

## Mongolic clausal complementation and information source (oral/poster)

There are two major clause complementation types in the Mongolic languages: a non-finite complement (one of about ten participles/action nouns with a case marker) and a finite one with an introducing complementizer (Buryat *geže* / Kalmyk *giž* / Khalkha *gež*, an imperfective converb of an auxiliary quotation verb *ge-/gi-*). The third type, with governed postpositions such as e.g. Khalkha *tuxai* ‘about’, comprises only a few constructions.

We argue that the first two types distinguish meanings related to the information source. Our analysis based on a text corpus and fieldwork material shows that not every predicate taking a clausal complement can take both these types. In this paper we will show the distribution of complement types with verbs of different semantic domains.

The *geže/giž* complementizer (< ‘saying’) is grammaticalized on the base of a direct speech construction with verbs of speaking as main predicates. Due to grammaticalization its scope is also expanded to verbs of cognition, emotion and even perception.

With verbs of cognition, the *ge-/gi-*complement indicates that the speaker’s knowledge is indirect (the result of complex logical operations, common knowledge etc.); some verbs – like Kalmyk *sana-* ‘think’ – only allow the *ge-/gi-*complement. With verbs of emotion it signals that the stimulus is not an actual event, but a mental construct (cf. “emotions caused and emotions projected”, Bolinger 1984), such that it is mostly used with verbs like ‘hope’ and ‘fear’ e.g. Buryat *ai-* ‘fear’:

- (1) *Buuda-xa-ny*                      *geže*    *ai-ba*                      *gü?*  
shoot-FUT-3sg                      CMPL fear-PST                      Q  
‘(She) was afraid that (he) will shoot?’

Typical for verbs of perception are non-finite complements in the accusative, constructions with the *geže/giž* complementizer being quite seldom; the distinction here is between immediate perception and “mental perception” (Verhoeven 2007:293). With verbs of hearing it is auditory vs. hearsay, e.g. Kalmyk *soys-* ‘hear, listen’:

- (2) *Zal-d*                      *bää-sn*                      *uls*    *Kugultinov*                      *šülg-üd-än*  
auditorium-DAT                      be-PP                      people K.                      poem-PL-REFL  
*umš-s-ig*                      *soys-v*  
read-PP-ACC                      hear-PST  
‘The people sitting in the auditorium listened to Kugultinov reading his poems.’
- (3) *Xalx*                      *Moŋhl-yn*                      *političesk*                      *boln*    *olna*                      *üüldäč-nr*                      *dund*  
Khalkha                      Mongolia-GEN                      political                      and                      social                      leader-PL                      among  
*dörvd jas-ta*                      *uls*    *oln*                      *bilä*    *giž*                      *soys-la-v*  
Dörbet bone-COM                      people many                      PTCL                      CMPL hear-PST.EVID-1sg  
‘I heard that there were many Dörbet people among Khalkha-Mongolian political and social leaders’.

With Kalmyk verbs of seeing only non-finite complements with the accusative (immediate perception) are grammatical; in Buryat also finite complement clauses with *geže* are possible, signalling interpreted information (obtained e.g. through inference); Buryat *xara-* ‘look, see’:

- (1) *Butid*    *Tagar-ai*                      *myaxa*    *sabša-x-iye-ny*                      *xara-na*  
B.                      T.-GEN                      meat    chop-PTCP-ACC-3sg                      look-PRS:3sg  
‘Butid watches how Tagar chops meat.’
- (2) *yamar*    *xemžee*                      *ab-aa-b*                      *geže*    *xara-ža*                      *üze-xe*  
what    measure                      take-PST-PTCL                      CMPL look-CVB                      see-PTCP  
*xeregtei-l*  
necessary-PTCL  
‘It is necessary to take a look at what measures are taken’.

Therefore, the opposition of the two complementation types with mental and psychic verbs in Mongolic can be seen as an opposition between a firsthand and a non-firsthand information source in dependent clauses (“evidentiality strategy”, Aikhenvald - Dixon 2003:18).