Conditional Constructions in the Manchu Language: A Study from the Perspectives of Semantics, Morphosyntax, Pragmatics and Typology

Chen (Arthur) CHEN

A Thesis Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Linguistics, the University of Auckland, 2013

This page is intentionally left blank

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.

This page is intentionally left blank

Acknowledgements

My deepest gratitude goes first of all to both of my supervisors, Liliya Gorelova and Frank Lichtenberk, without whom I could not have completed this thesis. In fact, without them I could not even have started my studies at the University of Auckland in the first place. A few years ago I developed a strong interest in the Manchu language when I was studying as a Masters candidate in Beijing. One day, when I found a webpage that showed Liliya's research interests, I tentatively wrote her an e-mail to express my wish to pursue my doctorate under her supervision. She soon replied with great enthusiasm, which moved me very deeply. Liliya volunteered to find me another supervisor, whom I later knew to be Frank, an excellent linguist, just as Liliya had described him to be. During the application to study at the University of Auckland, Liliya offered me sincere help with my research proposal. Being Liliya's doctoral student for these years, I cannot even start to mention how much I have learnt from the innumerable discussions that we had together, and from the elaborate written feedback that I received from her. Her expertise has initiated me into the field of Altaic linguistics. Liliya has set an example of a devoted linguist and her academic rigour has helped shape me as someone who believes in taking research seriously.

Frank has instructed and inspired me no less immensely during the years of my studies. Whereas Liliya has usually familiarised me with the important works by Altaic scholars, Frank has often noticed linguistic phenomena similar to what I describe in my thesis, recommending to me studies done on other languages of which I would otherwise never have known. Once when Frank had read a section of my thesis devoted to the functions of a Manchu participle (*bi-he*), he showed me a paper on past perfect forms in European languages, which gave me fresh insights into the problem and enabled me to improve my argumentation. Needless to say, there have also been countless other occasions when his questions propelled me to reconsider ideas that I had taken for granted all the time. Furthermore, Frank has always been supportive: when I finished each year's studies, uncertain whether I had done well enough, he would always give me encouraging remarks in the annual report. I can never thank him enough for his unfailing support.

and the marvellous barbecues we enjoyed. I will definitely miss those good times in the future. I would also like to thank all the friends from the virtual world known as the Internet, where we exchanged ideas on our common interests (especially in Altaic languages and the history of Inner Asia).

Last but not the least, words cannot express my gratitude to my parents, who do not understand my research but nonetheless have always put their unconditional faith in me and have selflessly dedicated themselves to my wellbeing. Their profound love for me has provided me with perpetual motivation to fight for a brighter future.

Banihalara Gisun (Acknowledgements in Manchu)

Ere baksi leolenšu oci, mini jorišara sefu se Liliya Gorelova jai Frank Lichtenberk juwenofi i keside teni bahafi šanggabuhangge ofi, mini dolo hukšeme wajirakū kai. Ubade bi juwe sefu de ten i šumin i banihalara gūnin be iletulebumbi. Juwe sefu waka bihe bici, bi baksi leolenšu be wajibure be aisehe, uthai Auckland Amba Tacikū de taciki sehe seme inu ainahai nashūn bahara bihe ni.

Ududu aniyai onggolo bi Beging de tukiyesi tacisi seme tacime bisire de, Manju gisun de šumin amtan banjinahabi. Emu inenggi Internet de hergire de, Liliya sefui sibkire amtan be tuwabure emu asui afaha be sabuha manggi, uthai inde jasigan arame cendeki seme, ini jorišara baksi tacisi ome taciki sere gūnin be inde alaha. Goidahakū Liliya sefu uthai halhūn mujilen i minde karu jasigan arafi, mini jalin gūwa emu jorišara sefu be baimbi seme cihanggai angga aljaha turgunde, mini dolo umesi acinggiyabuhabi. Mini amala sahangge, Liliya sefu mini jalin baime baha gūwa emu sefu oci, tob seme Frank sefu kai. Tere lak seme Liliya sefu ini karu jasigan de gisurehe adali, geren ci colgoroko emu gisurcisi kai.

Bi Auckland Amba Tacikū i baru tacire baita be baihanara de, Liliya sefu mini sibkire bodomin ergi de labdu aisilaha bihe. Amala bi Liliya sefui tacisi ofi, utala aniyai sidende sefui emgi leolenšu i baita be ton akū hebdehei jihe. Tere anggala, sefu geli daruhai mini leolenšu be narhūšame tuwancihiyahai, ereci mini tacime bahanahangge yargiyan i tolome gisureme wajirakū kai. Liliya sefu beyei cohotoi tacin fonjin i mimbe "Altai tacin" sere tala de yarume dosibuha bime, beyei yabun i alhūdaci ojoro emu tacihasi i durun tuwakū ilibuhabi.

Liliya sefui keside, tacin fonjin be kicerede urunakū umesi cira kimcikūi tuwarakū oci ojorakū sere doro giyan be ulhime mujilen de ejefi, inu sefui gese jingkini sain emu tacihasi oki seme oho.

Frank sefu mini ere ududu aniyai sibkire tacire dulenun de inu minde ambula jorišame tacihiyahabi. Liliya sefu oci, geren Altai tacihasi i araha oyonggo bithe cagan be daruhai minde takabumbi; Frank sefu seci, mini leolenšu de fisembuhengge be tuwaha manggi urkuji ede adalikan gisungge iletulenesu be gūniname, daljingga šu fiyelen be minde tucibume tuwabumbi. Sefu minde jombuhakū bihe bici, enteke sibkin be bi ainaha seme same muterakū bihe kai. Mini kemuni ejehengge, mini leolenšu i emu ubude Manju gisun i "bihe" sere šanggashūn ubusun i baitalan be araha bihe. Ere ubu be Frank sefu tuwaha manggi, uthai Yoropa geren gisun i duleke šanggashūn dursun be leolere emu šu fiyelen be minde tucibuhe. Ere šu fiyelen be hūlaha manggi, bi ice gūnigan jai tuwakūn bahara jakade, beyei leolere arga be inu sain obume mutehe. Ereci tulgiyen, Frank sefu geli mini leolenšu i ergide ton akū minde fonjime ofi, mini daci "esi uttu oci" sehe bihe labdu gūnigan be, dahūme kimcime gūninjara de isibuha. Enteke baita jaci labdu ofi mini fulu gisurere be baiburakū oho. Frank sefu geli mimbe daruhai huwekiyebumbihe. Aniyadari tacin wajirede, bi beyei šanggan absi ojoro be sarkū ofi dolo baibi facihiyašambihe. Enteke erinde, Frank sefu tacin arbun be šošome boolara bithe de urui mimbe saišame tukiyembi. Sefu mimbe uttu huwekiyebure turgunde tacisi bi ai hacin i baniha buhe seme inu tesurakū kai.

Niosilandu – Dulimbai Gurun Baksi Sibkin i Tacire Šangnahan (juwe gurun i sidende acalaha boljohon) akū bihe bici, mini tulergi gurun de tacire tolgin inu yargiyan ome muterakū bihe. Auckland Amba Tacikūi Tacire Šangnahan i Alban i Boo deri bi biyadari banjire menggun be lakcan akū aliha bihe. Ere turgunde bi Amba Tacikū de banihalambi. Ere alban i booi bodogosi Colin Ting agu, amba tacikūi tacire šangnahan be kadalara argai ergide baitangga mejige be minde labdu ulhibuhe bihe, erei jalin bi Ting agu de cohotoi banihalambi.

Bi geli Dulimbai Gurun de bisire mini Manju andasa de hukšeme gūnimbi, cohotoi Hū Aibo jai Lio Guwankiyun juwenofi de banihalambi. Aibo andai emgi oci bi 2007ci aniyade takanduhangge, tere fonde bi Manju gisun be tacime deribufi goidahakū bihe. I bodocin kunggeri i tacisi bicibe, Altai gisun jai suduri de umesi amuran bime sahangge labdu ofi, ere

yargiyan i minde šumilame urahin isibuha kai. Ertele Aibo anda meni juwenofi asude acahadari kemuni daruhai Manjurara turgunde, bi Manju gisun be an i cihalambime, Manjurara be inu onggorakū ome mutembi kai. Guwankiyun anda oci, inu Manju gisun be umesi bahanaha emu saisa inu. Ududu aniyai onggolo bi sibkin i jalin Dulimbai Gurun de marihade, Guwankiyun anda minde Manju gisun i (talkiyaringga) bithe labdu buhe bihe. Amala ere jergi bithe mini sibkinde baitalaha daita i umesi oyonggo emu sekiyen oho kai. Guwankiyun anda te alban baitai šolo de Simiyan (Mukden) hoton de menggun alirakū Manju gisun i kicen be giyangnambi ni, ere be gūnihadari, bi uthai beyede hendume, mini ere sibkirengge ainci baitangga ba bi dere seme, dolo ambula tohoroko.

Mini gucu Li Wenfeng minde ambula aisilaha turgunde inde banihalambi. Onggolo Beging de tacirede, be (gisurcin i kunggeri i) tukiyesi tacin gucu bihe. Amala Wenfeng Amerika Gurun de genefi, te inu baksi tacisi seme kiceme tacime bi. Bi Auckland de mini umesi baibure bithe hacin be baharakū erinde, Wenfeng emdubei suilara be bodorakū, eici ini beyei tacikū i bithei kuren deri ocibe, eici gūwa yamaka bithei kuren deri ocibe, urunakū mini jalin bithe be eldešeme sarkiyafi bahabumbihe. Uttu minde aisilaha turgunde, mini dolo ertele umesi hukšembi. Aikabade I amala mimbe aisila seci, bi inu toktofi kengse lasha muterei teile hūsun tucimbi.

Bi Richard Austin jai Cen Giyaiwei juwe gucu de hing seme banihalambi. Ere juwenofi seci, inu mini gese yaya gisun de watai amuran niyalma inu. Tese beyei baita de umesi ekšembi secibe, mini leolenšu be tuwame acabuha. Ere leolenšu de jai šuturu eici dursun de acanarakū ba bici, gemu mini beyei endebuku kai.

Mini baksi tacisi gucuse, beyei inenggidari sebjelere baita ocibe, geli tacin sibkin i dorgi jobošoro baita ocibe, urui mini emgi uhelembihe turgunde, mini simeli gūnin be tookabuha bime, ubade banjire tacirengge inu ele amtangga obuha. Jaide, Auckland hoton de takahala mini gucuse, daruhai mini emgi injeceme leoleceme, geli ton akū icangga barbikio be urgunjeme jeke bihe. Ere jergi turgunde, mini geren gucuse de banihalambi. Gūnici, amala Dulimbai Gurunde bederehe manggi bi urunakū tenteke selacuka inenggi be kidume gūnimbi kai! Ereci tulgiyen, Internet sere untuhungga jalan jecen de bisire mini geren gucuse, meni uhei amtan i ergide — cohotoi Altai gisun jai Dorgi Asiyai suduri jergide — beyei gūnigan be hūlašaha bihe. Ere turgunde bi cende banihalambi.

Banihalaki seci, bi adarame umesi haji mini ama eme be onggombi ni. Juwe sakda mini sibkirengge be umai ulhirakū bicibe, daci dubede isitala mimbe teng seme akdahai, cisu akū i mimbe elhe sain okini sere jalin jobome suilahai jihe. Ama emei ten i gosire gūnin erindari mimbe huwekiyebume, eldengge amaga inenggi i jalin lakcarakū fafuršabumbi kai.

2013ci aniyai 11 biyai 6 inenggi (Mukei usihanggi), Auckland Amba Tacikū de Ulhisu araha.

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

1	first person		IMP	imperative
2	second person		INCH	inchoative
3	third person		INCL	inclusive
ABIL	abilitative		INS	instrumental
ABL	ablative		IPFV	imperfective
ACC	accusative		N-	non-
ADJ	adjective		NEG	negative
APRH	apprehensive		NMLZ	nominaliser
AUX	auxiliary verb		OPT	optative
CAUS	causative		PASS	passive
CONC	concessive		PFV	perfective
COND	conditional		PL	plural
COOP	cooperative		PN	proper noun
COP	copula		POSS	possessive
CVB	converb		POT	potential
DAT	dative		PRED	predicative
DIM	diminutive		PRF	perfect
DIRN	directional		PROG	progressive
DS	different-subject		PROL	prolative
DUR	durative		PST	past
EMPH	emphatic		PTCP	participle
EPN	epenthesis		PTL	particle
EVID	evidential		Q	question particle/marker
EXCL	exclusive		QUOT	quotative
EXH	exhaustive		RECP	reciprocal
EXS	existential		SBJV	subjunctive
FIN	finite		SG	singular
FUT	future		SS	same-subject
GEN	genitive		TERM	terminative
HON	honorific		TOP	topic
IDR	indirect			

This page is intentionally left blank

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).[2] 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 kamcibuha 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).

(vii) *Orin emu julen* 'Twenty-one Stories', aka **Sidit Hüür** (Mongolian; traditionally: *Siditü Kegür*) 'The Bewitched Corpse', or **Shiyu Gushi** (Chinese) 'Stories of the Bewitched Corpse' (abbreviated as SG in the present study).

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-ci), 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

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

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, *aika* and *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 2.1   Truth Value for Conditional

Protasis	Apodosis	Conditional
True	True	True
True	False	False
False	True	True
False	False	True

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

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*[4] 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".[5] 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

and Kerslake 2000), Mongolian (Chenggeltei 1991), Manchu (Gorelova 2002), Even (Malchukov 2005), Evenki (Pevnov 1980; Nedjalkov and Bulatova 2005), and Japanese (Alpatov and Podlesskaja 2005).

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 Classifcation 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 symptons 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-russkij slovar'* [A Complete Manchu-Russian Dictionary] (Zakharov 1875). Descriptive grammars include *Grammaire tartare mantchou* (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 3.1   Manchu Converbs

Converb[7]	Suffix	Basic Meaning
Imperfective	*-me*	'while doing something…'
Perfective	*-fi*	'after doing/having done something…'
Conditional	*-ci*	'if [one] does something…'
Concessive	*-cibe*	'although/even if [one] does something…'
Durative	*-hAi*	'having been doing something…'
Terminative	*-tAlA*	'until [one] does something…'
Anticipative	*-nggAlA*	'before doing something…'
Exhaustive	*-tAi*	'to the extent of doing something'

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 3.2   Complex Conditional-converb Structures Expressing Modal Meanings

Modal Verb	Grammatical Polarity	Structure	Meaning	English Translation
o- 'to become/be'	Affirmative	V-*ci o-*	Possibility or permission	'can/may/be allowed to do something'
	Negative[8]	V-*ci ojo-rakū*		'cannot/may not/not be allowed to do something'
aca- 'to suit'	Affirmative	V-*ci aca-*	Obligation	'should/be supposed to do something'
	Negative	V-*ci aca-rakū*		'should not/not be supposed to do something'

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

---

[8] 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.

expressing the causal meaning 'since', 'because': *bithe* [book] *taci-ci* [study-COND] *tetendere* 'since [you] study the books'.

