

The Particle gü in the Secret History
Author(s): John Street
Source: *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 102, No. 4 (Oct. - Dec., 1982), pp. 619-630
Published by: American Oriental Society
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/601970
Accessed: 30/11/2010 16:29

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=aos.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



American Oriental Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the American Oriental Society.*

http://www.jstor.org

THE PARTICLE *GÜ* IN THE SECRET HISTORY

JOHN STREET

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, MADISON

The East Middle Mongolian equivalent of Classical Mongolian *kü* seemingly appears in the shape *gü* in works transcribed by means of Chinese characters. Analysis of all occurrences of *gü* in the *Secret History of the Mongols* shows certain oddities in the syntactic use of the particle, and two clearly distinct meanings. Sometimes *gü* adds exclamatory or intensive emphasis to its syntactic head; but in cases where that head occurred in an immediately preceding sentence, the particle stresses inter-sentential parataxis.

0. EAST MIDDLE MONGOLIAN of the 13th century *Secret History of the Mongols* possessed a small class of enclitic particles which, though of considerable syntactic and semanticinterest, are treated only superficially in standard grammatical works on the language. Members of this class are, first of all, syntactically bound: they never occur sentence-initial, but always after some other element. But unlike most bound forms (which typically are restricted to occurrence after either noun-stems or verb-stems), these particles occur in a wide variety of syntactic positions, e.g., after noun-stems, converbs, noun-plus-case sequences, etc. And with two possible exceptions (where the Chinese syllabic transcription is ambiguous) these elements do not have vowel-harmony alternants conditioned by the word which precedes.

Semantically these enclitics are interesting in that they sometimes show relationships between parts of different sentences contiguous within a discourse, rather than simply interrelating elements within a single sentence. Often the meaning they carry would, in modern conversational English, be reflected by differences in stress or intonation rather than by different sequences of overt segmental morphemes.

Most of these enclitics have some reflex in later stages of Mongolian, after the Middle Mongolian period. But the whole enclitic system has undergone notable changes between Middle Mongolian and the modern dialects; Script Mongolian of the intermediate period seems to exploit the resources of this system less coherently than did the Secret History, and one can never be certain that the syntax of the Classical language has not, in specific details, been influenced in some way by Tibetan models. Investigation of the use of enclitic particles in the Secret History should materially improve our understanding of Middle Mongolian per se, but may also enlighten us concerning details of the origin of the later Classical Mongolian, and of the modern dialects.

1. Script Mongolian had a particle *kü*, usually termed emphatic, which is barely mentioned in the sources most likely to be consulted by students of that language. Poppe 1954.186 says simply: "The particle *kü*, in emphatic pronunciation *kō*, stresses the meaning of the word to which it refers. [It] . . . is placed after the word to which it refers."[1] Two examples are then given, with *kü* translated as 'indeed' and 'really'. Grønbech and Krueger 1976.46 offers only a single example, and (under the heading "Strengthening Suffixes") states merely: "The particles *kü* and *ču* serve to emphasize the previous word." Lessing 1960.494 defines *kü* as "Particle emphasizing the preceding word (often written together with the emphasized word)"; seven examples are supplied.

The student of Mongolian who is acquainted with such sources will, when he attempts to read the Middle Mongolian of the Secret History, be more than a bit baffled to find that there *gü* (equivalent to Classical *kü*) is often to be translated as 'also, too', or simply 'and'. Yet all translators agree that this is what it means—in some of its occurrences. We shall see below that there is a simple solution to this problem.

---

[1] Poppe's remark concerning the "emphatic pronunciation" is emended in Poppe 1957.126, where Classical Mongolian *kü* is equated with Khalkha *xū*, *xō*.

2. In the Secret History (hereafter: SH), the particle equivalent to Classical Mongolian *kü* occurs 90 times.[2] In one single occurrence it is represented in the Chinese syllabic transcription by the character *k'u* $^{(a)}$, which is to be read as Mongolian *kü* (Lewicki 1949.46, character 380); this is in de Rachewiltz line 1908,[3] where we find the phrase *mün kü tede*. In the remaining 89 occurrences[4] the particle is written rather with *ku* $^{(b)}$ (Lewicki 1949.42, character 287); since normally a Chinese unaspirated initial corresponds to a Middle Mongolian voiced stop (and an aspirated one to a Mongolian voiceless one), the accepted transcription of this *ku* $^{(b)}$ is Mongolian *gü*.[5]

Since the expression *mün kü tede* of line 1908 is paralleled by *mün gü üge* in 838, *mün gü tende* in 4035, and by *mün gü* before other items in five additional passages, it seems that this unique writing of *kü* for *gü* must reflect some transcriptional problem rather than implying two different pronunciations for this morpheme in East Middle Mongolian.

The question remains, however, why the SH should apparently show an initial syllable *gü* in this and a number of other lexical items where all other evidence would lead us to expect *kü-*. In the SH we find, for example, *güün* 'man', *gürge-* 'bring', *gücün* 'strength'—all written in Chinese transcription with the same character *ku* $^{(b)}$ which represents our particle; but in the nearly contemporary ḥP'ags-pa script we find unambiguous voiceless aspirated initials in *k'u·un*, *k'ürge-*, *k'üč'ün*, and the particle *k'u*;[5a] and in modern dialects there occur equivalents such as Kalmuck /küməŋ/, /kürgə-/, and /küčəŋ/. In such words it is unclear, according to Poppe 1955.139, whether the language of the SH shows an early sonorization of the voiceless initial, or whether the SH writings resulted from some "orthographic confusion."[5b] At any rate, our particle is not unique in showing a voiced initial where a voiceless one might be expected; and this minor phonological problem cannot possibly affect the syntactic and semantic investigations pursued below.[6]

But one final point should be added concerning the Chinese transcription of this particle. The character *ku* $^{(b)}$ is pronounced with the third tone in the modern language, whereas *k'u* $^{(a)}$ has the first tone (or the fifth, "entering tone"). Murayama 1970.365 has suggested, in another connection, that a contrast between third- and first-tone syllables in Chinese was sometimes utilized by the transcribers of the SH to mark a distinction between Middle Mongolian long and short vowels; Doerfer 1975.42–43 accepts this hypothesis, though denying that such vowel-length had phonemic or (prior) historical significance. Hence it is entirely possible that in transcribing this particle, the Chinese were attempting to represent a long-vowel [gū]—perhaps an emphatic lengthening (cf. the Khalkha forms of footnote 1). One might even speculate that the particle was actually pronounced [kū] in Middle Mongolian, but that the transcribers somehow felt it more important to represent the length than to show the initial consonant accurately.

Despite this possibility, in what follows the SH

---

[2] By contrast, the enclitic *ber* (Street 1981) occurs 71 times, while the enclitics *lu* and *ci* each make fewer than a dozen appearances.

