Benjamin Brosig*

Expressing intent, imminence and ire by attributing speech/thought in Mongolian

Abstract: Quoted clauses in which an intention is declared are cross-linguistically known to develop into clauses that directly ascribe an intention to their subjects, and further into clauses that express the imminence of an event. In Khalkha Mongolian, several quotative constructions based on the quotative verb *ge-* have come to ascribe intention and then developed further semantic extensions:

 (i) The pattern *-x ge-*, featuring a fossilized Middle Mongol future-referring participial suffix, is used in a group of constructions that cover the semantic space between future time reference, intention (initially of the current speaker), and imminence.
 (ii) Quotational clauses ending in a particular tense-aspect-evidentiality suffix (including *-n*) and subordinated by a linking converb *ge-ž/ge-ed* are often systematically ambiguous between quotation and their purposive, causal and concessive extensions. Noun phrases with similar properties additionally allow for (dedicational-)benefactive and (allocational-)functive uses.
(iii) The pattern *-n ge-*, which in other Central Mongolic varieties resembles *-x ge-*, conveys the speaker's disbelief and anger about an actor's willful deeds when used in echo questions marked by *-n=AA*.

Based on conversational corpus data, this paper tries to provide a comprehensive picture of Khalkha Mongolian constructions in which the speaker's awareness of the subject's speech or thoughts is reinterpreted as attributing intentions and their derived notions.

Keywords: causality; emotion; imminence; intention; internal awareness; prospective; quotative verb; reported discourse.

***Corresponding author: Benjamin Brosig**, Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Republic of China; CNRS, LLACAN, Villejuif, France; and University of Bern, Institute of Linguistics, Bern, Switzerland, E-mail: benjamin.brosig@gmx.de

1 Introduction

This paper is concerned with the grammaticalization of all quotative indices that are based on the Khalkha Mongolian quotative verb *ge-* and have developed into constructions expressing intention, imminence and ire, as well as purpose and reason. The common denominator of these constructions is that they express or originally would have expressed the speaker's purported awareness of the (internal or external) discourse between event participants (potentially including the speaker), thereby attributing to them intentions, reasons for their actions, etc. At an initial stage of the grammaticalization of what is sometimes called "internal awareness", the division between the actual attribution of linguistically coded thoughts and the notions that are entailed by these thoughts is often arbitrary (Güldemann 2008: 425). For instance, inner speech in the Papuan language Usan can be used to situationally convey notions such as purpose, 'lest' [i.e., preventive purpose], pretense [i.e., imitative 'as if'], mistaken thought, inception [prospectivity?], attempting and listing (Reesink 1993). Several of the constructions discussed in this paper are similarly characterized by a low degree of semantic conventionalization. For instance, the Mongolian quotative verb *ge-* on its own as in (1a) or with a matrix verb as in (1b) regularly indexes actual speech or thought but in combination with certain preceding predicate forms (which are marked for tense, time of acquisition,[1] aspect and evidentiality) it can introduce a condition that constitutes the purpose, reason, non-preclusive counteracting factor ('although') etc. for the actions of the matrix clause, as in (1c). Consequently, these meanings synchronically still appear to arise from the attribution/projection of thoughts to subjects.

(1) a. *yal-an   ge-seŋ.*
        win-POT   QV-EST.PST
        'SUBJECT$_i$ will win, as SPEAKER$_{i/j}$ uttered.'

    b. *yal-an   ge-ž   xel-seŋ.*[2]
        win-POT   QV-CVB   say-EST.PST
        'SPEAKER$_i$ said that/: SUBJECT$_{i/j}$ will win.'

    c. *yal-an   ge-ž   /   ge-ed   oč-soŋ.*
        win-POT   QV-CVB   /   QV-CVB   go.there-EST.PST
        'SUBJECT$_i$ went there because/so that SUBJECT$_{i/j}$ will win.'
        (constructed)

---

1 'Time of acquisition' relates to whether the speaker just learned about the event that she refers to or knew about it beforehand (see Brosig 2018).
2 Informants reject *ge-ed* in this particular context, while e.g. forms like VERB-*An ge-ed xel-čix-seŋ(=)čin* 'because SPEAKER$_i$ said that SUBJECT$_{i/j}$ will VERB' are attested. This point requires future research.

At a more advanced stage of grammaticalization, the original attribution of thought is replaced by the notions entailed by these thoughts, and the construction itself may assume an invariable form (Güldemann 2008: 425). For Mongolian, this in particular applies to the grammaticalization cline from intention (1d) to purpose (1e) and prospectivity (1f), invariably marked by the synchronically idiosyncratic sequence -*x ge*-, and the expression of surprise and ire through a synchronically non-compositional use of the pattern -*n ge-n=ee* (1g).

(1) d. *yal-ax*   *ge-s=iiŋ.*
       win-FUT.PTCP   QV-EST.PST=ASS
       'SUBJECTᵢ wants to win.'

    e. *yal-ax*   *ge-ž*   /   *ge-ed*   *oč-soŋ.*
       win-FUT.PTCP   QV-CVB   /   QV-CVB   go.there-EST.PST
       'SUBJECTᵢ went there in order to win.'

    f. *yal-ax*   *ge-ž*   /   *ge-ed*   *bai-saŋ.*
       win-FUT.PTCP   QV-CVB   /   QV-CVB   AUX-EST.PST
       'SUBJECTᵢ was about to win.'

    g. *yal-an*   *ge-n=ee!*
       win-GEN   QV-POT=EMPH
       'How dare SUBJECTᵢ win!'
       (constructed)

The element that connects these constructions is the quotative verb *ge*- in its function as a quotative index. In this paper, a 'quotative index' is defined as "a segmentally discrete linguistic expression which is used by the reporter for the orientation of the audience to signal in his/her discourse the occurrence of an adjacent representation of reported discourse" (Güldemann 2008: 11). This excludes the suprasegmental marking of reported discourse, which is less likely to undergo further grammaticalization but is relevant for the expression of reported discourse as such (cf. Spronck and Nikitina 2019: 143). Quotative indices may delimit quotes on either or on both sides. Their defining lexical element can be a demonstrative, a generic speech verb etc., and the use of quote-initial regular speech verbs in finite, converbal or nominalized forms is in fact well-attested for contemporary Mongolian (Narmandax 2004: 70–89) and, especially with converbs, for its predecessor (Street 2013: 16–27). However, it can also be a 'quotative verb' like *ge*-. This cross-linguistically attested class of verbs is specialized in introducing reported discourse, but unable to refer to non-quoted speech content (such as e.g. *these words*). This feature sets them apart from generic speech verbs (Güldemann 2008: 82).

   Quotative indices, irrespective of origin, are known to adopt functions other than reporting verbal or mental discourse. The potential range of extended uses of quotative indices (which often develop from constructions that involve additional meaningful elements such as parts of the quote) is shown in (2). The basic entries and

order of this list are taken from the discussion in Güldemann (2008: 398–477), as indexed by lowercase "$_G$". Additional terms were taken from Matić and Pakendorf (2013), Chappell (2008: 49) and Arkadiev and Maisak (2018: 140), as indexed by their respective initials. The position of these terms within the list is partially arbitrary and does not always follow the groupings of the original authors. Where considered helpful, equivalent terms for similar or identical concepts are introduced by '~'.

(2)   Extended uses of quotative indices

        a.   Naming$_G$ ~ meta-linguistic use$_{MP}$

        b.   Reported evidence$_G$
            i.   hearsay marker$_{Ch}$
            ii.   mirative marker$_{Ch}$

        c.   Illocution reinforcement and related discourse functions$_G$
            i.   embedded question marker$_{Ch}$[3]
            ii.   discourse particle for self-evident assertions, warnings and echo questions$_{Ch}$
            iii.   exclamation marker$_{Ch}$
            iv.   enumerative conjunction$_{MP}$ ~ listing construction$_{Ch}$
            v.   topic marker$_{Ch,MP}$

        d.   Similarity and manner$_G$ ~ onomatopoeic word marker$_{Ch}$

        e.   Standard of comparison$_{MP}$ ~ comparative marker$_{Ch}$

        f.   Internal awareness$_G$ ~ internal/inner speech$_G$
            i.   intention, proximative, future$_G$
            ii.   deontic modality and indirect causation$_G$

        g.   Clause linkage$_G$
            i.   proposition-type clauses$_G$ ~ sentential complementation$_G$
            ii.   manner, purpose, reason, conditional, concessive clauses$_G$[4]
            iii.   relative clauses$_G$

        h.   Formation of ordinal from cardinal numerals$_{AM}$

---

3 To improve readability, Chappell's (2008) wording "marker of" has consistently been changed to "marker" and shifted to the end of the phrase.

4 Güldemann (2008) lists these entries as individual points on the same level as relative clauses and sentential complementation.

One characteristic feature of this list is that its hierarchical structure is partially incidental rather than intended, and different elements may be related when instantiated in a given language. For instance, most *ge*-based topic-marking constructions in Mongolian appear to be an extension of the naming function of *ge*- when applied to argument noun phrases. A functional connection of particular importance for this paper is proposed for the languages of Siberia by Matić and Pakendorf (2013: 386, cf. 375). They connect quotation, complementization (for predicates of speech, cognition, emotion and perception) and clause linkage (with reason, purpose, conditional and concessive clauses) into one major unit that is characterized by "direct verbal quotation and internal awareness" and "make[s] up the central complex of dissociative semantics" (p. 387).[5] They then connect these three functions with a number of other functions, such as naming, as one unit. They also assume that an "auxiliary" function in which the quotative verb combines with a dependent element to express intention is directly linked to the complementizer function (p. 386), but acknowledge that it probably derives from a "biclausal construction with direct speech" (p. 385), which would rather implicate a connection to internal awareness and purposive clauses. In this approach, then, the functions regarding reason, purpose and concessive clauses, on the one hand, and intention and purpose as expressed by an "auxiliary", on the other hand, can be treated as a connected functional cluster that can be analyzed without having to account for other extended functions.[6]

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 provides preliminaries: an overview over primary sources, methodology, conventions, and basics of Mongolian grammar. Section 3 introduces the core functions of the quotative verb *ge*-. Section 4 focuses on the expression of intent and imminence through the pattern *-x ge*-, Section 5 treats the complex of purposive, causal, concessive, benefactive and role-designating meanings through clausal complements delimited by the linking

---

5 Following Güldemann (2008: 6), Matić and Pakendorf (2013) define dissociation as the "representation of a spoken or mental text from which the speaker distances him/herself by indicating that it is produced by a source of consciousness in a pragmatic and deictic setting different from that of the immediate discourse".

6 This is important since most of the extended functions of quotative indices listed in (2) are attested for Mongolian, to my current understanding only with the exceptions of (c.i), (f.ii), and (h), while the existence of *ge*-based attributive clauses, (g.iii), seems to be inconsequential for the system of attributive clauses in Mongolian. In many of these grammaticalizations, the verb stem *ge*- merely accommodates a preceding element, or a specific meaning is brought about by the particular morphological form of *ge*-. For instance, when conditional clauses and (one subtype of) topics are marked by the form *gewel*, the conditional meaning entirely derives from the conditional converbal suffix *-wAl*, while *ge*- is needed to connect *-wAl* with finite clauses or noun phrases. That these clauses and phrases could alternatively be interpreted as actual utterances is (sychronically speaking) then only a side effect of the *ge*-based strategy.

converbal forms *ge-ž/ge-ed*, and Section 6 analyzes the extended emotive uses of the form *-n ge-n=ee*. Section 7 concludes by summarizing the results, addressing some of the literature, and pointing out perspectives for future research.

2 Preliminaries

This section contains background information that will help the reader to understand the details of this paper. First, Section 2.1 provides information on its data and the methods used to explore it. Section 2.2 introduces the conventions of transcription and for rendering examples from secondary sources. Finally, Section 2.3 familiarizes the reader with some characteristics of Mongolian grammar that are helpful for understanding the linguistic analysis of intention-related quotative constructions later on.

2.1 Data and methodology

The main data source for this study is a Spoken Corpus (SC) of Khalkha Mongolian, totaling about 135.000 words. It consists of two parts: SC1 (Zoljargal and Brosig 2012) consists of unscripted TV data, while SC2 (Zoljargal and Brosig 2017, plus the files khalkha0001/0002 from Zoljargal and Brosig 2012) consists of free conversational data. All tokens of *ge-* in SC were classified according to morphological form and then subdivided into different usage types by this author, with assistance from informants for cases deemed problematic. To complement this data set, interesting forms and usage patterns were manually noted down from the rather informal Mongolian translation of a Japanese manga, Ranma½ ('Ranma jibun no ichi'). It is based on a known English intermediate, which is usually cited alongside.[7] For some infrequent constructions, examples and text frequencies were taken from a general Internet corpus of 34.6 million words (IC) (Östling and Brosig 2011). Token counts from IC exclude identical sentences from different websites, unless indicated otherwise by lowercase ~wd~ 'with dublicates'. A few additional examples were

---

7 Takahashi, Rumiko. 1987–1996. Ranma½. Tōkyō: Shogakukan. 407 episodes of at least 16 pages in 38 volumes. With regard to the English translation found online, the adaption into English for Vol. 1–17, Prt. 4 was done by Gerard Jones & Toshifumi Yoshida (San Francisco: Viz Communications Inc., 1993–1999/2001), while the translations for Vol. 17, Prt. 4 to Vol. 38 were fan translations obtained, put together, and edited by the New Ranma Project, organized by EvlNabiki & SHADE (1999). The Mongolian translation, with translation mistakes that correspond to the English version, was mostly done by Atagu, Danzii, Konagi and Zoloogg (2009–2013) of Shurikenteam.

volunteered by informants ('INF') or taken from other sources. The meaning of critical examples was partially determined from conversational context, in the case of Ranma½ supported by the facial expressions of the interlocutors and partially with the support of 2–10 informants per example. Informants were Khalkha native speakers (either born to two Khalkha parents or born and raised in Ulaanbaatar) without a background in Mongolian linguistics or teaching who were recruited via classified ads on unegui.com (part time work). Most were from the age group 18–45, and approximately half were university students.

2.2 Transcription and adaption of examples from other sources

For the transcription of linguistic examples from Khalkha Mongolian, this paper employs the transcription system in (3a), which diverges from orthography in order to represent phonemes and syllable structure more accurately. In the bibliography, sources in two Mongolian scripts are transcribed by the letter. Cyrillic letters are transliterated strictly, as shown in (3b). Mongolian letters, in turn, are transcribed so as to disambiguate phonemes written by the same grapheme, as in (3c).

(3)   Transcription and transliteration conventions for (a) linguistic examples, (b) Mongolian Cyrillic and (c) Mongolian script
   a.   ɑ-a, ɔ-o, ʊ-u, e-e, ɵ-ö, ʉ-ü, i-i, j-y, w-w, ʲ-ʲ, p-b, pʰ-p, t-d, tʰ-t, k-g, ɢ-ɢ, kʰ-k, ts-z, tsʰ-c, tʃ-ž, tʃʰ-č, f-f, s-s, ʃ-š, x-x, m-m, n-n, ŋ-ŋ, ʐ-l, ɬ-lh, r-r
   b.   а-a, б-b, в-v, г-g, д-d, е-je [if Russian: e-e], ё-jo, ж-ž, з-z, и-i, й-j, к-k, л-l, м-m, н-n, о-o, ө-ö, п-p, р-r, с-s, т-t, у-u, ү-ü, ф-f, х-x, ц-c. ч-č, ш-š, ъ-'', ы-y, ь-', э-e [if Russian: э-ė], ю-ju, я-ja
   c.   ᠊-a, ᠊-e, ᠊-e̱, ᠊-i, ᠊-o/u, ᠊-ö/ü, ᠊-n, ᠊-b, ᠊-p, ᠊-q, ᠊-g/k, ᠊-ḵ, ᠊-ɢ, ᠊-l, ᠊-m, ᠊-s, ᠊-š, ᠊-t/d, ᠊-c, ᠊-j, ᠊-y, ᠊-r, ᠊-w, ᠊-f, ᠊-z, ᠊-c̱, ᠊-h, ᠊-ṟ

The transcription of examples taken from secondary sources has been adapted to (3a), and glossing is always mine. Translations from English sources were retained unless indicated otherwise. If deemed beneficial, a second translation was added below the original one. For some spoken examples, pauses are indicated by the plus symbol '+'.