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] *icihiya-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

The Final Stem/Root Vowel	Verb	Imperfective Participle
a	*ala*- 'to tell'	*ala-ra*
	isa- 'to gather'	*isa-ra*
o	*bodo*- 'to consider'	*bodo-ro*
	tolo- 'count'	*tolo-ro*
e, i, u, ū, oo, etc.	*gene*- 'to go'	*gene-re*
	ali- 'to accept'	*ali-re*
	hendu- 'to say'	*hendu-re*
	kūthū- 'to mingle'	*kūthū-re*
	too- 'to swear'	*too-re*

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

Verb Root	Imperfective Participle
bi- 'to exist/be'	*bisi-re*
je- 'to eat'	*jete-re*
ji- 'to come'	*jide-re*
gala- '(of sky) to clear up'	*galanda-ra*
ba- 'to be lazy'	*banda-ra*
o- 'to become/be'	*ojo-ro*

Table 3.5   Vowel Harmony in the Perfective Participle

Stem/Root Vowels	Verb Stem/Root	Perfective Participle	Suffixal Vowel
a-a-	*ala-* 'to tell'	*ala-ha*	
a-i-	*banji-* 'to be born'	*banji-ha*	
a-u-	*sabu-* 'to see'	*sabu-ha*	
i-i-	*ili-* 'to stand up'	*ili-ha*	***a***
i-u-	*iju-* 'to smear'	*iju-ha*	
i-ū-	*ikū-* 'to shrink'	*ikū-ha*	
u-u-	*buju-* 'to boil'	*buju-ha*	
e-e-	*gene-* 'to go'	*gene-he*	
e-i-	*benji-* 'to send'	*benji-he*	
e-u-	*hendu-* 'to say'	*hendu-he*	
i-e-	*fide-* 'to dispatch'	*fide-he*	***e***
u-i-	*ulhi-* 'to understand'	*ulhi-he*	
u-u-	*guku-* 'to perish'	*guku-he*	

Table 3.5 (Continued)

Stem/Root Vowels	Verb Stem/Root	Perfective Participle	Suffixal Vowel
o-o-	*bodo-* 'to consider'	*bodo-ho*	***o***
	sonjo- 'to choose'	*sonjo-ho*	
	tokto- 'to decide'	*tokto-ho*	

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

Verb Root	Perfective Participle
je- 'to eat'	*je-ke*
tuhe- 'to fall'	*tuhe-ke*
dosi- 'to enter'	*dosi-ka*
okdo- 'to welcome'	*okdo-ko*
guwe- 'to tweet'	*guweng-ke*
jo- 'to mention'	*jong-ko*

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] *ji-he* [come-PFV.PTCP] 'I came/I have come', *bi sin-de* [2SG(*si/sin*)-DAT] *bithe* [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 uthai* [then] *gene-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] *niyalma* [person] 'the person who came'; *buce-he* [die-PFV.PTCP] *haha* [man] 'a dead man'; *bi* [1SG] *sin-de* [2SG(*si/sin*)-DAT] *bene-bu-he* [send-CAUS-PFV.PTCP] *bithe* [book] 'the book which I made someone send to you'; *sin-i* [2SG(*si/sin*)-GEN] *yalu-ha* [ride-PFV.PTCP] *morin* [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, *banji-ha-ci* [be.born-PFV.PTCP-ABL] *ebsi* [hitherto] *ere* [this] *gese* [like] *beikuwen* [cold] *be* [ACC] *we* [who] *dulembu-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 *donji-* 'to hear', *sabu-* 'to see', *naka-* 'to stop': *age* [sir] *ji-he* [come-PFV.PTCP] *be* [ACC] *donji-hakū* [hear-PFV.PTCP.NEG] '[I] didn't hear that you came, sir'; *šun* [sun] *dosi-re* [enter-IPFV.PTCP] *hami-ka* [approach-PFV.PTCP] *be sabu-fi* [see-PFV.CVB], *teni* [only.then] *amasi* [back] *ji-mbi* [come-IPFV.FIN] 'only when [we] saw that the sun was close to setting did [we start to] come back'; and *suwe* [2PL] *becendu-re* [quarrel-IPFV.PTCP] *be*

[ACC] *naka-ø* [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-IPFV.FIN] 'I go to the *yamen* every day'; *cimari* [tomorrow] *simne-mbi* [take.exams-IPFV.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-*hAbi*, which obviously originated from the combination of the perfective participle (V-*hA*) and the existential particle *bi*. It also has a negative counterpart V-*hAkūbi*, which is, however, used less frequently than the negative perfective participle V-*hAkū*. Semantically similar to the perfective participle V-*hA*, the perfective finite form serves to describe a state of affairs as completed, which is usually located in the past: *tere gene-hebi* '[she or he] has already gone'.

The progressive finite form (V-*me bi*) is a combination of the imperfective converb (V-*me*) and the existential particle (*bi*), describing an "action or situation [that] is in progress" (Li 2010: 366):[9] *bithe* [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 *bi-he*, the perfective participle of the verb *bi-*. Such forms include: V-*hA bi-he*, V-*me bihe*/V-*mbihe*, and their negative counterparts V-*hAkū bi-he*, V-*rakū bi-he*. Their functions are discussed in Section 3.2.2.2, which focuses on the participle *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: *hūdun* [quick] *gene-ø* [go-IMP(i)] 'go quickly!', *min-de* [1SG(*bi/min*)-DAT] *ala-ø* [tell-IMP(i)] 'Tell me!', *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 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

Verb Root	Imperative (i)
bi- 'to be/stay'	*bisu*
bai- 'to seek'	*baisu*
gai- 'to take'	*gaisu*
je- 'to eat'	*jefu*
ji- 'to come'	*jio*
o- 'to become'	*oso*

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

48

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 speaker's intention of carrying out an action: *bi* [1SG] *tacikū* [school] *de* [DAT] *gene-ki* [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 something: *bi* [1SG] *manju* [Manchu] *gisun* [language] *be* [ACC] *taci-ki* [learn-OPT] *se-mbi* [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 confined to human beings: *tesu* [local] *ba-i* [place-GEN] *hafan* [official] *icihiya-kini* [handle-OPT] 'Let the local officials handle it!'; *tumen* [ten.thousand] *baita* [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 particle *ayoo*: *tere* [that] *jaka* [thing] *efuje-re* [be.broken-IPFV.PTCP] *ayoo* (*se-mbi* [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* [mutually] *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 3.8   Some Conjugated Forms of *o-* (as a Copular Verb):

Conjugation	Verb Form	Example
Imperfective Finite	*o-mbi*	*sain* [good] *o-mbi* '[one] becomes/will become good'
Imperfective Participle	*ojo-ro*	*han* [khan] *ojo-ro niyalma* [person] 'the man to become the khan'
Perfective Participle	*o-ho*	*halhūn* [hot] *o-ho* '[it] became/has become hot'
Imperative (i)	*oso*	*ekisaka* [quite] *oso* 'Be quiet!'
Conditional Converb	*o-ci*	*tere* [that] *haha* [man] *tondo* [honest] *o-ci* 'If that man is honest…'

Table 3.8 (Continued)

Conjugation	Verb Form	Example
Perfective Converb	*o-fi*	*gaitai* [suddenly] *halhūn* [hot] *o-fi* '[it] suddenly becoming hot…'

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

Form of Lexical Verb		Combination	Example
Affirmative	V-*me*	V-*me o-ho de*	*si* [2SG] *kice-me* [strive-IPFV.CVB] *taci-me* [study-IPFV.CVB] *o-ho-de* [become(AUX)-PFV.PTCP-DAT] 'If you study hard'
		V-*me o-fi*	*tere* [3SG/that] *ji-me* [come-IPFV.CVB] *o-fi* [become(AUX)-PFV.CVB] 'Because he comes'
	V-*rA*	V-*rA o-ci*	*bithe* [book] *hūla-ra* [read-IPFV.PTCP] *o-ci* [become(AUX)-COND] 'If [one] reads books'
Negative	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] *jide-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'
	V-*hAkū*	V-*hAkū o-fi*	*tere* [3SG/that] *ji-hekū* [come-PFV.PTCP.NEG] *o-fi* 'Because he did not come…'

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-*

Conjugation	Verb Form	Example
Imperfective Finite	*bi-mbi*	*bele* [grain] *kemuni* [still] *hecen* [city] *de* [DAT] *bi-mbi* [be-IPFV.FIN] 'there is still grain in the city'

Table 3.10 (Continued)

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

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)   *sin-i   dergi-de   emu   ahūn   bi-he   tofohon*
2SG(*si/sin*)-GEN   top-DAT   one   elder.brother be-PFV.PTCP fifteen
se   de   beye   dube-he
year(-old)   DAT   body   end-PFV.PTCP
beye dube-: 'to die', lit.: '(of the body) to end'
'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
              <u>*bi-he*</u>
              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*
              three   year-GEN   before   1PL.INCL-GEN   this.place-DAT   that/3SG
              geli   *we*   <u>*bi-he*</u>?   *funsan*   *yadahūn*   *kai*
              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*   <u>*bi-he*</u>
              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*

Lexical Verb Form			Complex Structure
Affirmative	Perfective Participle	V-*hA*	V-*hA bi-he*
	Imperfective Converb	V-*me*	V-*me bi-he*/V-*mbihe*
	Imperfective Participle	V-*rA*	V-*rA bi-he* (rather rare)
Negative	(Negative) Perfective Participle	V-*hAkū*	V-*hAkū bi-he*
	(Negative) Imperfective Participle	V-*rakū*	V-*rakū bi-he*

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 |

inu	*emke*	*takūra-ha*	*ba*	*akū*
even	one	send-PFV.PTCP	NMLZ	NEG

V-*hA ba akū*: '[one] did not V', lit.: 'there is no such thing as one's having V-ed'
'I had invited/did invite him, [but he] didn't even [so much as] send a dog [to my house]!' (OJ1: 44)

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

bi-he.		*min-de*	*emte*	*justan*	*gebu*	*jergi*
be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP		1SG(*bi/min*)-DAT	one.each	stripe	name	rank

ara-ha	*bithe*	*weri-hebi*
write-PFV.PTCP	letter	leave-PFV.FIN

'I did [indeed] ask/had asked their family names. [They] left one letter each, on which were written [their] names and ranks' (OJ1: 58)

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

habtala-ha	*andan-de*,	*in-i*		*cisu-i*	*tuhe-kebi*
blink-PFV.PTCP	instant-DAT	3SG(*i/in*)-GEN		self-GEN	fall-PFV.FIN

yasa habtala-ha andan-de: 'in the blink of an eye'
in-i cisu-i: 'naturally', 'by itself'
'Just now [the icicles] were hanging down below the eaves, [but] in the blink of an eye, [the icicles] naturally fell [onto the ground]' (AGA2: 107)

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

acabu-ki	*se-me*	*gūni-ha*	*bi-he*.
harmonise-OPT	say(AUX)-IPFV.CVB	think-PFV.PTCP	be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP

amala	*tuwa-fi*	*joo-ø*
afterwards	look-PFV.CVB	stop-IMP

V-*ki se-*: complex structure expressing intention/desire

'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)
si	*sikse*	*juwan*	*ba*	*se-me*		*hendu-he*
2SG	yesterday	ten	mile	say(AUX)-IPFV.CVB		speak-PFV.PTCP

bi-he.		*enenggi*	*ainu*	*gūsin*	*ba*	*se-mbi*
be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP		today	why	thirty	mile	say-IPFV.FIN

'Yesterday you said [the distance was] ten miles. Why do you say thirty miles today?' (LQD: 132)

(3.2 – 10)
cananggi,		*be*	*wargi*	*alin*	*de,*	*oihori*
day.before.yesterday		1PL.EXCL	west	hill	DAT	very

sebjele-he		*bi-he*				
enjoy-PFV.PTCP		be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP				

'The day before yesterday we enjoyed ourselves very much' (OJ2: 16)

(3.2 – 11)   *bi   inu   dule-ke   aniya   tuba-de   tata-ha*

1SG   also   pass-PFV.PTCP   year   that.place-DAT   lodge-PFV.PTCP

bi-he,   *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.   *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   beikuwen   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

ufarabu-ha	*bi-he-o*?	*si*	*te*	*jori-me*
lose-PFV.PTCP	be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP-Q	2SG	now	point-IPFV.CVB

tucibu-ø
take.out-IMP

jori-me tucibu-: 'to point out', lit.: 'to take out [by] pointing'

'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 *Gesamtbedeutung*, 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*,[12] 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-IPFV.PTCP   ACC
tuwa-me   bi-he-ngge,   hecen   gai-bu-ha
watch-IPFV.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-IPFV.PTCP   DAT   still   swear-IPFV.CVB
sure-mbihe,   amala   kudeše-hei,   nidu-re
shout-PST.IPFV   afterwards   beat.back.with.hands-DUR.CVB   groan-IPFV.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.IPFV   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
jin   get-PST.IFPV   now   five   tael   silver   DAT   one

62

ginggin hono baha-rakū
jin   still   get-IPFV.PTCP.NEG
dule-ke aniya: 'last year'
'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)

(3.2 – 20)　*Daiming   Gurun   sin-de   atanggi ere gese   šang   ambula*
　　　　　Ming   empire 2SG(*si/sin*)-DAT when   this like   reward   greatly
　　　　　<u>*bu-mbihe*</u>
　　　　　give-PST.IPFV
　　　　　šang bu-: 'to reward'
　　　　　'When did the Ming Empire ever generously reward you like this?' (MYK6: 26)

One can see from (3.2 – 16) – (3.2 – 20) that the structure V-*mbihe*/V-*me bi-he* is similar to the structure V-*hA bi-he* in that the structure V-*mbihe*/V-*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-*hA bi-he* in that the state of affairs represented by V-*mbihe*/V-*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-*hA bi-he*, the structure V-*mbihe*/V-*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 V-*rakū/-hAkū bi-he*

These structures consist of negative participles (imperfective V-*rakū*, perfective V-*hAkū*) and the form *bi-he*, and mainly serve as main predicates. Semantically they do not exhibit new patterns except for the negation of their affirmative counterparts: V-*hAkū bi-he* is the negation of the form V-*hA bi-he*, and the structure V-*rakū bi-he* is the negation of both V-*mbihe* and V-*rA bi-he* (however, it should be noted that the structure V-*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:

(3.2 – 21)　*bi   seibeni   niyalma-i   muke   tata-ra   be*
　　　　　1SG   formerly   people-GEN   water   pull-IPFV.PTCP   ACC

tuwa-ha	*bi-cibe*	*taci-hakū*	*bi-he*
watch-PFV.PTCP	be(AUX)-CONC	learn-PFV.PTCP.NEG	be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP

'Though I have watched people drawing water [out of a well] before, I have never learnt [to do it myself]' (LQD: 80)

(3.2 – 22)

juwe	*biya*	*gucule-fi*	*ishunde*	*dere*
two	month	befriend-PFV.CVB	mutually	face

fularja-hakū	*bi-he*
redden-PFV.PTCP.NEG	be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP

dere fularja-: 'to argue', 'to be angry', lit.: 'face reddens'

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

(3.2 – 23)

tere	*juwen*	*bu-rakū*	*bi-he*	*bi*
that/3SG	loan	give-IPFV.PTCP.NEG	be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP	1SG

dahūn dahūn i	*bai-re*	*de*	*hami-rakū*
repeatedly	request-IPFV.PTCP	DAT	bear-IPFV.PTCP

o-fi	*arkan seme*	*bu-he*
become(AUX)-PFV.CVB	reluctantly	give-PFV.PTCP

juwen bu-: 'to lend'

dahūn dahūn i: 'repteatedly'

arkan seme: 'reluctantly'

'[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)

(3.2 – 24)

nunggala-ha	*lalanji*	*booha*	*be*	*bi*	*hihala-rakū*
stew-PFV.PTCP	soft	dish	ACC	1SG	like-IPFV.PTCP

bi-he.		*te*	*urui*	*angga*	*de*	*nilukan*	*haihū*
be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP		now	just	mouth	DAT	smooth	soft

ningge	*be*	*buye-mbi*
NMLZ	ACC	love-IPFV.FIN

'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)   *agu-sa   ere   aiba   bi-he*
             sir-PL   this what.place be-PFV.PTCP
             'Sirs, what is this place?' (NSB: 68)

(3.2 – 26)   *si   ai   niyalma   bi-he*?   *bi   ainu   taka-rakū*
             2SG what   person   be-PFV.PTCP 1SG why   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).[13] 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*,[14] 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*):[15]

---

[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] *foholon* [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] *ni* [PTL]. '[So] in fact there is no matching [between them]! (I

(3.2 – 27)　*si　emu　sain　niyalma　<u>bi-he</u>　<u>ni</u>*
　　　　　　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)　<u>*dule*</u>　*emu　tondokon　niyalma waka　<u>bihe</u>　<u>ni</u>*
　　　　　　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　<u>bi-he</u>　<u>ni</u>*
　　　　　　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]!'
　　　　　　(AGA3: 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　<u>gelebu-mbihe</u>　<u>ni</u>
　　　　　　people　ACC　frighten-PST.IPFV　PTL
　　　　　　butu 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
　　　　　　<u>*wacihiyabu-ci*</u>　*aca-mbihe*
　　　　　　finish-COND　　suit(AUX)-PST.IPFV
　　　　　　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-rakū* [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) *sim-be*   <u>*guile-ci*</u>   <u>*aca-mbihe*</u>.   *sin-de*
2SG(*si/sin*)-ACC   invite-COND suit(AUX)-PST.IPFV   2SG(*si/sin*)-DAT

mejige *isibu-hakū-ngge*,   *ere-i*   *dorgi-de*
message send-PFV.PTCP-NEG-NMLZ   this-GEN   inside-DAT

sin-de   *aca-rakū*   *niyalma*   *bi-fi*   *kai*
2SG(*si/sin*)-DAT   suit-IPFV.PTCP.NEG   people   be-PFV.CVB   PTL

sinde acarakū niyalma: 'people who do not get along with you', lit.: 'people not suiting you'
bi-fi kai: 'indeed because there is/are/was/were'
'[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) <u>*donji-mbihe*</u>   <u>*bi-ci*</u>,   *urgun*   *i*   *doro-i*
hear-PST.IPFV   be(AUX)-COND   happiness   GEN   rite-GEN

acana-me   *gene-ci*   <u>*aca-mbihe*</u>
go.to.meet-IPFV.CVB   go-COND   suit(AUX)-PST.IPFV

urgun i doro: 'congratulations', lit.: 'the rite of happiness'
V-*ci aca-*: complex structure expressing obligation
'If [I] had heard [about your good news], [I] should have gone to meet [you and offer my] congratulations' (MFG: 7)

