Volume 8 in the Collected Works of M. A. K. Halliday

Studies in Chinese Language

M. A. K. Halliday

Edited by Jonathan J. Webster

continuum

Volume 8 in the Collected Works of M. A. K. Halliday

Studies in Chinese Language

M. A. K. Halliday

Edited by Jonathan Webster

continuum
LONDON • NEW YORK

Continuum
The Tower Building
11 York Road
London SE1 7NX

80 Maiden Lane
Suite 704
New York
NY 10038

First published 2005

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN 0–8264–5874–2 (hardback)
ISBN 978–1–847–06575–9 (paperback)

Typeset by RefineCatch Limited, Bungay, Suffolk
Printed and bound in Great Britain by MPG Books Ltd, Bodmin, Cornwall

CONTENTS

PREFACE

To fully appreciate the papers in this volume, *Studies in Chinese Language*, one needs to know something of Professor Halliday's experience as a young man in China leading up to his return to England in 1950 to complete his Ph.D. (For a more complete biographical account of his early years, see Webster 2005.)

After leaving the army in 1947, Professor Halliday decided to pursue his degree from the University of London externally in China. In that same year, he enrolled as a student at Peking University, where he took classes in the Chinese Department. A year later, 1948, he flew to Nanking, where the British Council had made the necessary arrangements for him to take the University of London examination, which was on Modern Chinese: a combination of language and literature, including the history of Chinese literature from 500 BC to the present day.

After completing his London degree, he took a job in China working for the Chinese Industrial Cooperatives. He worked for them for about six months until; as he tells it, in some small village in Gansu a letter arrived which had been chasing him for about three months which said he had been given a scholarship from England for postgraduate study. 'Proceed back to Peking immediately', began the letter, informing Professor Halliday that he had just been awarded a scholarship to undertake postgraduate study back in England. However, he was allowed to spend two more years studying in China before returning to England. The next six months were spent at Peking University, studying under Professor Luo Changpei, who started training him in historical linguistics and Sino-Tibetan studies. After about six months or so, however, it became clear to Luo that Professor Halliday was really more interested in working on Chinese dialects, so Luo sent him to work with Professor

Wang Li, then Dean of the Faculty of Arts at Lingnan University in Guangzhou (Canton), who was at that time carrying out a phonetic survey of the varieties of Cantonese of the Pearl River Delta region of central Guangdong province. In addition to contributing to the ongoing phonetic investigation, Professor Halliday also developed a grammar questionnaire which he used to elicit versions of Cantonese sentences in local dialects (see Chapter Three, 'Some Lexicogrammatical Features of the Dialects of the Pearl River Delta' for an account of his findings from that study; also samples of his field notes are included on the accompanying CD-ROM).

When Professor Halliday returned to England from China in 1950 to complete his Ph.D., he thought he would be studying at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) under the supervision of Professor J. R. Firth, and working on the material from his dialect work with Wang Li. But England in 1950 was at the height of McCarthyism, so even though he was not a member of the Communist Party, the fact that he refused to undertake not to become a member prevented him from being admitted to SOAS. Instead, he was admitted to the Chinese Department at Cambridge, where the emphasis was on classical, not modern Chinese. Realizing Professor Halliday's preference for studying modern Chinese dialects, his supervisor at Cambridge, Professor Gustav Haloun, suggested, as a compromise, that he work on the Chinese translation of the *Secret History of the Mongols*. Haloun also allowed him to go to London to study with Firth, who had agreed to take him on for informal supervision. This arrangement was soon to change, however, when Haloun suddenly died at the end of the year. Professor Halliday asked Firth if he would be willing to become his official supervisor, if it could be arranged. Firth agreed, and Professor Halliday, although still a student at Cambridge, was allowed to transfer to Firth's supervision, travelling regularly to SOAS. Thus the dedication to Professor Firth in the preface of the book based on his doctoral dissertation, 'The Language of the Chinese "Secret History of the Mongols"' (see Section One, Medieval Chinese Grammar), which reads 'I was very fortunate to have Professor Firth to guide me in the preparation of the present work, and it is a great pleasure to me to be able to dedicate it to him.'

This volume is divided into four sections, the first of which, 'Medieval Chinese Grammar', is the book based on his doctoral dissertation, 'The Language of the Chinese "Secret History of the Mongols"'. Section Two, 'Modern Chinese Grammar', contains two previously unpublished papers, Chapters Two and Four, in addition to one of Professor Halliday's first published papers, 'Grammatical Categories in Chinese' (1956), a

paper published just a year after completing his Ph.D., and three years before the publication of his doctoral dissertation. Section Three, 'Chinese Phonology', contains two papers, one offering a historical perspective, Chapter Five, 'The Origin and Early Development of Chinese Phonological Theory' (1981), the other, Chapter Six, 'A Systemic Interpretation of Peking Syllables' (1992), reflects the influence of his early training in traditional Chinese phonology under Luo and Wang, and subsequent experience with prosodic phonology under Firth. The fourth and final section, 'Grammar and Discourse', presents three papers which are more comparative in orientation, looking at the relation of discourse to the lexicogrammar in both English and Chinese.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to the original publishers for permission to reprint the articles and chapters in this volume. Original publication details are provided below, and also at the beginning of each chapter.

The Language of the Chinese 'Secret History of the Mongols' 1956. Copyright © Blackwell Publishing.

'Grammatical categories in Modern Chinese', from *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1956, pp. 177–224.

'The origin and early development of Chinese phonological theory', from *Towards a History of Phonetics*, edited by R. E. Asher and Eugenie J. A. Henderson (1981). Copyright © Edinburgh Press. www.eup.ed.ac.uk

'A systemic interpretation of Peking syllables', from *Studies in Systemic Phonology*, pp. 98–121 (1992). Copyright © Pinter, London.

'Grammatical Metaphor in English and Chinese', from *New Papers on Chinese Language Use*, edited by Beverly Hong (1984). Copyright © Research School of Pacific Studies, The Australian National University.

'The analysis of scientific texts in English and Chinese', from *Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power*. This chapter was originally presented at the International Conference on Research in Texts and Language, Xi'an Jiaotong University, March 1989. With kind permission of the Taylor and Francis Group.

'On the grammatical foundations of discourse', from *Grammar and Discourse: Proceedings of the International Conference on Discourse Analysis*, edited by Ren Shaozeng, William Guthrie and I. W. Ronald Fong (2001). Reprinted with permission from the University of Macau.

'The Secret History of the Mongols' on the accompanying CD-ROM is included with the kind permission of the Shanghai Classics Publishing House.

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

The first section is comprised of Professor Halliday's doctoral disssertation, 'The Language of the Chinese "Secret History of the Mongols 元朝秘史"', completed in 1955 for the degree of Ph.D. at the University of Cambridge, and first published by 'The Philological Society' in 1959. His aim was to provide 'a complete synchronic linguistic analysis', i.e. a descriptive grammar, of the Chinese translation of this personal biography of Genghis Khan known as the 'Secret History'.

The text was originally written in Mongolian in the thirteenth century AD and published with the addition of a Chinese translation and Chinese Gloss at the end of the fourteenth century. The complete text is included on the accompanying CD, including (i) the Mongolian version, which is in fact the earliest Mongolian document of any considerable length, (ii) the Gloss, i.e. a complete word-for-word rendering of the Mongolian in Chinese, and (iii) the Chinese translation, the earliest known text in Mandarin Chinese. The reason it was in Mandarin, as Professor Halliday explains, was that it had been translated into Chinese to be used as a textbook for Chinese civil servants who had to learn Mongolian, the official language of the civil service.

Professor Halliday's account of the 'The Language of the Chinese "Secret History of the Mongols 元朝秘史"' was intended, initially, to be 'purely descriptive', with 'statements valid for this language' arranged in a series of six sections, each dealing with a particular level of descriptive analysis: contextualization, graphics analysis, script and language, grammar, lexis, and phonology and transcription. The Chinese "Secret History of the Mongols 元朝秘史" played the role of linguistic informant, or, in fact, as Professor Halliday notes, 'an informant who is himself a linguist, in virtue of the plurilingual character of the text'. Professor

Halliday also envisaged his description 'may form part of a historical analysis composed of a series of descriptive statements arranged in time-sequence; and that the description, or parts of it, may be subjected to comparative treatment in juxtaposition both with other descriptive parts of the same historical statement and with other descriptive statements of languages where comparison will show systematic relationship'. Thus he indicates the categories of units, classes and functions used for making statements about the language may be compared with those 'set up for Modern Pekingese in my "Grammatical Categories in Modern Chinese", pp. 217–18' (see Chapter 3 of this volume).

Chapter One

THE LANGUAGE OF THE CHINESE "SECRET HISTORY OF THE MONGOLS 元朝秘史" (1959)

SECTIONS 1–5

1 The text

1.1 The "Secret History of the Mongols" is the name given to a composite text, originally written in Mongolian in the thirteenth century AD and published with the addition of a Chinese translation and Chinese Gloss at the end of the fourteenth century. The Chinese title of the whole work, and of the Chinese translation as a separate work, is *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih* (1). The Mongolian version probably at first had no title, though the first three words of the present text may originally have been the title of at least part of the work;[1] but the Mongolian title now in current use, *Mangqol-un niuča tobča'an*, of which the Chinese is a translation, was at some time given to the Mongolian version and later figures as the sub-title of the composite text.

1.2 The "Secret History" is a personal biography of Genghis Khan, beginning with an outline of the legendary history of the Mongol people and extending, in the last two chapters (designated in one tradition as "supplementary"), to the first part of the reign of Genghis' successor Ogodai Khan. The exact date of composition, as also that of the Chinese translation, is uncertain; the final sentence states that the book was completed in July of the year "Rat", and this has generally been assumed[2] to refer to the year 1240. Recently, however, Hung has shown that the year referred to may well be later by one or more twelve-year cycles, himself regarding 1264 as the most likely date (Hung, 1951: 487–92). The Chinese translation is thought to have been made not less than a century later, probably soon after the fall of the last Mongol

The Language of the Chinese 'Secret History of the Mongols', M. A. K. Halliday (1956).

emperor in Peking (1367) but possibly as late as 1404 (Hung 1951: 449–69; Pelliot 1949 (preface dated 1920); Haenisch 1931: Section 1, Foreword, p. 1.[3]

The composite text was preserved in China in various manuscript copies and prints, ultimately derived from two separate but not widely divergent originals: the (manuscript encyclopedia) *Yung-lo ta-tien* (2) (1403–08) edition, now lost, and an early Ming print, roughly contemporary and probably taken from the same original version, of which 41 pages have been preserved. The chief point of difference between the two is that the Yung-lo ta-tien version is divided into 15 chapters, while the other tradition has 12 (10 plus 2 supplementary).[4] Some details of the various copies made of the text in the subsequent period are given below.[5] In 1936 the Commercial Press, Shanghai, brought out an edition of the composite text photo-lithographically reproduced from a copy[6] of the 12-chapter version, with the 41 surviving pages of the original print inserted in place of the corresponding pages of the manuscript copy; it is this edition, forming part of the third series of the great Commercial Press library *Ssŭ-pu ts'ung-k'an* (3), which has been used for the purposes of the present study.

1.3 The composite text contains the Mongolian version, the Chinese version and the Chinese Gloss. The Mongolian version is written in what we may call "Sino-Mongolian" script: that is, by means of a limited number of Chinese characters used to represent the phonological system of the Mongolian more or less syllabically.[7] The entire text is thus written in Chinese characters. The Gloss, which is interlinear to the Mongolian version, is a complete word-for-word rendering of the Mongolian in Chinese. The Chinese version, which has also been published separately and a commentary added,[8] is a continuous text divided into paragraphs with each paragraph following the Mongolian passage of which it is a translation;[9] it is actually an abridged translation, some passages of the original being left out, though more often the abridgment takes the form of précis rather than of direct omission.[10]

1.3.1 The Mongolian version is the earliest Mongolian document of any considerable length, and contains many passages in verse, much of it doubtless traditional. The Mongolian text, or an earlier version of it, was used as source material for other contemporary histories; but after the fall of the Mongol empire in China, when the Sino-Mongolian script was no longer used, it was preserved only in the composite text and received little or no further attention until the twentieth century. Since 1900, four separate transcriptions have been made into romanized Mongolian, by Pelliot (1949, verse passages are indicated

typographically), Haenisch (1937), Kozin (1941) and Shiratori (1942), each, curiously, working independently of the other three;[11] and translations have been made by Naka (1907)[12] into Japanese, and by Haenisch (1948) into German and Kozin (1941)[13] into Russian. There is finally an incomplete French translation by Pelliot (1949).[14,15,16,17]

1.3.2 The question of the script in which the original version of the Mongolian text was written down is a matter of uncertainty. Palladius (Kafarov), the first European scholar to pay attention to the text, thought that the original version was written in Uighur-Mongolian script and had been lost (Palladius 1910); and this view, perhaps the most widely accepted (Haenisch 1948: 1; Pelliot 1948: 231; Shiratori 1942: Editor's Foreword, p. 1), was reinforced by the discovery by Pelliot in the late 1920s in the library of Ulan-Bator of a manuscript containing large parts of the "Secret History" in Uighur-Mongolian script (Pelliot 1930).[18] This manuscript was published in two volumes in Ulan-Bator in 1938 and is regarded by Kozin, who gives a transcription of it in the same volume with his two transcriptions of the "Secret History", as an attempt by seventeenth-century Mongol Buddhist scholars to rewrite the Mongolian text from the Sino-Mongolian script into the then current Uighur-Mongolian script; Kozin (1941: 25) holds the view that the only original form of the text was the Sino-Mongolian version, a view which Franke (1952: 7–10) likewise regards as a possibility. A third view, held by Hattori (1946), is that the original version was in hPags-pa script, while Poppe (1950) envisages the possibility that the Uighur-Mongolian original was first transcribed into hPags-pa and thence into Sino-Mongolian.

1.3.3 Whereas the Mongolian version has for some time occupied the interest of linguists and historians, the Chinese version has until recently been little studied: being a translation, and moreover abridged, its main interest is in the field of Chinese linguistics. Here, however, it is of particular interest, in that it is composed not in the literary language but in what may by opposition be referred to as "colloquial". It has been translated once only, by Palladius (1910);[19] but its unique position as a long continuous narrative in "colloquial" language of its date places it in the forefront of source material for descriptive and historical studies of the Chinese language.

1.4 The present work is concerned with the description of the language of the Chinese version. A cursory reading shows that the language is not literary Chinese, though forms taken from the literary language, rare in the first half of the book, appear with much greater frequency in the final chapters; and that it resembles the Mandarin dialect of the

reflect and, at the same time, influence the scientific trends of their times, and advances made by divergent "schools" of linguistics have become the common ground of all. Progress in recent decades has been considerable, and it is significant that in 1951 an international commission meeting in Paris under the auspices of the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies of UNESCO was able to draw up certain recommendations, by following which linguists engaged in descriptive grammar could ensure that their work would rest on a sound basis of up-to-date linguistic theory.

2.2.1 Firth (1951), in his introduction to the Report of the Commission, commented on the degree of progress and extent of agreement in linguistics that made the recommendations possible. "During the last thirty years linguistics has made great advances and today may be said to be in the van of the social sciences" (p. 70). "All the various streams contribute in varying volume and strength to present-day schools of linguistics, each of which has well-marked characteristics and specialized interests. But in the fundamentals of descriptive grammar there is general agreement which is to some extent expressed in the recommendations of the Paris symposium which provide the occasion for this article" (p. 73). Basing himself on these "fundamentals", the linguist can approach his material and state his results in such a manner that his work is of the greater value to others in his field.

2.2.2 Of the treatment of the material, Firth says: 'Language text must be attributed to participants in some context of situation in order that its modes of meaning may be stated at a series of levels, which taken together form a sort of linguistic spectrum. In this "spectrum" the meaning of the whole event is dispersed and dealt with by a hierarchy of linguistic techniques descending from social contextualization to phonology' (p. 76). A descriptive grammar of the language of a given text deals with "the meaning of the whole event"; the meaning is not separate from or opposed to the linguistic form but is a function of the whole text. The complete text has meaning in the social context in which it operates, and this is to be stated by the procedure of "contextualization". Commenting on the Report, Firth points out: 'It will be noticed that "linguistic forms" are considered to have "meanings" at the grammatical and lexical levels, such "meanings" being determined by interrelations of the forms in the grammatical systems set up for the language' (p. 85). Each element has meaning 'with reference to the specific system of which it is a "term", "unit" or "member" in a given language' (ibid.). The words (the units of lexical statement) of the text function in interrelations of collocation and in "ordered series";

grammatical forms are ranged as terms in paradigmatic systems and operate in syntagmatic relations in the structure. The comprehensive statement of such relations is the statement of the meaning of the text at these levels.

2.2.3 The whole of the Report of the Commission serves to guide the linguist in his approach to the material. "The recommendations", it is stated in the Report, "are not put forward as a formal scheme of description. In each case the method of analysis and description to be employed should be synchronic in principle and appropriate to the structure of the language under examination. The intention is simply to bring out certain general and necessary requirements for the descriptions of the type desired" (pp. 77–8). A number of the detailed recommendations have a direct bearing on the present work: these need not be listed here, but the closing paragraph of Firth's commentary may well be stressed. "Finally," says Firth, "there is nothing revolutionary or strikingly new in the recommendations. The important thing is that linguists of most schools would, I imagine, agree that any account of a modern spoken language which followed the recommendations would today be considered a good descriptive grammar" (p. 87). The question to be asked here is: what then of the application of these recommendations to an account of the language of a written text some six centuries old?

2.3 If the recommendations are to be valid for this purpose the aim of the description must be congruent with the aims envisaged by the compilers of the Report. The task here undertaken is the presentation, by means of a comprehensive statement in its own terms, of the language of a certain text, the Chinese translation of the "Secret History of the Mongols". The aim of the account is, initially, purely descriptive: to make statements valid for this language. As a wider aim it is envisaged that the description may form part of a historical analysis composed of a series of descriptive statements arranged in time-sequence; and that the description, or parts of it, may be subjected to comparative treatment in juxtaposition both with other descriptive parts of the same historical statement and with other descriptive statements of languages where comparison will show systematic relationship.[21] The task is prescribed for the purpose of the statement and in any case limits itself, since we have no other text of the period in the same language ("colloquial" not "literary") and style.[22] The approach to the material is thus congruent with the aims envisaged by the Report.