2.3 Structure of Khalkha Mongolian

Khalkha Mongolian is an agglutinating, almost exclusively suffixing language. Major inflecting word classes are nominals (nouns, adjectives, numerals, pronouns) and verbs. Nominals are marked for number (unspecified vs. explicit

plural), case (unmarked nominative and seven overt case suffixes), possession (reflexive subject possession clitics vs. personal non-subject possession clitics) and information structure (focus clitics). Verbs can optionally inflect for voice and lack of control ('completive'), but must take a suffix that groups them into one of three major formal classes. Finite verbs are confined to sentence-final position and can be subdivided into indicatives that mark tense and evidentiality and imperatives/hortatives. Participles can form attributes to nouns and postpositions, and some can also form sentence-final indicative predicates. Converbs prototypically form predicates of non-finite clauses, and linking converbs can also connect main and auxiliary verbs in complex predicates. The linking converb *-AAd* sometimes forms (quasi-)finite predicates. Verbal predicates are in clause-final position and can only be followed by sentence-final particles and arguments/complements mentioned as afterthoughts in sentence-final position. Non-finite verbal predicates can sometimes be followed by focus clitics. The order of the various arguments that precede the predicate is determined by information-structural considerations.

3 *Ge-* as a quotative verb

The Mongolian verb *ge-* is a 'quotative verb'. This means that it can only be used in contexts of quotation as in (4), but that it cannot take noun phrases as arguments. It thus differs from 'generic speech verbs' like *xel-* 'say' in (5) that can take nominal complements, but, in Mongolian, cannot introduce direct quotes by themselves.[8] In fact, *ge-* is the only overt segmental device in Mongolian that can take finite verb forms (as the bearers of evidentiality) or sentence-final particles (as the bearers of illocutionary mood) into its scope. Since *ge-* cannot normally be used without a quote, it cannot be used in one-word answers either. Consequently, the distribution of quotative *ge-* is almost fully complementary to that of any other verb. *Ge-* is the default strategy for embedding quotes, being (probably much) more common than exclusive marking through quote-initial markers or suprasegmental marking.

---

8 This is already true for its Middle Mongol cognate *keme-*, which could not take regular noun complements denoting speech like 'these words' (see Street 2013: 9–15 for details). For this reason, Matić and Pakendorf's (2013: 359–360) claim that "in all the languages in our sample [which includes Khalkha Mongolian], non-canonical SAY stems from (…) a generic speech verb" since, among other things, "[t]he use of the relevant verb with speech-content complements other than direct quotes is universally attested in our corpora and/or in dictionaries", is not warranted. If anything, one could try to argue that *keme-* stems from a generic speech verb at an earlier stage.

(4) *aw-č*   *ög-ön*   **ge-n=ee.**
     buy-CVB   give-POT   QV-IM.PRS=EMPH
     '[He] **says** [he] will buy it for [us].'
     (SC2: Khalkha0018)

(5) *teg-eed*   *ter-iig*   **xel-s=iiŋ.**
     do.like.that-CVB   that-ACC   say-EST.PST=ASS
     'Then [he] **said** that.'
     (SC1: TH, Ganbaatar)

Morpho-phonemically, too, *ge-* is not just a regular verb of Khalkha. Rather, it is the only monosyllabic verb that ends in a short vowel, which entails some idiosyncrasies and problems when attaching vowel-initial suffixes. Morphologically, for instance, it cannot form causatives, which its morpho-phonemically unremarkable Middle Mongol ancestor *keme-* was still able to do (cf. Street 2013). Since the details of this are not essential to the topic of this paper, they will be dealt with in a future publication.

In its most basic function, *ge-* is used for introducing quotes either on its own (6) or as a converbal auxiliary (*ge-ž* or *ge-ed*) to a matrix verb (7). If the reported speaker is to be mentioned, it can occur either before the quote as in (6a) or between *ge-* and matrix verb as in (7), and the same applies to the addressee. If only one sentence-initial nominative argument is present, the precise beginning of the quote is sometimes fuzzy. For instance, this initial argument could solely refer to the subject of the matrix clause (6a), to the subject of the quoted clause (6b),[9] or to both (6c). In addition, while (6a-c) all are translated as 'indirect quotation', (6) does not contain any overt deictic elements that would rule out *verbatim* quotation.

(6) *tuyaa*   *naimaŋ*   *sar-d*   *ir-en*   **ge-s=ii=šd.**
     NAME[10]   eight   month-DAT   come-POT   QV-EST.PST=ASS=DP
     a. 'Tuyaa$_i$ **said** that [she$_j$] will come in August.'
     b. 'SUBJECT$_i$ **said** (that) Tuyaa$_j$ will come in August.'
     c. 'Tuyaa$_i$ **said** that she$_i$ will come in August.'
     (SC2: Z07-6)

---

9 If a noun phrase refers to a subordinate subject, it can receive accusative marking. For pronouns, such differential subject marking is obligatory (cf. Guntsetseg 2016: 149).

10 In examples from SC2, person names were substituted for anonymization purposes.

(7) *naa-d=čan* · · · ɢoy · · sanaa · · *bai-n=aa*
MED-NOM=2POSS · nice · idea · AUX-IM.PRS=EMPH
ge-ž · *dorž* · *ax* · · · · · · · · · · ***xel-s=iiŋ=šd.***
QV-CVB · NAME · elder.brother · say-EST.PST=ASS=DP
'"This of yours is a nice idea", elder brother Dorj **said**.'
(SC1: Khalkha0001)

Next to forming verbal predicates that denote speech, *ge-* can also be used in a function that is frequently called 'complementizer' (e.g. Chappell 2008). In this function, it connects reported discourse to both transitive and intransitive verbs that express thought, such as *bod-* 'think' in (8), or that can be coerced into referring to speech or thought (Pürev-Očir 2001: 150–151). When introducing reported discourse for a matrix verb, *ge-* usually assumes the form of the two linking converbs *ge-ž* as in (8) and *ge-ed* as in (9). The functional difference between *ge-ž* and *ge-ed* has not been explored for Khalkha,[11] but since *-AAd* is found with continuative 'keep on' and resultative meanings (Brosig 2015a: 76–81, 111–116), while *-ž* is e.g. found in the neutral progressive, an explanation in terms of aspectuality might be worth investigating.

(8) *en* · *bol* · *min-ii* · *üürg=el* · ***ge-ž*** · ***bod**-žoi-ɢoo* · · *šüü=dee.*
this · TOP · 1SG-GEN · duty=FOC · QV-CVB · think-CVB-EST.PRS · DP=DP
'[I] **think that** this is just my duty.'
(SC1: TH, Ariunbold)

(9) *A* · *egč-iig* · · · · · · *uu-x=güi* · · · · · · *baix*
NAME · elder.sister-ACC · drink-FUT.PTCP=NEG · MP
ge-ed · ***bod**-žii-s-iiŋ.*
QV-CVB · think-PROG-EST.PST=ASS
'SUBJECT **was thinking that** elder sister A would probably not drink [whisky].'
(SC1: Khalkha0002)

When used as an independent quotative predicate, *ge-* tends to index speech but it may also report thoughts. In (10), *geed* could be replaced by the more explicit *gež bodood/xüseed* 'thinking/wishing that' (Narmandax 2004: 31–33). *Ge-* also

---

11 Knyazev's (2016) neat proposal for Kalmyk that *ge-ed* is restricted to quotes not asserted to hold true in the real world such as orders, hopes and fears does not apply to Khalkha. Since his results are based on elicitation with a single informant, they should not be accepted for Kalmyk *sine grano salis* either.

accommodates ideophones or *ad-hoc* sound improvisations, e.g. as manner adverbials (11).

(10) *Xur-iiŋ=č*   *üül=güi*   *celmeg*   *bai-Ø*   **ge-ed**
      rain-GEN=FOC   cloud=NEG   bright   AUX-IMP   QV-CVB
      Xil-iiŋ   *teŋger-iig*   *širt-ež*   *bai-n=uu*   *xöö.*
      border-GEN   sky-ACC   gaze-CVB   AUX-IM.PRS=Q.PLR   DP
      '"Be bright without even rain clouds!", **[thinking thus]** [she] was gazing at the sky above the border.'[12]
      (Narmandax 2004: 32, taken from a published poem)

(11) *xurr_xurr*   **ge-e=l**   *aimaar*   *unt-žii-n=aa.*
      SOUND_OF_SNORING   QV-CVB=ADD.FOC   awful   sleep-PROG-IM.PRS=EMPH
      'He is sleeping awfully **making** xurr xurr.'
      (SC2: Z08-7)

Next to quotation, *ge-* is also used in a metalinguistic naming function (see esp. Matić and Pakendorf 2013). Most prototypically, this includes the patterns in (12), in which a name is attributed to a preceding accusative noun phrase with a finitely used predicate,[13] and the pattern in (13), where the name is attributed to a modified noun phrase by a participle or atypically used linking converb.

(12) *nam-aig*   *činsanaa*   **ge-deg**.
      1SG-ACC   NAME   QV-HAB.PTCP
      'My name is Chinsanaa.'
      '[They] **call** me Chinsanaa.'
      (SC1: TH, Ariunbold)

(13) *banš-tai*   *šöl*   **ge-deg**   *xool*
      wonton-COM   soup   QV-HAB.PTCP   meal
      'the dish **called** "soup with wonton"'
      (SC1: TH, Ariunbold)

The quotative uses discussed in this section form the conceptual basis for the internal-awareness-based uses that are analyzed in the subsequent sections.

---

12 The structurally interrogative pattern =*UU xöö* is used in actual questions, rhetorical questions, but also in statements (as observed by one of the anonymous reviewers).
13 You could also say *bat namaig činsanaa gedeg* 'Bat calls me Chinsanaa', but this pattern is used much less frequently.

4 *-x ge-* as a specialized means of expressing intention and imminence

In the pattern *-x ge-*, the notions of intention and imminence are jointly expressed by the so-called 'future participle' *-x* and by an originally quotative *ge-* which it precedes. In contemporary Khalkha, future participles can only be used in finite predicates if followed by interrogative particles (14a), modal particles (14b) or a negator (14c), but in Middle Mongol, the form *-QU* (>*-x*) was still commonly used in sentence-final future-referring predicates as in (15) (Brosig 2014a: 18–21; Yamakoshi 2016: 93–95).[14]

(14) a. *za,*   ***suu-x=uu?***
           well   sit.down&sit-FUT.PTCP=Q.PLR
           'Well, would [you] sit?'

      b. ***taalagd-ax***   ***baixaa.***
           be.pleasing-FUT.PTCP   DP(probably)
           'It will probably be pleasant [to me].'

      c. *bi*   *yörön* +   ***xii-x=güi.***
           1SG   in.general   do-FUT.PTCP=NEG
           'Generally, I won't do [such work in our family life].'
           (SC1: TH, Ariunbold)

(15)   *teb_teŋgeri*   *edöe*   ***ire-gü.***
         NAME   now   come-FUT.PTCP
         'Teb Tenggeri will come now. (Know yourself what you [want to] do [to
         him] out of what you are able.)'
         (Middle Mongol: Secret History of the Mongols, Paragraph 245
         [Brosig 2014a: 18])

From the speaker's declaration of an impeding future action, *-x ge-* must have come to convey the speaker's intention (Song 2002: 36).[15] Synchronically, the extent to which *-x ge-* can still be used to predict future developments seems to be very limited. Song (2002) provides a few examples of the pattern *-x ge-n* as referring to actual quotation/hearsay such as (16). The potential suffix *-n*, which attaches to the

---

14 Brosig (2015a: 104, 107–109) assumes that there are a few peripheral finite uses in Khalkha, but these are probably best analyzed as nominalizations and thus as predicatively used noun phrases of equational sentences rather than as regular verbal predicates.

15 Adjacent /x/ and /g/ are sometimes assimilated to [xkʰ] or even fused to [kʰ].

quotative verb, goes back to an old progressive and in this context seems to be relatively neutral with regard to tense (non-future) and aspect. *-x ge-n* is absent from SC but well attested in IC (n_{IC} = 1862), and while Song's examples (from language education materials) otherwise resemble everyday language, examples like (17) from IC rather suggest that this type of usage is currently restricted to formal newspaper style.

(16) *Xed   xonog-oos   ix   boroo or-**ox**   **ge-n**.*
      how.many overnight.stay-ABL much rain   enter-FUT.PTCP QV-IM.PRS
      '**It is said that** there **will** be a heavy rain in a few days.'
      (Song 2002: 35)

(17) *Xurʲm-iiŋ   yoslol-iiŋ   üy-eer   niit   400 xamgaalagč*
      marriage-GEN ceremony-GEN period-INS altogether 400 guard
      *ažill-**ax**   **ge-n**.*
      work-FUT.PTCP QV-IM.PRS
      '**It is said that** during the marriage ceremony, altogether 400 guards **will** be on duty.' (IC)

Below, I will first discuss contexts in which *-x ge-* is used to express intention within one clause (Section 4.1), and then look at its more specialized functions. These include its use in purposive clauses in which the verb of the main clause is interpreted as working towards the subject's intended action in a subordinate clause (Section 4.2), i.e. 'VERBED in order to VERB'. A second specialization, this time within a single verb phrase, is the use of *-x ge-* in prospectives (Section 4.3), i.e. 'BE about to VERB'. The section concludes with a short discussion on the relative frequency of these usage patterns (Section 4.4).

4.1 Clause-internal intention

When combining with non-imperfective forms, *-x ge-* relatively consistently expresses the speaker's intention. Song (2002: 36) describes one such pattern as expressing the "wish/desire" of a "human subject", illustrating it with the form *-x ge-seŋ yum* (18), which can be contracted to [kʰsĩː]. For this pattern, informants rather consistently require first-person subjects in declaratives and second-person subjects in questions. However, this form contains the particle *yum* (=*iiŋ* as a clitic), which conveys the speaker's subjective conviction (Brosig et al. 2019) and thus independently favors a first person perspective. *-x ge-* also combines with the

pattern *-AA=we/yUU*,[16] a less common and intersubjectively distinct way of forming past-referring questions that is based on the modally connotated resultative participle *-AA* (see Song 1997: 243–285, Brosig 2015a: 63–66). Here, too, second-person subjects as in (19) are prevalent (n_{IC} = 16/17; $n_{Ranma½}$ = 12/12). For other forms, things are less clear. For instance, for *-x ge-* in combination with the converbal clause connector *-sAŋčAn* 'because, upon',[17] speaker subjects predominate (n_{SC} = 10/15, n_{IC} ≥ 146/201), but (human) non-speaker subjects are still solidly attested (accounting for 33% in SC and 17–27% in IC).[18]

(18)   *Boroo*   *namd-aasai[.]*   *xödöö*   *yaw-**ax***   ***ge-seŋ***   ***yum.***
       rain   abate-DES   countryside   go-FUT.PTCP   QV-EST.PST   ASS
       '[I] wish the rain would calm down. **[I] would like to** go to the countryside.'
       (Song 2002: 33)

(19)   *či*   *nad-tai*   *yuun-ii*   *tuxai*   *yar^j-**ax***   ***ge-e=w?***
       2SG   1SG-COM   what-GEN   about   talk-FUT.PTCP   QV-RES.PTCP=Q.IFR
       'What **did you want to** talk to me about?'
       (Ranma½: 27,810 & Vol 26 Prt 11)

(20)   *bid*   *xoyor*   *en-ii=čen*   *xai-ɢaad*   *aw-**ax***   ***ge-seŋčen***
       1PL   two   this-ACC=STC   search-CVB   take-FUT.PTCP   QV-CVB(since)
       zadɢai-ɢaar   *zar-dg=[g]uu~mardguu*   *ge-ed*   *bai-saŋ*   *baixkuuyuu.*
       loose-INS   sell-HAB.PTCP=NEG~etc   QV-CVB   AUX-EST.PST   MP
       '**When** the two of us **want**ed **to** find and buy this, [they] were saying that [it] is not sold in loose pieces or the like, you see.'
       (SC2: Z07-6)

16   *=(y)uu* is the polar question clitic, while *=we* is an information question clitic that is usually used with nouns and, among participles, most consistently with *-AA*, but not with adjectives (which require a dummy noun *yum*) (Brosig et al. 2019: 919, cf. 925–929) and less commonly with finite verbs.