(3.2 – 34) *tere*   *inenggi*   *baha*   *bi-ci*,   *sim-be*
that   day   get.PFV.PTCP   be(AUX)-COND   2SG(*si/sin*)-ACC

<u>*wa-mbihe*</u>
kill-PST.IPFV
'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] <u>*bi-he*</u> [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] <u>*o-ho*</u> [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] <u>*se-he*</u> [say-PFV.PTCP] 'He said, "I've come"' (direct speech, *se-* used alone); *tere* [that/3SG] <u>*hendu-me*</u> [speak-IPFV.CVB], *si* [2SG] *ebsi* [hither] *jio* [come.IMP] <u>*se-he*</u> [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] <u>*te-ki*</u> [live-OPT] <u>*se-me*</u> [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] <u>*se-me*</u> [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] <u>*se-re*</u> [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] <u>*ji-mbi*</u> [come-IPFV.FIN] <u>*se-me*</u> [say(AUX)-IPFV.CVB] <u>*donji-fi*</u> [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] <u>*se-re-ngge*</u> [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] <u>*se-ci*</u> [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).[17] 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 occurences of conditional-converb structures expressing conditionality.

lexical verb 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 V-*mbi* ([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]):

(4.1 – 1) *inenggi-dari* *hūla-ci*, *gisun* *eje-mbi*
day-every read-COND words remember-IPFV.FIN
'If [one] reads every day, [one] will remember words' (OJ1: 24)

(4.1 – 2) *muse* *dobori* *farhūn* *de* *cooha* *jura-ci*, *gurun*
1PL.INCL night dark DAT troops set.out-COND people
durge-mbi
be.disturbed-IPFV.FIN
'If we march the troops during the night, the people [in the city] will be disturbed' (MYK2: 37)

(4.1 – 3) *gene-ci*, *uthai* *hūdun* *jio*
go-COND then quick come.IMP
'If [you] go [there], then come [back] quickly!' (UH: 17)

(4.1 – 4) *suwe* *te-de* *acana-ci*, *mim-be* *guilefi*
2PL 3SG-DAT go.to.meet 1SG(*bi/min*)-ACC invite-PFV.CVB
sasa *yo-ki*
together go-OPT
'If you go to meet him, take me [and] let's go together' (MFG: 16)

(4.1 – 5) *age si* *mim-be* *wakaša-ci*, *bi* *yala* *sui mangga*
sir 2SG 1SG(*bi/min*)-ACC blame-COND 1SG really wronged
sui mangga: 'wronged', 'done injustice to'; *sui* 'guilt, sin', *mangga* 'difficult'
'Sir, if you blame me, I [will be] really wronged' (OJ2: 116)

(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)

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)   *daha-rakū*   *o-ci*,   *be*   *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)   *min-i*   *ere uniyen tukšan*   *banji-rakū*
            1SG(*bi/min*)-GEN   this cow   calf   give.birth-IPFV.PTCP.NEG
            o-ci,   *ayara   nimenggi*   *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)   *turgun   be*   *tucibu-me*   *ala-rakū*   *o-ci*,
            reason   ACC   reveal-IPFV.CVB   tell-IPFV.PTCP.NEG   become(AUX)-COND
            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) *giyan   de*   *acana-rakū*   *o-ci*,   *uthai*
            principle   DAT   suit-IPFV.PTCP.NEG   become(AUX)-COND   then
            naka-ø
            stop-IMP
            'If [the matter] does not suit [our] principles, then stop [handling it]!'
            (MFG: 11)

(4.1 – 11) *jete-re*   *jeku*   *akū*   *o-ci*,
            eat-IPFV.PTCP   provisions   NEG   become(AUX)-COND
            muse-i   *jušen*   *gemu*   *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)

(4.1 – 12)   *min-i*   *hese*   *akū*   *o-ci*,   *ume*
               1SG(*bi/min*)-GEN   order   NEG   become(AUX)-COND   do.not

               tucibu-re
               release-IPFV.PTCP

               ume V-rA: negative imperative (or, prohibitive) structure
               'If [you] do not [have] my order, do not release [her]!' (NSB: 92)

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)   *jiha*   *menggun*   *i*   *uda-fi*   *etu-re*
               money   silver   GEN   buy-PFV.CVB   wear-IPFV.PTCP

               o-ci,   *niyalma*   *oforo*   *deri*   *suk seme*
               become(AUX)-COND   people   nose   ABL   snorting

               inje-mbi   *kai*
               laugh-IPFV.FIN   PTL

               suk seme inje-: 'to laugh through the nose while trying to hold a straight face'
               'If [you] buy [the clothes] with money and wear them, people will laugh at you (through the nose)' (OJ2: 54)

(4.1 – 14)   *ali-me*   *gaisu*   *manggi*   *geli*   *angga*   *aifu-re*
               accept-IPFV.CVB   take.IMP   after   then   mouth   break.word-IPFV.PTCP

               o-ci,   *niyalma*   *jai*   *adarame*   *sin-i*
               become(AUX)-COND   people   again   how   2SG(*si/sin*)-GEN

               gisun   *be*   *akda-mbi*
               words   ACC   believe-IPFV.FIN

               ali-me gai-: 'to accept', 'to make a promise'
               angga aifu-: 'to break one's word'
               'If [you], after making a promise, break [your] word, how can people believe your words again?' (OJ2: 60)

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)   *age*   *tuwa-ki*   *se-ci*,   *bi*   *bene-bu-re*
                  sir   look-OPT   say(AUX)-COND   1SG   send-CAUS-IPFV.PTCP
                  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)   *min-i*   *emgi*   *banji-ki*   *se-ci*,   *juwe*   *juse*
                  1SG(*bi/min*)-GEN   together   live-OPT   say(AUX)-COND   two   children
                  be   *bošo-ø*!
                  ACC   expel-IMP
                  '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)   *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)

(4.1 – 18)   *age si*   *enenggi*   *aikabade*   *min-i*   *boo-de*
                  sir 2SG   today   if   1SG(*bi/min*)-GEN   house-DAT

---

[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.

dosi-rakū		*o-ci*,		*bi*	*yargiyan-i*
enter-IPFV.PTCP.NEG		become(AUX)-COND		1SG	real-GEN

sim-be	*usha-mbi*
2SG(*si/sin*)-ACC	be.angry-IPFV.FIN

yargiyan i: 'really'

'Sir, if you don't come into my house today, I will be really angry with you' (MFG: 49)

(4.1 – 19)	*aika*	*icakū*	*ba*	*bi-ci*,	*majige*	*joriša-me*
	if	inappropriate	place	be-COND	a.little	point.out-IPFV.CVB

tuwancihiya-ø	
correct-IMP	

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

(4.1 – 20)	*sin-i*	*boo-de*	*aika*	*mihan*	*yali*	*niongniyaha*
	2SG(*si/sin*)-GEN	house-DAT	if	young.pig	meat	goose

yali	*bi-ci*,	*bi*	*dosi-fi*	*je-ki*
meat	be-COND	1SG	enter-PFV.CVB	eat-OPT

'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

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

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-*rakū* 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).[19] 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) *donji-ha*   *bi-ci*,   *inu*   *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) *tere inenggi baha*   *bi-ci*,   *sim-be*
            that day   get.PFV.PTCP   be(AUX)-COND   2SG(*si/sin*)-ACC
            wa-mbihe
            kill-PST.IPFV
            'If [I] had captured [you] that day, I would have killed you' (MYK2: 46)

(4.1 – 23) *gūwa*   *niyalma*   *o-ho*   *bi-ci*,   *aina-ha*
            other   person   become-PFV.PTCP   be(AUX)-COND   do.what-PFV.PTCP
            se-me   *tuwa-rakū*   *bi-he*
            say(AUX)-IPFV.CVB   look-IPFV.PTCP.NEG   be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP

---

[19] Such constructions are analysed in other sections of this chapter.

ainaha seme: 'absslolutely', 'by any means', always used with negation

tuwa-: here meaning 'to prophesy', lit: 'to look [into someone's destiny]'

'If [he] were anybody else, [I] would absolutely not prophesy [for him]'

(NSB: 27)

(4.1 – 24) *weri*   *i*   *jombu-ha*   *be*   *majige*   *gai-ha*

other.people GEN advise-PFV.PTCP ACC a.little take-PFV.PTCP

bi-ci,   *inu* *e-de*   *tuhene-rakū*   *bi-he*

be(AUX)-COND also this-DAT fall-IPFV.PTCP.NEG be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP

'If [you] had taken even a little advice from other people, [you] would not have fallen into this [trap]' (AGA3: 35)

(4.1 – 25) *sa-ha*   *bi-ci*,   *aifini* *sim-be*

know-PFV.PTCP be(AUX)-COND long.ago 2SG(*si/sin*)-ACC

tuwanji-rakū   *bi-he-o*

come.to.see-IPFV.PTCP.NEG be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP-Q

'If [I] knew [that you lived here], wouldn't [I] have come to see you long ago?' (OJ1: 24)

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-*mbihe*, which, as argued in Section 3.2.2.2.2, is a complex form consisting of the imperfective converb (V-*me*) and the perfective participle of the verb *bi-* ('to exist/be'), *bi-he*. The predicate of a negative apodosis (see [4.1 – 23] – [4.1 – 25])[20] consists of the negative imperfective participle (V-*rakū*) and *bi-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-*hA bi-ci*. One such type of predicate structure consists of the past imperfective form V-*mbihe* (= V-*me bi-he*) and *bi-ci*. In the following example (also discussed in Section 3.2.2.3), the main predicate is a complex structure (V-*ci aca-*) expressing modality 'to be obligated to', where the auxiliary verb *aca-* is in the past imperfective form V-*mbihe*:

---

[20] Though the main clause of (4.1 – 25) is a question, it is formed by attaching the sentence-final question particle *o* directly to the main predicate — a negative verb structure, V-*rakū bi-he*. Thus, the analysis here of negative apodosis also applies to (4.1 – 25).

(4.1 – 26)   *donji-mbihe*   *bi-ci*,   *urgun   i   doro-i*
                hear-PST.IPFV   be(AUX)-COND   happiness GEN   rite-GEN

                acana-me   *gene-ci*   *aca-mbihe*
                go.to.meet-IPFV.CVB   go-COND   suit(AUX)-PST.IPFV

                urgun i doro: 'congratulations', lit.: 'the rite of happiness'

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

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

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 baha-ra*
                if   dragon   palace   GEN   glue   obtain-IPFV.PTCP

                bi-he   *bi-ci*,   *giranggi   jalan   be*
                be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP   be(AUX)-COND   bone   joint   ACC

                jalga-fi,   *yali   sukū   banjibu-ci*
                put.together-PFV.CVB   flesh   skin   generate-COND

                o-mbihe
                become(AUX)-PST.IPFV

                V-*ci o-*: 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)   *bi*   *moo-i*   *funghūwang*   <u>*ara-rakū*</u>   <u>*bi-ci*</u>,

                 1SG   wood-GEN   phoenix   make-IPFV.PTCP.NEG be(AUX)-COND

                 fujin   *be*   *boo*   *leose* *ci*   *tucibu-ci*

                 lady   ACC   house   building ABL   rescue-CAUS-COND

                 <u>*ojo-rakū*</u>   <u>*bi-he*</u>

                 become(AUX)-IPFV.PTCP.NEG   be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP

                 V-*ci ojo-rakū*: here meaning 'not to be able to do something', the negation of the structure V-*ci o-*, expressing permission/likelihood

                 'If I had not made the wooden phoenix, [we] could not have rescued the lady out of the building' (SG: 245–246)

(4.1 – 29)   *min-i*   *jui*   *be*   *dahūme*   <u>*aitu-hakū*</u>

                 1SG(*bi/min*)-GEN child   ACC   again   save-PFV.PTCP.NEG

                 <u>*bi-ci*</u>,   *fulehe*   <u>*lakca-me*</u>   <u>*bi-he*</u>

                 be(AUX)-COND   root   be.severed-IPFV.CVB be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP

                 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)

    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)   *Nomina Naikada*   <u>*alana-rakū*</u>   <u>*bi-he*</u>

                 PN   PN   go.to.tell-IPFV.PTCP.NEG   be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP

                 <u>*bi-ci*</u>,   *Nikan Wailan*   *be*   <u>*baha-mbihe*</u>

                 be(AUX)-COND   PN   ACC   get-PST.IPFV

                 'If Nomina and Naikada had not gone to inform [him], [we] would have caught Nikan Wailan' (MYK1: 36)

(4.1 – 31)   *bi*   *jakan*   *giyalame giyalame*   *sin-de*

                 1SG   just.now intermittently   2SG(*si/sin*)-DAT

                 <u>*jombu-rakū*</u>   <u>*bi-he*</u>   <u>*bi-ci*</u>,   *si*

                 remind-IPFV.PTCP.NEG   be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP   be(AUX)-COND   2SG

<div align="center">82</div>

kemuni   *wacihiyame* *šejile-me*   <u>*mute-rakū*</u>

still   completely   recite-IPFV.CVB   be.able-IPFV.PTCP.NEG

<u>*bi-he*</u>

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)   <u>*taci-hakū*</u>   <u>*bi-he*</u>   <u>*bi-ci*</u>,   *inu*

learn-PFV.PTCP.NEG   be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP   be(AUX)-COND   also

ulhi-me   <u>*mute-rakū*</u>   <u>*bi-he*</u>

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

Subordinate Clause (Protasis)	Main Clause (Apodosis)	Example
{(Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-*hA bi-ci*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*mbihe*]}	(4.1 – 21) and (4.1 – 22)
	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*rakū bi-he*]}	(4.1 – 23) – (4.1 – 25)
{(Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-*mbihe bi-ci*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*mbihe*]}	(4.1 – 26)
{(Subj1 +) (*aika/aikabade* +) Pred1 [V-*rA bi-he bi-ci*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*ci o-mbihe*]}	(4.1 – 27)
{(Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-*rakū bi-ci*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*ci ojo-rakū bi-he*]}	(4.1 – 28)
{(Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-*hakū bi-ci*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*me bi-he*]}	(4.1 – 29)
{(Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-*rakū bi-he bi-ci*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*mbihe*]}	(4.1 – 30)

Table 4.1.2 (Continued)

Subordinate Clause (Protasis)	Main Clause (Apodosis)	Example
{(Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-*rakū bi-he bi-ci*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*me mute-rakū bi-he*]}	(4.1 – 31)
{(Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-*hAkū bi-he bi-ci*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*me* + V*mute-rakū bi-he*]}	(4.1 – 32)

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*   <u>*wa-ci*</u>,   *min-i*
these   two   high.official   ACC   kill-COND   1SG(*bi/min*)-GEN

beye   *inu*   <u>*buce-he*</u>   <u>*gese*</u>   *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

<u>*mute-ci*</u>,   *ai*   <u>*bai-re*</u>
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 sekiyen   be   tucibu-he-de*,   *geli   mim-be*
        root source   ACC   reveal-PFV.PTCP-DAT   again   1SG(*bi-/min*)-ACC
        fetereku   se-mbi
        fastidious   say-IPFV.FIN
        da sekiyen: '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   beye   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)

(4.2 – 3)   *si*   *tuttu*   *te-he-de*,   *bi*   *absi*   *te-mbi*
2SG   like.that   sit-PFV.PTCP-DAT   1SG   how   sit-IPFV.FIN
'If/When you sit down like that, how will I sit?' (OJ1: 25)

(4.2 – 4)   *si*   *aikabade*   *daila-ha*   *de*,   *bi*
2SG   if   wage.war-PFV.PTCP   DAT   1SG

sim-be   *tookabu-mbi*
2SG(*si/sin*)-ACC   destroy-IPFV.FIN
'If you wage war [against me], I will destroy you' (MYK6: 25)