2.3.1 The problem of application of the descriptive techniques as outlined in the recommendations lies in their application in general to a

written text and in particular to a written text so complex in history and structure as the "Secret History of the Mongols". The recommendations made in the Report concerning the description at the grammatical and lexical levels present no special problems in their application to a written text as such. The order of analysis and of presentation of the material, where it is felt that the procedure should be from the larger to the smaller unit, beginning with the text as a whole and working towards the features of articulation, not only may be retained but is indeed the more desirable in handling a written text in that it involves moving from the known towards the unknown. At the two "outer" levels of contextualization and phonology, however, special problems arise in connection with a written text, and these will be dealt with in the respective sections (3 and 8). Moreover at least one other level of analysis is required by a written text, for statements to be made concerning the script, punctuation and so forth; and for the "Secret History of the Mongols" it has seemed desirable to discuss this aspect under two headings: "Graphic Analysis", which treats of the outward form of the written text, and "Script and Language", which treats of the script and its relation to the language of the text.

The description has thus been arranged in a series of six sections, in each of which statements are made about the language of the text at a particular level of descriptive analysis: contextualization, graphic analysis, script and language, grammar, lexis, and phonology and transcription.

3 Contextualization

3.1 Any text functions in a context, from which can be abstracted certain features relevant to the descriptive analysis. The context of a written text of the past is more complex, and more difficult to evaluate and make abstraction from, than that of a contemporary spoken language text. A written text of the past can be said to have context in two dimensions, arising out of the effect of writing on the place of a linguistic event on the time-track. On the one hand, the text of the Chinese translation of the "Secret History of the Mongols" exists today as a historical work and work of Chinese literature, and as such is read and used by various people for various purposes. On the other hand, the text has been in existence for some six hundred years and has its own "history". It is not necessary to insist on "two contexts"; the point is rather that a written text can be contextualized at any moment from the time of its being written down, so that its context could be presented "diachronically" in a series of "synchronic" statements.[23]

3.1.1 Of the use of contextualization in linguistic analysis, Firth has said that the concept of context of situation "is best used as a suitable schematic construct to apply to language events, and that it is a group of related categories at a different level from grammatical analysis but rather of the same abstract nature. A context of situation for linguistic work brings into relation the following categories:

A The relevant features of participants: persons, personalities.
  (i) The Verbal Action of the Participants.
  (ii) The Non-Verbal Action of the Participants.
B The relevant objects.
C The effect of the Verbal Action.

Contexts of situation and types of language function can then be grouped and classified." Context is "parallel with grammatical rules, and based on the repetitive routines of initiated persons in the society under description" (Firth 1950). In the context of a written text the same basic categories require to be brought into relation, since they are related **in the event** as with a spoken text. There will, however, be differences of emphasis: different features require to be marked, since the factors determining the two types of linguistic behaviour (including their effects) are different. In the situation in which a written text operates the form taken by the linguistic activity is socially determined as with an utterance; but the fact that the one is written and not spoken itself imposes certain requirements on the elements composing the text, which the nature of the script modifies in various ways. The literary form suited to the social role of the text is determined, as also is the style; and literary form and style further impose their own requirements.

3.1.2 The most significant difference in the treatment, however, does lie in the "two-dimensional" contextualization. This can be seen in terms of the relation of the writer to the other participants in the situation.[24] Since the creative effect of linguistic activity is indirect, that is, through the action of other human beings as participants, there is no (or very little) non-linguistic action on the part of a writer; the relevant features of the writer as a personality are observable only in his linguistic action (are internal, so to speak, to the text) so that, once the text is in existence, the writer ceases to function in the situation and is replaced by the text as "participant". In this way the linguistic activity of the writer continues to have creative effect long after it has taken place, through participants in an extended situation: extended not only by simple extension in time (for the creative effect of the spoken word can operate for long periods) but by the extension of the actor-participant

relation into a new dimension. This extension arises out of the nature of writing (though the tape-recorder has now done the same for speech) and has nothing to do with the written "style", although the latter may determine its creative effect.

3.2 The style of a written text is the sum total of the linguistic features through which the text operates in a specific function, this function being abstracted as common to a class of writing and marking it off from other classes. In this sense the "Secret History of the Mongols" is a narrative text. The word "history" did not figure in the original title of the Mongolian version (Hung 1951: 465).[25] The Mongolian version is in fact by content a biographical rather than a historical narrative; moreover it includes many passages of traditional wording and of dialogue. Its style may be characterized as "narrative, partly traditional, with dialogue in direct speech".[26] Since the Chinese version is a translation, the element of traditional narrative is lost, and the style is simple narrative. The dialogue remains throughout in direct speech. Differences in the language between passages of narrative and those of dialogue do occur; they are differences of style because of context (particularly the special context of dialogue in a narrative text) but must be taken into account in any statistical analysis.[27]

3.2.1 It is not known whether the Mongolian version was taken down from oral narrative or composed in writing; while the former may be the more probable, in either case in a language with no previous written literature the implication of narrative style is no more than free oral narrative with the influence of traditional narrative (the presence of traditional forms of utterance), much of which is clearly marked here by alliteration and chiming in initial syllables. For the Chinese version, however, the implication of narrative style is somewhat different. First, the Chinese version is indirect narrative: the author experienced the events he was narrating not directly but through the medium of a written text in another language. Second, the Chinese version was composed in writing. Third, Chinese was a language in which a long accumulation of written literature had replaced oral texts and developed a language and traditional style of its own.

3.3 The language of the "Secret History", however, is **not** "literary Chinese": this is in fact its significant feature, and therefore the language in which it is written is designated, by opposition to "literary", as "colloquial Chinese".[28]

3.3.1 The use of the term "colloquial" tends to carry its own implications, but it should not be taken in itself to imply a definite relation to any form of the spoken language of the time: indeed the relation of the

For the "Secret History" the following series of chronologies can be recognized:

3.4.1 Composition of the Mongolian (original) version of the "Secret History", probably entitled *Činggis-qahan-u huǰa'ur* ("The origins of Genghis Khan"). Suggested dates: 1240 (traditional), 1252 (Grousset),[29] 1264 (Hung 1951: 490): see colophon to the text (XII 58; 282), where the year is specified as one (the year "Rat") in a 12-year cycle.[30]

3.4.2 Composition of Chinese version of the "Secret History" in abridged translation from the Mongolian original; its compilation into a single work with the Mongolian version in Sino-Mongolian script and with the addition of the Chinese Gloss. This should be divided into three stages, though we cannot be certain of the exact ordering of the events, which might have taken place without interval.

(i) First stage: interlinear insertion of the Chinese Gloss to the Mongolian version in Sino-Mongolian script (with or without the Mongolian version in the other presumed "original" script, Uighur or hPags-pa).
(ii) Second stage: composition of the Chinese version entitled *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih* (1). (The translator did not necessarily see the Gloss, and (ii) may have preceded (i) in time.)
(iii) Third stage: compilation of the text in the present form (interlinear Gloss, intersectional Chinese version, Mongolian version in Sino-Mongolian script only, with certain changes from Sino-Mongolian script of (i) (Ch'ên (1934: 28, 29).

Date: some time, probably extending over a number or years, in the period 1369–1404. (Stage (ii), if it preceded stage (i), may antedate this period.)

3.4.3 Use of the text as linguistic teaching and reference material. It is possible that 2 (iii) should figure here, if the purpose of compilation in this form was solely for the use of interpreters. In any case the text once compiled was probably so used.

(i) Use of text in training Chinese as Mongolian interpreters.
(ii) First printing of text, probably for inclusion in enlarged Sino-foreign vocabularies (*Hua-i i-yü*) (4). Probable date: between 1404 and 1418. Use of text in conjunction with Chinese–Mongolian vocabulary (which already formed part of the first edition of *Hua-i i-yü* (1389) before inclusion of the "Secret History").[31]

3.4.4 Inclusion of the text in official compilations. A copy (extant)

of the Chinese version alone was submitted to the compilers of the (manuscript) encyclopedia *Yung-lo ta-tien* (2) for inclusion, but in the event the complete text was incorporated: the text was thus officially marked for preservation.

(i) Inclusion of text in official compilation *Yung-lo ta-tien*: in 15 chapters, forming chapters (volumes) 5179–5193 of the encyclopedia. Date of compilation of *Yung-lo ta-tien*, 1403–08.
(ii) A copy (presumed indirect) of the *Yung-lo ta-tien* edition was made by Sun Ch'êng-tsê (5) (1592–1676) as Book 9 of his compilation *Yüan-ch'ao tien-ku pien-nien k'ao* (6); Sun's whole work included in the official encyclopedia *Ssŭ-k'u ch'üan-shu* (7) (1773–82). (Since the "Secret History" occurred in Sun's work it was not copied separately from the *Yung-lo ta-tien* into the *Ssŭ-k'u ch'üan-shu*.)

3.4.5 The text in Chinese scholarship and bibliography. The work was recorded by a number of scholars as being in their possession; some of these scholars wrote colophons to the text.

(i) Inclusion in Sun Ch'êng-tsê's *Yüan-ch'ao tien-ku pien-nien k'ao* (see 4 (ii)).
(ii) Wan Kuang-t'ai (8) (1712–50) compiled a volume of selections from the Chinese version in two chapters (chüan) (25) and the preface, entitled *Yüan pi-shih lüeh* (9).
(iii) Ch'ien Ta-hsin (10) (1728–1804) wrote the colophon to the 15-chapter MS copy in his possession.
(iv) Pao T'ing-po (11) (1728–1814) collated the copy in 15 chapters. (This copy reached Palladius (Kafarov) in 1872 (see 6 (ii)).)
(v) Juan Yüan (12) (1764–1849) discovered MS, 15-chapter copy in Hangchow.
(vi) Ku Kuang-ch'i (13) (1776–1835) certified a 12-chapter copy (indirect) of the printed text, collating it with Ch'ien Ta-hsin's 15-chapter copy (see (iii)).
(vii) Chang Mu (14) (1805–1879) copied the Chinese version only from *Yung-lo ta-tien* in 1841 and in 1848 printed it in his *Lien-yün-i ts'ung-shu* (15).
(viii) Li Wên-t'ien (16) (1834–98) wrote a commentary on Chang Mu's edition, entitled *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih chu* (17), published in 1898.
(ix) Shên Tsêng-chih (18) (1850–1922) copied Chang Mu's version and wrote a commentary; his manuscript was acquired by Kuo

Tsê-yün (19) who printed it in 1945 in his *Ching-chi-t'ang ts'ung-shu* (20).

(x) Wên T'ing-shih (21) (1856–1904) acquired Ku Kuang-ch'i's 12-chapter copy (see (vi)) and had it recopied, presenting the recopy to Naitō Torajirō (1866–1934) in 1902; the latter recopied and sent it to Naka Michiyo (1851–1908) in Tokyo (see 6 (i)).

(xi) Wên T'ing-shih's own copy acquired by Yeh Têh-hui (22) (1864–1927) who published it in 1908 in a wood-block edition entitled *Mêng-wên Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih* (23).

(xii) Commercial Press, Shanghai, issued a photolithographic reprint (in *Ssŭ-pu ts'ung-k'an* (3)) of Ku Kuang-ch'i's certified text (see (vi)), with 41 pages replaced by corresponding pages discovered from the original printed edition, of which Ku's (indirect) copy was a facsimile.

3.4.6 The study of the text in modern China, in Japan and in the West.

(i) Palladius (Kafarov) acquired Pao T'ing-po's 15-chapter copy (see 5 (iv)) and published a Russian translation of the Chinese version (printed edition in vol. IV of the "Works of Members of the Russian Church Mission in Peking", 1910).

(ii) Naka Michiyo (see 5 (x)) published a Japanese translation on the basis of both the Mongolian and Chinese versions, entitled *Chingisu kan jitsuroku* (1907).

(iii) Through the work of these scholars the text has become generally known, and problems of language (e.g. the "reconstruction" of the Mongolian, i.e. its transcription into Roman or Uighur; grammar and vocabulary), the translation and the history of the text have occupied the attention of such scholars as Haenisch, Pelliot, Kozin, Shiratori and Ch'ên.

(iv) The text in translation in various languages is now available to historians and others as source material, and has been so used, for example, by Vladimirtsov. (Since the Mongolian version has been interpreted, the Chinese version no longer figures in this context, being itself incomplete.)

(v) In contemporary scholarship problems of the text continue to occupy a prominent position, with, for example, Mostaert's detailed discussion of points of translation, Hung's study of the transmission of the text and the discussion between Hattori and Kobayashi concerning the original script of the Mongolian version.

3.4.7 The text as literature in modern China. There is little mention of the text in works in Chinese literature and it is not recognized as having literary merit. Because it is unique in its combination of language and style, it does not fall into any currently recognized literary genre: it is not wên-yen ("literary" language) nor can it be classified with the great novels of the "colloquial" literature.[32] It can be fairly said that the "Secret History" is not read as literature in China today.[33] In the *Ssŭ-pu ts'ung-k'an*, the edition used in the present work, it is classified as "history".

3.4.8 The use of the text in the present work. From the point of view of this analysis the present study of the text represents the final point of contextualization. In this event the text participates as linguistic "informant" – in fact as an informant who is himself a linguist, in virtue of the plurilingual character of the text. This final stage in the reconstructed context of situation completes (again for the present analysis) the chain of creative effect of the original event, the writing of the text; this is admittedly a specialized form of context, but a significant one in that it requires that all linguistic events should be **recorded** and thus by a self-conscious process links the context of a written with that of a spoken text.

3.4.9 The above is offered as one method of contextualization for a written text. It is not a history of the text, but an abstraction of what are, for the linguist, the relevant features of past and present events in which the text has participated in one form or another. Such a scheme is put forward to correspond with the analysis at the level of context envisaged for a spoken text by the recommendations contained in the Report.[34]

4 Graphic analysis

4.1 In the transmission of the "Secret History of the Mongols" the original format of the text has been preserved with remarkable accuracy. This is undoubtedly because of its form as a bilingual text with a complete Gloss. Apart from textual variants, the only formal inconsistency in the tradition is that two separate divisions of the text into chapters (chüan) (25) have come down to us. In one tradition the text is divided into 15 chapters; this goes back to the *Yung-lo ta-tien* edition, the "Secret History" comprising chüan 5179–5193 of the great encyclopedia. In the other tradition the text is divided into 12 chapters, actually 10 plus 2 designated "supplementary" (hsü) (25); this goes back to the Ming print, as seen in the fragments, 41 pages in all, that have been preserved. In both, however, the number and division of paragraphs is identical. There are

282 paragraphs in all, and the division into chapters of the two versions of the text is shown in the following table, which indicates the paragraph with which each chapter begins:

12 ch.: 1 69 104 127 148 170 186 198 209 230 247 265
15 ch.: 1 69 97 119 141 154 170 186 198 208 225 239 247 265 277

Four of the chapters are thus the same length in both versions: 1, 6 (7), 7 (8) and 11 (13); and the 15-chapter version has a chapter division at the point where the "supplement" in the 12-chapter version begins.

4.1.1 With the Mongolian version as the starting point, the Gloss may be called "interlinear" in arrangement and the Chinese version "intersectional" (by paragraphs).[35] Each complete paragraph is given first in Mongolian with interlinear Gloss; this is then followed by the complete paragraph in Chinese, so that the division into paragraphs is fixed and clear. In the Commercial Press edition of Ku Kuang-ch'i's certified copy, which is the edition I have used for the purposes of this study,[36] the pages are numbered by chapters, each page having, as always in traditional Chinese book-production, two sides. The number of pages in the 12 chapters is as follows: 1:49, 2:51, 3:50, 4:51, 5:51, 6:54, 7:50, 8:58, 9:49, 10:45, 11:53, 12:58. In the original Ming print, as shown by the fragments, the pagination is also continuous, so that, for example, page 40 of Chapter 8 is page 396 in the original print.[37]

4.2 Each page of the text is divided into five columns by vertical lines running between the upper and lower margins. The Mongolian text is written (like the Chinese, vertically) in large characters at the left side of the column, with the Gloss in smaller characters to its right. The position, and size of print, of the Mongolian relative to the Chinese version are those of a text as opposed to a commentary. Unlike a continuous Chinese text, however, the Mongolian has subdivisions whose presence is indicated in the first place by spaces occurring between groups of characters. These spaces vary considerably in extent; in the first three chapters there is a tendency for them to be divided into long and short spaces corresponding to "piece"-divisions and word-divisions, but after Chapter 3 the length of spacing is quite arbitrary, so that for the text as a whole we can recognize simply word-division as a feature of the script of the Mongolian version.[38] The number of characters in a word ranges from one to about ten.

4.2.1 To the right of each Mongolian word is the Chinese Gloss to that word, so that the word of the Mongolian can be further recognized by its being the unit of the Gloss. The unit of the Gloss corresponding to one Mongolian word may be referred to as a "gloss", using a small g. The

the "Secret History" is fluid, particularly in the first two chapters, though tending to become more fixed and consistent thereafter.[50]

For the relation of the graphic symbols to the languages of the text see below, 5 "Script and Language".

5 Script and language

5.1 In its written symbols the "Secret History of the Mongols", including both versions and the Gloss, is a homogeneous text: it does not contain one written symbol that is not either an attested Chinese character or a character which, while not attested elsewhere, is made up of elements of the Chinese script so combined as to place it within the system of the latter.[51] Within the text, however, two scripts are to be distinguished: the Chinese and the Sino-Mongolian. The difference between the two is greater than that separating the French and the English scripts, both of which have as their substance the Roman alphabet; since, in addition to formal characteristics which serve to distinguish the Sino-Mongolian from the Chinese script to **an observer unable to read either** (the auxiliary transcription symbols of the former),[52] there being also formal characteristics which so distinguish French from English,[53] the relation of the unit of the script, the character, to the script as a whole is quite different in the two cases. The two scripts are in fact of basically different types, which we can identify by calling the Chinese script "lexical" and the Sino-Mongolian "phonological".[54, 55]

5.1.1 By the time of the compilation of the "Secret History" Chinese characters, in their relation to the forms of the Chinese language, had already constituted a stable system over a very long period. The identification of the character with that unit in the language of which it was the written symbol was well established.[56] The single character was not only the written symbol of a lexical unit (or at any rate lexico-phonological, since it is not identical with the unit required for lexical description: see 6B), but also usually analysable into parts of which one (and that, moreover, the basis of lexicographical entry) functioned as a unit in a system of written forms ("radicals") which classified lexically (by meaning at the lexical level) and lexicogrammatically[57] but not phonologically. Moreover, lexical forms themselves being "infinite" (that is, not operating as terms in limited systems), the character of the Chinese script is one of an infinite number of written symbols. The character of the Sino-Mongolian script, on the other hand, is the written symbol of a syllable, one of a finite number of phonological forms; the

number of characters is also finite, though it is greater than the number of such phonological forms. This greater quantity of characters is a result of not only the existence of a number of variants in arbitrary[58] use for one syllable but also a partial lexicalization of the script in an attempt at conformity with Chinese practice.[59]

5.2 Haenisch (1939: 186–191)[60] has listed the characters used in the Sino-Mongolian script of the "Secret History". He gives a total of 476 characters, plus 62 other symbols formed by the addition to a character of one or other of the two diacritic auxiliaries; actually 500 different characters, since 24 of those found with diacritic auxiliaries are never found without. The use of the diacritic auxiliary has definite implications: a character with a diacritic auxiliary has a different value in the phonological system from the same character without one, and Haenisch is thus right in considering the complex of character plus diacritic auxiliary as a separate symbol. In this way we arrive at the number of 538 different symbols. With the phonetic auxiliaries the case is different; they do not change the value of the character to which they are appended but have a distinct value of their own; they should be considered separate symbols, and bring the total of distinct **symbols** in the script to 552.

