represented in the subordinate clause, which is usually admitted as true by the addressee in the previous context ([4.6 – 7], [4.6 – 8] and [4.6 – 10]).

The conditional relation exists between the states of affairs described by the constructions, but not always in the content domain as it appears. It is necessary to analyse the constructions separately. First, in (4.6 – 9) the speaker’s observation that the addressee is decrepit at this age serves as a condition for the speaker’s reasonable concern that in years to come the addressee may become unable to manage his household. In (4.6 – 12), the speaker’s (temporarily) accepting that the addressee is feeling tired serves as a condition for his logical reasoning that city-builders are also feeling tired, since they are labouring greatly while the addressee has not done any physical work. Similar are the cases of (4.6 – 8) and (4.6 – 11). In all these cases, the conditional relation concerns an inference from one state of affairs to another.

In (4.6 – 7) the addressee’s claim that he finds it difficult for himself to make a living is not a condition for the speaker’s telling someone about his own suffering. Rather, according to the speaker, the addressee’s claim would automatically justify the speaker’s claim that he is suffering more in his life (thus, telling someone else or not is not the point). Since it is not the speaker but the addressee of this sentence who first brought up the topic of difficulty of life,

---

36 In its context, the addressee of (4.6 – 7) has complained about hardships in his life; the speaker of (4.6 – 8) implies in the context that the addressee has previously admitted that he (addressee) cannot take responsibility; and the speaker of (4.6 – 10) implies that the addressee has expressed his (addressee’s) opinion of good archery.
the addressee, who actually suffers less than the speaker, is not justified to claim that life is difficult for him. In (4.6 – 10), the addressee’s view that the archery of someone whose arrows scrape along the ground and hit the mark is considered as satisfactory would automatically justify the view that those archers whose arrows miss the mark by only a few inches, which obviously outperform the former, should be respected as experts. Since in fact common sense dictates that the archery of the latter level cannot be considered as outstanding, it naturally follows that it is absurd to consider the archery of the former level as satisfactory. Here the reasoning method of *reductio ad absurdum* is used.

However, although in (4.6 – 10) the conditional relation concerns the epistemic activity of inference, it is located in the content domain, not the epistemic domain. The reason is that each clause of this sentence explicitly describes an event of evaluation (*dabu-* ‘to take into account’ in the subordinate clause; *kundule-* ‘to respect’ in the main clause), and one event can logically lead to the other.

Declerck and Reed (2001: 331), in explaining English sentences similar to the comparison conditionals analysed here, argue that such sentences “create a transition from one (genuine) topic to another by finding or forcing, some feature common to old and new information”. This explanation undoubtedly sheds some light on the function of such sentences. However, this statement fails in a sense to capture how the function is realised. In fact, from the analysis of the sentences above one can see that the conditional relation necessarily exists between the two states of affairs described in a sentence. This relation is distinctive in that it concerns the epistemic activity of inference from one point of view to another. The first point of view in the sentence may be temporarily accepted as true by the speaker, but can usually be refuted by the consequent reasoning of *reductio ad absurdum*.37 It should be noted that while such a conditional relation can be present in the epistemic domain, it can also remain in the content domain in cases in which the construction itself consists of two events of evaluation ([4.6 – 10]).

---

37 However, in (4.6 – 9) and (4.6 – 11), which aim to draw the addressee’s attention to the second part of the constructions, the presumptions made in the first part of the constructions are retained.
4.6.3. Disjunction Conditionals

Some conditionals can be used as disjunctive constructions, approximately corresponding to *either...or* in English. Here are some examples:

(4.6 – 12) balai fyiente-me gisun eye-bu-rakū unreasonably spread.rumours-IPFV.CVQ words flow-CAUS-IPFV.PTCP.NEG
ο-ći, uthai niyalma de gebu ara-mbHi become(AUX)-COND then people DAT name make-IPFV.FIN
fyiente-me gisun eyebu-: ‘to spread rumours’, lit.: ‘spreading rumours, make [them] flow’
gebu ara-: ‘to call [someone] names’
’[He] either spreads rumours or calls people all kinds of names’ (lit.: ‘If [he] does not spread rumours, [he] will then call people names’) (AGA4: 75)

(4.6 – 13) ere be bai-rakū unreasonably request-IPFV.PTCP.NEG become(AUX)-COND that/3SG DAT
nanda-mbHi demand-IPFV.FIN
‘[He] either requests this [man] or demands that [man] [to satisfy his wish]’ (lit.: ‘If [he] doesn’t request this [man], [he] will demand that [man]’) (OJ1: 94)

(4.6 – 14) ere be nungne-rakū offensively annoy-IPFV.PTCP.NEG become(AUX)-COND that/3SG DAT
neci-mbHi offend-IPFV.FIN
‘[He] either annoys this [man] or offends that [man]’ (lit.: ‘If [he] doesn’t annoy this [man], [he] will offend that [man]’) (AGA3: 42 – 43)

(4.6 – 15) ere be sure-bu-rakū yell-CAUS-IPFV.PTCP.NEG become(AUX)-COND that/3SG then
habsanji-mbHi come.to.accuse-IPFV.FIN
‘Either [he] makes this [man] yell, or that [man] will come to accuse [him of causing troubles]’ (lit.: ‘If [he] does not make this [man] yell, that [man] will come to accuse [him of causing troubles]’) (AGA4: 78)

(4.6 – 16) niyalma goro bodo-rakū people far plan-IPFV.PTCP.NEG be(AUX)-COND definitely
hanci jobolon bi near trouble EXS.PTL
goro bodo-: ‘to plan about the future’, lit.: ‘to plan far [into the future]’
hanci jobolon: ‘current troubles’, lit.: ‘troubles nearby’
‘People either plan for the future or are concerned about current troubles’ (lit.:
‘If people don’t plan for the future, [they] definitely have troubles at present’)  
(OJ2: 106)

According to my corpus, one common characteristic of the disjunctive conditionals (4.6 – 12) – (4.6 – 16) is that the subordinate predicates take the negative form, consisting of the negative imperfective participle V-rakū and the conditional converb o-ci, while the main predicates take the affirmative form, either the imperfective finite form V-mbi or the existential particle bi.

The disjunctive conditionals describe two complementary states of affairs in the two clauses which nonetheless share the same topic and even the same subject.\(^{38}\) For instance, (4.6 – 12) – (4.6 – 15) describe how a particular man behaves in an annoying manner, and (4.6 – 13) – (4.6 – 15) mention two victims of his mischief (ere ‘this [man]’, tere ‘that [man]’). It should be noted that the states of affairs described are used only to exemplify the speaker’s view concerning the current topic, while the states of affairs themselves are usually generic in nature rather than specific. Therefore the demonstratives such as ere ‘this [man]’ and tere ‘that [man]’ in (4.6 – 12), (4.6 – 13) and (4.6 – 15) do not necessarily refer to specific individuals in the speaker’s mind, nor do the states of affairs refer to exactly what the speaker has witnessed: the fact known to the speaker may be much more complicated. It is possible that in (4.6 – 12) – (4.6 – 15) the speakers use the two events as examples because they are typical of what this particular person does, and thus general information is delivered by the speaker to the addressee about the person’s behaviour. In the case of (4.6 – 16), it seems that planning for the future and worrying about the present are regarded as two typical aspects of the topic involved — what people think of their lives.

Despite the implicit information suggested by these sentences (that is, there is in fact much more to be said of the topic than what is represented in the constructions), it is important to concentrate on their explicit content in order to interpret the use of conditionals in juxtaposing two states of affairs concerning the same topic. The two states of affairs in a construction present a situation with two “choices”, so that if one does not hold, the other

---

\(^{38}\) In (4.6 – 12) – (4.6 – 14), the subordinate clause and main clause share the same subject, which is implicit in all cases. In (4.6 – 15), the main clause has a different subject from that of the subordinate clause, but both clauses share the same topic — this particular man’s mischief.
automatically does. This involves syllogism: the major premise is that one of the two states of affairs (and probably only one state of affairs) holds, the minor premise is that one of the states of affairs does not hold, and the conclusion is that the other state of affairs necessarily holds. Between the two states of affairs per se there may not be a conditional relation; rather, the conditional relation demonstrates itself in the mental leap required for inferring the affirmation of one state of affairs from the negation of the other state of affairs. Therefore, the conditional relation is presented in the epistemic domain.

From the analysis of the three types of conditionals, one can see a common pattern as to how the conditional relation — the prototypical meaning of the conditional converb — is realised: it concerns the act of perception or reasoning. Therefore, the conditional relation is usually — though not in every case — present in the perceptual domain or the epistemic domain.

### 4.6.4. Degree Conditionals

A small number of conditional sentences employ the adverb *ele* ‘more’ together with the conditional converb in the subordinate clause, while the adverb *ele* (or in the form *elei*, which is not distinguishable in meaning from *ele*) is repeated in the main clause. Such constructions express the same meaning as the English comparative construction *the more...*, *the more...*. Here are some examples:

(4.6 – 17) \[ele\] juhe muke omi-ci, \[ele\] kangka-ambi
more ice water drink-COND more be.thirsty-IPFV.FIN
‘The more iced water [I] drink, the thirstier [I] become’ (OJ2: 152)

(4.6 – 18) si \[ele\] tafula-ci, \[ele\] cilcin mada-ambi
2SG more advise-COND more lump swell-IPFV.FIN
*cilcin mada-*: ‘to be angry’, lit.: ‘a lump swells’
‘The more you [try to] appease [his anger], the angrier [he] becomes’
(AGA4: 29)

(4.6 – 19) gidaša-ra hūsun elei amba o-ci,
oppress-IPFV.PTCP force more big become-COND
isele-re hūsun elei amba o-ambi
resist-IPFV.PTCP force more big become-IPFV.FIN
‘The greater the oppression [becomes], the stronger the resistance [will become]’ (IMN: 334)

On the surface the comparative meaning in the examples is not conditional. Sweetser (1996: 324–325), however, correlates the English construction “the Xer…, the Xer…” (“Xer” stands for the comparative of adjectives) to conditional constructions, arguing that they share a semantic structure. For instance, *The colder it gets, the happier we’ll be* entails a conditional relation: *If it gets colder, we’ll be happier*. Moreover, the degree of change of the two states of affairs seems to be proportionate to each other. The Manchu examples can also be analysed in a similar way. It can be inferred from the sentences that the states of affairs of the subordinate clause causes or enable the states of affairs of the main clause: in (4.6 – 17), the drinking of more iced water causes the stronger feeling of thirst, while in (4.6 – 19), greater oppression causes stronger resistance. In this sense, sentences (4.6 – 17) – (4.6 – 19) behave in much the same way as factual conditionals in Manchu, except for the presence of the adverb of degree *ele ‘more’* in both clauses. Furthermore, the causal relation between the two states of affairs can sometimes seem counter-intuitive: in (4.6 – 17) it is expected that drinking iced water would quench thirst, which is contrary to what is expressed by the sentence in question. Nevertheless, this unusual causal relation is exactly what the speaker intends to express in the context.

### 4.7 Evaluative Conditionals

In some sentences that share the basic morphosyntactic patterns of conditionals, the subject of the main clause, usually implicit, refers to the state of affairs represented by the subordinate clause. The main predicate can be regarded as an evaluation of the state of affairs represented by the subordinate clause. Semantically, these sentences consist of an overall single subject–predicate structure.

Just like ordinary conditionals, the predicates of the subordinate clauses can be either simple or complex. The following are some examples in which the subordinate clauses have simple predicates, which consist of the conditional converb of lexical verbs:
(4.7 – 1) *jurgan giyan be gai-me yabu-ci, beye-i*
righteous principle ACC take-IPV.CVB act-COND self-GEN
*teisu*
responsibility
'It is [one’s] own responsibility to act in accordance with righteous principles’
(lit.: ‘If [one] acts in accordance with righteous principles, [it is one’s] own responsibility’) (AGA1: 117)

(4.7 – 2) *yaya ulin jaka-i mangga suilacun be sa-ci,*
any wealth thing-GEN difficult hardship ACC know-COND
*oyonggo*
important
*mangga suilacun:* ‘difficulty and hardship’
'It is important [for one] to know the difficulty of [obtaining] any wealth’
(lit.: ‘If [one] knows the difficulty of [obtaining] any wealth, [it is] important’) (AGA2: 8)

(4.7 – 3) *tuba-de seberide-me te-ci, icangga*
that.place-DAT rest.in.a.shade-IPFV.CVB sit-COND comfortable
'It is comfortable [for us] to sit there resting in the shade’ (lit.: ‘If [we] sit there, resting in the shade, [it’ ll be] comfortable’) (MFG: 45)

(4.7 – 4) *emu tukiyesi simne me dosi-ci, udu*
one provincial.graduate take.exams-IPFV.CVB enter-COND how.much
*sali-mbi*
bе.worth-IPFV.FIN
*simne me dosi-:* ‘to take the examination and be admitted’
'How much does it cost [one] to take an exam to become a provincial graduate?’
(lit.: ‘If [one] takes an exam to become a provincial graduate, how much does [it] cost [one]?’) (AGA3: 77)

There are some cases in which the subordinate clause consists of two juxtaposed converbs. The following example (4.7 – 5), which is also shown in the analysis of alternative concessive conditionals in Section 4.5.2.2 (numbered as example [4.5 – 20]), consists of two independent sentences of the same type ([4.7 – 5a] and [4.7 – 5b]). In both sentences, the subordinate clause consists of two coordinate (subordinate) clauses, each represented by a conditional converb (with its own implicit subject).

(4.7 – 5a) *tuci-ci dosi-ci gemu waka;*
go.out-COND come.in-COND all inappropriate
While the subordinate clauses in (4.7 – 1) – (4.7 – 5) have simple predicates, complex predicates can also be used, consisting of the conditional converb of an auxiliary verb and a certain form of a lexical verb determined by the auxiliary verb. The following are some examples. In the subordinate clause of (4.7 – 6) the predicate contains the conditional converb of the auxiliary o-, o-ci, forming a complex structure with the imperfective participle of a lexical verb V-rA ([4.7 – 6]). In the second sentence of (4.7 – 7b), the predicate of the subordinate clause contains o-ci, which in turn forms a complex structure with the negative imperfective participle, V-rakū. In the first sentence of (4.7 – 7a), the predicate of the subordinate clause contains the conditional converb of the auxiliary verb se-, se-ci, which forms a complex structure, V-ki se-ci, while in (4.7 – 8) and (4.7 – 9) the predicates of the subordinate clauses are formed using the auxiliary bi- with converbs of lexical verbs.

while the subordinate clauses in (4.7 – 1) – (4.7 – 5) have simple predicates, complex predicates can also be used, consisting of the conditional converb of an auxiliary verb and a certain form of a lexical verb determined by the auxiliary verb. The following are some examples. In the subordinate clause of (4.7 – 6) the predicate contains the conditional converb of the auxiliary o-, o-ci, forming a complex structure with the imperfective participle of a lexical verb V-rA ([4.7 – 6]). In the second sentence of (4.7 – 7b), the predicate of the subordinate clause contains o-ci, which in turn forms a complex structure with the negative imperfective participle, V-rakū. In the first sentence of (4.7 – 7a), the predicate of the subordinate clause contains the conditional converb of the auxiliary verb se-, se-ci, which forms a complex structure, V-ki se-ci, while in (4.7 – 8) and (4.7 – 9) the predicates of the subordinate clauses are formed using the auxiliary bi- with converbs of lexical verbs.

(4.7 – 6)  
\[sain \ ningge \ be \ alhūda-me \ yabu-re, \ ehe-ngge\]  
good NMLZ ACC imitate-IPFV.CVB act-IPFV.PTCP bad-NMLZ  
be targacun obu-re o-ci, beye gūnin  
ACC taboo make-IPFV.PTCP become(AUX)-COND body mind  
de ambula tusangga  
DAT greatly beneficial  
\[targacun obu-: \text{‘to beware of (something bad)’}, \text{lit.: ‘to make a taboo’}\]  
‘It is greatly beneficial to [one’s] body and mind to act in imitation of what is good and to beware of what is bad’ (lit.: ‘If [one] acts in imitation of what is good and bewares of what is bad, [it is] greatly beneficial to [one’s] body and mind’) (OJ1: 79)

(4.7 – 7a)  
\[bi \ gene-ki \ se-ci, \ inu \ min-i \ ciha;\]  
1SG go-OPT say(AUX)-COND also 1SG(bi/min)-GEN desire  
(4.7 – 7b)  
\[gene-rakū \ o-ci, \ inu \ min-i \ ciha\]  
go-IPFV.PTCP.NEG be(AUX)-COND also 1SG(bi/min)-GEN desire  
\[V-ki se-: \text{complex structure expressing desire or intention}\]  
‘If I want to go [it is up to] my desire; if I do not go, [it is] also [up to my] desire’ (MFG: 5)
only mutually heart DAT put-IPFV.CVB be(AUX)-COND

damu ishunde mujilen de tebu-me bi-ci.

‘Only if/when [people] put each other in [their] hearts [can it be] the way of [being true] friends’ (MFG: 7)

(4.7 – 9)

boo-de noro-hoi bi-ci, absi ališacuka

‘How boring it is to stay at home [all the time]!’ (lit: ‘If [one] stays at home [all the time], how boring [it will be]!’) (OJ2: 88)

(4.7 – 10)

daruhai age-i tacibu-re be donji-ci, tere yala

‘If [I] can often hear your counsel, that will really be a favour for me’ (MFG: 26)

In a few cases, the main clause can have an explicit subject expressed by a demonstrative, tere ‘that’, which does not have a designatum in the outside world but refers to the state of affairs represented by the subordinate clause. The following is an example:

As stated at the beginning of this section, the main predicate of (4.7 – 1) – (4.7 – 10) serves to express an evaluation of the state of affairs represented by subordinate clause: the main predicate states something about the state of affairs (of the subordinate clause). It will be shown later that the same function of expressing evaluations is also realised in some examples that share the same morphosyntax as counterfactual conditionals (see [4.7 – 11] – [4.7 – 13]).

As shown in Section 4.1, ordinary conditionals typically have two subject–predicate structures (in terms of semantics), one in each clause. The semantic structure of a conditional can be represented by the formula “{Subj1 + Pred1} ↔ {Subj2 + Pred2}”. Both “Subj1” and “Subj2” refer to entities in the outside world. However, when the main subject (“Subj2”) refers to the state of affairs represented by the subordinate clause (“{Subj1 + Pred1}”), the whole sentence semantically has a single subject–predicate structure. In particular, when the
main subject does not have an explicit phonetic form, the formula becomes “Subj2{Subj1 + Pred1} ↔ Pred2”, with only one overall subject–predicate structure. In a sense, the examples of this section are reduced or degenerate conditionals. It should be noted that this analysis only concerns semantics, while in terms of morphosyntax, the examples are not distinct from the basic patterns of factual conditionals. The lack of explicit subjects in the main clauses of (4.7 – 1) – (4.7 – 9) is also frequent elsewhere in Manchu.

Apart from the constructions (4.7 – 1) – (4.7 – 9), which share the morphosyntax of factual conditionals, some sentences which are morphosyntactically identical with counterfactual conditionals can also be considered to be evaluative conditionals. The states of affairs in question are counterfactual. The following are some examples:

(4.7 – 11)  
\[ \text{han} \text{ ahūn-de} \text{ emu hebe o-fi,} \text{ muse de} \]
\[ khan \text{ elder.brother-DAT one plan become-PFV.CVB IPL.INCL DAT} \]
\[ kimungge Daiming gurun be daila-ki se-me \]
\[ hostile Daiming empire ACC make.war say(AUX)-IPFV.CVB \]
\[ unggi-he bi-ci, \text{ sain bi-he kai} \]
\[ send-PFV.PTCP be(AUX)-COND good be-PFV.PTCP PTL \]
\[ \text{emu hebe o-}: \text{ ‘to collaborate’, ‘to be on the same side’, lit.: ‘to be of one plan’} \]
\[ ‘\text{It would have been good if [you] had collaborated with my elder brother the khan, and had sent [a message] saying that [you would like to] wage war against the Daiming Empire, which is hostile to us [both]’ (MYK6: 26–27) \]

(4.7 – 12)  
\[ \text{ine mene gama-ha bi-ci,} \text{ sain bi-he} \]
\[ willingly take-PFV.PTCP be(AUX)-COND good be-PFV.PTCP \]
\[ \text{ine mene}: \text{ ‘willingly’, ‘as one wishes’} \]
\[ ‘\text{If [you] had taken that away as you wished, it would have been good’} \]
\[ \text{(OJ2: 150)} \]

(4.7 – 13)  
\[ \text{bi aika edun i cashūn bi-he bi-ci,} \]
\[ 1SG if wind GEN backward be-PFV.PTCP be(AUX)-COND \]
\[ hono yebe bi-he \]
\[ still good be-PFV.PTCP \]
\[ \text{edun i cashūn}: \text{ ‘with the back toward the wind’} \]
\[ ‘\text{If I had been [walking] with my back toward the wind, [it] would have been good’} \]
\[ \text{(OJ2: 10)} \]

In (4.7 – 11) – (4.7 – 13), the subordinate clauses contain the complex structure V-hA bi-ci, where V stands for a lexical verb (including the verb bi- ‘to exist/be’, in the form bi-he,
in the subordinate clause of [4.7 – 13]). The main predicates invariably consist of a nominal (sain ‘good’) and the perfective participle of the verb bi- ‘to exist/be’ i.e., bi-he. The function of expressing evaluation is transparent.