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-PFV.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) *tere-i*   *hūbin*   *de*   *dosi-ka*
          that/3SG-GEN   trap   DAT   enter-PFV.PTCP
          se-he-de,   *sarba-tala*   *o-mbi*
          say(AUX)-PFV.PTCP-DAT   writhe-TERM   become-IPFV.FIN
          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) *ere-ci* *tara afara* *manggašacuka* *baita* *teisulebu-he*
          this-ABL troublesome difficult   matter   encounter-PFV.PTCP
          se-he-de,   *adarame* *elehun* *i*   *gama-me*
          say(AUX)-PFV.PTCP-DAT   how   ease   GEN   handle-IPFV.CVB
          hoo hio *se-mbi*?
          decisively   say(AUX)-IPFV.FIN
          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) *talude*   *ufara-ha*   *se-he-de*,   *aliya-ha*
           by.chance   lose-PFV.PTCP   say(AUX)-PFV.PTCP-DAT   regret-PFV.PTCP
           se-me   *amcabu-rakū*   *kai*
           say(AUX)-IPFV.CVB   chase-IPFV.PTCP.NEG   PTL
           V-*ha seme*: 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) *talude*   *baita*   *be*   *sartabu-ha*   *se-he-de*,
           by.chance   matter   ACC   delay-PFV.PTCP   say(AUX)-PFV.PTCP-DAT

ainahai	*ali-me*	*mute-re*
how	take-IPFV.CVB	be.able-IPFV.PTCP

'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-*mbi* ([4.2 – 1] – [4.2 – 4], [4.2 – 6], [4.2 – 8] and [4.2 – 9]), the affirmative and negative imperfective participles V-*rA* ([4.2 – 5] and [4.2 – 11]) and V-*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-*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 4.2.1 Morphosyntactic Patterns of Non-prototypical Factual Conditionals

Subordinate Clause (Protasis)	Main Clause (Apodosis)	Example
{(Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-*hA de*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*mbi*]}	(4.2 – 1) – (4.2 – 3)
{(Subj1 +) *aika* + Pred1 [V-*hA de*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*mbi*]}	(4.2 – 4)
{(Subj1 +) *aika* + Pred1 [V-*me o-ho de*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*rA*]}	(4.2 – 5)
{(Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-*rakū o-ho de*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*mbi*]}	(4.2 – 6)
	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-IMP]}	(4.2 – 7)
{(Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-*hA se-he de*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*mbi*]}	(4.2 – 8) and (4.2 – 9)
	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*rakū*]}	(4.2 – 10)
	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*rA*]}	(4.2 – 11)

4.2.1.2   Interpretation

The structure of the participle in dative-locative (V-*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) *ecimari*   *ebsi*   *jide-re-de*,   *jugūn*   *giyai*   *de*
this.morning   hither   come-IPFV.PTCP-DAT   road   street   DAT
yabu-re   *urse*   *gemu*   *ili-me*
go-IPFV.PTCP   people   all   stand-IPFV.CVB
mute-rakū
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) *teike*   *min-i*   *emhun*   *ubade*   *tere-de*,
just.now   1SG(*bi/min*)-GEN   alone   that.place-DAT   sit-IPFV.PTCP-DAT
fa-i   *duthe*   *de*   *emu*   *cecike*   *do-habi*
window-GEN   wooden.lattice   DAT   one   small.bird   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) *tuktan*   *bi*   *abala-me*   *gene-he-de*,   *emu*   *suru*   *morin*
at.first   1SG   hunt-IPFV.CVB   go-PFV.PTCP-DAT   one   white   horse
yalu-mbihebi
ride-PST.IPFV.FIN
'At first, when I went to hunt, [I] was riding a white horse' (OJ2: 2)

(4.2 – 15) *ecimari*   *ili-fi*   *tuci-ke-de*,   *waburu* *sa* *gemu*
this.morning   get.up-IPFV.CVB   go.out-PFV.PTCP-DAT   damned   PL   all
ji-he
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 *wenn* can be used in either conditional or temporal constructions, corresponding to the English conjunctions *if* (conditional) and *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,[22] 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][23] 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)   *sin-i*   *tere*   *nionio*   *waliya-rakū*
2SG(*si/sin*)-GEN   that/3SG child   abandon-IPFV.PTCP.NEG

bi-he   *bi-ci*,   *inu*   *uyun*   *juwan*   *se*
be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP   be(AUX)-COND   also   nine   ten   year(old)

o-hobi
become-PFV.FIN

nionio: 'pupil of the eye', here an endearment for 'child'

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)   *gosi-rakū*   *bi-ci*,   *aina-ha*   *se-me*
love-IPFV.PTCP.NEG   be(AUX)-COND   do.what-PFV.PTCP   say(AUX)-IPFV.CVB

ere *gese*   *gosihon*   *gisun*   *i*   *tafula-rakū*
this   like   bitter   words   GEN   advise-IPFV.PTCP.NEG

aina-ha se-me: 'absolutely', 'by any means' always used with negation, lit.: 'no matter doing what'

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)   *bi*   *aika*   *ere* *lengseki*   *šabtu-ngga*   *mahala*   *be*
1SG   if   this   clumsy   ear.flap-ADJ   hat   ACC

bucile-fi   *cak seme*   *hūwaita-hakū*   *bi-he*
put.down-PFV.CVB   neatly   tie-PFV.PTCP.NEG   be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP

bi-ci,   *min-i*   *šan*   *i*   *hešen*   *haribu-hai*,   *te*
be(AUX)-COND   1SG(*bi/min*)-GEN   ear   GEN   margin   freeze-DUR   now

kemuni   *funce-mbi-o*
still   remain-IPFV.FIN-Q

šabtungga mahala: 'a hat with protective ear flaps'

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, *o-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) | *age* | *si* | *ere* | *baili* | *cashūla-ha* | *niyalma* | *be* |
| sir | 2SG | this | kindness | be.ungrateful-PFV.PTCP | person | ACC |

jono-rakū   *o-ci*,   *bi*   *inu*
mention-IPFV.PTCP.NEG   be(AUX)-COND   1SG   also
fanca-rakū   *bi-he*
get.angry-IPFV.PTCP.NEG   be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP
baili be cashūla-ha niyalma: '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) | *majige* | *niyalma-i* | *gūnin* | *bi-ci*, | *inu* | *sere-ci* |
| a.little | human-GEN | mind | be-COND | also | feel-COND |

aca-mbihe
suit(AUX)-PST.IPFV
V-*ci aca-*: complex structure expressing obligation
'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) | *i* | *aika* | *emu* | *usun* | *seshun* | *niyalma* | *o-ci*, |
| 3SG | if | one | bothersome | disgusting | person | be-COND |

bi   *inu*   *gisure-rakū*   *bi-he*
1SG   also   speak-IPFV.PTCP.NEG   be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP
'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.

97

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)   *gele-ci,*   *bi*   *ainu*   *amga-mbi*
              fear-COND   1SG   why   sleep-IPFV.FIN
              'If [I] were afraid, why would I sleep?' (MYK2: 38)

(4.2 – 26)   *bi*   *dosi-ki*   *se-ci,*   *aifini*   *uthai*   *dosi-mbi*
              1SG   enter-OPT   say(AUX)-COND   long.ago   then   enter-IPFV.FIN
              kai
              PTL
              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 4.2.2   Morphosyntax of Non-prototypical Counterfactual Conditionals

	Subordinate Clause (Protasis)	Main Clause (Apodosis)	Example
Type I	{(Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-*rakū bi-he bi-ci*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [N + *o-hobi*]}	(4.2 – 16)
	{(Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-*rakū bi-ci*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*rakū*]}	(4.2 – 17)
	{(Subj1 +) *aika* + P [V-*hAkū bi-he bi-ci*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*mbi*]}	(4.2 – 18)
Type II	{(Subj1 +) Pred1 [N + *o-ci*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [N + *bi-he*]}	(4.2 – 19) and (4.2 – 20)
	{(Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-*ci*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*ci aca-mbihe*]}	(4.2 – 21) and (4.2 – 23)
	{(Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-*rakū o-ci*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*rakū bi-he*]}	(4.2 – 22)
	{(Subj1 +) *aika* + Pred1 [N + *o-ci*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*rakū bi-he*]}	(4.2 – 24)

98

Table 4.2.2 (Continued)

	Subordinate Clause (Protasis)	Main Clause (Apodosis)	Example
Type III	{(Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-*ci*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*mbi*]}	(4.2 − 25)
	{(Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-*ki se-ci*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*mbi*] (+ *kai*)}	(4.2 − 26)

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

99

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-*ci*. 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   hūntahan   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)

(4.3 – 3)   *si   damu   honggon-i   kalar   se-re   ici*
              2SG   just   small.bell-GEN   jingling   say(AUX)-IPFV.PTCP   direction
              baihana-ci,   *aifini   šoforo-fi   aliya-habi*
              go.to.search-COND   already   seize-PFV.CVB   wait-PFV.FIN
              kalar se-: onomatopoeia imitating the sound of keys or small bells, 'to jingle'
              'When you just go and search [for the hawk] in the direction of the small
              bell's jingling sound, [you'll see that the hawk] has seized [its prey] and has
              long been waiting [for you]' (AGA4: 125)

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)   *bi   okdo-me   gene-ki   se-ci*,   *uksa*
              1SG   go.to.meet-IPFV.CVB   go-OPT   say(AUX)-COND   suddenly
              julergi   ergi   de   emu   amba   yohoron   heture-hebi
              front   side   DAT   one   big   canal   block-PFV.FIN
              okdo-me gene-: 'to go to meet'
              V-*ki se-*: 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)   *emu   moro   šahūrun   muke   omi-ha   bi-ci*,
              one   bowl   cold   water   drink-PVF.PTCP   be(AUX)-COND
              ilihai   andan-de   uthai   uju   nime-me   deribu-he
              immediate   instant-DAT   then   head   hurt-IPFV.CVB   begin-PFV.PTCP
              ilihai andande: '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)   *morin   be   dabki-me   tafa-ka   bi-ci*,
              horse   ACC   whip-IPFV.CVB   go.up-PVF.PTCP   be(AUX)-COND
              lo la   ucara-ha
              unexpectedly   encounter-PFV.PTCP
              'As [I] whipped the horse and rode up [the slope], [I] ran unexpectedly into

[it (the wild sheep)]' (AGA1: 103)

(4.3 – 7)   *uncehen*   *dahala-hai*   <u>*amcana-ha*</u>   <u>*bi-ci*</u>,
            tail   follow-DUR.CVB   go.to.chase-PFV.PTCP   be(AUX)-COND
            geli   *alin*   *be*   *daba-me*   <u>*gene-hebi*</u>
            again   hill   ACC   pass-IPFV.CVB   go-PFV.FIN
            '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*   <u>*ji-ki*</u>   <u>*se-he*</u>
            yesterday   free.time   get-PFV.CVB   come-OPT   say(AUX)-PFV.PTCP
            <u>*bi-ci*</u>,   *geli*   *aga-me*   <u>*deribu-he*</u>
            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*   <u>*gene-ci*</u>,   *emu*
            one   mountain   ACC   pass-IPFV.CVB   go-COND   one
            boo-de   *emu*   *hehe*   *emu*   *sarganjui*   *arki*   <u>*unca-mbi*</u>
            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*   <u>*waida-ci*</u>,   *muke*   *eye-me*
bucket   toss-PFV.CVB   scoop-COND   water   flow-IPFV.CVB
<u>*tokto-rakū*</u>
fix-IPFV.PTCP.NEG
tokto-: 'to fix', here 'to stop'
'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*   <u>*gene-ci*</u>,   *ilan*   *uju-ngga*
garden   ACC   go.to.look-IPFV.CVB   go-COND   three   headed
hutu   *yafan*   *i*   *dolo*   *tubihe*   <u>*je-me*</u>   <u>*bi*</u>
ghost   garden   GEN   inside   fruit   eat-IPFV.CVB   EXS.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*   <u>*tuwa-ci*</u>,   <u>*dule*</u>   *jeren*
slowly   spit-IPFV.CVB   take.out-PFV.CVB   look-COND   in.fact   gazelle
yali   *i*   *dorgi*   *emu*   *sele-i*   *muhaliyan*   <u>*bi-he*</u>   <u>*ni*</u>
meat   GEN   inside   one   iron-GEN   bullet   be-PFV.PTCP   PTL
waliya-me tucibu-: 'to spit out', lit.: 'to take out [by] spitting'
dule… bihe (*ni*): a mirative construction, meaning 'I didn't know that…(but I have just
realised it to my surprise)'
'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*   <u>*isina-ci*</u>,   *sakda*   <u>*mafa*</u>   <u>*mama*</u>   <u>*bi*</u>
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*   <u>*hūla-ci*</u>,   *umai*
gate   open-OPT   say(AUX)-IPFV.CVB   call-COND   at.all
jabu-re   <u>*niyalma*</u>   <u>*akū*</u>
answer-IPFV.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*   <u>*šejile-bu-ci*</u>,   *emke*
this.morning   3PL(*ce/cen*)-GEN   book   recite-CAUS-COND   one
emken   *ci*   <u>*eshun*</u>
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-*ci*) 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-*ci* and the complex structure V-*hA bi-ci* 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-ci*, with the perfective participle in it, would presumably express a perfective aspectual meaning: the completeness of the action. Thus the morphosyntactic difference between V-*ci* and V-*hA bi-ci* 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-*hA/rA-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 relation[24] 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-*hA/-rA-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.CVB   look-COND   in.fact   greatly
              labsa-me   *deribu-he*
              snow.heavily-IPFV.CVB   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.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)

(4.3 – 18)   *šan*   *waliya-fi*   *donji-ci*,   *cib*   *se-me*
              ear   throw-PFV.CVB   listen-COND   quiet   say(AUX)-IPFV.CVB
              heni   *jilgan*   *wei*   *akū*
              little   sound   tiny   NEG
              cib seme: 'quitely'
              wei akū: '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*   <u>*amtala-ci*</u>,   *šuwe*   <u>*ede-kebi*</u>
               use.a.spoon-PFV.CVB   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*   <u>*tuwa-ci*</u>,   *emu*   *amba*
               one   night   bear   sea   toward   look-COND   one   big
               elden   *be*   <u>*sabu-mbi*</u>
               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

karun 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 sentences[28] (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*   *gūni-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*   *gūni-ci*,   *emu*   *gisun*   *be*
khan   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 gūni-: '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*   *gūni-rakū*   *o-ci*,   *emu*
loath-IPFV.CVB   think-IPFV.PTCP.NEG   become(AUX)-COND   one

gosi-re		*gisun*	*bu-reo*	
have.mercy-IPFV.PTCP		word	give-IMP	

hata-me gūni-: 'to consider as loathsome', 'to dislike'

'If [you] do not consider [him] as loathsome, please give [me your] kind words [about him]' (OJ2: 70)

(4.4 – 6)
age	*si*	*waliya-me*	*gūni-rakū*	*o-ci*,
sir	2SG	abandon-IPFV.CVB	think-IPFV.PTCP.NEG	become(AUX)-COND

min-i	*boo-de*	*majige*	*feliye-reo*
1SG(*bi/min*)-GEN	house-DAT	a.little	walk-IMP

waliya-me gūni-: 'to despise', 'to have a low opinion of', lit.: 'to think by abandoning'

feliye-: here meaning 'to visit', 'to drop by'

'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:

(4.4 – 7)
age	*sin-de*	*aika*	*manju*	*bithe*	*bi-ci*,	*emu*
sir	2SG(*si/sin*)-DAT	if	Manchu	book	be-COND	one

udu	*debtelin*	*juwen*	*bu-reo*
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)

(4.4 – 8)
si	*unenggi*	*sa-ra-ngge*	*getuken*	*o-ci*,
2SG	really	know-IPFV.PTCP-NMLZ	clear	be-COND

uthai	*min-de*	*ulhibu-me*	*ala-rao*
then	1SG(*bi/min*)-DAT	explain-IPFV.CVB	tell-IMP

'If you really know [it] clearly, then could [you] please tell me and explain it?'
(MFG: 6)

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

[books] *akū* [NEG] 'I have no books' (MFG: 42). Sentence (4.4 – 8) is followed by the utterance *bi* [1SG] *yargiyan i* [really] *sarkū* [< *sa-rakū* know-IPFV.PTCP.NEG] *kai* [PTL] 'I really don't know that!' (MFG: 6).