[3] Throughout this article references to specific passages of the SH are given in terms of the numbered lines in the text of de Rachewiltz 1972b. A reader who does not have access to this work should note that its line numbers are a code referring directly to pages and lines of Pelliot 1949; the last two digits of de Rachewiltz's line numbers refer to a line of Pelliot, and digits preceding these refer to pages. (Thus 5001 refers to Pelliot 1949.50, line 1; 11117 to line 17 of page 111 of that work.)

The SH text cited is that established by de Rachewiltz; but I have changed his romanization slightly, chiefly in the interest of typographical simplicity and brevity. Note particularly my omission of the intervocalic apostrophe, and the use of *y* for non-syllable *i*, and *ŋ* for *ng*. I have added some capitalization and punctuation, but deleted de Rachewiltz's hyphens; following the practice of Mostaert and Cleaves (see Street 1957.5, 7) I write *d* and *g* for the syllable-final apical and pre-velar stops.

[4] Under *-gü* in the index verborum of de Rachewiltz 1972b are listed 90 occurrences; but one of these (in line 6819) turns out to be the interrogative particle.

[5] In both of these syllables the vowel is interpreted as front because of the front-velar consonant.

[5a] The last of these occurs twice in the *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* (Ligeti 1972.101–102), lines 10b6 and 11a6.

[5b] Hattori 1976 has more recently argued that the character *ku* $^{(b)}$ was used to represent both /gü/ and /kü/ sequences in Mongolian, for reasons having to do with the meanings (in Chinese) of characters *k'u* $^{(a)}$, *ku* $^{(b)}$, *etc.*

[6] Other Middle Mongolian documents are of no help with respect to the initial consonant of this particle. The *Hua-I i-yü* of 1389, like the SH, uses *ku* $^{(b)}$ for the particle (in six occurrences); sources transmitted to us in the Mongolian and Arabic scripts can offer no evidence on the matter, since neither writing system had a way of distinguishing the syllables *kü* and *gü*.

particle is written simply *gü* so as to follow the established convention for romanization.

2.1. Except for the fact that SH *gü* never occurs in sentence-initial position, there are no significant phonotactic restrictions on its positions of occurrence. It occurs after back-vowels as well as front ones, and after a representative assortment of consonants (*n*, *r*, *l*, *d*, *y*). A word following *gü*, likewise, may begin with any phoneme of the languages which is itself permitted in word-initial position.

2.2. In Street 1981 it was pointed out that the particle *ber* is more common (by a ratio of 4 to 1) in quoted sentences than in strictly narrative, non-quotational sentences. *Gü* shows no such statistically significant distribution: 49 occurrences are in quoted sentences (including decrees), 41 in simple narration.

And the distribution of *gü* through the 12 chapters of the SH is somewhat more even than that of *ber*. The particle occurs twice in Chapters 1, 8, and 10; once in 11; and from 6 to 10 times in all other chapters—except for Chapter 3, where (because of a clump of 15 occurrences within 18 lines [see passage 20 below] there are 23 occurrences.

3. In the SH the particle *gü* occurs in the four general syntactic positions discussed below. Functionally it is always a modifier (i.e., an optional element). At least when its head (the word or phrase which it modifies) is a single word, *gü* always follows that head; but in some cases it may be argued (see below, 4.4) that *gü* is placed within a phrase which it modifies.

The following sections cite *gü*-heads out of context, and make no attempt to prove the syntactic functions of such elements, or to translate the particle. It is hoped that the fuller citations given in section 4 below will satisfy the reader concerning the context, function and meanings of such words and phrases.

3.1. After nominal elements. In the following 14 instances, *gü* occurs in construction with a single noun (simple or derived) or a pronoun; such sequences function as (a) subject, (b) predicate complement, (c) indefinite direct object, or (d) object of a postposition. The following *gü*-heads occur.

(a) *kebteül* 'the night-guard' (9125), *teŋgeri* 'Heaven' (4112), *öesün* 'himself' (4113),[7] *bi* 'I' (11319), *ta* 'you' (6524, 6525), *mün* 'the same (one), he' (4830),[8] *müd* 'the same (ones), they' (3717bis, 3722);
(b) *buruu* 'fault, mistake' (12007);
(c) *berie* 'a (blow with a) stick' (8915), *nudurqa* 'a (blow of the) fist' (8915);
(d) *ecige* . . . *metü* 'like a father' (2207).

Two or three additional instances are more difficult to classify syntactically; these involve either (e) a participle having apparently nominal function,[9] or (f) what may be called a reduced nominal sentence. Type (e) is represented in the SH only by the *derel-gü gü tutum* 'everytime (they) wheel round' (5420) of passage 23 below. Type (f) is found in 7230: . . .*'qahan-nu-an gü' kee-jü* . . . 'saying "(such horses are) the qahan's . . ."'. And presumably in *'je gü' kee-ldü-ba* 'they agreed [lit. '(they) together said "yes"'] (1825) the *je* should be considered a noun (by hypostasis) rather than an interjection.

It is surprising that *gü* never occurs after a nominal element longer than one phonological word—i.e., after a noun which has some pre- or post-modifying element. Thus, *gü* apparently could not be substituted for the enclitic *ber* in SH sequences like the following (Street 1981.145):

bidanu aqtas (*ber*) 'our geldings'
tere bölög irgen (ber) 'that band of people'
sereküy (*ber*) *tanu* 'your suspicion'
altan jantawu (ber) *inu* 'his golden cup'.

3.2. After pre-nominal modifiers. In the SH *gü* occurs 19 times in the pattern *M gü H*—where *H* represents a head-noun and *M* its modifier—ONLY when *M* is (a) a numeral, (b) a demonstrative, or (c) a noun-plus-genitive sequence, with or without the reflexive-possessive suffix. The head of the construction is generally a single noun (singular or plural), which may then be followed by a genitive, accusative, or adverbial case ending. It is noteworthy that *M* is never an ordinary descriptive adjective: apparently a sequence like **sayin gü güün* 'a *good* man' was ungrammatical.[10]

---

[7] I assume that *mün Jelme öesün gü* here shows *mün Jelme* in apposition with *öesün gü*; hence (as de Rachewiltz) 'the same Jelme, all by himself'.

[8] Possibly *mün gü* here is not 'this very person', but is used adverbially (as in 4416), hence (as de Rachewiltz) 'all the same'.

[9] For participles as main verbs, see 3.4 (c) below; see also the immediately following note.

[10] It is further true that in the SH our particle never occurs after an adjective or participle functioning as predicate-complement. But I have noted one instance of each of these

The following instances are found in the SH; in these citations the particle is included in the Mongolian, but not translated.