17   As far as I am aware, *-sAŋčAn* has not previously been treated as a converbal suffix. I am opting for this analysis since the perfect participle *-sAŋ* in combination with the second-person possessive form *=čin* (which is also used for intersubjective information structuring, cf. Brosig et al. 2019) can form predicates of paratactic dependent clauses. If other personal-possessive forms attach to *-sAŋ*, or if any personal-possessive clitics attach to other participial suffixes (*-x*, *-dAg*), they merely form argument clauses. Note, though, that *-snAA*, i.e. *-sAŋ* plus the reflexive-possessive clitic *=AA*, has occasionally been listed as a converbal suffix (starting from Kas'janenko 1968 [2002]: 149, cf. Mönx-Amgalan and Kan 2014: 225). Since I lack a detailed analysis of *-sAŋčAn*, its current glossing is tentative.

18   For IC, the data set contains 34 tokens with clear third/declarative second-person subjects (as indicated by overt subjects or by context) and 2 structurally ambiguous tokens. For another 19 examples, I was unable to determine the subject from the concordances.

(21) *Naiz*   *büsgüi=maan*   *Ulaaŋ-Üüd*   *yaw-**ax***   ***ge-seŋčen***
      friend   woman=2POSS   TOWN   go-FUT.PTCP   QV- CVB(since)
      möŋg   *xereg-tei*   *bai-n.*
      money   necessity-COM   AUX-IM.PRS
      '**As** my girlfriend **want**s **to** go to Ulan-Ude, [we now] need money.' (IC)

Additionally, Song (2002: 36) proposes a category 'willingness/intention', for which an animate subject is sufficient. The problem with his example (22) is that the pattern *-x ge-w* with the literary past-tense suffix *-w* is almost non-existent ($n_{SC} = 0$, $n_{IC} = 8$). It is alive and well in Kalmyk (Baranova 2015: 71), though, so that these examples might possibly hail from Oirat authors of western Mongolia. Similarly, Matić and Pakendorf's (2013: 385) example (23) with the inferential past form *-ž(ee)* is not typical for common contemporary Khalkha usage.[19]

(22) *Mor^j=min'*   *us*   *uu-**x***   ***ge-w***.
      horse=1POSS   water   drink-FUT.PTCP   QV-MOD.PST
      'My horse was ready to drink water.' [sic!]
      'My horse wanted to drink water.'
      (Song 2002: 33)

(23) *tōxŋ xūg ŏrīn ide-xe ge-dž, maŋgas.*
      töö-xöŋ   *xüü-g*   *öör-ii=n*   *ide-**x***   ***ge-ž,***   *maŋgas.*
      span-DIM boy-ACC self-ACC=3POSS eat-FUT.PTCP QV-IM.INFER.PST ogre
      'Sie wollte auch den spannenhohen Jungen selbst auffressen, die Mangas.'
      'She [also] wanted to eat up the span-sized boy himself, the ogress.'
      (Ramstedt and Halén 1974: 4, cf. Matić and Pakendorf 2013: 385)

4.2 Purposive clauses

There is another construction that does not imply speech and that only requires an animate subject, namely *-x ge-ž/ge-ed* MATRIX.CLAUSE with the linking converbs *ge-ž* and *ge-ed*, as in (24) and (25). Hashimoto (2004) designates this construction as

---

19 *-x ge-žee*: $n_{SC} = 0$, $n_{IC} = 25$. The sequence *-x ge-ž* is tricky since one must distinguish the inferential past form *ge-ž* from the homophonous converb *ge-ž* and exclude the latter, alongside with particle-like uses of inferential *ge-ž* in interrogatives and exclamatives. If we only count *ge-ž* in absolute final position (as signaled by subsequent interpunctuation) of a declarative sentence that lacks a deictic manner adverbial (which could induce an exclamative reading), its frequency is $n_{SC} = 0$ and $n_{IC} = 1$.

"purposive", which can be understood as referring to a complex sentence "which encode[s] that one verbal situation, that of the matrix clause, is performed with the intention of bringing about another situation, that of the purpose clause" (Schmidtke-Bode 2009: 20). The term 'purposive' thus refers to a meaning that can be subsumed under intention but requires a particular discoursal and syntactic constellation. A Mongolian purposive construction usually requires identical subjects for dependent and main clause (cf. Skribnik 1987: 43). However, SC also contains (26) in which the purposive subject is co-referential with an implicit dative emoter (requirer) that is the sole animate argument of the matrix clause. Subjects in SC are either left unexpressed as in (26) or placed sentence-initially, so as to easily take scope over both purposive and main clause as in (24) and (25). In IC, even subjects following *-x gež* (but almost never *geed*) are attested.

(24) *Suragč-id*   *nom*   *unš-**ax***   ***ge-ž***   *nomiiŋ_saŋ-d*   *oč-ow*.
       pupil-PL   book   read-FUT.PTCP   QV-CVB   library   go.to-MOD.PST
       'The students went to the library to read a book.'
       (Hashimoto 2004: 44)

(25) *Yörön*   *moɢoi*   *šuud=l*   *xaz-**ax***   ***ge-ž***
       in.general   snake   direct=LIM.FOC   bite-FUT.PTCP   QV-CVB
       ***dair**-dag=güi*   *am^itaŋ=l=daa*.   *xamgiiŋ*   *türüüŋ-d*
       rush.forward-HAB.PTCP=NEG being = LIM.FOC=DP   most   first-DAT
       *zugt-**ax***   ***ge-ž=l***   ***temc**-en*.
       flee-FUT.PTCP   QV-CVB=LIM.FOC   fight-POT
       'In general, the snake is just an animal that does not just directly rush
       forward in order to bite. First of all, it just strives to flee.'[20]

(26) *marɢaaš*   *nögöö*   *neg*   *difüüzer*   *iŋ-eed*
       tomorrow   the.other   one   diffuser   do.like.this-CVB
       *aw-**x**=**ɢa-ad***   *difüüzr-iiŋ*   *möŋ*   *xeregtei*   *bol-č-loo*.
       take-FUT.PTCP=QV-CVB diffuser-GEN   money   necessary   become-COMPL-IM.FIRSTH.PST
       'To buy that diffuser tomorrow, [I] will need the money for the diffuser
       (lit. [for me] the money of [~for] the diffuser has become necessary).'
       (SC1: TH, Ganbaatar)

Hashimoto (2004: 44) claims that the purposive construction is complementary to the quotative pattern in that its matrix verbs must be verbs other than verbs of saying, communication, thinking and writing. However, while speech verbs in the

---

20 http://unuudur.mn/амьтан-судлаач-цодбаяр-могойн-тухай-сэрэмжлүүлж-байна, 2017-06-29 (interview).

purposive construction are uncommon, they are still possible. (27a) employs a purposive postpositional phrase while not coding the content of the words. The subsequent utterance (27b) delimits this purpose more narrowly, now using the pattern *-x ge-ed* SPEECH.VERB. In (27c), then, the speaker paraphrases (quotes) the actual words of the subject, which are skipped in the translation for reasons of space. The purposive *xurdaŋ bair-tai bol-G-ox ge-ed* cannot alternatively be interpreted as referring to an imminent event (presuming a structure similar to (38) below) since such a future development cannot yet be predicted. The distribution of speech and movement verbs is thus not fully complementary between the quotative and purposive constructions. Quite plausibly, *-x ge-* on its own might turn out to be sufficient to indicate that the predication in its scope is not actual speech (barring the literary pattern *-x ge-n*) though it requires different types of evidence from the ones used in this paper to actually prove this point.

(27)   a.   *uugan*   *bol*   *ter*   *xüŋ +*   *bid*   nar-iiŋ   *tölöö=l*
                originally   TOP   that   person   1PL   PL-GEN   PP:for=LIM.FOC
                yarʲ-aad   *bai-Gaa*   *baixkuuyuu. +*
                speak-CVB   AUX-EST.PRS   MP
                'Originally, that person is talking just for our sake, you see.'
   b.   *xurdaŋ*   *bair-tai*   *bol-G-ox*   **ge-e=l**
                quick   home-COM   become-CAUS-FUT.PTCP   QV-CVB=LIM.FOC
                yarʲ-žai-Gaa=šd. +
                talk-PROG-EST.PRS=MP
                'He's talking in order to let us get an accommodation quickly.'
   c.   "(…)"   *ge-e=d +*   *yarʲ-žai-Gaa*   *baixkuuyuu.*
                (…)   QV-CVB=LIM.FOC   talk-PROG-EST.PRS   DP
                "(…)", so he's talking, you see.'
                (SC2: Z08-2)

This being said, are there restrictions to verb classes that may occur in the purposive construction? Judging from SC, movement verbs seem to be very common (24), and verbs of assuming and maintaining body positions like *suu-* 'sit (down)' or *xewt-* 'lie (down)' are used occasionally. More generally, telic predicates (cf. Skribnik 1987: 42 on Buryat) with verbs such as *ög-* 'give', *or zas-* 'prepare the bed', *šiwüül-* 'tattoo' or *aw-* 'take > buy' in (28) are well-attested, while activity-type predicates without any lexicalized initial or final boundary are uncommon.[21]

---

21 I assume a two-level model of aspectuality, in which verbs with their realized argument structure are assigned to one basic actional class upon which aspectual markers operate. Next to telic predications with event-final boundaries, it recognizes predications with event-initial boundaries. These are either predicates in which the phase preceding this initial boundary can be

(28) *bi*   *neg* *picaa* *xii-**x***   ***ge-e=l***   *ugan*   ***matrʲaal***
  1SG   one   pizza   do-FUT.PTCP QV-CVB=LIM.FOC basically   material
  aw-caŋ.   *ča* *čad-kuu=l*   *bai-n.*
  take-COMPL.EST.PST IW be.able-FUT.PTCP.NEG=LIM.FOC AUX-IM.PRS
  'I've basically bought the material to make a pizza. [But] I just can't do it.'
  (SC2: Z01-1)

There is, however, one atelic class of verbs that is used quite commonly in the matrix clause of the purposive construction. Ulanova (1980: 94–96) characterized these as 'intentional verbs' (конкретный глагол намерения) and listed verb stems such as *zawd-* 'be about to; manage (with negation)', *zorʲ-* 'exert oneself to', *zütg-* 'exert oneself to', *naid-* 'hope', *xüs-* 'wish' and *orold-* 'attempt'. Her characterization turns out to be too broad, though, since the two verbs *naid-* and *xüs-* have to be excluded from this list. The sequence V-*x gež/geed xüs-* is occasionally found in IC ($n_{IC} = 54 + 5$),[22] but -*x ge-ž/geed* introduces a mere complement as in (29) rather than a preparatory action. The sequence V-*x gež/geed naid-* is absent from SC and IC, though V-SUFFIX *baix gež naid-* with the fossilized particle *baix* 'probably, possibly' < *bai-x* 'will be' is common. The late Ulanova might mistakenly have analyzed *baix* as a regular verb here.

(29) *Xʲatad-iiŋ*   *xögžl-öös*   ***ašag***   ***ol-ox***   ***ge-ž***
  China-GEN   development-ABL   advantage/profit   find-FUT.PTCP   QV-CVB
  xüs-č   ***bai-gaa*** (…)   *uls*   *büxeŋ*
  wish-CVB   AUX-RES.PTCP   folk   every
  'everyone who wants to make a profit from China's development' (IC)

What remains of this group, then, are conative main plus auxiliary verbs such as *orold-* 'attempt' ($n_{IC} = 1187 + 66$) and *üz-* 'see, attempt' ($n_{SC} = 5 + 0$, $n_{IC} = 210 + 260$) as in (30), and verbs of striving like *zütg-* 'exert oneself to' ($n_{IC} = 252 + 51$) as in (31), *zorʲ-* 'aim at, strive' ($n_{IC} = 48 + 3$), and *temc-* 'fight, strive [to]' ($n_{IC} = 40 + 5$), including some verbs that can be coerced into expressing effort such as *čičr-* 'tremble [to]' ($n_{SC} = 1 + 0$, $n_{IC} = 3 + 5$) and *ud-* 'take time' ($n_{IC} = 8 + 2$). In both cases,

---

referred to by a progressive (like *nuu(gd)-* 'go into hiding & be in hiding') or predicates for which no such pre-initial phase exists, but for which the initial boundary could still be referred to by a perfective form (e.g. *suu-* 'sit down & sit'). Unbounded predicates are activities and states. This understanding of aspectuality is based on insights of Johanson (2000), Sasse (2002), Breu (2005) and Croft (2012) and is sketched in Brosig (2014b: 5–7).
22 The first number represents construction with *gež*, the second with *geed*. Focalized forms that contain the limitative focus clitic =*l* are not included in these counts.

the construction expresses that the subject is, was or would be making attempts in order to reach a goal.

(30)   *bi   tör-söŋ   cag-aas=aa   xoi-š   aŋx*
       1SG   be.born-PRF.PTCP   time-ABL=RPOSS after-ALL first
       udaa=l   emegtei xüŋ-tei   yarilc-až   bai-n.   saiŋ
       time=LIM.FOC woman person-COM speak-CVB   AUX-IM.PRS good
       bai-n.   odoo   emegtei   xüŋ-d   xür-ex
       AUX-IM.PRS now   woman   person-DAT reach-FUT.PTCP
       ge-ed   üz-ii.
       QV-CVB   see/try/ever.do-HORT
       'This is the first time I have ever conversed with a woman, since I was born. Good. I will try touching a woman now.'
       (Ranma½: 246_12 & Vol 24 Prt 1)

(31)   *Süüliiŋ 20   žil=l   bid uls   šig   uls   bol-ox*
       last   20   year=LIM.FOC   1PL state like state become-FUT.PTCP
       ge-ž   zütge-lee.
       QV-CVB   strive-IM.FIRSTH.PST
       'Only the last 20 years we strove to become a state like a[ny other] state.' (IC)

At first glance, one could plausibly try to analyze *-x ge-ed/-ž üz-* in (30) as consisting of two immediate constituents: the intention-expressing *-x ge-* and *-AAd/-ž üz-*, i.e. an auxiliary verb that links up to the preceding verb via a converbal suffix as in (32). However, there is a semantic difference. In (32), the addressee is already undertaking the main action and is merely requested to improve her degree of proficiency. The complex predicate *ux-až üz-* 'try to understand' refers to a single event. In (30), the action of the purposive clause is merely aspired to. It refers to two distinct events. Secondly, if *üz-* in (30) was an auxiliary, it would take a predicate into its scope that denotes intention (namely, *-x ge-*). It should thus mean that the subject *tries to intend* the main action. But this is not the case – the subject quite clearly intends the action of the subordinate clause, and is only trying to find means to become able to perform it. Thirdly, only the conative verbs *üz-* and *orold-* can function as auxiliaries and form complex predicates, while a converb that precedes verbs such as *temc-* 'fight, strive' or *zütg-* 'exert oneself to' would refer to a distinct (though possibly simultaneous) action. But (30) and (31) are structurally and functionally equivalent and should be analyzed along the same lines. Consequently, it seems most appropriate to analyze these conative predicates as a subgrouping of main-clause predicates in the purposive construction.