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",[30] 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-*rAo* 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[31] 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 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)

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 toyou]" the day before yesterday, [he] didn't give [it to me in the end]' (MFG: 15)

(4.5 – 2) *age de*　　*emu*　　*baita*　*yandu-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', lit.: '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*   <u>*nere-cibe*</u>,   *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*   <u>*udu*</u>   *sain*   *ningge*   <u>*etu-rakū*</u>   <u>*bi-cibe*</u>,
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-*ci*]} ↔ {(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*kini*]}",

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   baita   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)
house-DAT   go.to.drop.by-OPT

'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-kini   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-IPFV.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

          <u>*te-kini*</u>,   *hono*   *ainahai*   *emu*   *afaha*   *hoošan*   *jiha*
          live-OPT   still   not.necessarily   one   piece   paper   money

          deiji-mbi-ni
          burn-IPFV.FIN-PTL

          geterakū juse: 'good-for-nothing children'
          hoošan jiha deiji-: '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)   <u>*uthai*</u>   *baha-fi*   <u>*wesi-rakū*</u>   <u>*yenderakū*</u>
          even   get-PFV.CVB   get.promoted-IPFV.PTCP   prosper-IPFV.PTCP

          <u>*o-kini*</u>,   *beye*   *bisi-re-de*,   *niyalma* *mahala*
          become(AUX)-OPT   body   be-IPFV.PTCP-DAT   people   hat

          tuhe-me   *kundule-me*   *tuwa-mbi*
          fall-IPFV.CVB   respect-IPFV.CVB   regard-IPFV.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)   <u>*uthai*</u>   *muse-i*   *kadala-ra*   *niyalma*
          even   1PL.INCL-GEN   manage-IPFV.PTCP   person

          <u>*baicanji-ha*</u>   <u>*se-me*</u>,   *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-IPFV.PTCP.NEG   become(AUX)-IPFV.FIN

          kadalara 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)   <u>*uthai*</u>   *ici*   <u>*aca-rakū*</u>   <u>*o-cibe*</u>,   *inu*
          even   direction   suit-IPFV.PTCP.NEG   become(AUX)-CONC   also

          nikede-me   *baitala-ci*   *aca-mbi*
          make.do-IPFV.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) <u>*wesi-ki*</u> <u>*mukde-ki*</u> <u>*se-ci*</u>, *ainahai* <u>*mute-re*</u>
advance-OPT go.up-OPT say(AUX)-COND how be.able-IPFV.PTCP

wesi-/mukde-: here both meaning 'to advance in rank', 'to get promoted'

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) *sin-i* *tacibu-re* *sain* *gisun* *be* *min-i*
2SG(*si/sin*)-GEN teach-IPFV.PTCP good words ACC 1SG(*bi/min*)-GEN

dolo <u>*buce-ci*</u> <u>*inu*</u> <u>*onggo-rakū*</u>
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)

(4.5 – 16) *majige* <u>*tathūnja-ci*</u>, <u>*inu*</u> <u>*haha*</u> <u>*waka*</u>
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) <u>*buce-rakū*</u> <u>*o-ci*</u>, *sukū* <u>*inu*</u> *emu jergi*
die-IPFV.PTCP.NEG become(AUX)-COND skin still one layer

<u>*kobci-mbi*</u>
fall.off-IPFV.FIN

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

(4.5 – 18) *yaya* *niyalma* <u>*belge-i*</u> <u>*gese*</u> *erdemu* <u>*bi-ci*</u>, *beye*
any person grain.of.rice-GEN like talent be-COND self

de <u>*tusangga*</u>
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
            bi-cibe,   *inu*   *urunakū*   *hami-mbi*   *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) *tuci-ci*   *dosi-ci*   *gemu*   *waka*;
             go.out-COND   come.in-COND   all   not.right
(4.5 – 21b) *te-ci*   *ili-ci*   *gemu*   *mangga*   *kai*
             sit-COND   stand-COND   all   difficult   PTL
             '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)   *te-cibe*   *ili-cibe*   *elhe*   *akū*
             sit-CONC   stand-CONC   peace   NEG
             'Whether [I] sit down or whether [I] stand up, there is no peace [inside me]'
             (MFG: 29–30)

(4.5 – 23)   *menggun*   *o-cibe*,   *damtun*   *o-cibe*,   *min-de*
             silver   become-CONC   pawn   become-CONC   1SG(*bi/min*)-DAT
             majige   *aisila-rao*
             a.little   help-IMP
             '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)

(4.5 – 24)   *uda-cibe*   *uda-rakū*   *o-cibe*   *in-i*
buy-CONC   buy-IPFV.PTCP.NEG   become(AUX)-CONC   3SG(*i/in*)-GEN
cihai   *gama-kini*
willingly   handle-OPT
'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)   *muse-i*   *ai*   *se-ci*,   *uthai*   *ai*   *gese gese*
1PL.INCL-GEN   what   say-COND   then   what   likewise
daha-me   *yabu-mbi*
obey-IPFV.CVB   act-IPFV.FIN
gese gese: 'likewise' 'accordingly'
'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)   *ai*   *bi-ci*,   *ai*   *be*   *tukiye-fi*   *ulebu-mbi*
what   be-COND   what   ACC   hold.up-PFV.CVB   feed-IPFV.FIN
tukiye-: 'to offer with both hands', 'to hold up'
ulebu-: 'to feed', 'to treat someone to food'
'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)   *absi*   *tuwa-ci*,   *absi*   *ubiyada*
how   look-COND   how   disgusting
'No matter how [you] look [at him], [you'll find him] so disgusting'
(OJ2: 134)

(4.5 – 28)   *te*   *ci*   *aika*   *mim-be*   *cooha-i*   *dain*   *de*
now   ABL   if   1SG(*bi/min*)-ACC   troops-GEN   battle   DAT
absi   *gene-ø*   *se-ci*,   *bi*   *absi*   *daha-mbi*
how   go-IMP   say-COND   1SG   how   obey-IPFV.FIN
cooha-i dain: 'battle, war'
'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)

(4.5 − 29)   *ya*   *ba-be*   *fonji-ci*,   *i*   *ya*   *ba-be*   *karu*
which   aspect-ACC   ask-COND   3SG   which   aspect-ACC   reply

giyangna-mbi
explain-IPFV.FIN

'No matter which aspect [I] ask [him] about, he will explain [it] in reply'
(AGA1: 58)

(4.5 − 30)   *yaya*   *we*   *mim-be*   *baihanji-ci*,   *boo-de*   *akū*
any   who   1SG(*bi/min*)-ACC   come.to.visit-COND   home-DAT   NEG

se-me   *jabu-ø*
say-IPFV.CVB   reply-IMP

'No matter who comes to visit me, reply [to them] that [I'm] not at home'
(OJ1: 105)

(4.5 − 31)   *si*   *ai*   *jaka*   *gaji-ø*   *se-ci*,   *bi*   *sin-i*
2SG   what   thing   bring-IMP   say-COND   1SG   2SG(*si/sin*)-GEN

gūnin   *de*   *aca-bu-me*   *uda-fi*   *hūlaša-ki*
mind   DAT   fit-CAUS-IPFV.CVB   buy-PFV.CVB   trade-OPT

gūnin de acabu-me: 'by making [something] fit [one's] mind', 'according to [one's] intention'
'Whatever you want [me] to bring, I will buy [it] as you wish and exchange [it with you for what I want from you]' (lit.: 'what you tell me to bring, that [I will] buy according to your intention and exchange [it]') (OJ2: 148).

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 $\{x_1, x_2, …, x_N\}$, 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):

(4.5 – 33) x_1 *bi-ci, x_1 be tukiyefi ulebumbi;*

x_2 *bi-ci, x_2 be tukiyefi ulebumbi;*

……

x_N *bi-ci, x_N be tukiyefi ulebumbi.*

Then, the series of conditionals one obtains can be further represented by the following formula:

(4.5 – 34) $\forall X \in S$: he has X → he offers X 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

---

[35] The underlining is mine.

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) <u>*absi*</u>   <u>*gisure-cibe*</u> *gisun*   *banjina-rakū-ngge*   *akū*
how   speak-CONC   words   produce-IPFV.PTCP.NEG-NMLZ   NEG
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) <u>*ai*</u>   *hacin*   *i*   <u>*taci-ha*</u>   <u>*se-me*</u>   *inu*   *ere*
what   kind   GEN   learn-PFV.PTCP   say(AUX)-IPFV.CVB   still   this
hūman   *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) <u>*yaya*</u>   *ba-de*   <u>*isinji-cibe*</u>, *derengge*   *etenggi sukdun inu*
whichever   place-DAT   arrive-CONC   horourable   powerful air   also
gaibuša-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)   *si*   *adasun* *be*   *ufi-ci*,   *bi*   *uthai* *jurgan* *goci-mbi*
              2SG   lapel   ACC   sew-COND   1SG   then   line   draw-IPFV.FIN
              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)   *ere*   *ogo*   *be*   *jafa-ci*,   *tere*   *monggon* *haya-mbi*
              this   hole   ACC   hold-COND   that/3SG collar   trim-IPFV.FIN
              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)   *julergi* *alin*   *de*   *emu*   *dobori* *dedu-ci*,   *amargi* *alin*
              south   mountain DAT   one   night   stay-COND north   mountain
              de   *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)   *emu   jui tuba-de   bisi-re   jušen   irgen   adun*
one   son   that.place-DAT   be-IPFV.PTCP   serf   people herd

ulha   be   tuwa-me   <u>gene-ci</u>,   emu   jui uba-de
livestock ACC   look-IPFV.CVB   go-COND   one   son this.place-DAT

bisi-re   ama   be   tuwa-me   <u>bi-kini</u>
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)   *erin   forgon oyonggo   <u>se-ci</u>,   fašša-ra-ngge*
time   season   important   say-COND   exert.effort-IPFV.PTCP-NMLZ

inu   oyonggo
also   important

erin forgon: '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)   *ji-he   cooha geren <u>se-ci</u>,   muse-i   cooha*
come-PFV.PTCP   troops many   say-COND   1PL.INCL-GEN   troops

inu   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)	*age*	*si*	*sim-be*	*banji-re*	*de*	*mangga*
	sir	2SG	2SG(*si/sin*)-ACC	live-IPFV.PTCP	DAT	difficult
	se-ci,	*min-i*		*ere beye-re*	*omiholo-ro*	
	say-COND	1SG(*bi/min*)-GEN		this freeze-IPFV.PTCP	starve-IPFV.PTCP	

gosihon	*i*	*ba-be*	*we-de*	*alana-ra*
bitterness	GEN	situation-ACC	who-DAT	go.to.tell-IPFV.PTCP

'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*,
2SG	2SG(*si/sin*)-ACC	take-IPFV.CVB	be.able-IPFV.PTCP.NEG	say-COND
i	*sin-ci*	*geli*	*ali-me*	*mute-rakū*	*kai*
3SG	2SG(*si/sin*)-ABL	still	take-IPFV.CVB	be.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
boo	*boigon*	*be*	*jafa-me*	*baita*	*be*	*icihiya-ci*
house	family	ACC	hold-IPFV.CVB	matter	ACC	manage-COND
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] old?' (MFG: 59)

(4.6 – 10)

ere	*gese*	*fijire-me*	*goi-ha*	*be*,	*si*
this	like	scrape.along.ground-IPFV.CVB	hit.mark-PFV.PTCP	ACC	2SG
aika	*dabu-ci*,		*tere*	*ca-fi*	*jorin*
if	take.into.account-COND		that/3SG	miss-PFV.CVB	target
goi-ha-ngge		*be*,	*aika*	*colgoroko*	*mangga*
hit.mark-PFV.PTCP-NMLZ		ACC	whether	outstanding	expert
se-me		*kundule-ci*	*aca-mbi-o*		
say(AUX)-IPFV.CVB		respect-COND	suit(AUX)-IPFV.FIN-Q		

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

jerguwen	*juwe-fi*	*hecen*	*saha-ra*	*niyalma*
material	carry-PFV.CVB	city	build-IPFV.PTCP	people

šada-rakū-n
feel.tired-IPFV.PTCP.NEG-Q

untuhun beye: 'empty-handed', lit.: 'empty body'

'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]).[36]

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   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', 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   o-ci*,   *tere   be*
this ACC   request-IPFV.PTCP.NEG become(AUX)-COND   that/3SG ACC
nanda-mbi
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   o-ci*,   *tere   be*
this ACC   annoy-IPFV.PTCP.NEG   become(AUX)-COND   that/3SG ACC
neci-mbi
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   o-ci*,   *tere   uthai*
this ACC   yell-CAUS-IPFV.PTCP.NEG become(AUX)-COND   that/3SG then
habšanji-mbi
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   o-ci*,   *urunakū*
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 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-mbi*
            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-mbi*
            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-mbi*
            resist-IPFV.PTCP   force   more   big   become-IPFV.FIN

137

'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-IPFV.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   sebderile-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
            be.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

(4.7 – 5b)   *te-ci*   *ili-ci*   *gemu*   *mangga*   *kai*
             sit-COND   stand-COND   all   difficult   PTL
             'It is inappropriate either to go out or to come in; it is difficult either to sit down
             or to stand up' (lit.: 'If [one] goes out, or if [one] comes in, [these are] both
             inappropriate; if [one] sits down, or if [one] stands up, [these are] both difficult')
             (OJ2: 124)

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-: 'to beware of (something bad)', 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-*: 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)

(4.7 – 8)   *damu   ishunde   mujilen de   tebu-me   bi-ci*,
             only   mutually   heart   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] hearts [can it be] the way of
             [being true] friends' (MFG: 7)

(4.7 – 9)   *boo-de   noro-hoi   bi-ci*,   *absi   ališacuka*
             home-DAT   stay-DUR   be(AUX)-COND   how   boring
             '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)

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:

(4.7 – 10)   *daruhai   age-i   tacibu-re   be   donji-ci,   tere   yala*
              often   sir-GEN   teach-IPFV.PTCP   ACC   listen-COND   that   really
              min-i   kesi   o-ho
              1SG(*bi/min*)-GEN   favour   become-PFV.PTCP
              'If [I] can often hear your counsel, that will really be a favour for me'
              (MFG: 26)

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)   *han   ahūn-de   emu   hebe   o-fi,   muse   de*
             khan   elder.brother-DAT one   plan   become-PFV.CVB   1PL.INCL   DAT
             kimungge   Daiming   gurun   be   daila-ki   se-me
             hostile   Daiming   empire   ACC   make.war   say(AUX)-IPFV.CVB
             <u>*unggi-he*</u>   <u>*bi-ci*</u>,   *sain*   <u>*bi-he*</u>   *kai*
             send-PFV.PTCP   be(AUX)-COND   good   be-PFV.PTCP   PTL
             emu hebe o-: 'to collaborate', 'to be on the same side', lit.: 'to be of one plan'
             '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)   *ine mene   <u>gama-ha</u>   <u>bi-ci</u>,   sain   <u>bi-he</u>*
             willingly   take-PFV.PTCP   be(AUX)-COND   good   be-PFV.PTCP
             ine mene: 'willingly', 'as one wishes'
             'If [you] had taken that away as you wished, it would have been good'
             (OJ2: 150)

(4.7 − 13)   *bi   <u>aika</u>   edun   i   cashūn   <u>bi-he</u>   <u>bi-ci</u>,*
             1SG   if   wind   GEN   backward   be-PFV.PTCP   be(AUX)-COND
             hono   yebe   <u>bi-he</u>
             still   good   be-PFV.PTCP
             edun i cashūn: 'with the back toward the wind'
             'If I had been [walking] with my back toward the wind, [it] would have
             been good' (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.[39] 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*   <u>*o-ci*</u>,   *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*   *hūla-ra*   *niyalma*   <u>*o-ci*</u>,
              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*   *urse*   <u>*o-ci*</u>,
              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*   <u>*o-ci*</u>,   *ure-re*   *hanci-kan*   *banji-me*
              fruit   TOP (< become-COND)   ripen-IPFV.PTCP   rather.near   grow-IPFV.CVB
              gai-fi   *teni*   *sain*
              take-PFV.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*   <u>*o-ci*</u>,   *ji-he*   *elcin*   *be*   *wa-ki*
              half   TOP (< become-COND)   come-PFV.PTCP   messenger   ACC   kill-OPT

se-mbi;
say-IPFV.FIN

(4.8 – 5b)   *dulga*   <u>*o-ci*</u>,   *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*   *bulcakū-ngge*   <u>*o-ci*</u>,
            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) *suwe 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) *tere   age   se-re-ngge,   muse-i   fe*
            that   young.man TOP (< say-IPFV.PTCP-NMLZ) 1PL.INCL-GEN   old
            adaki   kai
            neighbour   PTL
            '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) 1PL.INCL-GEN

147

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*   <u>*de*</u>   <u>*o-ci*</u>,   *emu julehen i*   *yabu-mbi*;
               duty   DAT   TOP (< become-COND)   whole-heartedly   act-IPFV.FIN

(4.8 – 13b)   *boo*   <u>*de*</u>   <u>*o-ci*</u>,   *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*   <u>*min-de*</u>   <u>*o-ci*</u>,   *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*   *se-re*   *bithe-i*   *niyalma*   <u>*be*</u>
               amiable   say(AUX)-IPFV.PTCP   book-GEN   people   ACC
               <u>*o-ci*</u>,   *durun*   *tuwakū*   *obu-me*   *alhūda-ra*
               TOP (< become-COND)   model   example   make-IPFV.CVB   imitate-IPFV.PTCP
               giyan
               reason
ler ler sere: 'amiable'
bithei niyalma: 'the literati', lit.: 'people of books'
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*   <u>*be*</u>
               brave   say(AUX)-IPFV.PTCP   army-GEN   people   ACC
               <u>*o-ci*</u>,   *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) <u>*aika*</u>   *cen-i*   *gese*   *asihata*   <u>*be*</u>   *o-ci*,
 if   3PL(*ce/cen*)-GEN   like   youngster   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

translation.