(a) *niken gü deü(-yi)* 'a younger brother [object]' 8720, *qoyar gü elcin* 'two messengers' (6 times, 6135–37), *qoyar gü miŋqad* 'two thousands' (8824), *qurban gü tümed* 'three ten-thousands' (3423);

(b) *mün kü tede* 'these same (people)' (1908), *mün gü üge* 'the same word(s)' (838), *mün gü yosu(-ar)* 'in the same manner' (6727, 8727), *mün gü jarliq (-iyar)* 'according to the same ordinance' (8737), *mün gü tende* 'right there' (4035),[11] *tere gü üdür (-ün)* 'of that day' (9010);

(c)[12] *Dayir usun-u gü caqaan(-i)* 'the white (horse) of Dayir-usun' (3002), *köüd-ü-en gü yeke köü* (11203) and *köüd-ü̃-en gü aqa(-yi)* (11206), both 'the eldest of their own sons'.

3.3. After adverbial elements. *Gü* occurs 25 times after (a) simple adverbs, (b) cased-nouns, and (c) converbs. In all but one poetic instance (passage 22 below) the adverbial-plus-*gü* immediately precedes the main verb of the sentence; and in all but one instance the *gü*-head is a single phonological word.

(a) *öter* 'fast, quickly' (2227), *ese* 'not' (3721, 6103),[13] *masi* 'very' (4730), *tedüy* 'thereupon' (4832), *mün* '(all) the same' (4416; see footnote 8), *eyin* 'in this way' (6807), *teyin* 'in that way' (1823, 1633, 1634);

(b) *söni-de* 'in the night' (2728), *tende* 'there, then' (6708, 7201, 7709, 7710; see footnote 11), *ger-tür* 'in the yurt' (11511), *sayiqa-tur* 'in friendship' (3408), *niken-e* 'in unity' (5301), *keer-e* 'in the field' (11510);

(c) *öter-le-n* 'hastily; rushing' (2227), *janci-ju* 'thrashing' (9716), *taul-ju* 'handing over' (8936), *ceriüd̃-iyen jasa-ad* 'arranging his troops' (2709),[14] *ayisu-n* 'approaching' (3103, 3104).

Perhaps one additional instance should be counted under (a) here: the *ünen gü* 'in truth' of line 525. But if so it is aberrant in that is occurs at the start of a sentence, rather than directly before a main verb.

3.4. After final verbs. In 28 instances *gü* occurs after the main verb of a sentence.[15] It is thus sentence-final—except in cases where the sentence has a

---

usages in the Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1338 (Cleaves 1951). In line 13 there we find:

'. . . *ečige inu sečen sayin bülege. köbegün ber inu sečen sayin kü buyu j̃-e' kemen* . . . '. . . saying "His father was wise (and) good. As for his son, (he) too [*kü*] must be wise and good" . . .'

And in line 18:

siltayan inu yayun kemebesü tngri-yin j̃ayayabar törögsen kü bui j̃-e. 'If one say, "What (is) the reason?" it must be that (they) have indeed [*kü*] been born by the destiny of Heaven.'

Note that—from the point of view of the SH—these passages are also somewhat aberrant in that the *kü*-heads are clearly longer than a single phonological word.

[11] Note that *tende* 'there, then' is synchronically the dative (in *-de*) of *tere* 'that' (although the lative of this stem is *teün-tür*, the ablative *teün-ece*, etc.).

[12] A somewhat simpler instance is found in a document of 1312 (Cleaves 1954), where it is interesting to note exact parallelism in the use of *gü* and *ber*:

. . . *minu kü yabudal tere kü metü boltuyai* (4-163b.11)

. . . *minu ber yabudal tere kü metü boltuyai* (4–164a.12)

Cleaves translates these (1954.82–83) as: 'Let my manner of acting be like that', and 'let my manner of acting also be like that'. (In light of the findings of Street 1981, and of what follows in the present article, I would prefer to translate 'Let my own conduct be just like that' on the one hand, and 'Let even *my* conduct be just like that' on the other.)

So in the *Hua-I i-yu* of 1389 (a21v–22):

. . . *inu gu sedkil-ier bolqatuqay* '. . . let him do as he wishes, again [= gü]'. (Literally 'let him cause it to be, according to his—again—thought'; this parallels *inu jorig-iyar* 'according to his intention' a few lines before.)

[13] The hortative-negative *buu* occurs as a *kü*-head in a document of 1312: see Cleaves 1954, line 160b.6. Like one SH instance of *ese gü* (see passage 14 below), this *buu kü* means 'never' or 'not even (then)'. (But Cleaves 1954.78 translates 'also not'.)

[14] For this somewhat problematic *gü*-head, see passage 21 below.

[15] In such cases there is an interesting syntactic question: whether *gü* modifies (i) the main verb alone (stem plus suffix), (ii) the entire sentence, or (iii) some sequence intermediate in length between (i) and (ii). Data from the SH alone is not sufficient to decide this matter, but probably (cf. the end of 4.1 below) the true head of *gü* in such a position is a sequence consisting of the main verb together with any immediately preceding adverbial modifier or (indefinite) direct object—but not including the subject or a modifying converbial phrase (if either of these is present in the sentence). If so, this fact would have crucial implications

postposed (and thus de-emphasized) subject pronoun; this latter follows the enclitic *gü*. The verb-suffix which immediately precedes this particle is (a) the past-tense *-lAA*, (b) the past-tense *-bA*, (c) the non-past participal *-GU*, or (d) one of the hortative endings (including the zero-ending abrupt imperative). The following verb forms are found, any postposed pronoun is included in parentheses.

(a) *ög-ülee* (*..bi*) 'I gave' (2217), *oro-ldu-laa* 'entered [with others]' (4629);
(b) *gödöl-ba*[16] 'moved' (3029), *ire-ba* 'came' (4220; 17 times in 3107–3205),[16] *oro-ba* 'entered, joined' (4612), *nödü-be* 'pounded' (4615);
(c) *ala-qu* 'will kill' (4416), *ala-qda-qu* (*..bi*) 'I will be killed' (4417);
(d) *darqa-la-dqun* 'you may be a darqan' (8537), *qatauci-suqay* 'I will strive hard' (10504), *qadauji* 'be careful!' (1828).

4. Let us now turn our attention to the semantics of the SH particle *gü*.

4.1. In section I above it was mentioned that Classical Mongolian *kü* is usually said to emphasize the word which immediately precedes it. And it is true that the SH particle *gü* does, in many instances, produce what may be called exclamatory (or intensive) emphasis.[17] In essence this means that in a sentence containing *gü*, this particle shows which portion of the sentence the speaker considers most important, and wishes to stress; often the *gü*-head offers new information concerning some situation already known to the hearer. Consider the following passages.[18]

(1) *Teŋgeri gü iheeba je.* (4112) '*Heaven* [or 'Heaven itself'] must have aided (him)!', or 'It was surely Heaven that protected (him)!'

This sentence is offered to explain the surprising fact that Jelme, alone and nearly naked, managed to dash into the enemy camp, steal some food, and rush back with it to the injured Chinggis Qahan; almost miraculously, 'He wasn't seen by a soul, on the way, either going into (the camp) or coming out'—and hence the above exclamation.