5.2.1 The two diacritic auxiliaries ǰuŋ and še$_3$ are prosodic markers, indicating features of Mongolian articulation not otherwise represented in the script. ǰuŋ indicates a back (velar/uvular) consonant in back vowel syllable, the use of a diacritic suggesting that the point of articulation was felt as significantly different from that of the back consonants in front vowel syllables: possibly post-velar or uvular, as opposed to velar or palato-velar. But the symbol is added (with a few exceptions) not to characters representing front vowel syllables with back consonant but to those representing syllables, back or neutral, with initial (h);[61] this gives no distinction of voiced and voiceless, and it is assumed that characters with this diacritic stood for either one of a pair of syllables, one having as initial a voiceless plosive, the other a voiced fricative: there is no trace of this distinction in the Sino-Mongolian script (Street 1957: 4). The reason for the choice of ǰuŋ ('centre') as diacritic in this function is not clear. But its use in the script is two-dimensional: it marks a back syllable and it marks a back consonant as syllable initial (the syllable final corresponding to which is represented by the phonetic auxiliary hei). še$_3$ ('tongue') combines with characters representing syllables with initial (l), and indicates some form of lingual articulation, presumably trill or roll, which we designate (r); it also combines with ř (and its variant ř$_4$) representing syllable-final (r) (but only from Chapter 3 onwards[62]). As the use

of a diacritic suggests, a distinction is meant here which was not felt to be present in Chinese.

5.2.2 The phonetic auxiliaries indicate the final consonant of syllables ending in a consonant. Of the 14 phonetic auxiliaries found in the text, five occur regularly whenever a certain consonant is to be marked as syllable final: hei (q), ke (k), ti_3 (t), le (l) and bu_5 (b). As variants of le for (l) there occur two other characters both having the signific element "water", le_2 and (once only) le_3, the latter a very rare character; these and not le occur in words glossed by designations as watercourse, river or lake, and by translation as čuan "river". As variant of ke, ki_8 occurs (once only, para. 267 (XII 10b)). Of irregular but frequent use are mu (m) (first occurrence para. 77 (II 10a)) and s_5 (s) (first occurrence para. 121 (III 39b)), which vary with the same characters written standard size in the text; mu also varies with zero occurring where the character used in the transcription of the syllable has final -m in Middle Chinese. Of irregular and infrequent occurrence are $či_3$ (č) (first occurrence para. 88 (II 26b); found only five times, all in Chapter 2 and always the same word) and $ši_{11}$ (š) (only occurrence para. 149 (V 1b)), the latter with variant $ši_{12}$ "room, house" (only occurrence para. 169 (V 49b), in a word glossed by translation as $faŋ_3z$ "house"). Finally ni (n) occurs frequently, but not regularly, in one syllable (en) (first occurrence para. 90 (II 30a)), and varies with zero (in Chapter 1) and le (? once only, in para. 104 (III 2b)); ni also occurs three times (in Chapter 10) in the syllable ǰan, always in the same word. The variants le_2, le_3 and $ši_{12}$ show the same tendency towards lexicalization of the script as is found with the standard characters.[63]

This use of a character to represent only the initial consonant of the syllable of which it is the symbol is an application of the *fan-ch'ieh* (28) method in Chinese phonology, whereby two characters are used to indicate the pronunciation of a third. The first of these, the *fan-ch'ieh shang-tzŭ* (29), indicates the *niu* (30) (class of initial), and only its initial consonant (*shêng-mu* (31)) is to be read, the final (*yün-mu* (32)) being disregarded; the second character likewise yields the final, its initial being disregarded.[64] The phonetic auxiliaries of the "Secret History" are to be read as the first character of a *fan-ch'ieh*, though here there is of course no second character.

5.2.3 While to each syllable in the phonological structure of the Mongolian language corresponds a number of interchangeable symbols in the script, the choice of a variant is in certain instances determined by this process which has been referred to as the "lexicalization" of the script. By this process, in some instances, in place of the character

regularly employed in the transcription of a given syllable a variant is chosen whose lexical meaning (in Chinese) is felt as akin to the meaning of the Mongolian word in which it operates. Thus, for example, the name Mt Burqan is transcribed, passim, as bu-ř$_4$-han. The character ř$_4$ has as signific element šan "mountain, hill" and was probably made up for the purpose of transcription: according to the Kanghsi Dictionary it occurs only in mountain names. Elsewhere, for the Mongolian value represented here by ř$_4$, the character ř is used. By this device the written symbol is made to convey, as it does in the Chinese script, lexical as well as phonological meaning.

It is difficult to estimate the resultant increase in the total number of symbols, since one cannot always decide whether a given variant is lexically determined or not. Where, as in the case of r$_4$, a radical is added, such determination is usually clear; Ch'ên instances 91 characters so formed, the majority with radicals šuei$_2$ "water", ma$_3$ "horse", niau "bird", keu "opening", mu$_3$ "eye", šan "mountain", tu "earth", zu$_2$ "foot", yi$_9$ "clothing", gim$_2$ "metal", mun$_2$ "gate", yiaŋ$_4$ "sheep", yian$_5$ "word", šu$_2$ "rat" and čuŋ$_4$ "insect", etc. Some of these Ch'ên calls 'characters invented for the "Secret History"', noting that they are not found elsewhere. Nine other variants listed by Ch'ên, though not having "lexicalizing" radicals, seem likewise determined: for example, bu$_6$ "step" in yia-bu$_6$ (yabu "go") instead of regular bu. Others, however, including both single characters (e.g. ǰe$_3$ not ǰe in ǰe$_3$-ši$_{11}$-gu$_3$, para. 117 (III 31b), glossed yiu$_3$tu$_3$di 'intending') and groups of characters lexicalized **in combination** (Ch'ên notes e.g. ši$_{13}$-li$_4$-wun$_4$, glossed giun$_2$z 'nobleman' (p. 25b)[65]), often cannot be classified with certainty as either determined or free variants.

5.2.4 If one recognizes only those distinctions made by the Sino-Monogolian script (as opposed to those known from other sources, such as "vowel harmony" in syllables where the script is prosodically neutral), there occur an average of about two symbols for each term (syllable or final consonant) in the phonological system recognized by the script;[66] while of the 250–300 variants a substantial proportion show lexical determination **in one direction** these variants never occur **without** lexical connotation, though they are not always found where such connotation would be appropriate.[67]

It is this feature of the existence of variants which distinguishes the Sino-Mongolian script from other syllabaries such as the Japanese kana scripts, though it resembles the script used for Old Japanese in for example the Manyōshu.

5.3 The interrelations among the languages and scripts of the

"Secret History" may be summarized as follows. The text of the "Secret History" is bilingual in script (Sino-Mongolian and Chinese) and in language.[68] The two main versions, named according to the language in which they are written, are the Mongolian version and the Chinese version. The Mongolian version is original; the Chinese version is a translation of it, somewhat abridged. Each language has its own script; the same symbols are used in both but have value at different levels. Each version contains forms from the language of the other; those which are relevant to a study of the language of the Chinese version are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Chinese forms found in the Mongolian version can be considered as "borrowings" by the Mongolian language, and thus as Mongolian forms and not as foreign forms in a Mongolian text. Where, however, the Chinese version contains Mongolian forms it must be recognized that, since the Chinese version is a translation, these forms may function not in the Chinese language as a whole but only in the Chinese text. The presence of these "translation forms" does not affect the **method** of analysis but they do require to be brought out in the statement, since they may not operate within the framework of Chinese systems.

5.3.1 This will apply both to lexical and to grammatical translation forms where such can be established. Lexical translation forms are usually obvious. They fall into two categories: proper names and others. Proper names (marked in the Gloss by designation glosses), which form the great majority, do not need separate statements, since they function in the Chinese system exactly as do Chinese proper names.[69] Other lexical translation forms, while functioning in the Chinese grammatical system, require separate lexical statements since they may need to be collocated in the language from which they are "borrowed". It is interesting that the Gloss, which, as said, contains no translation forms, renders such words by translation; yet the Chinese version uses not the translation but the Mongolian form of the original.[70]

The complete list of lexical translation forms other than proper names is given in Appendix D. The only form which it is doubtful whether to regard as a translation form or not is M. ǰam (plural ǰa-mu-t), which is both glossed and rendered in C. as ǰam (Gloss has plural ǰam mui). It is known that this word is borrowed from Mongolian into Chinese,[71] the process being assisted by the existence in Chinese of the word ǰam, Middle Chinese -m, 'to stand'; but since the Gloss has ǰam it will be treated as a Chinese word, not a translation form, the presence in the Gloss of a **separate** form being taken as the criterion for the presence in the Chinese of a lexical translation form.

of two (or more) exhaustive and consistent forms of statement should be preferred, cf. Spang-Hanssen (1949).

21. For "relationship" as a function of systems, see Allen (1953: 89–95).
22. For the use of the word "style", see 3.2; for "colloquial" and "literary", see 3.3.
23. I ignore here the specialized context of its use by linguists as a basis for linguistic statements, which it shares with all linguistic source material.
24. I retain the term "situation" for the whole diachronic framework of events within which the text operates. Readers of the text in 1955 are participants in this situation.
25. The first three words of this version "Činggis-qahan-u huǰa 'ur" ("The origin of Genghis Khan") were probably a title of part of the book, but there seems to have been no original title to the whole work. Cf. 1.1.
26. There is very little "oratio obliqua", as shown by the pronominal reference of the dialogue.
27. E.g. the interrogative mood (see 6B.2.6 and 6C.2.6) is found only in passages of dialogue, while imperative is frequent in "indirect commands".
28. Cf. Demiéville (1951: 47), on the use of the terms "vulgaire" and "littéraire".
29. R. Grousset, *L'Empire Mongol*, Paris, 1941 (quoted by Hung (1951)).
30. I give no further chronology for the Mongolian version. There is little doubt that it was in fact used as source material for Mongol histories (see Hung 1951, especially the diagram on p. 481). For the translation of the colophon, see e.g. Haenisch (1948). For explanation of references to the text, see 4.1.1 n.
31. For a detailed account of the Hua-i i-yü see Lewicki (1949).
32. Its nearest relative is perhaps the short story, such as those in the collection *Ku chin hsiao-shuo* (24). It is these short stories with which a systematic linguistic comparison should first be made; together with the Yüan drama, with which especially the dialogue passages of the "Secret History" might well be compared.
33. The situation seems to be different in Mongolia, where it appears the Mongolian version of the "Secret History" is now well known. This is to be expected in view of the position of Genghis Khan as a national hero, the unifier of the Mongol peoples.
34. Much of the material for the above section is to be found in the article by Hung (1951). It should be stressed, however, that Hung's purpose was the study of the transmission of the text in particular, concrete forms: original print, copies, etc. The data are presented here as facts relevant to context, this providing a broad basis for the treatment of the text as a restricted language.
35. On the arrangement of the text see also Street (1957: 1).

36. *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih, Ssŭ-pu ts'ung-k'an* edition (3rd series, History), Shanghai, Commercial Press, 1936: 10 chüan. (Chapters 8–9 and 10–11 each form one chüan (bound volume) in this edition.)
37. All references to the Chinese version of the text are given, first by chapter and page, second by paragraph and line. The page is further marked a or b, indicating recto or verso. The number of the line is the number of the piece (the unit of punctuation) in the paragraph, following the Commercial Press edition subject to the correction of a small number of misprints (see Appendix E.) So for example the reference (IV. 38b; 144.10) is to line (piece) number 10 of paragraph 144, which is on page 38, verso, of Chapter 4. References to pages falling within the fragments of the Ming print incorporated in this edition give the continuous pagination in parentheses, thus: (VII. 30a (336a); 194. 15), thus showing that the page in question is one of the 41 preserved.
38. In fact even the word is not always identifiable by the spacing, which is sometimes sacrificed for appearance or economy of paper. Nevertheless this spacing is a definite feature of the Sino-Mongolian script, and its omission may be regarded as an inconsistency in the use of the script. In these instances the word can always be identified by other means; see 4.2.1.1 n.
39. Where the Mongolian word consists of only one character, a dash is used instead of a bracket; this is equivalent to the hinge of a bracket (indicating a relationship between the two sides) without the bracket (which is required only when two or more characters are to be shown as grouped together). It is the bracket (or dash) which serves as the formal mark of the Mongolian word where the spacing is indistinct.
40. The list of designation glosses is as follows:

    řin miŋ "name of a man"
    niu miŋ "name of a woman"
    fu_4 řin miŋ "name of a lady"
    wu_4 miŋ "name of a shaman"
    $guan_2$ miŋ "name of an office" (with occasional instances of other, specific names of offices)
    siŋ "clan", siŋ miŋ "name of a clan"
    $ǰuŋ_2$"tribe", $ǰuŋ_2$ miŋ "name of a people"
    di_2 miŋ "name of a place"
    $čiŋ_6$ miŋ "name of a town"
    fu_7 miŋ "name of a prefecture"
    $ǰeu_2$ miŋ "name of a district"
    ho_3 miŋ "name of a river"
    $šuei_2$ miŋ "name of a watercourse"
    hai_3z miŋ "name of a lake"
    šan miŋ "name of a mountain"
    $šeu_3$ miŋ "name of an animal (species)"

ma_3 miŋ "name of a horse"
yiu_4 miŋ "name of a fish (species)" (and occasional instances of other names of animal species)

There is some inconsistency in the use of brackets with names of species: $šeu_3$ miŋ and yiu_4 miŋ appear sometimes without a bracket, sometimes with; while geu_2 miŋ "name of a dog (species)" occurs only with a bracket. One can think of these as names of species for which the translator did not know any Chinese equivalent; they are the "borderline cases" of proper names. In some instances in the early chapters personal names, where the name has occurred recently above, have no gloss; and two names of (? species of) horses appear without gloss.

In the fragments of the Ming print Mongolian words glossed by řin miŋ have a thick line in the place of the bracket. Other designation glosses have, as in Ku Kuang-ch'i's certified copy, nothing.

The Mongolian words Čiŋgis (Genghis), glossed Tai zu (his Chinese reign title), and baatur, glossed $yiuŋ_2ši_{10}$ "hero", are unbracketed. Likewise are some proper names which, having Chinese equivalents, receive translation glosses, e.g. Mongolian Kitat, glossed Ki_7dan_2 "Kitan".

41. All forms quoted from the "Secret History" are given in special transcription (see 8 and Appendix A). For the Chinese characters, the transcription may be compared with the Chinese syllabary (at end); the subscript figures refer to the corresponding characters in the syllabary.
42. There is considerable inconsistency, not only in the form of the brackets (some having no hinges at all, where one and where two might be expected) but also in the extent of the Mongolian word. For instance in para. 17 (I. 10a) ügei-bolba "was no more, died" is treated as one word (is enclosed in one bracket) and glossed, with two hinges, wu/zuo-liau; in the same column ügei boluqsa(n), "(after he) had died" is treated as two words, the first glossed wu, and the second zuo-liau-di. These inconsistencies, however, are not of such extent as to invalidate the general principle.
43. See 6A. 2–4.
44. See 5.2.2. The character $še_3$ found in this position in para. 123 (3. 43b) is a misprint for ke.
45. Chiefly proper names; see 5.3.1.
46. Since the Gloss contains no Sino-Mongolian script (proper names being designated; see 4.2.1.1), the auxiliary transcription symbols do not occur in the Gloss.
47. For example in paras 50 (I. 31a/b) and 54 (I. 34b) we find the name Daritai-otčigin in four versions, one correct (with two auxiliary transcription symbols), the others having the three different possible errors!
48. According to Ch'ên Yüan this change in the transcription is another modification of the "lexicalizing" type (see 5.2.3) in the Sino-Mongolian script, the Chinese word written ba_2 having a sense comparable to that of the Mongolian termination ba.

49. See 5.2.2.
50. Ch'ên (p. 29a) concludes that the Sino-Mongolian script of the "Secret History" was a later improvement, imperfectly applied, of that of the *Hua-i i-yü* (4). His reasons are that the "lexicalizing" variants are not found in the latter (which has, for instance, be bie ba_4 and ba_5 for ba_2), and that the diacritic auxiliary $di\eta_2$ occurring in the *Hua-i i-yü* for syllable-final (l) has been *incompletely* replaced by the phonetic auxiliary le in our text – the 15-chapter "Secret History" having relics of $di\eta_2$, while the addition of the diacritic auxiliary $še_3$ to the character ř is likewise incomplete.
51. See 5.2.3.
52. The spacing/bracketing of the Sino-Mongolian script is another characteristic. While the bracketing might be regarded as a feature of the Gloss, or at any rate not part of the Sino-Mongolian script, it seems that it is in fact the presence of brackets which has led to, by permitting, an inconsistent use of spacing; and one might justifiably abstract from the two a formal mark of delimitation of a unit "word", nothing corresponding to which exists in the Chinese script. A text in Sino-Mongolian script without a Gloss would presumably furnish us with a unit which we could designate a "word" marked off entirely by spacing. The fact that the Sino-Mongolian script here contains no stop is another formal difference; but the stop cannot be regarded as a regular feature of the Chinese script before the late nineteenth century, and conversely one could insert stops in the Sino-Mongolian text without violating its principles – though in fact the writer did not do so.
53. It is not contended that there is any parallel, in their place in the system of the script, between the French diacritics, with their heterogeneous functions, and the Sino-Mongolian auxiliary transcription symbols. The point is that, to a person not knowing either language, the diacritics (transcription symbols) not only mark off a French (Sino-Mongolian) text from an English (Chinese) one but also frequently (but not always) mark off an element, such as a word, of the former script found in a text of the latter.
54. The lexical nature of the Chinese script was early recognized by Du Ponceau, who held that it was not ideographic but (syllabic and) "lexigraphic". See Du Ponceau (1848: 36, 59 and Section II passim). See also the reference to this work in Firth 'Atlantic Linguistics' (1949: 104). Du Ponceau further (e.g. on p. 113) employed the term "logographic", also used by Chao of the Chinese script. See Chao (1934).
55. J. C. Street's work *The Language of the Secret History of the Mongols* (1957) gives a comprehensive account of the Mongolian language of the text, and includes a section (pp. 2–8) on phonology in which he discusses the Sino-Mongolian script and its relation to Mongolian. The outline in the following paragraphs is intended merely to fill in the background to the Chinese version and show how it links up with the original Mongolian at different levels.