Like the factual examples (4.7 – 1) – (4.7 – 10), the counterfactual evaluative conditionals also consist of an overall single subject–predicate structure in terms of semantics (but not morphosyntax). Thus, sentences (4.7 – 11) – (4.7 – 12) can be regarded as (semantically) reduced or degenerate counterfactual conditionals.

4.8 Conditionals and Topic Constructions

Numerous studies have addressed the important questions of how to define subject and topic, and how to distinguish the two concepts from each other in languages of different grammatical systems (Li and Thompson 1976; Chafe 1976; etc.). In his well-known paper, Keenan (1976) proposes a detailed method that can be applied to nouns or nominal structures in order to determine whether or not they are subjects. In Altaic languages (Turkic, Mongolic and Tungusic languages), which are not topic-prominent, nominals used to encode the subject can denote an agent, an experiencer, or some other semantic role, while at the same time functioning as the topic. When semantic and pragmatic structures do not coincide, Altaic languages normally use certain markers to indicate the topic. In this respect, Manchu (and probably Classical Mongolian as well) occupies a special status among Altaic languages, since it has developed — in addition to simple topic markers — a series of special syntactic structures to mark the topic (Gorelova 2004: 61; Gorelova and Orlovskaja 2010). This section analyses some sentences in Manchu that formally appear to be factual conditionals but are actually topic constructions. In such a sentence a conditional converb (V-ci) and a preceding component form a left-dislocated structure that functions as the topic. The conditional converb can be that of the copular verb o- ‘to become/be’, the quotative verb se- ‘to say’, or of any lexical verb. The following analysis is arranged in accordance with the choice of conditional converb.

The first type of topic construction makes use of the conditional converb of the verb o- ‘to

39 It should be noted that in contrast to Altaic languages, the Altaic-like (or quasi-Altaic) languages, Korean and Japanese, are subject- and topic-prominent (Li and Thompson 1976: 460), and possess distinct markers for both subject and topic.
become/be’, o-ci, which is placed after a nominal ([4.8 – 1] – [4.8 – 5]), or after a nominalised structure ([4.8 – 6]). The topicalised nominal structures can consist of only a single noun ([4.8 – 1], [4.8 – 4] and [4.8 – 5]) or of a noun modified by a clause ([4.8 – 2] and [4.8 – 3]). Here are some examples:

(4.8 – 1)  booha  o-ci,  amtan  suwaliyata,  guwejihe
delicacies  TOP (< become-COND)  taste  miscellaneous stomach
kokira-bu-mbi
harm-PASS-IPFV.FIN
‘Speaking of delicacies, [their] tastes are miscellaneous, [and because of this] one’s stomach will be harmed’ (AGA2: 111)

(4.8 – 2)  Manju  bithe  hüla-ra  niyalma  o-ci,
Manchu  book  read-IPFV.PTCP  people  TOP (< become-COND)
urunakū  hergen  tome  gemu  getukele-me  sa-ci
definitely  word  every  all  make.clear-IPFV.CVB  know-COND
aca-mbi
suit(AUX)-IPFV.FIN
V-ci aca-: complex structure expressing obligation
‘Concerning the people who read Manchu books, [they] should make clear [the meaning of] each and every word [of the books]’ (MFG: 3)

(4.8 – 3)  im-be  sa-rkū  urs e  o-ci,
3SG(i/in)-ACC  know-IPFV.PTCP.NEG  people  TOP (< become-COND)
tere  be  durun  ara-mbi  se-mbi
that/3SG  ACC  form  make-IPFV.FIN  say-IPFV.FIN
sa-rkū < sa-ra [know-IPFV.PTCP]’ + akū [NEG]
durun ara-: ‘to be pretentious’, ‘to put on airs’
‘As for those people who do not know him [well], [they] will say that he is pretentious’ (lit.: ‘…say him to be pretentious’) (MFG: 56)

(4.8 – 4)  tubihe  o-ci,  ure-re  hanci-kan  banji-me
fruit  TOP (< become-COND)  ripen-IPFV.PTCP  rather.near  grow-IPFV.CVB
gai-fi  teni  sain
take-IPFV.CVB  only.then  good
ure-re hancikan: ‘when nearly ripe’, lit.: ‘rather near ripening’
‘As for fruits, [it is] good to take [and eat them] only when [the fruits] grow until they are nearly ripe’ (AGA2: 119)

(4.8 – 5a)  dulga  o-ci,  jī-he  elcin  be  wa-ki
half  TOP (< become-COND)  come-IPFV.PTCP  messenger  ACC  kill-OPT
se-mbi;
say-IPFV.FIN

(4.8 – 5b) dulga o-ci, oforo šan be faita-fi
half TOP (< become-COND) nose ear ACC cut-PFV.CVB
unggi-ki se-mbi
send-OPT say-IPFV.FIN
‘As for half [of them], [they] say, “[let’s] kill the messenger”; As for [the other]
half [of them], they say, “[let’s] cut off [the messenger’s] nose and ears and send
[him back]!”’ (MYK6: 19)

(4.8 – 6) tere taci-re de bulcakā-ngge o-ci,
that/3SG learn-IPFV.PTCP DAT lazy-NMLZ TOP (< become-COND)
damu sefu-i šorgi-re be tuwa-mbi
only teacher-GEN urge-IPFV.PTCP ACC look-IPFV.FIN
‘As for those lazy at learning, [they] only depend on the teacher’s urging [them]’
(lit: ‘...only look to the teacher’s urging [them]’) (AGA1: 62)

In all the sentences above except (4.8 – 1), the subject is omitted, which is common in
Manchu. The nominal or nominalised structures marked by the conditional converb o-ci,
which serve as the topics, refer to the same entities as the (omitted) subjects ([4.8 – 2], [4.8 –
3], [4.8 – 5] and [4.8 – 6]) as well as the object (of the verb gai- ‘to get’ in [4.8 – 4]) of the
ensuing clauses. For instance, in (4.8 – 2), the topicalised nominal structure manju bithe
hūla-ra niyalma ‘people reading Manchu books’ refers to exactly the same entity as does the
omitted subject of the following clause. In (4.8 – 4) the nominal tubihe ‘fruits’ has two roles.
First, it is logically the omitted subject of the verb structure ure-re hancikan banji-me
‘growing till almost ripe’; second, it is also the omitted object of the verb gai-(fi) ‘taking’,
which has its implicit subject, ‘people (in general)’.

In (4.8 – 1), where no subject or object is omitted in the clauses following the conditional
converb o-ci, the nominal booha ‘dishes’ is a topic proper, bearing relevance to the following
clauses without logically being the subject or object of either of them: the subject of the first
clause amtan ‘taste’ is relevant to booha ‘delicacies’, and the second clause guwejihe
kokirabumbi ‘the stomach will be harmed’ is causally linked to the first clause and therefore
also relevant to booha.

It should also be noted that (4.8 – 5) consists of two sentences ([4.8 – 5a] and [4.8 – 5b]),
each of them an independent topic construction. They are juxtaposed for contrast.
The second type of construction uses the conditional converb of the quotative verb *se- ‘to say’, se-ci*. It can follow a nominal or pronominal structure ([4.8 – 7] – [4.8 – 9]) in the same way as the conditional converb *o-ci*, while it can also take a complement clause whose predicate has a finite verb form ([4.8 – 10]). The following are some examples:

(4.8 – 7)  
inenggi se-ci, moo-i abdaha ci hono fulu kai  
day TOP (< say-COND) tree-GEN leaf ABL still many PTL  
‘Speaking of [our] days [in the future], [they are] indeed more numerous than the leaves of a tree’ (MFG: 21)

(4.8 – 8)  
nure se-ci, horon-i okto Geli waka,  
wine TOP (< say-COND) poison-GEN drug even NEG  
oktolo-me wa-ra de gele-mbi semeo  
poison-IPFV.CVB kill-IPFV.PTCP DAT fear-IPFV.FIN PTL  
horon i okto: ‘poisonous drug’  
oktolo-me wa-: ‘to poison to death’  
‘Speaking of wine, [it is] not even poison; [do you] fear [that it will] poison [you] to death?’ (MFG: 47)

(4.8 – 9a)  
bi se-ci, Manju gurun;  
1SG TOP (< say-COND) Manchu people

(4.8 – 9b)  
suve se-ci, Hūlun gurun  
2PL TOP (< say-COND) Hulun people  
‘As for me, [I am of] the Manchu people; as for you, [you are of] the Hulun people’ (MYK2: 26)

(4.8 – 10a)  
buda je-mbi se-ci, bi yargiyan i sin-de  
meal eat-IPFV.FIN TOP (< say-COND) 1SG really 2SG(si/sin)-DAT  
isi-rakū;  
reach-IPFV.PTCP.NEG

(4.8 – 10b)  
nure omi-ki se-ci, si min-ci cingkai  
wine drink-OPT TOP (< say-COND) 2SG 1SG(bi/min)-ABL completely  
eberi weak  
‘Speaking of eating, I really am no match for you (lit.: ‘I cannot reach your level’); [but] speaking of drinking, you are absolutely too weak [a match] for me (lit: ‘If we say “let’s drink”, you are much worse than I am’’) (MFG: 52)

In (4.8 – 7), the nominal *inenggi* ‘day(s)’, highlighted by the converb *se-ci*, is referentially the real subject of the following clause. Similarly in (4.8 – 8) the nominal *nure* ‘wine’ is the real subject of the first clause/predicative structure (i.e. ‘not being poison’), and
the subject of the embedded verb structure *oktolo-me wa-ra* ‘killing by poisoning’ of the second clause. Example (4.8 – 9) consists of two topic constructions, just as (4.8 – 5), functioning as contrastive topics. However, it differs from (4.8 – 5) in that the topic marker is *se-ci* instead of *o-ci*, and that the topicalised components are pronouns (*bi* ‘I’, and *suwe* ‘you (pl.)’).

Example (4.8 – 10) also consists of two topic sentences, which together show a contrast. However, the topicalised information in each construction is a state of affairs, represented by a finite verb structure instead of a nominal one (which represents only a state, rather than an action). Specifically, in the first clause, the state of affairs represented by *buda je-mbi* ‘eat [meals]’ is topicalised, while in the second clause, it is the state of affairs represented by *nure omi-ki* ‘drink wine’. In each of the clauses, the subject and the predicate are related to the topicalised state of affairs. For instance, in the first clause, the speaker’s considering himself not as good as the addressee is relevant to the topic of eating meals. Thus the conditional converb *se-ci* in (4.8 – 10) serves to set the background for the information of the ensuing clause. This function lies exactly at the core of conditionality in that the realisation of one state of affairs can be understood as the background for the realisation of the other state of affairs. Nevertheless, conditionality mostly denotes a causal relation, which is lacking in topicality.

It should be noted that the nominalised participles of the quotative verb *se-* ‘to say’, just like its conditional converb, can also serve as a topic marker. The following are two examples where the form *se-re-ngge* serves as a topic marker, which takes as its complement a nominal structure ([4.8 – 11]) or a finite verb form ([4.8 – 12]). Functionally, they are identical to (4.8 – 7) – (4.8 – 10).

(4.8 – 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tere</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>se-re-ngge,</th>
<th>muse-i</th>
<th>fe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>that</td>
<td>young.man</td>
<td>TOP (&lt; say-IPFV:PTCP-NMLZ)</td>
<td>IPL.INCL-GEN</td>
<td>old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adaki</td>
<td>kai</td>
<td>neighbour</td>
<td>PTL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Speaking of that man, [he is actually] our old neighbour’ (OJ1: 29)

(4.8 – 12)

| gabta-mbi | se-re-ngge, | muse-i |
| shoot.arrow-IPFV:FIN | TOP (< say-IPFV:PTCP-NMLZ) | IPL.INCL-GEN |
Manju-sa-i oyonggo baita
Manchu-PL-GEN important matter
‘Speaking of archery (lit.: ‘saying that [one] shoots arrows’), [it is] an important matter for us Manchus’ (OJ1: 39)

Returning to the conditional converb o-ci, it seems that apart from nominals and nominalised structures, case structures (that is, nominal or pronominals governed by postposed case markers) can also be topicalised, especially the dative-locative (governed by de) and the accusative (governed by be) structures. Here are some examples:

(4.8 – 13a) alban de o-ci, emu julehen i yabu-mbi;
duty DAT TOP (< become-COND) whole-heartedly act-IPFV.FIN
(4.8 – 13b) boo de o-ci, emu suihen i banji-mbi
home DAT TOP (< become-COND) clear-mindedly live-IPFV.FIN
emu julehen/suihen i: both meaning basically the same, ‘with [one’s] whole heart/a clear mind’
‘When [he is] on duty, [he] acts whole-heartedly; when [he is] at home, [he] lives a life with a clear mind’ (OJ1: 50)

(4.8 – 14) te min-de o-ci, min-i jalin de
now 1SG(bi/min)-DAT TOP (< become-COND) 1SG(bi/min)-GEN sake DAT
gūwa be geli gabta-rakūbi-o
other ACC also shoot-IPFV.NEG.FIN-Q
‘Now as for me, would I not shoot [arrows] at other people for my [own] sake?’
(MYK2: 2)

(4.8 – 15) ler ler sere bithe-i niyalma be
amiable say(AUX)-IPFV.PTCP book-GEN people ACC
o-ci, durun tuwakū obu-me alhūda-ra
TOP (< become-COND) model example make-IPFV.CVB imitate-IPFV.PTCP
V-rA giyan: structure expressing obligation/necessity
‘As for the amiable literati, [people] should make them [good] examples [for others] to follow’ (UH: 31)

(4.8 – 16) hoo hoo sere cooha-i niyalma be
brave say(AUX)-IPFV.PTCP army-GEN people ACC
o-ci, kalka hecen obu-me nikendu-re giyan
TOP (< become-COND) shield city.wall make-IPFV.CVB depend-IPFV.PTCP reason
hoo hoo sere: ‘brave’
cooha-i niyalma: ‘warrior(s)’, lit.: ‘man/people) of the army’
kalka hecen: ‘shield and wall’

‘As for brave warriors, [people] should make them the shield and wall [on which] to depend [to protect the city]’ (UH: 32)

(4.8 – 17) aika cen-i gese asihata be o-ci,
if 3PL(ce/cen)-GEN like younger ACC TOP (< become-COND)
min-i yasa-i hošo-de inu dabu-rakū
1SG(bi/min)-GEN eye-GEN corner-DAT even take.into.account-IPFV.PTCP.NEG kai
PTL

‘Speaking of young people like them, I wouldn’t take them seriously [at all]’ (lit.: ‘…take [them] into account [by glancing at them] from the corner of my eye’) (OJ1: 82)

The same as (4.8 – 5), (4.8 – 9) and (4.8 – 10), example (4.8 – 13) also consists of two topic constructions, each of which sets the domain of the topic for the state of affairs of the following clause. Apart from the gloss of (4.8 – 13), it seems that the verb o- in the two constructions can also be interpreted as a verb meaning ‘to become/be’, which has an implicit subject (‘he’). In this case the translation provided is literally understood as expressing a temporal relation: the time when he is working and the time when he is staying at home. Still, the temporal relation can also set the background for a state of affairs, and the temporal subordinate clause can serve as a topic.

Example (4.8 – 14) topicalises the dative-locative structure min-de ‘to me’, while the following clause reveals information concerning the speaker (‘myself’). However, in contrast with (4.8 – 13), the conditional converb o-ci in (4.8 – 14) serves as a topic marker, and min-de o-ci cannot be interpreted as a structure expressing a temporal (or conditional) relation. The reason is that no subject referring to an entity in the outside world can be properly identified for o-ci in the structure min-de o-ci. Rather, this “subject” could only be identified as one referring to a discourse or textual entity such as “the state of affairs in question” or “the current conversational topic”, in which case the structure min-de o-ci could be understood as ‘If/When the state of affairs in question is to/about me’. Then one would find that, despite its form as a temporal or conditional structure, this understanding would also lead to the same function (topicalisation) as the phrase ‘as for me’ in the English
When the conditional converb o-ci follows an accusative case structure, as in (4. 8 – 15) – (4.8 – 17), its role as a topicaliser becomes all the more salient. The reasons are that, first, the accusative case structure in question is obviously the real argument of the lexical verb in the following clause, and that without the converb o-ci it fits perfectly in the clause. Second, the conditional converb o-ci performs no other function than drawing the addresser’s attention to the accusative case structure. In this respect, (4.8 – 15) is similar to (4.8 – 14) in that there cannot be a subject referring to an outside-world entity for the converb o-ci, but perhaps only a subject which refers to a discourse or textual entity. Yet, even if one assumes that such a subject of o-ci exists, one still has to account for the presence of the accusative marker be, which indicates the existence of a verb requiring the accusative case — a verb denoting an action, or at any rate ‘what to do’ with the nominal structure governed by the accusative case. Such a verb is missing in the structure since it is present only in the following clause, for instance, obu- ‘to make’ and alhūda- ‘to imitate’ in (4.8 – 15).

The attempt to identify the abstract subject may shed some light on the cognitive process involved in the adoption of the conditional converb o-ci as a topic marker, that is, how conditionality is related to topicalisation here. Example (4.8 – 17) is particularly revealing in this respect, which makes use of the conditional connector aika ‘if’ together with the conditional converb o-ci in topicalising the accusative case structure. By itself (4.8 – 17) is not a conditional construction, but the conditional connector aika seems to represent the mental activity of supposition. It is then reasonable to analyse it in a domain of representation different from the content domain — indeed in the speech-act domain. The function of the framed structure aika ... be o-ci becomes clear: the supposition that the current conversational topic concerns what to do with the young people (therefore asihata in [4.8 – 17] in the accusative case) leads to the speech act of offering the comment that one (the speaker) does not take those young people seriously. The supposition, which is expressed via linguistic forms, naturally highlights, or topicalises, the accusative case structure. In a similar way, this analysis also applies to (4.8 – 15) and (4.8 – 16), though they do not contain the conditional connector aika.

Following this line of thought, the mechanism involved in the previously analysed topic
constructions (4.8 – 1) – (4.8 – 10), which contain the conditional converbs o-ci or se-ci but no dative-locative or accusative case structures, can also be explained. First, in the case of topic constructions containing the converb o-ci, an abstract, discourse subject denoting the current conversational topic can be reasonably identified, just as in the analysis of (4.8 – 14). For instance, in (4.8 – 1), booha o-ci can be interpreted in a verbose way as ‘if the current conversational topic concerns dishes’, while the following clause can be interpreted as the speaker’s speech act: ‘I offer the following comment that…’. Thus the conditional relation is established in the speech-act domain, but not in the content domain of the construction.

Second, in the case of topic constructions containing the converb se-ci, it suffices to consider the original meaning (‘to say’) and the common function of the quotative verb se-, in which case a subject (referring to a human being) can be identified for it. For instance, in (4.8 – 7), mure se-ci can be interpreted as ‘if I/we speak of wine’, and the following clause, just as in (4.8 – 1), can be considered as a performance of a speech act: ‘I offer the following comment that…’.

Some of the dative-locative case structures topicalised by o-ci have become fixed or nearly fixed expressions in Manchu, serving as text connectors. Their function is comparable to the English expressions for one thing..., for another... or on the one hand..., on the other.... The following are two examples:

(4.8 – 18)  
emu-de o-ci,  
min-de  
ungga  
jalan-i

one-DAT TOP (< become-COND) 1SG(bi/min)-DAT senior generation-GEN

niyalma bi,  
era  
age  
be  
sabu-re  
unde;

jai-de

top people  
EXS.PTL this young.man ACC see-IPFV.PTCP not.yet second-DAT

o-ci,  
ji-he  
taitai-sa,  
min-i

TOP (< become-COND) come-PFV.PTCP madame-PL 1SG(bi/min)-GEN

mentuhun sarganjiu  
be  
inu  
majige  
tuwa-ki

foolish daughter ACC also a.little look-OPT

min-i mentuhun sarganjiu: a humble way of referring to one’s own daughter, lit.: ‘my foolish daughter’

‘For one thing, there are people of the elder generation [in my family], [who] haven’t met this young man yet; for another thing, Mesdames, [you] who have come [to my house], please take a look at my daughter as well’ (OJ2: 70)

(4.8 – 19)  
suwe  
emu  
ergi-de  
o-ci,  
menggun  
be

2PL  one  side-DAT TOP (< become-COND) money ACC
Apart from the conditional converb of the auxiliary verbs, topic constructions can also employ the conditional converbs of ordinary lexical verbs, as in the following examples. Except for (4.8 – 23), each of them consists of two parallel, semantically related topic sentences:

(4.8 – 20a) \( \text{kangna-ci, eihen ja; } \)
ride-COND donkey easy

(4.8 – 20b) \( \text{bungna-ci, aha ja } \)
bully-COND slave easy

‘A donkey is easy to ride on; a slave is easy to bully’ (lit.: ‘As for riding, a donkey is easy; as for bullying, a slave is easy’) (Proverb) (OJ2: 38)

(4.8 – 21a) \( \text{vabu-ci, durun; } \)
walk-COND model

(4.8 – 21b) \( \text{ašša-ci, kemun } \)
moved-COND standard

‘When [he] walks, [he can be seen as] a model; when [he] moves, [he can be regarded as] the standard’ (OJ1: 50)

(4.8 – 22a) \( \text{je-ci, jete-re-ngge akū; } \)
eat-COND eat-IPFV.PTCP-NMLZ NEG

(4.8 – 22b) \( \text{etu-ci, etu-re-ngge akū } \)
wear-COND wear-IPFV.PTCP-NMLZ NEG

‘As for eating, there is nothing to eat; as for clothing, there is nothing to wear’ (OJ1: 64)
In all the four examples above, the lexical verb in the form of a conditional converb serves to set the domain of topic for the state of affairs in the following clause, but does not display any real conditional or temporal relation. For instance, in (4.8 – 20), the conditional converb kangna-ci [ride-COND] sets the domain of the topic for the statement eihen [donkey] ja [easy]. Furthermore, there is a semantic relation between the converb and the nominal eihen [donkey], the latter being the former’s patient (thematically). Similarly in (4.8 – 21), the person being described, though only implicitly referred to, is the one who performs the act denoted by the conditional converb yabu-ci [walk-COND]. The two sentences in example (4.8 – 22) first set the domain of the topic with the conditional converb of a lexical verb (je-ci in [4.8 – 22a], etu-ci in [4.8 – 22b]) and then repeats the same lexical verb in the nominalised structures (jete-re-ngge in [4.8 – 22a] and etu-re-ngge in [4.8 – 22b]), which in turn serves as the subject of the clause. Finally, in (4.8 – 23), the conditional converb jobo-ci [toil-COND] determines the topic concerning who has toiled, and the following clause is a comment on the toil of a relevant person. Similarly (4.8 – 17), the topic structure of (4.8 – 23) has the conditional connector aika ‘if’, which can be regarded as an indicator of the mental activity of supposition involved.