(2) *'Bi ber ene eyetür oroldulaa gü. Jici qaniyen camayi tebcin yadaba.'* (4629–30) '"For my part, I *did* take part in this plot [lit. 'did cooperatively enter into this agreement']. But I couldn't abandon you, my qan."'

Here Altan-ashuq is making an admission of guilt which could well have resulted in his arrest and imprisonment.

(3) *'Aqa deü cinu amaan sidüen bileüden ayisu. Teyin ke[b]te. Qadauji gü.'* (1827–28) '"Your brothers are approaching, whetting their mouths and teeth. Lie as you are; (and) be careful!"'

This is the warning of Sorqan-shira to Temüjin, who after escaping from the Tayichiud—but still fettered—is hiding along the bank of a stream with only his face above water. An earlier warning had been:

(4) *'Teyin gü ke[b]te. Ülü jaaqu bi.'* (1823) '"Lie just as you are! I won't point (you) out (to them)."' (De Rachewiltz translates more freely [1971.140]: 'I will not give you away'.)

---

for the syntactic analysis of Mongolian, in terms either of immediate consituent analysis or of generative phrase-structure rules and transformations. (Full analysis of interrogative sentences may eventually clarify this matter.) But to simplify the presentation here, only main verbs are listed below—as though they, alone, were the *gü*-heads. See the discussion at the end of section 4.1 below.

[16] I follow the practice of de Rachewiltz (see his 1972b.3) in carrying over into romanization the Chinese logographic representation of this past-tense suffix, i.e., using *-ba* in cases like this, even though the suffix surely was pronounced with a front vowel (alone or in a diphthong).

[17] It is important to distinguish between two different senses of the vague term 'emphasis'. An English sentence like *The* butler *did it* can mean either 'the person who did it was the butler rather than the maid (who was the chief suspect)', or 'the person who did it was—to my astonishment—the butler (whom I'd never even suspected)'; in the first interpretation we have contrastive emphasis, in the second exclamatory or intensive emphasis. By contrast, (*Yes,*) *the butler* **did** *strangle her* would normally be interpreted as having exclamatory emphasis, while (*No,*) *the butler* **strangled** *her* is more likely contrastive (i.e., he didn't stab or drown her). The SH particle *gü* never shows contrastive emphasis.

[18] In translating these passages into English I have relied heavily on the excellent translation of de Rachewiltz 1971–81. But since my goals here are grammatical rather than literary, my own translations are often more literal than those of de Rachewiltz. And of course, our interpretations of the Mongolian sometimes differ in minor details. (Other SH translations—into a variety of languages—have of course been consulted from time to time, but are not cited below; while it might be interesting to compare the ways in which different translators have handled the particle *kü*, such a comparison would take us much too far afield here.)

The following are additional examples of exclamatory *gü*.

(5) . . . *mün Jelme öesün gü usun erijü abciraju . . . qaana üulba.* (4112–13) 'The same Jelme, all by himself [*öesün gü*], looked for water, brought (it back) . . . (and) made the qaan drink (it).'

(6) '*Ükügsen qan güünü teriün inu ta gü hoqtolju abcirad. Nököete ta gü kemgerid.*' (6524–25) '"(It is) *you* [*ta gü*] (who) cut off the head of the dead qan and brought (it here). (It is) *you* [*ta gü*], secondly, who crushed (it) to pieces."'

(7) '. . . *qarqam sayin aqta uciraasu, qahannuan gü keejü amu je bi.*' (7229–30) '"If (I) find . . . geldings with beautiful croups, I (always) say '(they will be) the qahan's [*qahan-nu-an*]!'"'

(8) '. . . *Ciŋgis qahan ecigeyin cinu jarlig: "Keerün üyile keere gü noyalaqu bülee; gerün üyile gertür gü noyalaqu bülee."* . . .' (11509–10) '"An ordinance of your father, Chinggis Qahan, (stated that) one was to settle field matters in the field [*keer-e gü*], domestic matters in the yurt [*gertür gü*]."' I.e., 'It is in the field that field matters are to be settled. . . . '

Similar exclamatory uses of *gü* occur in lines 1825, 3408, 4832, and 8915; cf. also passages 14 and 18 below. Generally appropriate for translation into English are words such as 'just (so); actually, (he) himself', or structures of extra-position ('it was . . . who . . . '), or simply emphatic stress.

In passage (2) above, the *gü* can be taken as emphasizing the main verb which it follows. But analogous passages in which exclamatory *gü* follows a main verb indicate that in this position the particle emphasizes not just the verb alone, but that verb plus its immediately preceding modifier. This modifier is either an adverbial element (as in the first two passages below) or a direct object (as in the third). Hence in (2) what is emphasized is probably the sequence *eyetür oroldulaa* and not just the last of these words. (Cf. the remarks of footnote 15 above.)

(9) '*Aqa deüyi baraba. Qara kitadtur ba oroba gü.*' (4612) '"(He) has destroyed his brothers. And (he) has even joined the Qara-kitad!"' I.e., 'He has gone so far as to join the Qara-kitad also'.

(10) *Tayiciud ber kökijü mün söni böed jöricen Jamuqa jüg gödölba gü.* (3028–29) 'The Tayiciud, for their part, became frightened, and that same night in great confusion actually moved to Jamuqa's side.'

What is surprising here is not that the Tayiciud should have moved (*gödölba*)—for everyone seems to have been moving camp during that night and the following day; but that these people 'moved to Jamuqa's side' is worthy of note, since many others (listed in the following section of the SH) abandoned Jamuqa and joined Temüjin instead.

(11) '*Erde üdür kēesü doloan nasutuyi Merkid irgen dawuliju odcu, qara alaq esige daqu emüsgejü, Seleŋgeyin Buura keere Merkidün aur nödübe gü.*' (4613–15) '"To speak of (his) early day(s), the Merkid people carried him off at the age of seven; they gave him a kid-skin coat with black spots to wear, and on the Buura steppe of the Selengge (River he) even pounded (grain in) a Merkid's mortar (*Merkid-ün aur nödü-be gü*)!"'

Similar uses of *gü* in sentence-final position occur in 8537 and 10504.

4.2. In contrast to its exclamatory-emphatic usage, however, the SH particle *gü* very frequently means simply 'too, also'.[19] This meaning is apparently formally conditioned: it is present when a *gü*-head has already occurred—without *gü*—in the same syntactic function which it has in the *gü*-phrase. I.e., two (or more) sentences, usually in immediate succession, show similar or identical internal syntax, and contain at least one lexical item in common; *gü* then occurs after one of the common lexical elements in its second (or subsequent) occurrence. What the particle emphasizes, in such cases, is not, as such, the word which immediately precedes it, but rather the fact of lexico-syntactic repetition. Simply put, *gü* stresses inter-sentential parataxis.[20] Consider the following passages (in which lexical repetitions are set in bold-face).

