The Interrogative Particle in Early Middle Mongolian

JOHN C. STREET MADISON, WISCONSIN

1. Introduction. During the 13th and 14th centuries the Mongolian language used a single enclitic particle to form yes/no questions. The shape *-UU* is used below to represent various shapes of this particle found in the different writing systems then employed for Mongolian.

The particle was not required in questions of a second sort: those formed by an interrogative word such as Secret History (hereafter **SH**) *ken* 'who?', *ker* 'how?', or *yeki-* 'do what?', etc.. For the few cases where such a word does occurs in the same sentence as the interrogative particle, see §7.4 below.

Most if not all later varieties of Mongolian do have an interrogative particle cognate with Middle Mongolian *-UU*. But usage during the 13th and 14th centuries was quite different from that in later varieties of the language, both spoken and written, so is worthy of separate investigation.

There seem to be just 139 instances of *-UU* in the primary texts of early Middle Mongolian: those included in the first three volumes of Louis Ligeti's series *Monumenta linguae mongolicae collecta*.[1] In addition, the *Twelve deeds of Buddha* and *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* — two works of early Middle Mongolian that have come down to us only in 17th-century copies — supply a further forty-seven occurrences. (Being translations from Tibetan, such texts are not always free of influence from Tibetan syntax.) Table 1 shows how many times the particle occurs in different sources, and the nature of the immediately preceding elements. The texts involved are the following; any text in Ligeti's volumes that is not specifically named here seems to contain no occurrence of the interrogative particle. The Secret History (**SH**: 115 occurrences),[2] the Hua-i i-yü (**HI**: 2);[3] documents written in the 'Phags-pa script (**Phgs**: 10);[4] Sino-Mongolian inscriptions (**SMI**: 6),[5] Letter of 1290 from Aryun to Pope Nicholas IV (**Let**: 2),[6] Hsiao-ching (**HC**: 3),[7] a tax exemption included in Ligeti's "Documents from Turkestan" (**DocT**: 1);[8] Twelve deeds of Buddha (**TDB**: 24),[9] and Subhāṣitaratnanidhi (**SRN**: 23).[10]

Text: / Number of occurences:	SH 115	HI 2	Phgs 10	SMI 6	Let 2	HC 3	Doc T 1	TOTAL 139	TDB 24	SRN 23
Prior element:										
(1) Noun	3							3	5	
(2) Adjectival element										
Negative adjective (*busu, ügei*)	4	1		1		2		8	1	
Other adjective	6							6		
Noun + *-tu/-tü*	1							1		
(3) Adverbial element										
Negative adverb *ülü*	23		9	3	2		1	38	7	14
Negative adverb *ese*	21		1					22	1	3
Noun plus case-form	3							3		
Other adverb	7							7	1	
(4) Verb form										
Finite verb	7			1		1		9	6	
-ju/-jü converb	3							3		
Nomen futuri	37	1		1				39	3	6

Table 1: Occurrences of the interrogative particle in early Middle Mongolian documents

The formal shapes and functions of these various occurrences are discussed separately below. In transcriptions of the Secret History and Hua-i i-yü here, the intervocalic apostrophes of de Rachewiltz and Ligeti are omitted; their syllable-final *i u t k* are replaced by *y w d g*. Transliteration and transcription of 'Phags-pa script follow the conventions of Ligeti 1972b. The haček usually used over *c* and *j* in romanization of Script Mongolian is here generally omitted as redundant. In citing passages from all three writing systems, proper names and sentence-initial words are capitalized, and inter-word morpheme divisions are marked before inflectional endings, both nominal and verbal. (But the copula *bu-y/bu-i/bu-i̯* is normally written without a hyphen, as are *y*-final plurals of indicative endings such as *-bay/-bey*.) In addition, a plural suffix is separated from its base by a raised dot (·).

2. Form. The basic form of the interrogative particle in spoken Middle Mongolian must have been a long high-rounded vowel, /ū/ or /ū/, suffixed respectively to front- or back-harmonic words. In the vertical Mongol script these were generally represented by the letter-sequences <ku> or <qu>. The initial letters here prove that the particle was vowel harmonic (with either front or back vowels). That those letters represented hiatus (romanized as *g*/γ) rather than actual velar stops in this particle is proved by 'Phags-pa forms which Ligeti transliterates as <"ü-lu-·u>, <ˈe-sä-·u> and transcribes as *ülü'ü, ése'ü*. Ligeti's raised-dot symbol and apostrophe in such forms romanize the special 'Phags-pa letter which "in the Yüan epoch, ...in intervocalic position served to indicate a hiatus between two adjacent vowels [the second of them long] belonging to two separate syllables" (Poppe 1957:23). The length of the vowel in our particle was apparently primary rather than secondary, i.e. inherited from Proto-Mongolian rather than itself the product of contraction of two separate vowels.

In addition to these basic forms, however, our texts show a number of alternative writings for the particle, as discussed below.

2.1 Forms in Script Mongolian. Table 2 shows all the shapes assumed by the interrogative particle in our texts written in the Mongol script. The extreme paucity of examples, especially from our primary texts, leaves us uncertain as to the distribution of some forms. We find, for example, no passages at all with the particle occurring after a consonant other than *y* or (in the SRN) *n*.

From the Table we see that our most reliable texts almost always write the particle as part of the prior word; only after the 14th century

did it become common practice to write the particle as a separate entity.

The use of doubled vowel letters in some of the shapes in Table 2 was apparently intended as a graphic representation of vowel length. Such writings are, of course, common at a later time: witness *degüü* 'younger brother', *ilegüü* 'much', *buu* 'gun', *cooqur* 'motley, spotted', etc.. But this spelling convention was available at an earlier time as well: our primary texts show *buu* 'don't!', *doora* 'below', *qoor* 'harm' and a few other such forms. For the interrogative particle, the double-vowel writing had the advantage of preventing misinterpretation of <ku> as the emphatic particle *kü* (SH *gü*), which, written as a separate word, was not vowel-harmonic. As in various later Script forms, the double-vowel writing created what was in effect a morphological spelling (like English *byte* vs. *bite* and *bight*), uniquely identifying one specific morpheme.

It should be noted that all the *g-* and *γ*-initial shapes of Table 2 occur after a vowel; these and the other single-vowel shapes leave the length unmarked.

Text: / **Occurrences:**	SMI **6**	Let **2**	HC **3**	DocT **1**	TOTAL **12**	TDB **24**	SRN **23**
-gü / -γu	6	2	1	1	10	9	18
#gü / #γu						3	2
-ü / -u						1	2
-yü (or *-ü*)						1	
-yuγu (or *- uγu*)			1		1		
#üü / #uu						10	
#ügü			1		1		
-i							1

Table 2: Shapes of the interrogative particle in early Script Mongolian
(A hyphen indicates that the particle is connected to the prior word; # that a space separates the two)

Other shapes on the Table are somewhat more problematic. The unique shape *-i* found in SRN *qarasquni* (see below) turns up also in the Secret History; see examples #82 and #88 below. Whether this was a reduction — perhaps a dialect form — of *ū̄/ū,* or an historically separate suffix, is unknown. Two possible *y*-initial forms of the particle occur in HC *uqamuyu[γ]u* and TDB *sedkimüyü*; for these see §2.31 below. The *-uγu* of the former word, and the *#ügü* occurring in that same text's *ügei ügü* must simply represent the long vowel, though such writings for our particle are unique in early Script documents.

* * *

The actually occurring words that include interrogative particles are the following, with hyphens representing morpheme divisions within a graphic word: *cida-qu-γu* 'would be able?' and *busu-γu* 'not?' (SMI 1335.21, 40);[11] *bu-yu-γu* 'do exist?'[12] (SMI 1338.13); and *ülü-gü* 'not?' (SMI 1335.39; SMI 1338.20, 23; Let 1290.26, 32). Twice we find *üle-gü* (HC 33b1, DocT 16) with a doublet of *ülü* known from the Muqakaddimat al-Adab (Cleaves in HJAS 17:107-08, citing Mostaert). There is also the form cited above from the Hsiao-ching: *ügei ügü* '[was there] not?' (HC 16b1; de Rachewiltz 1982:33). That text also has a lacuna that is to be filled as *uqamuyu[γ]u [ci]* 'do you understand?',[13] representing either *uqa-mu-yuγu* or *uqa-muy-uγu* (HC 1b4; see §2.31 and example #7 below).

Forms in the Subhāṣitaratnanidhi are *bol-qu-γu* 'may arise?' (220), *ala-yu-γu* 'would kill?' (420), and *gicki-kü-gü* 'would step?' (377), in addition to *ülü-gü* (26, 56d, 67, 89, 189, 220, 264, 312, 351, 367, 389, 417), *ülü gü* (179, 379), and *ese-gü* (56b, 243, 338). Also *a-qu·n-u* (167; example #88 below), *qural-qu·n-u* (342), and *qaras-qu·n-i* (360).

The Twelve Deeds of Buddha provides the following forms: *bol-umu uu* 'is?' (8r26), *törö üü* '[is the] rule?' (8v1); *tedüi üü* 'thus?' and *ire-kü üü* 'will come?' (both 28r25); *esrua uu* 'Brahmā?', *qurmusta uu* 'Indra?', *vayisiravani uu* 'Vaiśravana?', and *tngri üü* 'a god?' (32r25-32v2); *cida-qu uu* 'would be able?' (27r16; cf. the *cida-qu-γu* above), *a-qu uu* 'will be?' (56v26). All of these are written with a space before the interrogative particle, as is one instance of *ülü gü* (60r19), one of *ese gü* (58v5-6), and one odd *bu-yu gü* (34r18). The remainder have no such space: *üüled-be-ü* 'have you performed?' (62v25), *sedki-mü-yü* or *sedki-müy-ü* 'do you think?' (20v11; see §2.31 below); *bu-yu-γu* 'exists?' (7r22, 37r27), *busu-γu* 'not?' (40r6), and *ülü-gü* 'not?' (30r12, 30r20, 40v6, 42r3, 55r11, 65r5). (In two further cases, Poppe 1967 takes the <ku> of <üluku> to represent the emphatic particle *kü*

[20v11, 62v25], despite the fact that this is not written as a separate entity, as one might expect.)

2.2 Forms in 'Phags-pa script. The nine instances of *ülü'ü* noted in Table 1 are found in Ligeti 1972b:23, 37, 42, 47, 53, 66, 71[bis], 82; the *èse'ü*, in Ligeti 1972b:101.

2.3 Forms in Chinese syllabic transcription. The Secret History and Hua-i i-yü together show 117 instances of the interrogative particle. Table 3 shows how these are written after different consonants and consonant-vowel sequences at the end of the immediately preceding morpheme. The second column shows (a) the Chinese character or characters that are used to write a particular collocation of prior-element plus interrogative particle: the romanizations with superscript numbers refer to the Chinese characters of Hattori 1973.40-44. There follow (b) a transliteration of these characters, and (c) a transcription of the sequence, in italics. The third column shows the number of instances of each particular collocation; the last two give examples with back- and front-harmony, with reference to specific lines in the SH or HI.[14] Note that this table does not mark any vowel length, but romanizes words as they actually appear in the text.