With all the examples analysed, the following is a general remark on previous studies concerning the relation between conditionals and topic constructions. Haiman (1978) argues that conditionals are actually topics, since conditionals share the characteristic of topics, that is, the givenness of information. This view of identifying conditionals with topics has been criticised by other scholars. Sweetser (1990) points out that a conditional usually has a hypothetical nature and therefore its protasis is not presupposed to be true. In this sense, the protasis of a conditional is not given information. As Sweetser (1990: 126) argues, the protasis “is given only relative to the apodosis”. Moreover, according to Sweetser, the protasis serves as a sufficient condition for the fulfilment of the apodosis. Similarly, Gorelova (2006) points out that the causal relation exists within conditionals but not in topic constructions. Gorelova also stresses a difference between conditionals and topics: topic is a
pragmatic relation, and conditional is semantic. Thus, conditionals are conceptually distinct from topics.

Nonetheless, conditionals and topics are somehow interrelated. Traugott (1985) notes that diachronically topic markers are among the forms in which conditional markers may originate. On the other hand, Gorelova (2006) explores the use of existential verbs\(^ {40} \) and verbs of speech as topic markers in Altaic languages (including Manchu), in particular the cases where these verbs occur as conditional converbs. Gorelova (2006) states that existential verb structures introduce indefinite nominals, through which the nominals become \textit{given} in context and can serve as topics. However, Gorelova (2006) does not elaborate further on the mechanism involved in topicalisation concerning how the givenness of conditionality leads to the givenness of topicality. This is where the present study makes its contribution. The analysis of this section adopts the cognitive perspective in explaining how the core meanings of the verbs \textit{o}- and \textit{se}- cooperate with the conditional converb in topicalising other structures: operating in the speech-act domain, the converb \textit{o-ci/se-ci} connects the supposition about the current conversational topic and the speech-act of offering a relevant topic through conditionality.

\section*{4.9 Constructions Containing Perception Verbs or Cognition Verbs}

In a number of conditional-like constructions in Manchu, the verbs in the subordinate clauses that occur as the conditional converb are those denoting acts of perception, or of obtaining or processing information. On the other hand, the main clauses specify the content of perception, the information obtained, or the result of the processed information. As a whole, these constructions function to indicate the source of information — evidentiality, an important concept that has been extensively studied cross-linguistically (Chafe and Nichols 1986; De Haan 1999, 2001, 2006; Palmer 2001; Aikhenvald 2003, 2004; etc.), or the mental activities involved in processing information.

In terms of the interclausal relation within these constructions, it seems that conditionality does not exist directly between the two states of affairs involved. In some cases,

\[^{40}\text{Gorelova (2006: 149) terms the verbs } bi\text{- ‘to exist/be’ and } o\text{- ‘to become/be’ both as “existential verbs”.}\]
the conditional relation can be found in a domain other than the content domain. In other cases, the temporal relation can be established. Constructions of the last type can be regarded as a special subtype of temporal construction.

### 4.9.1 Evidential Strategies in Manchu

In Manchu, evidentiality does not constitute a grammatical category as such, but is expressed through lexical and syntactic means. Specifically, it is expressed by structures formed using perception verbs such as *tuwa-* ‘to look’,\(^{41}\) *donji-* ‘to listen/hear’ and *amtala-* ‘to taste’, when their subjects designate the speaker of the sentence. Relevant to my study are cases in which the perception verbs occur as the conditional converb (V-\(\text{ci}\)) in the subordinate clause. The following are some examples in which the verb *tuwa-* ‘to look’ is used:

\[(4.9 – 1)\]
\[
\text{min-i} \quad \text{beye} \quad \text{nimeku} \quad \text{arbun} \quad \text{be} \quad \text{tuwa-ci} \quad \text{ujen}
\]
\[1SG(\text{bi/min})-\text{GEN} \quad \text{self} \quad \text{illness} \quad \text{situation} \quad \text{ACC} \quad \text{look-COND} \quad \text{serious}
\]
‘The situation of my illness appears to be serious’ (lit.: ‘Looking at the situation of [my] illness myself, [I find it] serious’) (NSB: 7)

\[(4.9 – 2)\]
\[
\text{sim-be} \quad \text{tuwa-ci,} \quad \text{arki} \quad \text{nure} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{haji}
\]
\[2SG(\text{si/sin})-\text{ACC} \quad \text{look-COND} \quad \text{liquor} \quad \text{wine} \quad \text{DAT} \quad \text{dear}
\]
‘You seem to be fond of liquor and wine’ (lit.: ‘Looking at you, [I find that you are] fond of liquor and wine’) (OJ2: 184)

\[(4.9 – 3)\]
\[
\text{im-be} \quad \text{tuwa-ci,} \quad \text{gebsere-fi} \quad \text{giranggi} \quad \text{teile}
\]
\[3SG(\text{i/in})-\text{ACC} \quad \text{look-COND} \quad \text{emaciate-PFV.CVB} \quad \text{bone} \quad \text{only}
\]
\[
\text{funcie-hebi}
\]
remain-PFV.FIN
‘Looking at him, [one could see/I saw that he] was emaciated, [and] only bones remained [of him]’ (OJ2: 132)

\[(4.9 – 4)\]
\[
\text{ere-be} \quad \text{tuwa-ci,} \quad \text{jalan} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{baita} \quad \text{teksin} \quad \text{akü} \quad \text{mujangga}
\]
\[\text{this-ACC} \quad \text{look-COND} \quad \text{world} \quad \text{GEN} \quad \text{affairs} \quad \text{equal} \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{true}
\]
‘Looking at this, [one can see that] the affairs of the world are really not the same [as each other]’ (OJ2: 74)

\[(4.9 – 5)\]
\[
\text{te} \quad \text{bi} \quad \text{tuwa-ci,} \quad \text{suwen-i} \quad \text{ere} \quad \text{cooha} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{afa-ha}
\]
\[\text{now} \quad \text{1SG} \quad \text{look-COND} \quad \text{2PL(suwe/suwen)-GEN} \quad \text{this} \quad \text{troops} \quad \text{DAT} \quad \text{fight-PFV.PTCP}
\]

\(^{41}\) As already pointed out in Section 4.3.2.4, the verb *tuwa-* ‘to look’ is considered as a perception verb in a rather general sense. It seems that the verb denoting visual perception, *sabu-* ‘to see’, does not occur in the form of the conditional converb in the same syntactic position as the conditional converb of *tuwa-*.
se-me tusa akū, urunakū buce-mbi
say(AUX)-IPFV.CVB benefit NEG certainly die-IPFV.FIN

V-hA se-me: the concessive structure meaning ‘even if someone does something’

‘Now it appears to me (lit.: ‘as I look’) that even if [my troops] fight against your troops, there will be no benefit [for me], — [I] will certainly die’
(MYK7: 11)

In (4.9 – 1) – (4.9 – 4), the perception verb *tuwa-* ‘to look’ takes a direct object — nominal ([4.9 – 1]) or pronominal ([4.9 – 2] – [4.9 – 4]) in the accusative case — which represents the perceived entity, while the main clause of each construction expresses the speaker’s (referentially also the perceiver’s) evaluation of this perceived entity ([4.9 – 1] – [4.9 – 3]) or the speaker’s inference or conclusion ([4.9 – 4] and [4.9 – 5]). In (4.9 – 5) the verb *tuwa-* ‘to look’ does not have an explicit direct object, but the existence of the perceived entity can be inferred from the context, that is the *status quo* of the warfare. While the perception verb *tuwa-* ‘to look’ would be expected to indicate that the information is obtained via *visual* perception, it usually represents visual perception in a metaphorical way.

Specifically, visual perception is literally represented in (4.9 – 1) – (4.9 – 3), whereas in (4.9 – 4) and (4.9 – 5), the verb *tuwa-* ‘to look’ actually refers to the mental activity of knowing, which is metaphorically the visual perception of one’s mind’s eye.

In some cases the perception verb *tuwa-* ‘to look’ takes a complement clause, instead of a simple nominal or pronominal as its object, as shown by (4.9 – 6) and (4.9 – 7):

(4.9 – 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gcu-se</th>
<th>gemu</th>
<th>sim-be</th>
<th>leole-he</th>
<th>be</th>
<th>tuwa-ci,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>friend-PL</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>2SG(si/sin)-ACC discuss-PFV.PTCP ACC</td>
<td>look-COND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

sin-de inu majige bi-fi dere
2SG(si/sin)-DAT also a. a.little be-PFV.CVB PTL

‘Looking at [the fact] that all your friends have been talking about you, [I suppose that] probably there is something [true in what they say] about you’

(OJ2: 6)

(4.9 – 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>in-i</th>
<th>tere</th>
<th>baita-be</th>
<th>getukele-me</th>
<th>yargiyala-rakū,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3SG(i/in)-GEN that affair-ACC clarify-IPFV.CVB verify-IPFV.PTCP.NEG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>kalu mulu</th>
<th>tuttu</th>
<th>yabu-re</th>
<th>be</th>
<th>tuwa-ci,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>careless</td>
<td>that.way</td>
<td>behave-IPFV.PTCP ACC</td>
<td>look-COND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| aimaka | emu | pulu pala | muwa | niyalma-i | gese |
|看似 |  |  |  |  |  |
| seemingly one | disorderly | imprudent | person-GEN | like |

*kalu mulu: ‘careless’*
pulu pala: ‘disorderly’
aimaka...i gese: a simulative structure meaning ‘seemingly like...’

‘Looking at [the fact] that he does not clarify or verify that matter, [and] behaves carelessly that way, [I think that he looks] like an unorganised, imprudent person’ (AGA4: 92)

The perception verb donji- ‘to listen/hear’ occurs as the conditional converb donji-ci to indicate that the information is gained via hearsay, as shown by (4.9 – 8) – (4.9 – 11) below. Particularly, in (4.9 – 8), (4.9 – 9) and (4.9 – 11), the quotative verb se- ‘to say’ is also used in combination with donji-, a usage described in Qing Dynasty grammars (e.g., UH: 68).
Moreover, (4.9 – 10) specifies the source of information as niyalmai ala-ra ‘people’s saying’. Also, the time of the hearsay is not restricted to the time of utterance (the present), and past time reference is also permissible: (4.9 – 11) specifies the time of hearsay as sikse ‘yesterday’.

(4.9 – 8)

\[
\text{donji-ci, si te Manju bithe taci-mbi se-mbi}
\]
\[
\text{hear-COND 2SG now Manchu book learn-IPFV.FIN say-IPFV.FIN}
\]
‘[I] hear [people] say that you read Manchu books’ (OJ1: 17)

(4.9 – 9)

\[
te \text{donji-ci, mujakū hūwaša-fi hafan o-ho se-re}
\]
\[
\text{now hear-COND truly grow.up-PFV.CVB official become-PFV.PTCP say-IPFV.PTCP}
\]
‘Now [I] hear [people] say that [he] has truly grown up and become an official’ (OJ1: 29)

(4.9 – 10)

\[
niyalma-i ala-ra be donji-ci, tere niyalma, fuhali enduri adali banji-habi
\]
\[
\text{people-GEN tell-IPFV.PTCP ACC hear-COND that man really god like grow-PFV.FIN}
\]
‘[I] hear people say that that man is grown [in such way that he looks] like a god’ (OJ2: 28)

(4.9 – 11)

\[
sikse donji-ci, muse-i hebeše-he songkoi
\]
\[
\text{yabu-bu-ha se-mbi handle-PASS.PFV.PTCP say-IPFV.FIN}
\]
‘Yesterday [I] heard that [the matter] was handled according to [the result of] our discussion’ (AGA3: 6)
The sense of taste as the source of information is indicated by the perception verb *amtala*- ‘to taste’ in (4.9 – 12):

(4.9 – 12)  
bi  
amtala-ci  
majige  
nitan  
1SG taste-COND  
a.little  
insipid  
‘To me, the dish tastes a little insipid’ (lit.: ‘As I taste [the dish], [I feel that its taste is] a little insipid’) (LQD: 52)

There are also sentences which indicate that the information is obtained via investigation: the following examples (4.9 – 13) and (4.9 – 14) contain the conditional converb of *baica-ci* ‘to investigate’. This type of sentence was used frequently in memorials submitted by ministers to the Manchu emperors, and became a fixed style.

(4.9 – 13)  
baica-ci,  
hūda-i  
urse  
udu  
bele  
be  
uda-fi  
investigate-COND  
business-GEN  
people  
although  
grain  
ACC  
buy-PFV.CVB  
asara-cibe  
bele  
kemuni  
hecn  
de  
bi-mbi  
store-CONC.CVB  
grain  
still  
city  
DAT  
be-IPFV.FIN  
\[\text{hūda-i } \text{urse: ‘business people’, ‘merchants’}\]  
‘(Upon review we find that) even though merchants buy and accumulate grain, still there is grain in the city’ \(^{42}\) (Li 2010: 193)

(4.9 – 14)  
baica-ci,  
Kašigar  
karun  
te-re  
Mergen  
er  
investigate-COND  
Kashgar  
GEN  
sentry  
sit-IPFV.PTCP  
PN  
this  
aniya  
nadan  
biya-de  
isiBu-me  
ilan  
aniya  
jalu-kabi  
year  
seven  
month-DAT  
reach-IPFV.CVB  
three  
year  
fulfil-PFV.FIN  
\[\text{aniya } \text{nadan } \text{biya-de } \text{isiBu-me } \text{ilan } \text{aniya } \text{jalu-kabi}\]  
‘(Upon review we find that) Mergen, who is stationed at the sentry post of Kashgar, has completed his three-year term in the seventh month of the year’ (Li 2010: 193)

Unlike the verbs *tuwa*- ‘to look’, *donji*- ‘to listen/hear’, and *amtala*- ‘to taste’, the verb *baica*- ‘to investigate’ does not indicate perception as such, but represents the intentional act of obtaining information. On the other hand, however, it serves, as do the perception verbs, to indicate the source of information (that is, investigation, or ‘review’, as shown in the translations of [4.9 – 13] and [4.9 – 14]). Additionally, in terms of morphosyntax, the examples (4.9 – 13) and (4.9 – 14) are similar to (4.9 – 1) – (4.9 – 12) in that the subordinate

\(^{42}\) The translations of (4.9 – 13) and (4.9 – 14) are quoted from Li (2010: 193).
clauses end in the conditional converb. Therefore, sentences like (4.9 – 13) and (4.9 – 14) can also be considered as instances of evidentiality.

In Section 4.3, which discusses the temporal meaning expressed by conditional-converb structures, the cases of perception verbs are also examined (Section 4.3.2.4). However, those sentences do not necessarily exhibit evidential meanings. When the subject of the perception verb does not designate the speaker of the sentence, the perception verb does not by any means represent the speaker’s source of information. For instance, though in (4.9 – 15) and (4.9 – 16) below, the verbs tuwa- ‘to look’ and donji- ‘to listen’ are used respectively, the speaker of (4.9 – 15) describes the visual perception of the lady in question, while the speaker of (4.9 – 16) describes what Nishan Saman (‘she’) heard. Neither sentence indicates the speaker’s source of information:

(4.9 – 15)  fujin gene-fi tuwa-ci, uyun ursu sele-i hoton
lady go-PFV.CVB look-COND nine layer iron-GEN city
bi
EXS.PTL
‘When the lady went and looked, [she found that] there was a nine-layered iron city’ (SG: 324)

(4.9 – 16) donji-ci, dolo hutu songgo-ro jilgan ambula bi
listen-COND inside ghost cry-IPFV.PTCP sound many EXS.PTL
‘As [she] listened, [she heard] there were many crying sounds of the ghosts’ (NSB: 75)

On the other hand, when the perceiver and the speaker are one and the same entity, the sentence is able to express an evidential meaning. The following are some examples, among which (4.9 – 20) and (4.9 – 21) were also discussed in Section 4.3.2.4 (sentences [4.3 – 18] and [4.3 – 19], respectively).

(4.9 – 17)  sangga deri dosi tuwa-ci, ere tede darabu-mbi,
hole ABL inward look-COND this that.DAT invite.to.drink-IPFV
tere ede bederebu-mbi
that/3SG this.DAT return-IPFV.FIN
‘When [I] looked inside through the hole [of the window], [I saw that] they were inviting each other to drink’ (lit.: ‘this [man] was inviting that [man] to drink, and that [man] was returning [a toast]’) (OJ1: 77)
(4.9 – 18) \( \text{šehun bigan de isina-fi tuwa-ci, niengniyeri} \)
barren wilderness DAT arrive-PFV.CVB look-COND spring
\( \text{arbun absi buyecuke} \)
appearance how lovely
‘When [I] arrived at the wilderness and had a look, [I saw] what a lovely spring [it was]!’ (OJ2: 90)

(4.9 – 19) \( \text{sek seme gete-fi donji-ci, cin i boo-de} \)
suddenly wake-PFV.CVB listen-COND main GEN house-DAT
\( \text{niyalma ji-fi den jilgan i gisun gisure-mbi} \)
man come-PFV.CVB loud voice GEN word speak-IPFV.FIN
\( \text{sek seme: ‘suddenly’} \)
\( \text{cin i boo: ‘main room’, i.e. ‘living room’} \)
\( \text{den jilgan i: ‘in a loud voice’} \)
‘Waking up suddenly, [I] heard (lit.: ‘when [I] listened, [I heard]’) a man come into the living room speaking in a loud voice’ (OJ2: 156)

(4.9 – 20) \( \text{šan waliya-fi donji-ci, cib se-me heni jilgan wei} \)
ear throw-PFV.CVB listen-COND quiet little sound tiny
\( \text{akū} \)
NEG
\( \text{cib seme: ‘quietly’} \)
\( \text{wei akū: ‘none at all’} \)
‘When [I] pushed (lit.: ‘threw’) my ear [against the window] to eavesdrop, [I heard] it was very quiet and there was no sound at all’ (AGA1: 149)

(4.9 – 21) \( \text{saifila-fi amtala-ci, šuwe ede-kебi} \)
use.spoon-PFV.CVB taste-COND completely go.bad-PFV.FIN
‘When [I] tasted [the food] using a spoon, [I found that it] had gone completely bad’ (AGA1: 97–98)

It should be noted that the perception verb tuwa- ‘to look’ in (4.9 – 17) and (4.9 – 18) describes concrete acts of visual perception in its literal sense. Also, the perception verb donji- ‘to listen/hear’ in (4.9 – 19) and (4.9 – 20) describes concrete acts of auditory perception, distinct from its usage in (4.9 – 8) – (4.9 – 11), which describe hearsays, and thus can be seen as acts of auditory perception in a metaphorical sense.

In general, the perception verbs in (4.9 – 17) – (4.9 – 21) represent specific intentional acts of perception that form part of a temporal sequence with other actions: the acts of arriving and looking in (4.9 – 18), the acts of waking up and listening in (4.9 – 19), and so forth. This characteristic distinguishes them from (4.9 – 1) – (4.9 – 14), in which the acts of
perception are represented in a general way in the sense that no specific intentional act of perceiving is described. Here different types of syntactic behaviours are observed among the examples. Specifically, the uses of perception verbs in (4.9 – 17) – (4.9 – 21) are the most literal and the verb structures all take objects. In these sentences the temporal meaning is primary and the evidential meaning is secondary. On the other hand, the perception verbs in (4.9 – 8) – (4.9 – 14) are left-dislocated and take no explicit object or complement, behaving as grammatical markers. The evidential meaning in these sentences is (almost) exclusive. Between the two types are sentences such as (4.9 – 1) – (4.9 – 4), (4.9 – 6) and (4.9 – 7), in which the perception verbs take explicit objects or complements. In these sentences no temporal meaning is expressed and evidentiality is expressed exclusively.

It is demonstrated that the perception verbs *tuwa-* ‘to look’ and *donji-* ‘to listen/hear’ are both capable of encoding more than one type of evidentiality. This phenomenon is by no means unheard of in various other languages, in which the verbs denoting visual and auditory perceptions are also shown to be polysemous in indicating evidentiality (Witt 2009; Chafe and Nichols 1986; and Aikhenvald 2003, 2004). In Manchu, the syntactic behaviour of perception verbs (as shown above) and the type of evidentiality seem to be interrelated. In (4.9 – 17) – (4.9 – 21), where the two verbs represent specific acts of perception in temporal sequences with other acts, the types of evidentiality are visual (for *tuwa-* ) and auditory (for *donji-* ) respectively. In (4.9 – 1) – (4.9 – 7), the verb *tuwa-* ‘to look’ indicates visual perception in a more or less abstract way. Similarly, in (4.9 – 8) – (4.9 – 11), the verb *donji-* ‘to listen/hear’ indicates hearsay, which, as the source of information, can be regarded as an abstract form of auditory perception.