56. The Chinese word tzŭ (26) is the modern name for this identity. Following the Chinese practice, we shall use the one word "character" to denote not only the written symbol but also the linguistic unit which it symbolizes.
57. E.g. the majority of characters with radical (no. 64) šeu$_1$ represent monosyllabic free verbs.
58. The arbitrary use of variants in the Sino-Mongolian script of the *Hua-i i-yü* is queried by Lewicki; see 8.2. n.3.
59. *Liu San-wu's* (27) preface to the Mongolian Chinese *Hua-i i-yü* of 1389 gives an interesting view of a contemporary Chinese opinion of the superiority of a script (such as Chinese) on lexical principles over one (such as Sino-Mongolian) on phonological principles. See E. Haenisch (1952: 7), where this preface is translated.
60. Lewicki (1949: 29–50) lists the characters used in the Sino-Mongolian script of the *Hua-i i-yü* (4) of 1389: 436 + 8 phonetic auxiliaries + 3 diacritic auxiliaries + 64 formed by the addition of a diacritic to another symbol. Lewicki recognizes 110 homophonic variants and discusses (pp. 66, 67) possible reasons for their use.
61. On the question of the roman transcription of the phonological system represented by the Sino-Mongolian script see 8.5.1.
62. With one instance in Chapter 2. See Ch'ên, (1934: 28a).
63. Haenisch (1939) lists bu (b) among the phonetic auxiliaries, but does not list ki$_8$ (k) or či$_3$ (č). bu is not found in the Commercial Press edition. Pelliot (1949) transcribes ŋe-de, glossed ǰe$_2$li "here", in Chapter 1 (e.g. para. 24 (I 15b)) as ädä; the gloss suggests that this should rather be ändä, with zero variant for the phonetic auxiliary ni.
64. Thus the phonetic auxiliaries are found only in syllables of structure (C)VC, where they represent final C. If, for example, the character ti$_3$ is represented phonologically as initial t, final i, then when this character is used as phonetic auxiliary it has value t as final C in a structure (C)VC.
65. But in the word ni-ču-gun, "naked", cited by Hung (p. 455) as a lexicalizing combination ("you-without-pants"), ni and ču are regular.
66. Haenisch recognizes 293 distinct phonological values. The number arrived at by a transcription of the Sino-Mongolian script based on a phonological analysis of Chinese will of course depend on that analysis, and the system I have used here gives only 273 (see 8).
67. Cf. Ch'ên, (1934: 19a): "le$_2$ is not used wherever there is water, but wherever le$_2$ is used there is water."
68. It might be possible to consider the language of the Gloss as a third language, since it does have a grammatical system of its own. This grammatical system, however, is simply that of Mongolian and does not function outside the text; so that, while the language of the Gloss has some of the characteristics of a pidgin, the systems of which it is made up do not combine into one single system and it must be denied the status of a

and compare the frequency of occurrence of certain elements, commonly found as piece-final, in these 282 pieces with their frequency in the 5,386 pieces of the whole work, we find striking differences.

6A.2.1 The most frequent piece-final, liau, occurs 630 times as piece-final (in 11.7 per cent of the total pieces) but 120 times as paragraph-final (42.9 per cent of the total): it is nearly four times as frequent in paragraph-final pieces as in the pieces as a whole. Another frequent piece-final, ǰe, occurs 124 times (2.3 per cent) as piece-final but 28 times (9.9 per cent) as final of a paragraph-final piece. This suggests that liau and ǰe are to be thought of as final features of some unit larger than the piece (but smaller than the paragraph, since they occur respectively 510 and 96 times as finals of pieces that are not paragraph-finals).

6A.2.2 On the other hand the characters ši$_2$, ŋa, xian and heu, and the combination šaŋteu$_2$, occur respectively 156, 108, 49, 20 and 9 times as piece-final, but none of them occurs as paragraph-final. This also suggests that we require a linguistic unit larger than the piece, a unit to which these elements are never final, and that the pieces to which they are final are always part of this larger unit. At the same time it confirms the assumption, justifiable on general grounds,[3] that the piece has some validity as a linguistic unit and may form the basis of the stage in the analysis next after the larger unit to be set up.

6A.2.3 Frequent also as piece-finals are lai and kiu. These occur 299 times as piece-final and 17 times as paragraph-final, 5.6 per cent and 6.0 per cent respectively. This closeness not only confirms the validity of the piece, by suggesting that lai and kiu function as piece-finals, but, if this assumption is correct, justifies the choice of the paragraph-final piece as a basis for statistical comparison.[4]

6A.3 We must therefore admit the need for a unit larger than the piece, and the unit to be set up to meet this requirement will be called the "sentence". So there are 282 points where we know a sentence to begin and 282 where we know one to end. In fact there are no such frequently recurring characters or combinations to be met with as piece-initial, so that in the delimitation of the sentence the above piece-finals can serve as a preliminary guide to what is to be expected. In dealing with a written text it is impossible formally to **delimit** every sentence without reference to smaller units, though one may **establish the category of** sentence without such reference. It is quite obvious from a reading of the text that the sense of the single piece is often not "complete"; but this in itself does not necessitate the setting up of a larger unit because one cannot state at which points in the text the sense is completed, and the larger category is of no use if every member cannot

be more or less clearly assigned to it. There may be "borderline cases" but the criteria for the demarcation of such a unit need to be reasonably exact in application, and therefore formal rather than notional.

6A.3.1 There are, as has been shown, certain formal criteria which help to differentiate between pieces that are sentences or sentence-final pieces and pieces that do not complete a sentence. It is not maintained that this differentiation is made without reference to "meaning"; on the contrary, the whole analysis is made on the fundamental assumption that the meaning of the text can be stated, this being in fact what the linguist, in applying his techniques, sets out to do. In saying that $ši_2$, ŋa and so on do not occur as sentence finals, we are setting up a type of sentence in which these forms occur in a certain position, namely at the end of a piece which is not final in the sentence; and this classification of sentence types is part of the statement of meaning at the grammatical level. This is quite other than to say that because certain pieces are hypothetical in sense, or because they contain the English translation meaning 'when', 'if', they must be treated as incomplete. The presence of $ši_2$, ŋa and so on is a formal criterion, the choice of which is guided by the assignment of grammatical meaning to these elements: the meaning of ŋa may be stated in the terms that it forms one member of a certain word-class the members of which make up a system of piece-finals which are not sentence-finals,[5] and as such it excludes other members of the class, such as $ši_2$, and, as a member of its class, determines the assignment of the piece to a certain type.

6A.3.2 As a corollary to this distinction between "sentence pieces" (pieces which are at the same time complete sentences – of which at least two must exist, since paragraphs 215 and 237 each consist of one piece only) and "non-sentence pieces", if the category of sentence is a valid unit for grammatical statements we must expect to find parallel structures in **sentences** irrespective of their division into pieces. The most striking examples of this are (II 47b; 66.10–12) and (X 11b–12a; 236.1–5 and 237), where in each instance two sentences parallel in structure are juxtaposed, the one in one piece, the other consisting of two and five pieces respectively. The parallelism in structure suggests that the piece may show so great a variety that the statement of grammatical structures, to be exhaustive and simple, can only be based on the sentence. The position of the piece in the grammatical statement is not of course thereby determined in one way or the other.

6A.4 To summarize the problem dealt with in these paragraphs: it will be found necessary in linguistic analysis at the grammatical level to set up a unit, the sentence, which is less than the text and greater than the

unit of lexical statement, the word. In the present written text there is a unit, the piece, marked off formally by punctuation. Is this graphic unit, the piece, coextensive with the linguistic unit, the sentence? The answer must be: no. The sentence that is set up must be (as a category) larger than the piece, since certain forms which are final to the piece are not final to the sentence. Of the relation between the two we may say so far that: 1, a piece ending in liau or ǰe will normally be final in the sentence; 2, a piece ending in $ši_2$, ŋa, xian, heu or $šaŋteu_2$ will normally be non-final in a sentence; 3, a piece ending in lai or kiu may be either final or non-final in a sentence.

6A.4.1 In the preceding paragraphs the method of procedure in the analysis has been exemplified with reference to one particular problem: the establishment of the unit of grammatical statement. The descriptive statement as a whole is not of course made to follow the order of procedure in the inquiry, which would involve cumbersome and lengthy accounts of the steps taken to arrive at each statement. The next section (6B: "Grammatical categories") will begin with a summary of all the grammatical categories employed in the statement at this level, followed by an account of each; in 6C and D the categories will be further described by translation and exemplification. (For section 6D, please refer to the CD-Rom provided.) In certain instances some indication is given of the reasons for the choice of a particular form of statement rather than any other.

6B Grammatical categories

1 Scheme of categories

6B.1 The following is a summary of the categories of units, classes and functions into which the material is organized for statement:[6]

(i) Units:
  (a) Graphic:
    Chapter Paragraph Piece Character (graphic)
  (b) Linguistic: Sentence Clause Word Character (linguistic)

(ii) Classes (systemic):
  (a) Sentence classes: Compound/Simple
  (b) Clause classes:
    (1) Free/Bound
    (2) Verbal/Nominal

(3) (α) Voice: Passive/Ergative/Active (neutral)
(β) Aspect: Perfective/Imperfective/Non-perfective (neutral)
(γ) Mood: Interrogative/Imperative/Affirmative (neutral)
Bound clause classes: Conditional/Genitival

(c) Word classes:[7]
(1) Free/Bound
(2) Verbal/Nominal/Adverbial
(α) Verbal word classes: Verb/Pro-verb
Verb classes: Free/Bound
Bound verb classes: Prepositive/Auxiliary/Postpositive
(β) Nominal word classes: Noun/Pronoun
Noun classes: Free/Bound
Bound noun classes: Numeral/Auxiliary/Postpositive
(γ) Adverbial word classes: Adverb/Particle
Adverb classes: Free/Bound
Bound adverb classes: Preverbal/Final/Conjunctive
(d) Character classes: Free/Bound

(iii) Functions (structural):
(a) Free clause functions: Sentential/Non-sentential
(b) Free word functions: Substantive/Attributive

6B.1.1 The graphic units have been discussed above (see Section 4 "Graphic Analysis"). The relation between the graphic and the linguistic units can be stated in terms of extent. The largest linguistic unit, the sentence, is smaller than the paragraph and has no graphic unit corresponding in extent. The clause is not exactly coextensive with the piece, but is the linguistic unit most nearly corresponding to it: the majority of the pieces form one clause. The one-to-one correspondence between the linguistic and the graphic character is implied in the use of the term "character" for both.

6B.1.2 The classes and functions are the grammatical categories of the linguistic units.[8] The terms "system" and "structure", as used by Firth, are distinguished in the manner described by Robins (1953): the system is a paradigmatic construct by reference to which each term is defined as excluding all the other terms; the structure is a syntagmatic framework of interrelated elements stated as values, the exponents of

which are segments of the text. If it is said that a clause, active in voice, may be found with one of three simple structures NVN, NV or VN, this gives a three-term system of clause-structures for the active voice, (N)V(N); it might then be added that the exponent of value V in this structure may be free verb or pro-verb,[9] giving a two-term system for V here, (N)V_2(N). The classes set up for each unit are systems independent of any structure, whereas the functions can be identified only in the structure; one could of course talk of a "system" of functions, once the latter have been identified, so that it is a characteristic of each system as well of functions as of classes to be **exhaustive**; for example all clauses are passive, ergative or active (neutral) in aspect, and all occurrences of free nouns are as substantive or attributive.

6B.1.3 Classes and functions are formally marked. The mark of a class may be said to be the "interior form" of its members, the form of the forms themselves; while that of a function is "exterior form", that is the presence and relative position of other elements. Interior form is taken to include lexical form; by "lexical form" is meant the assignment of a **word** to a certain class on the basis of the categories and combinations to which it is susceptible,[10] and of a character to the class of "free" or "bound" according to whether or not it is a word (i.e. is assignable to a word-class). The presence of a word assigned to a certain word-class may in its turn be the criterion for the determination of a class of clause: the verbal clause is determined in the first place by the presence of a verb. Since other classes of verb can occur only in combination with a free verb, a verbal clause always contains a free verb; the latter may be defined with reference to the verb-group (see 6B.3.1), that is, by certain possibilities of combination.

6B.1.4 The interrelations among the terms sentence, clause, word and character in the system of linguistic units may be stated within the grammar, though there are implications outside the grammatical level: the word, having been established in the grammatical analysis, becomes the unit of lexical statement.[11] The sentence, which in a spoken text can be contextualized, in a written text has no independent context of situation; sometimes, however, a form of contextual analysis can be applied to forms at the level of sentence and clause.[12] The character (which, however, is here established without the aid of the grammar) is in this text the unit of phonological statement.

6B.1.4.1 At the same time, sentence, clause, word and character all operate within the grammatical system. Here each term is defined as consisting of one or more complete exponents of the term next in succession. Each unit therefore admits an opposition of "compound"

are stated as structures in linear representation using letters to symbolize the operative values, as follows:

V Free verb substantive, verb group or pro-verb
v Bound verb
N Free noun substantive, noun group or pronoun[19]
n Bound noun
A Free adverb or complex group
a Bound adverb
p Particle

It is sometimes convenient to symbolize the categories of word-classes which may operate with these values. With regard to V, N and A it is to be assumed that the relevant forms (free, "pro-" or group) may operate here unless otherwise specified; if it is desired to refer to the value V, N or A in a structure where only the free form may operate, the symbol F is used. To refer to a group, the V, N or A is written above a line below which is given the structure of the group, in which the reference of the symbol F will be shown by the group letter (thus F in verb group must = free verb).

To specify which class of bound word may operate with the values v, n and a the following symbols are used:[20]

Pr Prepositive (verb), preverbal (adverb)
Au Auxiliary (verb, noun)
Po Postpositive (verb, noun)
Nu Numeral (noun)
Fi Final (adverb)
Co Conjunctive (adverb)

If it is not clear from the presence of a group letter which value is referred to, the symbol will be preceded by a raised v, n or a. Thus ^{a}Pr = preverbal adverb, which is the word-class operating with value a in the given structure; while $\frac{V}{FPo}$ would show that here the element with value V is a verb group the structure of which is free verb+postpositive verb.

6B.2.2.1 In a clause with only one exponent of the value N, the order may be NV or VN. Where there are two, the normal order is NVN; but in verbal clauses in ergative or passive voice the order is NNV.[21] Where there is an exponent of A in the clause the normal order will be (N)AV(N); in ergative clauses NANV, in passive clauses NNAV.[22] In the ergative and passive clause structures the first N (but not the second) may be absent.[23]

Less common structures in an active clause are NN(A)V and (N)(A)VNN. The latter is found only with a small group of free verbs as exponents of V. The former resembles the ergative and passive clause structure in being contextually determined: see 6C.2.4. A less common position of A, with value "complex group" only, in an active clause, gives structure (N)VNA.

6B.2.3 Verbal and nominal clauses are defined according to the exponence of V: a verbal clause has free verb, a nominal clause pro-verb. A verbal clause contains one, and only one, free verb in substantive function. A nominal clause contains no free verb substantive; it normally contains a pro-verb and at least one exponent of N, but it may be without a pro-verb and even without a noun, its defining characteristic being absence of free verb substantive. Such instances in the text are, however, few, there being only five nominal clauses with no pro-verb.

Both verbal and nominal clauses may be free or bound, but they are distinguished from one another in their possibility of combination with other categories (see 6B.2.8).

6B.2.4 Voice, aspect and mood are classes of the clause. Each is ordered in a three-term system of which one term is formally unmarked and is considered as "neutral"; for instance, a clause which is active may also be described as "neutral in voice". In each class the neutral form is statistically the most frequent in occurrence, and is the "non-determined" form when features of contextual determination can be shown to operate.[24] That voice, aspect and mood are considered as categories of the clause and not of the verb is a result of their being marked by formal distinctions in the clause: variations in the structure, and the presence of elements which are not only not part of the verb but often not even juxtaposed with it.[25]

The three terms in the voice system are ergative, passive and active or neutral. To the unmarked, active form corresponds the basic structure (N)V(N). The basic structure of the marked terms is (N)NV. The determining structure of the ergative voice is (N)vNV, where v has for exponent the prepositive verb ziaŋ, rarely ba; that of the passive is (N)vNVp, where v is prepositive verb ši, and p is di. The passive is very rare in the "Secret History", but it has been set up here because it is formally identical with the passive of Modern Pekingese, which shows the same three-term voice system. The ergative of Modern Pekingese is identical except that the relative frequency of ziaŋ and ba is reversed.[26]

6B.2.5 The three terms in the aspect system are perfective, imperfective and non-perfective or neutral. Perfective aspect is marked by post-verbal liau; in clauses of structure (-)V-, where there is at least one

exponent of value N following the verb, liau may be either non-final (immediately following V) or final.[27] A clause of this structure in which liau occurs non-finally is normally not sentence-final, whereas one with final liau is always sentence-final. In a perfective clause of structure (-)V, liau is of course unmarked as to position, and such a clause may or may not be sentence-final.[28] There is thus a subsidiary system of perfective clauses, the three terms of which may be designated non-final, final and unmarked. Imperfective aspect is marked by ǰo which always directly follows the verb.[29] Imperfective clauses are normally not sentence-final.

6B.2.6 The three terms in the modal system are interrogative, imperative and affirmative or neutral. Interrogative is marked by the presence of one of the particles ma, madau$_3$ and (once) feu in clause-final position; imperative by one of the particles ǰe, ǰo, yieǰe and za in the same position. Clauses with interrogative words (see 6C.3.16), such as šuei "who?", are not considered interrogative, being formally identical (quâ clause) with other affirmative clauses. Modal particles have absolute final position, all other final forms (e.g. final liau) preceding them.[30]

6B.2.7 Both verbal and nominal clauses may be either bound or free. The two terms in the system of bound clauses are conditional and genitival. The conditional bound clause is marked adverbially, by the presence of (i) a preverbal adverb, (ii) a final adverb, (iii) a combination of the two or (iv) a combination of preverbal adverb with the particle di.[31] The genitival bound clause is marked by the presence of the particle di (very rarely ǰi$_3$) in final position.[32]

6B.2.8 There are certain restrictions in the possibilities of combination of clause classes. In a text of limited extent such as the "Secret History" it is necessary to distinguish between those combinations which can be regarded as **excluded** on statistical grounds and those whose non-occurrence is **predicted** on these grounds and therefore cannot be regarded as a feature of the language. Since for example there are only 25 interrogative clauses in the text, and less than $\frac{1}{12}$ of the total clauses are nominal (454 out of 5719), the predicted number of interrogative nominal clauses would not be greater than two, and the fact that in the event there is only one cannot be regarded as excluding or making irregular the combination of nominal with interrogative.