The Table has three exceptional forms labelled "exceptional". The *g* of *ese-gü* (see example #43) is clearly an erroneous writing for the expected *ese-ü*, which actually occurs twenty times in the SH; it was a carry-over from the hypothetical Mongol script version of the SH which 14th-century transcribers used to produce the version known to us today.[15] The forms *olon-ta-wu* '[too] many times' and *cöen-te-wü* '[too] few times' (see #37) are both written with the characters *tau+u*^{1}. The suffix here is the well-known one forming multiplicative numerals (SH *niken-te* 'once', *qurban-ta* 'three times', etc.), here occurring after morphemes meaning 'many' and 'few'. The *w* here simply reflects a fleeting transitional sound between the two vowels, normally written only within a morpheme. Cf. one SH occurrence of *mauy-la-* vs. three of *mawuy-la-* 'be displeased, angry', and many further instances of *-w-* in *mawuy* 'bad' and related forms. This *w* was certainly non-phonemic, and could well be omitted in romanization.[16]

A few forms are rather more problematic. At first sight the shape *Jociyuu* (in "residual instances", top row) might be taken as having *-yuu* after the *-i* of *Joci*, a man's name. But this turns out to be a representation of *Joci-yu-u* (or just possibly an abbreviated form of **Joci-yi-uu*) with the accusative ending intervening between the name and the particle; see example #9 below. The form *köndeledüyü* in SH

Prior element	Prior element plus interrogative particle	Occurrences	Examples	
-(C)a or *-(C)u*;	(C)V+u^{1} = u = *u/ü*	SH 3/5, 22/26 HI 1/0	*man-a-u* 5439, *uqa-ba-u* 1354; *ab-qu-u* 2335, *bu-yu-u* 2452 (see endnote 26)	*ese-ü* 6232 etc., *ükü-be-ü* 2020, 2029; *büg-cü-ü* 2499, *ülü-ü* 6275 etc.
-(C)e or *-(C)ü*	(C)V+u^{1}+u^{1} = uu = *üü*	SH 0/1		*ile-üü* 6354
	Exceptional (see §2.3)	SH 1/2	*olon-ta-wu* 1465	*ese-gü* 7249, *cöen-te-wü* 1466
-b	bu^{2}+u^{1} = uu = *uu/üü*	SH 2/2	*tab-uu* 5431, 5466	*jöb-üü* 5430, 5466
	bi^{1} = bi = *bi*	SH 1/1	*tab-i* Z305	*jöb-i* Z305
-t	tu^{2} = tu = *du*	SH 3/0	*busu·t-u* (= *busu·d-u*) 3041, 3042, 3125	
-n	nu^{2} = u = *u*	SH 7/0	*a-qu·n-u* 2428	
	nu^{2}+u^{1} = uu = *üü*	SH 0/2		*mököri-ül-de-gü·n-üü* 5061, *niken-üü* Y337
-y	yiu^{1} = yu = *yu/yü* (see §2.31)	SH 25/5	*a-quy-u* 2155, *ajira-bay-u* 2498, *yada-quy-u* 5043	*ög-güy-ü* 5232, *üje-bey-ü* X297; *köndeledüy-ü*(?) 6218 (see §2.31)
	yu^{1}+u^{1} = yuu = *yuu/yüü*	SH 1/1 HI 1/0	*alda-quy-uu* Y318, *bol-quy-uu* HI 3:06a5	*üje-bey-üü* 7368
-q = /γ/	qu^{1}+u^{1} = quu = *quu*	SH 1/0	*caq-uu* Y044	
-r	ru^{3} = ru = *ru/rü*	SH 3/1	*ama-ar-u* 6224, *kilbar-u* X076-77	*kele-er-ü* 6227

Table 3: Collocations of morpheme-final elements plus interrogative particle in SH and HY

Residual instances:
Top row: *olja-u* 2338; *busu-u* SH 8295, HI 2:11b3; *Joci-yu-u* Y225; *juqa-ju-u* 6354; *berke-dü-ü* = *berke-tü-ü* 7164, *itege-jü-ü* 5407.
First *-n* row: *abura-qu·n-u* 2124, *bol-qu·n-u* 7267, *taala-qda-qu·n-u* 5446.
First *-y* row: *hiri[c]e-güy-ü* 6337, *ügüle-gde-güy-ü* Z196.

6218 (modifying *güün*) is unique,[17] and somewhat puzzling. If not an erroneous writing of some sort, it is the sole clear instance of a *y*-initial allomorph of our particle in the Secret History: *köndeledü-yü* (see §2.31 below). Further, one passage has two instances (example #82 below) of the shape *-i* for the interrogative particle found in SRN 360 (example #88), and also apparently in the Bodhicaryāvatāra (Bosson 1969:25).

Of the remaining 110 clear instances of the interrogative particle, eleven show a doubled vowel (six front *-üü*, five back *-uu*) while ninety-nine have simple *-ü/-u*. Careful investigation has thus far unearthed nothing in the graphic, phonological, or syntactic context that systematically correlates with the difference between the longer and shorter forms of the interrogative particle,[18] so we must apparently assume that they were equivalents.

In what follows here it is assumed that all of these two-vowel forms reflect similar two-vowel Script writings in the Urtext on which the Chinese editors based their transcription;[19] and that the simple one-vowel writings reflect the Script's one-vowel shapes *gü, gu, ü, u*. All would thus represent simply long /*ū*/ and /*ū*/ in the spoken language. In romanizing the SH and HI, Ligeti, de Rachewiltz, et al. distinguish two-vowel writings as *ü'ü/u'u*, simple one-vowel ones as *ū* and *ū*. That practice will be continued in what follows here, but with the apostrophe omitted, as always between vowels.

2.31 Problems with intervocalic *-y-*. Table 3 reflects one unstated assumption that requires discussion. Any or all of the thirty-three forms listed in the *-y* rows might theoretically have the morpheme division before that consonant rather than after it. That is how all these forms were treated in Ligeti 1971 and de Rachewiltz 1972.[20] But in thirty-two cases the morpheme prior to the interrogative particle is one otherwise known to have had alternants both with and without a final *-y*; unless there is independent evidence that the particle sometimes had *y*-initial allomorphs one would certainly assume the consonant was part of that prior element. In fact this is absolutely necessary in the case of three finite-verb forms, where we know that the shorter shapes *-ba/-be* (past tense) and *mu/mü* (non-past) are singular, while the *-y* forms *-bay/-bey* and *-muy/-müy* are plural. The morpheme division must be after the *y* in *üje-bey-ū* (SH X297) 'have [you two] seem [them]?' and *üje-bey-üü ta* (SH 7368) 'did you[pl.] see?', vs. the singular found, for example, in the /ükü-be-ü/ 'did [he] die?' of 2020, 2029. The *ajira-bay-ū* of SH 2498 likewise has an overt plural subject. A morpheme cut before the *y* in these three

forms would be simply wrong. It might be thought that the same argument proves that two problematic forms mentioned above should be cut before the *-y-*, as HC *uqa-mu-yu[γ]u* and SRN *sedki-mü-yu*; for each of these unquestionably has a singular subject, implied if not stated. But it turns out that the so-called plural alternants of the finite-verb endings are often used, in the SH and elsewhere, to show respect on the part of the speaker or writer for a single man or woman overtly specified, or implied, as subject of the clause. The SH, for example, shows dozens of instances where the plural alternant *-bay/-bey* is used in this fashion,[21] and we find similar use of the plural *-muy/-müy*. Now the SRN form with which we are concerned is addressed to the Bodhisattva, who is referred to as *ci* just a few lines earlier; the HC sentence is addressed by Confucius to one of his favorite disciples, Tseng-Tzu. Hence we may assume morpheme cuts *uqa-muy-u[γ]u* and *sedki-müy-u*, with respect-plural forms of the finite ending.

The situation is less clear in twenty-nine of the thirty-three SH instances, where our particle occurs after a singular nomen futuri; for in such cases there is no principled way of deciding how to interpret such forms. The short nomen futuri is *-kü/-qu* in the Script, the longer one *-küy/-quy*; the SH and HI have additionally a seemingly random *-k~-g* alternation in both. Unfortunately the semantic/syntactic distinction between the shorter and longer forms is unclear in most syntactic positions,[22] so context is of no help in deciding between the two. A form such as *aquyu* (*a-* plus nomen futuri plus *-UU*), could always be interpreted as either *a-qu-yu* or *a-quy-u*. In SH line 2155, Pelliot's edition uses the latter transcription (without the macron, as always) in the text proper, but mentions the former with a question mark in a footnote (Pelliot 1949:17); two lines later he reverses these, although the context is identical! Thereafter, for both front- and back-harmony forms he seems to prefer sometimes one form, sometimes the other (always mentioning the other option in a footnote) — thus seemingly attempting to introduce a distinction not overtly represented in our text. What his basis may have been for individual decisions of this sort we do not know.

Without some theory as to the syntactic or semantic difference between pairs such as *a-qu-yu* and *a-quy-u*, anyone who prepares an index or edition of the Secret History must, in effect, cut the Gordian knot by rather arbitrarily choosing one solution or the other. De Rachewiltz, in his 1972 index, wrote all such forms, front and back, as the shorter nomen futuri plus the *y*-initial interrogative particle; so also did Ligeti in his edition of the text. Kuribayashi 2001, on the other hand, always shows the morpheme division after the *y* in both

front and back forms. It is this second solution that is represented in Table 3 and the sections below — tentatively preferred simply because the assumption of existence, at this stage of the language, of *y*-initial allomorphs of the interrogative particle rests solely on one unique form, apparently *köndeledü-yü*, in line 6218 of the Secret History.

Of course such *y*-initial forms became more common in later stages of Script Mongolian, and are found in many if not all modern varieties of the language. But I would suggest that such forms originated, through false analogy, sometime after the Secret History was first written down, and were not present in Proto-Mongolian. One may hope that further research will eventually shed more light on this whole matter.

3. Function: neutral position and local emphasis. In languages like contemporary Japanese and Khalkha Mongolian the location of an interrogative particle within a sentence is generally predictable: these occur at or very near the end of a sentence, real or potential. This is by no means the case in Middle Mongolian, where *-UU* is much freer in its occurrence. On the one hand, the particle may occur at or near the end of the predicate of the main clause in what may be called **neutral position**: there it simply queries the truth value of the entire sentence. On the other, the particle may be located at some point earlier in the sentence, having in effect been moved back for what may be called **local emphasis** on some sentence element that is the primary focus of the question. This is somewhat like the difference between a simple English question such as *Will you be home by three o'clock today?* (when this is merely a request for information), as opposed to *Will you be home by three o'clock today?* (perhaps implying *or is that the time you expect to leave the office?*), or *Will you be home by three o'clock today?* (implying perhaps *or is it tomorrow you'll get home early?*).

The presentation below distinguishes three syntactic types of yes/no questions, each with a slightly different neutral position for the interrogative particle.

(a) Non-negative sentences with a full-verb predicate (§4);
(b) Non-negative copular and truncated sentences (§5);
(c) Negative sentences (§6).

The term **full verb** here is used to mean any verb other than the copular forms *buy* or *bü-lee* when either is used in its predicative sense, after a nominal or adjectival predicate.[23] Neutral position for (a) is after the last word of the predicate; for (b) it is after the predicate complement and before a copula, if any. For (c) it is immediately before the last verb of the sentence, and attached to one of the negative adverbs *ese* or *ülü*.

Aside from a few rhetorical questions that are posed by the author of the work containing them (e.g. SMI 1335.39 bis, SRN passim), all yes/no questions in our texts come from directly quoted sentences embedded within other sentences. In citing examples of this sort below I omit the quotation marks which in more extensive citation of the passage would be placed around the entire quoted sequence, along with any earlier portion of the quoted sequence that is of no immediate relevance; and also omit any introductory converb and concluding verb that formally mark the fact of quotation. Capitalization is added, and a certain amount of punctuation. Most examples come from the Secret History, and before parenthetical 4-digit line numbers the abbreviation **SH** is generally omitted.

Each of the specific statements below is given the fullest possible exemplification from the relatively small body of yes/no questions provided by our sources. At a few points I have constructed what I believe to be a potential Middle Mongolian word or sentence in order to illustrate some point or other; such hypothetical items are marked with an asterisk.

A slash (/) in examples marks the start of a poetic line. In citing passages with local emphasis, the special symbol ♦ marks neutral position for that sentence, while underlining shows the *-UU* and the element seemingly emphasized.

4. Non-negative sentences with a full-verb predicate. In yes/no questions ending with a full verb in which there is no special emphasis on some particular word or phrase within the sentence, and no instance of *ese* or *ülü* 'not' in the main clause, the interrogative particle is attached to the last word of the predicate: a verb with one of the indicative endings. Of the seven examples of this pattern cited below, the first two here are simple requests for information, the others rhetorical.

(1) *Temüjin ger-tür bu-yu-ū?* 'Is Temüjin at [his] tent? (2452). Here both Temüjin and the tent have been mentioned earlier: the question is a straightforward one. Note that the *bu-yu* here (and just below) is used in its existential rather than predicative sense. There is a somewhat similar question in TDB 7r22.

(2) *Jigüntei-yin köbegü·d inu bu-yu-γu?* 'Does Jigüntey have [any] sons?' (SMI 1338.13; lit. 'Are there sons of him of Jigüntey'). Similarly TDB 34r18, 37r27 (#86).

(3) *Üje-bey-ū̄?* 'Did [you] see [them]?' (addressed to two people; X297).

(4) *Tede qurban Merki·d maqad geyi·d-tür-iyen ajira-bay-ū?* 'Have those three Merkid gone home perhaps?' (2498). See #11 below for a following 'or' question.

When a pronoun subject of the main verb occurs after the predicate, that pronoun follows the interrogative particle, which remains attached to the main verb.

(5) *Üje-bey-üü ta?* 'Did you(pl.) see [him]?' (7368).

(6) *Tede qurban haran-i uqa-ba-ū ci?* 'Did you(sg.) get a good look at those three men' (1354; in translating, Cleaves uses 'observe' here, de Rachewiltz 'notice').

(7) *[Degere-ece] dorodu·s-tur kür-tele cimaliqai ügei-yi uqa-muy-u[γ]u [ci]?* 'Do you know that...there was no animosity from [those who were] above to those who were below?' (HC 1b3-4; tr. de Rachewiltz 1982:41. See endnote 13 above for the filled lacuna of the Yüan-period block print; §2.31 for the respect plural.) For a question with *bol-umu uu* see #23 below.

Our texts supply no instance of the above pattern with verbs having indicative endings other than past *-bA* and non-pasts *-(U)mU* and *-(U)yU*, so there is no telling whether the interrogative particle could occur after other endings such as past-tense *-(U)lAA* and *-JUU*, or whether perhaps neutral position would have before rather than after such verb forms. There are unanswered questions for several other rather crucial syntactic sequences as well.