From the perspective of semantics and syntax, the relation between the structure formed by a conditional converb V-*ci* and the rest of the sentence still remains to be explained. It can be stated from the outset that there is no direct conditional or temporal relation characterised by the conditional converb, within each construction. However, in light of the analysis in Section 4.3.2.4, one is still able to elucidate what the conditional converb contributes in a construction as a whole, if a proper implied predicate (as part of a proposition) that involves an act of perception is considered in the main clause. Thus, the conditional converb relates two states of affairs, both concerning acts of perception, which can be examined in terms of
conditionality or temporality. Meanwhile, the domains in which such a relation is presented should also be identified. The following will examine each of the verbs in question including the perception verbs, as well as the verb baica- ‘to investigate’.

First, concerning the perception verb tuwa- ‘to look’, in (4.9 – 1) the speaker’s looking at the state of his own illness leads to his conclusion that he is seriously ill. In (4.9 – 18), the speaker’s intentional act of looking leads to the result of his seeing the lovely scene of spring, and his intentional act and his perception are in a temporal sequence, since they are concrete, realised states of affairs (in the past). Second, concerning the perception verb donji- ‘to listen/hear’, in (4.9 – 8) the speaker’s listening (to other people’s words) leads to his knowing or hearing (the news) that the addressee reads Manchu books. The same can be stated of constructions (4.9 – 9) – (4.9 – 11). In (4.9 – 19), the speaker’s intentional act of listening leads to his hearing someone speak loudly, and his intentional act and his perception are temporally related. The same applies to (4.9 – 20). Third, since the verb amtala- ‘to taste’ is not polysemous as are tuwa- and donji- when indicating evidentiality, it is plain to see that in both (4.9 – 12) and (4.9 – 21), the speaker’s trying the food leads to his discovering the taste. In (4.9 – 21), the states of affairs, set in the past, are temporally interrelated. Finally, concerning the verb baica- ‘to investigate’, in (4.9 – 13) the speaker’s investigation leads to his discovering the situation in the city.

In each case analysed above, the latter, caused state of affairs could be reasonably inferred and represented by an implied proposition (in the main clause), whose predicate is a perception or cognition verb (SEE, HEAR, TASTE, KNOW, CONCLUDE, and so forth). Such a verb shares the same subject with the perception verb in the form of conditional converb. This can be shown by the translations of some of the constructions. For instance, the translation of (4.9 – 17), ‘When [I] looked inside through the hole [of the window], [I saw that] they were inviting each other to drink’ has an implied proposition in which the predicate is SEE, which embeds the main clause within its scope. Bringing out these implied propositions also helps identify the domains in which the semantic relations are presented. Specifically, the constructions that have SEE, HEAR, or TASTE as the implied predicate represent the semantic

43 It seems that in (4.9 – 12) and (4.9 – 21), which involve the gustatory perception, the implied predicate TASTE cannot be added into the main clause of the English translation, due to the grammatical properties of the English verb taste. This is why
relation (that is, causation or temporal sequence, characterised by the conditional converb) in the perceptual domain. On the other hand, the constructions that have KNOW or CONCLUDE as their implied predicate represent the semantic relation in the epistemic domain.

It should be noted that the perception verbs do not necessarily determine that the predicates of the implied propositions should also be perception verbs. Therefore, the presence of perception verbs in the constructions does not mean that the semantic relation is necessarily presented in the perceptual domain. For instance, both (4.9 – 2) and (4.9 – 3) have an implied predicate, CONCLUDE (or INFER), and thus involve the epistemic domain rather than the perceptual domain, despite the presence of *tuwa*- ‘to look’.

### 4.9.2 Constructions Containing Cognition verbs

Apart from perception verbs such as *tuwa*- ‘to look’ and *donji*- ‘to listen/hear’, and verbs indicating the obtaining of information such as *baica*- ‘to investigate’, cognition verbs such as *gūni*- ‘to think’ and *bodo*- ‘to consider’ can also occur as the conditional converb and introduce a clause. Such verbs may take accusative case structures as their own objects ([4.9 – 27]), but this is not obligatory. The following are some examples:

(4.9 – 22) *gūni-ci, geli suihu-me omi-ha*

think-COND again be.rowdy drink-PFV.PTCP

*suihu-me omi-*: ‘to be drunk and be rowdy’

‘[I] think that [he] is drunk and being rowdy again’ (OJ1: 99)

(4.9 – 23) *bi gūni-ci, onco tondo mujilen ci dele akū*

1SG think-COND broad righteous mind ABL top NEG

‘I think [that] there is nothing greater than a broad and righteous mind’

(MYK4: 17)

(4.9 – 24) *bodo-ci, sin-i feliye-re ba umesi*

consider-COND 2SG(si/sin)-GEN frequent-IPFV.PTCP place very

*tongga kai* few PTL

‘I think that there are indeed very few places that you frequent’ (OJ1: 35)

---

alternative expressions are used in translation, such as ‘[I feel that its taste is] a little weak’ and ‘[I found that] it had gone completely bad’. Conceptually, however, the implied predicate TASTE can still make sense in expressing the involved perception, in the same way as the other perception verbs SEE and HEAR.
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The verb *gūni*—‘to think’—can also co-occur with a preceding perception verb, *tuwa*—‘to look’, which indicates the information based on which the inference is drawn:

(4.9 – 25) **fe be** bodo-ci, sin-i emgi yabu-ha
old ACC consider-COND 2SG(si/sin)-GEN together go-PFV.PTCP
gucu-se gemu amban o-ho
friend-PL all high.official become-PFV.PTCP
*sini emgi yabu-*: ‘to work with you’, lit.: ‘to go [to the workplace] with you’

‘Thinking of the old days, [one can see that] those friends who used to work with you have all become high officials’ (OJ1: 56)

By means of the conditional converb of cognition verbs, each of the constructions (4.9 – 22) – (4.9 – 25) functions mainly to present the speaker’s opinion explicitly — in the sense that the speaker says *I think* before his or her statement, which contrasts with an ordinary statement without such an expression.

In (4.9 – 22) – (4.9 – 25), just as in the constructions containing perception verbs previously analysed, the semantic relation characterised by the conditional converb is not presented directly within the construction. It is not difficult, however, to discover that this semantic relation is presented in the epistemic domain. For instance, in (4.9 – 1), the speaker’s thinking leads to his conclusion that his guests are hungry. The case of (4.9 – 28) is slightly more complex, since it involves a perception verb as well. Yet, the semantic relation is also in the epistemic domain: the speaker’s looking at the situation leads to his thinking, which in turn leads to his conclusion that the person he mentions has forgotten what is supposed to do.
4.9.3 Summary

The constructions analysed in this section involve verbs of perception or verbs of cognition in the form of the conditional converb, and indicate the source of information, and/or the obtaining or processing of information. All of these constructions share a uniform morphosyntax, which can be represented by the following formula (4.9 – 27):

\[(4.9 – 27) \quad (\text{Speaker-Subject} +) (\text{Object/Complement} +) \text{Perc./Cog.V-cit, Statement}\]

A few characteristics of this formula should be clarified. First, “Speaker-Subject” means that the subject of the verb V refers to the speaker of the whole sentence — that is, the subject should either be omitted or be an explicitly first person singular pronoun ‘I’ (or a first person plural pronoun ‘we’). Secondly, “Object/Complement”, which is not obligatory, represents a state of affairs that is perceived, searched or considered. Third, “Statement” refers either to what the speaker perceives or to the inference or conclusion that she or he makes.

For each construction, an implied proposition can be inferred of which the predicate embeds the main clause (“Statement”) within its scope, in order to shed light on how the semantic relation characterised by the conditional converb is presented. This is the same method applied in Section 4.3.2.4 when analysing temporal constructions with perception verbs. The type of this implied predicate — whether concerning perception or epistemic activity — determines the domain in which the semantic relation is presented: perceptual or epistemic. The implied predicate can be of a different type from V in the subordinate clause of (4.9 – 27), especially in a construction containing the verb tuwa- ‘to look’ in which the main clause is a conclusion or an inference (see [4.9 – 2], [4.9 – 4] and [4.9 – 5] for instance). In this case the implied predicate would be CONCLUDE or INFER, and the semantic relation would be presented in the epistemic domain, not the perceptual domain.

When the verb V in (4.9 – 27) does not take an object, that is, when V occurs alone as a conditional converb or together with the first person singular pronoun (bi ‘I’), the whole construction is rendered as one consisting of a matrix clause and an embedded clause, sentences such as I see/hear/think that something happens in English. The similarity is brought about by the order of V and the statement, which is mirrored in English, as well as in
many other European languages. However, such syntactic similarity is only superficial. There are two reasons. First, the conditional converb V-ci is syntactically dependent on the clause following it, while in English the preceding clause (I see/hear/think/… is syntactically (but not semantically) independent. Second, not all the Manchu verbs (of perception or cognition) previously analysed can take the clause following them as their authentic complement.

As for the second reason, one can examine whether it is possible to put this clause in front of the verb — via inserting, if necessary, the accusative marker be, or the imperfective converb of the quotative verb se-, se-me, which usually serves as a complementiser similar to that in English. Admittedly, the verbs donji- ‘to listen/hear’ and gūni- ‘to think’ can take preceding complements, which would be expected to be the default syntactic type for an SOV language such as Manchu. The following are two examples, showing the two verbs taking preceding complements respectively:

\[(4.9 – 28)\]

Yehe-i cooha be enenggi ji-mbi, cimari
Yehe-GEN army ACC today come-IPFV.FIN tomorrow
ji-mbi se-me donji-ha
come-IPFV.FIN say(AUX)-IPFV.CV hear-PFV.PTCP
‘[I] have heard [people say] that Yehe’s army will come today, or [that] they’ll come tomorrow’ (MYK2: 37)

\[(4.9 – 29)\]

era amba gurun i Daiming han be abka-i
this great empire GEN Ming khan ACC heaven-GEN
emu šajin i banji-mbi dere se-me gūni-ha
one law GEN live-IPFV.FIN PTL say(AUX) think-PFV.PTCP
bi-he
be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP
‘[I] used to think that the lord of the Great Ming Empire would certainly live in accordance with the law of heaven’ (MYK5: 43)

The complements governed by se-me in (4.9 – 28) and (4.9 – 29) represent the content of hearsay and of thinking respectively, just as in (4.9 – 8) and (4.9 – 22). Therefore they can be expected to follow the conditional converb of their respective governing verbs in constructions such as (4.9 – 27), as postposed complements. In contrast, other verbs analysed previously, such as tuwa- ‘to look’, amtala- ‘to taste’, and baica- ‘to investigate’, cannot take complement clauses in the same way as donji- and gūni-. Therefore, in constructions
containing the verbs *tuwa-* or *amtala-* which have the morphosyntax represented by (4.9 – 27), the “Statement” clauses cannot be regarded as postposed complements of these verbs.

Constructions such as *(bi) tuwa-ci/donji-ci/gūni-ci/*... are syntactically different from the English constructions *I see/hear/think that*..., and they occur quite frequently in Manchu. Their frequent usage distinguishes the verbs *tuwa-* *donji-* and *gūni-* from other verbs. In addition, they should be distinguished from the temporal constructions containing the same verbs, which primarily express temporal sequence.

Finally, it should be pointed out that the verbs of perception or cognition can also occur in structures other than the conditional converb, while realising the same functions as their conditional converb in the constructions analysed in previous subsections. These structures include *V*-hA-de *[V-PFV.PTCP.DAT]* and *V*-hA *[V-PFV.PTCP] ba-de *[place-DAT]*. The former usually expresses a temporal relation, and sometimes expresses a conditional relation (see Section 4.2.1). The following are some examples:

\[(4.9 – 30)\]
\[
\text{ere be tuwa-ha de, ubaliyambu-re be}
\]
\[
\text{this ACC look-PFV.PTCP DAT translate-IPFV.PTCP ACC}
\]
\[
\text{taci-re oonggolo, neneme Manju gisun taci-re}
\]
\[
\text{learn-IPFV.PTCP before firstly Manchu language learn-IPFV.PTCP}
\]
\[
\text{be oyonggo o-bu-re be sa-ci aca-mbi}
\]
\[
\text{ACC important make-IPFV.PTCP ACC know-COND suit(AUX)-IPFV.FIN}
\]
\[
V-rA be oyonggo obu-: ‘to make it a priority to do something’, lit.: ‘to make doing something important’
\]
\[
V-ci aca-: complex structure expressing obligation/responsibility
\]
\[
‘Looking at this, [I think that one] should know [the reason for] making it a priority to learn the Manchu language first before learning to translate’ (OJ1: 3)
\]

\[(4.9 – 31)\]
\[
\text{donji-ha ba-de, emu gucu se asihan bime, geli}
\]
\[
\text{hear-PFV.PTCP place-DAT one friend age young and also}
\]
\[
\text{beleni sefu bi, bithe de asuru kice-rakū}
\]
\[
\text{available teacher EXS.PTL book DAT very be.diligent-IPFV.PTCP.NEG}
\]
\[
‘I hear that a friend, who is young and has a teacher available, isn’t very diligent in learning (lit.: ‘in books’)’ (Stary 1983: 442)
\]

\[(4.9 – 32)\]
\[
\text{ere-be gūni-ha-de, ai hacin i baili jafa-ki}
\]
\[
\text{this-ACC think-PFV.PTCP-DAT what kind GEN kindness hold-OPT}
\]
\[
\text{se-he se-me, tumen de emgeri}
\]
\[
\text{say(AUX)-PFV.PTCP say(AUX)-IPFV.CVB ten.thousand DAT once}
\]
4.10 Other types of constructions

This section analyses two types of conditionals that do not neatly fall into the categories previously analysed: inferential conditionals and performative speech-act conditionals.

4.10.1 Inferential Conditionals

In some conditional sentences, the state of affairs of the subordinate clause does not serve as a condition for the state of affairs of the main clause, but it is possible to make an inference the state of affairs of the main clause based on that of the subordinate clause. In these sentences, the subordinate clause usually describes a concrete, particular state of affairs, while the main clause describes a more abstract one, a conclusion drawn from the former state of affairs. Here are some examples:

(4.10 – 1) manjura-rakū o-ci, uhai da sekiyen be
speak.Manchu-IPFV.PTCP.NEG become(AUX)-COND then root source ACC
onggo-ho kai
forget-PFV.PTCP PTL
da sekiyen: ‘origin’, ‘true identity’
‘If [one] does not speak Manchu, [it will mean that one] has forgotten [his] true [Manchu] identity’ (AGA1: 17)

(4.10 – 2) juwe ajige deo be gosi-rakū
 two little younger.brother ACC love-IPFV.PTCP.NEG
o-ci, han ama be onggo-ho dere
become(AUX)-COND khan father ACC forget-PFV.PTCP PTL
‘If we do not love [our] two little younger brothers, [it will mean that we] have forgotten [our] father the khan’ (MYK8: 44)
In (4.10 – 1), what the speaker means is not that the behaviour of not speaking Manchu leads to one’s having forgotten his or her Manchu identity. Rather, the speaker wants to point out that the behaviour of not speaking the language is characteristic of someone who has forgotten his or her ethnic identity. Thus, if a Manchu person does not speak his/her native language, one can infer that this person has forgotten his or her identity. Similarly in (4.10 – 2), if the speaker does not love his younger brothers, one can infer that the speaker has forgotten his father. Likewise in (4.10 – 3), if the addressee would like to taste the food offered by the speaker, the speaker will infer that the addressee does so to show his favour. Just as mentioned above, in each sentence the first state of affairs — a behaviour — is concrete, and is only a sign, or a piece of evidence of the second state of affairs, which is an abstract state of mind.

Similar conditional sentences in English, such as If Ann is wearing a wedding ring, she and Bob finally got married (Dancygier 1998: 86), have long been studied (Sweetser 1990; Dancygier 1998). Sweetser (1990: 117) labels them as “epistemic conditionals”, arguing the relation between the two clauses is one at the epistemic level, where “the knowledge causes the conclusion”. Thus, in light of previous studies, it is arguable that in conditional sentences (4.10 – 1) to (4.10 – 3), the conditional relation, which is presented between premises and conclusions, is in the epistemic domain (or, at the epistemic level).

4.10.2 Performative Speech-act Conditionals

Section 4.4 analyses speech-act conditionals in which the conditional relation holds true, but the condition itself (concerning personal feelings of the addressee) is used as a politeness strategy. In the so-called “performative speech-act conditionals” analysed here, no politeness strategy is involved, and the verbs in the main clauses are performative verbs (as
defined by Austin 1962), that is, verbs that perform the speech acts they denote when they are simply uttered (for example, the verb promise in I promise that I will do my duty, where the speaker makes a promise by uttering the verb). Additionally, in these conditionals, the state of affairs represented in the subordinate clause specifies the content of the speech act represented in the main clause. In the following examples, (4.10 – 4) expresses a speech act of oath-taking, while (4.10 – 5) expresses a speech act of making a bet.

(4.10 – 4)  
\[ \text{enenggi} \quad \text{fiyaratala} \quad \text{tanta-rakū} \quad o-ci, \quad bi \]  
today \quad very.much \quad beat-IPFV.PTCP.NEG \quad \text{become(AUX)-COND} \quad 1SG  
\[ \text{uthai} \quad \text{gashū-kini} \]  
then \quad take.oath-OPT  
\[ \text{fiyaratala} \quad \text{tanta}:- \quad \text{‘to beat someone very badly’} \]  
‘If [I] do not beat [him] very badly, let me take an oath’ (OJ2: 38)

(4.10 – 5)  
\[ \text{lahin} \quad \text{fasilan} \quad \text{tuci-rakū} \quad o-ci, \quad \text{muse} \]  
troublesome \quad discord \quad come.out-IPFV.PTCP.NEG \quad \text{become(AUX)-COND} \quad 1PL.INCL  
\[ \text{aika} \quad \text{mekte-kini} \]  
if \quad bet-OPT  
\[ \text{lahin} \quad \text{fasilan} \quad \text{‘troubles’, ‘problems’} \]  
‘If troubles don’t happen [because of him], let’s make a bet’ (AGA4: 101)

As stated above, the verb gashū- ‘to take an oath’ in (4.10 – 4) is a performative verb, as is the verb mekte- ‘to bet’ in (4.10 – 5), since the speaker makes an oath when he utters gashū-kini ‘let me take an oath!’ and the speaker plays his part in making a bet when he utters mekte-kini ‘let’s make a bet’.\(^{44}\)

The conditional relation presented in the two examples is unusual. Specifically, in (4.10 – 4) the speaker’s not beating someone badly does not lead to his taking an oath. In (4.10 – 5) the troubles’ not happening does not lead to the speaker’s making a bet with the addressee. Both cases need explanation. Since speech acts are involved, it is reasonable to examine the content of these speech acts, regardless of the conditional morphosyntax. In (4.10 – 4), what the speaker wishes to express can be paraphrased as ‘I swear that I will beat him very badly today, and if I do not beat him very badly today, may Heaven punish me for breaking my oath’. What the speaker of (4.10 – 5) wishes to say is ‘Let’s make a bet: I believe that

\(^{44}\) It does not matter much whether the addressee is willing to take part in this bet, since the most important thing about (4.10 – 5) is that the speaker shows that he will not hesitate to make this bet.
troubles will happen. If troubles do not happen as I expect, may I lose the bet and you win it’. The content of these speech acts is actually specified in the subordinate clause, although in the form of negation (‘if I don’t beat him very badly today’, ‘if troubles don’t happen’).

In light of the explanation, it can be shown that the speech acts expressed by (4.10 – 4) and (4.10 – 5) are performed, and not made conditional on the state of affairs represented in the subordinate clause. In (4.10 – 4) and (4.10 – 5), the conditional relation is in fact between the non-realisation of the speaker’s prediction (the non-realisation is expressed via a negative form in the subordinate clause) and what the speaker views as an undesirable consequence.

On the other hand, the conditional sentences themselves seem to put the conditional relation between the non-realisation of the speaker’s prediction and the speech act expressed by the main clause. Pragmatic considerations may help explain this. Usually, people do not feel the need to take an oath or make a bet when they express their opinions. However, when their statements sound unbelievable to their addressees, or when they want to show their determination to carry out something, they may need to take an oath (or make a bet) to guarantee the truth of their words. Thus, if one regards the non-realisation of the speaker’s prediction as the addressee’s potential disbelief, one can also consider the conditional relation in sentences such as (4.10 – 4) and (4.10 – 5) as present between the addressee’s disbelief (regarding the speaker’s prediction) and the speaker’s performance of the speech act of taking an oath or making a bet. In such cases, the conditional relation is present in the speech act domain.

This may appear to contradict the previous analysis, which states that the conditional relation is present between the non-realisation of the speaker’s prediction and the undesirable consequence facing the speaker. Nevertheless, the inconsistency disappears when one considers how taking an oath or making a bet serves to dispel the addressee’s disbelief regarding the speaker’s prediction. That is, when one takes an oath or makes a bet and one’s words prove to be untrue, one will be punished for breaking an oath — either by a deity or by other people — or be made to pay for losing a bet. Therefore, the addressee’s potential disbelief serves as a condition for the speaker to take an oath or to make a bet, which guarantees the truth of the speaker’s words through guaranteeing a certain undesirable consequence for the speaker if he or she is proved to be wrong.
Chapter 5  Discussion

Based on the analysis in Chapter 4, this chapter addresses two important issues of the present study: first, identifying prototypes for conditional constructions in Manchu; second, relating all the other constructions to the prototypes by investigating the shared aspects of semantics. These two issues are discussed in Section 5.1 and Section 5.2, respectively.