---

[19] Of the 90 occurrences of *gü* in the SH, I count 21 that are clearly exclamatory (or intensive), and another ten that are probably so. The translation 'too, also' or the like is appropriate in perhaps 48 instances; but 19 of these occur in a single passage (20, below). Some passages showing special semantic problems are discussed in 4.3–4.5 below.

[20] Mongolian makes much greater use of parataxis than does English: where English would conjoin by means of a conjunction such as *and, also, too, but, or*, Mongolian often simply juxtaposes the elements between which conjoining is implied. This is true both of lexical and phrasal elements, and of whole sentences as well. E.g., *sečen sayin* 'wise (and) good' (see footnote 10); *mantur irejü esügcilejü* 'coming to us (and) drinking kumiss'; *Belgünütey Belgünüd oboqtan bolba. Bügünütey Bügünüd oboqtan bolba.* 'From Belgünütey stemmed the Belgünüd clan; (and) from Bügünütey the Bügünüd.' (Of course there are other cases of English conjoining where Mongolian prefers hypotaxis; e.g., *aqanar*

(12) '*Ordoyin cerbin ökidi, gerün köüd, temeecini hükecini* **kebteül** *basaalaju, ordoyin ger tergeni* **asaratuqay**. *Tuq güürge dōro jida* **kebteül asaratuqay**. *Ayaqa saba* **kebteül** *gü* **asaratuqay**.' (9122–25) '"Let the night-guard superintend the cherbi-girls of the palace, the boys of the yurt, the camel-herds and cow-herds, (and) let (them) be responsible for the palace yurt-wagon. Let the night-guard be responsible for the standards, the trumpets, (and) the lances beneath (them). Let the night-guard, too [*gü*], be responsible for (the) bowls and vessels."'

Here in these successive sentences *kebteül* is subject of *asaratuqay* (with direct object); in the third repetition of this lexico-syntactic element *gü* appears after the subject, and means simply 'also'. (Contrast the exclamatory use of *gü* after a subject in passage 1 above.) The next two sentences also show *kebteül* as subject of other verbs with the *-tuqay* ending, but no further *gü* appears; hence use of this particle is clearly optional rather than obligatory in such circumstances.

(13) '*Onannu Deliün boldaqa büküytür Temüjini törööküytür buluqan nelkey* **ögülee bi**. *Ene köüben Jelmeyi* **ögülee** *gü* **bi**.' (2216–17) '"When (you people) were at Deliün-boldaq on the Onon (River, and) when (you) Temüjin were born, I gave (you) sable swaddling-clothes (as a gift). I also [*gü*] gave (you) this son of mine, Jelme."' (Contrast this with the exclamatory *oroldulaa gü* of passage 2 above.)

One might think that the second of these sentences should be translated 'I even gave you this son of mine, Jelme'. But when one compares all SH uses of *gü* in lexico-syntactic repetitions, it becomes clear that the meaning 'also, too' is the only one which is appropriate to all such passages; hence such translations— used in the past by most SH translators in most such passages, but never explained heretofore—are in fact correct.[21]

The next two examples show contrasting exclamatory and paratactic uses of *gü* in maximally similar positions, i.e., after *ese* 'not' and before a verb ending in *-bA*.

(14) '. . . *Jürkini jirqoan üdüd gülicejü ese gü iregdeba.*' (3720–21) '"(We) waited 6 days for the Jürkin, (but they) never came."'; or perhaps better '. . . (but they) didn't come even then' (cf. footnote 13). (The indirect passive of *ire-* 'come' is literally '(we) suffered (from their) not coming'.)

(15) '*Qacari cimayi Nekün taysiyin köün keejü bidanaca* **"ci qan bol" kēesü, ese bolba je ci**. *Altani cimayi Qutula qan lu meden yabulua ecigeyüen meden aqsaar* **"ci qan bol" kēesü, ese** *gü* **bolba je ci**.' (6031–6103) '"Qucar, when I said that from among us you, as the son of Nekün-taishi, should become qan, you declined. When I said that you, Altan, should then become qan and govern us like your father Qutula-qan had been governing us, you too declined."' (This is de Rachewiltz' translation [1977.39]. The first sentence is, very literally: 'When (I) said "you become qan" from among us, saying that you, Qucar, are son of Nekün-taishi, you surely [*je*] did not become.'.)

Here are additional instances of paratactic *gü*, after adverbial elements and after a predicate noun.

(16) *Merkidün ulus Seleŋge huruu* **sönide** *dürbejü yabuquytur, bidanu ceriü*[*d*] *dürbejü yabuqun Merkidi* **sönide** *gü daracaju dawulin talan yabuquytur* . . . (2726–28) 'As the Merkid people fled at night down the Selengge (River), (and) as pillaging and plundering went on while our troops, also [*gü*] at night, kept pressing (hard after) the fleeing Merkid. . . .'[22]

(17) . . . *caqaan tuq bayiuluad Ciŋgis qahanna qan nere* **tende** *ögba. Muqalida guy-oŋ nere* **tende** *gü ögba. Jebeyi Naymannu Gücülüg qani nekeülün* **tende** *gü cauraulba.* (7707–10) '. . . [they] set up the white standard. . . ., and at that time [**tende**] gave Chinggis Qahan the title (of) qan. Then too [*gü*] (they) gave the title guiong to Muqali. Then too [*gü*] (they) sent Jebe

---

deüner kelelеldüjü morilaba. 'The brothers discussed (the matter) together, and set out on horseback.' [literally: '. . . discussing, rode'].) Since 'and' is often appropriate in the English translation of simple (unmarked) parataxis, parataxis emphasized by *gü* is appropriately translated as 'also, too'.

[21] The present writer was somewhat skeptical that such translations truly represented the semantic value of *gü* until he noted the first example cited in footnote 10 above: there 'also, too, as well' is the only translation possible. Seemingly, too, such translation is always appropriate for *gü* under the above-specified conditions.

[22] This is the only case I have noticed where the lexico-syntactic parallelism emphasized by *gü* occurs within a single sentence; but this sentence involves conjoining (and then embedding) of two underlying deep-structure sentences—one without *gü* and one with.

on a war mission to pursue Güchülug qan of the Naiman.' (Equivalently, one might translate: 'It was then, too, that. . . .')

(18) *Höelün eke ügülerün, 'köüdi* **öter** *seriülüdkün' kēed, Höelün eke* **öter** *gü bosbi. Temüjintan köüd öterlen gü bosuad, moridiyan bariju . . .* (2226–28) 'Mother Höelün said: "Wake up the children quickly"; (and) Mother Höelün got up quickly too [*gü*]. Temüjin and the other children got up really fast [*öter-le-n gü*: exclamatory] (and) grabbing their horses. . . .'