Those combinations which can be regarded as excluded, because their non-occurrence is not predicted, are as follows. Nominal clauses exclude marked voice;[33] in the aspect and modal systems, nominal excludes imperfective and imperative,[34] while the combination of nominal and perfective is rare.[35] Nominal clauses are regularly bound.[36] Bound clauses

exclude only marked mood. Of the combination of the voice, aspect and modal systems, that of marked voice with marked aspect is regular, as is that of marked voice with marked mood; combinations of marked mood with marked aspect are, however, rare.[37]

3 Word and character

6B.3 The category of "word" is set up to meet the need for a linguistic unit smaller than the clause and larger than the character. Although the character is unambiguously delimited in a written text, its grammatical meaning quâ character can only be stated in terms of the opposition "bound/free"; it cannot be assigned by interior form to classes operating in clause structures. The unit which can be so classified is greater than the character, consisting of one or more complete characters, and is called the "word" in accordance with the normal practice of descriptive grammar. Like the sentence and clause, the word cannot be delimited by purely graphic criteria. Its delimitation as well as its classification will be on the basis of its interior, including lexical, form.[38]

6B.3.1 The establishment of the word-classes of verb and noun, and the assignment to these classes of elements delimited as words, proceed through the description of "groups", specifically the "verb group", "noun group" and "complex group".[39] A verb group is a group of verbal elements (words) among which there obtain certain interior relations determining the operation of the various elements; the noun group is likewise a group of nominal words, the complex group one of both verbal and nominal words. The group is not a unit in the grammatical system: it does not operate in the unit series sentence-clause-word-character, since this is a system in which each term consists of one or more complete members of the term following, whereas a clause may contain no group at all. The determining feature of the group, on the other hand, is precisely that it is always interchangeable in the structure with a member of the free word class corresponding to it: the verb group is one term in the two-term system of values for V in the verbal clause structure, namely free verb/verb group.

6B.3.1.1 The bound classes of the verb can only operate in a group: prepositive verb only in the complex group, other bound verbs in the verb group or complex group. Only the free verb can stand alone as exponent of V.[40] The structure of the verb group is $\frac{V}{(Au)F(Po)}$, where Au, F and Po have values auxiliary, free and postpositive verb. In fact if both Au and Po are absent we do not talk of a verb *group*, so that the structure here symbolized is that of value V in a verbal clause.[41] A verb group always contains a free verb.

6B.3.1.2 The bound classes of the noun can normally operate only in the noun-group; while the noun group as such forms part of the complex group, it is only in the complex group that the postpositive noun can replace the noun group; elsewhere only the free noun can stand alone as exponent of N. The structure of the noun group is $\frac{N}{((Nu)(Au))F(Po)}$, with numeral, auxiliary, free and postpositive noun.[42] The postpositive noun may be absent; the numeral and auxiliary nouns may both be absent, but if either one is present the other is normally also present.[43] There is a subsidiary structure of the noun group, or "minor noun group", thus: $\frac{N}{NuAu}$.

Occasionally a noun group may have value A in a structure NAV; such a noun group always contains a postpositive noun.

6B.3.1.3 The complex group has adverbial value in the clause structure, though the elements of which it is composed are nominal and verbal words, the free form being a noun.[44] The basic structure is $\frac{A}{\sim PrN}$: prepositive verb followed by noun group (or free noun). A subsidiary structure has postpositive verb: $\frac{A}{\sim PoN}$.[45] A further feature of the prepositive type of the complex group is that the prepositive verb may be preceded by an auxiliary verb.[46] Unlike the verb group, which can only operate in a verbal clause, but like the noun group, the complex group occurs in both verbal and nominal clauses, with the limitations that in the nominal clause (i) only the prepositive complex group is found and (ii) a complex group never contains an auxiliary verb.

6B.3.2 The group is considered as unable to be split, though this is not taken to exclude attribution. A free verb substantive, whether alone or within a verb group, may be immediately preceded by a free verb attributive; and a free noun substantive, whether alone or within a noun or complex group, may be immediately preceded by a free verb or noun attributive or by a genitival bound clause.

6B.3.3 Thus the identification of the verbal and nominal word classes proceeds paradigmatically through the description of the structure of the three types of group. All classes of **verb** and **noun** are identified within the group; free verb and free noun are further identified in the clause structure, where their value is that of the corresponding group. Pro-verb and pronoun have identical respective values in the clause structure but are identified by their exclusion from the group.

The paradigmatic identification of word classes in the clause structure permits the syntagmatic identification of a word as a member of a certain word class,[47] this being further assisted (as said above) by the categories and combinations to which the word is susceptible. By the latter means, a word may be assigned to a word class on the basis of a category which

"compound" and "simple" with those of verb, noun and so on; but some general tendencies are observable. Words of more than two characters are rare in the "Secret History'.[57] Bound verbs are almost all of one character, except for some disyllabic (and even trisyllabic) auxiliary verbs. Of the bound nouns, all auxiliary nouns are monosyllabic, postpositive nouns both monosyllabic and disyllabic. Numerals are of one to three syllables.[58] All pro-verbs except one are monosyllabic;[59] pronouns have one or two characters.[60] The proportion of monosyllabic words among the free verbs is much higher than that among the free nouns. Bound adverbs are of any extent; among the free adverbs the verbal and nominal adverbs tend to be monosyllabic, the clausal adverbs polysyllabic.

6B.3.7 The classification of words as put forward here has much in common with the traditional Chinese classification of (lexical) characters in Old Chinese and in the literary language based on Old Chinese. This recognized "full" and "empty" characters (to retain the unusual English translation: the Chinese is *shih tzŭ* (33) and *hsü tzŭ* (34)), the "full" being the purely lexical words, noun and verb, the "empty" the partly or wholly grammatical. "Full" characters in turn were distinguished into "live" (*huo tzŭ* (35)) and "dead" (*ssŭ tzŭ* (36)), or verbs and nouns respectively. The problem of whether or not the Chinese language recognized word classes, or "parts of speech", has occupied European linguists from Humboldt onwards (Simon 1937). There can be no question that, in the language of the "Secret History" it is not true,[61] as sometimes asserted (Margouliès 1943), that a word may "function as any part of speech" – though it is true that a character per se (as distinct from a monosyllabic word) is not assigned to one of a system of classes corresponding to "parts of speech". We have seen that there is some degree of lexical identification between the word classes, and a complete lexicon would certainly show some forms assigned as words to both verbal and nominal classes; nevertheless the majority of the lexical forms would be found assigned to one word class only. We must agree with Simon's conclusion, drawn with reference to Old Chinese and the literary language, that word classes must be recognized.[62] Whereas, however, in the description of inflected languages it is possible to proceed with words as elements of structures, the exponents being identified morphologically, by grammatical form and scatter; in the description of Chinese the word and its classes must be identified by other means.

Notes for section 6: A and B

1. Harris, (1952) proposes a method for going "past the sentence limitations of descriptive linguistics". This has not been attempted here, though a study of sequences of sentence structures on similar lines would be possible on the basis of the present description. The only extension of the present analysis across sentence boundaries is in the use of "context of mention" (see 6C 1.8).
2. There are 5,380 pieces in this edition as printed. I have made a total of 26 corrections in the punctuation, by the addition of 16 and the deletion of 10 stops, bringing the number of pieces to 5,386. Reference to pieces throughout will be to the text as amended in this way. For details of suggested emendations in the punctuation, as well as in the text itself, see Appendix E. For a table showing the number of pieces in each chapter, and the average number of pieces per paragraph, see Appendix C.
3. Since the text is prose, the stop clearly has some linguistic significance, which is likely to have some relation to grammatical categories.
4. Note that the figures given above are for the occurrence of these forms as **piece**-final, and not as **clause**-final, data for which are given in Appendix C.
5. This is not of course the description which will finally be given of this word-class, but a provisional description that could be made at this stage of the inquiry. Actually they are "final adverbs" serving as markers of a "conditional (bound) clause".
6. This may be compared with the Summary of Categories set up for Modern Pekingese in Halliday (1956: 217–18) (this volume, Chapter 3). Categories with the same name are to be regarded as comparable (not identical).
7. The unit "word" is a term in the system of linguistic units set up for grammatical statement: it is thus a category forming part of the object of the description at the grammatical level. At the same time the "word" is the **sole** object of the description at the lexical level. For lexical statement, however, the word-classes require to be somewhat differently ordered, thus:

   (1) Lexical ("infinite"): Free verb/Free noun/Free adverb
   (2) Lexicogrammatical and grammatical ("finite"):
   Verbs: Prepositive/Auxiliary/Postpositive
   Pro-verb
   Nouns: Numeral/Auxiliary/Postpositive
   Pronoun
   Adverbs: Preverbal/Final/Conjunctive
   Particle

   of which the particle is grammatical, the others lexicogrammatical. See further 7A.

8. The graphic units have of course no classes and functions as such, since they represent only the method of arrangement of the linguistic material. If the piece, for instance, were to be considered as having linguistic validity and therefore having classes and functions, it would *ipso facto* be classified also as a linguistic (grammatical) unit.
9. Strictly "a member of the class of free verb or pro-verb". The possibility of occurrence of a **class** with given value in a structure is systemically restricted; that of a member of a class as exponent is restricted by collocation (see 7A).
10. This procedure of paradigmatic identification is in fact no different from that employed in determining word classes even in such a highly inflected language as Classical Latin. Cf. 6B 3.3.
11. In a language with "institutionalized" words, the word as lexicographical unit may not correspond exactly to the word set up in the grammatical analysis: cf. Robins (1953: 125).
12. See 6C.1.8.
13. As in written texts in modern Chinese or in European languages (where the sentence is taken to extend until marked as closed by a full stop).
14. The two complementary oppositions of "compound/simple" and "sentential (clausal, etc.)/non-sentential (non-clausal, etc.)" could of course be stated at the level of each unit, but this would serve no descriptive purpose.
15. Actually free noun or noun-group, or pronoun; see 6B.3.1.
16. For the position in the clause, see 6B.2.2; for the complex group, 6B.3.1.3.
17. A perfective clause with liau in clause-final position may, however, be final or non-final to a sentence, while a perfective clause with liau in what is considered to be **marked** final position (see 6B.2.5) is always sentence-final.
18. It is unnecessary to distinguish "main", "co-ordinate" and "subordinate" as separate functions within the category "non-sentential". "Subordination" might be defined as the function of all clauses in a compound sentence except the last, but such a category serves no further purpose. The concept of "subordination" might best be related directly to the class of "bound clause", which is already defined as a class by interior form.
19. N must be taken to include the possibility of a list of nouns substantive, theoretically unlimited in extent. The symbolization N . . . is rejected as too clumsy.
20. Only one word-class, the particle, can operate at p. With free adverbs and particles the following further abbreviations have been employed:

    (cl) Clausal
    (ve) Verbal
    (no) Nominal

21. More narrowly: ergative NvNV, passive NvNVp. For the exponents of v and p in these structures, see below on ergative and passive voice, 6B.2.4.

22. More narrowly NAvNV and NvNAVp.
23. I have not considered values having exponent zero, preferring to talk of distinct structures.
24. See 6C.1.8 and 2.4.1, 2.5.1.
25. The question is a terminological one: the naming of certain categories of the clause (see 6C.2.4–6).
26. Cf. Y. R. Chao, (1948: 51). ba is Chao's "pre-transitive"; see pp. 49, 162.
27. "Final" position may be more strictly defined as "not followed by any other lexical or lexicogrammatical word in the same clause". Occasionally "final" liau is followed by another particle.
28. The type of perfective clause in which liau occurs twice, once post-verbally and once finally, frequent in Modern Pekingese, occurs only once in the "Secret History". Chao, *Mandarin Primer* (1948: 40–1) distinguishes for Modern Pekingese -le (=liau) "word suffix -le for completed action" and "phrase suffix -le for new situation, . . ., for progress in narration, . . ., etc."; later (p. 132) he says of phrase suffix -le that it indicates "a new situation . . ., or a new realization of an existing situation". The formally ambiguous (post-verbal and final) le he regards as the two forms "telescoped into one". As Chao points out, other forms of New Chinese, such as Modern Cantonese, distinguish the two lexically, so that there is no ambiguity, and admit both together if the clause ends with V.
29. There are five instances where ǰo follows a form that could be analysed as VN. It seems preferable however to consider these forms (e.g. ki_5ma_3 "(be(ing)) on horse-back") as (compound) verbs, the position of ǰo being the criterion. The five instances are: ki_5ma_3ǰo (IX 10b; 213.21), xuozianǰo "polishing arrows" (V 51a: 169.16), ǰimtuǰo "(pillowing the ground, i.e.) (sleeping) on the ground" (VI 47b; 183.22), čueiluiǰo "crying (letting fall tears)" (X 416; 245.27) and čueiyian$_4$ǰo "with mouth watering" (VII 40b; 195.25).
30. The text has liau madau$_3$ (three occurrences), liau ma (1), liau ǰe (2), liau ǰo (1).
31. For the special type of conditional clause marked by one of four post-positive verbs, see 6C.2.7.
32. Except (i) di preceded by the prepositive verb ši, which marks a passive (free) clause, and (ii) di preceded by a preverbal adverb, which marks a conditional clause.
33. The non-occurrence of passive voice in nominal clauses is predicted; it is, however, excluded in Modern Pekingese. That of ergative is excluded, some 32 being predicted where none occurs.
34. No occurrences; about 23 and 12 respectively predicted.
35. Three occurrences, 86 predicted.
36. 82 occurrences as compared with the predicted figure of 94. The closeness seems to confirm the validity of this distinction.

37. This is predictable on other grounds. Marked modal clauses are normally sentence-final, whereas those with marked aspect (except final perfective) are normally not sentence-final. All occurrences of this combination have in fact final or unmarked perfective aspect. See 6C.2.5–6.
38. Cf. Chao (1948: 48); and Robins (1953: 110): "in the study and analysis of speech the basic and only immediate datum is the sentence, and . . . words . . . must be formally established in each language investigated before they can be used as a basis for further statements".
39. Cf. Meriggi (1953). Drawing examples from Modern Pekingese, Meriggi says: "dans les langues indochinoises modernes, c'est le *groupement des mots*, avec la subordination phonétique et sémantique qu'il entraîne avec soi, qui forme leur véritable grammaire, l'essence de leur type" (p. 189; Meriggi's italics). And later: "Si nous avons affaire à un texte, nous devons, pour le comprendre, commencer toujours par répérer ces groupes qui constituent la phrase; une fausse séparation d'éléments qui en fait sont liés, ou bien une réunion d'éléments qui ne le sont pas, c'est-à-dire, en un mot, un groupement différent de celui qui était conçu par le sujet parlant (ou écrivant), entraînera les pires malentendus" (p. 191). Cf. also H. F. Simon, (1953) passim.
40. In the verbal clause. Since the verb group must contain a free verb (and not a pro-verb) it cannot operate in nominal clauses. The only exponent of V in the nominal clause is the pro-verb.
41. Cf. Chao (1948: 48). Chao's classification of the verb of Modern Pekingese is presented conceptually – the work being, as indicated in the title, a primer for English-speaking students – but in fact every one of his categories is formally differentiated by its combinatory possibilities and susceptibility to categories (e.g. of suffixation with -le). There is no regular correspondence between the categories here set up and Chao's (conceptual) categories, but Chao's "auxiliary verb" is formally marked as corresponding to my own; his "classificatory verb" is my "pro-verb", treated here as a separate word-class because of its not functioning within the group. Chao (p. 47) has "pro-verb" in a different sense. My "postpositive verb" is not regarded by Chao as a category of the verb, but is referred to as "potential" and "directional complements" (p. 45). My "prepositive verb" is Chao's "preposition" ("pre-positives" on p. 49). What Chao calls "quality verb intransitive, or adjective" falls within my category of "free verb", forming part of the sub-class "intransitive (free) verb" (see 6C.3.1).
42. The terminology and classification here adopted differ from those of H. F. Simon (1953) for Modern Pekingese as follows: My "numeral" is Simon's "determinative" minus the "demonstrative"; my "auxiliary" covers Simon's "determinator" plus some of his "determinate"; my "free" covers Simon's "noun" plus the remainder of his "determinate"; my "postpositive" is Simon's "substantival suffix". Simon's category "determinator" is unnecessary for the language of the "Secret History". For

On the question of the (lexical) unit to which the classes of "free" and "bound" are to be referred, see Yang, (1949) and Chao, (1945).

57. Most of these are probably adverbs. It is often impossible to determine whether an element with the value of free noun in the structure of a given syntagm should be considered as consisting of one word or two (attributive plus substantive).
58. For the members of this class see 6C.3.8.
59. wuyieu. For $suei_2$, see 6C.3.2.
60. All disyllabic pronouns have mui as second character.
61. That is, to assume the validity, for linguistic purposes, of such a statement would render an exhaustive grammatical description extremely complex. Indeed the remark may be taken to imply the impossibility of a descriptive grammar.
62. Simon, (1937: 110–11): "He [Gabelentz: Chinese Grammar, Leipzig, 1881 – M. A. K. H.] *declares that the existence of grammatical categories is proved by the fact that Chinese words differ in their syntactical behaviour.* Certain words, this obviously means, behave generally as nouns, others generally as verbs, etc. To give an example, two words are not understood in the same manner by the listener or reader if the first is, for instance, a noun and the second a verb, or the reverse. If the noun precedes the verb, it will generally be conceived as the subject; if the verb precedes, the noun will generally be taken as the object. How could this phenomenon be explained if there were no word categories?" (Simon's italics).

SECTION 6: C

6 Grammar

6C Translation of categories

1 Translation and comparison

6C.1 In Section 6A and B, the grammatical categories of the Chinese language of the "Secret History" were presented by means of a systematic description. The intention here is to proceed further in the identification of these categories with the help of translation reference.

6C.1.1 The naming of a grammatical category does not imply its identification with a homonymous category set up in the description of other languages.[1] I have drawn as far as possible on the terminology in current use in descriptive linguistics, introducing new terms only when no "equivalent" standard term seemed to present itself. The criteria for such "equivalence" are, however, undefined, so that, even where these are formal (contextual or grammatical), terminological identity does not enter into the statement. Since the descriptive method is both formal and universally applicable, I have avoided the use of terms which are generally employed in analyses that are either wholly or partly not formal-grammatical. This is not to say that the logical or conceptual categories of such an analysis "do not apply", or could not be applied, to this as to any other language.[2] But in a **linguistic** analysis such as is required by a descriptive grammar it seems preferable to confine oneself to linguistic criteria. The presentation of the formally established categories in a systematic statement can then be supplemented by translation reference to the language of description.

6C.1.2 There are thus as it were two poles from which the language which is the medium of the description impinges upon the language under description. In the systematic statement of grammatical categories the terminology of the description is as it were collocated afresh: it becomes itself a restricted lexical system in the "metalanguage" of description.[3] At the opposite pole lies the translation of the text in the language of description. The difficulty lies in the search for points of contact between the language of the text and intermediate regions of the language of description. The relating of the forms of the language of the text as exponents of its categories, and of the categories themselves, to forms and categories of the language of description presupposes some analysis of the latter. It does not fall within the scope of descriptive grammar to make a parallel descriptive statement of the language which,

with its "metalanguage", is the medium of description. If this is not to be done, then any statement which relates the forms of the text to the language of description at any point intermediate between the two poles depends on some prior identification of grammatical function between the two languages.