4.1 Local emphasis in a non-negative full-verb predicate. If the interrogative particle is placed somewhere before the main verb rather than after, it emphasizes the element to which it is attached. This can be any of the following.

A subject:

(8) *Teŋgeri qajar-un jayaan caq. Yeke oro yeüd-ge-küy caq-uu gür-be♦?* De Rachewiltz (2004:176) translates: '[This is] the destiny and [favourable] time [decreed] by Heaven and Earth. Could it be that the time has come when the great throne will pass [to a new ruler]?' (Y043-44; cf. *Moŋqol-un caq jayaan buy je.* in 7298). Here the *-UU* has, in effect, been moved forward from **gür-be-ū̄* to a position after the subject of that verb. More literally: 'Is [it] indeed the time to change the great throne that has come?'.

A direct object:

(9) *Joci-yi kelele kee-rün, Joci-yu-ū tüši-n ügüle-müy♦?* 'When [you] say that Joci should speak, do you mean it's Joci [you] appoint [as your successor]?' (Y224-25). The two Chinese characters (Hattori's *yu^{l}+u^{l}*) after the second *Joci* surely represent the accusative ending — probably in the allomorph *-yu-* (Street 1957:29-30) — plus the interrogative particle.

A converb, sometimes one in the second sentence of a paratactic 'or' sequence:

(10) *Aman in-u ecige köü kee-jü a-mu; aburi in-u öere bu-yu. Itege-jü-ū̄ a-muy♦ ta?* 'His mouth is saying [that we're like] father and son; but his behavior is certainly [*-yu*] different. Do you [still] really trust [him]?' (5406-07).

(11) *Tede qurban Merki·d maqad geyi·d-tür-iyen ajira-bay-ū? Büg-cü-ū̄ a-muy♦?* 'Have those three Merkid gone home perhaps? Or are they in fact lying in ambush?' (2498; cf. #4 above). Similarly the second question in #13 below.

Some other adverbial element:

(12) *'Südü-er ama-ar ol-ulca-ju büšire-ye' ese-ü kee-ldü-leey? Edöe qan ecige min-u, südü-er ama-ar-ū̄ ol-ulca-ju qaqaca-ba♦ ci?* 'Didn't [we] agree that [if someone tried to sow discord between us] we would believe [each other] by settling [matters] face to face [lit. 'by tooth and mouth']? Qan my father, was it through face-to-face agreement that you have left [me]?' (6222-24; the first sentence here properly belongs in §6.11 below.) In lines 6225-27 nearly identical sentences have *ama-ar kele-er* 'by mouth [and] by tongue' and *ama-ar kele-er-ū̄* in place of *südü-er ama-ar-ū̄*.

(13) *Ta qoyar nama tebci-jü 'Ile-üü gē-sü' kee-leey♦ ta? 'Juqa-ju-ū gē-sü' kee-leey♦ ta.*[24] (6353-55). De Rachewiltz (2004:101, 645) translates: 'When you rejected me, you two, did you say that you would leave me, [breaking with me] openly, or did you say that you would leave me after you had consulted [only] among yourselves?'. More literally '...did you say "We will leave openly?" or did you say "We will leave agreeing [just between ourselves]?".' The second sentence here is similar to #11 in emphasizing the converb in a paratactic sequence.

A third example of this sort will be discussed in §7.2, but may be mentioned here:

(14) *Jamuqa yabu-daq kele-tü bü-lee. Jöb-üü tab-uu ügüle-n bu-yu♦?* 'Jamuqa has a glib tongue. Is he right in what he says?

Is he correct?' (5430-31; tr. de Rachewiltz 2004:85, 603-4; more literally, 'Is he speaking rightly, correctly?'.) Note that the *bu-yu* here acts as an auxiliary verb; see endnote 23. The double interrogative sequence here occurs also in adjectival function; see §5.4 and #81 below.

One passage has local emphasis on two elements functioning as adjectival modifiers.

(15) *Qan ecige min-u /qaljir-quy-ū güün-e /qadqu-qda-ba♦ ci? /Köndeledü-yū güün-e /köki-ül-de-be♦ ci?* 'My father the Qan, /Have you been stung /By someone standing at the side? /Have you been stirred up /By someone coming between us?' (6217-19; morpheme division perhaps *Köndeledüy-ū*). Tr. de Rachewiltz 2004:96, who adds (ibid. 638) 'coming between us' is literally "'staying in the way (= crosswise)' i.e. obstructing the path (between us)".

An entire quoted sentence may have local emphasis.

(16) *Ambaqay qahan-i ükü-be-ū ci kee-jü Höelün-e gür-tele eyin kee-gde-küy bol-bi♦?* 'Is it because you say [to yourself] that Ambaqay Qahan is dead that we are spoken to in this fashion even by Höelün?' (2028-29; This is literally: 'Is it [by] you[r] saying "Ambaqay Qahan is dead" that it has come to the point that [we are] to be spoken to in this fashion even by Höelün?'). Similarly the preceding sentence (2020-22), which is syntactically more complex.

What is interesting about this last sort of local emphasis is that properly the interrogative, while questioning the truth value of the entire sentence, should really be emphasizing the quoted sentence plus the verb *kee-* and its subject. That is, (9) in effect combines two sentences, a statement and a question: **Höelün-e gür-tele eyin kee-gde-küy bol-bi.* 'It has come to the point where [we] are spoken to thus even by Höelün', and something like **'Ambaqay qahan ükü-be' ci kee-mü-ū?* 'Do you [Höelün] say [to yourself] "Ambaqay qaan has died"?'. Here Middle Mongolian combines these by using indirect discourse, which here involves both adding the accusative ending to the subject of the embedded sentence and appending the interrogative particle to the last word of that sentence. See #38 below for a much simpler instance of this pattern.

4.2 Summary. Given the examples above, it seems clear that while the interrogative particle can, for local emphasis, be placed on virtually any component of the base sentence, neutral position for *-UU* in this type of interrogative sentence is at the end of the predicate, after the main verb. This is the same position that can be occupied by the affirmative particle *je* 'surely'. In our limited corpus this *je* never occurs in a yes/no question formed with *-UU*, which is scarcely unexpected inasmuch as the two are, in a sense, at opposite ends of the certainty scale.

5. Non-negative copular and truncated sentences. By **copular sentence** is here meant simply a sentence whose predicate consists of a nominal or adjectival element plus the past-tense copula *bü-lee* or non-past *buy*.

The term **truncated sentence** refers to a sentence in which the copula *buy* has been omitted. Such omission was apparently possible in any sentence whose predicate consisted of a nominal or adjectival element of any length plus final *buy*. Similar omission is found in modern Khalkha,[25] and probably in most other varieties of contemporary Mongolian. For early Middle Mongolian such truncation is exemplified by the following pairs of sentences.

Qoyar jalau·s buy. '[You] are two youths [= young men].' (2353-54). Cf. *Eme jalauy.* '[My] wife is young.' (7101; *jalauy* is a feminine *-y* form; see Street 1990:373).

(17) *Ayi torluq qan, joki-quy-ū buy?* 'Oh foolish qan, is [that] proper? (7136). Cf. *Yaun joki-quy?* 'How is [that] proper?' (7100).

Tus qan-iyan tebci-n yada-qsan sedkil tan-u jöb buy. 'Your thought that you could not do away with your rightful lord is correct.' (5077-78; tr. de Rachewiltz 2004:72-73). Cf. *Sere-küy ber tan-u jöb.* 'You're right to be suspicious' (1128; lit. 'Your doubting is correct').

Ci yaun güün buy? (5256) 'Which clan do you belong to?' (lit. 'what sort [of] person are you?'). Cf. *Yaun güün ci?* (1093, 2449), which has the same meaning, being a truncation of a theoretical **Yaun güün buy ci?*.

/Seüder-ece busu nökör ügey /seül-ece busu cicua ügey buy bida. 'We have /no companion other than [our] shadow[s], /no whip but a tail.' (2083-84). Cf. *Busu·d-i tan-u kereg ügey.* '[We have] no need of you others.' (2140).

Note that a terminal *je* (SH 4456) or postposed subject pronoun do not prevent truncation:

(18) *Teŋgeri-de maqa taala-qda-qu·n-ū bida?* '[If we did that] who knows whether we would be favored by Heaven?' (5446; lit. 'Would we perhaps be loved by Heaven?').

It seems clear that truncation was a sign of normal, relaxed speech; it is extremely common in the Secret History's frequent direct quotation of speech, but rare in formal documents such as inscriptions and edicts. When truncation does appear in such documents, it is used for stylistic reasons. In the following passage from SMI 1362.36-37, for example, four instances of truncation avoid frequent repetition of the copula: *bui* is retained only in the concluding sentence. (The symbol ∅ here marks points where *bui* has been omitted. The translation is based on that in Cleaves 1949:89; his romanization is here slightly modified.)

Ima-daca jirγuγan köbegü·d törö-gsen a-juγu. Yekemed inu Bolodbuq-a ∅. Ded inu ǰungšu šing-un bingǰang Oron ∅. Γutuγar inu Buyan ∅. Dötüger inu Bayan Suu ǰiu-yin tungǰi bol-uγsan a-juγu. Tabtuγar inu Tuγluγ edüged-tür Isin-a cölge-yin sunggon ∅. Jirγuduγar inu Derbiš čümui ön-ü sem ön bui. 'Six sons were born of her. His eldest [son is] Bolod Buqa. His second [is] Oron, *p'ing-chang* of the *chung-shu-shêng*. His third [is] Buyan. His fourth, Bayan, became *t'ung-chih* of Ju-chou. His fifth, Tuγluγ, [is] now *tsung-kuan* of the Isina circuit. His sixth [son] Derbish is *ch'ien-yüan* of the *ch'u-mi-yüan*.'

For a rather similar sequence, see TDB 32r24-v1 (partially cited as #24 below).

Truncation is particularly common after a nomen futuri. For example, the truncated question *Kedüy-i ab-qu?* 'How many will [you] take?' (2335), and its truncated answer *Bi ülü ab-qu.* 'I won't take [them].' (2340), may be compared with a full form having the past copula: *...ab-qu-ū bü-lee* 'Would [I] have been [able] to take [them]....? (#19). It is such truncation that makes it appear as though endings *-qu(y)* and *-kü(y)* can function as indicative endings at sentence-end.

5.1 Neutral position. If copular and truncated sentences worked like those in §4 above, we would expect neutral position to involve placement of the *-UU* immediately after *buy* or *bü-lee*. But this is never the case.[26] Of the ten non-negative copular yes/no questions in our texts, nine — involving no special emphasis — show the interrogative particle immediately before the copula rather than after it. (The tenth, which has the particle earlier in the sentence, involves a special problem for which see #81 and §7.2 below.) As for similar truncated questions, there are thirty-nine in the Secret History, perhaps a dozen in other sources. Of the thirty-nine, all but four have the interrogative particle at the end of the predicate: it could well have immediately preceeded the copula before that was deleted. The remaining four have the particle located earlier in the sentence — and all clearly involve local emphasis, as shown in §5.4 below.

Thus it is certain that neutral position for copular and truncated sentences is after the predicate complement, nominal or adjectival, and before the copula if there is one. This is by no means surprising, since the complement is the focus of information in such sentences. As in full-verb sentences, a subject pronoun may be postposed, so that it follows the copula (if there is one) or the predicate complement plus *-UU* (if there isn't).

5.2 Examples of copular sentences with *-UU* in neutral position. Here are all the non-negative copular questions from our texts, other than #17 and #81.

(19) *Nökör bi cima-daca aŋgi-da ede mori·d-iyan ab-qu-ū bü-lee?* 'Friend, would I have been [able] to [re]capture these horses without you?' (2334-35).

(20) *'Ükü-ül-sü' kē-esü ükü-ül-ün yada-quy-ū bü-lee bi?* 'If I['d] intended to kill [him], would I have been unable to do so?' (5042-43).

(21) *Min-u beye saki-ju qono-qu kilbar-ū buy? Ger tergen yeke auruq newü-küy-tür sau-quy-tur asara-quy kilbar-ū buy?* 'Is it easy to spend the night guarding my person? Is it easy to take care of the tent-cart[s] when the main base camp is in motion or sitting [still in one place]?' (X076-77).

(22) *...kē-esü bilik-tü toyin busu-ū buy.* 'considering that...., is [he] not a wise monk?' (HI 2:11b3; lit. 'is [he] other-than a wise monk?'. This is an extremely lengthy sentence, its many subordinate clauses of no syntactic relevance to the final one.) TDB 40r6 has a syntactically similar predicate.

(23) *Egün-ü uruγ-un udum-dur eyin bol-umu uu; ese bü-gesü γajar usun-u törö üü bui?* 'Is this so [only] in the lineage of his relatives, or is it [so in] the rules of [this] area? (TDB 8r25-v1; tr. Poppe 1967:116, with footnote that 'area' is lit. 'land [and] water'). The first sentence here exemplifies §4.