(19) In a passage (too long for full citation here) at the very end of the SH, Ögödey enumerates what he considers four positive accomplishments of his life, and four faults or errors. In 11930–3 we find '*Niken* **buruu** *minu ene bolba je.*' '"This was surely one error of mine."'; in 11934, '. . . *niken* **buruu** *ene bolba je.*' '"This was surely an error."'; and in 12007, '**Buruu** *gü bolba.*' '"(This) was also an error."' or '"(This) was a further error."'

Equally clear paratactic uses of *gü* are found, for example in lines 4730, 6708, 8936, and 11319.[23]

This section would not be complete without mention of one truly notable SH passage which shows 19 paratactic *gü*'s. It is in paragraphs 120–122, where we are given a catalog of leaders who sided with Temüjin after his break with Jamuqa.

(20) In line 3101 a sentence ends in *ayisun ajuu* '[three Toquraun brothers] arrived (to join Temüjin)'; the next two sentences show *Basa . . .* **ayisun** *gü* **ajuu** 'Further, . . . [so-and-so] arrived too' (3103–04). Two sentences then end in **ireba** '[so-and-so] came' (3105–06); then one in **ireba** *gü* '[so-and-so] also came' (3107); then **ireba** (3109); then a string of 11 sentences with **ireba** *gü* and one with *Basa . . .* **ireba** *gü* (3110–21). After an absence of 18 lines,[24] **ireba** *gü* reappears four times at the end of successive sentences in lines 3203–05 (with *Basa . . .* in the second and fourth of these). De Rachewiltz in translating these lines (1972a.161–62) scatters the words 'also, too, then' through the passage in order to add some slight variety to the lexico-syntactic parallelism which would otherwise be extraordinarily monotonous in English.

A single passage seems to represent a genuine exception to the above-stated formal condition for the paratactic usage of *gü*.

(21) *. . . Jamuqa qoyar tümed* **ceriüdiyen jasa***ju bayijuuy. Ede ber . . .* **ceriüdiyen jasa***ad gü, gürülcejü jici tanilduju. . . .* (2707–09) '. . . Jamuqa set his two-tümen (of) troops in battle order. These (leaders) for their part . . ., also put their troops in battle order; and as (the two groups) came together (the leaders) at once recognized each other.'

Here a **jasaju gü* would satisfy the paratactic conditioning stated above, but *jasaad gü* does not. This difficulty is resolved if we take *gü* here to modify *ceriüdiyen jasa-* rather than *jasaad* (or *ceriüdiyen jasaad*). Quite possibly *gü* after a converb always modifies the verb stem (with modifiers) rather than the converb as such; the SH, unfortunately, does not supply enough data to decide this matter. (Cf. the remarks of footnote 15, above.)

4.3. In one SH passage the particle *gü* is clearly used to reinforce the phonological, morphological, lexical, and syntactic parallelism which constitutes poetic diction in Mongolian.

(22) '*Olon dayisuntur haulurun*
qamtu nikene hauluya.
Oroa görögesüntür abalarun
nikene gü qamtu abalaya.' (5029–31) De Rachewiltz translates (1976.53):
'"When we attack the enemy hosts,
As one we shall attack together;
When we hunt wild beasts, together
As one we shall hunt them!"'

In light of the discussion of 4.2 above, we may assume

[23] De Rachewiltz (1974.69) translates *gü* as 'also' in one passage where there is no parataxis (as defined above): 'Next morning Sorqan-shira and Jebe, who had been retainers of Tödöge of the Tayiciut, also arrived—the two of them' (4219–20). Here we have *gü* after *ireba* 'came'; *ireba* alone has not occurred earlier, but de Rachewiltz's 'and' seems to mean 'in addition to Sorqan-shira's wife' (who has in fact just appeared). By the above-stated rule, *gü* here should be exclamatory, '*did* come; actually came'; and this makes sense, in context, if we translate 'the two of them . . . finally arrived'. For one of Chinggis Qahan's first remarks to the two is: 'Why did you delay (coming to me)?'. (Note that in this passage there is a virtually untranslatable *ber*, which contrasts these two men with the daughter of Sorqan-shira.)

[24] One wonders whether these lines—the totality of section 121—may have been a later interpolation into an otherwise continuous passage; for the *ireba gü* of 3203 seems the only instance in the SH of a paratactic *gü* referring to a simplex (*ireba*) or identical phrase (*ireba gü*) which occurred more than one sentence earlier.

this *gü* to be paratactic; thus, literally: 'As one, also, let us hunt together.' (The fact that *nikene* has been moved to the beginning of the line in its second occurrence presumably adds some intensive emphasis; we would expect the *gü*-phrase to be located immediately before the verb.) But since it is precisely in poetry that English does employ parataxis most frequently (suppressing a conjunction and using non-final punctuation) de Rachewiltz' translation may be considered impeccable—assuming that the exclamation point translates the voluntative *-ya*, and not the *gü*.

The only other occurrence of *gü* in poetry is less clear.

(23) '*Tooriquy tutum*
toyi jokiyu.
Derelgü gü tutum
dem jokiyu.' (5420–21)

Neither de Rachewiltz (1977.28) nor Poppe (see de Rachewiltz 1977.46) translates the *gü* here; and it is left unglossed in the Chinese interlinear "translation." De Rachewiltz translates:

> '"Everytime they encircle (the enemy)
> Their battle array holds;
> Everytime they wheel round
> Their ranks hold."'

It is not clear to me whether *gü* here is exclamatory ('whenever (they) actually wheel round [i.e., feign retreat]'; see de Rachewiltz, loc. cit.), or whether the syntactic parallelism alone is sufficient to trigger the paratactic sense of *gü* here. Examination of poetic passages with *kü* in later epics may perhaps clarify such usage.

4.4. There are two slight problems in the use of *gü* after a pre-nominal modifier.

Consider the following passage.

(24) *Jamuqa Uwas Merkidün Dayir usuni arbilaju abuqsan altan büse Temüjin andada büseleülba. Dayir usunu gü ebertü ünügün caqaani Temüjine unuulba.* (3001–03)[25] 'Jamuqa put on (his) sworn brother Temüjin the golden belt taken as loot (from) Dayir-usun of the Uwas Merkid. (He) had Temüjin mount the kid-white (horse) with a horn, also of Dayir-usun.'

It is clear from context that the *gü* here must mean 'also', rather than being exclamatory; yet the apparent *gü*-head consists of name-plus-genitive, and this sequence did not occur earlier—though name-plus-accusative did. We should here recollect an odd fact of Mongolian syntax: that the reflexive(-possessive) morpheme when occurring with a noun and any case ending must follow the case ending even though logically it belongs with the noun. I.e., a phrase like 'to (his) own wagon' is expressed not by a sequence **tergen-iyen-dür* 'wagon-own-to', but by *tergen-dür-iyen* literally 'wagon-to-own'; structurally the reflexive morpheme here goes with the noun, and the case suffix applies to the discontinuous sequence of noun-plus-reflexive. If we assume that *gü* shares this peculiarity of the reflexive suffix,[26] then the proper *gü*-head in (22) is not *Dayir usunu* (which has not occurred before) but *Dayir usun* (which has, in the accusative *Dayir usun-i*). The paratactic sense of *gü* is thus entirely regular in this passage.