6C.1.3 Such identification of grammatical function across languages, highly desirable as it is, cannot be regarded as resting on a sure foundation before much more systematic comparison has been undertaken. If the criteria for identification are themselves to be grammatical, they must be founded on systematic descriptions of the languages to be compared; but the language of description, not being itself under description, must if its forms are to be used as terms in the identification have already been so described. If such a description is not to hand and familiar we should seek criteria other than grammatical for the grammatical identification. Criteria of contextual reference may provide a basis for the identification of at least some part of the grammatical systems of the two languages.[4]

6C.1.4 Since the relationship implied in the contextual identification of terms in grammatical systems is not in any sense genetic, but (as it may be called) "systematic", such a relationship may be established between the language of the text and any language which presents itself as a convenient point of reference. In this way in a descriptive grammar we may use the language of description, thus establishing contact at a point intermediate between the poles of systematic statement and translation. We may establish "degrees of relationship" (Allen 1953) such that, when enough systems have been compared, the relative closeness of various fields in the two languages may be demonstrated.

6C.1.4.1 With the "Secret History", besides comparison with English, the language of description, there is the further possibility of comparison with Modern Pekingese. Such comparison is likely to yield higher degrees of relationship: not that in every system where comparison is possible the "Secret History" will necessarily appear more closely related to Modern Pekingese than to English, but that the number of comparable systems will be greater as between the "Secret History" and Modern Pekingese and that, of the systems comparable in all three languages, the majority will show a closer relationship between the two forms of Chinese than between either of these and English.

6C.1.5 As an instance of (i) contextual identification of grammatical function and (ii) systematic comparison on this basis, and of the place of these procedures in a descriptive grammar, we may compare the personal pronoun systems of the "Secret History", Modern Pekingese

and English. Here the systems can be identified as comparable between the "Secret History" and Modern Pekingese by grammatical criteria without contextual reference: in both languages (but not, e.g., in Modern Cantonese) the pronoun enters into the system of nominal word classes in simple opposition to the noun; this can be established by its value in the structure and non-operation in the noun group. For a comparison with the English personal pronoun it is necessary to state that both show contextual reference to persons participating in the linguistic event and categorized as "speaker", "addressee" and so on (Firth 1950; see 3.1.1). This reference is then the criterion for identification of single terms in the different pronominal systems. Terms with the same contextual reference will be identified **irrespective of the difference in the total number of terms in the system**.[5] Such reference must be **exactly co-extensive**.[6]

6C.1.5.1 The (personal) pronoun systems of the three languages can be stated and compared as follows:

Reference	SH	Mod. Pek	English
1[7]	wuo	wuə[8]	I[9]
11			
13	ŋam		
133	wuomui		
1133	ŋammui[10]		
		wuəmən	we
12	za		
122[11]	zamui[12]	zamən	
1122			
2	ni[13]	ni[14]	
22	nim		
223	nimui	nimən	you
2233	nimmui[15]		
3	ta	ta	he
			she[16]
33	tamui[17]	tamən	they[18]

6C.1.5.2 Any two of these systems may be compared and a degree of relationship stated for each pair. Comparing the 12-term system of the "Secret History" with the 7-term system of Modern Pekingese we find that of the total of 19 terms 4 are identical, giving a possible reduction in a comparative statement to 19 − 4 = 15 terms, or a degree of relationship $\frac{15}{19}$. (In the "Secret History" and English a reduction of only two terms is

possible, giving a lower degree of relationship $\frac{8}{9}$.) In making a terminological identification between these four terms (for example as first, second and third person singular and third person plural) we should be identifying these terms **between the two languages** (whereas we should not identify, for example, "perfective aspect" in the "Secret History" and in Modern Pekingese until some similar comparative statement had been made).[19]

6C.1.6 In fact, though the degree of relationship between any pairs of systems in the "Secret History" and Modern Pekingese may vary considerably, the systems of grammatical categories in the two languages, identified grammatically (with lexical support, but without reference to context), are closely related. In naming the categories of the "Secret History" I have used the same names as can be (and are by myself) applied to categories of Modern Pekingese with which they are identified (at any level), for example "voice" and "aspect" as categories of the clause; where formal identification has not been made, I have used terms also employed for Modern Pekingese where they seemed appropriate, a procedure which seems justified not only for terminological economy but because of the obvious (if unformulated) relationship between the totality of the systems of the two languages and the identity of the techniques of description applied by myself to both. The closeness of the systems of grammatical categories is itself the comparative basis (at the grammatical level) for a view of the "Secret History" and Modern Pekingese as two stages of the same language.

6C.1.7 Since the aim and scope of the present work are descriptive and particular rather than historical and comparative, a systematic comparison with Modern Pekingese, which is not the language of description, should be reserved for separate treatment. Moreover the field of application of contextual criteria to grammatical identification across languages is restricted. For this reason in approaching the language of description at a point intermediate between the "metalanguage" of systematic statement and the language of translation it may be desirable to face the latter pole, as it were, rather than the former; that is to say, in referring the forms of the "Secret History" to English we may take as the point of reference the language of an English translation of the text.

A form of the "Secret History" will then be regarded as corresponding to (that is, capable of being translated, in the event, by) a form in the English translation.[20] This translation reference may be systematized to the extent that the English form can be assigned to some category definable in use; but the description will always face the pole of translation,

6C.2.3 The verbal/nominal dimension of clause classes is not reflected in translation, though some common feature can be abstracted from the translation equivalents of the pro-verb, which marks a nominal clause; and the absence from the nominal clause system of marked voice and imperfective aspect may be to a certain degree reflected in the absence from its equivalents in the translation of the passive form of the verb and of tense-forms "is (was, etc.) -ing". The verbal clause includes the type of those which in English have predicative adjective. (Examples of verbal and nominal clauses: 6D.2.3 are on the CD-ROM provided.)

6C.2.4 The categories of voice, aspect and mood are categories of the clause. The terms here chosen are those regularly employed with other languages in the description of the verb; the translation and contextual reference, however, suggest some reasons for the use of these terms in the naming of certain categories formally established in the clause.

In the system of voice there is no regular grammatical translation reference, and what English equivalence can be observed depends on identification by context of mention. It is possible to make some contextual distinction (i) between marked and unmarked voice and (ii) between ergative and passive. If we consider a given syntagm active in voice, structure $N_{(a)}VN_{(b)}$, where (a) and (b) are contextual referents, we can set up two non-commutable variants (having, that is, the same contextual reference) with marked voice where both $N_{(a)}$ and $N_{(b)}$ precede V. Of these variants, the ergative will appear as $N_{(a)}N_{(b)}V$, the passive as $N_{(b)}N_{(a)}V$.[27]

6C.2.4.1 There is some correlation between the dimension of voice in the clause and the contextual dimension in which are opposed the given and the new. The tendency is for the referent of the given to precede that of the new within the limits imposed by the basic grammatical structure. This can be expressed in tabular form (where N_1, N_2 are the grammatical (positional) categories, (a), (b) the contextual referents):

Voice	*Structure*	*Given*	*New*
Active	$N_{1(a)}VN_{2(b)}$	$N_{(a)}$ or $N_{(a)}V$	$VN_{(b)}$ or $N_{(b)}$
Ergative	$N_{1(a)}N_{2(b)}V$	$N_{(a)}N_{(b)}$	V
Passive	$N_{1(b)}N_{2(a)}V$	$N_{(b)}V$ or $N_{(b)}$	$N_{(a)}$or $VN_{(a)}$[28]

Since this type of contextual reference is normally made in spoken English by intonation/stress, and in written English is ignored, there is no grammatical translation equivalent (except insofar as in a spoken

language intonation can thereby be considered a grammatical category).[29]

There are two subsidiary structures in the active clause, one of which is likewise contextually determined. These are: (i) NNV(N) which, like the passive, has contextual reference $N_{(b)}N_{(a)}V$, with N_b given and V new (occasionally, like the ergative, $N_{(a)}N_{(b)}V$);[30] (ii) (N)VNN which is restricted to certain exponents of V, of which the only regular one is yiu "give".[31]

6C.2.4.2 In most cases the ergative of the "Secret History" is equivalent to that of Modern Pekingese; sometimes, however, for the ziaŋ of the ergative Modern Pekingese would have prepositive verb na_2 (in active clause). There is perhaps some inconsistency in the assignment of ziaŋ and the ši of the passive to the **lexico**grammatical word class of prepositive verb, since their meaning in this structure can be stated purely grammatically and they are unrestricted by collocation,[32] rather than to the class of particle; their position in the structure is, however, that of prepositive verb and not that of particle (which follows, or is final in, what it modifies). ziaŋ is frequently found also as a free verb and as a postpositive verb, and occasionally as a verbal adverb;[33] ba, which occurs eight times in ergative clause, is found also twice as free verb. The passive clause is to be distinguished from the special instance of the bound genitival (active) clause (of type (ii) and preceded by ši) which it resembles but from which it is formally distinct (see 6C.2.8.2). (Examples of voice: 6D.2.4 are on the CD-ROM provided.)

6C.2.5 In the aspect system likewise it is possible to observe a contextual correlation, and the translation of aspectival forms can be systematized to the extent that it depends on this correlation. In general marked aspect denotes the relatedness (imperfective and non-final perfective) or unrelatedness (final perfective) of the following context. An imperfective clause or a non-final perfective clause has at least one referent given to the following clause or itself operates as a term in the context of the following clause: it has context either related to, or the same as, the following clause; while in a clause following a final perfective clause all referents are new. A clause unmarked in aspect is neutral as to contextual reference, and an unmarked (final/non-final) perfective clause is as a category similarly neutral, though any given exponent may be syntagmatically assigned to one or the other term.

6C.2.5.1 The terms "perfective" and "imperfective" are chosen (their use being current with regard to Modern Pekingese) because the reference given by an imperfective clause is one of **prolongation**, while that given by a perfective clause is one of **succession**.[34] That is to say, a

perfective clause, in its operation (or that of one of its terms) in contextual relation to the following clause, appears as a term in a series or succession, while an imperfective clause appears as one in a hierarchy or progression. For this reason the perfective has the formal dimension of final/non-final, the final marking the last of the series, while the imperfective has no such dimension.

It thus happens that a clause with non-final perfective or with imperfective aspect is almost never sentence-final (cf. Průšek (1946): function of subordination), while a clause with final perfective aspect is always sentence-final.[35]

With regard to non-final perfective aspect, four points may be noted. (i) It frequently occurs in a bound clause, the non-finality of which in a succession is implied in its being bound. (ii) It has no direct time reference, occurring in both free and bound clauses where past reference is excluded: here English (which usually employs past tense forms in narrative, the narrative as such in the "Secret History" being neutral in aspect) may have a variety of forms, including compound past tenses, determined in subordinate clauses by structures of tense-sequence. (iii) It is frequent in parallel clauses, where, however, non-final perfective is usual even in the second (last) clause (if the second had final perfective in fact there would be no parallelism). (iv) There are some instances of it in a paragraph-final clause, where it is prima facie unlikely that contextual reference would extend forward; but the majority of these instances are in the genealogies in Chapter 1, which could be regarded either as extended parallelism or as related in context (with e.g. zuoliau. . . siŋši$_6$ "founded the clan. . ." given); a few other instances do not seem to be accounted for in this description.

6C.2.5.2 As additional features of aspect may be noted:

(i) The imperfective particle ǰo is frequently found (47 out of a total of 328 occurrences) in prepositive complex group modifying a prepositive verb (where, therefore, the clause is not itself imperfective); here the same prolongation reference **within** the clause is marked as a feature of prepositive verb.

(ii) There seems to be a correlation between marked aspect and structures with monosyllabic final free verb (cf. above, n., Průšek (1950): aspective particle with simple verbs). This is generally observable throughout, and is particularly pin-pointed by one clause (see example 6D.2.5 no.5 on the CD-ROM provided). The only frequently occurring combination of marked categories is indeed that of ergative voice (NNV) with perfective aspect; here,

as in other perfective clauses with final V, the perfective clause is marked merely as one term in a series but unmarked as to final/non-final.

(iii) In Modern Pekingese the combination of perfective aspect with negative adverb normally implies contrast with (i.e. non-operation of the negative adverb in) the previous context, and can usually be translated as "no longer" or "not, after all (as originally intended)". This is not generally so in the "Secret History" where negative perfective is not a separate term in the system but is merely as it were the sum of its parts; there are, however, a few instances resembling Modern Pekingese (see examples 6D. 2.5 nos. 6,7 on the CD-ROM provided).

(iv) Occasionally liau modifies a prepositive verb; this is not considered to constitute a separate verbal system, but rather, like the regular use of jŏ with prepositive verb, to specify a relation normally linking clauses or sentences as operating within the clause. In a verb group with postpositive verb the position of liau and ǰo is following the postpositive verb; ǰo is, however, very rare here. For the relation of postpositive verb to perfective aspect, see 6C.3.5.1.

(v) Combinations of aspective particle with the postpositive verbs (type (ii)) lai, kiu and yieu do not form a separate system. These are discussed in relation to postpositive verbs (see 6C.3.5.4).

6C.2.5.3 The Modern Pekingese aspect system shows certain important differences, in particular: (i) the presence of a term with (post-verbal) guə (perhaps best regarded as a specialized form of the perfective; alternatively as postpositive verb); (ii) the presence of a specialized negative system; (iii) the possibility of occurrence of both non-final and final liau in one clause.[36] The systems are, however, clearly comparable; no comparison has been attempted here, in view of the detailed discussion of Modern Pekingese aspect which this would entail.

As is implied by the contextual reference, a free clause with imperfective or non-final perfective aspect may often be translated as an English subordinate clause (with "after. . .", "seeing that. . ." and so forth). An imperfective clause often requires English verb-forms "is (was, etc.) -ing".

The imperfective particle ǰo should be distinguished from the postpositive verb ǰau occurring only after certain free verbs (6C.3.5.1.1), and from clause-final ǰo marking imperative mood: all are written with the character ǰo. (Examples of aspect: 6D.2.5. Please refer to the CD-Rom provided.)

6C.2.6 The category of "mood", like that of aspect, is marked by certain particles in the clause, those of mood being always final. The neutral term in this system is affirmative mood, and no change in the clause structure is associated with the marked terms of the modal system.

6C.2.6.1 The regular form of the interrogative has final particle ma; clauses of this type can be translated with English interrogative verb form. Clauses with $madau_3$(15 occurrences) require an exclamatory form, which may or may not be interrogative in English. There is one interrogative clause with feu (XI. 17b; 252.17). All these forms exclude the occurrence in the clause of an interrogative word (some, but not all, of which have ma as final syllable; see 6C.3.17); clauses with interrogative word (noun or adverb) are considered affirmative, there being no grammatical distinction between these and other affirmative clauses. Thus English interrogative verb form is the translation equivalent not only of interrogative mood but also of affirmative mood in "information questions" with words such as šuei "who?".

Modern Pekingese has not only ma (now written ma_2) similarly restricted, but also ni_2 which can both replace ma and combine with interrogative word; ni_2 is absent from the "Secret History". $madau_3$ is absent from Modern Pekingese; we may compare the latter's (pre-verbal) $nandau_3$ which has, however, a contrary implication absent from $madau_3$ ("(surely) you don't mean. . .?");[37] and Modern Cantonese me (m tuŋ . . . me? = $nandau_3$ . . . ma_2?) contrasted with interrogative ma. Modern Pekingese has in addition a quite distinct interrogative form of an "alternative" type, characterized by the repetition of (at least) the verb, preceded in the second instance by the negative adverb. This form is very rare in the "Secret History"; perhaps the only two occurrences are (II. 45b–46a; 100.15, 20), one of which is an answer to the other. Because of its rarity and incomplete identity with the Modern Pekingese, this form is not regarded as interrogative here. (Examples of interrogative mood: 6D.2.6.1 are on the CD-ROM provided.)

6C.2.6.2 In imperative mood the "Secret History" distinguishes a first, a second and a third person imperative, rendered as such in English but, unlike English, all formally marked. First person imperative is marked by final za (five occurrences), formally identical with personal pronoun za.[38]

Second person imperative has regularly ǰe, sometimes ǰo (17 occurrences[39]); there is no observable distinction between the two. Very occasionally ǰe occurs in clauses (e.g. X. 13b; 238.8–9) translated as first person imperative. ǰe and ǰo regularly collocate with prepositive verb giau "tell, order", requiring "indirect command" in translation.

3 The word

6C.3 In the consideration of the translation of word-classes, some correspondence with English word-classes can be indicated, with (in the case of the bound word-classes) some reference to the translation of the group in which these operate. In addition translation reference by means of "specimen translation" is given for members of a word-class which are of particular interest or of frequent occurrence. Reference to context of mention is valid in some instances in relation to the group; and some comparison is made with Modern Pekingese forms.

6C.3.1 A free verb may have substantive or attributive function, and attributive function permits the further distinction of the free verb into the sub-classes "transitive" and "intransitive".

6C.3.1.1 (i) A free verb, which in combination with a following noun forms a verbal clause is said to be "transitive".[52] Such a verb never has attributive function, since in structure VN it is always substantive (its "attribution" taking the form of a genitival clause), while there is no unambiguous instance in the "Secret History" of a transitive verb attributive to a verb. Only a transitive verb can have substantive function in a clause with marked voice.

A transitive verb is usually rendered in English by a (finite) verb. This may be of the type recognized in English as "intransitive", for example lai "come".

6C.3.1.2 (ii) A free verb which in combination with a following noun does not form a clause but is attributive to it, the combination thus having value N in the structure, is said to be "intransitive". An intransitive verb may thus have substantive or attributive function, but it never has substantive function in a clause with marked voice or with post-verbal N.[53]

An intransitive verb in substantive function is usually rendered by an English predicative adjective with "is" etc.; in attributive function by an attributive adjective or, if attributive to a verb, by an adverb.[54] (Examples of free verbs: 6D.3.1 are on the CD-ROM provided.)

6C.3.2 The pro-verb has value V in the structure of the nominal clause, the order of elements in which is, as in the active verbal clause, (N)V(N). Specimen translations of the eight pro-verbs of regular occurrence in the "Secret History" are as follows:

ši	"is"
yieu	"there is; has"
wu	"there is not, has not"

zai	"is at"
miŋ	"is called"
řu and s	"is like"
$suei_2$ preceded by numeral nouns	"is . . . (years old)"

Of the 30 occurrences of pro-verb řu, six are in řu ho "what is . . . like?, how is?, why is?" and four in řu x "is like this".