(24) *...ene ken bol-bai? .... Adagavati-yin ejen Vayisiravani uu? Ariγui-daki aγlaγ-taki tngri üü bui?* 'Who is this...? .... Is this the lord of Aṭakāvatī, Vaiśravana? Or is this a god who dwells in a pure region, in hermitage?' (TDB 32r24-v2; tr. Poppe 1967:134).

5.3 Examples of truncated sentences with *-UU* in neutral position. The most common pattern has the predicate complement ending with a nomen futuri, and sometimes followed by a subject pronoun.

(25) *Noyan minu, Olocin küregen-i ene ada tülegen-ece abura-n tonil-γa-γul-un cida-qu-γu?* 'Would I be able to save and rescue from this danger the imperial son-in-law, Olochin, my prince?' (SMI 1335.21; tr. Cleaves 1950:97, 117 fn. 112). Similarly SH 7105, TDB 27r16.

(26) *Jöb a-quy-ū?* 'Are [they] right?' (Z496).

(27) *Teŋgeri idqa-n a-quy-ū?* 'Is Heaven warning us?' (2154-55, 2157).

(28) *Soyurqa-asu aulja-ul-uasu bol-quy-ū?* 'If [you] favor [them] and allow [them] to present [themselves], will it [not] do?' (Y457-58; here, as often, a *not* added in the English translation makes it clear that a rhetorical question implies an affirmative answer). Similar syntax is found in SH 5442, 7243, 7270, Z340, Z486, Z495.

(29) *Köün-ece-en qaqaca-quy-ū? Törö-dece qaqaca-ba. Hiri[c]e-güy-ū̄? Üyile-dece hirice-bey bi.* 'Abandon [my] own son? [In doing that, I] abandoned the norm. Part [from him]? [In doing that, I] parted from [my] duty.' (6336-38; see de Rachewiltz 643. The first verb is literally 'separate from'.)

(30) *Egeci-yen ire-esü jayila-ju ög-güy-ū̄ ci?* 'If your elder sister comes [here], will you yield [your place] to her?' (5231-32).

(31) *Jalqamšiq-ta·n Tayici·ud ayis-un aqu·n-ū?* 'Are the frightful Tayichiud approaching?' (2427-28). Similarly SH 7113 (with postposed *tede*), 7252.

Further instances involving a nomen futuri are SH 5061 (*...mököri-ülde-gü·n-üü bida* 'would we [not] be beheaded...?'), 5446 (#18), 6162-64 (#80), 7267 (*...berke bol-qu·n-ū* 'will it [not] be difficult...?'), Y318, Z196 (*ügüle-gde-güy-ū̄ bi*), Z218 = Z225, Z346; HI 3:06a5 (*jobolang bol-quy-uu*); TDB 56v21-26 (*...sayin aqu uu*). See also several examples in §7.4 below.

Other types of predicate are also attested in truncated sentences, but there is not even one example of a nominal element in predicative position; perhaps truncation was not possible in such a case.

(32) *Jirqoduar deü busu-ū ci?* 'Are you not [my] sixth younger brother?' (8295; lit. 'Are you other [than, as it were,] a sixth younger brother [to me]?').

(33) *Moŋqol je andaqar-ta·n busu·d-ū?* 'Don't [we] Mongols take "yes" as an oath?' (3124-25; lit. 'Are [we] Mongols [people] other [than] having yes [as] an oath?'). Similarly SH 3041-42 (bis, with postposed *bida*).

(34) *Ying šui-yin ebüge inu J̌ung ken ügüle-gsen üge metü, ed-i könggele-n aγali aburi-yi degejile-kü üge inu, olan-a üliger bol-γa-γda-qui busu-γu?* 'Words such as those which J̌ung ken (Chung-hsien), the grandfather of Ying šui (Ying-jui), spoke — words about despising wealth and exalting character — are they not to be made an example for the multitude?' (SMI 1335.39-40; tr. Cleaves 1950:101).

(35) *Boγda sayi·d-un aγali aburi anu, taqimtaγu bol-qui-aca degere basa neme-gde-kü anu ügei ügü?* 'Was there not something in the virtue of the sages that surpassed filial piety?' (HC 16a6-b1; tr. de Rachewiltz 1982:45, fn. 179; see Mostaert 1953:102).

5.4 Examples of non-negative copular or truncated sentences with local emphasis. There is only one instance (#81 below) of a copular sentence of this type; it has the *-UU* emphasizing an adjectival element. But this is exceptional on other grounds: see §7.2. The three examples below involve truncated questions, the first two with local emphasis on an adverbial element.

(36) *Qurcaqus Buyiruq qan ecige-yin cin-u joba-n edüy quri-ya-ju a-qsan ulus-i cin-u, man-a-ū mede-ül-gü♦? Ken-e ber yeki-n mede-ül-gü?* 'Is he going to let us rule your people that your father Qurchaqus Buyiruq Qan laboriously gathered in such [numbers]? How is he going to allow anyone to rule [them]?' (5437-39).

(37) *Olonta-wū quyu-ul-ju ög-besü deejile-gde-gü♦? Cöente-wū̄ quyu-ul-ju ög-besü doromjila-qda-qu♦?* 'If it was [only after] making [you] ask [for her] many times that [I] gave [you my daughter in marriage], would [you] respect [me] more? If [after only a] few times, would [you] think less of [me]?' (1465-67; lit. 'would [I] be thought more/less of?'). Alternatively it might be the daughter rather than the speaker who is implied subject of the two nomina futuri (de Rachewiltz 2004:335).

There is, finally, one instance of local emphasis on a one-word sentence; cf. #16 above.

(38) *Bi sayin nökör-i cima-yi muŋtani-ju ayis-u kee-n 'Sayin nökör-e tusa bol-su' kee-n nököce-jü ire-be bi. 'Olja-ū' kee-jü ab-qu♦ bi?* 'Because you, a good friend approached [me] and was in trouble, I came along as your companion, saying I

would be [of] help to a good friend. Would I [now] take [the horses] as booty?' (2336-38; lit. 'Is it [by] saying [to myself]) "[It's] booty" that I would take [the horses]?'.

6. Negative sentences. As Table 1 shows, our sources contain a large number of yes/no questions — nearly all of them rhetorical — in which the main verb is negated by one of the adverbs *ese* or *ülü*, both 'not'.[27]

When occurring without an interrogative particle, either of these negatives is normally positioned immediately before the verb which it modifies and is intended to negate: typically this is the last verb of a sentence (*Bi ülü ab-qu.* 'I won't take [them]', Y159), or a converb that ends a subordinate clause (*uruq-a ülü toa-n* 'not counting [him] as one of the family', 1151-52), or a past participle or nomen futuri occurring within a subordinate clause (*güün-e ese ög-te-gsen bö-esü* 'if [she] hasn't already been given to a husband', 1043-44; *üge·s-tür-iyen ülü gür-gü-yin tula* 'because of [their] not keeping their word', Y305-07).

6.1 Neutral position in negative yes/no questions. In the earliest and most reliable of our sources all but one of the sixty-one yes/no questions containing *ese* and *ülü* in the main clause[28] have the interrogative particle attached to the negative adverb; neutral position for the resultant two-morpheme sequence is immediately before the last verb of the sentence. Thus:

(39) *Bi nidöni cima-da ese-ǖ ügüle-lee?* 'Didn't I speak to you earlier?' (3016-17; for *nidoni*, see de Rachewiltz 2004:408).

(40) *Köü·d-ün min-u aqa Joci ülü-ǖ buy?* 'Isn't Joci the eldest of my sons?' (Y285).

(41) *Üi̯led-ü'esü ülü-'ü ayu-qu mu̯n?* 'If [he] does [such things], should he not fear [punishment]?' (Phgs 1289 Edict, Ligeti 1972b:37).

Our secondary texts generally follow this same pattern, with two exceptions, the first of which may perhaps hold true also for earlier texts. This involves sequences of an *n*-converb plus a form of *bü-* 'be': in none of our sources is this sequence ever interrupted by *ese-ǖ* or *ülü-ǖ*. Rather — most obviously in twelve instances in the Subhāṣitaratnanidhi — the negative-plus-interrogative element regularly appears before the converb in such questions, with no obvious local emphasis.[29] The sole Secret History instance (just below, and in §6.23) could well be interpreted as local emphasis, but since contrasting neutral instances are lacking we cannot be certain.

(42) */Niγur-iyan jasa-n arci-suγai keme-besü /urida toli-yi ülü gü arci-n bui?* 'If one wishes to wipe and arrange one's face, does one not first wipe the mirror?' (SRN 379; similarly in stanzas 26, 67, 89, 179, 189, 264, 312, 351, 367, 389, 417).

(43) *Moŋqol-i cöeken ese-ǖ*[30] *kee-n bü-leey?* 'Weren't we saying that the Mongols were few [in number]?' (7248-49; or with local emphasis, as in §6.23 below, 'Didn't we keep saying...', or 'didn't we indeed say...').

The second exception involves a historical change in the position of the interrogative particle in negative questions. In the Secret History, when that particle and *ese* or *ülü* apply to the same verb they nearly always formed a single phonological word. In later centuries there was a change in question formation that eventually restricted the reflex of *-UU* to position at the end of the predicate, thus forcing separation of the negative and interrogative morphemes, and generally destroying the contrast between neutral position and local emphasis. This is seen most clearly in a few passages where the Altan Tobci, compiled in the mid-17th century, directly reflects a passage from the Secret History. Consider the following comparisons.

(39*)[31] SH 3016-17: *Bi nidöni cima-da ese-ǖ ügüle-lee?* 'Didn't I speak to you earlier?

AT 793-4: *Bi urida cima-dur ese kü ögüle-lügei üü?* 'Didn't I speak to you earlier?'

and:

(44) SH 4419-20: *Bari-qda-asu nama-yi eyimü-yi ülü-ǖ jia-qu bü-lee ci?* 'If [you'd been] captured, would you really not have revealed that I [was in] such [condition]?'

AT 1365-66: *Bari-γda-basu namayi-yi eyimüi-yi üle-kü jaγa-qu bö-lügei üü ci?*

In these two cases (Vietze 1992:18, 31) and other passages as well,[32] an interrogative particle with doubled vowel, written separately, was added after the final verb. This forced reinterpretation of the original interrogative particle after *ülü* or *ese* as the emphatic particle *-kü*; what had been local emphasis on the negative was thus maintained. A different reinterpretation of *ülü* + *-UU* was also possible (Poppe 1967:90), as the word that had initial *h* in the Secret History (*hüleü*; SH 8207, etc.) came to be written in the Script variously *ülegüü/ülügü/ilegüü/ilegü/ilügü* 'much, superfluous; excess'. In fact 17th-century glosses in the Altan Tobci interpret <üluku> at least once as *ülemji* (AT 2851) and once as *ilegü* (AT 2854).

The purpose of this historical digression is to offer a possible explanation of three yes/no question in the Twelve Deeds of Buddha,

the text of which, though composed in the 14th century, is known to us only from a manuscript dating from the 17th century.

(45) *Tegün-e qurica-qui üiles-i ese-kü üiled-be-ü ta?* 'Have you not indeed performed before him [your] actions of seduction?' (TDB 62v24-25).

(46) *Eden-i ederi-n örösiye-n ülü-kü sedki-müy-ü yaγun?* 'Why do you not think with compassion and pity of them' (TDB 20v10-12; tr. Poppe 1967:124).

(47) *Tedüi-üü ülü ire-kü üü?* 'Then he will not come [back again]?' (TDB 28r25; see §7.3).

Given the facts from texts which more reliably represent the facts of spoken Middle Mongolian, it seems likely that all three of these sentences were alterations of original yes/no questions with the interrogative particle before rather than after the main verb. It might additionally be noted here that the terminal *yaγun* of #46 may indicate some influence of Tibetan syntax on this rightward shift of the interrogative particle; see §7.4 below.

* * *

The following three subsections exemplify neutral position in different types of negative yes/no questions. In each case the *ese-ū* or *ülü-ū* is located directly before the last verb.

6.11 Examples in negative yes/no questions with full-verb predicate. There are twenty-two instances of this pattern in our texts, sixteen of them with *ese*.

(48) *'Eke-ben deü·ner-iyen eri-n od' ese-ū kele-lüe bi?* 'Didn't I say [to you] "Go find your mother and younger brothers"?' (2231; similarly 3022; with reciprocal *kee-ldü-leey* 3124, 6223 [#12], 6226; with *ügüle-* 3016-17 [#39], *ügüle-ldü-* 6220-21).

(49) *Ci 'Moŋqol-un hünir mawuy' kee-jü ese-ū bü-lee?* 'Weren't you [earlier] saying "The Mongols smell bad"?' (7442-43).

(50) *Tere metü nököe gürdün cin-u bi ese-ū a-juu?* 'Wasn't I your other wheel like that?' (6234-35; referring to a two-wheeled cart, which needs both wheels to function). Similarly 6232.