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 addressee'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), *nure 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,   *ere age*   *be*   *sabu-re*   *unde*;   *jai-de*
             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   *sarganjui*   *be*   *inu*   *majige*   *tuwa-ki*
             foolish   daughter   ACC   also   a.little   look-OPT
             min-i mentuhun sarganjui: 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

baitala-ki	*se-re*		*jalin,*	*emu*	*ergi-de*
use-OPT	say(AUX)-IPFV.PTCP		sake	one	side-DAT
o-ci,		*madagan*	*be*	*baha-ki*	*se-re*
TOP (< become-COND)		interest	ACC	get-OPT	say(AUX)-IPFV.PTCP
turgun	*sui akū*	*men-i*		*akdula-ra*	*niyalma*
reason	guilt NEG	1PL.EXCL(*be/men*)-GEN		warrant-IPFV.PTCP	people
be	*ušabu-fi*	*aina-mbi*			
ACC	implicate-PFV.CVB	do.what-IPFV.FIN			

V-*ki se-*: complex structure expressing intention/desire

sui akū: 'innocent', lit.: 'no guilt'

akdula-ra niyalma: 'warrantor(s)'

V-*fi aina-*: 'why do something', 'what is the point of doing something'

'Why do you, for the sake of using money on one hand, and in order to earn interest on the other, implicate us, [who are] the innocent warrantors?'

(MFG: 58)

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)	*kangna-ci,*	*eihen*	*ja*;
	ride-COND	donkey	easy
(4.8 – 20b)	*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)	*yabu-ci,*	*durun*;
	walk-COND	model
(4.8 – 21b)	*ašša-ci*,	*kemun*
	move-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)	*je-ci*,	*jete-re-ngge*	*akū*;
	eat-COND	eat-IPFV.PTCP-NMLZ	NEG
(4.8 – 22b)	*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)

(4.8 – 23)   *aika*   *jobo-ci*,   *saman* *gege* *fulu*   *jobo-ho*
              if   toil-COND   shaman lady   much   toil-PFV.PTCP
              'If [anyone] has toiled, [it is] the shaman [who] has toiled') (NSB: 88)

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 *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 *o-* and *se-* cooperate with the conditional converb in topicalising other structures: operating in the speech-act domain, the converb *o-ci*/*se-ci* connects the supposition about the current conversational topic and the speech-act of offering a relevant topic through conditionality.

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] Gorelova (2006: 149) terms the verbs *bi-* 'to exist/be' and *o-* '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-*ci*) in the subordinate clause. The following are some examples in which the verb *tuwa-* 'to look' is used:

(4.9 – 1) *min-i*   *beye*   *nimeku arbun* *be*   *tuwa-ci*   *ujen*
             1SG(*bi/min*)-GEN self   illness situation ACC   look-COND 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) *sim-be*   *tuwa-ci*, *arki*   *nure*   *de*   *haji*
             2SG(*si/sin*)-ACC look-COND liquor wine   DAT   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) *im-be*   *tuwa-ci*, *gebsere-fi*   *giranggi* *teile*
             3SG(*i/in*)-ACC look-COND emaciate-PFV.CVB   bone   only
             funce-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) *ere-be*   *tuwa-ci*, *jalan* *i*   *baita* *teksin* *akū*   *mujangga*
             this-ACC   look-COND world GEN   affairs equal   NEG   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) *te bi tuwa-ci*, *suwen-i*   *ere cooha* *de*   *afa-ha*
             now 1SG look-COND 2PL(*suwe/suwen*)-GEN this troops DAT   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)

gucu-se	*gemu*	*sim-be*	*leole-he*	*be*	*tuwa-ci,*
friend-PL	all	2SG(*si/sin*)-ACC	discuss-PFV.PTCP	ACC	look-COND

sin-de	*inu*	*majige*	*bi-fi*	*dere*
2SG(*si/sin*)-DAT	also	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)

in-i	*tere*	*baita-be*	*getukele-me*	*yargiyala-rakū,*
3SG(*i/in*)-GEN	that	affair-ACC	clarify-IPFV.CVB	verify-IPFV.PTCP.NEG

kalu mulu	*tuttu*	*yabu-re*	*be*	*tuwa-ci,*
careless	that.way	behave-IPFV.PTCP	ACC	look-COND

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

kalu mulu: 'careless'

pulu pala: 'disorderly'
aimaka...i gese: a similative 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)   *donji-ci,   si   te Manju   bithe   taci-mbi   se-mbi*
            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 donji-ci,   mujakū hūwaša-fi   hafan   o-ho*
            now hear-COND   truly   grow.up-PFV.CVB official become-PFV.PTCP
            se-re
            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,*
            people-GEN tell-IPFV.PTCP   ACC   hear-COND   that   man
            fuhali   enduri   adali   banji-habi
            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*
            yesterday   hear-COND   1PL.INCL-GEN   discuss-PFV.PTCP according
            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 hecen   de   bi-mbi
store-CONC.CVB   grain   still   city   DAT   be-IPFV.FIN
hūda-i 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 i   karun   te-re   Mergen ere*
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
'(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', *doŋji-* '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)   *šehun*   *bigan*   *de*   *isina-fi*   *tuwa-ci*,   *niengniyeri*
             barren   wilderness   DAT   arrive-PFV.CVB   look-COND   spring
             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)   *sek seme*   *gete-fi*   *donji-ci*,   *cin*   *i*   *boo-de*
             suddenly   wake-PFV.CVB   listen-COND   main   GEN   house-DAT
             niyalma   *ji-fi*   *den*   *jilgan*   *i*   *gisun*   *gisure-mbi*
             man   come-PFV.CVB   loud   voice   GEN   word   speak-IPFV.FIN
             sek seme: 'suddenly'
             cin i boo: 'main room', i.e. 'living room'
             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)   *šan*   *waliya-fi*   *donji-ci*,   *cib se-me*   *heni*   *jilgan*   *wei*
             ear   throw-PFV.CVB   listen-COND   quiet   little   sound   tiny
             akū
             NEG
             cib seme: 'quietly'
             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)   *saifila-fi*   *amtala-ci*,   *šuwe*   *ede-kebi*
             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[43] 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.

(4.9 – 25)   *fe   be   <u>bodo-ci</u>,   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)

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 – 26)   *tetele   umai   mejige   akū   be   <u>tuwa-ci</u>,   <u>gūni-ci</u>*
            up.till.now   at.all   news   NEG   ACC   look-COND   think-COND
            aifini   hū   i   da i   amala   makta-fi
            already   back.of.neck   GEN   base GEN   behind   throw-PFV.CVB
            onggo-hobi
            forget-PFV.FIN
            hū i da: 'the base of the back of the neck'
            hū i da i amala maktafi onggo-: 'to forget completely' (lit.: 'to forget by throwing behind one's neck')
            'Seeing that up until now there is no message [from him] at all, [I] think that [he] has completely forgotten [what I told him to do]' (OJ2: 182)

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)   (Speaker-Subject +) (Object/Complement +) Perc./Cog.V-*ci*, 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.CVB   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)   *ere   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)   *ere be   tuwa-ha   de,   ubaliyambu-re   be*
               this ACC   look-PFV.PTCP   DAT   translate-IPFV.PTCP   ACC
               taci-re   onggolo,   neneme   Manju   gisun   taci-re
               learn-IPFV.PTCP   before   firstly   Manchu language learn-IPFV.PTCP
               be   oyonggo   o-bu-re   be   sa-ci   aca-mbi
               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)   *donji-ha   ba-de,   emu   gucu   se asihan bime,   geli*
               hear-PFV.PTCP   place-DAT   one   friend   age young and   also
               beleni sefu   bi,   bithe   de   asuru   kice-rakū
               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)   *ere-be   gūni-ha-de,   ai   hacin   i   baili   jafa-ki*
               this-ACC   think-PFV.PTCP-DAT   what   kind   GEN   kindness hold-OPT
               se-he   se-me,   tumen   de   emgeri
               say(AUX)-PFV.PTCP   say(AUX)-IPFV.CVB   ten.thousand   DAT   once

tehere-bu-me   *mute-mbi-o*
equal-CAUS-IPFV.CVB be.able-IPFV.FIN-Q
baili jafa-: 'to repay kindness'
V-*ki se-*: complex structure expressing desire or intention
*ai hacin i ...*V-*hA se-me*: 'no matter how [one] does something'
'Thinking [about] this, [then consider:] how can [one] possibly repay the kindness [of one's parents], no matter how [one] wants to do so, by making [one's effort] equal to even [so little as] a ten-thousandth [of the kindness]?' (AGA1: 34–35)

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,*   *uthai*   *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)

(4.10 – 3)   *damu   majige   angga   <u>isi-ci</u>,   uthai   mim-be*
               only   a.little   mouth   reach-COND   then   1SG(*bi/min*)-ACC
               <u>*gosi-ha*</u>
               favour-PFV.PTCP
               angga isi-: a respectful way of saying 'to taste'
               'If only [you could] so much as taste [it] a little, [I would consider it as a sign that you have] shown me favour' (OJ1: 79)

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)   *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)

(4.10 – 5)   *lahin*   *fasilan*   *tuci-rakū*   *o-ci,*   *muse*
            troublesome   discord   come.out-IPFV.PTCP.NEG   become(AUX)-COND   1PL.INCL
            aika   *mekte-kini*
            if   bet-OPT
            lahin fasilan: '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:

(5.1 − 1) *yaka* *bade* *gene-he-de* *aika* *jaka* *baha-ra*
some place-DAT go-PFV.PTCP-DAT some thing get-IPFV.PTCP

be *adarame* *sa-ra*
ACC how know-IPFV.PTCP

'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)

(5.1 − 2) *geren* *niyalma* *ambula* *ginggule-me* *dorolo-me*
many people greatly respect-IPFV.CVB salute-IPFV.CVB

hengkile-fi, *aika* *jaka* *bu-re* *niyalma* *fik seme*
kowtow-PFV.CVB some thing give-IPFV.PTCP people thickly

ili-habi
stand-PFV.FIN

fik se-me: 'thickly', 'crowdedly'

'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)

(5.1 − 3) *Cahar* *Kalka* *men-de* *dain* *ji-fi*,
Chakhar Khalka 1PL.EXCL(*be/men*)-DAT war come-PFV.CVB

men-i *aika* *jaka* *be* *gemu*
1PL.EXCL(*be/men*)-GEN any thing ACC all

gama-ha
take.away-PFV.PTCP

'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:

(5.1 − 4) *tere* *sim-be* *weihun* *nungge-rahū* *aikana-rahū*
that/3SG 2SG(*si/sin*)-ACC alive swallow-APRH do.anything-APRH

se-mbi-o
say(AUX)-IPFV.FIN-Q

V-*rahū se-*: complex structure expressing worry/concern

'Are you afraid that he would swallow you alive or do anything to you?' (AGA3: 63)

174

(5.1 – 5)   *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.IPFV
             '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]):

(5.1 – 6)   *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)

(5.1 – 7)   *ere baita* *be*   *aika*   *icihiya-me*   *mute-rakū-i*
             this matter ACC   probably manage-IPFV.CVB   be.able-IPFV.PTCP.NEG-GEN
             gese
             like
             '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).

(5.1 – 8)   *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)

(5.1 – 9)   *tere*   *niyalma-i* *gisun* *yabun*   *kukduri* *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)

175

(5.1 – 10)	*i*	*gūwa*	*be*	*holto-mbi*	*dere,*	*age*	*si*
	3SG	other	ACC	deceive-IPFV.FIN	PTL	sir	2SG

	<u>*aika*</u>	*sarkū*
	whether	know.IPFV.PTCP.NEG

'He may [be able to] deceive others, [but] sir, [how could] you not know [about him]?!' (OJ1: 93)

(5.1 – 11)	<u>*aika*</u>	*baita*	*bi-o*
	whether/any	matter	EXS.PTL-Q

'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:

(5.1 – 12)	*min-de*	<u>*aika*</u>	<u>*ba-de*</u>	*kimun*	*bi-he-o*
	1SG(*bi/min*)-DAT	any	place-DAT	grudge	be-PFV.PTCP-Q

'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-i* *ujula-ha* *beise* *ambasa-i*
lest 1PL.INCL-GEN lead-PFV.PTCP prince.PL minister.PL-GEN

beye *emken* *juwe* *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* *ili-fi* *tuwa-ø*,
2SG(si/sin)-GEN self back stand-PFV.CVB 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*
lest 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:[45] (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) *tere   usin-i   haha   ekše-me   gene-fi   gai-ci*,
that   field-GEN   man   hurry-IPFV.CVB   go-PFV.CVB   get-COND

aisin   be   sabu-rakū
gold   ACC   see-IPFV.PTCP.NEG

usin 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) *age   de   emu   baita   yandu-ci*,   *baibi   angga*
sir   DAT   one   matter   request-COND   merely   mouth

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) *balai   fiyente-me   gisun   eye-bu-rakū*
unreasonably   spread.rumours   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', 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*   *taci-re*   *de*   *bulcakū-ngge*   <u>*o-ci*</u>,
             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/aikabade* 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/aikabade…*V-*ci* a candidate for prototypical (factual) conditional constructions. However, apart from the conditional converb, the connector *aika/aikabade* 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)   <u>*aikabade*</u>   *muse-i*   *alban-i*   *niyalma*   <u>*gai-bu-ha*</u>
             if   1PL.INCL-GEN   labour-GEN   people   take-PASS-PFV.PTCP

             <u>*de*</u>,   *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*   <u>*aikabade*</u>   <u>*daila-ha*</u>   <u>*de*</u>,   *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*   <u>*aika*</u>   *udu*   *erin*   *nurhūme*
             meat   dish   ACC   if   several   meal   successively

             <u>*dubi-he*</u>   <u>*de*</u>,   *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

ojo-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

o-ho-de,   *si*   *uthai*   *sa-rkū*
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

180

construction, which are exemplified by (5.1 – 25) – (5.1 – 28).[47]

Table 5.1.1 Syntactic Patterns of Prototypes of Factual Conditional Constructions

Subordinate Clause (Protasis)	Main Clause (Apodosis)	Example
{*aika/aikabade* + (Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-*ci*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*mbi*]}	(5.1 – 25)
{*aika/aikabade* + (Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-*ci*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*rakū*]}	(5.1 – 26)
{*aika/aikabade* + (Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-*rakū o-ci*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*mbi*]}	(5.1 – 27)
{*aika/aikabade* + (Subj1 +) Pred1 [V-*rakū o-ci*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*rakū*]}	(5.1 – 28)

(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) *aika* *suntan* *be* *telebu-me* *mute-rakū*
if net.bag ACC stretch.taut be.able-IPFV.PTCP.NEG

o-ci, *taka* *sim-be*
become(AUX)-COND temporarily 2SG(*si/sin*)-ACC

erge-mbu-rakū
rest-CAUS-IPFV.PTCP.NEG

'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 *bi-he* in either clause of a conditional construction *suffices* to produce the counterfactual meaning. The rather rare exceptions to this, it seems, are those in which the structure containing *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) *elhei* *waliya-me* *tucibu-fi* *tuwa-ci*, *dule* *jeren*
slowly spit-IPFV.CVB take.out-PFV.CVB look-COND in.fact gazelle

yali i *dorgi* *emu* *sele-i* *muhaliyan* *bi-he* *ni*
meat GEN inside one iron-GEN bullet be-PFV.PTCP PTL

waliya-me tucibu-: 'to spit out'
dule… bihe (*ni*): a mirative construction
'As [I] spat [it] out and took a look, [I realised to my surprise that] it was an iron bullet in the gazelle's meat!' (AGA2: 114)

(5.1 – 30) *dengjan* *dabu-fi* *tuwa-ci*, *umesi* *yobo*, *dule* *emu*
lamp light-PFV.CVB look-COND very funny in.fact one

butu *hūlha* *jortai* *hutu* *ara-me* *niyalma* *be*
sneaky thief intentionally ghost pretend-IPFV.CVB people ACC

gele-bu-mbihe *ni*
fear-CAUS-PST.IPFV PTL

'As [I] lit the lamp up to take a look, [I suddenly realised to my surprise that] very funnily, [it was] in fact a sneaky thief, [who was] intentionally pretending to be a ghost to frighten people!' (OJ2: 68)

---

[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].[49] 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