(32) *saiŋ* *ux-**až*** ***üz-Ø!***
      good dig/understand-CVB see/try/ever.do-IMP
      'Try to understand [this] well!'
      (SC2: khalkha0001)

Looking at clearly intentional, subordinate clauses of the structure *-x ge-ed/-ž* in SC, there is a leftover of up to five structurally similar tokens that should perhaps not be described as prospective. In these cases, the subject had first intended to take a certain action, but then, for some reason or another, failed to perform it as intended as illustrated in (33) and (34). The intention expressed in the dependent clause arises before the event of the main clause, and the linking converbal suffix (usually *-AAd*) thus fulfills its most basic function of connecting clauses that express successive events. Consequently, in spite of their purposive-like structure, it seems that these tokens are more adequately explained as clause-internal intention markers (cf. Section 4.1).

(33) *bii* *odoo* *neg* + *dusaaɢuur* ***aw-k-aa=l***
      1SG now one pipette take-FUT.PTCP.QV-CVB=LIM.FOC
      mart-č-aad *bai-x=iiŋ.*
      forget-COMPL-CVB AUX-FUT.PTCP=ASS
      'I now want to buy a pipette, but I keep on forgetting it.'
      (SC2: Z05-2)

(34) *oloŋ* *aŋʲɢ-tai* *bol-ɢ-**ox*** ***ge-ed***
      many section-COM become-CAUS-FUT.PTCP QV-CVB
      yad-caŋ.
      perform.imperfectly&unwillingly-COMPL.EST.PST
      'They wanted to make it a long [TV] series, but they bungled it up.'
      (SC2: Z07-4)

4.3 Prospectivity

Next to notionally independent intention-denoting uses (Section 4.1) and subordinate predicates that express the purpose of a main clause (Section 4.2), *-x ge-* also forms prospectives (sometimes also called 'proximatives'). In this function, it refers to "[a] temporal phase located close before the initial boundary of the situation described by the main verb" (Kuteva 1998: 127; adapted by Hashimoto 2004: 44). Notionally, the prospective meaning is derived from intention in that 'SUBJECT$_i$ is saying that SUBJECT$_i$ will …' is reinterpreted as 'SUBJECT$_i$ is about to …'. Since a single,

punctual utterance of intention could not easily refer to a PHASE, prospective *-x ge-* is used in connection with a marker of an ongoing situation, either progressive (*-ž bai-* > *-žAi-* > *-žii-*) or continuative-resultative (*-AAd bai-*) as in (35).

(35) *mööm=öö   id-**ex=ke-ed**   **bai-**ɢaa=ŋ   baix=daa en.*
      breast=RPOSS eat-FUT.PTCP=QV-CVB AUX-EST.PRS=ASS MP=DP   this
      '[It] probably **is about to/wants to** suckle, this one.'
      (SC2: Z07-2)

For this construction to be clearly distinct from intentional *-x ge-*, it would need to be able to convey prospectivity without intentionality. In (35), intentionality is still present alongside imminence. However, uses with inanimate subjects (Song 2002: 36) like (36) demonstrate that intentionality can be absent. Conversely, purely intentional uses of the pattern *-x gež/geed bai-* without prospectivity seem to be rare but attested: in (37), the speaker has no reason to believe that Akane will actually manage to get her revenge on Ranma but has just observed that she is undertaking actions to that end.

(36) *xaraŋxui   bol-**ox=ke-žii**-n.*
      dark   become-FUT.PTCP=QV-PROG-IM.PRS
      'It **is about to** become dark.'
      (SC2: Z07-4)

(37) *akane   ranma-ɢaas xarʲuu-ɢaa   aw-**ax**   **ge-ed bai**-ɢaa*
      NAME   NAME-ABL   answer-RPOSS take-FUT.PTCP QV-CVB AUX-EST.PRS
      bololtoi.
      MP
      'I wonder if Akane is trying to get back at him.'
      'Akane probably **wants to** get her revenge on Ranma.'
      (Ranma½: 360_11 & Vol 34 Prt 5)

Besides the full prospective pattern that employs a progressive or resultative-continuative form, there are also a few instances of 'elliptic' prospectives, i.e. uses of *geed* (but not *gež*) that are clearly non-intentional but not followed by the copular auxiliary *bai-*. In (38), *geed* is used in connection with the limitative focus clitic *=l*, which generally excludes a resultative and reinforces a continuative perspective. Furthermore, the form *-x ge-ž=üü* in (39) might have to be classified as indicating imminence alongside doubt, a notion regularly conveyed by the inferential past polar question form *ge-ž=üü* (though this type of example is more complicated since *gežüü* in other contexts is more reminiscent of an unanalyzable particle that cannot index speech even if preceded by verb forms other than *-x*).

(38) A: *za*   *B-gaar*   *yüü*   *bai-n?*   *ažl=aa*   *xii-gee=l*
      well   NAME-INS   what   AUX-IM.PRS   work=RPOSS   do-CVB=LIM.FOC
      bai-n=uu?
      AUX-IM.PRS=Q.PLR
      'Well, what's up with B? Are you keeping on doing your work?'

   B: *ažl=aa*   *xii-gee=l*   *yadar-č*
      work=RPOSS   do-CVB=LIM.FOC   get.tired-CVB
      *üx-**x**=**ke-e=l**.*
      die-FUT.PTCP=QV=CVB=LIM.FOC
      'Yep, working myself to death.'
      lit. 'Keeping on doing my work and, getting tired, **being about to** die.'
      (SC2: Z08-1)

(39) *iŋ-eed*   *duus-**ax***   ***ge-ž=üü***?
      do.like.this-CVB   end-FUT.PTCP   QV-IM.INF.PST=Q.PLR
      '[Leaving the ring means instant defeat!] Can it all be over?!' (~'Is it about
      to end like this?')
      (Ranma½ 2_148 & Vol 3 Prt 8)

4.4 Usage frequencies of different *-x ge-*based patterns

The pattern *-x ge-* is one of the most common extended uses of *ge-*. *Ge-* is attested about 3,859 times in SC and preceded by *-x* in 355 or almost one of 11 occurrences. Clearly second to actual quotation (with approx. 2,207 unambiguous tokens), it still outnumbers other extended uses such as information-structural phrase marking ($n_{SC} \approx 332$) and naming ($n_{SC} \approx 222$). This presumes, of course, that one decides to count all uses of *-x ge-* as one functional domain (as already advocated by Skribnik 1987: 49 for Buryat). To see whether this is indeed justified, we will take a look at Table 1 which provides an overview of all functions of *-x ge-* in SC and of the specific morphological forms of *ge-* that fulfill them. Subscript numbers in the first two columns count the subset of instances that involves the limitative focus clitic *=l*. The difference between 'intent' and 'purposive' is structural rather than semantic.

Judging from Table 1, intent (including purposives) and its derived imminence meaning account for at least 343 tokens that can thus be seen as constituting one functional domain. Among excluded tokens, the only uses that are demonstrably unrelated are those connected to naming. In these uses, the participle in *-x* is not a dependent predicate but a verb in its dictionary form that the speaker meta-linguistically refers to as in (40). Most of the remaining excluded tokens are from

Table 1: Frequencies of forms based on -x ge- in the Spoken Corpus.

		Converb			Participle	
		Linking		Specialized		
		-x ge-ž(=l)	*-x ge-ed(=l)*	diverse	*-x ge-seŋ*	other
Intent	quasi-finite		7_2		7	
	attr/nmlz				2	
	non-finite		9_5	17		
Purposive	non-finite	14_1	53_{14}	2		
	postposed		6			
Imminence	quasi-finite		6			
	with auxiliary *bai-*	114	106_{10}			
excluded	naming use	1			1	1
	incomplete		6_2		2	
	unclear function					1

incomplete utterances that were terminated by the speaker, broken off by an interlocutor, or inaudible on the recording so that they could not be classified but could conceivably have been uttered with the intention of expressing intent.[23]

(40) *či*   *ɢudar-č-ax*   *ge-deg*   *üg*
      2SG   eat/drink(PEJORATIVE)-COMPL-FUT.PTCP   QV-HAB.PTCP   word
      med-x=üü?
      know-FUT.PTCP-Q.PLR
      'Do you know the word *ɢudarčax*?'
      (SC2: Khalkha0019)

As a first take-away from Table 1, we can see that the most grammaticalized uses are also the most frequent. Prospective and purposive constructions prevail, which can freely be used with non-speaker subjects and have specialized in one specific function. They outnumber various constructions that express the speaker's intention in different synactic contexts, while actual -x ge-based quotations are entirely absent from SC.

Taking a closer look at non-purposive intent-related forms, we observe that -x ge- is not attested with any morphologically finite verb forms in SC similar to those in (22), (23) and (39). Even quasi-finite uses (of participles and converbs) are only

---

23 The single token with unclear function is *-x ge-x* in the expression *xii-lg-ex* **ge-x**=*küü-g=en med-küü* make-CAUS-FUT.PTCP QV-FUT.PTCP=NEG-ACC=3POSS know-FUT.PTCP.NEG (SC2: Z01-1). If *ge-x* was absent (i.e. as an inadvertent reduplication of the preceding syllable) and *küü* was used as an independent word, this could be translated as '[I] don't know whether [I] should have it made or not'.

attested with two forms. The first is the 'perfect participle' *ge-seŋ*, mostly in its established assertive past-tense form *ge-s=iiŋ* ($n = 4$), as in (18),[24] and the second is the converb *geed* in a finite use, as in (38). On the other hand, paratactic intentional clause-connective uses are occasionally attested, either with the specialized converbs *gesnee* ($n = 2$), *geŋgüüt*, *gexeer*, *gexleer* (each $n = 1$) and *geseŋčen* ($n = 13$) or with the linking converb *geed*.[25]

In prospectives, the difference between the 'imperfective' and 'perfective' converbal forms *gež* and *geed* is not quite clear. In SC, the frequencies of prospectives with *gež* and *geed* are not significantly different. In the somewhat more formal IC, prospectives with *gež* ($n = 9711_{wd}$) are almost three times as frequent as those with *geed* ($n = 3561_{wd}$). Presuming that written Khalkha data is more conservative, this would suggest that, irrespective of the specific factors that motivate their distribution, *geed* is gaining ground on *gež*.[26] In the purposive constructions of SC, *geed* is preferred, perhaps since the converbal suffix *-AAd* connects more loosely than *-ž* (though this should ideally be shown in a separate study). When addressing this question, the parallel distinction in actual quotatives with matrix verbs (preliminary count: $n_{gež} = 397$ vs. $n_{geed(=l)} = 207$) should also be taken into account. Both forms also contrast in most uses discussed in Section 5 and in metalinguistic attributive and topicalizing uses.

5 Purposive, causal, concessive, benefactive and role-designating constituents in the scope of *ge-*

In this section, I will focus on a number of extended meanings and connotations that adverbial clauses and noun phrases in the scope of *ge-* can assume, namely

---

24 The regular negation of VERB-*s=iiŋ* is VERB-*AA=güi=m* (where *=iiŋ* and *=m* are both variants of the assertive particle *yum*). Therefore, even though the suffixes *-sAŋ* (>-*s*) and *-AA* (>-*e*) are not cognate, one instance of the negated form *ge-e=güi=m* is included in this count.

25 *-ŋGUUt* indicates immediate succession of events, and *-snAA* might fulfil a similar function. *-xlAAr* and *-xaar* are commonly used when introducing an *explanandum*. *-sAŋčAn* is discussed in FN17.

26 In the Secret history of the Mongols, the most common linking converb form of *kee-* (>*ge-*) was *ke'en* ($n = 384$) followed by *ke'ejü* ($n = 143$) and *ke'e'ed* ($n = 47$) (de Rachewiltz 1974: 255–257). Overall, there seems to be a process in which *-n* is replaced by *-JU*, while the relatively less productive Middle Mongol converbal suffix *-(G)Ad* is intruding on the uses of *-JU*. For instance, *-JU* has ceded its original resultative function (see Matsuoka 2008: 104–112) to *-(G)Ad* (cf. Dugarova and Jaxontova 1988: 219–220).

on purposive, causal, concessive, benefactive and role-designating functions.[27] These extended meanings arise from the reinterpretation of the speaker's intention as expressed in speech or thought into actual goals, causes etc. Moreover, as Matić and Pakendorf (2013: 375) observe, they are synchronically usually still ambiguous between these two interpretations. A given aspecto-temporal-evidential form preceding *ge-* may not fully determine its clause-connective function but it does delimit a range of possible functions of the dependent clause in the highly general pattern [CLAUSE *ge-ž/ge-ed* CLAUSE]. The different clause-connective meanings that arise in this construct will be the main topic of Section 5.1. Argument roles that may also involve different morphological forms of *ge-* and form phrasal rather than clausal constituents will be discussed in Section 5.2.

5.1 The clausal marking of purpose, cause and concession

While the purposive construction discussed in Section 4 with the 'future participle' *-x* is a common and highly specialized means for expressing the subject's goal or intent, other forms that refer to future activities or intentions can occasionally yield similar meanings. As noted by Schmidtke-Bode (2009: 43–45), many forms that potentially refer to the future, be they aspecto-temporal (future; non-past/present; imperfective; prospective) or modal (hypothetical/irrealis/potential; desiderative/optative; intentional; subjunctive), are found in purpose clauses in his balanced typological sample. In Mongolian, potentially future-referring forms other than *-x* are less rigid when combining with *gež/geed* in that they tend to allow for actual quotative interpretations. If 'quotation' is defined more broadly to include the quotation or ascription of thoughts (cf. (10)), these forms only differ from non-quotative intention-marking constructions in that they still *demonstrate* (suggest, instantiate) a *concrete* linguistic way of thinking of that intention.

Relatively clear cases of quotation-based potential purpose clauses can be seen in (41) to (43). In (41), a first-person hortative form expresses the purpose for

27 The word *causal* is used as an adjectival form that corresponds to the words *reason* and *cause* alike, both of which are used in their regular English meanings. *Reason* is inadvertently used when speaking of "a rational ground or motive", i.e. when referring to an actant's motivation for undertaking an action, while *cause* refers to "something that brings about an effect or a result", i.e. to some natural cause. From an external perspective, both words thus refer to "the thing that makes some fact intelligible" (all definitions from https://www.merriam-webster.com, retrieved 2020-06-24), and both will be treated as two aspects of the same concept.

which the speaker has lain down to sleep.[28] In (42), the immediate first-hand past is used in its second function of referring to an imminent speaker-controlled future (see Brosig 2018: 57–58, 65–66). It can thus be understood as expressing the intention of its generic speaker subject to go to Israel, which can be understood as the purpose (or condition) of the subsequent clause about changing planes. In the less common purposive pattern in (43), a desiderative form codes an event that the main-clause subject was hoping for as a potential consequence of conducting the action of the matrix clause.