(51) */Ücügüken tataγal-i daγa-n oro-ju /yeke nur-a bol-uγsan-i ese-gü üje-be?* 'Have you not seen [water] run down a ditch and become a great gully?' (SRN 338; similarly SRN 243).

(52) *...edöe 'Tan-u-a·n sayi üje-sü' kee-n sedki-jü ese-ū a-muy?* 'And [even] now, does [she] not wish to see the happiness of you, her [sons]?' (Y270-71; tr. de Rachewiltz 2004:186; lit. '...is [she] not thinking, saying [to herself] "I will see [to] the good of you my [son]s".').

(53) *Od-uasu olon aduun an-u joqsa-ju ülü-ū qocor-uujay?* 'If [we] go [after them], won't their many herds stop [to rest] and stay behind?' (7165-66; similarly 7166-67, 7168)

Further instances may be found in SH 3496, 8222, X040, Y249, Y250-51, and possibly 8070 (before *bari-ujiyi*).

6.12 Examples in negative yes/no questions with copular predicate. There are fourteen instances of this pattern in out texts, only two of them with *ese*.

(54) *...noyan-u kü sayin inu ese-gü bui?* '...is it not [to the] good of the ruler, too? (SRN 56b; the last three words are also in a 'Phags-pa fragment of this text, Ligeti 1972b:105).

(55) *Ciŋgis qahan ecige-yin bidan-u jarliq-tur buy. 'Olon ayu-ul-i; gün ükü-ül-i' kee-gü ese-ū bü-lee?* '[It] was in a statement of our father Chinggis Qaan: wasn't he [accustomed] to say "Multitude[s of people] make [one] afraid; deep [waters] make [one] die".' (Z348-50; see de Rachewiltz 2004:208, 1018).

(56) *Edeger üge·s keme-besü, tüg tümen od-tur kür-tele düri dürsü bol-γu üge·s ülü-gü bui?* 'As for these words, are they not words which will become an example and model up to many myriad of years?' (SMI 1335.39, tr. Cleaves 1950:101).

(57) *Teyin ber bü-gesü, tngri-lüge nigen-e qamuγ yirtincü-de-ki·n-ü üliger ger-e inu, ci kü ülü gü bui?* 'If that is so, are you yourself not truly the testimony and example for all who live in the world, including the gods?' (TDB 60r16-19, tr. Poppe 1967:157, with *yourself* and *truly* added to represent the particles *kü* and *gü* respectively).

(58) *Γaγca mǫngke tngri-dür jalbari-basu jųg-iger sedki-jü a-basu, silam-dur ora-γsan metü ülü-gü bei?* '[But] if only one prays to eternal Heaven, and thinks as is proper, is it not as though he had converted to Christianity?' (Let 1290.29-32).[33]

(59) *...ötögü boγo·d-un uraγ-aca ülegü ülü-gü bui?* '...is it not more than [that which has been done for] the descendants of the elders and the slaves?" (SMI 1338.23; tr. Cleaves 1951:70, with two lengthy footnotes). Note here the *ülegü* (= SH *hüleü*).

Further instances may be found in SH 6275 (*...yosun tere ülü-ū buy*), 6521-22, Y285 (#40); TDB 30r12, 30r20 (see §6.22), 40v6, 65r5 (*γayiqa-γda-qu ülü-gü bui*); SRN 56d (*üjesküleng-tü ülü-gü bui*).

6.13 Examples of negative yes/no questions with truncated predicate. There are eighteen clear instances with *ülü*, none with *ese*. It is notable that our texts show this pattern only with a nomen futuri; there are, for example, no instances of negative yes/no questions in verbless sentences where the predicate consists of a simple noun or adjective (cf. §5.3).

(60) *Tarbaqan bol-ju kimusu-ar-iyan malta-ju qajar-tur oro-asu, calir bol-ju coki-ju eri-jü ülü-ǖ güyice-gü ci?* 'If they turn into marmots and burrow into the ground with their claws, will you not become an iron rod and, digging and searching for them, catch up with them?' (8070-72; tr. de Rachewiltz 2004:127). Similarly 8073-75.

(61) *Teyin bö-esü, Negü·s aqa deü-yen ciul-qa-ju ci uruq-un uruq-a gür-tele mede-jü ülü-ǖ a-qu?* 'If so, will you not gather the Negüs brothers and rule them, to the offspring of [your] offspring?' (9224-26). Similarly 8480-81.

(62) *Ta qoyar urida bayi-qsa-ar, e·de bü-gü·n-i aqala-ju ülü-ǖ a-qu·n ta?* 'Since you two stood [by me] earlier, will you not be at the head of all these [here]?' (3491-92).

Additional instances like the above may be found in SH 9024-25, 9076-77, and Y174.

Lastly, there is a formulaic expression which occurs, with slight variations, no less than nine times in 'Phags-pa texts and once in the Mongol script.

(63) *...basa Čin Taw-miṅ ǰarliq-tu gē-ǰü yosu üge'ü·n üi̯le·s bu̯ üi̯led-tügei̯. Üi̯led-ü'esü ülü-'ü ayu-qu mu̯n?* '*Ch'en Tao Ming*, for his part, is not to commit unlawful deeds, saying that he has an edict. If he does, should he not fear [punishment]?' (Ligeti 1972b:53, 1314 Edict; tr. Poppe 1967:53).

(64) *Ėde basa senšiṅ·ud ǰarliq-tan kē-ǰü yosu üge'ü·n üi̯le·s üi̯led-ü'esü, mu̯d basa ülü-'ü ayu-qu·n?* 'Likewise if these Taoist monks commit unlawful deeds, saying they have an edict, should they not fear [punishment]?' (Ligeti 1972b:82, 1351 Edict).

Similar expressions may be found in Ligeti 1972b.23, 37 (#41), 42, 47, 66, with two such questions in a more divergent sequence in Ligeti 1972b.71. A further variant, in the Mongol script, is found in the 1369 tax exemption (DocT 16) romanized in Ligeti 1972a:217.

6.2 Local emphasis in negative yes/no questions. In some fourteen passages — half of them emotionally charged passages in the Secret History — the negative adverb plus interrogative particle occurs at least one word earlier than its neutral position. Most commonly it is before, rather than after, a nomen futuri that is followed by *bü-lee* or *buy*. In any case, the earlier position apparently emphasizes both the negation and the immediately following element. In the examples here the symbol ♦ marks neutral position for each negative-plus-interrogative element.

6.21 There are five instances of *ülü-ǖ* plus nomen futuri in copular sentences with *bü-lee*. The first is one of the few yes/no questions that actually receives an answer; part of the latter is here cited as the second of these examples.

(44*) *Nama-yi eyimü bol-ju gebte-n böe-tele, nicügün yeki-n güyi-jü oro-ba ci? Bari-qda-asu nama-yi eyimü-yi ülü-ǖ jia-qu ♦ bü-lee ci?* '[Chinggis Qaan spoke again:] "While I [was] lying [here], being [wounded] like this, why did you run naked into [the enemy camp]? If [you'd been] captured, would you really not have revealed that I [was in] such [condition]?".' (4417-20).

(65) *Nama-yi ünen bol-qa-ju, qubcasun na-da ög-[c]ü asara-qu bü-lee. Bi morin unu-ad üje-tele edüy jaura ülü-ǖ ire-gü ♦ bü-lee?* 'Treating me [as] sincere, [they] would have given me clothes and looked after me. [Then] when I'd jumped on a horse and [fled] as they looked on, [can you imagine that] in that brief moment [I] really wouldn't have come [back to you]?' (4425-28; cf. de Rachewiltz 2004:67, 531).

(66) *Cima-yi eyin jirüge yada-quy-i mede-gsen bö-esü, qadun ber güün bö-esü, eke-yi cin-u Gürbesü-yi abcira-ju, cerig ülü-ǖ jasa-ul-qu ♦ bü-lee?* 'If [we] had known that your heart would fail you like this, shouldn't we really have brought your mother Gürbesü [here] and — even though she is just a woman — let [her] actually command the army?' (7293-96).

(67) *Nama-yi güyi-jü güyice-jü, šibilger in-u bari-ju kituqay juqul-uqsan qar in-u tata-ju, kituqay ese alda-qsan bö-esü, Jetey Jelme qoyar-i gür-cü ire-tele köün-ü amin-tur qōr ülü-ǖ gür-ge-gü ♦ bü-lee?* 'And when I ran and caught up with him, seizing his plaits and pulling the hand that was drawing the knife, if the knife had not dropped, wouldn't he actually have done harm to the child's life before Jetei and Jelme arrived?' (9155-59; tr. de Rachewiltz 2004:147, with *actually* added).

One Sino-Mongolian inscription supplies a fifth instance of this pattern:

(68) *...šing tai-yin yeke üile qadaγala-γul-uγsan bü-gesü, ülü-gü bol-qu ♦ bü-lege?* '...if one had [but] caused [him] to supervise the great affairs of the *šing* (*shèng*) or the *tai* (*t'ai*), would [that] not have been truly a success?' (SMI 1338.20; tr. Cleaves 1951:70, with *truly* added).

In a footnote to this passage, Cleaves remarks (p. 93) that "The implication of this statement is that Jigüntei, had he had the opportunity, would have distinguished himself at a much higher level of official service". Inasmuch as this stele is a memorial to Jigüntei and his accomplishments, emphasis here is entirely appropriate.

6.22 Our sources show three instances of *ülü-ü* plus an adjective in a copular sentence with *buy*; the Hsiao-ching supplies an example with a uniquely different pattern before the copula.

(69) *Busu·d irgen mǫngke tngri-yi umarta-ju busi bol-γa-ju, qudal qulγai uile·s uiled-kü·n, ülü-gü [o]llan ♦ bui?* 'As for [those] other people [you mentioned], who forgetting Heaven eternal and disobeying it, carry out deeds of falsehood and theft, are they not indeed numerous?' (Let 1290.24-26; this is the Il-Khan Aryun's letter responding to the suggestion of Pope Nicholas IV that Aryun convert to Christianity).

(70) *Töre-gsen ere-de ükü-esü taki qor numun-lüe-ben yasun-lua niken-e kebte-esü, ülü-ū sayin ♦ buy?* 'Isn't it indeed right for any man born that when he dies he should lie with his quiver and bow alongside his bones?' (7160-61; tr. de Rachewiltz 2004:113, with *indeed* added).

(71) */Od-cu doroita-n a-tala mun da ese /od-basu, ülü-gü sayin ♦ bui?* '/Is it not really better, however, not to go, /instead of going and suffering defeat?' (TDB 55r9-11; tr. Poppe 1967:152, with *really* added).

This last may be contrasted with a somewhat similar neutral passage in TDB 30r18-20: *.../degedü qutuγ-i bütü-ge-küi-e / tere inu degedü ülü-gü bui?* '/Will it not be best /for the completion of the supreme stage of sanctity /[if...]?'; tr. Poppe 1967:132. See also #54 above.

(72) *...mün tendeken-e üle-gü uqa-ju a-n ♦ bui?* '[If he reveres his ancestors with utmost sincerity and respectful thoughts,] precisely then do the spirits of the ancestors not truly perceive (= manifest themselves)?' (HC 33b1, with *ule* for *ülü*; tr. de Rachewiltz 1982:50, with *truly* added).

6.23 There are five Secret History passages with *ese-ü* occurring earlier than in neutral position. The first includes two instances of this pattern; the last three examples have full verbs rather than merely the copula *buy*.

(73) *Keli 'qan ecige' kee-gü bü-lee? 'Kiduaci ebügen' ese-ū kee-gü ♦ bü-lee? Nama keli 'anda' kee-n bü-lee? 'Toqtoa böe sartaqcin qonin-u seül jübci-jü yabu-yu' ese-ū kee-gü ♦ bü-lee?* (6416-20). De Rachewiltz (2004:103, 652-53) in effect added '[rather]' to translate the local emphasis here: 'When did he [ever] say "[our] father the Qan"? Didn't he [rather] say "the old murderer"? When did he [ever] call me "sworn friend"? Didn't he [rather] say [that I am like] "Toqto'a the shaman wearing the tail of a Sartag sheep"?'. (Compare this with *kee-gü ese-ū bü-lee* in #55 above.)

(43*) *Moŋqol-i cöeken ese-ū kee-n ♦ bü-leey? Hodun-aca olon qal-ta·n buy.* 'Didn't we keep saying that the Mongols [were] few [in number]? They have [camp] fires more numerous than the stars!' (7248-49; but note the remarks on this passage in §6.1).

(74) *Ginji-ben mültül-de-jü edöe — ese-ū buqsa-ju ♦ a-qsa·d? — bayis-cu teyin šilemelje-n ayis-ay te·de.* (7342-43). De Rachewiltz 2004:119 takes the words *ese-ū buqsa-ju aqsa·d* as an interpolated clause (the participle echoing a prior *günesüle-d te·de*) applying to *ginji-ben*: 'Loosed from their chains — which had surely restrained them! — they are now full of joy and are approaching thus, slavering [at the mouth].' In effect his 'surely' translates the local emphasis here. More literally the interpolation would be 'have [they] not indeed restrained [them]?'.