5.1 The Prototypes of Conditional Constructions

Some work is done in Section 4.1 in exploring the basic patterns of both factual and counterfactual conditionals, which serves as a foundation for the search for the prototypes. The conditional relation is evident between the clauses of the basic patterns of conditionals. However, from the analysis in other sections, one can see that the semantic relation within a construction cannot always be determined merely by means of morphosyntax, since the meaning of specific lexical items and the context also play important roles. Yet, this is not tantamount to denying the existence of “good” examples — the prototypes — of conditional constructions. The present section aims to define the prototypes in terms of morphosyntax and identify them in actual use of language.

It should be stated from the outset that the morphosyntactic criteria to be used are not obligatory for a construction to express the (factual or counterfactual) conditional meaning. The reason is that in order to express the conditional meaning, one can choose from a variety of means, including semantic, morphosyntactic and pragmatic strategies (Section 4.2 analyses factual conditionals that would otherwise be temporal sentences and counterfactual conditionals that would otherwise be interpreted as factual conditionals). Rather, the constructions that meet the criteria are those least dependent on context or other factors and the most likely to give rise to the conditional interpretation. The present study takes into consideration Qing Dynasty Manchu grammars and the frequency of use among the data collected. It is assumed that the grammatical structures of which the usage came to be recorded in Qing Dynasty Manchu grammars were considered by the authors to be significant
and in a sense prototypical. The use of structures in the data can either corroborate the statements of Qing Dynasty grammars or supplement them.

The discussion of prototypes is given below according to the type of conditionals: factual conditionals and counterfactual conditionals. The dichotomy is made on account of the morphosyntactic distinctiveness of the two types of constructions. As stated in Section 4.1, though Manchu also has hypothetical conditionals, they do not have a distinctive morphosyntax as factual or counterfactual conditionals do. Rather, they are morphosyntactically indistinguishable from factual conditionals, and the hypothetical meaning is inferred from the context. Therefore, prototypes cannot be found for hypothetical conditionals in terms of morphosyntax.

Before the discussion of prototypes, the conditional connectors *aika* and *aikabade* are examined. In Section 4.1 it is pointed out that in conditional sentences the connectors *aika* and *aikabade* can be regarded as semantic and functional analogues of the English conjunction *if*, and that use of either of the connectors *aika/aikabade* reinforces the conditional interpretation. Therefore, conditional constructions containing the connector *aika/aikabade* are regarded as good examples, or prototypes, of conditionals. Thus, in view of this role of the connectors *aika* and *aikabade*, it is important to explore their functions in all possible contexts. Since *aika* and *aikabade* do not always function as conditional connectors, I will use a neutral term “word form” when referring to them in the discussion in Section 5.1.1.

5.1.1 The functions of *aika* and *aikabade*

5.1.1.1 The word form *aika*

Morphologically, *aika* consists of the interrogative pronoun *ai* ‘what’ and a suffix -*kA*, which seems to indicate indefiniteness or lack of specificity (also seen in *weke* < *we* ‘who’ + *ke*; *yaka* < *ya* ‘which’ + *ka*, both referring to a person whose name cannot be recalled at the moment’). According to Gorelova (2002: 220), the word form *aika* can express “the interrogative meaning as well as the indefinite meaning of ‘any’, ‘some’”. Here are some examples:
‘If [you] go out somewhere, how [can you] know [if you can] get something (i.e. ‘If you go out somewhere, what if you can get something?’)’ (SG: 283)

‘Many people saluted [him] and kowtowed [to him] with great respect, [and] there was a large crowd of people standing [around him], [in the hope of] giving [him] something’ (SG: 301)

‘The Chakhar and Khalka (Mongols) came to wage war against us, and took everything [of ours] away’ (MYK8: 32)

The indefiniteness or non-specificity of aika is also visible in a verb derived from it — aikana- ‘to do anything/something’ (compare: the interrogative pronoun ai ‘what’ and the interrogative verb derived from it, aina- ‘to do what’), which is mostly used in sentences expressing irrealis modalities. The following two examples concern the apprehensive modality (5.1 – 4) and the (counterfactual) conditional modality (5.1 – 5) respectively:

‘Are you afraid that he would swallow you alive or do anything to you?’ (AGA3: 63)
min-i akda-ha jui aikana-ha
1SG(bi/min)-GEN trust-PFV.PTCP son do.anything-PFV.PTCP
bi-ci, sim-be faitara-me wa-mbihe
be(AUX)-COND 2SG(si/sin)-ACC slice-IPFV.CVb kill-PST.IPbV
‘If [you] had done anything to my trusted son at all, [I] would have killed
you by slicing [you into pieces]’ (MYK 6: 51)

The word form aika can have more than one interpretation. When it co-occurs with a
structure formed using the nominal postposition, gese ‘like’, the word form aika can function
independently as an indefinite determiner ([5.1 – 6]), or function as part of the collocation
aika...gese ‘it seems that (probably)’ ([5.1 – 7]):

sin-de aika jaka bai-ki se-re gese
2SG(si/sin)-DAT some thing ask-OPT say(AUX)-IPFV.PTCP like
V-ki se: complex structure expressing desire or intention
‘It seems that [he] wants to ask for something from you’ (MFG: 12)

era bai'ta be aika icahiya-me mute-rakū-i
this matter ACC probably manage-IPFV.CVb be.able-IPFV.PTCP.NEG-GEN
like
gese
‘It seems that [you] probably cannot manage this matter’ (UH: 51)

Moreover, when used in a question, aika can serve as an indefinite pronoun ([5.1 – 8]), or
render the sentence a polar question ([5.1 – 9] and [5.1 – 10], which are actually uttered as
rhetorical questions), or can even be compatible with either of these two interpretations ([5.1
– 11]; the precise meaning is inferred in the context).

sin-i beye-de ne aika hafan bi-o
2SG(si/sin)-DAT self-DAT now any official EXS.PTL-Q
‘Do you hold any official position now?’ (lit.: ‘Is there any official
[position] on you?’) (AMH: 37)

tere ntiyalma-i gisun yabun kuduri se-me
that/3SG man-GEN speech behaviour braggart say-IPFV.CVb
bi aika hendu-hekū-n
1SG whether say-PFV.PTCP.NEG-Q
‘Didn’t I say that that man’s speech and behaviour [were like those of a]
braggart?’ (OJ1: 44)
‘He may [be able to] deceive others, [but] sir, [how could] you not know [about him]?!’ (OJ1: 93)

‘Is there any matter?’ (UH: 51)

Through the sentences above, one can see that in some cases the function of the word form *aika* has transformed from an indefinite determiner or pronoun to a grammatical item expressing non-assertive meanings (possibility in [5.1 – 7]; and polar questions in [5.1 – 9] and [5.1 – 10]). Since *aika* can occur in a polar question, it is reasonable to expect that it can occur in a conditional construction as well. This is similar to the usage of the English conjunction *if*, which can be used in both conditionals and indirect speech of questions. Numerous studies have explored the correlation between interrogative markers and markers of conditionals (Jespersen 1940; Haiman 1978; Traugott 1985; Palmer 2001; Nordström 2010), and some of these studies (Palmer 2001; Nordström 2010) argue that polar questions have irrealis modality, just as conditionals do. In this sense, the Manchu word form *aika* invariably serves to express the irrealis modality in its non-pronominal or non-determiner usages.

### 5.1.1.2 The word form *aikabade*

The word form *aikabade* is a combination of *aika* (as an indefinite determiner) and the noun *ba* ‘place’, which takes the dative-locative marker *de*. Literally, *aikabade* (or written separately as *aika bade*) means ‘at a certain place’. Metaphorically, it expresses the meaning ‘in some/any way’, ‘somehow’. Here is an example:

‘Did I in any way have a grudge [against him]?' (MYK7: 41)
The word form *aikabade* can also be used in sentences expressing irrealis modality. The following are examples in which *aikabade* is used with apprehensive verb structures (*V*-rahū *[se-]*) in [5.1 – 13] and [5.1 – 14]; *V-ra ayoo* in [5.1 – 15]. See Section 3.1.3.1.4 for the apprehensive modality in Manchu), bearing some resemblance to the English conjunction *lest* (which is glossed ‘lest’ throughout the following examples for the sake of convenience, but not necessarily translated so in each sentence):

(5.1 – 13)  
*aikabade* muse-ı  ujula-ha  betse  ambasa-ı  
leste  1PL.INCL-GEN  lead-PTCP  prince.PL  minister.PL-GEN  
beye  emken  jiwe  tuhe-rahū  se-me  haira-mbi  
self  one  two  fall-APRH  say(AUX)-IPFV.CVB  cherish-IPFV.FIN  
‘[I] cherish our leading princes and ministers, fearing that one or two of our leading princes and ministers might fall [in battle]’ (MYK3: 51)

(5.1 – 14)  
sin-i  beye  amala  il-i-fi  tuwa-ơ,  
2SG(si/sin)-GEN  self  back  stand-PTCP  look-IMP  
min-i  gisun  be  jurce-me,  sin-i  beye  
1SG(bi/min)-GEN  word  ACC  disobey-IPFV.CVB  2SG(si/sin)-GEN  self  
*aikabade*  dosi-rahū  
leste  enter-APRH  
‘You stay in the rear and watch, lest you engage [yourself in the battle], disobeying my command’ (MYK5: 34)

(5.1 – 15)  
muse  afa-ci,  *aikabade*  amala  aliyacun  
1PL.INCL  fight-COND  lest  afterwards  regret  
ojo-ro  ayoo  
become-IPFV.PTCP  PTL  
‘If we fight, [I am] afraid that we might regret it afterwards’ (MYK6: 4)

Apart from its role in expressing the apprehensive modality, the function of *aikabade* as a connector in conditional constructions, as shown in Section 4.1, is also to express the irrealis modality.

To sum up, both *aika* and *aikabade*, whose basic functions are to serve as an indefinite (or interrogative) determiner or pronoun and an indefinite (interrogative) adverb, respectively, have grammaticalised in some cases, as shown above, to express (or at least contribute to the expression of) irrealis modal meanings. This process may be explained by the fact that the speaker lacks certainty both when she or he uses indefinite word forms (such as pronouns,
determiners, or adverbs) and when she or he expresses irrealis meanings.

5.1.2 Identifying the Prototypes of Conditional Constructions

In view of the functions of the word forms *aika* and *aikabade*, one can see that, from the perspective of syntax, the presence of such word forms alone in a sentence does not necessarily guarantee the conditional interpretation. However, when combined with conditional-converb structures in a subordinate clause, the conditional meaning is expressed. On the other hand, from Chapter 4 one can also see that, without the presence of the word form *aika/aikabade*, constructions containing conditional-converb structures serve to realise a variety of functions apart from expressing conditionality, even when morphosyntactically they do not differ from the basic group of factual conditionals. Here are some examples:

(5.1 – 16) expresses the temporal meaning, (5.1 – 17) expresses the concessive meaning, (5.1 – 18) constitutes a disjunctive construction, and (5.1 – 19) is a topic construction:

(5.1 – 16)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tere</th>
<th>usin-i</th>
<th>haha</th>
<th>ekše-me</th>
<th>gene-fi</th>
<th>gai-ci</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>that</td>
<td>field-GEN</td>
<td>man</td>
<td>hurry-IPFV.CVB</td>
<td>go-PFV.CVB</td>
<td>get-COND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| aisin | be | sabu-rakū |
| gold  | ACC | see-IPFV.PTCP.NEG |

*uisin i haha*: ‘peasant’, lit.: ‘man of field’
‘When the peasant went hurriedly to get [the gold], [he] did not see the gold’ (OJ2: 82)

(5.1 – 17)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>age</th>
<th>de</th>
<th>emu</th>
<th>baita</th>
<th>vandu-ci,</th>
<th>baibi</th>
<th>angga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sir</td>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>matter</td>
<td>request-COND</td>
<td>merely</td>
<td>mouth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| juwa-ra | de | manggaša-mbi |
| open-IPFV.PTCP | DAT | be.hesitant-IPFV.FIN |

*angga juwa*-:: ‘to open [one’s] mouth’ ‘to speak up’
‘Sir, [I have] something [for which] to request your favour, but [I am] just hesitant [about whether] to say [it]’ (OJ1: 85)

(5.1 – 18)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>balai</th>
<th>fiyente-me</th>
<th>gisun</th>
<th>eye-bu-rakū</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unreasonably</td>
<td>spread.rumours</td>
<td>words</td>
<td>flow-CAUS-IPFV.PTCP.NEG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| o-ci, | uthai | nivalma | de | gebu | ara-mbi |
| become(AUX)-COND | then | people | DAT | name | make-IPFV.FIN |

*fiyente-me gisun eyebu*-:: ‘to spread rumours’, lit.: ‘spreading rumours, make [them] flow’

45 Sentences (5.1 – 17) – (5.1 – 19) were also analysed in different sections of Chapter 4: sentence (5.1 – 7) was presented as (4.5 – 2); (5.1 – 18) as (4.6 – 12); and (5.1 – 19) as (4.8 – 6).
“gebu ara-: ‘to call [someone] names’

‘[He] either spreads rumours or calls people all kinds of names’ (lit.: ‘If [he] does not spread rumours, [he] will then call people names’) (AGA4: 75)

(5.1 – 19) tere tacire de bulcakū-ngge o-ci,
that learn-IPFV.PTCP DAT lazy-NMLZ TOP(< become-COND)
damu sefu-i šorgi-re be tuwa-mbi
only teacher-GEN urge-IPFV.PTCP ACC look-IPFV.FIN

‘Speaking of those lazy at learning, [they] only depend on the teacher’s urging [them]’ (lit: ‘...only look to the teacher’s urging [them]’)) (AGA1: 62)

It can then be concluded that from the perspective of morphosyntax, it is the framed structure consisting of both the connector aika/aiakabade and the conditional converb V-ci in the subordinate clause of a sentence that gives rise to the conditional interpretation. This makes a sentence containing the framed structure aika/aiakabade...V-ci a candidate for prototypical (factual) conditional constructions. However, apart from the conditional converb, the connector aika/aiakabade can also combine with dative-locative participial structures (especially V-hA-de) in expressing the conditional meaning. The participle can be that of a lexical verb ([5.1 – 21] – [5.1 – 23]), or of an auxiliary verb such as o-, which forms a complex structure with a lexical verb ([5.1 – 24]). The following are some examples:46

(5.1 – 21) aikabade muse-i alban-i niyalma gai-bu-ha
if 1PL.INCL-GEN labour-GEN people take-PASS-PFV.PTCP
deka, aina-mbi
DAT do.what-IPFV.FIN
alban i niyalma: ‘labourers’
‘What [will we] do if our labourers are taken [by the enemy]?’ (MYK5: 17)

(5.1 – 22) si aikabade daila-ha de bi sim-be
2SG if wage.war-PFV.PTCP DAT 1SG 2SG(si/sin)-ACC
tookabu-mbi
destroy-IPFV.FIN
‘If you wage war [against me], I will destroy you’ (MYK6: 25)

(5.1 – 23) yali booha be aika udu erin nurhūme
meat dish ACC if several meal successively
dubi-he de oforo-i hanci fime-ci
get.used.to-PFV.PTCP DAT nose-GEN near put-COND

46 Sentences (5.1 – 22) and (5.1 – 24) were analysed in Section 4.2, as (4.2 – 4) and (4.2 – 5), respectively
oj-o-rakū
become(AUX)-IPFV.PTCP.NEG
V-ci o-: complex structure expressing possibility or permission
‘If [one] gets used to having meat dishes for several meals in a row, [he] cannot [bear to] put [meat] near [his] nose’ (AGA2: 122)

(5.1 – 24) bi aika sin-de emu baita fonji-me
1SG if 2SG(si/sin)-DAT one thing ask-IPFV.CVB
a-ho-de, si uthai sa-rakū
become(AUX)-PFV.PTCP-DAT 2SG then know-IPFV.PTCP.NEG
se-re
say-IPFV.PTCP
sarkū < sa-rakū < sa-ra [know-IPFV.PTCP] + akū [NEG]
‘If I ask you about something, then you will say you don’t know’ (MFG: 6)

The framed structure (aika/aikabade...V-hA-de) exemplified by (5.1 – 21) – (5.1 – 24) can serve to express the conditional meaning unambiguously. It is noteworthy that the structure aika/aikabade...(V-me) o-ho-de was already recorded in Qing Dynasty grammars (UH: 50; AMH: 16–17), in parallel with the structure aika/aikabade...V-ci. Nevertheless, all else being equal, sentences containing the structure aika/aikabade...V-ci would be more appropriate as the prototypes of factual conditional constructions than sentences containing the structure aika/aikabade ...V-hA-de. There are several reasons: both structures can equally express conditionality; the conditional converb V-ci is morphologically simpler than the dative-locative participle V-hA-de; and conditional constructions making use of V-ci are predominant.

Thus the prototypes for factual conditional constructions can be defined and identified in terms of a set of morphosyntactic criteria, stated as follows. A prototypical factual conditional consists of two clauses, the first being a subordinate clause and the second a main clause. The subordinate clause contains the connector aika/aikabade, with the conditional converb V-ci of a lexical verb serving as the subordinate predicate if the clause is affirmative, or with the structure V-rakū [V-IPFV.PTCP.NEG] o-ci [become(AUX)-COND] if the clause is negative.

The main clause contains the imperfective finite form (V-mbi) of a lexical verb as the main predicate if the clause is affirmative, or the negative imperfective participle (V-rakū) of a lexical verb if the clause is negative. The presence of a subject is not obligatory in either clause, since Manchu is a pro-drop language. Table 5.1.1 shows all these patterns of
construction, which are exemplified by (5.1 – 25) – (5.1 – 28).47

Table 5.1.1 Syntactic Patterns of Prototypes of Factual Conditional Constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinate Clause (Protasis)</th>
<th>Main Clause (Apodosis)</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{aika/aikabade + (Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-ci]}</td>
<td>((Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-mbi])</td>
<td>(5.1 – 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{aika/aikabade + (Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-ci]}</td>
<td>((Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-rakū])</td>
<td>(5.1 – 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{aika/aikabade + (Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-rakū o-ci]}</td>
<td>((Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-mbi])</td>
<td>(5.1 – 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{aika/aikabade + (Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-rakū o-ci]}</td>
<td>((Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-rakū])</td>
<td>(5.1 – 28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5.1 – 25)  
aikabade  in-i  baru  emu  gūnin  mujilen-i  
if  3SG(i/in)-GEN toward one thought mind-GEN
baita  be  hebdene-ci,  damu  oilori  deleri
matter  ACC  go.to.discuss-COND  only  superficial
se-me  jabu-mbi
say(AUX)-IPFV.CVB  reply-IPFV.FIN
oilori  deleri  se-me: ‘superficially’, ‘perfunctorily’
‘If [you] go to discuss something [that is] on your mind, [he] will only reply to you perfunctorily’ (MFG: 7)

(5.1 – 26)  
muse  aika  kunggur  se-me  gene-ci,  
1PL.INCL  if  in.droves  say(AUX)-IPFV.CVB  go-COND
tere  boo-i  niyalma  urunakū  niyalma  geren
that/3SG  house-GEN  people  definitely  people  many
se-me  eime-me  dedu-bu-rakū
say-IPFV.CVB  dislike-IPFV.CVB  spend.night-CAUS-IPFV.PTCP.NEG
kunggur  se-me: ‘in droves’, ‘in large numbers’
dedu-bu: ‘to accommodate’, lit.: ‘to make [people] spend the night’
‘If we go there in droves, people of that house will definitely dislike [us] because [our] people are too many, and [they] will not accommodate [us]’ (LQD: 105)

(5.1 – 27)  
age  si  enenggi  aikabade  min-i  boo-de  
sir  2SG  today  if  1SG(bi/min)-GEN  house-DAT
dosi-rakū  o-ci,  bi  yargiyan  i
enter-IPFV.PTCP.NEG  become(AUX)-COND  1SG  really
sim-be  usha-mbi
2SG(si/sin)-ACC  be.angry-IPFV.FIN
yargiyan  i: ‘really’  <  yargiyan  ‘real’  +  i  [GEN/INS]

47 Sentences (5.1 – 25) and (5.1 – 27) were analysed in Section 4.1, as (4.1 – 17) and (4.1 – 18), respectively.
‘Sir, if you don’t come into my house today, I will be really angry with you’ (MFG: 49)

(5.1 – 28)  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{aika} & \quad \text{suntan} \quad \text{be} \quad \text{telebu-me} \quad \text{mute-rakû} \\
\text{if net.bag} & \quad \text{ACC} \quad \text{stretch.taut} \quad \text{be.able-IPFV.PTCP.NEG} \\
o-ci, & \quad \text{taka} \quad \text{sim-be} \\
\text{become(AUX)-COND} & \quad \text{temporarily 2SG(si/sin)-ACC} \\
gerge-mbu-rakû & \\
\text{rest-CAUS-IPFV.PTCP.NEG} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘If you cannot stretch taut that net bag, [I] will not let you rest for the moment’ (AGA4: 132)

In the analysis of counterfactual conditionals (Sections 4.1.2 and 4.2.2) it was shown that the presence of a structure containing the perfective participle \textit{bi-he} in either clause of a conditional construction \textit{suffices} to produce the counterfactual meaning. The rather rare exceptions to this, it seems, are those in which the structure containing \textit{bi-he} (in the main clause of a conditional-like sentence) forms a mirative construction with sentential particles, as shown in (5.1 – 29) and (5.1 – 30):\(^{48}\)

(5.1 – 29)  

\[
\begin{align*}
elhei \quad \text{waliya-me} \quad \text{tucibu-fi} \quad \text{tuwa-ci}., \quad \text{dule} \quad \text{jeren} \\
\text{slowly spit-IPFV.CVB} \quad \text{take.out-PVF.CVB} \quad \text{look-COND in.fact gazelle} \\
yali \quad i \quad \text{dorgi emu sele-i muhaliyan bi-he ni} \\
\text{meat GEN inside one iron-GEN bullet be-PVF.PTCP PTL} \\
waliya-me tucibu-: \text{ ‘to spit out’} \\
\text{dule... bihe (ni): a mirative construction} \\
\text{ ‘As [I] spat [it] out and took a look, [I realised to my surprise that] it was an} \\
\text{iron bullet in the gazelle’s meat!’ (AGA2: 114) }
\end{align*}
\]

(5.1 – 30)  

\[
\begin{align*}
dengian \quad \text{dabu-fi} \quad \text{tuwa-ci}, \quad \text{umesi yobo, dule emu} \\
\text{lamp light-PVF.CVB} \quad \text{look-COND very funny in.fact one} \\
\text{butu hâlha jortai hutu ara-me niyalma be} \\
\text{sneaky thief intentionally ghost pretend-PVF.CVB people ACC} \\
gele-bu-mbihe ni \\
\text{fear-CAUS-PST.IPVF PTL} \\
\text{ ‘As [I] lit the lamp up to take a look, [I suddenly realised to my surprise that]} \\
\text{very funnily, [it was] in fact a sneaky thief, [who was] intentionally} \\
\text{pretending to be a ghost to frighten people!’ (OJ2: 68) }
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{48}\) Sentence (5.1 – 29) was presented in Section 4.3 ([4.3 – 12]) and sentence (5.1 – 30) was presented in Section 3.2.2.3 ([3.2 – 30]).
Sentences such as (5.1 – 29) and (5.1 – 30) are distinguishable by means of morphosyntax: the sentential particles *dule* ‘in fact’ and *ni* (interrogative/mirative particle), which combine with structures containing *bi-he*, help to rule out such sentences when prototypes of counterfactual conditionals are being considered.