(41) *unt-**ii**   **ge-ed**   xewt-senčen*
sleep-HORT   QV-CVB   lie-CVB(upon)
yöröösöö   unt-až   čad-ax=kuu   bai-n=aa.
at.all   sleep-CVB   can-FUT.PTCP=NEG   AUX-IM.PRS=EMPH
'Upon lying down saying/thinking "I shall sleep" [~in order to sleep], I could not sleep at all.'
(SC1: TH, Badaruugan)

(42) *ongocn-ii bilet aw-aad + izrail yaw-**laa**   **ge-ed** + moskwa*
plane-GEN ticket take-CVB Israel go-IM.FIRSTH.PST QV-CVB TOWN
damž-aa[d]=l suu-n.
go.via-CVB=LIM.FOC sit-IM.PRS
'Having bought a flight ticket, + saying/thinking "I'm off to Israel" [~if you want to go to Israel, ~in order to go to Israel], + you can only change planes [~take a seat while transferring] in Moscow.'
(SC1: Khalkha0001)

(43) (…)   *asuudl-iig xolb-ogd-ox   Gazr-uud anxaar-č*
           problem-ACC connect-PASS-FUT.PTCP place-PL notice-CVB
*üz-**eesei** **ge-ž** iinxüü **üzeg** **caas**   **niil-üül**-lee.*
see-DES   QV-CVB thus pen paper   unite-CAUS-IM.FIRSTH.PST
(a) 'Saying/Thinking "May the responsible offices become attentive to the problems of (…)", [I]'ve put pen to paper.'
(b) '[I]'ve put pen to paper, so that the responsible offices may become (…)'
(IC)

---

28 Cenggeltei (1999 [1979]: 307), in a syncretic grammar that covers a wide array of Inner Mongolian dialects, mentions that, next to -*x* (as discussed above) and the potential -*n* (to be discussed later on in Sections 5.1 and 6), even this hortative (written as -*yA*) can express imminence. However, prospectives like *budaɢa bolu-ya ge-jü bayi-na* 'The meal is about to become ready' are not possible in Khalkha.

Particularly with *geed*, the pattern [FINITELY.USABLE.PREDICATE.FORM$_i$ *geed/gež* MATRIX.PREDICATE$_j$] can also refer to consecutive events, i.e. '[first] said "P$_i$," and [then did] P$_j$'. In this case, P$_i$ cannot be interpreted as the purpose of P$_j$ but might instead temporally precede it as its motivation or cause. With dependent intentional forms in *-x ge-ž/-eed*, such consecutive interpretations can only arise in examples like (34), in which the matrix predicate explicitly precludes the prevalent purposive interpretation.

If the subject may be understood as adapting a purpose first and as only then opting for a means to realize it, this purpose and the subject's reason for conducting the action of the matrix clause might become difficult to distinguish. As long as the predicate of the quotational clause conveys the speaker's intention through the use of suffixes like *-ii* and *-lAA*, the interpretation still remains purposive, and it would take a pause after the converb to enforce a strictly sequential, rather than causal, interpretation. But if the morphological form of the subordinate predicate does not denote intentionality, the distinction may disappear entirely. For instance, the potential suffix *-n* can refer to a predicted, intended or scheduled future (Brosig 2015a: 53–54) so that no explicit claim regarding the subject's intention or lack of it is made. Consequently, clauses in *-n ge-ed* are potentially ambiguous between purpose and reason. In (44), the movement verb in the matrix clause still favors a purposive interpretation. But in (45), the action in the quotational clause is what the subject had in mind when undertaking the main clause action and thus both its goal and cause.[29]

(44) *aaw*   *oroi*   *ažl-aas=aa*   *ömön*   *xüŋ-tei*
      father   evening   work-ABL=RPOSS   before   person-COM
      *uulz-**an***   ***ge-ed***   ***gar-**saŋ*   *baix*.
      meet-POT   QV-CVB   exit-EST.PST   MP(perhaps)
      'Father probably **went out** in the evening before his work **to (=saying [I] will)** meet someone.'
      (SC2: khalkha0015)

(45) *golomt*   *bank*   *online_banking_interface=ee*   *šinčl-**en***   ***ge-ž***
      heartfire bank   online_banking_interface=RPOSS modernize-POT   QV-CVB
      bür   *10dax^{j}aŋ*   ***dord**-uul-žee*.
      full   10times   worsen-CAUS-IM.INF.PST

---

29 One of the anonymous reviewers objected that the first clause of (45) should be analyzed as a topic, i.e. without recourse to speech or thought, but that the analysis suggested here would be possible if *gež* was replaced by *geed*. Since the precise cut-off points between *gež* and *geed* are likely to vary between individual speakers and the wide range of *ge*-based topicalization structures that would have to be addressed here must remain beyond the scope of this paper, I will not investigate this further.

'Golomt bank's [online] update system has actually made its online banking interface 10 times worse.'
Saying/Thinking "We **will** modernize our online banking interface" [~Intending to modernize their online banking interface/Because they wanted to modernize their online banking interface], Golomt Bank made it as much as 10 times worse.'
(Dovchin et al. 2018: 145)

If the predicate of the quotational clause cannot refer to the future, it cannot express a goal either. In a more-than-quotative interpretation, it is then most straightforwardly understood as the reason for the event in the matrix clause. In (46), with a bare adjectival predicate, such an interpretation is most straightforward. (47) lends itself to two different extended interpretations, depending on how the temporal order of events is constructed. If the speaker first speaks/thinks and then, as a result of the proposition thus contemplated, becomes glad, as in (a1), then this can be reinterpreted in causal terms, as in (a2). If, on the other hand, the speaker thinks/speaks and feels glad at the same time, as in (b1), then the process of thinking/saying something (as denoted by *geed*) can lose its independence and get reinterpreted as the content of feeling glad, as in (b2). *Geed* would thus function as a mere complementizer for *bayarl-* 'feel glad', as it did in (9) above for *bod-* 'think'.

(46)   ***daraa=n***   ***id-xed*** +   ***Goy ge-ed*** *ter-iig*   *aw-caŋ*
         after=3POSS   eat-CVB.when   nice QV-CVB that-ACC   take-COMPL.PRF.PTCP
         bai-sii=šd,   *tuyaa.*
         AUX-EST.PST=DP   NAME
         (a) 'Tuyaa said/thought "[It's] nice to eat afterwards [= after the main dish]" and bought it.'
         (b) 'Tuyaa bought it because it is nice to eat afterwards.'
         (SC2: Z01-1)

(47)   *texdee* *ter*   *üy-d*   *bi*   ***ömöör-löö***   ***ge-ed***
         but   that   time-DAT   1SG   jump.to.defence-IM.FIRSTH.PST QV-CVB
         bayral-žai-ɢaa=šdee,   *medeež.*
         be.glad-PROG-EST.PRS=DP of.course
         (a1) 'But at that time, I said/thought "He has jumped to my defence" and was glad.'
         (a2) 'But at that time, I was glad because he had jumped to my defence.'
         (b1) 'But at that time, I was glad saying/thinking "He has jumped to my defence".'
         (b2) 'But at that time I was glad that he had jumped to my defence.'
         (SC2: Z04-3)

Occasionally, clauses that can be interpreted as motivating the matrix clause (as its purpose or cause) are not found in their canonical adverbial position but rather follow the matrix clause. In this position, they add an explanation about something that the speaker thinks might not have become sufficiently clear from the previous sentence. In SC, such postposed clauses apparently involve actual quoted speech though this need not be consequential. In (48), the speaker merely claims that people usually speak in this way about Mongolian mothers. Only if the addressee accepts this claim at face value, could she interpret the behavior of the Mongolian mothers as the reason for their bad reputation. Alternatively, if she rejects the talk as slander, then these slanderous speech events themselves would be instrumental in bringing about their bad reputation among the Mongolian population. While the most common form in postposed contexts is *ge-ed* (n_{SC} = 56), *ge-ž* is also possible (n_{SC} = 17) as illustrated in (49).

(48) *eež*   *bol*   *yörön*   *odoo=l +*   *aygüi* *muu*   *ner-tei*
      mother   TOP   in.general   now=LIM.FOC   rather   bad   name-COM
      bai-ɢaa   *baixgüiyüü. + eež*   *zagan-dag,*   *eež*   *zod-dog*
      AUX-EST.PRS   MP   mother   scold-HAB.PTCP   mother   hit-HAB.PTCP
      ge-e=l.
      QV-CVB=LIM.FOC
      'Mothers, in general, now, have a rather bad reputation,
      you see. [As_{causal/instrumental} people] are always speaking:
      "Mother [always] scolds [me], mother [always] beats [me]."'
      (SC1: TH, Badaruugan)

(49) *Xošū ixe džargal naer boldž, nojonto boldž gedž.*
      Xošuu   *ix*   *žargal*   *nair*   *bol-ž,*
      banner   much   happiness   feast   become-IM.INFER.PST
      noyoŋ-toi   *bol-ž*   ***ge-ž.***
      master-COM   become-IM.INFER.PST   QV-CVB
      'Es wurde ein grosses Freudenfest des Xošū, da man einen Herrscher bekam.'
      'A big joyous feast took place in the banner, because they said: "We've got a new overlord.'
      (Ramstedt and Halén 1974: 33, 41, cf. Matić and Pakendorf 2013: 376)

In contemporary Mongolian, most of the devices used in purposive clauses such as the finite suffixes -*n* and -*lAA* and the hortative -*ii* cannot be negated directly. Negative future-referring utterances are formed by negating the future participle -*x*. This might suggest that the patterns discussed in Sections 4 and 5 converge

under negation. However, sentences like (50), in which a dependent predicate in
-*x = güi gež*/*geed* negates purpose or reason, are absent from SC and extremely rare
in IC, perhaps accounting for only a dozen tokens. Therefore, it seems that negative
purposives are much more commonly formed from other patterns, such as the
purposive postposition *tuld* (with preceding genitive) in combination with a
negated future participle (n_{SC} = 2, n_{IC} = 1402) as in (51).

(50) *busd=an* *teg-eed* *xamt-iiŋ* *am^jdral=aa*
      other=3POSS do.like.that-CVB together-GEN life=RPOSS
      *süitg-**ex=güi*** ***ge-ed*** *nuu*-ɢaad *yaw-dag* *baix*.
      destroy-FUT.PTCP=NEG QV-CVB hide-CVB go-HAB.PTCP MP(perhaps)
      '[Couples that are so madly in love that they never thought of another
      person but each other perhaps make up 10%.] The others then
      presumably go about and **hide** it, **so that** [they] **don't** destroy their shared
      life [~ **saying that** I **will not** destroy our shared life].' (IC)

(51) *teg-eed* + *xii-**x**=**küi-ŋ*** ***tuld*=*al*** *či*
      do.like.that-CVB do-FUT.PTCP=NEG-GEN in.order=LIM.FOC 2SG
      xož-ox *yostoi* *baixkuuyuu*.
      win-FUT.PTCP should(ADJ) MP
      'So just **in order not to** do it, you must win, you see.'
      (SC2: Khalkha0017)

Moreover, the pattern -*lAA geed* with the immediate first-hand past -*lAA* can also
be used to express concessive meaning (cf. Cenggeltei 1999 [1979]: 306, 384:
dutaɢdaqu aya qandulɢa 'stance that something is lacking'). The pattern is
found in seven examples from Ranma½. The subordinate clauses in -*lAA* always
refer to actions of the addressee that the speaker witnessed, while in the matrix
clause predicate the speaker claims that the former action is to no avail. The
latter is expressed by a modal adjective (52) or regular predicate (53) that is
negated by the existential to standard negator =*güi* (see Brosig 2015b, under
review).[30]

---

30 *Ge-* also conveys adversative and concessive meanings in several other morphosyntactic en-
vironments: (i) as part of the discourse-structuring adverbs *ge-tel* 'although' and *ge-wč* 'but', which
were originally specialized converbs, (ii) in the form =*č ge-seŋ* 'even (though)', which contains the
additive focus clitic =*č* and which, in spite of the participial suffix -*sAŋ*, forms adverbials, and (iii)
in concessive uses of specialized converbs like *ge-xed*. However, (i) and (ii) have lost all reported-
speech meaning and are thus synchronically unrelated to internal awareness. The forms in (iii)
mostly derive their meaning from their suffixes (as once would have been true of the forms in (i)),
and, in contrast to most examples in this paper, would refer to potential/conditional rather than
actual speech events.

(52)   Butler: *uučl-aarai*!
                   forgive-IMP(polite)
                   'Excuse me!'
        Akane: *uučl-alt*   *gui-**laa***   ***ge-ed***   *nemer=**güi**!*
                   forgive-ness   beg-IM.FIRSTH.PST   QV-CVB   benefit=NEG
                   'You think apologizing will help!!'
                   'Even though you have apologized, it won't benefit you.'
        (Ranma½: 368_10 & Vol 35 Prt 2)

(53)   [Final scene of a story about a hair-restoring medicine that only takes
        effect when the user bursts into anger, but lets the hair come off again
        if the user laughs. After several eventful interactions, this hair restorer
        has been used up, leaving Genma in his original bald stage.]
        Akane: Don't feel bad. That hair looked silly anyway.
        Ranma: Besides, you don't need hair. You're an old man.
        Genma: Shut up, Ranma! Show some respect to your father!
        Soun: *uural-**laa***   ***ge-ed***   *üs=čen*   *dax^jaad*
                   be.angry-IM.FIRSTH.PST   QV-CVB   hair=2POSS   again
                   *urɢ-ax=**güi***   *šdee*…
                   grow-FUT.PTCP=NEG   DP
                   'Getting angry won't make it grow anymore…'
                   '**Even though you got angry**, your hair wo**n't** grow again
                   (I tell you).'
                   (Ranma½: 315_16 & Vol 30 Prt 4)

In contrast to *-x ge-* in Section 4, the precise frequencies of the constructions
discussed in this section are difficult to determine with confidence since the
contrast between goal, cause, concession and actual quotation partially lies in the
eye of the beholder, which then would require a questionnaire-based study to
quantify. Instead, Table 2 displays the number of examples as I preliminarily
classified them. These counts thus display the foundation of my analysis rather
than its result. Since the classification fulfilled a heuristic function, it is rather
liberal so that the labels 'intent' (including purpose), 'reason' and 'clarification'
(for reason, intent and other forms of explication in sentence-final position) were
assigned over 'quotation' if in doubt. Quasi-finite uses of the converb *ge-ž* (in which
the suffix *-ž* goes back to Middle Mongol converbal suffix *-JU*) were not included
since current heuristics often cannot distinguish them from the homophonous
immediate inferential past form *ge-ž* (in which *-ž* goes back to the finite Middle
Mongol female inferential past suffix *-Jigi*). The table also excludes roughly
$40_{geed(=l)}+10_{gež}$ currently unclassified examples, most of which seem to express

Table 2: Potential for extensions related to intention and reason.

		ge-ž	*ge-ed(=l)*
Non-finite	Intent	12	25_9
	Intent/reason	4	1
	Reason	14	46_{10}
	Quotation	8	194_{63}
Quasi-finite	Clarification	?	67_{22}
	Quotation	?	94_{35}

Subscript numbers count the subset of forms of *geed* with the limitative focus clitic =*l*.

actual quotation (non-finite, quasi-finite, or with matrix verbs like *teg-* 'do like that'). Due to the preliminary nature of this data, no explicit conclusions will be drawn from it.

5.2 Noun-phrasal role markings

Next to quoted sentences in the scope of quotative converbs which are reanalyzed as adverbial clauses, *ge*-framed quotes can occasionally be reinterpreted as determining the semantic role markers of noun phrases. Besides indicating purpose and cause, these functions may resemble benefactive and functive phrase marking of other languages, though both labels need to be qualified further in order to accurately describe the Mongolian phrase role types. We will first look at benefactive (Section 5.2.1) and then at functive phrase marking (Section 5.2.2).

5.2.1 Dedication and benefaction

A first phrase-marking pattern is connected to the idea that the subject of *ge-* dedicates herself or her devotion, energy, life etc. to some entity or its august cause. The entity to which such efforts are directed is marked like a regular direct object, i.e. it receives accusative case (signaling specificity), reflexive-possessive clitics (which indicate subject possession and replace the accusative with most nouns), or zero marking (for unspecific entities). This usage pattern is remarkable since *ge-* cannot take direct objects that denote its speech content (cf. Section 3), though it might be closely related to its Middle Mongol function to appoint (name) a person for an office (see Street 2013: 10–11), as in (54). In the modern pattern, the person or entity under discussion is not or no longer chosen (named) for an office, but for the speaker's love and affection, as shown in (55).