In Modern Pekingese the category can be established on the same criterion of non-operation in the verb group; Modern Pekingese has məi (mui_2) or məiyiəu for wu and (hau)siaŋ for řu, s. It is doubtful whether to regard yiəu as a pro-verb in Modern Pekingese, where, unlike məiyiəu, it regularly combines with an auxiliary verb.

Or the 118 and 30 occurrences of pro-verbs yiəu and wu, seven and one respectively are in structure NV (one NNV) where VN might be expected.[55] This is not unparalleled in Modern Pekingese, especially where the N:V relation is that of given:new in the context:compare (I. 36b; 55.11) s wuo ban fu_4řin yieu yieǰe "let there be a(nother) woman like me". To this may be related the regular use of yieu as postpositive verb (type (iib)) (see below, 6C.3.5.5).

All pro-verbs occur also as either prepositive or postpositive verbs, or both: the identification of some of these is given in the table in 6C.3.5.3.1. (Examples of pro-verbs: 6D.3.2 are on the CD-ROM provided.)

6C.3.3 Of the bound verb classes, the auxiliary verb operates in both the verb group, where it precedes the free verb, and the prepositive complex group, where it precedes the prepositive verb.[56] Those of frequent occurrence in the "Secret History", with specimen translations, are:

lai and kiu	"to, in order to, came/went and"[57]
ko and $koyi_2$	"can, may, is qualified to, it may be that"
yiau and yiu_3	"will, is going/wants to"
neŋ and de	"can"
ken	"is willing to"
gam	"dare"
bei	(passive verb form)
bi_2	"must"
ši[58]	

lai and kiu frequently occur following another auxiliary verb or a quasi-complex group (see 6C.3.4.2).

The system is comparable with that of Modern Pekingese, where however yiu_3 and the less common yiu_3yiau are absent, while kə (ko),

regular (69 occurrences) in the "Secret History", is narrowly restricted in Modern Pekingese which has regularly kəyi (koyi$_2$); the latter form in the "Secret History" (19 occurrences) never follows a negative adverb and in nine instances can be translated "is qualified to".

A number (but not all) of the auxiliary verbs occur also as free verbs; some of these and others also as prepositive verbs. ziaŋ, which also occurs frequently as free verb ("bring, take"), as prepositive verb in ergative clause and as postpositive verb (see 6C.3.5.2), occurs ten times as auxiliary verb, translated as "will": compare Modern Pekingese adverb jiaŋlai (ziaŋlai) "in the future", which occurs once in the "Secret History" where it could be regarded as auxiliary verb ziaŋ plus auxiliary verb lai; and "Secret History" (once only, in (II. 32b; 91.4)) ziaŋx$_2$, adverb "about to". (Examples of auxiliary verb: 6D.3.3 are on the CD-ROM provided.)

6C.3.4 Prepositive verbs are distinguished into two types according to whether or not they operate in a complex group having adverbial value in the clause structure.

6C.3.4.1 (i) A prepositive verb of this type combines with following N into a complex group which normally has direct pre-verbal position, occasionally initial position, in the clause; the complex group then has adverbial value, so that (vN)V = AV. Prepositive verbs of this type are frequently modified by the imperfective particle ǰo, recalling the -ing form of words used in their translation. The most frequent prepositive verbs of this type, with specimen translations, are:

yiu	"with (accompanying), for (on behalf of)"
zai and yiu$_2$	"at, in, on"
řu	"like"
duei (collocating with free verb šuo "say")	"to"
bei	"by (with passive verb form)"
z$_2$	"from, through"
ǰi and dau	"to, reaching, by (time)"
zuo	"as, being"
yiuŋ	"with (using)"
liŋ$_2$	"with, leading"

The translation of the complex group is thus usually a prepositional phrase, the prepositive verb (together with the postpositive noun where present) being rendered by a preposition (with the postpositive noun there is often the possibility of a compound preposition: e.g. zai . . . heu "behind, at the back of", dau . . . həu "behind, to the back of").

The Modern Pekingese system is comparable; of the forms listed above, some are not usual in Modern Pekingese, their regular equivalents being shown in the following table with occurrences of both in the "Secret History" in parentheses:

Secret History	Modern Pekingese
yiu (171)	gən$_2$ (-), tuŋ (16) "accompanying"
	gəi (-) "on behalf of"
z$_2$ (60)	xuŋ (13)
ǰi (47)	dau (37)
yiu$_2$ (100)	zai (51)
řu$_1$ (100)	gən$_2$ . . . yiyiaŋ (-), etc.

Of the occurrences of řu in the "Secret History", 58 are in řuho "how?", Modern Pekingese zənma(yiaŋ), and 12 in řux "like this", Modern Pekingese ǰəyiaŋ (ǰe$_2$yiaŋ), nayiaŋ. Frequent in Modern Pekingese also is na$_2$ (1), of which the equivalent in the "Secret History" is ziaŋ in ergative clause.

For the relation between prepositive and postpositive complex group, see 6C.3.5.3.1.

6C.3.4.2 (ii) A prepositive verb of this type occurs in formally identical combination with following N, but the combination (vN) has no value as such in the structure, and is regarded as forming a "quasi-" complex group.[59] Most frequent among this type, which never has imperfective particle ǰo, are:

giau	"tell (order)"
miŋ$_2$ and liŋ	"order"
gian	"see"
ši$_4$	"make (cause)"
čai	"send (order . . . to go and)"
šuo	"say"
ǰi$_7$	"know"
hiu	"permit"
kuŋ	"be afraid"

The translation of the quasi-complex group thus takes the form of a verb followed by noun clause or by noun and verb infinitive: "told him (to go)", "saw him (go)", "know that he (went)", etc.; including "say", etc. with reported speech.

Modern Pekingese has a comparable system, in which some rather more usual equivalents are as follows:

Secret History	Modern Pekingese
giau (230)	jiau ($giau_2$) (-)
liŋ (19)	$miŋ_2$ (43)
gian (42)	kaŋjian (-gian) (-)
$ši_4$ (34)	š ($ši_4$) and jiau (giau2)
čai (30)	da_2fa (-)
$ǰi_7$ (17)	$ǰ_7dau_3$ (-)
hiu (16)	siu (hiu) and řaŋ (-)
kuŋ (12)	kuŋpa (2), pa (2)

Some prepositive verbs of this type are disyllables of which the second character is regularly a postpositive verb (e.g. tiŋde "hear"); since, however, these are relatively few it seems simpler to regard them as compound prepositive verbs than as prepositive verbs followed by postpositive verb (restricting the latter to occurrence following a free verb). Among collocations regular with prepositive verbs of type (ii) is that of giau with imperative final particle ǰe.[60]

6C.3.4.3 A special sub-type within this type of prepositive verb is formed by the three words ši, yieu and wu. This might be considered a third type intermediate between types (i) and (ii), or the forms could be assigned to both types, since it is sometimes doubtful whether to regard the group in which they occur as a complex or a quasi-complex group, and sometimes one, sometimes the other seems preferable. In translation, ši and yieu are often omitted; if translated, their rendering when preceded by a noun resembles the forms used in type (i): ši "(being =) is . . . and" (or passive verb form, e.g. (II. 44a; 99.7); compare passive form), yieu "having, with, has . . . Who/which"; without the preceding noun, the form is more comparable with those of type (ii): ši "it is (. . . Who/which)", yieu "there is (. . . Who/which), some". wu with preceding noun may be translated "without, not having, has not . . . Who/which", without preceding noun as "(there is) no (. . . Who/which), no one/-thing".[61]

Modern Pekingese has š and yiəu, while wu is replaced by məi(yiəu). yiəu, however, is more restricted, the use to which corresponds zero translation reference (for example (I. 23a; 38.3) yieu na fu_4řin $hueidau_3$ "the woman answered"), which is very frequent in the "Secret History", not being found in Modern Pekingese.[62]

Likewise transitional between the two types are the words bei and

unmarked; this is formed by the negative adverb bu and the postpositive verb de[65] in position between the free verb and the postpositive verb, thus:

FPo, (unmarked); F-bu-Po, negative; F-de-Po, potential;
F-bude-Po, negative potential.

Examples from the text of the marked terms are: (negative) (VIII. 48b; 208.12) xši$_2$ řuo še$_2$buǰuŋ Saŋgun "if you had not hit Saŋgun then" (še$_2$ = "shoot"); (potential) (II. 51b; 103.12) wuo suoyi$_2$ duo$_2$deguo "that was how I was able to escape"; (negative potential) (II. 49a; 102.5) hiŋbudeřu$_2$ "could not get in". Since adverbial modification is by immediate precedence, it is the postpositive and not the free verb that is modified by the negative: the first example might be (non-contextually) translated "if, when you shot at Saŋgun, you had not hit him".

In Modern Pekingese this system is much more extensive than in the "Secret History", but has only three terms, the negative potential – budə – being absent, while the negative term is often translated "cannot" and contrasts with the form with a negative adverb (bu, more often məi (mui$_2$)) preceding the **free** verb (in the "Secret History" the verbal adverb buxeŋ, equivalent of məi (see 6C.3.16), likewise precedes the free verb). Modern Cantonese has the four terms FPo, F-m-Po, F-dak-Po and m-F-dak-Po (with dak and the regular negative adverb m) in a comparable system.

6C.3.5.1.3 The postpositive verb de occurs also a regular postpositive verb of this type; it never occurs, however, in potential form (i.e. is never repeated). It occurs in three formally distinct types of syntagm, requiring different translation forms: (i) in negative form or in interrogative clauses or clauses with interrogative word, translated as a potential form of the free verb – (VII. 17a; 190.14) wuo zuobude ni yieu$_4$šeu "I cannot act as your right wing"; (ii) in other ("positive") clauses, not clause-final, usually requiring a distinct lexical form (but sometimes possibly "get, catch") – (II. 8b; 76.3) diau$_2$de yi go gim$_2$se yiu$_4$ř "hooked a golden fish" (or "was fishing and caught . . ."); (iii) in positive clauses but with clause-final position, marking the clause as bound (conditional) as sometimes reflected in the translation of this and the following clause as one: (II. 6b; 74.8) yiaŋ$_2$de řzmui ǰaŋčiŋ liau "her sons grew up *in her care* (by her tending)".[66] It is sometimes doubtful whether to regard a form as potential (F-de-Po) or as two clauses (F-de/F), e.g. (IX/ 26b; 219.8) laideči liau or laide/či liau "came late" – here the latter is preferable as či does not occur elsewhere as postpositive verb.

In Modern Pekingese the first type is restricted (to a use which may be exemplified by pəŋbudə (-de) "can't stand knocking about"), de here in general being replaced by other postpositive verbs; in type (ii) it is, as noted above, replaced by others, but a number of Modern Pekingese compound verbs have də as the second character. Type (iii) is regular in Modern Pekingese.

6C.3.5.2 Type (i) sub-type (b) contains 11 postpositive verbs, operating (like those of sub-type (a)) in the verb group following the free verb, but distinguished by certain possibilities of combination one with another. If these eleven are stated in three groups, symbolized x, y and z, combinatory possibilities (where F = free verb) (in addition to Fx[67], Fy and Fz) are: Fxz, Fyz, Fxyz.

The members of the groups are:

group x (1 member)	ziaŋ
group y (8 members)	huei, ču, zin_2, $řu_2$, ki, hia, guo, zeu[68]
group z (2 members)	lai, kiu.

Specimen translations of group y, which usually requires an English post-verbal adverb, are: "went *into* the forest" ($řu_2$, in (II. 14b; 79.20)), "drive the horses *out*" (ču, in (II. 31b; 90.45)), "has run *away*" (zeu, in (II. 19b; 82.3)). Group z will usually not figure in the translation but may affect the form of the verb: "*went* in pursuit" (not "came") for si_2ziaŋ kiu in (IV. 3b; 128.7).[69] ziaŋ, group x, should, it seems, be grouped in some way with lai and kiu, though not into a single system since lai and kiu are mutually exclusive, while neither excludes ziaŋ. It requires no translation but frequently collocates with free verbs denoting movement where English may have "over", "along", "away", etc.[70]

The comparable type in Modern Pekingese is that of **unstressed** postpositive verbs, which likewise have combinatory possibilities, though only in two groups (y and z; jiaŋ (ziaŋ) being absent). Modern Pekingese excludes $řu_2$ from the postpositive verb system, having as equivalent jin (zin_2) (sense "in"; the "Secret History" has zin_2 in the system (11 occurrences) but in sense "forward"[71]), and has zəu (zeu) as type (i a) (non-combining, stressed); but includes in this type šaŋ which does not combine in the "Secret History" (it probably should be assigned to this sub-type, especially in view of its special relation to hia (in translation šaŋ = "up", hia = "down"); but since there are no occurrences of šaŋ in combination there is no alternative but to assign it to sub-type (a)).[72]

6C.3.5.3 Type (i) sub-type (c) contains 12 postpositive verbs operating not, as those of sub-types (a) and (b), in the verb group, but in the postpositive complex group. Three features distinguish the members of

this sub-type: (i) they may occur separated from the free verb by a noun; (ii) they may follow a postpositive verb of type (i a); (iii) they never occur without a following noun.

The translation resembles that of the prepositive complex group, and indeed all the members of this sub-type are also prepositive verbs of type (i) (but not vice versa).[73] The 12, with specimen translations (and compare 6C.3.4.1), are:

zai and yiu_2	"at, in, on"
yiu	"for"
z_2	"from, through"
ǰi and dau	"to"
zuo and wuei	"as"
řu	"like"
yieu	"with, having"
wu	"without, not having"
miŋ	"(who is) called, named"

Modern Pekingese recognizes this type, with some difference in the forms in regular use: yiu_2 ("at"), ǰi and wuei are excluded, zai, dau and zuə (zuo) or daŋ being regular (respective) equivalents: yiu ("for") is replaced by gəi, z_2 by xuŋ, řu by e.g. gən (gen_2) . . . yiyaŋ and wu by məi(yiəu); in addition to miŋ there is the comparable siŋ "(who is) surnamed".

6C.3.5.3.1 This lexical identification of postpositive verbs of this sub-type with prepositive verbs extends to the identification of most of the members with either free verbs or proverbs. The following table shows the forms identified, with occurrences in the "Secret History":

	Prepositive	Postpositive	Free verb	Pro-verb
yiu_2	100	19		
z_2	60	1		
yiu	171	70	freq.	
ǰi	47	33	freq.	
dau	37	31	freq.	
zuo	26	52	freq.	
zai	51	26		35
řu	100	4		30
miŋ	9	13		90
wuei	14[74]	21		4
yieu	103	4[75]		119
wu	13	1		30

There is thus, with these exponents, a formal identity of prepositive and postpositive complex groups. This distribution is again linked with contextual reference, the later position being as usual that of the new: for example (II. 45b; 100.5) giau zuo_3 zai heičez li "told her to sit in the black wagon", but (III. 16b (116b); 110.10) Borte zai na baisiŋ nei tiŋ jo "Borte heard him from among the folk" where heičez "black wagon" does not occur above while baisiŋ "folk" does (110.7).[76]

6C.3.5.4 Type (ii) of postpositive verbs includes two systems, sub-types (a) and (b), of forms occurring in clause-final position; they are, however, positionally distinguished, as those of sub-type (a) precede final (perfective) liau, those of (b) follow it (but precede the modal particles, which have absolute final position). Where the two occur in the same clause, (a) precedes (b). Since they do not directly follow the verb, they might be considered as belonging outside the class of postpositive verb; but since most of the forms are lexically identified with postpositive verbs of type (i), their assignment to this class seems justifiable. The two systems have respectively place and time reference.

Sub-type (a) includes only the two forms lai and kiu. These terms operate in a simple dimension of direction towards or away from the speaker or narrator, sometimes other relevant person or object. They thus resemble lai and kiu in type (i) and likewise frequently require no translation; often, however, they may affect the choice of verb (e.g. "come", "bring" in clauses with lai, "go", "take" in clauses with kiu), and sometimes are rendered analytically, as (it might be) "walked up", "send here" contrasted with "walked away", "send there".

Modern Pekingese has an identical system. In both the "Secret History" and Modern Pekingese there is a tendency for these forms to occur in sentence-final clauses.

6C.3.5.5 Sub-type (b) has the four terms yieu, yieulai, lai and yie, occurring 15, 20, 24 and 9 respectively. This system has direct time reference, and would if its use were more extended be considered a fourth category of clause classes along with voice, aspect and mood: the terms would be neutral (unmarked), present (yieu and yie) and past (lai and yieulai). Since, however, not many more than one in a hundred clauses (67 out of 5719) would have marked "tense" (if it were so called), it seems preferable to consider it a postpositive verb system with time reference in contrast to the place reference of sub-type (a).

In view of the special interest of this sytem (the absence of any comparable system in Modern Pekingese), every instance has been either quoted or referred to in the examples (6D.3.5 on the CD-ROM provided). It may be noted here that of the occurrences of yieu, six are in

nominal clauses with pro-verb zai "is at" and of the rest three are in imperfective and one in unmarked perfective clauses; of yie, seven have lai as free verb or postpositive type (i), one of these and the other two are perfective, while four have adverb ŕugim "now" and one has auxiliary verb ziaŋ "will, is going to". Of clauses with yieulai, 14 have adverbial past time reference (as with xeŋ, zaisian, etc.); of those with lai, 15 have adverbial past time reference. All clauses with postpositive verbs of this type are free.

There is an interesting correlation with the English tense forms of the translation. The equivalents given here (with the verb "come" as example) are appropriate in every instance and in many seem to be demanded:

> yieu and yie "comes, is coming", yieulai "has been coming, used to come, was coming; came (after subordinate clause)", lai "had come, came".

yieu shows a preference for nominal clauses and clauses with intransitive free verbs, yie for those with transitive free verbs.[77]

This system is absent from Modern Pekingese, which has, however, one comparable form laiǰə (laiǰo), the equivalent of lai here (e.g. in (II. 37b; 94.2) "when Temuǰin was nine, he had been parted from Dei-sečen's daughter Borte-wuǰin"; Modern Pekingese could certainly have laiǰə): laiǰə may, with guə (absent from the "Secret History"), be included in the Modern Pekingese aspect system.[78] (Examples of postpositive verbs: 6D.3.5 are on the CD-ROM provided.)

6C.3.6 The free noun is regularly rendered by an English noun. The members of this class include the many personal and place names in the "Secret History": the vast majority of these are Mongolian words, but their place in the Chinese system is identical with that of Chinese free nouns. A free noun regularly has attributive function to another (following) free noun; it is sometimes doubtful whether to regard a given syntagm as a single (compound) free noun or as two free nouns, the first with attributive function: in general if both elements are found separately as free nouns substantive the latter statement is preferred, otherwise the former.