It seems that the conditional connector *aika/aikabade* is not obligatory in order to identify the prototypes of counterfactual conditionals, since the structures containing *bi-he* guarantee (with only a few identifiable exceptions, as stated above) the counterfactual meaning in a conditional sentence. Therefore, the morphosyntactic criteria for identifying the prototypes of counterfactual conditionals centre round structures containing *bi-he*. It should be noted that, although the presence of structures containing *bi-he* in either the subordinate or the main clause is sufficient for the counterfactual meaning, a prototype of counterfactual conditional would be expected to contain such a structure in the main clause. This is in accordance with the majority of examples of counterfactual conditionals: they either have an affirmative main clause ending in the structure V-*me bi-he*/V-*mbihe*, or a negative main clause ending in the structure V-*rakū bi-he*. In addition, it is indicated in Qing Dynasty Manchu grammars that the perfective participle *bi-he* is used in the main clause of counterfactual conditionals (UH: 30–31; AMH: 15–16). Thus the main clause of prototypical counterfactual conditionals can be defined as containing the structure V-*me bi-he*/V-*mbihe* (affirmative) or V-*rakū bi-he* (negative).

The morphosyntactic criteria for the subordinate clause of prototypical counterfactual conditionals need further discussion. First, for most examples of counterfactual conditionals, the affirmative subordinate clause contains the complex structure V-*hA* [V-PFV.PTCP] *bi-ci* [be(AUX)-COND]. Therefore it is appropriate to consider this structure as prototypical for the affirmative subordinate clause. Second, concerning the negative subordinate clause, there seems to exist more than one morphosyntactic pattern that can be considered as the prototype, since they co-exist in Manchu and none of them seems to be predominant. One such pattern is the complex structure V-*rAkū* [V-IPFV.PTCP.NEG] *bi-he* [be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP] *bi-ci* [be(AUX)-COND], which is used (together with the complex structure V-*hA bi-ci*) as

---

49 When V in the structure is an auxiliary verb, it can further build complex structures with preceding lexical verbs. For instance, the auxiliary verb *bi-* can build a structure as V-*mbihe* (V-*me bi-he*), in which V is a lexical verb. Together they form the complex structure V-*mbihe bi-ci* (< V-*me bi-he bi-ci*).
illustration for counterfactual conditionals ([5.1 – 33]). A similar pattern is one that replaces \( V-rAkū \) with \( V-hakū \) [V-PFV.PTCP.NEG] in the complex structure, thus producing \( V-hakū bi-he bi-ci \) ([5.1 – 35] below). In contrast, the participle \( bi-he \) is removed in the other pattern, which contains the complex structure \( V-hAkū bi-ci \) or \( V-rakū bi-ci \) ([5.1 – 36] and [5.1 – 37], respectively). Morphologically, the complex structure \( V-hAkū bi-ci \) (< \( V-hA akū bici \)) can be regarded as the negative counterpart of the structure \( V-hA bi-ci \), which is used in the affirmative subordinate clause; therefore, \( V-hAkū bi-ci \) may also qualify as a prototypical structure in the negative subordinate of a counterfactual conditional. Table 5.1.2 shows the morphosyntax of the prototypes (as defined above) of counterfactual conditionals, exemplified by (5.1 – 31) – (5.1 – 37). All the examples of counterfactual conditionals are also analysed in Section 4.1.2.

Table 5.1.2  Syntactic Patterns of Prototypes of Counterfactual Conditional Constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinate Clause (Protasis)</th>
<th>Main Clause (Apodosis)</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{{(Subj1 +) (aika/aikabade +) Pred1 [V-hA bi-ci]}}</td>
<td>{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-mbihe/V-me bi-he]}</td>
<td>(5.1 – 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{{(Subj1 +) (aika/aikabade +) Pred1 [V-hA bi-ci]}}</td>
<td>{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-rakū bi-he]}</td>
<td>(5.1 – 32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{{(Subj1 +) (aika/aikabade +) Pred1 [V-rakū bi-he bi-ci]}}</td>
<td>{Subj2 + Pred2 [V-mbihe/V-me bi-he]}</td>
<td>(5.1 – 33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{{(Subj1 +) (aika/aikabade +) Pred1 [V-rakū bi-he bi-ci]}}</td>
<td>{Subj2 + Pred2 [V-rakū bi-he]}</td>
<td>(5.1 – 34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{{(Subj1 +) (aika/aikabade +) Pred1 [V-hakū bi-he bi-ci]}}</td>
<td>{Subj2 + Pred2 [V-mbihe/V-me bi-he]}</td>
<td>(5.1 – 35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{{(Subj1 +) (aika/aikabade +) Pred1 [V-hAkū bi-ci]}}</td>
<td>{Subj2 + Pred2 [V-mbihe/V-me bi-he]}</td>
<td>(5.1 – 36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{{(Subj1 +) (aika/aikabade +) Pred1 [V-rakū bi-ci]}}</td>
<td>{Subj2 + Pred2 [V-rakū bi-he]}</td>
<td>(5.1 – 37)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
‘If [I] had heard [about your news], [I] would also have come to see [you]’  
(OJ1: 89)

‘If [you] had taken even a little advice from other people, [you] would not have fallen into this [trap]’  
(AGA3: 35)

‘If Nomina and Naikada had not gone to inform [him], [we] would have caught Nikan Wailan’  
(MYK1: 36)

‘If I had not reminded you from time to time, you would still have been unable to recite [it] completely’  
(ASA1: 54)

‘If [I] had not learnt it, [I] would not have been able to understand it’  
(UH: 30)

dahūme aitu-: to revive, lit.: ‘to save [one to let one live] again’
'If you had not revived my child, the root [of my family] would have been severed' (NSB: 87)

(5.1 – 37)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Part of Speech</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bi-moo-i</td>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>wood-GEN phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funghūwang</td>
<td></td>
<td>ara-rakū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bi-ci, fujin be boo leose ci tucibu-ci</td>
<td>be(AUX)-COND</td>
<td>lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ojo-rakū bi-he</td>
<td>become(AUX)-IPFV.PTCP.NEG</td>
<td>be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V-ci ojo-rakū: ‘may not do sth’ ‘cannot do sth’, the negation of the structure V-ci o-,
expressing permission or possibility

‘If I had not made the wooden phoenix, [we] could not have rescued the lady from the building’ (SG: 245–246)

With all the prototypes of factual conditionals (see Table 5.1.1) and counterfactual conditionals (see Table 5.1.2) identified in terms of morphosyntax, only a final step would still be needed to examine the relation between the subordinate clause and the main clause within each construction in order to ensure that the conditional meaning is expressed. In fact, it turns out that all of the constructions identified as prototypes above express the conditional meaning (either factual or counterfactual). In addition, each of the two clauses of any conditional describes a state of affairs, and the conditional relation is present in the content domain, involving two propositions. Therefore, these sentences in question qualify as true prototypes of conditionals.

5.2 Prototypical Conditionals and Their Relations to Other Non-conditional Constructions

As demonstrated in Chapter 4, each of the various types of constructions shares certain characteristics with the prototypical conditionals. On the one hand, the non-prototypical conditionals that use dative-locative participial structures V-hA-de (see Section 4.2.1) share with the prototypes the conditional meaning. On the other hand, all the other types of constructions contain conditional-converb structures in the first half of the sentence. However, when all the constructions are considered together, they do not necessarily have common characteristics. Rather, with the prototypes in the centre, they constitute a semantic-morphosyntactic network, which can be seen as the definition of
“conditional constructions” in the most general sense. The present section will review (and summarise) the relations between the prototypical conditionals and the non-prototypical constructions and the relations between the non-prototypical constructions.

It should be noted that the categories of constructions in Chapter 4 are not always mutually exclusive, since the constructions are not classified along one and the same axis. Rather, the categorisation aims to highlight a certain particularity in terms of semantics and function. For instance the speech-act conditionals analysed in Section 4.3 are identical with some of the basic patterns of conditionals analysed in Section 4.1, but the former are distinctive in terms of pragmatic environment. Also, some of the constructions analysed in Section 4.9 — those involving perception verbs and set in the past — can also be assigned to the category of temporal constructions in Section 4.3. In this case constructions of these two categories have an overlap, but neither subsumes the other.

Before re-examining all the constructions analysed in the previous chapter, it is useful to restate what constitutes prototypical conditionality. The present study takes the speaker of a sentence and the context into consideration. It holds that prototypical conditionality involves two states of affairs A and B, such that in the context the speaker of the sentence considers both states of affairs as unrealised and that A causes or enables B (in the sense that A is an insufficient but necessary state of affairs in a set of unnecessary but sufficient states of affairs that leads to the realisation of B; see Section 2.1.3.1). As stated in Section 2.3, the reality status of conditionality in natural language is not always absolute and its interpretation is largely dependent on context. Categories such as “factual”, “hypothetical” and “counterfactual” are conceptually distinct from each other, but they can by no means cover the whole range of reality statuses of linguistic conditionality. Still, prototypical semantics can be defined for these categories, especially for “factual” and “counterfactual” conditionals. Specifically, in a prototypically factual conditional relation, both A and B are in the non-past temporal plane, and the speaker considers them to be unrealised but realisable (and therefore B as well). In a prototypically counterfactual conditional relation, A and B can either be in the past temporal plane or in the present, and the speaker considers A and B both unrealised and unrealisable in the temporal plane concerned.

One can see that prototypical conditionality generally includes the following properties:
(i) suppositiveness; (ii) causality or enablement; and (iii) temporal sequence. The present study assumes that all constructions using conditional-converb (V-ci) structures embody at least one of these aspects, conditioned by other factors such as pragmatics and context. This assumption is held regardless of the meanings expressed by the constructions, which may not appear to be related to any of these properties. This leads to another assumption of the present study, that is, the aspects of meaning in question can be presented in any of several domains: the content domain, the speech-act domain, the epistemic domain and the perceptual domain.

The following summary of the constructions examines the properties in which the meaning conveyed by each category of construction is related to prototypical conditionality, and the domain in which the conditional converb V-ci functions.

### 5.2.1 Temporal and Conditional Relations

It is known from the analysis in Section 4.2 (on non-prototypical conditionals) and in Section 4.3 (on temporal constructions) that conditional-converb structures and dative-locative participial structures have a functional overlap — both of them can express either the temporal meaning or the conditional meaning. However, they differ in their mechanism when they express the same meaning. To start with, their basic functions are different. As pointed out by Qing Dynasty grammars of Manchu, the basic function of the conditional-converb structure is to express the conditional relation IF (UH: 17; AMH: 13). The basic function of the dative-locative participial structure, on the other hand, is to express the temporal relation ‘when’ (AMH: 1). Second, when the dative-locative participial structure expresses the conditional meaning, the constructions can still allow the temporal interpretation (see [5.2 – 1] below), whereas the temporal constructions containing the conditional-converb structure are incompatible with the conditional interpretation (see [5.2 – 2]). The following two examples, illustrating this contrast, were taken from Section 4.2 (as [4.2 – 3]) and Section 4.3 (as [4.3 – 2]), respectively:

(5.2 – 1)  
\[
\text{si} \quad \text{tuttu} \quad \text{te-he-de}, \quad \text{bi} \quad \text{absi} \quad \text{te-mbi}
\]
\[
\text{2SG} \quad \text{like.that} \quad \text{sit-PFV.PTCP-DAT} \quad \text{1SG} \quad \text{how} \quad \text{sit-IPFV.FIN}
\]
‘If/When you sit down like that, how will I sit?’ (OJ1: 25)
Sentence (5.2 – 1) is in a non-past context and the states of affairs described cannot be inferred as true. The dative-locative participial structure does not exclude the temporal interpretation because temporal relations are not limited to any specific temporal context. In contrast, (5.2 – 2) is in a past context, and the states of affairs described in this sentence, along with others, are in a temporal sequence, all of which can be inferred as true. This is incompatible with conditionality, which concerns suppositions rather than factual states of affairs.

To sum up, dative-locative participial structures, which usually express the temporal relation, can obtain a causal interpretation and express the conditional relation, when the given context concerns the present or the future. On the other hand, conditional-converb structures, which usually express the conditional relation, can lose their suppositive nature and confine themselves to expressing the temporal relation, when the given context concerns the past.

Finally, a brief remark is needed concerning the counterfactual conditionals analysed in Section 4.2.2. In terms of their morphosyntax, they are less complex than the prototypes of counterfactual conditionals (see Section 4.1.2 and Section 5.1) in different ways and to various degrees. Specifically, some share with the prototypes the patterns of subordinate clauses, some share the patterns of main clauses, while others appear to be factual conditionals. This fact demonstrates that in expressing counterfactual conditionality, Manchu can resort to morphosyntax or context.

5.2.2 Conditionals Involving Speech Acts

Two different types of conditionals involving speech acts are analysed in Chapter 4. The first type is termed “speech-act conditionals” (Section 4.4), and the second type,
“performative (speech-act) conditionals” (Section 4.10).

Speech-act conditionals morphosyntactically belong to one of the basic patterns of conditional constructions (analysed in Section 4.1) whose main clause is not a statement but a request or command. The conditional relation is presented between one state of affairs and a (non-declarative) speech act. However, the speech-act conditionals stand out in the choice of the verb in the subordinate predicate. Specifically, the choice of this verb is limited to one of the few that describe personal feelings about other people, namely, emotive verbs, such as gosi- ‘to love/favour’ (see [5.2 – 3]). More importantly, the state of affairs described in the subordinate clause cannot be denied by the addressee on pragmatic grounds — denying them would be pragmatically infelicitous and would potentially damage the personal relationship between the speaker and the addressee, or cause the addressee dishonour. This is different from an ordinary conditional that does not concern personal feelings, in which the state of affairs in the subordinate clause can be denied (see [5.2 – 4]).

Thus, when the speaker utters a speech-act conditional (characterised by a non-deniable subordinate clause), he or she only appears to make a supposition about the state of affairs (concerning the addressee’s personal feelings), while in fact presupposing it, and in a sense imposing it on the addressee as well. Therefore, the subordinate clause of such a conditional only serves as a politeness strategy for the speaker to utter his or her request, which is expressed in the main clause. The following sentences are taken from Section 4.4 ([4.4 – 1] and [4.4 – 8], respectively), of which (5.2 – 3) employs the politeness strategy, while (5.2 – 4) does not employ it.

(5.2 – 3)  
\[ \text{gosi-ci, min-de ala-me bu-reo} \] 
\( \text{have.mercy-COND 1SG(bi/min)-DAT tell-IPFV.CVB give-IMP} \) 
‘If [you] have mercy [on me], would [you] tell me please?’ (NSB: 25)

(5.2 – 4)  
\[ \text{age sin-de aika manju bithe bi-ci, emu} \] 
\( \text{2SG(si/sin)-DAT if Manchu book be-COND one} \) 
\( \text{udu debitelin juwen bu-reo} \) 
\( \text{how.many volume loan give-IMP} \) 
emu udu: ‘several’, ‘some’ 
juwen bu-: ‘to lend’
‘Sir, if you have Manchu books, could you please lend [me] some volumes [of them]?’ (MFG: 41)
A performative (speech-act) conditional contains a performative verb in the main clause, that is, the speaker performs the act denoted by the verb simply by uttering it. The subordinate clause of a performative (speech-act) conditional serves to specify the content of the speech act, though via a negation that appears to be the condition for the speech act. The following example is taken from Section 4.10 ([4.10 – 4]):

(5.2 – 5) enenggi fiyaratala tanta-rakū o-ci, bi
today very.much beat-IPFV.PTCP.NEG become(AUX)-COND 1SG
uthai gashū-kini
then take.oath-OPT
fiyaratala tanta-: ‘to beat someone very badly’
‘If [I] do not beat [him] very badly, let me take an oath’ (OJ2: 38)

As analysed in Section 4.10, the conditional relation is actually between the addressee’s disbelief regarding what the speaker will do (in this example, of beating someone badly) and the speaker’s speech act (in this example, of taking an oath) that implies undesirable consequences for the speaker if he does not keep his word.

5.2.3 Concessive Constructions

There are two types of concessive constructions — concessive conditionals and concessives proper. Concessive conditionals can be further divided into three types: (i) scalar concessive conditionals (even if…); (ii) alternative concessive conditionals (whether…or…); (iii) universal concessive conditionals (whatever/whoever/wherever…). Each type of concessive conditional is found in Manchu, as shown by the following examples (taken from Section 4.5: [4.5 – 15], [4.5 – 20] and [4.5 – 26]):

(5.2 – 6) sin-i tacibu-rei sain gisun be
2SG(si/sin)-GEN teach-IPFV.PTCP good words ACC
min-i dolo buce-ci, inu onggo-rakū
1SG(bu/min)-GEN inside die-COND still forget-IPFV.PTCP.NEG
mini dolo: ‘in my heart’, lit.: ‘inside me’
‘Even if [I] die, [I] will not forget the kind words you teach me’
(MYK7: 10)
Like ordinary conditionals, concessive conditionals express suppositions about the states of affairs represented in the subordinate clauses and do not entail them. In contrast to ordinary conditionals, however, concessive conditionals usually do entail the states of affairs represented in the main clauses (König 1986). Additionally, concessive conditionals appear to lack or negate the conditional relation between the two states of affairs concerned. Still, as König (1986: 231) points out, all the types of concessive conditionals “relate a set of antecedent conditions to a consequent”, which is realised by different means. That is, according to König (1986: 231), a “focus particle” (even) in the case of scalar concessive conditionals, a disjunction (whether...or...) in the case of alternative concessive conditionals, and a universal or free-choice quantifier (whatever, whoever, and so forth) in the case of universal concessive conditionals.

Concerning scalar concessive conditionals, previous studies (e.g., König 1986; Sweetser 1990) point out that even if introduces an extreme state of affairs that is the most unfavourable for the occurrence of the consequent. Thus, by affirming this relation, a scalar concessive conditional gives rise to the understanding that all states of affairs that are not as extreme as the one introduced by even if will also bring out the consequent in question.

It is shown in Section 4.5 that a universal concessive conditional such as (5.2 – 8) can be interpreted as an abstraction of a series of ordinary conditionals X bici, X be tukiye fi ulebu mbi (X stands for a nominal structure) that differ from each other only in the content of X. Following this train of thought, it is plain to see that an alternative concessive conditional such as (5.2 – 7) can also be interpreted as an abstraction of two conditionals. Thus, all the types of concessive conditionals are linked to ordinary conditionals.
It seems that in a language like English only scalar concessive conditionals morphosyntactically resemble ordinary conditionals — there is the conjunction *if* in *even if* — while the other two types do not. In contrast, all the three types of concessive conditionals in Manchu can share part of the morphosyntax of a prototypical conditional — the presence of conditional-converb structures in the subordinate clauses. This does not mean, however, that conditional-converb structures are the only means for concessive conditionals. In fact, other morphosyntactic patterns exist as well, especially concessive-converb structures (V-*cibe*), as shown in Section 4.5. Qing Dynasty Manchu grammars (UH: 30; AMH: 38) demonstrate that the verb V-*cibe* always expresses concession: either concessives proper or concessive conditionals. Therefore, the concessive verb V-*cibe* (and complex structures it forms) can be seen as the core mechanism of expressing concession.