A second problem concerns *gü* after a numeral and before a noun. What is odd here is that such a sequence is always preceded by another nominal-plus-noun sequence (without *gü*) where the nouns are identical, though the numerals may differ: in the sole instance where they differ, the *gü* could be taken as having either the exclamatory or the paratactic sense; when the numerals are the same, the 'also, too' seemingly pertains to the whole numeral-plus-noun sequence rather than just to the numeral.

(25) *Minqad minqadaca ilqaju iregsed nayman minqad turqaud bolba. Kebteül qorcinlua qoyar gü minqad bolba. Tümen kesigten bolba.* (8823–25) Omitting *gü* in translation, this is as follows. 'Those selected from the various thousands made up [*bolba*; lit. 'became'] eight thousands (of)

[25] These sentences immediately follow, and closely parallel, the sentences: 'Temüjin put on (his) sworn brother Jamuqa the golden belt taken as loot (from) Toqtoa of the Merkid. (He) had (his) sworn brother Jamuqa mount Toqtoa's . . . (mare).' (De Rachewiltz 1972a.159 translates 'offered . . . as mount' rather than the more literal 'had . . . mount'.)

[26] This was, in fact, assumed in Street 1957.28 for 'emphatic particles' in general. While perhaps a trivial point synchronically, such parallelism between emphatic particles and the reflexive-possessive has important implications for the prehistory of all such morphemes—which seemingly were once free forms occurring before (rather than after) their nominal heads. Similar rightward displacement is, synchronically, still optional with the genitive of personal pronouns, and seems to de-emphasize the displaced element; contrast *min-u üge-tür* 'at (these) word(s) of mine' (5507) and *ger-tür min-u* 'into my yurt' (1321).

day-guards. The night-guard, with quiver-bearers, made two thousands. (In all, this) made 10,000 [or 'a tümen of'] guards.'

If the particle is here taken as exclamatory, the second sentence would be '. . . made *two* thousands' or '. . . made just two thousands'; if as paratactic, then '. . . made two further thousands'. (Pao 1965.40 makes the former interpretation: '. . . precisely reached two thousands in number'. De Rachewiltz 1981.123 prefers the latter: '. . . there were also two thousand night-guards with quiver-bearers'.)

(26) . . . *Jamuqa teriüten Jadaran harban qurban qarin nökücejü* **qurban tümed** *bolju . . . Ciŋgis qahantur morilaju. . . . Ene kelen medeed Ciŋgis qahan—harban qurban güreed büleey—***qurban** *gü* **tümed** *bolju Jamuqayin esergü inu morilaju. . . .* (3418–24) '. . . Jamuqa, at the head of the Jadaran, and his allies making thirteen tribes and forming (altogether) three tümen . . . moved against Chinggis-qahan. . . . Informed of this, Chinggis-qahan with his thirteen camps formed also three tümen [*qurban gü tümed*: paratactic] and set out against Jamuqa.' (The translation is that of de Rachewiltz 1974.56.)[27]

(27) '*Nadur elcin ilērün, qan ecige* **qoyar elcin** *ilē. Seŋgüm anda* **qoyar** *gü* **elcin** *ilē. Jamuqa anda* **qoyar** *gü* **elcin** *ilē. Altan* **qoyar** *gü* **elcin** *ilē. . . .*' (6134–36) '"When (you) send messengers to me, the qan my father (should) send two messengers. Sworn brother Senggüm (should) send another (?) two messengers. Sworn brother Jamuqa (should) send another two messengers. Altan (should) send another two messengers."' (Three others are immediately told to 'send another two messengers'.)

Here it is not entirely clear whether the meaning is 'two further messengers' or 'another two messengers', i.e., whether the paratactic *gü* pertains to the numeral alone or to the numeral-noun repetition.[28] But in light of passage 26 above, and similar passages in lines 8720 and 11203, it seems probable that in such instances of numeral-*gü*-noun the particle modifies the discontinuous numeral-noun sequence rather than the numeral alone. This interpretation seems reasonable since (as we saw in 3.1 above) *gü* never occurs after any premodifier-plus-noun sequence.[29]

4.5. Because of the inherent meaning of *mün* 'same; the very', the otherwise clear distinction between exclamatory-intensive and paratactic uses of *gü* is considerably blurred when the particle occurs after this word (which functions as pronoun, adjective, or adverb) or its plural *müd*. Presumably *mün gü* in its exclamatory-intensive sense would be 'the *same*; the very same', while paratactically it would be 'the same, too; the same, again' or 'the same as before'. Similar blurring may perhaps be seen in *teyin gü*: 'in just that way; just so' on the one hand, and 'in that way, too; in the same way' on the other.[30] In fact, in two passages where paratactic emphasis is intended with these *gü*-heads, this intention is underlined by the addition of *basa* 'further, again'.

(28) '*Öcigen nikente biljiur qodoliduqsani teyin gü buliju abulaa. Edöe basa teyin gü buliba.*' (1633–34) '"Once recently (they) took away (from us) in just that way the lark (we'd) shot with a horn-tipped arrow. Now, again [*basa*], (they've) robbed (us) in the same way."'

---

[27] The two occurrences of *qurban tümed* are in contiguous sentences by virtue of the fact that a portion of line 3423 is an interjected sentence: 'Informed of this, Chinggis Qahan—there were 13 camps—formed also three tümed . . .'

[28] De Rachewiltz 1977.41 translates 'should also send two messengers', as though *gü* followed the imperative *ilē*.

[29] A generative treatment of Middle Mongolian might thus assume that an underlying sequence *numeral-noun-*gü* is subject (synchronically) to an obligatory rule which displaces the enclitic to pre-nominal position. Very likely an actual sequence numeral-*gü*-noun was potentially ambiguous, being the surface manifestation either of *numeral-noun-*gü* or of underlying numeral-*gü* before a noun. (A similar leftward displacement of *gü* may well explain why converb-*gü*-auxilliary-suffix occurs [e.g., *ayisun gü a-juu* in passage 20 above] but not converb-auxilliary-suffix-*gü* [i.e., **ayisun a-juu gü*]. And since *gü* never occurs after a postposition, one wonders whether a phrase like *ecige gü metü* could translate both 'like a real father' and 'really like a father'—the latter with leftward displacement on the enclitic.) Compare such obligatory leftward displacement with the above-mentioned rightward displacement which is optional for the genitive of personal pronouns, but obligatory for the reflexive and *gü* after case endings.