Subordinate Clause (Protasis)	Main Clause (Apodosis)	Example
{(Subj1 +) (*aika/aikabade* +) Pred1 [V-*hA bi-ci*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*mbihe*/V-*me bi-he*]}	(5.1 – 31)
{(Subj1 +) (*aika/aikabade* +) Pred1 [V-*hA bi-ci*]}	{(Subj2 +) Pred2 [V-*rakū bi-he*]}	(5.1 – 32)
{(Subj1 +) (*aika/aikabade* +) Pred1 [V-*rakū bi-he bi-ci*]}	{Subj2 + Pred2 [V-*mbihe*/V-*me bi-he*]}	(5.1 – 33)
{(Subj1 +) (*aika/aikabade* +) Pred1 [V-*rakū bi-he bi-ci*]}	{Subj2 + Pred2 [V-*rakū bi-he*]}	(5.1 – 34)
{(Subj1 +) (*aika/aikabade* +) Pred1 [V-*hakū bi-he bi-ci*]}	{Subj2 + Pred2 [V-*rakū bi-he*]}	(5.1 – 35)
{(Subj1 +) (*aika/aikabade* +) Pred1 [V-*hAkū bi-ci*]}	{Subj2 + Pred2 [V-*mbihe*/V-*me bi-he*]}	(5.1 – 36)
{(Subj1 +) (*aika/aikabade* +) Pred1 [V-*rakū bi-ci*]}	{Subj2 + Pred2 [V-*rakū bi-he*]}	(5.1 – 37)

(5.1 – 31)   *donji-ha*   *bi-ci*,   *inu*   *tuwanji-mbihe*
hear-PFV.PTCP   be(AUX)-COND   also   come.to.see-PST.IPFV
'If [I] had heard [about your news], [I] would also have come to see [you]'
(OJ1: 89)

(5.1 – 32)   *weri*   *i*   *jombu-ha*   *be*   *majige*   *gai-ha*
other.people   GEN   advise-PFV.PTCP   ACC   a.little   take-PFV.PTCP
bi-ci,   *inu*   *e-de*   *tuhene-rakū*
be(AUX)-COND   also   this-DAT   fall-IPFV.PTCP.NEG
bi-he
be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP
'If [you] had taken even a little advice from other people, [you] would not
have fallen into this [trap]' (AGA3: 35)

(5.1 – 33)   *Nomina Naikada*   *alana-rakū*   *bi-he*
PN   PN   go.to.tell-IPFV.PTCP.NEG   be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP
bi-ci,   *Nikan Wailan*   *be*   *baha-mbihe*
be(AUX)-COND   P.N.   ACC   get-PST.IPFV
'If Nomina and Naikada had not gone to inform [him], [we] would have
caught Nikan Wailan' (MYK1: 36)

(5.1 – 34)   *bi*   *jakan*   *giyalame giyalame*   *sin-de*
1SG   just.now   intermittently   2SG(*si/sin*)-DAT
jombu-rakū   *bi-he*   *bi-ci*,
remind-IPFV.PTCP.NEG   be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP   be(AUX)-COND
si   *kemuni*   *wacihiyame*   *šejile-me*   *mute-rakū*
2SG   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)

(5.1 – 35)   *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-IPFV.PTCP.NEG   be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP
'If [I] had not learnt it, [I] would not have been able to understand it'
(UH: 30)

(5.1 – 36)   *min-i*   *jui*   *be*   *dahūme*   *aitu-hakū*
1SG(*bi/min*)-GEN   child   ACC   again   save-PFV.PTCP.NEG
bi-ci,   *fulehe*   *lakca-me*   *bi-he*
be(AUX)-COND   root   be.severed-IPFV.CVB   be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP
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)   *bi*   *moo-i*   *funghūwang*   <u>*ara-rakū*</u>
    1SG   wood-GEN   phoenix   make-IPFV.PTCP.NEG

    <u>*bi-ci*</u>,   *fujin* *be* *boo* *leose* *ci* *tucibu-ci*
    be(AUX)-COND   lady   ACC   house   building   ABL   rescue-COND

    <u>*ojo-rakū*</u>   <u>*bi-he*</u>
    become(AUX)-IPFV.PTCP.NEG   be(AUX)-PFV.PTCP

    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)   *si*   *tuttu*   *te-he-de*,   *bi*   *absi*   *te-mbi*
             2SG   like.that   sit-PFV.PTCP-DAT   1SG   how   sit-IPFV.FIN
             'If/When you sit down like that, how will I sit?' (OJ1: 25)

(5.2 – 2)	*tere*	*hūntahan*	*be*	*gana-ci*,	*dere*	*de*	*gece-me*
	that	mug	ACC	go.to.get-COND	table	DAT	freeze-IPFV.CVB

tokto-hobi
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 got stuck to the table'
(AGA2: 84)

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) *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], would [you] tell me please?' (NSB: 25)

(5.2 – 4) *age*   *sin-de*   *aika*   *manju*   *bithe*   *bi-ci*,   *emu*
           sir   2SG(*si/sin*)-DAT if   Manchu   book   be-COND   one
           udu   *debtelin*   *juwen*   *bu-reo*
           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-re*   *sain*   *gisun*   *be*
        2SG(*si/sin*)-GEN   teach-IPFV.PTCP   good   words   ACC
        min-i   *dolo*   *buce-ci*,   *inu*   *onggo-rakū*
        1SG(*bi/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)

(5.2 – 7)   *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)

(5.2 – 8)   *ai*   *bi-ci*,   *ai*   *be*   *tukiye-fi*   *ulebu-mbi*
　　　　　　 what   be-COND   what   ACC   hold.up-PFV.CVB   feed-IPFV.FIN
　　　　　　 '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)

　　　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 tukiyefi ulebumbi* (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 converb V-*cibe* always expresses concession: either concessives proper or concessive conditionals. Therefore, the concessive converb 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 converb 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 converb V-*ci* can also occur in concessives proper.

It has been demonstrated that the conditional converb V-*ci* can occur in all semantic types of concessive constructions: both concessive conditionals and concessives proper. In these constructions the conditional converb V-*ci* seems to serve as an alternative for the concessive converb V-*cibe*. The morphological similarity between the two converbs may also account for this phenomenon. Gorelova (2002: 280) points out the possibility that the concessive converb V-*cibe* originated from the concessive converb V-*ci*. If this supposition is true, it would then be reasonable to assume that in expressing the concessive meanings, the converb V-*cibe* has emerged as a marked form while the converb V-*ci*, which allows a number of semantic possibilities, remains unmarked. On the other hand, it may be true that since the conditional converb can occur in concessive conditionals, and since Manchu does not distinguish between concessive conditionals and concessives proper morphosyntactically, the conditional converb 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 *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 *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.

5.2.4   Parallel Constructions

The sentences analysed in Section 4.6 share a *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):

(5.2 – 9)   *julergi* *alin* *de* *emu* *dobori* *dedu-ci*, *amargi*
south mountain DAT one night stay-COND north
alin *de* *emu* *dobori* *dedu-ø*
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

194

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

ine mene: 'willingly', 'as one wishes'
'If [you] had taken that away as you wished, it would have been good'
(OJ2: 150)

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-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)

(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)

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

(5.2 – 19a) *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

(5.2 – 19b) *nure*   *omi-ki*   *se-ci*,   *si*   *min-ci*
wine   drink-OPT   TOP (< say-COND)   2SG   1SG(*bi/min*)-ABL
cingkai   *eberi*
completely   weak
'Speaking of eating, I really am no match for you (lit.: 'I cannot reach your level'); [but] speaking of drinking, you are completely too weak [a match] for me (lit: 'you are much worse than I am')' (MFG: 52)

(5.2 – 20a) *je-ci*,   *jete-re-ngge*   *akū*;
eat-COND   eat-IPFV.PTCP-NMLZ   NEG
(5.2 – 20b) *etu-ci*,   *etu-re-ngge*   *akū*
wear-COND   wear-IPFV.PTCP-NMLZ   NEG
'As for eating, there is not anything to eat; as for clothing, there is not anything to wear' (OJ1: 64)

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.

(6.1 – 1) *usu*   *ya*   *kine*   *o*   *ur-u*   *mise*   *mo*
mortar   as.well.as   pestle   ACC   sell-PRS.PTCP   shop   also

ar-eba,   *yama*   *kara*   *matsu*   *o*   *ki-tte*   *ki-te*   *u-tte*
exist-COND   mountain   ABL   pine   ACC   cut-CVB   come-CVB   sell-CVB

i-ru   *hito*   *mo* *i-mashita*
be-PRS.PTCP   people   also exist-PST

'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).

(6.1 – 2) *sono*   *kado*   *o*   *magar-eba*,   *mise*   *ga*   *ar-u*
that   corner   ACC   turn-COND   shop   NOM   be-PRS.PTCP
'If [you] turn round the corner, there will be a shop'
(Alpatov and Podlesskaja 2005: 640)

(6.1 – 3) *mado*   *o*   *ake-reba*,   *soto*   *wa* *ame*   *da-tta*
window   ACC   open-COND   outside   TOP   rain   be-PST
'I opened the window to find it was raining' (lit.: 'As I opened the window, [I found that] it was raining outside') (Alpatove and Podlesskaja 2005: 641)

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:

(6.1 – 4) *jidō*   *furikae*   *deki-reba*   *benri*   *desu*   *ne*
automatic   transfer   be.able-COND   convenient   be.PRS   PTL
'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)   *futsū*   *yokin*   *to*   *i-eba*,   *nihon* *de*   *wa*   *riritsu*
               ordinary   deposit QUOT say-COND   Japan   LOC   TOP   interest.rate
               ga   *zuibun* *hikui-n*   *desu*   *ne*
               NOM   very   low-NMLZ   be.PRS   PTL
               '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)   Even
           ak-mu   (*tiniv*)   *muču-ča*   *bi-sek-e-n*,
           brother-1SG (yesterday) return-PFV.PTCP   be(AUX)-DS.COND-EPN-3SG
           bujuh-ne-če   *bi-mč-u*
           hunt-DIRN-PFV.PTCP   be(AUX)-SBJV-1SG
           '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*   <u>*eme-če*</u>   <u>*bi-sik-i-s*</u>,
2SG   1SG(*bi/min*)-ALL   come-PFV.PTCP   be(AUX)-DS.COND-EPN-2SG
bi   *sin-du*   *purta-va*   <u>*bu-mče-v*</u>
1SG   2SG(*si/sin*)-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*   <u>*aj-ča*</u>   <u>*bi-mi*</u>,
1SG   sister-ACC.DEF-2SG   cure-PFV.PTCP   be(AUX)-SS.COND
ahi-ja-vi   <u>*ga-mča-v*</u>
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*   <u>*ielten-eke-n*</u>,   *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*   <u>*ete-mi*</u>,   *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)
am-mu-da   *gasči-rak-a-n*,   *nö-v*
father-1SG.POSS-EMPH   ask-DS.COND-EPN-3SG   brother-1SG.POSS
e-h-ni   *emep-te*
not.do-NFUT-3SG   stay-NEG.CVB
'Although [my] father asked [him to do so], my brother did not stay'
(Malchukov 2005: 547)

(6.1 – 16)   Even ([universal] concessive conditional)
ngi-vul-de   *gasči-rak-a-n*,   *e-te-m bö-r*
who-ever-EMPH   ask-DS.COND-EPN-3SG   not.do give-NEG.CVB
'Whoever asks [for this], I will not give [this] away' (Malchukov 2005: 548)

(6.1 – 17)   Evenki (concessive proper)
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)
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
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:

(6.1 – 20)   Evenki

omolgī   *bi-mi*   *tiken*   *gūn-cē*

youth   TOP (< be-SS.COND)   such.way   say-PST.PTCP

'As for the youth, [he] said in such a way…' (Gorelova 2006: 160)

(6.1 – 21)   Negidal

ge, *tay Buγa*   *bi-mi*   *o-l-ca*,   *beynge-l-be*

well that PN   TOP (< be-SS.COND)   create-INCH-PST.PTCP animal-PL-ACC

o-ca-n

create-PST.PTCP-3SG.PRED

'Well, that Buga began creating, [and he] created animals' (Gorelova 2006: 160)

(6.1 – 22)   Negidal

Omnankan   *gun-mi*,   *deγin-ji-da*   *hul-le-n*,

PN   TOP (< say-SS.COND)   bird-INS-PTL   go-PRF-3SG.PRED

gehuktami-da   *hul-le-n*

on.foot-PTL   go-PRF-3SG.PRED

Omnankan: a mythical creature of the Upper World

'As for Omnankan, [he] flies like a bird and walks on foot'
(Gorelova 2006: 160)

6.1.3   Mongolian (Mongolic)

In Mongolian,[52] the particle *bol*, orthographically identical with the stem of the copular verb *bol-* 'to become/be',[53] 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.

(6.1 – 23)   *či*   *min-ü*   *beye*   *bol-oγsan*   *bol*,   *nada*   *ača*

              2SG   1SG(*bi/min*)-GEN   self   be-PFV.PTCP COND   1SG(*nada*) ABL

              ilegüü   *bačimda-xu*   *yum*

              more   worry-IPFV.PTCP 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 of *bol-* 'to become/be', i.e., *bol-bal*. The other view (e.g., Sanzheev 1953–1964) hypothesises that *bol* came from the conditional converb of an existential verb **a-* 'to be', i.e. **a-bol*, which has disappeared in the course of time.

'If you were me, you would be more worried than I [am now]'[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) *ene*   *bol*   *man-u*   *nutuɣ-un*   *ɣarulta*
            this   TOP   1PL(*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) *teimü*   *nom*   *begejing-dü*   *bol*   *bai-xu*   *maɣad*   *ügei*
            like.that book   Beijing-LOC   TOP   be-IPFV.PTCP certainly   NEG
            maɣad 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) *tere*   *xümün-ü*   *aman-ača*   *bol*,   *eimü*   *üge*
            that   person-GEN   mouth-ABL   TOP   such   word
            ɣaru-mar   *yum*
            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)

---

[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)   *säl   kechik-ip   käl-gän   bol-singiz,   män*
a.little   be.late-CVB   come-PFV.PTCP   be(AUX)-COND.2HON 1SG
sirt-qa   chiq-ip   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)   *baldur-raq   de-gän   bol-singiz,   orun-din*
early-DIM   say(*dä/de*)-PFV.PTCP   be(AUX)-COND.2HON bed-ABL
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)   *ägär   biz yaxshi   ögän-mi-gän   bol-saq,   bu*
if   1PL good   study-NEG-PFV.PTCP   be(AUX)-COND.1PL   this
qetim-qi   imtihan-ni   yaxshi   ber-äl-mi-gän
time-ADJ   exam-ACC   good   give(*bär/ber*)-ABIL-NEG-PFV.PTCP
bol-attuq
be(AUX)-PST.IPFV.1PL
imtihan bär-: 'to take (lit.: 'give') an exam'
'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:

(6.1 – 30) *män*   *kino*   *kör-üwat-sam*,   *mu'ällim*   *meni*   *chaqir-ip*
            1SG   movie   see-PROG-COND.1SG teacher   1SG.ACC call-CVB

chiq-ip kät-ti
go.out-CVB leave-PST.3SG/PL
'When I was watching a movie, the teacher called me to go out'
(Cheng et al. 1996: 394–395)

(6.1 – 31) *u*   *käl-sä*,   *silär*   *ämgäk*   *qil-iwatqan*   *ikän-silär*
            3SG   come-COND.3SG/PL 2PL   labour   do-PROG.PTCP   COP.IDR-2PL
'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" (Hämit 2003: 311). The following is an example:

(6.1 – 32) *aka-m*   *bar-sa*,   *u*   *nahayiti*   *qopalliq*
            elder.brother-1SG.POSS go-COND.3SG/PL 3SG very rudeness

qi-ptu
do-PST.IDR.3SG/PL
qopalliq qil-: 'to act rudely'
'My elder brother went, but s/he apparently acted really rudely'
(Hämit 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:

(6.1 – 33) *bir qetim*   *uyghurchä*   *kino*   *kör-säk*,   *bir qetim*   *xänzuchä*
            one time   Uyghur   movie   see-COND.1PL one time   Chinese

kino   *kör-äyli*
film   see-OPT.1PL
'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-dä   ap'aq   qar*, ...)   *töwän-dä*
          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

		Counterfactual Cond.	Temporal	Concessive	Contrastive	Evaluative Cond.	Topic	Perc./Cog. Verbs	Inferential Cond.
Tungusic	Even	√	√	√		√			
	Evenki	√	√	√		√	√		√
	Negidal						√		
Mongolic	Mongolian	√					√		
Turkic	Uyghur	√	√	√	√		√		
Altaic-like	Japanese				√	√		√	

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

converb of certain perception verbs (see Sections 4.3.2.4 and 4.9). Table 6.2 summarises the constructions analysed in Chapter 4 and discussed in Chapter 5.