In two passages we find *ese-ū*, in sentences with a full verb, moved further forward in the sentence.

(75) *Edöe ese-ū bayas-cu teyin duyal-un ♦ ayis-ay te·de?* 'Do they not rejoice now as they draw near, bounding thus in joy?' (7356-57; tr. de Rachewiltz 2004:120). More literally this is: 'Is it not now [with] rejoicing [that] they come bounding in joy?'; or perhaps even — to emphasize the *ese*, which probably implies that the joy preceded the event itself — 'Is it not now in joyful anticipation that...'. (Neutral position is unclear here; see §6.1.)

The second such passage shows a fine combination of alliteration, syntactic parallelism, and phonological repetition in a vituperative passage directed at Tayang Qan. (It is notable that of the twenty words, fifteen are front-harmonic. On the basis of statistics for the SH as a whole, one might expect only nine or ten.)

(76) *Kündü eme-yin šie-küy qajar-a*
ese qar-uqsan
gürdün-ü tuqul-un belcier-tür[34]
ese gür-ügsen
eme Tayaŋ jirüge yada-run
ese-ū̄ e·de üge·s ügüle-jü ♦ ilē-jüüy. (7280-2)

Clearly the third *ese* here was moved forward as far as possible in the last clause for poetic emphasis, without specifically emphasizing the immediately following word. De Rachewiltz (2004:117, 700-701) translates: '[That] woman Tayang, /Who [dares] not walk further than /A pregnant woman [goes] to urinate; /Who does not [even] venture so far as /A wheel[-tied] calf [reaches] for its feed, has lost heart and has sent me that message, hasn't he?'

6.3 Exceptional cases.

6.31 Separation of *ese* and *-UU*. As was mentioned in §6.1 above, 60 of the 61 passages in which the interrogative particle co-occurs in a main clause with *ese* or *ülü* have the particle attached to that negative adverb. The single exception, below, has *ülü* positioned where we would expect *ülü-ü* to occur with local emphasis, but the particle has been moved to a point still earlier in the sentence, and clearly reflects local emphasis of the element that precedes it.

(77) *...min-u uruq-tur niken-üü sayin ülü töre-gü ♦ a-juu?* '...was there not [destined] to be born among my descendants [even] one [son and potential heir] who is good?' (Y336-37).

We cannot now know to what extent this was a general and viable pattern at this early stage of the language.

6.32 Two 'or not' questions. There is an interesting use of *ülü-ū̄* in SH Y059-60:

(78) *Ene eye-tür man-u oro-qu ülü-ū̄-yi ker ♦ mede-gde-gü?* 'Who knows whether they will [or will] not agree to our proposal?' (tr. de Rachewiltz 2004:176). This is more literally 'How [is it] to be known that "[they are going] to enter into this agreement of ours [or] not?"'.

Clearly a second *oro-qu* is understood after the *ülü-ū̄* here, and before the *-yi*.[35] Consider also this similar example from SRN 220:

(79) *Jun-u bulaγ ebesün-ü γal /egülen-ü jaγura-ki naran tergel saran /oyun bilig maγu·n-luγa amara-ldu-qui /mede-ge ügei, kereg caγ-tur bol-qu-γu ülü-gü.* '/A summer spring, a grass fire; /the sun and full moon between the clouds; /friendship with those of poor intellect and wisdom: /one cannot know whether [these] will emerge at a time when they are needed.'

Apparently this is a statement rather than a question: a statement with an embedded double question. It seems poetically abbreviated, with preposing of the final words, from something like **Kereg caγ-tur bol-qu-γu ülü-gü [bol-qu-yi] mede-ge ügei [buy]*, literally '[It is] unknowable "[are these] to become [available] at a time [of] need? [or] not [become so]?".' If so, we may understand that sentence #78 is a question only by virtue of the interrogative word *ker*; and that the particle *-UU* applies only to *ülü [oro-qu]*. Clearly SH *ülü-ū̄* and Script *ülü-gü* were the Middle Mongolian equivalents of Khalkha *(ü)güy yüü* as in *Tėr üüniyg mėdnė üü ügüy yüü?* 'Does he know this or not?' or *Bi tüüniyg xiyj cadna uu, cadaxgüy yuu mėdėxgüy.* 'I don't know whether I can do it or not'. This pattern is not attested in our limited corpus of early Middle Mongolian texts, but is found once in line 751 of the Altan Tobci (Vietze 1992:17): *Tümüjin ger-tür buyu uu, ügei üü?* 'Is Temüjin in the tent, or not?'. The equivalent Secret History passage (#1 above) lacks the last two words.

The fact that there are only two instances of this "or not" construction in our limited corpus of early Middle Mongolian texts forcibly reminds us that this language surely had patterns of syntax we will never fully understand, and others we may never even suspect.

7. Other uses of the interrogative particle.

7.1 An embedded interrogative question without *kee-*. In one exceptional passage, one-word truncated sentences twice occur as object of the nominalized postposition *metü* 'like, as if'.[36]

(80) *Hiluqad-quy-ū metü-tür*
hiluqad-ba.
Qal-quy-ū metü-tür
qal-qu·n bol-un
qayiran köün-ü min-u qacar-tur
qadaasun qada-ul-bay.

'When it would have been better /Not to stir him up, /We did stir him up; /When it would have been better /Not to provoke him, /We did provoke him — [thus,] alas, /We have been the cause of their driving /A nail into my son's cheek.' (6162-64; tr. de Rachewiltz 2004:94).

Most literally (in tortured English), this is: '[We] stirred [him] up during a "should-[we-]stir-[him]-up?"-like [time]; provoking [him] during a "should-[we-]provoke-[him]?"-like [time]....'. This usage

seems unique in early Middle Mongolian, though passages in the next section below might be interpreted in a similar way.

Note that the first three-word sentence here, instead of containing a question as its first word (with *-UU* in neutral position), could theoretically be itself a question as a whole, with the *-UU* moved forward from sentence-end for local emphasis. Similarly the second, longer sentence. But in actuality, the words here would make little sense under this interpretation (which seems that of Pelliot 1949:187), and in any case the Chinese translation shows the above interpretation to be the correct one (Mostaert 1953:92).

7.2 The set phrase *job-üü tab-uu*. Consider the following passage, already mentioned in §4.1.

(14*) *Jamuqa yabu-daq kele-tü bü-lee. Jöb-üü tab-uu ügüle-n bu-yu♦?* (5430-31). Cleaves 1982:91 translates: 'Jamuya hath vain words. Is he speaking rightly? truly?'. De Rachewiltz 2004:85, translating 'Jamuqa has a glib tongue. Is he right in what he says? Is he correct?', adds a footnote that this is "A rhetorical question implying that he [= Jamuqa] is untrustworthy".

Clearly the words *jöb-üü tab-üü* function adverbially here, modifying the verbal sequence *ügüle-n bü-*. And clearly the two phonological words form a coordinate construction: omitting either would leave a grammatical sentence. Thus *jöb-üü tab-üü* is a **doubly coordinate sequence** (Street 1957:50-51): in addition to the coordination of *jöb-üü* and *tab-üü*, *jöb* is coordinate with *tab*, and the first *-UU* with the second. The above translations assume that the sentence as a whole is a question: one belonging in §4.1 above, with local emphasis on *jöb* and *tab,* used adverbially.

The semantics seems clear in this one instance, but is less so in the two other occurrences in our texts. The paired interrogative words appear once in adjectival function: the *jöb-üü tab-üü*, as a unit, modifies *sedkil* 'thought, mind, heart'.

(81) *Caur Beki-yi quyu-asu, müd-lü bidan-i doromjila-ju ülü ög-ün bü-lee. Edöe ker buruuy-a buuljar ide-re uri-juu? Öe·d-iyen yekejile-kü·n haran buruuy-a yeki-n 'Ög-sü' kee-n uri-qu·n bü-leey? Jöb-üü tab-uu sedkil buy?* (5463-66). De Rachewiltz translates (2004:86-87) 'When we requested Chaur Beki, those same [people] despised us and would not provide her. How is it that now, on the contrary, they invite you to dine at the betrothal feast? Why do people who think themselves [so] important invite you, and contradicting themselves [now] say "We shall provide her"? Are they right? Are they correct?'. (This fails to translate the *sedkil*; see below.)

In one of the sections (§§269-282) of the Secret History that were later additions to the Urtext, this phrase appears with interrogative particles having the unique and aberrant shape *-i* (or perhaps long *-ī*?). Neither Cleaves 1982 nor de Rachewiltz 2004 discusses this form; the Chinese glosses are exactly the same as for *-UU* in the two passages above, so clearly the 14th-century editors accepted the *-i* here as equivalent to *-UU*. But this apparent phonological shape for the interrogative particle (see also #88 below) remains inexplicable:

(82) *Ba bü-rün busu helige-tü bulqa irgen-tür morila-ul-da-ju, 'Jöb-i tab-i bol-qu bol-ba' kee-jü bü-küy-tür, Büri Güyüg qoyar-a eyin kee-gde-ed eye ügey tarqa-qda-ba.* (Z304-07). De Rachewiltz (2004:206-7) translates: 'So, just at the time when, having been sent to ride against a rebellious people of a different race, we are asking ourselves whether we had been successful, Büri and Güyük spoke to us in this way, and we parted in disaccord.'

As de Rachewiltz points out (2004:604), this set phrase "is used to express uncertainty with regard to the outcome of an enterprise such as a military campaign". Probably *jöb-üü tab-üü* was a true idiom — i.e. a sequence of morphemes whose meaning is not fully predictable from the meaning of the component words and their construction(s) — and meant something like 'of questionable outcome or implication'.[37]

On further point must be added. It remains unclear whether the four-word quoted sentences in all three examples should be taken as truly questions, with the double interrogative particles moved for local emphasis, or whether these sentences were actually statements including one-word embedded questions, as in §7.1. If the latter, #14 would mean 'He is speaking in a questionable [i.e. untrustworthy] manner'; literally, '[He] is speaking [in an] "is it right? is it true?" [manner]'. The second passage is either something like 'Are [their] intentions really straightforward?', or a simple statement: '[Their] intentions are questionable.' Likewise, if the middle portion of #82 is a single quoted question, it is more literally 'when [we] are saying [to ourselves] 'Has [the campaign] turned out to be of uncertain outcome?'. Or that sequence could be rather a simple statement: '[The campaign] has turned out to be of uncertain outcome.'

7.3 A problematic question with two interrogative particles. In the Twelve Deeds of Buddha there is an aberrant sentence part of which was cited at the end of §6.1 above.

(47*) */Tende γaγca-γar kerke-n qocor-bai? /Tegün-ece busu basa yaγun ögüle-bei? /Tedüi-üü ülü ire-kü üü? /Delgerenggüi-e basa ögüle.* 'How could he remain there alone? What else did he say? Then he will not come [back again]? Tell me again in detail!' (TDB 28r23-26; tr. Poppe 1967:130)

In a note on p. 92, Poppe wrote simply "The interrogative particle is both on *tedüi* and the verb", but offered no explanation for this oddity. In light of the historical discussion in §6.1 above, I would suggest that this sentence is a modification of an earlier one with the emphatic particle *kü* (Street 1982, esp. p. 624a): **Tedüi kü ülü-gü ire-kü?* 'So actually (= *kü)* he will not come [back]?'. In the Secret History and other texts *tedüy* is either 'thus, so, in that way' or 'to that extent, as big as'; the single SH instance of *tedüy gü* in line 6265 [= AT 59b *tedüi kü*] is translated 'and so' by Cleaves. The modification I'm suggesting moved the interrogative particle to a position after the verb, as in §6.1, but reinterpreted the emphatic *kü* as another instance of the interrogative particle *gü* = *üü*, which, like *kü*, would also have had emphatic force here.

7.4 Doubly interrogative questions. It is a bit surprising to find that a few sentences in both the Secret History and our secondary sources contain not only the interrogative particle in the main clause, but an interrogative word as well. All of these are rhetorical questions, most truncated, and all have the interrogative particle in neutral position.[38] Such doubly interrogative sentences probably had emphatic or exclamatory force, rather like English utterances such as "Why would he conceivably do such a thing?!" or "Who would believe that, I ask?". In effect, the *-UU* reinforces the earlier interrogative word.

(83) */Seüder-ece busu nökör ügey-tür /seül-ece busu cicua ügey-tür, Tayici·ud aqa deü-yin qašiun dawus-un yada-n büküy-tür, 'Haci ken-e abura-qu·n-ū?' kee-jü bü-küy-tür, 'Ker a-ya?' kee-n eyin ki-ldü-müy ta.* 'When, /with no friend but [our] shadow, /no whip but [our horse's] tail, we cannot bear the bitterness of our Tayichiud brothers and are asking [ourselves] who might possibly help us take vengeance, you are treating one another thus, saying "How can we live together?".' (2122-25).

The first quoted sentence here is literally 'By whom, conceivably, [are we] to take vengeance?'. This was stated more fully in 2099, a further example of this pattern: *...haci ken-e abura-n cida-qu·n-ū?* 'by whom might [we] possibly be able to take vengeance?'.