(54)   *Batu-yi*   *kee-leey.*
        NAME-ACC   QV-FIRSTH.PST.PL
        '[They] have designated Batu [as the one to decide the matter].'
        (Secret history of the Mongols, Paragraph 276 [Street 2013: 10])

(55)   *Yaa-ɢaad*   **nam-aig**   **ge-ed**   **bai-n,** *(…)*
        do.what-CVB   1SG-ACC   QV-CVB   AUX-IM.PRS
        '(Also, he's a person with status, education and a keen business sense. But
        I am just a normal teacher. [We're] very different.) Why **does he want me**
        [lit. why **does [he] keep on saying me**], (there are other women who also
        [like him] have excellent salaries and working positions.)' (IC)

This dedicational use can be found not only in contexts where *ge-* is the main
predicate of a clause, but also when it forms attributes and adverbials (cf. Yáo
2007: 43). In the attributive use of this pattern, the modified noun phrases usually
seem to refer to people, as in (56), or to feelings, as in (57), designating them as
devotees.

(56)   **ex_orŋ=oo**   **ge-seŋ**   **moŋgol**   **xüŋ**   *bür-t*
        mother_land=RPOSS   QV-PRF.PTCP   Mongolian   person   each-DAT
        zorʲuul-aw.
        dedicate-MOD.PST
        '[I] dedicate[d] this to every Mongolian who loves his homeland.'
        (Yáo 2007: 43)

(57)   **čam-aig ge-seŋ**   **min-ii** **xair** öörčl-ögd-öö=güi   šüü!
        2SG-ACC QV-PRF.PTCP   1SG-GEN love   change-PASS-RES.PTCP=NEG   DP
        'My love for you is unchanged.'
        (Ranma½: 4,347 & Vol 9 Prt 21)

For the discussion at hand, the use of the pattern [DIRECT.OBJECT *ge-*LINKING.CONVERB] in
adverbial position is of the most interest. Judging from instances of the sequence
WORD-*iig ge-* in IC,[31] it mostly combines with two types of matrix predicates. The first
type refers to dedication (sacrifice, love), with predicates such as *zorʲ-uul-* 'dedicate
[to]', *amʲdr-* 'live [for]', *üx-* 'die [for]', *ɢar=aa delg-* 'stretch out one's hands [to]' and

---

31 It is not *a priori* clear whether the referential nouns and matrix verbs found with accusative-
marked nominals resemble those without case or with reflexive-possessive clitics. The decision to
specifically look at accusative-marked forms was practical since for these there are relatively few
unique tokens (n_{IC} = 274) with relatively few false-positives (n_{IC} = 212) among them.

setgel ɢarɢ- 'show interest/compassion [for]' (n_{IC} ≥ 13). Typical examples are (58) and (59) with pronominal accusative phrases.

(58) **Ganc-xaŋ   čam-aig   ge-ž**   bi   am'dar-dag   bai-saŋ.
sole-DIM   2SG-ACC   QV-CVB   1SG   live-HAB.PTCP   AUX-EST.PST
'I used to live only for you.' (IC)

(59) *Man-ai-x-aŋ*   **nam-aig ge-seer**[32]   *xamag   yum=aa*
1PL-GEN-NMLZ-PL   1SG-ACC   QV-CVB   all   thing-RPOSS
zor'uul-dag.
dedicate-HAB.PTCP
'My people do everything for me.'
(Yáo 2007: 43)

The meaning of the adverbial phrase in such contexts is close to what Zúñiga (2014: 554) classifies as "absolute benefaction", which implies that the beneficiary benefits indirectly from the consequences of the main event (rather than from the event itself or from a patient acted upon in the event).

The second type of matrix predicate in this construction involves verbs of movement (n_{IC} = 33), particularly *ir-* 'come' (n_{IC} = 24) and occasionally *yaw-* 'go' (n_{IC} = 7). Some instances of *ir-* and all instances of *yaw-* turn out to be aspectual modifiers of a main predicate *ge-* that indicate that the action of caring continued either towards a reference point in the present (*ir-*) or from some reference point onwards (*yaw-*) as illustrated in (60).

(60) *Eež=min'*   **bid**   **nar-iig**   **ge-ž**   **yaw-saar**   **bai-ɢaad**
mother=1POSS   1PL   PL-ACC   QV-CVB   go-CVB   AUX-CVB
öör-iig=öö=č   *bod-ox*   *zaw=güi*   *bai-saar*
self-ACC=RPOSS=ADD.FOC   think-FUT.PTCP   free.time=NEG   AUX-CVB
xorwoo-giiŋ   möŋx   *bus-iig   üz-seŋ=dee.*
world-GEN   eternal   NEG=ACC   see-EST.PST=DP
'**Having continuously gone about caring for us** and having had no time to ever think of herself, my mother saw the non-eternity of the world [=died].' (IC)

For the majority of its tokens, though, *ir-* is an actual matrix predicate that denotes spatial movement. In this pattern, the direct object refers to a person as the goal of

---

32 The somewhat literary suffix *-sAAr* refers to a long-lasting, continued event. In spoken language, this semantic range tends to be covered by *-AAd*.

or reason for the movement as in (61). Oftentimes, the goal also benefits from the consequences of this movement as in (62).[33]

(61) *Xüm-üüs* **nam-aig ge-ed** *ir-wel   bi   daG-uul-aad*
      person-PL 1SG-ACC QV-CVB come-CVB(if) 1SG follow-CAUS-CVB
      med-ex   yum=aa   xel-eed zöwl-ööd   ög-ön.
      learn+and+know-FUT.PTCP thing=RPOSS say-CVB advise-CVB give-POT
      'If people come to see me [a distinguished teacher], I show them around and give them advice, telling them what I know.' (IC)

(62) *nöxör=maan   ažl=aa   xay-aad   **nam-aig   ge-ed***
      husband=1PL   work=RPOSS throw.away-CVB 1SG-ACC   QV-CVB
      ir-lee.
      come-IM.FIRSTH.PST
      'My husband gave up his job and came to join me [abroad].' (IC)

Polysemy between benefactives, goals and causes is cross-linguistically common (Kittilä and Zúñiga 2010: 22–24) and indeed is not restricted to matrix verbs of spatial movement as can be seen from (63). This sentence contains a predicate that can express sacrifice. When presented out of context, informants readily recognize a benefactive reading (a) and a purpose reading (b). The latter refers to the prize which the subjects want to obtain (as intended in the folktale from which the example was taken). Even a causal reading (c) is accessible (though much less salient) in which the subjects designate the object as the reason of their dire fate.

(63) *namäig gedž oloŋ saen ere daŋdā üxedžaēnā*
      nam-aig ge-ž *oloŋ   saiŋ   er   dandaa   üx-žai-n=aa.*
      1SG-ACC QV-CVB many   good   man   always   die-PROG-IM.PRS=EMPH
      'Many valiant men are always dying (a) for my benefit (b) for obtaining me (c) because of me.'
      (Ramstedt and Halén 1974: 20–21, 24 [also Dejan Matić, p.c. 2016-4-20], my translation)

---

33 Next to this rather specialized goal-benefactive, other more common benefactive constructions of Khalkha Mongolian use auxiliaries of giving such as *ög-* 'give' as in (60) and *xairl-* 'love, bestow'). Self-benefactives seem to use *aw-* 'take, buy' (though there are other uses of *aw-* as an auxiliary that would need to be distinguished), and malefactives draw extensively on the passive construction (see Umetani 2008). These patterns thus closely resemble the main patterns of other (South, South-East and East) Asian languages (cf. Radetzky and [Yamashita] Smith 2010).

5.2.2 Functive uses

In a second distinct phrasal use, NOUN *ge-ž* can be used by the subject to allocate a function or substitutive role to another participant ($n_{SC} = 2$) as in (64). In contrast to the dedicational-benefactive uses discussed in Section 5.2.1, this allocational-functive use seems to be based on the reinterpretation of an originally identify-designating predicative use and may indeed still be interpreted as facultatively involving speech.

(64)	*eež=en*	*piiw ög-öö=l,*		*aaw=an*	+	***daruulaɢ***	***ge-ž***
	mother=3POSS	beer give-CVB=LIM.FOC		father=3POSS		pacifier	QV-CVB

tamʲax   *ög-öö=l*   @.
tobacco   give-CVB=LIM.FOC   LAUGHTER

'Her mother would give beer to her [instead of milk], and her father would give her a cigarette **as a pacifier [= saying "[Here,] [this is/have a] pacifier"]**.'
(SC2: Khalkha0017)

This usage pattern contrasts with a pure 'functive' role (see Creissels 2014) in which a function is simply fulfilled by, but not allocated to, a participant including the subject, which in Mongolian is most often marked by the instrumental *-AAr* (cf. Hashimoto 2002: 116–117, Section 2.3.2 'status') as in (65). It also differs from a specifically substitutive role as marked by the postposition-like pattern *-iiŋ oroŋ-d* 'in place of' in (66).

(65)	*Šüüx*	*xural-d*	***ömgöölögč-öör***	*R.Nasaŋžarɢal,*	*xarʲaŋ*
	court	assembly-DAT	defender-INS	NAME	but

niislel-iiŋ   *Prokuror-iiŋ*   *ɢazr-iiŋ*   *xʲanalt-iiŋ*   *prokuror*
capital.city-GEN   prosecutor-GEN   place-GEN   control-GEN   prosecutor

T.Žadambaa   ***uls-iiŋ***   ***yallagč-aar***   *orolc-soŋ*   *yum.*
NAME   state-GEN   accuser-INS   participate-EST.PST   ASS

'At the court session, R. Nasanjargal acted **as lawyer of defence**, but the supervising prosecutor T. Jadambaa from the Capital City Prosecutor's Office [acted] **as public prosecutor**.' (IC)

(66)	*öö,*	***calʲaŋ-giiŋ***	***oroŋ-d***	*xool*	*ög-ön*	*ge-n=ee.*
	INTERJ	salary-GEN	place-DAT	food	give-POT	QV-POT=EMPH

'Well, s/he said s/he will give you food **instead of a salary**.'
(SC2: Z07-4)

6 Emotion-related uses of *ge-n=ee*

In this section, we will take a look at the development of the pattern [DECLARATIVE-*n ge-n=ee*] to express the speaker's surprise and anger as illustrated in (67). In this pattern, the specific quotative verb form *ge-n=ee* takes the potential suffix -*n* into its scope, but the resulting meaning is neither a quote, as *ge*- would imply, nor does it predict a future event, as would befit the most accessible meaning of -*n*. Instead, it mainly conveys the emotive stance of the current speaker *vis-à-vis* an event that belongs to the past or to an extended present.

(67)   *ranma,*   *čam-aig*   *xaraal*   *id-eg!*   *xalz_tulaaŋ-aas*
         NAME   2SG-ACC   curse   eat-3IMP   duel-ABL
         *zugt-**an***   *ge-**n**=ee!*
         flee-POT   QV-POT=EMPH
         [Ryoga walking alone, thinking to himself, recalling a past event:]
         'Curse you, Ranma! **Running out on our duel**!'
         (Ranma½: 2023 & Vol 2 Prt 2)

Before the emotive uses of [DECLARATIVE-*n ge-n=ee*] can be discussed in Section 6.2, several related more general constructions are introduced in Section 6.1 as a background.

6.1 The parts from which [declarative-*n ge-n=ee*] is assembled

At first sight, emotive [DECLARATIVE-*n ge-n=ee*] looks like an instantiation of the general quotative pattern [QUOTATION *ge*-SUFFIX] (cf. (6)) in a specific aspecto-temporal-evidential form. However, the range of uses of the suffix -*n* has to be clarified before we can take a closer look at its function in the word *genee*.

The suffix-clitic-combination -*n=AA* in *ge-n=ee* goes back to a Late Middle Mongol present progressive. It apparently evolved along the path -*n a-mu* -CVB AUX-PRS.IPFV > -*nAm* (present progressive) > -*nA* (general present) > -*n* (defocalized potential). The general present use (with the historically secondary meaning of the speaker's immediate access to the event) survives with the copular auxiliary *bai*-, cf. (7) above. As a defocalized potential marker (see Brosig 2015a: 51–63), tense-neutral -*n* refers to the potential development of events. If the reference time is present or past, it refers to a potential-habitual event as in (68a). If it is future, the form usually refers to a single (predicted, scheduled etc.) future event as in (68b). Out of context, -*n* is mostly interpreted as future-referring.

(68) a.   *eež*   *buruu*   *xereg*   *xii-wel*   ***zod-ii=šd.*** (…)
             mother   wrong   action   do-COND.CVB   hit-POT=DP
             yamar_saiŋdaa *man-ai*   *aaw*   *ix*   ***ömöör-ön.*** (…)
             no.wonder   1PL-GEN   father   much   defend-POT
             man-ai   *aaw*   *teg-deg*   *bai-saŋ.*
             1PL-GEN   father   do.like.that-HAB.PTCP   AUX-EST.PST
             'Mother would hit me if I did something wrong. No wonder my father
             would protect me a lot. (…) My father used to do so.'

      b.   *OXU-iiŋ* *ediiŋ_zasg-iiŋ* *ösölt*   *2014–2015* *oŋ-d*   *buur-an.*
             STATE-GEN   economy-GEN   growth   year-DAT   decrease-POT
             'The economic growth of the Russian Federation will decrease in
             2014–2015.'
             (Brosig 2015a: 57, 54)

When short word-final vowels were lost and *-nA* evolved into *-n*, the old longer
variant was apparently reanalyzed as a separate, 'emphatic' form *-n=AA*. While this
form might in some [declarative] contexts signal an honorific stance towards the
addressee (Brosig 2015a: 75–76), it is also commonly used instead of *-n* when
forming information questions as in (69) and confirmatory echo questions as in (70).

(69)   *xay-laa*   *caɢaaŋ*   *sar-iiŋ-x=aa*   *buuz-iig*   ***xezee***
         two-COLL   white   month-GEN=NMLZ=RPOSS   dumpling-ACC   when
         xii-n=ee?
         do-POT=EMPH
         'When will the two of us prepare the Lunar New Year's dumplings?'
         (SC2: Z03-1)

(70)   A: *xedeŋ-d*   *ir-x=iiŋ*   *bol,*   *ter*   *xoyor?*
            how.many-DAT   come-FUT.PTCP=ASS   if   that   two
            'When might they come, those two?'

       B: *xoyron-d*   *ir-en.*
            two-DAT   come-POT
            'They will come on the second.'

       C: *xoyron-d*   ***ir-n=ee?***
            two-DAT   come-POT=EMPH
            'They will come on the second?'

       B: *dx.*
            INTERJ
            'Mhm.'
            (SC2: Z07-6)

Declarative [QUOTATION *ge-**n**=ee*], in turn, is most commonly used to locate a speech event in a wider present (71) (cf. [4]) or in the past (72). In the latter use, it seems to be less time-specific than any of the evidential past-tense suffixes but still more so than the converbal form *geed* in its quasi-finite general-purpose quotative use. The fine-grained differences between these forms require future investigation.

(71) A: C + *delgüür* *xaa-laa.*
  NAME shop close-IM.FIRSTH.PST
  'C … the shops are about to close!'