Table 6.2   A Summary of Conditional Constructions in Manchu

		Conditionality or What Aspect of It	Domain of Semantic Presentation	Additional Remark
Prototypes		Conditionality	Content	
Non-prototypical Conditionals			Content	
Temporal		Temporality only	Content	
Speech-Act Conditionals		Conditionality	Speech-act	Protasis used as politeness strategy
Performative Conditionals				Protasis specifying content of speech act
Concessives Proper		Not applicable	Content	
Concessive Conditionals	**Scalar**	Conditionality	Content	Conditionality as a many-to-one correspondence
	Alternative			
	Universal			
Parallel Constructions	**Contrast**	Conditionality	Content / speech-act / epistemic / perceptual	
	Comparison			
	Disjunction			
	Degree	Causality/ conditionality	Content	
Evaluative Conditionals		Conditionality	Content	Main subject referring to protasis state of affairs; "reduced conditional"
Topic Constructions		Conditionality	Speech-act	Topic → Comment
Perception/Cognition Verb Constructions		Conditionality / temporality / causality	Epistemic / Perceptual	
Inferential Conditionals		Conditionality	Epistemic	Phenomenon → inference

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-*mbihe*/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.

Bibliography

1 Manchu Materials Used

AGA   Aisin-Gioro, Ihing. 1802. *An i gisun i amtan be sara bithe* [The book for knowing the taste of   ordinary language (in four books)]. Peking.

AMH   Uge Šeoping. 1730. *Manju bithei gisun de aisilara mudan i hergen* [Functional words in the Manchu language]. (*Cing wen ki mung bithe* [An elementary textbook of Manchu] 3). Peking: Sanhuaitang.

IMN   Hu, Zengyi (ed.). 1994. *Ice manju nikan gisun kamcibuha buleku bithe / Xin man han da cidian* [A New Manchu Chinese Dictionary]. Ürümchi: Xinjiang Renmin Chubanshe.

LQD   Chuang, Chi-fa (ed.). 1984. *Qing yu lao qi da* [Lao qi da: a Manchu translation]. Taipei: Wenshizhe Chubanshe.

MFG   Uge Šeoping. 1730. *Nikan gisun kamciha manjurara fiyelen i gisun* [Passages of Manchu dialogues with Chinese Translation]. (*Cing wen ki mung bithe* [An elementary textbook of Manchu] 2). Peking: Sanhuaitang.

MYK   *Manjui yargiyan kooli* [Veritable records of the Manchus (in eight books)]. 1985. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju.

NSB   *Nišan saman bithe* [The tale of the Nišan Shaman]. A manuscript presented to Alexander V. Grebenshchikov by Dekdengge.

OJ1   Chang, Hwa-ker. 2005. *Sume hūlara manju gisun i oyonggo jorin i bithe* [Essentials of the Manchu language with Chinese annotation]. Taipei: Wenshizhe Chubanshe.

OJ2   Chang, Hwa-ker. 2005. *Sume hūlara sirame banjibuha nikan hergen i kamcibuha manju gisun i oyonggo jorin i bithe* [Recompiled essentials of the Manchu language with Chinese annotation]. Taipei: Wenshizhe Chubanshe.

SG   Ji, Yonghai, Bai Liyuan & Zhao Bingwen (translation and annotation). 2002. *Shi yu gushi* [Stories of the bewitched corpse]. Beijing: Zhongyang Minzu Daxue

Chubanshe.

UH   Heotiyan Wanfu & Liu Fengshan. 1894. *Dasame foloho manju gisun i untuhun hergen i temgetu jorin bithe* [Essensials of the functional words in Manchu: A reprint]. Peking: Longfusi Juzhentang.

2   References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2003. Evidentiality in typological perspective. In Alexandra Aikhenvald & Robert Dixon (eds.), *Studies in evidentiality* (Typological Studies in Language 54), 1–31. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aisin-Gioro, Yingsheng. 2004. *Manyu zashi* [A comprehensive handbook of the Manchu language]. Beijing: Xueyuan Chubanshe.

Akatsuka, Noriko. 1986. Conditionals are discourse-bound. In Elizabeth Closs Traugott, Alice ter Meulen, Judy Snitzer Reilly & Charles. A. Ferguson (eds.), *On conditionals*, 333–351. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Alpatov, Vladimir M. & Vera I. Podlesskaja. 2005. Conditionals in Japanese. In Xrakovskij, Viktor S. (ed.), 629–655.

Amiot, Joseph Marie. 1788. *Grammaire tartare mantchou*. Paris.

Austin, John Langshaw. 1962. *How to do things with words*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Avrorin, Valentin A. 1949. *O kategorijax vida i vremeni v man'čžurskom jazyke* [On categories of aspect and tense in the Manchu language] (Izvestija AN SSSR VII(1)) [Proceedings of the Academy of Sciences, USSR, VII(1), 60–66].

Avrorin, Valentin A. 2000. *Grammatika pis'mennogo man'čžurskogo jazyka* [Grammar of the written Manchu language]. Saint Petersburg: Nauka.

Bennett, Jonathan. 2003. *A philosophical guide to conditionals*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Chafe, Wallace L. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects and topics. In Charles N. Li (ed.), *Subject and topic*, 25–55. New York: Academic Press.

Chafe, Wallace & Johanna Nichols (eds.). 1986. *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology* (Advances in Discourse Processes 20). Norwood, N.J.: Abex.

Cheng, Shiliang, Abduräshit Yaqub, Mirza Kärim, Zhang Dingjing, Zhang Liang, Hu Yi, Talant, & Jin Chou (eds.). 1996. *Xiandai weiwueryu yufa / Hazirqi zaman uyghur tili grammatikisi* [A grammar of Modern Uyghur]. Ürümchi: Xinjiang Renmin Chubanshe.

Chenggeltei. 1991. *Mengguyu yufa* [A grammar of Mongolian]. Hohhot: Nei Menggu renmin chubanshe.

Cherkasova, E. T. 1973. *Russkie sojuzy nemestoimennogo proisxoždenija* [Russian conjunctions of non-pronominal origin]. Moscow: Nauka.

Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect: an introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Comrie, Bernard. 1986. Conditionals: A typology. In Elizabeth Closs Traugott, Alice ter Meulen, Judy Snitzer Reilly & Charles. A. Ferguson (eds.), *On conditionals*, 77–99. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dahl, Östen. 1997. The relation between past time reference and counterfactuality: A new look. In Angeliki Athanasiadou & René Dirven (eds.), *On conditionals again* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 143), 97–114. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Dancygier, Barbara. 1993. Interpreting conditionals: Time, knowledge and causation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 19. 403–434.

Dancygier, Barbara. 1998. *Conditionals and prediction: Time, knowledge and causation in conditional constructions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

De Haan, Ferdinand. 1999. Evidentiality and epistemic modality: Setting boundaries. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 18. 83–101.

De Haan, Ferdinand. 2001. The place of inference within the evidential system. In *International Journal of American linguistics* 67. 193–219.

De Haan, Ferdinand. 2006. Typological approaches to modality. In William Frawley (ed.), *The expression of modality*, 27–70. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Declerck, Renaat & Susan Reed. 2001. *Conditionals: a comprehensive empirical analysis.*

Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

DeLancey, Scott. 1997. Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information. *Linguistic Typlogy* 1. 33–52.

Fillenbaum, Samuel. 1986. The use of conditionals in inducements and deterrents. In Elizabeth Closs Traugott, Alice ter Meulen, Judy Snitzer Reilly & Charles. A. Ferguson (eds.), *On conditionals*, 179–195. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fleischman, Suzanne. 1989. Temporal distance: a basic linguistic metaphor. *Studies in Language* 13(1). 1–50.

Friedman, Victor. 1986. Evidentiality in the Balkans: Bulgarian, Macedonian, and Albanian. In Wallace Chafe & Johanna Nichols (eds.) 1986, 168–187.

Gerbillion, Jean-François. 1696. *Elementa linguae tartaricae*. Paris.

Gökse, Aslı & Celia Kerslake. 2005. *Turkish: A comprehensive grammar*. London & New York: Routledge.

Gorelova, Lilija M. 2002. *Manchu grammar*. Leiden: Brill.

Gorelova, Lilija M. 2004. Grammatičeskie sredstva pragmatičeskogo strukturirovanija predloženija man'čžurskom jazyke [Grammatical means of pragmatic structuring of sentence in the Manchu language]. In *Gumanitarnye Nauki v Sibiri* [Humanities in Siberia] 4. 60–70.

Gorelova, Lilija M. 2006. Typology of information structures in the Altaic languages. In Elena V. Boikova and Rostislav B. Rybakov (eds.), *Kinship in the Altaic world* (Proceedings of the 48th Permanent International Altaistic Conference, Moscow 10–15 July, 2005), 149–171. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Gorelova, Lilija M. & M. N. Orlovskaja. 2010. Informacionnye struktury v srednemongol'skom i man'čžurskom jazykax (tipologičeskij, êtnoistoričeskij i areal'nyj aspekty) [Information structures in Middle Mongolian and Manchu (typological, ethno-historical and areal aspects)]. In *Bjulleten' Obščestva Vostokovedov* RAN [Newsletter of the Oriental Society, Russian Academy of Sciences] 17. 573–622. Moscow: Institut Vostokovedenija RAN.

Greenberg, Joseph H. (ed.). 1963. *Universals of language*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Haiman, John. 1978. Conditionals are topics. *Language* 54. 512–540.

Haspelmath, Martin & Ekkehard König (eds.). 1995. *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective: Structure and meaning of adverbial verb forms — adverbial participles, gerunds* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 13). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jacobsen, William. 1986. The heterogeneity of evidentials in Makah. In Wallace Chafe & Johanna Nichols (eds.) 1986, 3–28.

Jackson, Frank. 1987. *Conditionals*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Jespersen, Otto. 1940. *A modern English grammar on historical principles V: Syntax*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Johnson-Laird, P. N. 1986. Conditionals and mental models. In Elizabeth Closs Traugott, Alice ter Meulen, Judy Snitzer Reilly & Charles. A. Ferguson (eds.), *On conditionals*, 55–75. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Janhunen, Juha. 1996. *Manchuria: An ethnic history*. Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.

Keenan, Edward L. 1976. Towards a universal definition of "subject". In Charles N. Li (ed.), *Subject and topic*, 305–334. New York: Academic Press.

König, Ekkehard. 1986. Conditionals, concessive conditionals and concessives. In Elizabeth Closs Traugott, Alice ter Meulen, Judy Snitzer Reilly & Charles. A. Ferguson (eds.), *On conditionals*, 229–246. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lavrov, Boris V. 1941. *Uslovnye i ustupitel'nye predloženija v drevnerusskom jazyke* [Conditional and concessive sentences in the Old Russian language]. Moscow & Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.

Lebedeva, E. P. & Lilija M. Gorelova. 1994. *Sidi kur – sibinskaja versija "volšebnogo mertveca": Teksty v zapisi V. V. Radlova* [Sidi kur – a Sibe version of the "bewitched corpse" cycle: Texts recorded by V. V. Radlov (with transliteration and an English introduction by Giovanni Stary)] (Aetas Manjurica 4). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Lehmann, Christian. 1974. Prinzipien für 'Universal' 14. In Hansjakob Seiler (ed.), *Linguistic Workshop II*, 69–97. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.

Li, Charles N. & Sandra A. Thompson. 1976. Subject and topic: A new typology of language. In Charles N. Li (ed.), *Subject and topic*, 457–489. New York: Academic Press.

Li, Gertraude Roth. 2010. *Manchu: A textbook for reading documents* (2nd edn.). National

Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

Liu, Jingxian, Ji Yonghai & Qu Liusheng. 1986. *Manyu yufa* [A Manchu grammar]. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.

Mackie, John Leslie. 1975. Causes and conditions. In Ernest Sosa (ed.), *Causation and conditionals*, 15–38. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Meadows, Thomas Taylor. 1849. *Translations from the Manchu – with the original texts, prefaced by an essay on the language*. Canton: Press of S. Wells Williams.

Malchukov, Andrej L. 2005. Conditional constructions in Even. In Xrakovskij, Viktor S. (ed.) 2005, 527–555.

Miglioranza, Adriano. 2004. Alla ricerca del verbo essere in mancese: La frase nominale, il verbo 'bimbi' e il verbo 'ombi' tra il mancese classico e il sibe parlato. A paper presented at a workshop in Torino.

Nedjalkov, Igor' V. & Nina Ja. Bulatova. 2005. Conditional constructions in Evenki. In Xrakovskij, Viktor S. (ed.) 2005, 556–576.

Nordström, Jack. 2010. *Modality and subordinators*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Pevnov, Alexander M. 1980. *Deepričastie na -mī v êvenkijskom jazyke* [The converb in *-mī* in the Evenki language]. PhD thesis. Leningrad: Leningradskoe Otdelenije Instituta Jazykoznanija, Akademija Nauk SSSR.

Palmer, Frank R. 2001. *Mood and modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Podlesskaja, Vera. I. 2001. Conditional constructions. In Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher & Wolfgang Raible (eds.), *Language typology and language universals: An international handbook* (Vol. 2), 998–1010. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Ramstedt, Gustaf John. 1902. *Über die Konjugation des Khalkha-Mongolischen* (Mémoire de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 19). Helsingfors: Die finnische Litteraturgesellschaft.

Sechenbaatar, Borjigin. 2003. *The Chakhar dialect of Mongol – A morphological description*. Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.

Sinor, Denis. 1968. La Langue mandjoue. In *Handbuch der Orientalistik. Fünfter Band: Altaistik. Dritter Abschnitt: Tungusologie*, 257–280. Leiden-Köln: Brill.

Stalnaker, Robert C. 1975. A theory of conditionals. In Ernest Sosa (ed.), *Causation and conditionals*, 165–179. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stary, Giovanni. 1983. *Emu tanggû orin sakda-i gisun sarkiyan – Erzählungen der 120 Alten. Beiträge zur mandschurischen Kulturgeschichte* (Asiatische Forschungen 83). Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Stary, Giovanni. 1985. *Three unedited manuscripts of the Manchu epic tale "Nišan saman-i bithe": facsimile edition with transcription and introduction*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Sweetser, Eva. 1990. *From etymology to pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sweetser, Eva. 1996. Mental spaces and the grammar of conditional constructions. In Gilles Fauconnier & Eva Sweetser (eds.), *Spaces, worlds and grammar*, 318–333. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Taylor, John R. 1995. *Linguistic categorization*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1985. Conditional markers. In John Haiman (ed.), *Iconicity in syntax*, 289–307. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Van der Auwera, Johan. 1986. Conditionals and speech acts. In Elizabeth Closs Traugott, Alice ter Meulen, Judy Snitzer Reilly & Charles. A. Ferguson (eds.), *On conditionals*, 197–214. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van linden, An & Jean-Christophe Verstraete. 2008. The nature and origins of counterfactuality in simple clauses: cross-linguistic evidence. *Journal of Pragmatics* 40. 1865–1895.

Vasmer, Max. 1986 [1950 – 1958]. *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (in 4 volumes). Russian translation by Oleg N. Trubachjov. Moscow: Progress.

Volkova, Maja P. 1961. *Nišan samani bitxe* (*predanie o nišanskoj šamanke*): *Izdanie teksta, perevod i predislovie* [Nišan samani bithe (legend about Nishan Shamanness): Publication of the text, translation and foreword]. Moscow: Institut Narodov Azii, Akademija Nauk SSSR.

Von der Gabelentz, Hans Conon. 1833. *Eléments de la grammaire mandchoue*. Altenburg.

Von Möllendorff, Paul Georg. 1892. *A Manchu grammar with analysed texts*. Shanghai: The

American Presbyterian Mission Press.

Vovin, Alexander. 2005. The end of the Altaic controversy. *Central Asiatic Journal* 49(1). 71–132.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1997. Conditionals and counterfactuals: Conceptual primitives and linguistic universals. In Angeliki Athanasiadou & René Dirven (eds.), *On conditionals again* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 143), 15–59. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Witt, Richard J. 2009. Auditory evidentiality in English and German : The case of perception verbs. *Lingua* 119. 1083–1095.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1958. *Philosophical investigations*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Blackwell.

Xrakovskij, Viktor S. (ed.). 2005. *Typology of conditional constructions* (LINCOM Studies in Theoretical Linguistics 25). München: LINCOM GmbH.

Xrakovskij, Viktor S. (ed.). 2012. *Typology of concessive constructions* (LINCOM Studies in Theoretical Linguistics 50). München: LINCOM GmbH.

Zakharov, Ivan I. 1875. Polnyj *man'čžursko–russkij slovar'* [A complete Manchu–Russian dictionary]. Saint Petersburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk.

Zakharov, Ivan I. 1879. *Grammatika man'čžurskogo jazyka* [*Grammar of the Manchu language*]. Saint Petersburg.

Zäynäp Niyaz & Wang Yu. 2001. *Weiwu'eryu kouyu duben* [A reader for spoken Uyghur]. Beijing: Zhongyang Minzu Daxue Chubanshe.

Zhao, Jie. 1989. *Xiandai manyu yanjiu* [Studies of the modern Manchu language]. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.