(84) *Höelün eke...Gücü nere-tü köüken-i, ...Kököcü nere-tü köüken-i, ...Šigiken Qutuqu nere-tü köüken-i, ...Boroul nere-tü köüken-i, e·de dörben-i ger dotora tejie-rün, Höelün eke köü·d-te-en '/Üdür üje-gü-yin nidün /söni sonos-qu-yin cikin ken-e bol-qa-quy-ū?' kee-n ger dotora tejie-bey.* 'Mother Höelün reared in her tent these four: the boy named Güchü..., the boy named Kököchü..., the boy named Shigiken..., and the boy named Boroul.... Mother Höelün said, "For whom [but my sons], I ask, would I make [of these foundlings] /Eyes, [for them] to see in the day, /Ears, for [them] to hear at night?" — and for [the sake of] her sons reared them in her tent.' (4241-49).

(85) *Qalqa ken-e bol-da-quy-ū bi?* 'Who could possibly become my shield?' (3187). With the passive of *bol-* 'become', this is literally 'by whom, conceivably, [am] I to be benefitted by [his] becoming a shield?'. A much longer sentence in SH 3191-95 similarly ends *...amin-a min-u qoriyaan ken-e bol-da-quy-ū bi?*, in effect 'Who in the world might give me refuge?'.

Similarly, a passage from the Twelve Deeds of Buddha where the sentence includes an existential *bu-yu*:

(86) *Köbegün-ü minu amin-i ögg-ügci, ken ba ende bu-yu-γu ele?* 'Is there just [no] one here, I ask, who can grant me my son's life?' (TDB 37r26-27). Poppe 1967:138 translates 'Who is here who can grant me my son's life?'; but the *ele* is preclusive 'just' in this position (Street 1986b:213-15), and the *ken ba* is indefinite 'anyone who' — or '[no] one who' in English, since a negative answer is implied.

Our secondary sources have a further pattern in which *yaγun* 'what [reason], why?'[39] follows a full verb or nomen futuri. In the former case, e.g. #46 (repeated below), this pattern could have resulted from the merger of a complete question with a following brief sentence **Yaγun?* or **Yaγun bui?* (cf. SH Y301). But when a nomen futuri is involved, according to Bosson 1969:25, sequences *verb + interrogative + 'what'*, in the Subhāṣitaratnanidhi at least, show the Mongolian translation "slavishly follow[ing] the idiom of the Tibetan original".

(46*) *Eden-i ederi-n örösiye-n ülü-kü sedki-müy-ü yaγun?* 'Why do you not think with compassion and pity of them?' (TDB 20v10-12; tr. Poppe 1967:124).

(87) */Baγatu·d dayisun-i ala-n yada-basu ber /öber-ün nökö·d-iyen ala-qu-γu yaγun?* 'Even if heroes are unable to kill the

enemy, why would they kill their own retainers? (SRN 420). Similarly SRN 377 (with *...gicki-kü-gü yaγun*).

(88) */Qor-tu ariγa-tu görüγe-tü oi-dur /mede-küi sedkil-ten a-qu·n-u yaγun?* 'Why would intelligent [people] stay in a forest with noxious carnivorous beasts?' (SRN 167; tr. Bosson 1969:237). Similarly stanzas 342 and 360. The latter has the rare shape *-i* for the interrogative particle, in *...ed-i qayirala-n qaras-qu·n-i yaγun?* '...why should one be avaricious about possessions?'.

It is not clear whether such *-UU yaγun* questions have the exclamatory/emphatic force of examples 83-86; perhaps we should add 'conceivably' before 'kill' in the translation of (87) and modify the others in some fashion.

8. Conclusions. The interrogative particle in early Middle Mongolian was what may be termed a **floating particle**: for purposes of emphasis it could float from one point to another on the surface structure of a sentence, though at a deeper level remaining in construction with the remainder of the sentence as a whole. In this respect it was like the rising question intonation of American English, which applies to an entire clause or sentence, though the locus of greatest pitch-rise can be at various points, for local emphasis.[40] Other particles of early Middle Mongolian functioned like ordinary morphemes, being in construction with contiguous elements of varying length and function. In later centuries the interrogative particle ceased to float, and became generally restricted to position at the end of the predicate.

In later centuries, too, the Script language (and modern spoken varieties such as Khalkha) developed *y*-initial shapes for the interrogative particle. These must have come into being, at the start, through misinterpretation of originally contrasting pairs such as *-mU/-mUy* and *-bA/-bAy* (both singular/plural, as other indicative endings) and nomen futuri endings *-kü/-küy* and *-qu/-quy*, when any of these occurred before *-UU*. In the Secret History such pairs with and without *-y* already seem sometimes to be used interchangeably; as the semantic distinction was totally lost in these pairs, the original contrast between, say, singular *-be-ü* and plural *-bey-üü* must have come to seem mere free variants. Altan Tobci writings such as *bölügei üü*, *amui uu*, and the gloss *kelebei üü* (see endnote 32), clearly indicate that even at a relatively late date the *i* (= /y/) was still felt to be part of the verb; but eventually — in modern Khalkha, for example — reanalysis assigned the /y/ to the interrogative particle instead.

NOTES

[1] Many of the *indices verborum* produced for these texts by Ligeti and others fail to index *-UU* separately from the full words in which these occur, so the count here may have missed a few instances of this particle.

[2] See especially Kuribayashi 2001 and Rachewiltz 2004. The first of these is the most convenient source for the SH text since it provides a romanization, based on that of Ligeti 1971, on pages facing an excellent reproduction of the Mongolian text in Chinese characters (the Ku manuscript of the *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih*); there are also full indexes of words and inflectional endings. The second supplies the best English translation (with full commentary), but Cleaves 1982, being more literal, is sometimes helpful as well.

[3] For the text (in romanization and in Chinese characters) and full indexes see Kuribayashi 2003. Haenisch 1952 and Mostaert 1977/95 supply translations with commentary.

[4] See Poppe 1957, Ligeti 1972b and IVLMMT 3.

[5] See Cleaves 1949, 1950, and 1951; Ligeti 1972a and IVLMMT 1.

[6] See Mostaert and Cleaves 1952; Ligeti 1972a and IVLMMT 2.

[7] See de Rachewiltz 1982; Ligeti 1972a and IVLMMT 2.

[8] See Ligeti 1972a and IVLMMT 2.

[9] See Poppe 1967; Ligeti 1974 and IVLMMT 5.

[10] See Bosson 1969 (esp. p. 25 for the interrogative particle), Ligeti 1973, and IVLMMT 4. The translations here depend heavily on those in Bosson's edition.

[11] I.e. the Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1335, lines 21 and 40.

[12] Note the back vowel harmony here, although the copular verb is *bü-* in many inflected forms. For the Secret History we find back-vowel romanizations *buyu* and *bui* written in de Rachewiltz 1972:205, but front ones *büy-yü* and *büi* in Kuribayashi 2001:664-65, following Ligeti. Below I write *bu-yu* and *buy*.

[13] In his 1982 article on the HC, de Rachewiltz reconstructed *uqamuyu[γu ci]* here; but after re-examining a photocopy of the original text (better then the microfilm available to Ligeti, who read *uqamuyu[u ci]*) has recently concluded that "there is a space after *yu* just right for the gamma", and "one can clearly see the right curve of the final *u*" (personal communication of 4 October 2008).

[14] Four-digit line-numbers are here used for the SH. The first digit refers to one of the twelve chapters in the SH (with X, Y, Z standing for chapters 10-12); the second and third digits to a (folded) leaf of the Ku edition; and the last (0-9) to the five lines of text on the recto and verso sides of a leaf. This is the system, developed for use on a personal computer, that was used in my 1986 monograph on Secret History punctuation (see Street 1986:14). Kuribayashi 2001 and 2004 utilize a similar system, but with two-digit chapter- and line-numbers; thus line 10:19:05 in the 2001 work is my X194. Unfortunately neither system makes it easy to locate the translation of a specific line in de Rachewiltz's definitive work of 2004.

[15] See de Rachewiltz 2004.lxxxix, fn. 109 for full discussion of this matter.

[16] One cannot help wondering, however, whether the glide-plus-vowel writing was intended as a representation of vowel length.

[17] Note that line 2997 of the Altan Tobci (§96a) has *köndelen kümün* in a different passage, one not included in the SH.

[18] For example, it might have been thought that the longer forms would be found more often before the open spacing between Chinese characters which represents punctuation (i.e. potential speech pauses; Street 1986), but this seems not to be the case. Note that in Monguor (de Smedt & Mostaert: *Le dialecte Monguor* [Mouton: 1964], p. 136) the interrogative particle is not infrequently lengthened before a pause.

[19] Igor de Rachewiltz and I have discussed this assumption in correspondence, and are in full agreement on the matter. I am most grateful to him for reading and commenting on an early draft of the present article. Note that this assumption explains the otherwise utterly anomalous writings *-baan/-been* (= *-bān/-bēn*) which occur eight times (seven of them in Chapter 1) for the possessive-reflexive suffix normally written simply *-ban/-ben*. Further, the *qojidauuldaju* of line 2018 must represent *qojida-ūl-da-ju*, with overt marking of the primary vowel length of the causative morpheme; and in 2371 *neyileüleed* = *neyile-ül-ēd* length is similarly marked for the perfective converb. In line 4039, too, *Alauud* writes the plural of *alaq* 'multicolored' in the placename *Ala·ūd Turqa·ud* 'the Mottled Sentinels'; Pelliot 1949.34 emended the first word to *Ala'ud* "comme dans la version chinoise" — an emendation now clearly unnecessary.

[20] The latter was presumably following Mostaert 1953:102 and Mostaert/Cleaves 1952:465; see de Rachewiltz 2004:709-10.

[21] Full exemplification is supplied in my article "Middle Mongolian past-tense -BA in the *Secret History*", now in preparation. Ozawa Shigeo referred to such usage as honorific in his 1961 article "The system of the indicative endings in Middle Mongolian", *Gengo Kenkyū* 40.33-80.

[22] Poppe 1954:94 stated that "In the pre-classical language *-qu* and *-quy* were used indiscriminately..."; see Poppe 1957:39-40 for further discussion.

[23] Lack of crucial examples makes it difficult to know how best to define the class of copular forms for present purposes. Possibly *a-juu* used in the predicative seems should be included. The sequence *-UU a-juu* occurs twice; in 7165 it does seems emphatic (with *a-* thus a full verb), but the instance in 7477 is less clear. It would seem logical to add *bu-yu* to the list, but evidence is lacking since in none of its six co-occurrences with *-UU* (see ##1, 2, 14, 86) is that verb form used in the predicative sense. The status of forms of *bol-* remains indeterminate as well; in #16 below *bol-bi* is treated as a full verb by default.

[24] Since our texts offer no example of *-UU* after this *l*-initial past-tense ending, neutral position here may perhaps have been, exceptionally, before rather than after *kee-leey*.

[25] See pages 154-58 et seq. of my 1963 *Khalkha structure* (Indiana University Publications; Uralic and Altaic Series, vol. 24). A review by H.-P. Vietze in *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* (61:5/6.260-62) pointed out an error in §7.33 there, but the remainder of §7 seems still valid. For Japanese, a typologically very similar language, one may cite, from p. 43 of Roy Andrew Miller's *Bernard Bloch on Japanese* (Yale University Press, 1970), Bloch's statement that "Before the [interrogative] particle *ka*..., the non-past indicative of the copula, *dá*, is replaced by a zero alternant (i.e. drops out)....".

[26] On the one hand, our texts show no instance of *-UU* after the *l*-initial past-tense ending, as in *bü-lee*. On the other, a combination of *buy* plus *-uu* or *-ū* (in Chinese transcription) or *bui* plus *-uγu* (in the Script) would most probably have a shape identical with *bu-yu* itself or a sequence of that plus *-UU*. Only two such forms actually occur in our primary texts; but both involve the existential rather than predicative use of this copula, and both were treated (##1-2 above) as *bu-yu-u* and *bu-yu-γu* rather than *buy-uu* and *bui-uγu*. That interpretation seems unquestionably correct for SH 2452, since *buu-yu* recurs in the next, related, sentence.

[27] The semantic difference between these two negatives is of no real significance to what follows here, but in general we may view the distinction as one of aspect, *ese* being perfective, *ülü* imperfective. Any reflection of this semantic contrast in one's translations will, of course, depend on the tense of the verb or verbs involved, and the general context. A third negative adverb, *bu* (*bü* in Ligeti's romanization), never occurs in questions. For negative expressions *busu* 'different, other (than), non-' and *ügey* 'without', see examples ##7, 32-35, and 79.

[28] The location of *-UU* is not affected by an *ese* or *ülü* in a subordinate clause, e.g. by the *ese bügesü* in #23.

[29] However, all the SRN instances occur at the end of a stanza, and one might perhaps argue that they are emphasized as "punch lines".