  B: *aw-č* *ög-**ön*** ***ge-n=ee.*** *bai-žii-Ø ! +*
  take-CVB give-POT QV-POT=EMPH AUX-PROG-IMP
  enčee *baissaŋ-ii* *yum* *yarʲ-žii-n.*
  here swimming.pool-GEN thing speak-PROG-IM.PRS
  '[He_C] says [he_C] will buy it for [us_A&B]. Wait a little. [We_B&C]'re just talking about swimming-pool-related things!'
  (SC2: Khalkha0018)

(72) *za daraa-d=an [inaudible.word] + odoŋ-ko + en bai-n. + en sonʲoŋ.*
  sonʲoŋ-oos en radʲoo telwiz-iiŋ deed surɢuul-d sur-čai-ɢaa. + araw-dugaar
  aŋɢ tögs-öxd=ön bii asuu-x=güi yuu? + zaa min-ii oxʲoŋ, aaw=an oxʲoŋ=oo
  yamar surɢuulʲ-d … or-uul-maar bai-n ge-seŋ=čen +
  bi *tan-ii* *mereɡžl-iig* *aw-an,* + *ezemš-**en*** ***ge-n=ee.***
  1SG 2SG.HON-GEN profession-ACC take-POT master-POT QV-POT=EMPH
  (…) *teg-eed bi oxʲoŋ=oo radʲoo telwiz-iiŋ deed surɢuulʲ-d or-uul-s=iiŋ.*
  'Well, the next is Odonko, this one. By the way, she is studying at the College of Radio and Television. When she finished grade 10, I asked [her], you know: "Well, my daughter, to which university should your father(=I) send you?", and upon [me] saying [this], **[she] says**: "I **will** acquire and master your profession." (…) So I enlisted my daughter in the College of Radio and Television.'
  (SC1: TH, Parik Jagaa)

In questions, [QUOTATION *ge-n=ee*] is used for clarificational information questions and echo questions. Information questions like (73) ask about a constituent that the speaker was unable to discern correctly in the interlocutor's previous speech. Echo questions like (74), in turn, try to confirm that a particular constituent of an utterance was indeed perceived correctly. In information questions, *=AA* is preferred over the information question clitic *=be* for structural reasons: Since *=be* goes back to a copula, it does not as easily combine with finite verbs like *ge-n*. In echo questions like (74), by contrast, *=AA* is chosen over the polar question clitic *=UU* for semantic reasons since the latter would yield open rather than confirmatory questions.

(73)   *xeŋ*   *tex-seŋ*   **ge-n=ee?**
       who   do.like.that-EST.PST   QV-POT=EMPH
       bi   *say*   *yöröösöö*   *oiloɢ-soŋ=guu.*
       1SG   recently   at.all   understand-PRF.PTCP=NEG
       'Who, **did you say**, did so? Just now I couldn't follow at all.'
       (SC2: Z08-1)

(74)   Grandma: *či* *marɢaaš-iiŋ*   *temceeŋ*   *deer* *sacüki* *awxai-g*
                  2SG tomorrow-GEN   contest   on   NAME   miss-ACC
                  yal-ž   *čad-an*   *ge-ž*   *bod-ož* *bai-n=uu?*
                  defeat-CVB can-POT   QV-CVB   think-CVB AUX-IM.PRS=Q.PLR
                  'Do you~Ranma~ think you can defeat miss Satsuki in tomorrow's
                  match?'
       Daimonji: *marɢaaš* **ge-n=ee**?!
                  tomorrow   QV-POT=EMPH
                  'Tomorrow, **you say**?!'
       Grandma: *bi* *say*   *temceeŋ*   *marɢaaš*   *bol-on*   *ge-seŋ*
                  1SG   recently   contest   tomorrow   become-POT QV-PRF.PTCP
                  bičig   *aw-laa.*
                  writing   take-IM.FIRSTH.PST
                  'I have just received word that the match is to be tomorrow.'
                  (Ranma½: 3,343)

Apart from asking for information that was not properly perceived auditively, the
pattern [QUOTATION *ge-n=ee*] and particularly its instantiation [NOUN/ADJECTIVE
ge-n=ee] can also be used as an evaluative response towards a piece of information
that the current speaker was mentally unprepared for. (75) is *prima facie* a
confirmatory echo question. But since both interlocutors assume that the current
speaker successfully decoded the audio signal of the preceding utterance, it is
instead understood as a statement of disbelief and/or dislike on the speaker's part.

(75)   Küno: *yuu?!*   *"süi-t*   *zaluu"*   **ge-n=ee**?!
                 what   vow-COM   young.man   QV-POT=EMPH
                 [face in anger, disbelief and despair] 'What?! Fiancé?!'
       Nabiki: *aaŋxaŋ* …   *man-ai*   *aaw*   *ranma-giiŋ*   *aaw*   *xoyor*
                 INTERJ   1PL-GEN   father   NAME-GEN   father   two
                 šiid-seŋ   *yum.*   *akane*   *ranma-tai*   *gerl-en.*
                 decide-EST.PST ASS   NAME   NAME-COM   marry-POT
                 'Uh-huh. My dad and his dad decided. Akane's going to marry
                 Ranma.'
                 (Ranma½: 1:83 & Vol 1 Prt 4)

Next to actual interrogative and negative evaluative uses, some tokens of this pattern are used to convey the speaker's surprise about and appreciation for a referent previously mentioned by the interlocutor. In (76), this non-interrogative interpretation is facilitated by the use of an interjection of surprise. For actual spoken language examples, one would also expect a lack of interrogative intonation.

(76)   Soun: *ranma*   *aaw-tai-ɢaa*   *xamt*   *tulaaŋ-ii* *beltgel*
                  NAME   father-COM=RPOSS   together   fight-GEN   training
                  xii-ž   *ayal-dag.*   *sayxaŋ*   *ted*   *xʲatad-aar*
                  do-CVB   travel-HAB.PTCP   recently   3PL   China-INS
                  dairaŋ_öŋgör-söŋ   *bololtoi*
                  pass.by-EST.PST   MP(probably)
                  'Ranma and his father have been on a voyage of training./Recently, it seems, they crossed into China.'

        Nabiki: *xööx!*   *xʲatad*   **ge-n=ee!**
                  INTERJ(German:hui!) China   QV-POT=EMPH
                  'Wow! China!'

        Akane: *xʲatad-aar*   *yaw-ax*   *yuu=n*   *saixaŋ*   *ge-ž?*
                  China-INS   go-FUT.PTCP   what=3POSS   nice   QV-IM.INFER.PST/CVB
                  'What's so great about walking to [~through] China?'
                  (Ranma½: 1:13 & Vol 1 Prt 1)

6.2 Emotive [declarative-*n ge-n=ee*]

A pattern [DECLARATIVE-*n ge-n=ee*] is also found with a rather specific exclamatory use which neither involves quotation nor closely resembles echo questions. Used like this, as e.g. in (77), it expresses the speaker's incredulous stance and anger towards an improper event and its willful perpetrator. A single event, marked by -*n*, is situated in the past or extended present. This diverges from regular uses of -*n* that are future in the absence of indications to the contrary, and habitual-potential rather than mono-eventual if they do refer to a non-future event.

(77)   *tulaaŋ-ii* *dund-uur*   *öör*   *tii-š=ee*   *xar-**an***   **ge-n=ee** …
        fight-GEN   middle-PROL   other   such-ALL=RPOSS look-POT   QV-POT=EMPH
        či   *nam-aig*   *xündetg-ex=güi*   *bai-n!!*
        2SG   1SG-ACC   respect-FUT.PTCP=NEG AUX-IM.PRS
        '**You look elsewhere in the midst of battle** … you do not take me seriously!!'
        (Ranma½: 1:130–131 & Vol 1 Prt 7)

In my data, this type of usage is confined to Ranma½ with at least 32 tokens (i.e. more than one for each 200 comic pages), while it is absent from SC and even IC. Some informants pointed out that such language would be more common in comics, or movies in general, or would be appropriate for scolding children. Eight out of nine informants were able to emulate this usage with utterances set in fictive everyday discourse. The semantic and functional range of emotive *-n ge-n=ee* in Ranma½ and in emulation of it were relatively homogeneous when compared to other sentence-final non-quotative emotive uses of *ge-* such as the inferential past question form *ge-ž=üü* and the imploring imperative form *ge-eč* (on which I hope to publish in the future). Most instantiations are understood as coding disbelief, anger and vengefulness, which may be directed at an overt or unexpressed second or third person subject as in (77)–(80).

(78)   *nowš-iiŋ*   *xüüxd-üüd!*   *tanüki-giiŋ*   *xöšöö-g*
         trash-GEN   child-PL   NAME-GEN   monument-ACC
         süitg-en   *ge-n=ee!*
         ravage-POT   QV-POT=EMPH
         'Damn kids! **Vandalizing the Tanuki cage**!'
         (Ranma½: 325_16 & Vol 31 Prt 4)

(79)   *či*   *min-ii*   *ažl-iig*   *iim*   *baɢ*   *möŋ-öör*
         2SG   1SG-GEN   work-ACC   so   little   money-INS
         ünl-en   *ge-n=ee!*
         evaluate-POT QV-POT=EMPH
         'How dare you compensate my work with so little money!' (INF)

(80)   *man-ai*   *naiz-uud*   *min-ii*   *uts-iig*   *orold-on*   *ge-n=ee*.
         1PL-GEN   friend-PL   1SG-GEN   phone-ACC   try-POT   QV-POT=EMPH
         'How dare my friends spy out my phone!' (INF)

For a small number of tokens, some informants emphasized disagreement as in (81b) and (82b) (which always also involved dissatisfaction) over anger as in (81a) and (82a). These include (81), in which the speaker forcefully criticizes his father, and (82), in which a student criticizes her professor's grading. The criticized decisions would have been uttered at some point by a former interlocutor and could

thus (in the disagreement reading) be conceived of as quoted. At the same time, an incredulous stance is expressed.[34]

(81)　*bi　üün-iig=čen …　teneg　ge-meer　bai-n.　nad-aas*
　　　1SG　this-ACC=2POSS　stupid　QV-PTCP(inclined)　AUX-IM.PRS　1SG-ABL
　　　asuu-lgüi=geer … nad-ad süit_büsgüi soŋɢ-on　ge-n=ee …
　　　ask-CVB.NEG=INS　1SG-DAT　fiancée　choose-POT　QV-POT=EMPH
　　　a.　'Well, I STILL say … this whole thing SUCKS! Picking my fiancee
　　　　　for me … without even asking!!'
　　　b.　'I'm inclined to call this [action] stupid. Is he really saying that
　　　　　he will pick me a fiancee without asking me [how can he]?!'
　　　　　(Ranma½: 1:10–11 & Vol 1 Prt 1)

(82)　*nad-ad iim　baɢ　düŋ　tawʲ-an　ge-n=ee!　ter professor*
　　　1SG-DAT　such　small　result　put-POT　QV-POT=EMPH　that professor
　　　nad-ad ugan　ix　saiŋ=al xand-dag　bai-saŋ
　　　1SG-DAT　originally very　good-FOC　turn.to-HAB.PTCP AUX-EST.PST
　　　yumsaŋ.
　　　DISAPPOINTMENT
　　　a.　'[thinking] How could s/he give me such a low grade! That professor
　　　　　was originally treating me very well, after all.'
　　　b.　'How can s/he say that he will give me such a low grade. (…)' (INF)

During elicitation, informants regularly paraphrased [DECLARATIVE-*n ge-n=ee*] with another exclamative pattern illustrated in (83a). Here, a clause with *yaaž* 'how' is taken into the scope of the auxiliary *čad-* 'can [physical/mental ability]'. This auxiliary, in turn, is marked as either a present progressive (*-ž bai-n*) or modal past (*-w*) and ends in the interrogatively used clitic =*AA*. Both patterns can indeed be used in rather similar situation types as becomes clear from comparing (83) with (84). It seems, however, that the pattern used for paraphrasing is overall less harsh,

---

34 As one anonymous reviewer pointed out, this usage would also entail a different intonation. A realization such as [sɔŋ'ɢɔn gi'˥˦neː] with accent on both word-final syllables and a rising tone on the utterance-final syllable seems to yield a quotative interpretation such that the current speaker disagrees with the quoted statement. This would partially resemble a regular question pattern in which the sentence-final question particle (=*UU*, =*wee*) may, but need not, receive a tonal rise (Svantesson et al. 2005: 93–94). By contrast, the same sentence would express anger but not quotation if its penultimate word is pronounced neutrally; the first syllable of *genee* receives stress and its last (long and still prominent) syllable receives falling intonation. It should be kept in mind, though, that these proposed prosodic patterns for emotive uses of [DECLARATIVE-*n ge-n=ee*] were not observed in natural discourse but are merely based on the introspection of a small number of informants.

emphasizing disbelief over anger. It is more widely used, i.e. present in IC and possibly SC (with a single ambiguous example), and occasionally overheard in everyday conversation.

(83)   *či*   **yaa-ž**   *bagš-tai-ɢaa*   *iŋg-ež*   *yarʲ-ž*
       2SG   do.how-CVB   teacher-COM=RPOSS   do.like.this-CVB   speak-CVB
       čad-až **bai-n=aa**!?
       can-CVB AUX-IM.PRS=EMPH
       'How dare you speak that way to your master!?'
       (Ranma½: 356_11 & Vol 34 Prt 1)

(84)   *či*   *muu…*   *ecg-iiŋ-x=ee*   *tuxai* *iŋg-ež*
       2SG   bad   father-GEN-NMLZ=RPOSS   about do.like.this-CVB
       *yarʲ-**an***   **ge-n=ee**
       speak-POT QV-POT=EMPH
       'Why you little … talking to your father like that.'
       lit. 'You bad [person] … **talking about your father like this!**'
       (Ranma½: 4,074 & Vol 7 Prt 5)

In all anger-related examples from Ranma½, the clause in the scope of *ge-n=ee* is declarative. But two informants created examples that feature an information question based on *yaaɢaad* 'why' (85), in apparent analogy with the pattern with *čad-*, yet still expressing anger (85a). The other informants rejected this, insisted on interpreting the embedded potential suffix *-n* as future and *ge-* as actually quotative (85b).

(85)   *či*   **yaaɢaad**   *nam-aig*   *darɢ-iiŋ*   *xažuud*   *bai-xad*
       2SG   why   1SG-ACC   boss-GEN   next.to   AUX-CVB.when
       *üns-**en***   **ge-n=ee**?!
       kiss-POT QV-POT=EMPH
       a.   **'Why the hell dare** you kiss me in the presence of [my/our] boss!'
       b.   **'Why did you say that you will** kiss me in the presence of [my/our] boss?' (INF)

For those informants who interpret (85) as (85a), this type of example suggests that [DECLARATIVE-*n ge-n=ee*] itself is closely related to information questons.

     Overall, the explanation why the pattern [DECLARATIVE-*n ge-n=ee*] is capable of conveying the notion of anger seems to involve both echo questions and internal awareness, but a concrete grammaticalization path is hard to establish with confidence. One conceivable scenario might be the following: originally, a quoted (second- or third-person) speaker would have declared her intention to act in a

certain way, using a verb suffixed by -*n*. The current speaker would challenge this first statement by forming an echo question, which, rather than trying to confirm the words of the reported speaker, would emphasize the unexpected and unwelcome character of this intention (e.g. (82b)). This pattern would in the course of time have been reinterpreted as a statement (including a change of prosody, which expresses the anger that it originally only implicated). With this declarative shift, the temporally unspecific *genee* (cf. (72)) seems to have acquired past reference. As a consequence of this, the quoted intention would (by implication) already have been implemented at the time of speech so that the current speaker's anger now relates to a wilful past action.[35]

7 Conclusion

In this paper, the grammaticalization of the internal awareness of speech/thought was investigated in a 135,000 word conversational corpus of Khalkha Mongolian, with additional evidence from a Mongolian manga translation and a larger corpus of Internet data. We took a closer look at several constructions that, by means of the speaker's purported awareness of internal or ascribed speech or thought, are used to attribute intentions and derived notions to a discourse participant. A first grammaticalization chain concerns the combination of the participial suffix -*x*, which originally referred to the future, but has now more or less lost its finite uses, with the quotative verb *ge*-. With a general present-type marking in literary contexts, it can still refer to future events. In perfective contexts, it consistently expresses intention. Several of these perfective patterns favor the identity of the subject with the current speaker (in declaratives) or addressee (in questions). The most common subtype of this intention-related usage is a specialized purposive construction. It basically requires identical subordinate/matrix subjects and favors movement verbs and other telic predicates in the matrix clause. In progressive contexts, intention broadens to prospectivity (aka imminence), thus allowing for non-sentient subjects.

