SOME REMARKS ON THE LANGUAGE OF THE SECRET HISTORY OF THE MONGOLS WITH REFERENCE TO THE DEVERBAL SUFFIXES -MÜSER, -MSAR

Masaru Hashimoto /Japan/

We find the words санамсаргүй "unexpectedly, sudden(ly)", ухамсаргүй "irresponsible(ly)", тоомсоргүй "inattentive(ly), indifferent(ly)" in Modern Mongolian. In so-called Written Mongolian the corresponding forms are also known: i.e., uqamsar ügei "without understanding," sanamsar ügei" without thinking or realizing "toγamsar ügei "without esteeming or realizing".

The suffix -msar -mser is found to have a function of deverbal nouns: i.e., Suffix -msar -mser with the negative ügei forms nouns designating qualities. (q.v. Poppe, Grammar of Written Mongolian, p. 48.)
sanamsar ügei "thoughtless" < sana- "to think"
uqamsar ügei "unintelligent" < uqa- "to understand"

The suffix -msar may be connected with a deverbal noun-forming suffix -ser (/-*sar). The function of -ser is to form nouns designating lack or absence of something. eg.,keüser "sterile (women) < keü "son", "without child". But it seems to me that the -ser is unproductive.

From the Altaic linguistic point of view, -ser /-*sar may be etymologically related with the privative suffixes -siz /-sïz, -suz/ -süz, -saz/ -säz common in Turkic languages.

In this connection it should be remarked that the forms with -msar very often occur with a negative ügei "no, not, absence" in Modern and Written Mongolian.

Here we must refer to the passages concerned in the Secret History We can find three examples with -msar and -müser there. In addition, an example with -msar is found in Hua-i I-yü of 1389.

(1) Hö'elün-üjin ügülerün, aqa minu Čiledü kei ö'ede kegüli-iyen keyisümser ke'er qajar-a ke'eli-ben ölösümüser büliyi. (S.H. 56)

(2) Boroqul noyan gürčü qurban haran yeke čerig-ece urida yabura odču üde jilda uqamsar berke hoi-dur horum-iyar yabuqun bolun-- (S.H. 240).

(3) Qorim gürün üdü'üye, uqamsar ada edüjü,-- (Hua-i I-yü. 19) It is evident from the Chinese translation "不當令" (he did not have his hair blow in the wind) 'keyisümüser', "不當飢" (he did not have his stomach hunger) ' ölösümüser' and "不覺" (without perceiving)" uqamsar" that the suffix -müser or-msar has a negative (or privative) meaning. The translator into Chinese in the Ming dynasty translated -müser by bu xeŋ '不當' "negative with past time reference" and -msar by bu '不' "regular negative", but in fact, no distinction would be found between the two suffixes in meaning. The form uqamsar has the corresponding ухамсар "consciousness" in shape in Modern Mongolian. As for the keyisümüser or ölösümüser, however, we could not find the corresponding form anywhere in Written and Modern Mongolian.

Lubsan Danzan, the author of "Altan Tobči (Nova)" substituted the following phrases for these ones. i.e.,

(4) Üjin eke yeke dayun-bar uyilaju ügülerün: aqa Čiledü:
kei ögede
kegül-iyen keyisügseger
keger yajar-a
kegeli-ben ölösügseger bülüge. (56)

(5) Boroγul noyan kürčü γurban aran yeke čerig-ün ǰurida yabura odču üde jilda uqamsar berke oi-dur orum-iyar yabuqun bolun-- (240)

In Altan Tobči, the form uqamsar remained unchanged, but the rare forms keyisümüser and ölösümüser in the Secret History were replaced by the converbum abtemporale keyisügseger and ölösügseger. It appears to me that Lubsan Danzan failed to grasp the original negative meaning that the -müser had contained since ever. In addition, I think that such a negative meaning attested in these forms would have already become unknown to Mongolian people in I7-th century. Though the uqamsar remained unchanged in Altan Tobči, it is highly problematic whether it should have had a negative meaning or not there.

Dr.Ts. Damdinsuren translated the passages concerned into Modern Mongolian as the following. i. e., Үүнд өэлүн

Үжин үгүүлрүүн: "Миний эр Чилэгү,

Сэрүүн салхинд
Сэвлэг үсээ хийсгэж
Хээр хөндөө
Гэлсээ өлсгөж яахин зовох болов

As for uqamsar, he omitted it in his translations (in old script and new script) published in I947 and I957. i.e.,

Борохул ноён, тэнд очоод гурван
Хүнийг дагуулан их цэргийн тэргүүн үлэш
орой бэрх ойн потор нарийн харгуйгаар явж
байтал...

However, in a new edition ойлгохоо appears instead of uqamsar. i.e.,

Борохул ноён тэнд очоод
гурван хүнийг дагуулан их цэргийн тэргүүн
үл оройг ойлгохоо бэрх ойн потор нарийн
харгуйгаар явж байтал...