[30] Text has *esegü*, with the <g> erroneously carried over from the vertical script.

[31] Inclusion of an asterisk with a passage number indicates that part of all of the passage was earlier presented (with the same number) in some other connection.

[32] E.g. AT 620-1 = SH 2231, AT 798-9 = SH 3021-22. The *ese-ū kee-ldü-leey bida* of SH 3124 becomes *ese kü kemelügei üü* in AT 864-66, where glosses include *kelebei üü* (and *ögülebeü*). Such writings prove that the *-i* was then still felt as part of the past tense morpheme, not of the interrogative particle, and thus clarify the history of later *y*-initial forms of the particle.

[33] Mostaert/Cleaves 1952:452 treat the *γaγca* here (as earlier in line 18) as adverbial rather than as an adjective modifying *möngke Tngri*. One wonders whether the Pope's translators would have understood this sentence in that way. For the word can mean simply 'single' as in SH 1033 *maŋlay dumda qaqca nidü-tü* 'having a single eye in the middle of his forehead'. (For interesting remarks on *tengri* as 'Heaven, deity, God', see Poppe 1957.68-70.)

[34] YCPS *beljieltür* emended to *belciertür*: see Ligeti in *Central Asiatic Journal* 24.299, fn.16.

[35] For the use of the accusative ending *-yi* before *mede-* 'know', note SH 6511-12: *Oŋ Qan Seŋgüm qoyar-i söni ker ber qar-uqsan-i ese mede-gde-be.* 'It was not known how Ong Qan and Senggüm had escaped during the night.'

[36] For such nominalization, cf. the direct object *in-u metü·s-i* 'those like him' (lit. 'the likes of him') in SH 5264.

[37] It is notable that the Altan Tobci (line 1865; Vietze 1992.43) glossed the equivalent of *tab-uu* in example #14* as *buruγu* 'wrong'; hence 'Is he speaking rightly or wrongly?'. (The only other instance of this set phrase in AT line 1887 = #81 is unglossed.)

[38] What one might consider an exception is the 'or not' questions of §6.32. There the *ülü* would have preceded the second *oro-qu* or *bol-qu* before that was omitted.

[39] Cf. Mostaert 1953:125, Cleaves 1982:195, fn. 63.

[40] In the old Trager-Smith system for description of English, an **intonation pattern** was a suprasegmental morpheme consisting of pitch levels and a terminal contour; such patterns were in construction with sequences of segmental morphemes, etc.. The interrogative intonation pattern for American English was the morpheme √23↑, with the pitch rise to level 3 occurring on the syllable with primary stress — which could be moved about for emphasis of a specific lexical item. (See p. 56 of George L. Trager and Henry Lee Smith, Jr: *An outline of English structure* [Studies in Linguistics, Occasional Papers, 3]. Second printing, Washington D. C.: American Council of Learned Societies, 1956.)

WORKS CITED

Bosson, James E. 1969. *A treasury of aphoristic jewels; The Subhāṣitaratnanidhi of Sa Skya paṇḍita in Tibetan and Mongolian.* Uralic and Altaic Series 92. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Publications.

Cleaves, Francis Woodman. 1949. "The Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1362 in memory of Prince Hindu". HJAS 12.1-132, with 27 plates.

Cleaves, Francis Woodman. 1950. "The Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1335 in memory of Chang Ying-jui". HJAS 13.1-131, with 35 plates.

Cleaves, Frances Woodman. 1951. "The Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1338 in memory of J̌igüntei". HJAS 14.1-104 with 32 plates.

Cleaves, Francis Woodman. 1982. *The Secret History of the Mongols. Vol. 1 (translation).* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, for the Harvard-Yenching Institute.

de Rachewiltz, Igor. 1972. *Index to the Secret History of the Mongols.* Uralic and Altaic Series 121. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Publications.

de Rachewiltz, Igor. 1982. "The Preclassical Mongolian version of the Hsiao-ching". *Zentralasiatische Studien* 16.7-109. Also: "More about the Preclassical Mongolian version of the Hsiao-ching"; *Zentralasiatische Studien* 19.27-37 (1986).

de Rachewiltz, Igor. 2004. *The Secret History of the Mongols: A Mongolian epic chronicle of the thirteenth century. Translated with a historical and philological commentary.* Two volumes. Brill's Inner Asian Library 7/1 and 7/2. Leiden: Brill.

Haenisch, Erich. 1952. *Sino-Mongolische Dokumente vom Ende des 14. Jahrhunderts.* Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin: Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst. Jahrgang 1950 Nr. 4. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Hattori Shirô. 1973 "The Chinese dialect on which the transcription of the *Yüan-ch'ao Mi-Shih* was based". *Acta Asiatica; Bulletin of the Institute of Eastern Culture* [Tokyo] 24.35-44.

HJAS. *The Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard-Yenching Institute.

IVLMMT 1-5. *Indices verborum linguae mongolicae monumentis traditorum*, by Louis Ligeti. Budapest; Akadémiai Kiadó.

Vol. 1: *Monuments préclassiques. 1. XIII^e et XIV^e siècles.* [Première partie]. 1970.

Vol. 2: *Monuments préclassiques. 1. XIII^e et XIV^e siècles.* [Deuxième partie]. 1972.

Vol. 3: *Monuments en écriture 'phags-pa. Pièces de chancellerie en transcription chinoise.* 1973.

Vol. 4: *Trésor des sentences. Subhāṣitaratnanidhi de Sa-skya paṇḍita.* 1973.

Vol. 5: *Les douze actes du Bouddha: Arban qoyar ǰokiyangγui üiles, de Čhos-kyi 'od-zer.* 1974.

Kuribayashi, Hitoshi & Choijinjab. 2001. *Word- and suffix-index to the Secret History of the Mongols; based on the romanized transcription of L. Ligeti.* CNEAS Monograph Series 4. Sendai, Japan: Center for Northeast Asian Studies, Tohoku University.

Kuribayashi, Hitoshi. 2003. *Word- and suffix-index to Hua-yi Yi-yü, based on the romanized transcription of L. Ligeti.* CNEAS Monograph Series 10. Sendai, Japan: Center for Northeast Asian Studies, Tohoku University.

Ligeti, Louis. 1971. *Histoire secrète des Mongols.* Monumenta Linguae Mongolicae Collecta 1. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Ligeti, Louis. 1972a. *Monuments préclassiques 1: XIII^e et XIV^e siècles.* Monumenta Linguae Mongolicae Collecta 2. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. Indexed in IVLMMT 1 and 2.

Ligeti, Louis. 1972b. *Monuments in écriture 'phags-pa [et] Pièces de chancellerie en transcription chinoise.* Monumenta Linguae Mongolicae Collecta 3. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. Indexed in IVLMMT 3.

Ligeti, Louis. 1973. *Trésor des sentences: Subhāṣitaratnanidhi de Sa-skya paṇḍita.* Traduction de Sonom gara. Monumenta Linguae Mongolicae Collecta 4. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. Indexed in IVLMMT 4.

Ligeti, Louis. 1974. *Les douze actes du Bouddha: Arban qoyar ǰokiyangγui üiles, de Čhos-kyi 'od-zer. Traduction de Šes-rab seṅ-ge.* Monumenta Linguae Mongolicae Collecta 5. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. Indexed in IVLMMT 5.

Mostaert, Antoine, & Francis Woodman Cleaves. 1952. "Trois documents mongols des Archives Secrètes Vaticanes". HJAS 15.419-506, with 8 plates.

Mostaert, Antoine. 1953. *Sur quelques passages de L'Histoire Secrète des Mongols.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard-Yenching Institute. [Reprinted from HJAS 13-15 (1950-52).]

Mostaert, Antoine. 1977/95. *Le matériel mongol du Houa i i iu... de Houng-ou (1389).* Vol. 1, Edité par Igor de Rachewiltz, avec l'assistance de Anthony Schönbaum, 1977. Vol. 2 (Commentaires), par Antoine Mostaert et Igor de Rachewiltz, 1995. Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques 18, 27. Bruxelles: Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises.

Pelliot, Paul. 1949. *Histoire secrète de Mongols.* Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.

Poppe, Nicholas. 1954. *Grammar of Written Mongolian.* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Poppe, Nicholas. 1957. *The Mongolian monuments in ḥP'ags-pa script.* (Second edition translated and edited by John R. Krueger.) Göttinger Asiatische Forschungen 8. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Poppe, Nicholas. 1967. *The twelve deeds of Buddha, a Mongolian version of Lalitavistara; Mongolian text, notes, and English translation.* Asiatische Forschungen 23. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Street, John C. 1957. *The language of the Secret History of the Mongols.* American Oriental Series 42. New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society.

Street, John C. 1982. "The particle *gü* in the *Secret History*". *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 102:4.619-30.

Street, John C. 1986. *On the 14th century punctuation of Mongolian in the Yuan-ch'ao pi-shih.* Mongolia Society Occasional Papers 12. Bloomington, Indiana: The Mongolia Society.

Street, John C. 1986b. "The particle *ele* in early Middle Mongolian". *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 80.195-258.

Street, John C. 1990. "Nominal plural formations in the *Secret History*". *Acta Orientalia Hungaricae* 44:3.345-79. (Appeared 1993.)

Vietze, Hans-Peter, and Gendeng Lubsang. 1992. *Altan Tobči: Eine mongolische Chronik des XVII. Jahrhunderts von Blo bsaṅ bstan 'jin.* Text and Index. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.

Book Reviews

The Royal Hunt in Eurasian History. THOMAS T. ALLSEN. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006. ISBN 0-8122-3926-1 (hardback); $55.00

Thomas Allsen, who has now produced a number of highly valuable volumes on Mongolian imperial times, moves with the present volume to an examination of a major category of elite display, royal hunts, viewed over the long term. As is the case with Allsen's previous works, the present volume is very carefully researched and his topic is thoroughly documented. Allsen's control of bibliography is, as always, impressive.

The book is organized into thirteen chapters, including a conclusion. Examined in them are hunting in general terms, including the purposes of hunting (chapters 1 and 2), hunting parks (chapter 3), hunting partners (chapter 4, on hunting dogs, etc.), the administration and conservation of hunting resources (chapters 5 and 6), the role of hunting for establishing manhood and princely virtue, and to exhibit power and for purposes of legitimation (chapters 7-9), the movements involved with hunting and their connection with court activities (chapter 10), hunting and training for war (chapter 11), and the "internationalization" of hunting, namely the traffic in hunting partners and specialized trainers (chapter 12). The conclusion takes a Braudelian look at the whole subject.

Discussion in each category is extremely full, although, given the nature of the subject matter, there is some overlap, but this is useful for focusing ideas and is never tedious. The undersigned found much new throughout the book, in particular the chapters on animal partners and the traffic in them where Allsen proves himself a good ethnobiologist as well as historian. The discussion of the hunting cheetah is particularly useful.

The volume is well produced and has few typos and a good index. I also found no major errors of any importance. Allsen is reliable as

ALS 2'
ZA 62405 : 30131

Copyright © by The Mongolia Society

ISBN # 978-0-910980-93-7
ISSN # 0190-3667

Our Address:
The Mongolia Society, Inc.
322 Goodbody Hall, Indiana University
1011 East Third Street
Bloomington, Indiana 47405-7005

Member of the
Council of Editors of Learned Journals
since 1993

Printing and Binding: VictorGraphics, Inc.
Typesetting and Layout: Composed by
Johan Elverskog

INFORMATION FOR AUTHORS

Authors are asked to submit manuscripts together with an electronic copy by disk or by e-mail attachment. The electronic copy is preferred in *text-only* format with notes in a separate file. Articles translated from a foreign language should be accompanied by a copy in the original language. For style, please see a recent issue of *Mongolian Studies: The Journal of the Mongolia Society*. Citations of Russian-language works should be according to the International or ALA system. Citations of Chinese-language works should be according to the Wade-Giles or Pinyin system. Bibliographic citations of Mongolian-script works should be according to the appendix to Antoine Mostaert, *Dictionnaire Ordos*.

UNIV.-

MONGOLIAN STUDIES

Volume Thirty for 2008
and
Volume Thirty One for 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME XXX – 2008

Articles

Political Slang in Mongolian
by Ochirbat Sambuudorj 1

The Translation History of the Mongolian Bible
by Staffan Rosén 19

The Interrogative Particle in Early Middle Mongolian
by John C. Street 43

Book Reviews

Thomas T. Allsen, *The Royal Hunt in Eurasian History*
Reviewed by Paul D. Buell 83

Karl Rudolf Bittigau, *Mongolische Grammatik. Entwurf einer Funktionalen Grammatik (FG) des modernen, literarischen Chalchamongolischen*
Reviewed by György Kara 85

Ole Bruun, *Precious Steppe: Mongolian Nomadic Pastoralists in Pursuit of the Market* and *Mongols from Country to City: Floating Boundaries, Pastoralism and City Life in the Mongol Lands*
Reviewed by Tristra Newyear 89

Elza-Bair Buchinova, *The Kalmyks*
Reviewed by Michael Gelb.....93