Distinct from concessive conditionals, concessives proper entail both clauses. Nonetheless, in Manchu the two types of concessive sentences comprised by the verb V-*cibe* are not distinguished morphosyntactically but are largely determined by the context. On the other hand, as shown in Section 4.5, the conditional verb V-*ci* can also occur in concessives proper.

It has been demonstrated that the conditional verb V-*ci* can occur in all semantic types of concessive constructions: both concessive conditionals and concessives proper. In these constructions the conditional verb V-*ci* seems to serve as an alternative for the concessive verb V-*cibe*. The morphological similarity between the two verbs may also account for this phenomenon. Gorelova (2002: 280) points out the possibility that the concessive verb V-*cibe* originated from the concessive verb V-*ci*. If this supposition is true, it would then be reasonable to assume that in expressing the concessive meanings, the verb V-*cibe* has emerged as a marked form while the verb V-*ci*, which allows a number of semantic possibilities, remains unmarked. On the other hand, it may be true that since the conditional verb can occur in concessive conditionals, and since Manchu does not distinguish between concessive conditionals and concessives proper morphosyntactically, the conditional verb would also be expected to occur in concessives proper. König (1986: 243) points out that, of concessives proper, concessive conditionals and conditionals, “conditionals are the most flexible in meaning”, since they are the most open to different
interpretations if “given the right contextual conditions”. This is indeed also true of the Manchu constructions containing the conditional-converb structures.

To sum up, as König (1986: 231) points out, concessive conditionals involve a \textit{many-to-one correspondence} between two states of affairs represented ("a set of antecedent conditions to a consequent"), and different types of concessive conditionals use different methods in expressing this relation. In contrast, prototypical conditionals involve a \textit{one-to-one correspondence}. Yet it is in this aspect that concessive conditionals and prototypical conditionals are connected. As for concessives proper, specifically in Manchu, they are not morphosyntactically distinct from concessive conditionals. Since concessive conditionals can be formed by conditional-converb structures, concessives proper also allow this possibility.

\subsection*{5.2.4 Parallel Constructions}

The sentences analysed in Section 4.6 share a \textit{semantic parallelism} between the two component clauses: the states of affairs represented in both clauses of a sentence concern the same topic and differ from each other in a certain respect. In general there are four types: (i) contrastive conditionals; (ii) comparison conditionals; (iii) disjunction conditionals; and (iv) degree conditionals. They can be exemplified by the following sentences (all taken from Section 4.6: [4.6 – 3], [4.6 – 9], [4.6 – 12] and [4.6 – 17], respectively):

\begin{verbatim}
(5.2 – 9) julergi alin de emu dobori dedu-ci, amargi
          south mountain DAT one night stay-COND north
alin de emu dobori dedu-o
          mountain DAT one night stay-IMP

‘While [you should] stay one night in the south mountain, stay one night
in the north mountain [as well]!’ (MYK5: 6)

(5.2 – 10) si ere se-de uthai uttu oibo-ko
2SG this age-DAT then so become.decrepit-PFV.PTCP
o-ci, se baru o-ho manggi adarame
become(AUX)-COND age toward become-PFV.PTCP after how
boo boigon be jafa-me baita be icihiya-ci
house family ACC hold-IPFV.CVB matter ACC manage-COND
\end{verbatim}
o-mbi
become(AUX)-IPFV.FIN
se baru o-: ‘to become aged’, ‘to get old’
boo boigon: ‘household’
V-ci o-: complex structure expressing possibility/permission
‘If you are already so decrepit at this age, how could you manage your household and handle matters after you get [really] aged?’ (MFG: 59)

(5.2 – 11) balai fiyente-me gisun eye-bu-rakū
unreasonably spread.rumours-IPFV.CVB words flow-CAUS-IPFV.PTCP.NEG
o-ci, uthai niyalma de gebu ara-mbi
become(AUX)-COND then people DAT name make-IPFV.FIN
fiyente-me gisun eyebu-: ‘to spread rumours around’, lit.: ‘spreading rumours, make [them] flow’
gebu ara-: ‘to call [someone] names’
‘[He] either spreads rumours around or calls people all kinds of names’ (lit.: ‘If [he] does not spread rumours around, [he] will then call people names’)
(AGA4: 75)

(5.2 – 12) ele juhe muke omi-ci, ele kangka-mbi
more ice water drink-COND more be.thirsty-IPFV.FIN
‘The more iced water [I] drink, the thirstier [I] become’ (OJ2: 152)

Despite the interclausal relation in each of the sentences (contrast, comparison, disjunction or relevance of degree), the conditional or causal relation can always be found in a certain domain. In (5.2 – 9), the issuing of one command necessarily enables or causes the issuing of the other command, both commands constituting an entirety. Here conditionality exists in the speech-act domain. In (5.2 – 10), the speaker’s observation that the addressee is decrepit by now causes his concern about the addressee’s future life. The conditional relation presents itself in the epistemic domain, since the speaker makes an inference based on his observation. In (5.2 – 11) the conditional relation is less obvious, involving a syllogistic reasoning process: the major premise is that of the two states of affairs, one and perhaps one only is true; the minor premise is that the first state of affairs (this person’s spreading rumours) is held to be untrue; and the conclusion is that the second state of affairs (this person’s calling people names) is true. Thus, conditionality is in the epistemic domain, since the negation of one state of affairs enables/causes the affirmation of the other state of affairs. In (5.2 – 12) a conditional relation is straightforwardly present between the two states of affairs: the
speaker’s drinking more iced water causes his feeling thirstier, though this may sound contrary to what one would expect. Furthermore, the degree of the former state of affairs is proportionate to the degree of the latter state of affairs.

5.2.5 Evaluative Conditionals: Reduced Conditionals

Section 4.7 analyses some conditional sentences in which the subject of the main clause, usually implicit, does not refer to any entity in the outside world but denote the state of affairs represented in the subordinate clause. Semantically (rather than syntactically), the subordinate clause serves as the subject of the sentence as a whole, and the main clause serves as the predicate of the sentence, “evaluating” the state of affairs of the subordinate clause. The subordinate predicate can either be simple, consisting of the conditional converb of a lexical verb ([5.2 – 13]), or complex, consisting of the conditional converb of an auxiliary verb which combines a lexical verb (in [5.2 – 14] the auxiliary verb bi- combines the imperfective converb of a lexical verb, tebu- ‘to put’, that is, tebu-me). Additionally, evaluative conditionals can be either factual conditional ([5.2 – 13] and [5.2 – 14]) or counterfactual ([5.2 – 15]). The following are some examples (all taken from Section 4.7: [4.7 – 1], [4.7 – 8] and [4.7 – 11]):

(5.2 – 13)  jurgan giyan be gai-me yabu-ci, beye-i
            righteous principle ACC take-IPFV.CVB act-COND self-GEN
teisu
             responsibility
            ‘It is [one’s] own responsibility to act in accordance with righteous principles’ (AGA1: 117)

(5.2 – 14)  damu ishunde mujilen de tebu-me bi-ci,
            only mutually mind DAT put-IPFV.CVB be(AUX)-COND
teni gucu-i doro
            only.then friend-GEN way
            gucu-i doro: ‘the way of [being true] friends’
            ‘Only if/when [people] put each other in [their] mind can it be the way of [being true] friends’ (MFG: 7)

(5.2 – 15)  ine mene gama-ha bi-ci, sain bi-he
            willingly take-PFV.PTCP be(AUX)-COND good be-PFV.PTCP
The distinguishing characteristic of evaluative conditionals is that semantically there is one overall subject-predicate structure. In contrast, ordinary conditionals, which have a subject-predicate structure in each clause, can be semantically represented by the formula “{Subj1 + Pred1} ↔ {Subj2 + Pred2}”. Evaluative conditionals can be regarded as reduced or degenerate forms of ordinary conditionals and can be represented by the formula “Subj2 {Subj1 + Pred1} ↔ Pred2”. Besides, like ordinary conditionals, evaluative conditionals do not entail the states of affairs represented in the subordinate clauses.

5.2.6 Topic Constructions
Section 4.8 discusses the conditional-like sentences that serve as topic constructions, in which the conditional clauses serve to introduce topics. The verb in the form of the conditional converb V-ci is mostly the copular verb o- ‘to become/be’, or the quotative verb se- ‘to say’. In a few cases the verb can be some other lexical verb. The following are some examples of topic sentences (all taken from Section 4.8: [4.8 – 2], [4.8 – 14], [4.8 – 7], [4.8 – 10] and [4.8 – 22], respectively):

(5.2 – 16)  
Manju    bithe  hūla-ra   niyalma  o-ci,  
Manchu  book  read-IPFV.PTCP people  TOP (< become-COND)  
urunakū  hergen  tome  gemu  getukele-me  sa-ci  
definitely  word  every  all make.clear-IPFV.CVB know-COND  
aca-mbH  
suit(AUX)-IPFV.FIN  
V-ci aca-: complex structure expressing obligation  
‘Concerning the people who read Manchu books, [they] should make clear [the meaning of] each and every word [of the books]’ (MFG: 3)

(5.2 – 17)  
te  min-de  o-ci,  min-i  jalin  de  
now 1SG(bi/min)-DAT  TOP (< become-COND) 1SG(bi/min)-GEN sake  DAT  
gūwa  be  geli  gabta-rakūbi-o  
other  ACC  also  shoot-IPFV.FIN.NEG-Q  
‘Now as for me, would I not shoot [arrows] at other people for my [own] sake?’ (MYK2: 2)
The present study argues that, as shown in Section 4.8, the conditional converb V-ci in Manchu can serve as a topic marker because the conditional relation can be retrieved within these topic constructions. However, conditionality is not presented in the content domain, but in the speech-act domain. In the sentences where o-ci, a conditional converb, topicalises a nominal structure or a case structure, an abstract subject that can be inferred that does not denote an entity in the outside world but refers to the current conversational topic or the state of affairs under discussion. Thus, topic sentences using o-ci as a topic marker can be interpreted as: ‘if the state of affairs under discussion is X, I offer the following comment Y’ (X and Y stand for the topic and the comment in a topic sentence). The conditional relation can be represented as: the state of affairs under discussion being X enables or causes the speaker’s offering the comment Y.

The sentences where se-ci, the conditional converb of the quotative verb se- ‘to say’,
serves a topic marker are more straightforward than the topic sentences containing o-ci, since the implicit subjects of se- denote people (who hold the current conversation). The topic sentences containing se-ci can be interpreted as: ‘if I speak of X, I offer the following comment Y’. In the topic sentences where neither o-ci nor se-ci is used, lexical verbs themselves occur in the form of the conditional converb and serve as topics. However, they should be interpreted in a similar way as are the topic sentences containing either o-ci or se-ci: ‘if the state of affairs under discussion is X/if I speak of X, I offer the following comment Y’.

5.2.7 Constructions Containing Perception or Cognition Verbs, and Inferential Conditionals

Section 4.9 analyses conditional-like sentences in which verbs denoting perception, obtainment of information or cognition verbs occur in the form of the conditional converb in the subordinate clauses. The main clauses of these sentences either specify the content of perception or the conclusions drawn via mentally processing the obtained information. Such verbs include tuwa- ‘to look’, donji- ‘to listen/hear’, amtala- ‘to taste’, baica- ‘to investigate’, gūni- ‘to think’, and bodo- ‘to consider/think’. The conditional-converb structures formed by these verbs have become somewhat fixed expressions in Manchu. In particular, all of them (except amtala- ‘to taste’) frequently occur alone in the leftmost position of sentences (or sometimes with first-person pronouns), introducing the main clauses. Theoretically the grammar of Manchu would not forbid any other (lexical) verb to occur in this position, but such use of verbs denoting perception, obtainment of information or cognition seems to prevail.

In these sentences under discussion, when the subject of the verb denoting perception or obtainment of information (but not cognition verbs) also refers to the speaker, that is, when their subject is in the first person, such a verb (in the form of the conditional converb) can be regarded as a lexical evidential strategy in Manchu. As for the cognition verbs, they do not indicate the source of information, but the epistemic process of the speakers.

Many (even if not all) of these sentences represent acts of perception (or obtaining information or thinking) that have been performed by the speakers, rather than express suppositions about the acts. In this sense, conditionality, which has a hypothetical nature,
cannot exist within these sentences. However, causality can still be found, though not in the content domain. Specifically, if the main clause of such a sentence represents the content of direct perception, the causal relation is presented in the perceptual domain. If the main clause represents an *inference* (or a conclusion, etc.) based on the information perceived or obtained, the causal relation is in the epistemic domain. Therefore, the domain in which the causal relation is presented (perceptual or epistemic) does not necessarily conform to the type of the verb in the subordinate clause (whether it denotes perception or cognition).

Finally, inferential conditionals deserve a brief remark. They are another type of construction that involves the conditional relation presented in the epistemic domain. As shown in Section 4.10, an inferential conditional involves the process of deductive thinking, from an observed phenomenon (represented by the subordinate clause) to a reasonable conclusion (represented by the main clause). Thus, the conditional relation is not presented in the content domain, but in the epistemic domain.
Chapter 6  Conclusion

This chapter concludes this thesis and consists of two sections. Section 6.1, in view of the analysis in Chapters 4, compares the functions of conditionals of other Altaic (or Altaic-like) languages with the functions of Manchu conditionals, placing Manchu within a larger typological picture. Section 6.2 summarises the contribution of the present study. Both sections suggest future research that can be conducted, concerning the research of conditionality in other Altaic languages and Manchu linguistics, respectively.

6.1  Typological Comparisons between Conditionals in Manchu and Those in Other Altaic (and Altaic-like) Languages

In previous studies some Altaic (and Altaic-like) languages have been shown to share similar semantic or syntactic patterns with Manchu conditionals that have been analysed in the present study. The following provides examples of conditional constructions from previous studies as well as from materials of other languages (in which no systematic research on conditionals has been done). These examples are not meant to — and are not, by any means, able to — present the functions of conditionals in the languages concerned exhaustively, but are only intended to illuminate what I consider to be the most relevant features as far as the present study is concerned.

6.1.1  Japanese (Altaic-like)

Alpatov and Podlesskaja (2005: 636) note that conditional-converb (V-ba) structures can express the contrastive relation, which presents “two situations that differ in some particular point, but are otherwise similar”. This function is also found in Manchu “contrastive conditionals” as discussed in Section 4.6.1. The following is a Japanese example: 50

50 The glosses (as well as translations) of some examples in Section 6.2 from previous studies are modified to suit the format adopted in this thesis.
There were shops with mortars and pestles, as well as people who came down to sell pine trees cut in the mountains’ (Alpatov and Podlesskaja 2005: 636)

Alpatov and Podlesskaja (2005) also discuss “observational” conditionals, as shown by (6.1 – 2) and (6.1 – 3). Alpatov and Podlesskaja (2005: 640) explains that in (6.1 – 2) the conditional relation exists “not between the ‘turning round the corner’ and ‘the shop’s location’, but rather between the ‘turning round the corner’ and the possibility for the listener to see the shop”. Although not explicitly stated, this relation involves precisely what the present study terms as the “perceptual domain” (see Section 4.3.2.4 and Section 4.9).

Moreover, some of the “conditional complements” in Japanese represent the states of affairs “as desirable or undesirable” (Alpatov and Podlesskaja 2005: 646). Such sentences are comparable to the evaluative conditionals of Manchu, in which the main clause serves to “evaluate” the state of affairs represented by the subordinate clause (see Section 4.7). The following is an example from Japanese:

Well, it would be convenient [for me] if [I] could make an automatic transfer’ (Alpatov and Podlesskaja 2005: 646)
It seems that in Japanese the quotative verb structure *to iu* ‘to say that’ can serve to mark the topic of a sentence when the verb *iu* ‘to say’ takes the form of the conditional converb, *i-eba* (see [6.1 – 5]).

(6.1 – 5)  
\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{futsū} & \text{yokin} & \text{to} & \text{i-eba}, & \text{nihon} & \text{de} & \text{wa} & \text{riritsu} \\
\text{ordinary} & \text{deposit} & \text{QUOT} & \text{say-COND} & \text{Japan} & \text{LOC} & \text{TOP} & \text{interest-rate} \\
\text{ga} & \text{zuibun} & \text{hikui-n} & \text{desu} & \text{ne} \\
\text{NOM} & \text{very} & \text{low-NMLZ} & \text{be.PRS} & \text{PTL} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Speaking of ordinary deposits, in Japan the interest rate is very low’

(Alpatov and Podlesskaja 2005: 640)

This function is encountered in Manchu in the case of the conditional converb of the quotative verb *se-* ‘to say’, *se-ci* (see Section 4.8).

6.1.2 **Even, Evenki and Negidal (Tungusic)**

The Even, Evenki and Negidal languages are all genetically closely related (Janhunen 1996: 67, 73). Thus conditional sentences from these languages are discussed together here whenever appropriate.

Sentence (6.1 – 6) is a counterfactual conditional in Even. In the subordinate clause, the complex predicate consists of a perfective participle and the conditional converb\(^{51}\) of the verb *bi-* ‘to be’. In the main clause, the complex predicate consists of another perfective participle, which is followed by the subjunctive form of the verb *bi-*.

(6.1 – 6)  
\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{Even} & \text{ak-mu} & \text{(tiniv)} & \text{muču-ča} & \text{bi-sek-e-n,} \\
\text{brother-1SG} & \text{(yesterday)} & \text{return-PFV.PTCP} & \text{be(AUX)-DS.COND-EPN-3SG} \\
\text{bujuh-ne-če} & \text{bi-mē-u} \\
\text{hunt-DIRN-PFV.PTCP} & \text{be(AUX)-SBJV-1SG} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘If my brother had come back [yesterday], I would have gone hunting’

(Malchukov 2005: 536)

Evenki has a counterfactual conditional with a similar morphosyntax ([6.1 – 7]): the

\(^{51}\) Even, Evenki and Negidal all have two forms of conditional converbs, depending on whether the subordinate and the main clause of a conditional have the same subject or have different subjects. The same-subject conditional converb has the form *V-mi*, while the different-subject conditional converb has the form *V-rAk*. The latter form has multiple morphophonemic variants and is followed by personal endings (which in many cases require epenthesis).
subordinate clause has a complex predicate consisting of a perfective participle and the conditional converb of the verb bi- ‘to be’ (used as an auxiliary verb). The main predicate consists of the subjunctive form of a lexical verb. However, it is not clear whether an Evenki counterfactual conditional can have a complex main predicate as in the Even example (6.1 – 6), or whether an Even counterfactual conditional can have a simple main predicate as in the Evenki examples (6.1 – 7) and (6.1 – 8).

(6.1 – 7) Evenki

si min-dule  eme-če  bi-sik-i-s.
2SG 1SG(bi/min)-ALL come-PFV.PTCP be(AUX)-DS.COND-EPN-2SG

bi sin-du  purta-va  bu-mče-v
1SG 2SG(si/si)-DAT knife-ACC.DEF give-SBJV-1SG

‘If you had come to me, I would have given you the knife’
(Nedjalkov and Bulatova 2005: 560)

(6.1 – 8) Evenki

bi ekin-me-s  aj-ča  bi-mi.
1SG sister-ACC.DEF-2SG cure-PFV.PTCP be(AUX)-SS.COND

ahi-ja-vi  ga-mča-v
wife-ACC.INDF-REFL.POSS take-SBJV-1SG

‘If I could cure your elder sister, I would take her as my wife’
(Nedjalkov and Bulatova 2005: 560)

Conditional-converb structures in both Even and Evenki can express temporal relations, which is a function also found in Manchu (see Section 4.3). Such temporal relations include simultaneity and anteriority. The following examples are taken from Even and Evenki expressing anteriority and simultaneity (both languages can express both temporal relations):

(6.1 – 9) Even (anteriority)

ömen anngani  ielten-eke-n,  kunga  balda-ča
one  year  pass-DS.COND-3SG  child  be.born-PFV.PTCP

‘When one year had passed, a child was born’ (Malchukov 2005: 545)

(6.1 – 10) Evenki (anteriority)

mo-va  una-ri-var  ete-mi,  mit  ungtu
firewood-ACC.DEF saw-PTCP-POSS.PL finish-SS.COND 1PL.INCL another

avala ngene-d’enge-t
work  go-FUT-1PL.PRED
‘When finishing sawing the firewood, we shall go [to do] some other work’
(Pevnov 1980: 12)

(6.1 – 11) Evenki (simultaneity)

*bira-li d’avra-d’a-rak-i-n, girki-n homoty-va*

river-PROL boat-IPFV-DS.COND-EPN-3SG friend-3SG.POSS bear-ACC.DEF

*pertyren-e-n*

shoot-NFUT-3SG

‘While he was boating along the river, his friend shot a bear’
(Nedjalkov and Bulatova 2005: 557)

A type of sentence in Evenki mentioned in Pevnov (1980) is comparable to an evaluative conditional in Manchu (see Section 4.7). Similarly, Malchukov (2005: 540) discusses “evaluative-hortative” conditionals in Even, pointing out that such conditionals “have an indirect illocutionary function”, which is “to prescribe the listener to perform” the act represented in the subordinate clause. Nedjalkov and Bulatova (2005) demonstrate that conditionals in Evenki can also have the same “evaluative-hortative” function. Here are some examples:

(6.1 – 12) Even

*nulge-sn-ek-u aj (bi-mče)*

nomadise-INCH-DS.COND-1SG good (be-SBJV.3SG)

‘[It] would be good to set out’ (Malchukov 2005: 540)

(6.1 – 13) Evenki

*min-du d’avra-d’a-mi urge*

1SG-DAT go.by.boat-IPFV-SS.COND difficult

‘It is difficult for me to go by boat’ (Pevnov 1980: 16)

(6.1 – 14) Evenki

*Kodakčon-akaj, edu d’ulle-ve bi-sik-i-s, aja*

PN-brother here two.days-ACC.DEF be-DS.COND-EPN-2SG good

*bi-mče*

be-SBJV.3SG

‘Brother Kodakča, it would be good if you spent two days here’
(Nedjalkov and Bulatova 2005: 572)

In both Even and Evenki, conditional-converb structures are able to express concessive meanings, just as in Manchu (see Section 4.5): concessives proper and concessive
conditionals are equally possible.