[30] Possibly all anaphoric elements were subject to such blurring when occurring as *gü*-heads; but the SH offers so few examples that no clear pattern emerges. (The *tende gü* of 7201, for example, could be 'there too' [= 'on the southern slopes of the Altai'], or 'just there, just then'. De Rachewiltz' translation [1978.57] 'also . . . on that occasion' seems to me inappropriate.)

The first *gü* here is exclamatory; the *teyin* refers back to an incident described in lines 1624–25. The second *gü*, presumably intended paratactically (lit. 'in that way, too'), is reinforced by *basa*.

(29) *Bodoncar . . . '. . .' keeba. Aqa inu Buqu qatagi tere üge inu yauna ber ese bolqaba. Basa* **mün üge** *ügüleesü, aqa inu yauna ber ülü bolqan, qariu inu ese doŋqodba. Bodoncar yabuju basa* **mün** *gü* **üge** *ügüleba.* (833–901) 'Bodonchar said ". . .". His brother Buqu-qatagi paid no attention to these [lit., 'this'] word(s) of his. When again [*basa*] (he) said the same word(s), his older brother paid no attention and uttered no response to him. As (they) went along (further), Bodonchar again [*basa*] spoke the same word(s) as before.'

Here a semantic distinction between (paratactic) 'the same as before' and (intensive) 'the very same' is virtually imperceptible in English. In lines 3717–22, where there is no *basa*, three instances of *müd gü* (referring to the Jürkin) are adequately translated simply as 'the same (people)'.

5. To conclude this discussion of the particle *gü* in the SH, let us briefly consider how this enclitic is treated by the Chinese interlinear glosses accompanying the syllabically-transcribed Mongolian text.

If we exclude four instances (1825, 1633–34, 4832) where glossing is contextual (in terms of a *gü*-phrase in syntactic context) rather than carried out lexeme-by-lexeme, it turns out that *gü* is glossed either by *chih* $^{(c)}$ or by *yeh* $^{(d)}$—or else left entirely unglossed.

The gloss *chih* occurs for only five occurrences of *gü*; all of these are clearly exclamatory, and, as such, have been cited in section 4.1 above (passages 1, 4, 5, 8). In Chinese, according to Dobson 1974.480, this *chih* is a "particle of sentential mood; indicating surprise, wonder, indignation or heightened emotion in general." Thus the Chinese editors of the SH recognized the exclamatory nature of *gü* in at least these few (optimally clear) cases.

Omission of a gloss for *gü* (found only in the first half of the SH text) seems to be random from the semantic point of view: three exclamatory *gü*'s are unglossed (passages 3 and 10 above, and line 4417); one paratactic *mün gü*[31] (passage 29); one blurred *mün kü* (1908); and one poetic occurrence (5420) cited above in passage 23.

[31] Note that *chih* $^{(c)}$ is regularly used to gloss *mün* 'same'; the Chinese may well have felt the blurring mentioned in 4.5 above.

In all other occurrences, *gü* is glossed *yeh* $^{(d)}$. This is true both in clear exclamatory passages (e.g., 2, 6, 7, 9, 11 above), and in all paratactic passages which have any gloss at all. But it should be noted that this same *yeh* is also used to gloss the SH elements *ba*, *teki/taki*, *ci*, and *ber*. As pointed out in Street 1981.165, this *yeh* may mean 'and, even, also, besides, still', but is also employed as a mark of emphasis (following the word it stresses).

Just as Western scholars have sometimes lumped together enclitics such as *gü*, *ci*, and *ber* under the vague term "emphatic particles"—without attempting a finer semantic analysis of their differences—so the Chinese editors of the SH seem to have been satisfied with a similarly-broad employment of the gloss *yeh* to represent different Mongolian particles, and different senses of both *gü* and *ber*. That these editors did not distinguish between exclamatory and paratactic uses of *gü* in precisely the way these have been described above need not surprise us; that they did, sometimes at least, distinguish between *chih* and *yeh* in glossing *gü* offers some confirmation of the hypothesis here offered: that the SH particle *gü* was used—and used systematically—in two different senses.

GLOSSARY

(*a*) $k'u^{1,5}$ = 虧

(*b*) ku^3 = 古

(*c*) $chih^3$ = 只

(*d*) yeh^3 = 也

REFERENCES

Cleaves, Francis W. 1951. 'The Sino-Mongolian Inscription of 1338 in memory of Jigüntei', *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 14.1–104.

___ 1954. 'The *Bodistw-a čari-a awatar-un tayilbur* of 1312 by Čosgi Odsir', *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 17.1–129.

de Rachewiltz, Igor. 1971–81. '[English translation of] the Secret History of the Mongols', *Papers in Far Eastern History* [Canberra] 4.115–163 (1971), 5.149–175 (1972a), 10.55–82 (1974), 13.41–75 (1976), 16.27–65 (1977), 18.43–80 (1978), 21.17–57 (1980), 23.111–146 (1981).

[Translation of the first nine chapters of the Secret History; the first two chapters are covered in the first issue above, one in each of the following ones.]

___. 1972b. *Index to the Secret History of the Mongols.* Uralic and Altaic Series 121. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Dobson, W. A. C. H. 1974. *A dictionary of the Chinese particles.* Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.

Doerfer, Gerhard. 1975. 'Bemerkungen zum Vokalismus des Monguor (Langvokale im Urmongolischen? III)', *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 73.36–94.

Grønbech, Kaare, and John R. Krueger. 1976. *An introduction to Classical (Literary) Mongolian*, Second edition. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Hattori Shirō. 1976. 'Some problems of the reconstruction of the Mongolian sounds of the Secret History of the Mongols: on the word gu-un', pp. 261–272 in Walther Heissig, et al. (eds.), *Tractata Altaica* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz).

Lessing, Ferdinand, et al. 1960. *Mongolian-English dictionary.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Lewicki, Marian. 1949. *La langue mongole des transcriptions chinoises du xiv^e^ siècle. Le Houa-yi yi-yu de 1389.* Travaux de la Société des Sciences et des Lettres de Wrocław, Seria A, Nr. 29.

Ligeti, Louis. 1972. *Monumenta linguae mongolicae collecta, III: Monuments en écriture 'phags-pa. . . .* Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Murayama Shichirô. 1970. 'Die Entwicklung der Theorie von den primären langen Vokalen im Mongolischen', pp. 359–70 in Louis Ligeti (ed.), *Mongolian Studies* (Amsterdam: B. R. Grüner).

Pao Kuo-Yi. 1965. *Studies on the Secret History of the Mongols.* Uralic and Altaic Series 58. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Pelliot, Paul. 1949. *Histoire Secrète des Mongols.* Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.

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

___. 1955. *Introduction to Mongolian comparative studies.* Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

___. 1957. *The Mongolian monuments in ḥ P'ags-pa script.* Second edition. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

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

___. 1981. 'The particle *ber* in the Secret History', *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* N. F. 1.142–68.