...(Damdinsuren, Gaadamba, I976) Thus a negative meaning is not attached there either. As remarked above, the Hua-i I-yü proved that -msar had still preserved the negative (privative) meaninglin I4-th century in spite of being unproductive. Judging from that, it is assumed to be after I4-th century that -msar

had lost the privative meaning.

Moreover the suffix -müser or -msar may be analyzed into the smaller elements -m + -sar (-ser). If so, what does it mean then? We may have the following possible interpretations on the morphemic element -m. As you know, the suffix -m or -ma forms deverbal nouns. e.g., toqum "saddle cloth" < toqu- "tosaddle", nayadum "game, play" < nayad- "to play", γayiqama "wonderful, astonishing" < γayiqa- "to be astonished". (Poppe, Grammar of Written Mongolian, pp. 47,48.)

If interpreted differently, the -m or -ma may be related with the negative suffix -ma -mä- very common in Turkic since ever. As for the -ma- -mä- (negative), it is used as a deverbal verb suffix. The privative -s^{o}z is a denominal noun suffix, however in Turkic. Therefore, there is no possibility that the -s^{o}z can immediately follow the -ma-/-mä- (negative) synchronically. Considering this word-formation in Turkic, there is little possibility that the formant -m of -msar in Mongolian could have been a deverbal verb forming negative suffix in origin. In addition, we find deverbal noun forming suffixes -m and -ma/-mä also in Turkic. e.g.,
talïm "Raub" (talï- rauben").
kädim "Kleidung" (käd- "anziehen").
yämä "Reiter" (yäl- "reiten"). (-ma/-mä: rare suffix) (A.von Gabain; ATG, 3.Auflage, p.72.)

As for the -sar/-ser in Mongolian, we can find its probable related form -sĕr (privative) in Chuvash that corresponds to the -siz in Turkic. Moreover, it should be remarked that the compound suffixes -msiz and -maq-siz are found in Ancient Turkic (-maq: deverbal noun forming suffix).

In this connection, a suffix -msir may be found in toomsir (тооМШир), toomsirgüi : variant forms or toomsor "attention", toomsorgüi "inattentive(ly)" in Modern Khalkha Mongolian.

It may safely be assumed from above that the -msar/-m(ü)ser in the Secret Hitory and Hua-i i-yü is composed of the noun forming suffix -m and the privative -sar/-ser, Moreover, we will be able to reconstruct the priva-

tive componnd suffix -*m-sVr (V:vowel- i, a/e) as Proto-Altaic form in comparison with the Chuvash-Turkic ones.

As for the reason why the form in -msar/ -m(ü)ser is of rare occurrence in Middle Mongolian, I will conclude that as a negative ügei with the almost same function as -sar/ -ser became more common than the latter, the -sar/-ser gradually came to be of less occurrence.

References

J.Benzing, "Das Tschuwaschische", Handbuch der Orientalistik I. Abt.,V.Band,I.Abschnitt, Leiden Köln, I963.

Ts. Damdinsuren, Mongol-un Nigucha Tobchiyan, Ulan-Bator, I947.

Монголын Нууц Товчоо, Улаанбаатар,I957.

Ц.Дамдинсүрэн,Ш.Гаадамба,Монголын Нууц Товчоо, УБ, I976.

A. von Gabain, Alttürkische Grammatik, 3. Auflage, Wiesbaden, I974.

E. Haenisch, Manghol un Niuca Tobca'an (Yüan-Cha'o Pi-Shi), Teil I, Wieesbaden, I962. Sino-Mongolische Dokumente vom Ende des I4. jahrhunderts, Berlin, I952.

M.A.K. Halliday, The Language of the Chinese "Secret History of the Mongols, Oxford, I959.

В.Котвич, Исследование по Алтайским языкам. Москва. I962.

L.Ligeti, Histoire Secrete des Mongols. Texte en Écriture Ouigoure Incorporé dans la Chronique Altan Tobči de Blo-Bzan Bstan-'jin. Budapest, I974.

R.A.Miller, japanese and the Other Altaic Languages, Chicago London. I97I. Nihongo to Arutaishogo, (japanese revised version of the same book), Tokyo, I98I.

A.Mostaert, F.W.Cleaves, Altan Tobči, A Brief History of the Mongols by blo. bzan bsTan. 'jin. Cambridge, Massachusetts. I952.

N.Poppe, Grammar of Written Mongolian, second printing, Wiesbaden, I964.

O.Pritsak, Das Alttürkische, Handbuch der Orientalistik --I. Abt., V. Band, I.Abschnitt, Leiden Köln, I963.

G.J.Ramstedt, Uber die Konjugation des Khalkha-Mongolischen, (Neudruck der Ausgabe