In a second group of constructions, the internal awareness of actual discourse co-exists with an alternative interpretation in which the quotational clause is reinterpreted as an adverbial subordinate clause that acts as a purpose, cause, or counteracting ('concessive') factor of the matrix clause. The adverbial clause can have a fully distinct argument structure from the matrix clause and is subordinated

---

35 The anger-related use of -*n genee* has not been reported for other dialects (i.e. the cognate form in Khorchin would be a prospective, cf. Brosig 2014c: 24–25), so we might conceivably be dealing with a relatively recent development in which -*n ge*-, rather than the older -*x ge*-, is first reinterpreted as expressing intention.

by either of the linking converb forms *ge-ž* and *ge-ed*. The semantic type of the adverbial clause depends on the form of the predicate of the quotational clause. Intention-conveying future-referring forms yield purposive, and non-future forms yield causal meanings. Potential forms in *-n* allow for both interpretations. Concessive interpretations require the first-hand past form *-lAA*.

If the 'reported' element is phrasal rather than clausal, two possible patterns were identified. First, a nominal phrase may be designated as a goal or beneficiary of the subject's dedication, which may even allow for causal interpretations. This construction is based on a direct-object pattern that is highly untypical for *ge-*, which as a quotative verb cannot take speech-referring accusative objects. In a second usage, a bare nominal phrase that seems to go back to a presentational nominal predicate is used to allocate a function, as a substitute, to a noun phrase.

Finally, I looked at one usage of the pattern [QUOTATION-*n ge-n=ee*], which can be used to express the speaker's anger towards an improper event and its willful perpetrator. This was hypothesized as going back to an incredulous use of an echo question regarding the subject's declared intention.

Interestingly, previous research seems to emphasize developments from benefactives to purposives (Kuteva et al. 2019: 74–76) or from purpose to reason clauses (e.g. Rice and Kabata 2007), which could then be motivated by the economy of coding one with the other (Schmidtke-Bode 2010). In the *ge*-based Mongolian constructions of this type, however, the partially distinct structural coding of purposive, causal, concessive, benefactive and substitutive uses suggests that these would probably have emerged in parallel here. They all are conveyed by reference to a thought (either of events or of physical entities) that the quoted speaker holds in her mind while committing another action. This purported thought then provides the only and often ambiguous clue to how the subject's main action is to be contextualized.

While this paper focused on a group of constructions that are all related to the speaker's internal awareness as expressed by *ge-*, it would be highly desirable to situate these constructions within a larger functional network. For instance, next to the two purposive constructions discussed in this paper, there are at least two related constructions. In one of these, an instrumental form of the future participle forms complements for a closed set of matrix predicates, e.g. *yaw-ax-aar šiid-lee* '[I']ve decided to go'.[36] More so than with *ge-ž* MATRIX.PREDICATE, the complement here

---

36 The Khalkha instrumental cannot normally express movement towards a place (and the uses discussed by Hashimoto [2002: 120, §3.1.3] are more readily interpreted in terms of a location within which movement takes place). Allative uses of instrumentals were also absent in Middle Mongol (cf. Street 1957: 36, Jorigtu and Elesünceceg 2000: 105–107). For such functions, Khalkha innovated a specialized allative case *-ruu* (<'downhill') and also continues to use the lative > dative *-d* (cf. Street 1957: 34, 36, Jorigtu and Elesünceceg 2000: 66–81).

has phrasal rather than clausal status, and *-x-AAr*, e.g. followed by [an open class of] movement predicates (cf. Hashimoto 2002: 122), can often replace purposive *-x ge-*. Secondly, there are purposive clauses with *-x-iiŋ tuld*, a genitive form of a future participle preceding the conjunction *tuld* 'in order to'. This construction seems to represent a typologically less common type of purposive construction that introduces topics (cf. Schmidtke-Bode 2009: 123–129). It then combines with focal matrix clauses which describe the possible means of realizing this purpose and often feature deontic modal adjectives, thus allowing for actionally stative predicates. In some other contexts, *-x=iiŋ tuld* seems to be interchangeable with *-x ge-ž*. In order to determine the precise semantic properties of the constructions discussed in this paper, contrastive research would be indispensable.

Glosses

1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
ABL	ablative
ACC	accusative
ADD	additive
ALL	allative
ASS	assertive particle
AUX	copular auxiliary
CAUS	causative
COM	comitative
COMPL	"completive"
CVB	converb
DAT	dative
DES	desiderative
DP	discourse particle
EMPH	"emphatic"
EST	established
FIRSTH	firsthand
FOC	focus
FUT	"future"
GEN	genitive
HAB	habitual
HON	honorific
HORT	(ad)hortative
ID	identity
IFR	information
IM	imminent
IMP	imperative
INFER	inferential

IW	incomplete word
INS	instrumental
INTERJ	interjection
IPFV	imperfective
LIM	limitative
MED	medial
MOD	modal
MP	modal particle
NEG	negation
NMLZ	nominalizer
NOM	nominative
NPST	non-past
PASS	passive
PL	plural
PLR	polar
POSS	possessive
POT	potential
PRF	"perfect"
PROG	progressive
PROL	prolative
PROSP	prospective
PRS	present
PST	past
PTCP	participle
Q	question particle
QV	quotative verb
RES	"resultative"
RPOSS	reflexive possessive
SG	singular
STC	stance marker (<2POSS)
TOP	topic

References

Arkadiev, Peter & Timur Maisak. 2018. Grammaticalization in the North Caucasian languages. In Heiko Narrog & Bernd Heine (eds.), *Grammaticalization from a typological perspective*, 116–145. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baranova, Vlada. 2015. Grammaticalization paths of the verb *gi-* 'say' in Kalmyk. *Mongolica Pragensia* 2015(2). 57–76.

Breu, Walter. 2005. Verbalaspekt und Sprachkontakt: Ein Vergleich der Systeme zweier slavischer Minderheitensprachen. In Sebastian Kempgen (ed.), *Slavistische Linguistik 2003*, 37–95. Sagner: München.

Brosig, Benjamin. 2014a. The aspect-evidentiality system of Middle Mongol. *Ural-Altaic Studies* 13(2). 7–38.

Brosig, Benjamin. 2014b. *Aspect, evidentiality and tense in Mongolian: From Middle Mongol to Khalkha and Khorchin*. Stockholm: Stockholm University dissertation. https://su.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:735288/FULLTEXT01.pdf (introduction).

Brosig, Benjamin. 2014c. The tense-aspect system of Khorchin Mongolian. In Pirkko Suihkonen & Lindsay Whaley (eds.), *Typology of languages of Europe and Northern and Central Asia*, 3–65. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Brosig, Benjamin. 2015a. Aspect and epistemic notions in the present tense system of Khalkha Mongolian. *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana* 11(3). 46–127.

Brosig, Benjamin. 2015b. Negation in Mongolic. *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 95. 67–136.

Brosig, Benjamin. 2018. Factual vs. evidential? The past tense forms of spoken Khalkha Mongolian. In Ad Foolen, Helen de Hoop & Gijs Mulder (eds.), *Evidence for evidentiality*, 45–75. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Brosig, Benjamin. under review. Negation in Khalkha Mongolian. In Ljuba Veselinova & Matti Miestamo (eds.), *Negation in the languages of the world*. Berlin: Language Science Press.

Brosig, Benjamin, Foong-Ha Yap & Kathleen Ahrens. 2019. Assertion, assumption and presupposition: An account of the erstwhile nominalizer YUM in Khalkha Mongolian. *Studies in Language* 43(4). 896–940.

Chappell, Hilary. 2008. Variation in the grammaticalization of complementizers from verba dicendi in Sinitic languages. *Linguistic Typology* 12(1). 45–98.

Cenggeltei. 1999 [1979]. *Odu üy-e-yin mongɣul kelen-ü jüi. nemen jasaɣsan keblel* [A grammar of modern Mongolian. A revised edition]. Kökeqota: Öbür mongɣul-un arad-un keblel-ün qoriy-a.

Creissels, Denis. 2014. Functive phrases in typological and diachronic perspective. *Studies in Language* 38(3). 605–647.

Croft, William. 2012. *Verbs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

de Rachewiltz, Igor. 1974. *Index to the Secret history of the Mongols*. Bloomington: Indiana University.

Dovchin, Sender [Dovčin, Senderijn], Alastair Pennycook & Shaila Sultana. 2018. *Popular culture, voice and linguistic diversity*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dugarova, Galina S. & Natalia S. Jaxontova. 1988. Resultative and perfect in Mongolian. In Vladimir P. Nedjalkov (ed.), *Typology of resultative constructions*, 209–220. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Güldemann, Tom. 2008. *Quotative indexes in African languages: A synchronic and diachronic survey*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Guntsetseg, Dolgor [Günceceg, Dolgoryn]. 2016. *Differential case marking in Mongolian*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Hashimoto, Kunihiko. 2002. The instrumental in Mongolian. *Muro(ran) kō(gyō)dai(gaku) kiyō* [Memoirs of the Muroran Institute of Technology] 52. 111–125.

Hashimoto, Kunihiko. 2004. Metarepresentational motivations: The grammaticalization of the verb of saying *ge-* in Mongolian. *Tsukuba English Studies* 22. 35–49.

Johanson, Lars. 2000. Viewpoint operators in European languages. In Östen Dahl (ed.), *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*, 27–187. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Joriɡtu, Gu & Elesünceceg. 2000. *Mongɡul kelen-ü teyin ilɡal-un sudulul* [A study of case in Mongolian]. Kökeqota: Öbür mongɡul-un surɡan kümüjil-ün keblel-ün qoriy-a.

Kas'janenko, Zoja Kononovna. 1968 [2002]. *Sovremennyj mongol'skij jazyk* [Modern Mongolian language]. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo Universiteta.

Kittilä, Seppo & Fernando Zúñiga. 2010. Benefaction and malefaction from a cross-linguistic perspective. In Fernando Zúñiga & Seppo Kittilä (eds.), *Benefactives and malefactives*, 1–18. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Knyazev, Mikhail. 2016. Complementizers in Kalmyk. In Kasper Boye & Petar Kehayov (eds.), *Complementizer semantics in European languages*, 665–690. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kuteva, Tania. 1998. On identifying an evasive gram: Action narrowly averted. *Studies in Language* 22. 113–160.

Kuteva, Tania, Bernd Heine, Bo Hong, Haiping Long, Heiko Narrog & Seongha Rhee. 2019. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matsuoka, Yūta [松岡雄太]. 2008. *Mongorugo-no asupekuto-ni kan-suru kenkyū* [A study of aspect in Mongolian]. Fukuoka: Kyūshū University dissertation.

Matić, Dejan & Brigitte Pakendorf. 2013. Non-canonical SAY in Siberia: Areal and genealogical patterns. *Studies in Language* 37(2). 356–412.

Mönx-Amgalan, Yümžirijn & Šin Kan. 2014. *Orčin cagijn mongol xelnij büteever sudlal* [The morphology of modern Mongolian]. Ulaanbaatar: Soyombo Printing.

Narmandax, Tömör-Očirijn. 2004. *Mongol xelnij xöndlöngijn oruulbar ögüülbertej nijlmel ögüülber* [Complex sentences containing an inserted external clause]. Ulaanbaatar: Mongolian National University of Education dissertation.

Östling, Robert & Benjamin Brosig. 2011. Corpus of Khalkha Mongolian internet texts from the domain .mn. 34,642,000 words, text file.

Pürev-Očir, Bjambažavijn. 2001. Mongol xelnij xöndlöngijn oruulbar ögüülbertej nijlmel ögüülberijn deed ögüülberijn prjedikatiin üil ügijn tuxai [On the predicative verb of matrix clauses in complex quotative sentences]. Reprinted in Bjambažavijn Pürev-Očir (ed). 2007. *Mongol xelnij bütec, utga, üüreg, xereglee* [The structure, meaning, function and usage of Mongolian], 145–175. Ulaanbaatar.

Radetzky, Paula & Tomoko [Yamashita] Smith. 2010. An areal and cross-linguistic study of benefactive and malefactive constructions. In Fernando Zúñiga & Seppo Kittilä (eds.), *Benefactives and malefactives*, 97–120. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Ramstedt, Gustaf John & Halén Harry. 1974. *Nordmongolische Volksdichtung*, vol. 2. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Reesink, Ger. 1993. "Inner speech" in Papuan languages. *Language and Linguistics in Melanesia* 24. 217–225.

Rice, Sally & Kaori Kabata. 2007. Crosslinguistic grammaticalization patterns of the allative. *Linguistic Typology* 11. 451–514.

Sasse, Hans-Jürgen. 2002. Recent activity in the theory of aspect. *Linguistic Typology* 6. 199–271.

Schmidtke-Bode, Karsten. 2009. *A typology of purpose clauses*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Schmidtke-Bode, Karsten. 2010. The role of benefactives and related notions in the typology of purpose clauses. In Fernando Zúñiga & Seppo Kittilä (eds.), *Benefactives and malefactives*, 121–146. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Skribnik, Elena. 1987. Burjatskie polipredikativnye konstrukcii s pokazatelem *geže* [Buryat polypredicative constructions with the marker *geže*]. In Majja I. Čeremisina (ed.), *Pokazateli svjazi v složnom predloženii (na materiale jazykov raznyx sistem)* [Connective devices in complex sentences (in materials from languages with different systems)], 32–50. Novosibirsk: Nauka.

Song, Jae-mog. 1997. *Tense, aspect and modality in Khalkha Mongolian*. London: SOAS dissertation.

Song, Jae-mog. 2002. Grammaticalization of the verb *ge-* 'to say' in Khalkha Mongolian. *Ōsaka keizai hōka daigaku sōgō kagaku kenkyūsho nenpō* 3. 29–38.

Spronck, Stef & Tatiana Nikitina. 2019. Reported speech forms a dedicated syntactic domain. *Linguistic Typology* 23(1). 119–159.

Street, John. 1957. *The language of the Secret history of the Mongols*. New Haven: American Oriental Society.

Street, John. 2013. *On quotation in Middle Mongolian: The verb ke(m)e- 'to say'*. Bloomington, IN: Mongolia Society.

Svantesson, Jan-Olof, Tsendina Anna, Anastasia Karlsson & Vivan Franzén. 2005. *The phonology of Mongolian*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ulanova, Alevtina Erdni-Gorjaevna. 1980. K probleme funkcij glagola gex v sovremennom mongolskom jazyke [On the problem of functions of the verb 'gex' in Modern Mongolian]. In Majja I. Čeremisina (ed.), *Analitičeskie sredstva svjazi v polipredikativnyx konstrukcijax* [Analytical connectives in polypredicative construction], 91–102. Novosibirsk: Siberian branch of AS USSR, Institute of history, philology and philosophy.

Umetani, Hiroyuki [梅谷博之]. 2008. *Mongorugo no shiekisetsuji -UUL to ukemisetsuji -GD no imi to kōbun* [Meaning and syntax of the Mongolian causative suffix -uul- and passive suffix -gd-]. Tokyo: Tokyo University dissertation.

Yamakoshi, Yasuhiro. 2016. Predicative non-past participles in The secret history of the Mongols. *Altai Hakpo* 26. 85–101.

Yuu, Ke ceng [Yáo, Kèchéng]. 2007. Mongɣul kelen-ü "gekü" gedeg üge-yin tuqai ögülekü ni [On the word *gekü* in Mongolian]. *Dumdadu ulus-un mongɣul sudulul* 2007(4). 41–44.

Zoljargal, Baasanjav [Zolžargal, Baasanžavyn] & Benjamin Brosig. 2012. *Corpus of unscripted Khalkha Mongolisaraan TV data*. 9 hours, video/audio and text files.

Zoljargal, Baasanjav [Zolžargal, Baasanžavyn] & Benjamin Brosig. 2017. *Corpus of spoken Khalkha Mongolian*. 9 hours, audio and textgrid files.

Zúñiga, Fernando. 2014. Benefaction proper and surrogation. *Studies in Language* 38(3). 543–565.