(6.1 – 15) Even (concessive proper)

\[\text{am-\text{-}mu-da \ gasči-rak-a-n, \ nö-v} \]
father-1SG.POSS.EMPH \ ask-DS.COND-EPN-3SG \ brother-1SG.POSS
\[\text{e-h-ni \ emep-te} \]
not.do-NFUT-3SG \ stay-NEG.CV

‘Although [my] father asked [him to do so], my brother did not stay’
(Malchukov 2005: 547)

(6.1 – 16) Even ([universal] concessive conditional)

\[\text{ngi-vul-de \ gasči-rak-a-n, \ e-te-m \ bö-r} \]
who-ever.EMPH \ ask-DS.COND-EPN-3SG \ not.do \ give-NEG.CV

‘Whoever asks [for this], I will not give [this] away’ (Malchukov 2005: 548)

(6.1 – 17) Evenki (concessive proper)

\[\text{sun-da \ bi-rek-i-n \ bi \ upkačin \ ulaip-ča-v} \]
coat-EMPH \ be-DS.COND-EPN-3SG \ 1SG \ whole \ get.wet-PST.1SG

‘Although I had a coat, I got all wet’ (Nedjalkov and Bulatova 2005: 571)

(6.1 – 18) Evenki ([scalar] concessive conditional)

\[\text{tygde-d’e-rek-i-n-ket, \ eme-d’enge-vun} \]
rain-IPFV-DS.COND-EPN-3SG-CLT \ come-FUT-1PL

‘Even if it rains, we shall come’ (Nedjalkov and Bulatova 2005: 571)

Nedjalkov and Bulatova (2005: 563) describes conditionals “of logical conclusion” in
Evenki, which correspond to sentences termed “inferential conditionals” in the present study
(see Section 4.10). The following is an example:

(6.1 – 19) Evenki

\[\text{songo-d’or \ bi-mi, \ teli \ ku-si-ve} \]
cry-PTCP \ be-SS.COND \ that.is \ fight-PTCP

‘If [he] is crying, that means that he has had a fight’
(Nedjalkov and Bulatova 2005: 564)

Gorelova (2006: 159–160) discusses the use of the conditional converb as a topic marker.
These include bi-mi [be-COND] in Evenki/Negidal, and gun-mi [say-COND] in Negidal. The
following are examples:
Evenki

\( \text{omolg}\)i \quad \text{bi-mi} \quad \text{tiken} \quad \text{gün-cē} \\
\text{youth} \quad \text{TOP (< be-SS.COND)} \quad \text{such.way} \quad \text{say-PST.PTCP} \\
‘As for the youth, [he] said in such a way…’ (Gorelova 2006: 160)

Negidal

\( \text{ge, tay Bu}\)ya \quad \text{bi-mi} \quad \text{o-l-ca,} \quad \text{beynge-l-be} \\
\text{well that} \quad \text{PN} \quad \text{TOP (< be-SS.COND)} \quad \text{create-INCH-PST.PTCP} \quad \text{animal-PL-ACC} \\
\text{o-ca-n} \quad \text{create-PST.PTCP-3SG.PRED} \\
‘Well, that Buga began creating, [and he] created animals’ (Gorelova 2006: 160)

Negidal

\( \text{Omnnankan gun-mi,} \quad \text{deyin-ji-da hul-le-n,} \quad \text{PN} \quad \text{TOP (< say-SS.COND)} \quad \text{bird-INS-PTL} \quad \text{go-PRF-3SG.PRED} \\
\text{gehuktami-da hul-le-n} \quad \text{on.foot-PTL} \quad \text{go-PRF-3SG.PRED} \\
\text{Omnnankan: a mythical creature of the Upper World} \\
‘As for Omnnankan, [he] flies like a bird and walks on foot’ \\
(Gorelova 2006: 160)

6.1.3 **Mongolian (Mongolic)**

In Mongolian, the particle *bol*, orthographically identical with the stem of the copular verb *bol-* ‘to become/be’ (Gorelova 2006: 162–163) mentions two views concerning the origin of the particle *bol*. According to one view (e.g., Sechenbaatar 2003: 187–188), the particle *bol* may be a shortened form of the conditional converb (\( V-bal \)) is not used. The following is an example of a counterfactual conditional, in which the particle *bol* follows a perfective participle in the subordinate clause. The main predicate is an imperfective participle followed by a multifunctional particle that can be used to express modal and other meanings.

\( \text{či} \quad \text{min-ü} \quad \text{beye} \quad \text{bol-ösan} \quad \text{bol,} \quad \text{nada} \quad \text{ača} \quad \text{ilegüü} \quad \text{bačimda-xu} \quad \text{yum} \quad \text{more} \quad \text{worry-IPFV.PTCP} \quad \text{PTL} \quad \text{2SG} \quad \text{1SG(hi/min)-GEN} \quad \text{self} \quad \text{be-PFV.PTCP} \quad \text{COND} \quad \text{1SG(nada)} \quad \text{ABL} \quad \text{PTL} \)

52 The Mongolian language discussed here is the standard written variety used inside the People’s Republic of China, rather than the Khalkha Mongolian, which is the standard language of the Republic of Mongolia. Accordingly, the transcription is based on the traditional Mongolian script, which is the norm in China.

53 Gorelova (2006: 162–163) mentions two views concerning the origin of the particle *bol*. According to one view (e.g., Sechenbaatar 2003: 187–188), the particle *bol* may be a shortened form of the conditional converb (\( V-bal \)) is not used. The following is an example of a counterfactual conditional, in which the particle *bol* follows a perfective participle in the subordinate clause. The main predicate is an imperfective participle followed by a multifunctional particle that can be used to express modal and other meanings.

6.1.3 **Mongolian (Mongolic)**

In Mongolian, the particle *bol*, orthographically identical with the stem of the copular verb *bol-* ‘to become/be’, can serve as a conditional marker in sentences where the conditional converb (\( V-bal \)) is not used. The following is an example of a counterfactual conditional, in which the particle *bol* follows a perfective participle in the subordinate clause. The main predicate is an imperfective participle followed by a multifunctional particle that can be used to express modal and other meanings.
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52 The Mongolian language discussed here is the standard written variety used inside the People’s Republic of China, rather than the Khalkha Mongolian, which is the standard language of the Republic of Mongolia. Accordingly, the transcription is based on the traditional Mongolian script, which is the norm in China.
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6.1.3 **Mongolian (Mongolic)**

In Mongolian, the particle *bol*, orthographically identical with the stem of the copular verb *bol-* ‘to become/be’, can serve as a conditional marker in sentences where the conditional converb (\( V-bal \)) is not used. The following is an example of a counterfactual conditional, in which the particle *bol* follows a perfective participle in the subordinate clause. The main predicate is an imperfective participle followed by a multifunctional particle that can be used to express modal and other meanings.

\( \text{či} \quad \text{min-ü} \quad \text{beye} \quad \text{bol-ösan} \quad \text{bol,} \quad \text{nada} \quad \text{ača} \quad \text{ilegüü} \quad \text{bačimda-xu} \quad \text{yum} \quad \text{more} \quad \text{worry-IPFV.PTCP} \quad \text{PTL} \)
'If you were me, you would be more worried than I [am now]'\textsuperscript{54} 
(Chenggeltei 1991: 384)

Besides its role in forming conditionals, the particle bol can also serve as a topic marker as well (Gorelova 2006). The following is an example in which bol topicalises a demonstrative:

(6.1 – 24) \textit{ene bol man-u nutuγ-un γarulta} 
this TOP 1PL(\textit{ba/man})-GEN hometown-GEN product 
‘Speaking of this, [it is] a product of our hometown’ (Chenggeltei 1991: 401)

Apart from following nominals, the particle bol is can also occur after oblique case structures (and can topicalise them). Sechenbaatar (2003) notes this function in the Chakhar dialect of Mongolian. The function is comparable to that of the Manchu conditional converb o-ci when it topicalises cases structures (see Section 4.8). The following are two examples from standard written Mongolian. In (6.1 – 25) the particle bol follows a noun in the locative case, and in (6.1 – 26) it follows a nominal phrase in the ablative case. In both examples the conditional meaning is expressed, while the case structures can be regarded as topics.

(6.1 – 25) \textit{teimü nom begejing-dü bol bai-xu mayad ügei} 
like.that book Beijing-LOC TOP be-IPFV.PTCP certainly NEG 
\textit{mayad ügei}: ‘probably’, lit.: ‘not certainly’
‘If we are talking about Beijing, there are probably books like that’ (lit.: ‘Such books if in Beijing, there are probably [such books]’) (Chenggeltei 1991: 401)

(6.1 – 26) \textit{tere xümin-ü aman-ača bol, eimü üge} 
that person-GEN mouth-ABL TOP such word 
\textit{γaru-mar yun} come.out-POT:PTCP PTL 
‘If we are talking about that man, such words can indeed come out of his mouth’ (lit.: ‘If out of that man’s mouth, such words can [indeed] come out’) (Chenggeltei 1991: 401)

\textsuperscript{54} Since the examples in Section 6.2.3 are originally provided with Chinese translations in Chenggeltei (1991), I am fully responsible for their English glosses and translations here.
6.1.4 Uyghur (Turkic)

In expressing the counterfactual conditional meaning, Uyghur uses a complex structure in the subordinate clause, which is a recurrent pattern among the languages discussed above. Again, the subordinate predicate consists of the perfective participle (either affirmative or negative) and the conditional converb of the verb bol- ‘to become/be’ (used as an auxiliary verb). The main predicate may be either simple or complex. When it is simple, it may take either the past imperfective form ([6.1 – 27]), or the present indirect form ([6.1 – 28]). When the main predicate is complex, it usually consists of the perfective participle and the past imperfective form of the verb bol- ([6.1 – 29]).

(6.1 – 27)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sä̱l} & \quad \text{kechik-ip} & \quad \text{käl-gän} & \quad \text{bol-singiz,} & \quad \text{män} \\
\text{a.little} & \quad \text{be.late-CVB} & \quad \text{come-PFV.PTCP} & \quad \text{be(AUX)-COND.2HON} & \quad \text{1SG}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{sirt-ga} \quad \text{chiq-ip} \quad \text{ket-ättim}
\]

outside-DAT go.out-CVB leave-PST.IPFV.1SG

‘If you had come a little bit later, I would have gone out’

(Zäynäp and Wang 2001: 198)

(6.1 – 28)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{baldur-raq} & \quad \text{de-gän} & \quad \text{bol-singiz,} & \quad \text{orun-din} \\
\text{early-DIM} & \quad \text{say(ðä/de)-PFV.PTCP} & \quad \text{be(AUX)-COND.2HON} & \quad \text{bed-ABL}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{tur-may-dikän-män}
\]

get.up-NEG-PRS.IDR-1SG

‘If you had said [that] a little earlier, I wouldn’t have got up from bed’

(Cheng et al. 1996: 393)

(6.1 – 29)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ägär} & \quad \text{biz} & \quad \text{yaxshi} & \quad \text{ögän-mi-gän} & \quad \text{bol-saq,} & \quad \text{bu} \\
\text{if} & \quad \text{1PL} & \quad \text{good} & \quad \text{study-NEG-PFV.PTCP} & \quad \text{be(AUX)-COND.1PL} & \quad \text{this}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{qetim-qi} \quad \text{imtihan-ni} \quad \text{yaxshi} \quad \text{ber-äl-mi-gän}
\]

time-ADJ exam-ACC good give(bär/ber)-ABIL-NEG-PFV.PTCP

\[
\text{bol-attuq}
\]

be(AUX)-PST.IPFV.1PL

‘If we hadn’t studied well, we couldn’t have performed well in the exam’

(Cheng et al. 1996: 393)

Conditional-converb structures in Uyghur can also express temporal relations. The following are two examples:
‘When I was watching a movie, the teacher called me to go out’

‘When he came, [he found that] you were doing physical work’
(Cheng et al. 1996: 443)

Just as in Manchu, Even, and Evenki, the Uyghur conditional converb can express the concessive relation, indicating “that the subject matter of the sentence is spoken in opposition to another matter or state” (Hämít 2003: 311). The following is an example:

‘My elder brother went, but s/he apparently acted really rudely’
(Hämít 2003: 311)

Contrastive conditionals also exist in Uyghur (see Section 4.6.1 for Manchu examples; see also the Japanese example [6.1 – 1]). The following is an example:

‘Let’s see a Uyghur movie one time, and see a Chinese film some other time [for a change]’ (Zäynäp and Wang 2001: 252-253)

Again, it is not surprising to find that the Uyghur conditional converb can not only serve as a topic marker but also governs a case structure. The following is an example where the conditional converb bol-sa topicalises a locative structure:
(6.1–34) (tagh üst-i-dā ap’aq qar, ...) töwän-dā
mountain top-3POSS-LOC pure.white snow below-LOC
bol-sa, küpkük muz
TOP (< be-COND.3SG/PL) clear.blue ice
‘On the mountain top — pure white snow, … and below — clear blue ice’
(Hämit 2003: 111)

6.1.5 Summary

The comparison between conditional constructions in Manchu and those in some other related or typologically similar languages involve most of the categories analysed in Chapter 4. These include counterfactual conditionals (Even, Evenki, Mongolian and Uyghur); temporal constructions containing conditional-converb structures (Even, Evenki, and Uyghur); concessives proper and concessive conditionals (Even, Evenki and Uyghur); contrastive conditionals (Japanese and Uyghur); evaluative conditionals (Japanese, Even and Evenki); topic constructions (Evenki, Negidal, Mongolian and Uyghur); sentences with the conditional converb of perception verbs (Japanese); and inferential conditionals (Evenki). Table 6.1 summarises the comparison (in grey).

Table 6.1 A Cross-linguistic Comparison between Conditionals in Manchu with Those in Other Altaic or Altaic-like Languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tungusic</td>
<td>Even</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evenki</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negidal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolic</td>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkic</td>
<td>Uyghur</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altaic-like</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As pointed out at the beginning of Section 6.1, this comparison is only partial, and it does not necessarily mean that the conditional constructions in these languages are only comparable to the Manchu constructions mentioned here. However, starting from the shared
characteristics under discussion, and with a proper corpus, one can further investigate the conditional constructions in any of these languages (which have not yet been systematically studied) using the approaches of previous studies as well as that of the present study. On the other hand, based on such individual studies, a more comprehensive study of conditional constructions can be conducted. In this process, numerous other issues relevant to conditionals (such as the tense-aspect-modality system, among others) will have to be addressed, which will be beneficial to the overall understanding of the languages in question.

6.2 The Contribution of the Present Study

The present study aims to provide a comprehensive description of conditional constructions in Manchu. In defining “conditional constructions”, the present study adopts a prototype-theory approach (Taylor 1995). That is, the category “conditional constructions” consists of central members (prototypes) and peripheral members (non-prototypes) both semantically and morphosyntactically. While each of the various peripheral members shares a certain characteristic with the prototypes, no single characteristic is shared by all members of the category: all peripheral members are connected with each other through the prototypes. Semantically, prototypical conditionality is defined as a relation between two states of affairs (A and B), represented by two clauses — a subordinate clause and a main clause. While neither A nor B is entailed by the sentence, A is a cause of B: as explained by Mackie (1975), A is an insufficient but necessary state of affairs out of a set of unnecessary but sufficient states of affairs that causes B. Morphosyntactically, prototypical patterns of Manchu conditionals are identified based on Qing Dynasty Manchu grammars and on actual use attested in the corpus. The non-prototypes, distinct in various ways and to different degrees from the prototypes in morphosyntax or semantics, are analysed in relation to the prototypes.

In analysing all the constructions, the present study adopts the approach used by Sweetser (1990) and Dancygier (1998), which recognises multiple domains where certain aspects of conditionality are likely to be presented. These domains include the content domain, the speech-act domain, and the epistemic domain. In addition, the present study also refers to “the perceptual domain” when analysing constructions that contain the conditional
Table 6.2  A Summary of Conditional Constructions in Manchu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prototypes</th>
<th>Conditionality or What Aspect of It</th>
<th>Domain of Semantic Presentation</th>
<th>Additional Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-prototypical Conditionals</td>
<td>Conditionality</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal</td>
<td>Temporality only</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech-Act Conditionals</td>
<td>Conditionality</td>
<td>Speech-act</td>
<td>Protasis used as politeness strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performative Conditionals</td>
<td>Conditionality</td>
<td></td>
<td>Protasis specifying content of speech act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessives Proper</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessive Conditionals</td>
<td>Scalar</td>
<td>Conditionality</td>
<td>Conditionality as a many-to-one correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel Constructions</td>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>Conditionality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>Content / speech-act / epistemic / perceptual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disjunction</td>
<td>Causality / conditionality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative Conditionals</td>
<td>Conditionality</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Main subject referring to protasis state of affairs; “reduced conditional”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic Constructions</td>
<td>Conditionality</td>
<td>Speech-act</td>
<td>Topic → Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception/Cognition Verb</td>
<td>Conditionality / temporality / causality</td>
<td>Epistemic / Perceptual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferential Conditionals</td>
<td>Conditionality</td>
<td>Epistemic</td>
<td>Phenomenon → inference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contribution of the present study can be viewed from two perspectives: that of the
research of linguistic conditionality and that of Manchu linguistics. First, the present study is based on a corpus and investigates the conditional constructions in a particular language (Manchu) in which no such research has been conducted before. It supplements the existing body of studies on conditional constructions with new materials. The present study identifies morphosyntactic prototypes for factual and counterfactual conditionals (Section 5.1), and explores the range of functions of conditional constructions (Chapter 4) in terms of semantics, morphosyntax and pragmatics (Section 5.2). It is of the same type as numerous previous studies and its research approach has benefited from them (Dancygier 1998, Declerck and Reed 2001 on English conditionals; and studies included in Xrakovskij 2005 on conditionals in a wide range of languages that exhibit different grammatical systems). In particular, the present study is relevant to, and inspired by, studies conducted on the conditionals in languages such as Even (Malchukov 2005), Evenki (Pevnov 1980; Nedjalkov and Bulatova 2005), and Japanese (Alpatov and Podlesskaja 2005), which are genetically (Even and Evenki) or typologically (all of the three languages) close to Manchu (see Section 6.1 for details).

Second, the present study is a contribution to Manchu linguistics. This is not to claim that conditionals have been entirely neglected in previous studies. Indeed, Qing Dynasty Manchu grammars record examples of conditionals, and later works of Manchu studies address conditionals (especially when discussing the conditional converb), but the present study has the advantage of collecting data from a corpus of a considerable size and of providing an in-depth analysis of the conditionals. Moreover, in order to analyse counterfactual conditionals, the present study also touches upon various issues of the Manchu verb system (see Section 3.3.3). Thus, the present study puts forward ideas that have not been expressed before, especially concerning the functions of bi-he, the perfective participle of the verb bi-‘to exist/be’. Specifically, it is argued that bi-he has transformed from a predominantly aspectual form that expresses completedness to a tense form that emphatically expresses the past meaning, a change that distinguishes bi-he from the perfective participle of other verbs. This specific case corroborates and exemplifies Avrorin’s (1949) statement concerning the semantic transformation of Manchu participles. The present study then discusses complex structures containing bi-he (e.g., V-hA bi-he, V-mpihe/V-me bi-he; see Section 3.3.3), pointing out that they incorporate the pastness of bi-he into their semantics. Furthermore, it is
demonstrated that both simple and complex structures formed by bi-he can express or contribute to the expression of non-temporal meanings that are related to the state of knowledge, including modal meanings (such as uncertainty and counterfactuality) and mirativity.

Apart from the issues of the Manchu verb system, the present study also summarises the functions of the words aika/aikabade (Section 5.1.1) in discussing the morphosyntax of prototypical conditionals. While in conditional sentences the word forms aika/aikabade are used as conditional connectors (semantic analogues of if in English), they have different functions in other types of sentences. Specifically, the word form aika, originally an indefinite determiner or pronoun meaning ‘some/something’, ‘any/anything’ (derived from the interrogative ai ‘what’ with an indefinite suffix -kA), is also used in questions (especially in rhetorical questions) to reinforce the interrogative meaning. The word form aikabade can occur as an indefinite adverbial (with the meaning ‘in some/any way’), or as an approximate equivalent of lest in apprehensive modal sentences. Admittedly, the present study cannot claim to have discovered these functions, which are more or less illustrated in Qing Dynasty grammars (UH; AMH). However, it relates the other functions of the words aika/aikabade to their function in conditional sentences, pointing out that the speaker of these sentences demonstrates uncertainty or non-assertion.

Various linguistic issues of Manchu involved in the present study can be further explored. It was demonstrated in Chapter 4 that the non-prototypical conditional constructions of Manchu overlap with other constructions, such as temporal, concessive, and topic constructions, all of which allow more than one morphosyntactic pattern and deserve separate research in their own rights. Furthermore, the tense-aspect-modality system of Manchu verbs, which in certain respects still perplexes researches despite the existing studies, requires a thorough analysis based on a sufficiently large corpus. Corpus linguistics, then, is quite likely to help answer some old questions as well as leading to new discoveries.
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