A free noun may operate in a noun group; personal and place names do so only infrequently. It may be followed by the plural particles mui and deŋ, especially personal names. It may be followed by di, marking its attribution to what follows; there is also a small group of free nouns, polysyllabic with di as the final syllable (see 7B.3).[79]

6C.3.7 The pronoun has been discussed previously (6C.1.5.1). (Examples 6D.3.7 are on the CD-ROM provided.)

6C.3.8 The numeral noun occurs as the first element in the

classification in Modern Pekingese is almost totally absent from the "Secret History": there is only one instance of the type (such as kankan, kanyikan "have a look") so frequent in the former where a free verb is repeated with or without intervening yi "one". The unique example is (II. 25a; 86.4) seu yi seu, translated "search"; alternatively "make a search". (Examples of an auxiliary noun: 6D.3.9 are on the CD-ROM provided.)

6C.3.10 The postpositive noun occurs as final element in the noun group. Whether or not the noun group of which it forms a part is itself part of a complex group, the postpositive noun can usually be translated by an English preposition, the latter being, with the complex group, the translation equivalent of the prepositive (or the postpositive) verb plus postpositive noun.

About half of the postpositive nouns in the "Secret History" are simple (monosyllabic) words, the other half compound, disyllabic; many of the latter are formed from a simple positive noun plus following $bian_2$, mian, $gian_2$, or teu_2. Frequently the translation of such a pair is identical, and it is unnecessary to regard the two as separate types; it may be noted, however, that compound postpositive nouns (alone among the bound nominal classes) are lexically identifiable with free nouns.

Those of frequent occurrence, with specimen translation, are:

li, $liteu_2$	"in (inside, into)"
$ču_2$	(see below)
nei	"among, inside"
šaŋ, šaŋ mian, $šaŋteu_2$	"on"
hiŋ	(see below)
ban, yiban	"like"
$bian_2$	"beside"
ǰuŋ, $ǰuŋgian_2$	"amidst, between"
xian, $xianteu_2$, xianmian	"in front of"
$duŋ_2bian_2$	"to the east of"
$gian_2$, $liaŋgian_2$	"between"
genxian[84]	"in front of" (see below)

Modern Pekingese has a comparable system, in which most of the same forms operate; there are, however, some differences. yiban is usually replaced by yiyiaŋ, $liaŋgian_2$ by $ǰuŋgian_2$, ǰuŋ often by daŋǰuŋ. Of the remainder listed above, three (hiŋ, $ču_2$ and genxian) are absent from Modern Pekingese.

6C.3.10.1 hiŋ, $ču_2$ and genxian form a separate sub-system in that, unlike other postpositive nouns, they may occur following pronouns.[85]

hiŋ may be regarded (with Haenisch) as a grammatical translation form, the equivalent (as in the Gloss) of the Mongolian noun-terminations of the accusative and locative (occasionally other) cases. It is possible however to circumscribe the use of hiŋ, together with $ču_2$ and genxian, in the Chinese version. (i) They follow nouns of human reference (pronouns, personal names, kinship terms and the interrogative word šuei "who?") and place names. (ii) The noun group in which they operate, whether or not preceded by the prepositive verb, regularly takes a preverbal position and has the value of a prepositive complex group.

They seem in many instances to be interchangeable, and will often not figure in the translation; where they do, the translation may be more or less specific, the more specific being the more differentiated – hiŋ collocates more readily with free verbs of motion ("to"), $ču_2$ and genxian with those of location ("at"). Sometimes $ču_2$, omitted in English, would require French "chez"; while genxian collocates with šuo "say (to)",[86] and with place names may be translated specifically as "in front of", "at the foot of".[87]

Modern Pekingese has no exact equivalents, but would often have postpositive nali ("there") for hiŋ and $ču_2$, sometimes di $di_2faŋ$ for the latter. Modern Cantonese has a (phonological) variant of $ču_2$ as postpositive noun, beside the regular form in other uses. With genxian may be compared Modern Pekingese (especially) ciantəu ($xianteu_2$) in this use.[88] (Examples of postpositive noun: 6D.3.10 are on the CD-ROM provided.)

6C.3.11 As a category the free adverb belongs to the lexically defined, "infinite" word classes; but the text of the "Secret History" is limited in extent and in fact contains 296 different members of this class. A few of these are listed in 7C.6–10. Unlike the other free word classes, the free adverb does not admit a distinction of function into substantive and attributive; its class function is attributive. Three types are distinguished according to the unit modified (clause or word) and, if a word, the class of word (verb or noun). Of the three types, only type (i) is free in the sense that the free verb and noun are free.[89]

6C.3.11.1 Type (i) are clausal adverbs. They take pre-verbal position, initial or non-initial, in the clause which they modify: in general, initial position is that of the given, non-initial that of the new. The majority have time reference, including specific ($miŋ_3ři$ "to-morrow") and non-specific ($naši_2$ "at that time"); the remainder, including interrogative adverbs,[90] are such as are often designated as adverbs of cause, manner and so forth (řuho "how, why?", yinx "therefore", je_2ban "in this way").

6C.3.11.2 Type (ii) are verbal adverbs. These take immediate pre-verbal position, which may therefore in a given syntagm be ambiguous: an adverb which cannot occur separated from the verb is considered verbal, but in the text many are left in doubt. Since the distinction is valid for Modern Pekingese, the difficulty may be avoided by a "squint" at the latter; if no reference were to be made to Modern Pekingese, there would be no alternative but to regard all those which never occur separated from the verb as unmarked, limiting type (i) to those found in marked clausal position. The verbal adverbs include negative adverbs and a number with time reference (including complex time-negation forms: see 6C.3.16) and place reference (yi_3z_2 "already", je_2li "here"); the remainder are of "number", "extent", "degree" and so forth (du "all", $xinz_2$ "-self", haušeŋ "very").

6C.3.11.3 Type (iii) are nominal adverbs. These immediately precede a noun and are rarely ambiguous in the text. One group of nominal adverbs occur between nouns and may be described as "linking" (biŋ "and"); the remainder may be designated "pointing" (singular reference) (je_2 "this", x_2 "second, next") and "grouping" (plural reference) (ju_3 "all").

These classes may be recognized in Modern Pekingese, with many of the same exponents though with perhaps more lexical variation than in the free verbs and nouns (though less than in the bound adverbs: see below). As an example, there are 13 compound clausal adverbs with ři ("day") as final syllable in the "Secret History": ten of these remain in Modern Pekingese but with tian replacing ři, the other three retain ř (ři) but are infrequent; tian does not occur in adverbs in the "Secret History". On the other hand such distinctive forms as the clausal adverbs guo_2řan and yiuanlai (Modern Pekingese guəřan š ni "so it **was** you! (as predicted)" and yiuanlai š ni "so it was **you**! (no prediction)") occur in the "Secret History" with exactly the same connotations as in Modern Pekingese.[91] (Examples of free adverbs: 6D.3.11 are on the CD-ROM provided.)

6C.3.12 The preverbal adverb, which not only itself is bound but also marks the clause in which it operates as a bound (conditional) clause, is so called because it takes pre-verbal position preceding or following N_1 in the clause: in general, a noun preceding preverbal adverb is given to the context of the following clause, one following preverbal adverb is not. This class has the possibility of (extended) colligation with the final adverb.

6C.3.13 The final adverb, likewise both bound and "binding", always has absolute final position in the clause.

Both the preverbal and the final adverb, and the combination of the two, are normally translated by a subordinating conjunction. The preverbal and final adverbs of regular occurrence in the "Secret History", with specimen translation, are as follows:

Preverbal adverb	Final adverb(s) with which collocation is regular	Translation
yin	(di-)šaŋteu$_2$	because, since
wuei	" "	(it was) because (. . . that)
řuo	ŋa, ši$_2$, ǰe	if ("if and when"), if anyone
suei$_3$	ŋa	although
gi$_2$	ŋa	when, after, since
ču$_4$	ši	earlier when
dan, danxeŋ, danfan	ŋa, ši$_2$, di	if (. . .) any, whenever, whoever, whatever
fan	ši$_2$, ču$_2$, di	every (time, -where that, one who, etc.)
ki$_3$	ši$_2$, gian$_2$ etc.	(as final adverb)
z$_2$	ši$_2$, heu	after
suo	di, ǰe	that which, those who
xai		just when

Final adverb (without pre-verbal adverb)

ši$_2$, ši$_2$gian$_2$, diši$_2$fun	when
gian$_2$, ǰuŋgian$_2$	while
heu, diheuteu$_2$	after
ŋa	if
šaŋteu$_2$	because
ču$_2$	where
ǰe	whoever, anyone who; that which

Some simple preverbal adverbs have alternative compound forms with ši as second syllable (řuoši, fanši, etc.); the translation is unchanged. Sometimes this ši could alternatively be regarded as a prepositive or auxiliary verb. Some others have yieu as second character, particularly in collocation with the final adverb ǰe (e.g. řuoyieu wuei$_4$ǰe "if anyone disobeys").

It is perhaps in the classes of preverbal and final adverb that there is the widest lexical divergence between the "Secret History" and Modern Pekingese. As examples: from those listed above, (i) for both yin and wuei (preverbal) Modern Pekingese has yinwuəi, which occurs only once in

the "Secret History"; (ii) dan with its compounds (preverbal) is absent from, and has no equivalent in, Modern Pekingese;[92] (iii) for $ši_2$, $ši_2gian_2$, etc. (final), Modern Pekingese has equivalent dišəu ($diši_2$ heu_2), which is not found in the "Secret History"; (iv) Modern Pekingese has no final adverb corresponding to ŋa (dihua, which can often be translated "if", is more restricted than either the ŋa of the "Secret History" or the Modern Pekingese **preverbal** adverbs regularly translated as "if");[93] (v) there is no final adverb in Modern Pekingese corresponding to $šaŋteu_2$;[94] (vi) ki_3 does not enter into the Modern Pekingese system.[95] (Examples of preverbal and final adverb: 6D.3.12–13 are on the CD-ROM provided.)

6C.3.14 The conjunctive adverb occupies pre-verbal position in the clause, always following the pre-verbal noun where one is present. Itself a bound form, it is not "binding': the clause in which it operates is free. It is distinct from the verbal adverb, with which it normally has identical position, in that (i) it regularly occurs in a clause following a conditional clause, where it marks the free form in the sentence structure of bound-free; (ii) it collocates in this relationship with certain preverbal and final adverbs; and (iii) it normally indicates a related or same context with the previous clause even where the latter is not bound.

In a clause following a conditional clause the conjunctive adverb is normally untranslated in English; and its translation frequently takes the form of the subordination of the previous clause even when this is free; in general the conjunctive adverb is specifically rendered in English only when the previous clause is not subordinated. Those of most frequent occurrence, with specimen translation, are:

bian, zieu, suei and $yiu_2ši$	"then"
$suoyi_2$	"so"
kiuo	"but"
yie and $yieu_3$	"even then, also"
$ši_2$	"at that time"
heu	"afterwards"

Of these, $yiu_2ši$ and $suoyi_2$ are also clausal adverbs, yie and yieu verbal adverbs and $ši_2$ and heu final adverbs.

This class constitutes a distinctive feature of Modern Pekingese, which has many of the same exponents. Of those above, suei is missing and bian restricted to writing; kiuo is normally replaced by danš (danši) or dau_2; ši and heu are entirely absent;[96] while one of the most characteristic conjunctive adverbs of Modern Pekingese, xai (written xai in the "Secret History", more frequently now xai_2), which operates in a special

The compound clausal adverbs moši, mobu, mobuši and mogam (occurrences 1, 4, 8, 1), together with mo as verbal adverb (1), may be translated identically as "must" (= 'it must be that'), or (as frequently) in interrogative clauses as "surely . . . cannot (= it cannot be that . . .)?";[106,107] compare Modern Pekingese nandau$_3$.

bu and mo occur identically in the clausal adverbs buřu, buřuo and mořuo which may be rendered "it would be better if"; Modern Pekingese buřu.

feu occurs once (XI. 17b; 252.17) as final interrogative particle, collocating with xeŋ in the clause, where Modern Pekingese would have məiyiəu (" (did . . .) or not?").

6C.3.17 (ii) Interrogative words. These include the two free nouns šuei "who?" and šimma "what?" (occurrences 24, 8), identical in Modern Pekingese, together with the numeral noun gi (9) which sometimes = "how many?" and "which?", and some clausal, verbal and nominal adverbs.

řuho "how?, why?" (64) and hogu "why?" (3) are clausal adverbs; Modern Pekingese has wuəišə(n)ma (wueišimma) and zə(n)ma (zemma), of which in the "Secret History" the latter never occurs, while the former occurs once, but, like wueišim, not before preverbal noun.

Verbal adverbs are zemšeŋ (9) and zemšeŋban (3) "how?, why?";[108] wueišim (6), wueišimma (1) and ho (1) "why?"; hoču$_2$ (2) "where?", and ki$_4$ (6) "how (could (it) possibly (be that))?". Modern Pekingese has zə(n)ma(yiaŋ) "how?, why?"; wuəisə(n)ma "why?"; nali "where?"; and ci (ki$_4$) with similar use but more restricted.

Nominal adverbs are šimma (13), šim (7) and ho (8) "what?, which?"; and duošau (3) "how many?". Modern Pekingese has šə(n)ma (šimma) and duəšau (duošau), together with the determinative noun na "which?" (*shang-shêng* (51) tone; na in the "Secret History" would never be read in this tone).

The "Secret History" thus presents a series of negative and interrogative words (including interrogative particles) in which the labial nasal (m) operates as either initial or final. The forms occurring may be summarized here:

Form	Word class	Negat./Interrogat.
šim	Adverb (nominal)	Interrogative
šimma	Noun (free); Adverb (nominal)	"
zem (šeŋ)	Adverb (verbal)	"
ma	Particle	"
madau$_3$	"	"

Form	Word class	Negat./Interrogat.
mo	Adverb (verbal)	Negative
mo (-ši, etc.)	Adverb (clausal)	Negative (freq. in interrog. clause)
$wuei_2$	Adverb (verbal)	Negative
wu	Pro-verb; Verb (pre-positive)	Negative

Of these, negative adverb mo (and in moši, etc.) has final -k in the Middle Chinese system, while $wuei_2$ and wu have initial m-.[109]

6C.3.18 (iii) Pronominal words. The pronoun system proper of the "Secret History" has been regarded as made up of the 12 personal pronouns in two parallel series of six, plus the irregular ru_3, bi and ji_3. A small number of other words of infrequent occurrence could be included in the pronoun system, on the grounds that they stand as exponent of value N but do not operate in the noun group: z_2 and z_2gi_4 (occurrences 6, 2) "self", and the forms x (1) "this" and je_2 and na "this", "that" (**pronominal** occurrences 2, 1 only). In Modern Pekingese jə (je_2) and na, and zji (z_3gi_4) especially in combination with a personal pronoun, regularly have value N.[110]

šuei "who?" and šimma "what?" might also be considered as pronouns. There is no system of negative or indefinite pronominal or attributive forms; but the use of interrogative words in repetition or in combination with negative or other verbal adverbs (du, yiə), characteristic of Modern Pekingese as a regular equivalent of English forms such as "anyone", "no one", "whoever", is almost unknown to the "Secret History". The latter has instead certain terms in the conditional clause system of bound adverbs, occasionally in combination with interrogative words but more often without any form that could be regarded as pronominal.[111]

Please refer to the CD-Rom provided for Section 6D.

Notes for section 6: C

1. Or with any supposedly "universal" category. The possibility of the comparative identification or even the universality of at least some categories is not to be excluded, but the criteria need to be fully defined. Cf. Robins (1952).
2. It may be more difficult to apply to Chinese than to a highly inflected language an analysis that is part logical, part grammatical. There is, for example, no category of "nominative case" to be linked with that of "subject" into a complex grammatical-logical category. A positional analysis could yield a category N_1 which could be termed "subject",

defined as "the first pre-verbal free noun (or noun group) not forming part of a complex group, or the first pre-verbal pronoun, in a clause"; but if the subject, in this sense, is to be more than a purely grammatical (positional) category, such that the statement "the subject of a clause takes position N_1 in the structure" is not a tautology, we require a (universally valid) propositional logic, not based on any one language, which would account for the fact that, for example, Modern Pekingese na š wuə siə di is often the contextual equivalent of English "I (*I*) wrote that".

3. As used by Hjelmslev. See e.g. Martinet (1942–45: 33).
4. As proposed by Allen (1953: especially pp. 99–100). The contextual identification of (terms in) grammatical systems may be one way of establishing relationships which, for Allen, is a function of systems (not of languages).
5. The question of the identification of terms in systems with different numbers of terms must depend on the level at which identification is made. If identification is made, as here, by contextual reference, such identification seems permissible, since the two terms can be identified by what is (contextually) excluded as well as by what is included. Until contextual identification is established, however, such identification is much more difficult; grammatical identification would seem to require the **exclusion** of a like number of terms. If, for example, the Modern Pekingese form (verb plus) guə is included as a fourth term in the aspect system, can we still identify the liau of the "Secret History" with the liau of Modern Pekingese?
6. For example English "you" is not identifiable with Modern Pekingese **either** ni **or** niмən.
7. Explanation of reference: 1 = speaker; 11 = speakers (more than one); 2 = addressee; 22 = addressees; 3 = other person; 33 = other persons. The combinations given are those occurring in the "Secret History", though these in fact include most of those possible. 2233, for instance = "more than one addressee plus more than one other person".
8. For the transcription of Modern Pekingese, see Appendix A.
9. Case distinctions in the English personal pronoun system are ignored. For contextual reference, "I/me" forms a single term. Since English is not the language under description, the complex pronouns recognized by some grammarians, such as "you and me", are also ignored.
10. za occurs once as 133, in (V. 35a; 163.3), zamui once as 11, in (V. 16b; 162.20). ŋam and wuomui cannot be distinguished by contextual reference. ŋam is more frequent (39 occurrences, wuomui 8); ŋammui occurs once only (XII. 31a; 275.25).
11. Including 123, 1233, etc.
12. ŋam occurs twice and wuomui once where reference includes 2 (22), in (I. 21b; 35.6), (III. 40a; 121.5) and (V. 8a; 149.29). za, zamui occur 42 and 18 times respectively; there is a tendency for more than one addressee or other

person (22 or 33) to be included in the reference of zamui (13 out of 18 occurrences), while za is frequently 12 only (25 out of 42 occurrences). za and zamui are also used in the narrative (with the author as speaker, the reader as addressee): (III. 16b (116b); 110.4), (VI.10b; 171.19), (XII.7a; 265.52) and (III. 33a; 119.9).

13. According to Lü Shu-hsiang, (1940b), nin (nim) is never singular in the "Secret History". nim does however occur in a few doubtful cases where there **seems** to be only one addressee: (V. 45a, b; 167.29, 32), (VII. 12b; 189.14), (VII. 40a, 41a; 195.5, 59) and (X. 45a; 246.16).
14. nin is excluded from the Modern Pekingese system as being rather narrowly restricted in use.
15. ni occurs sometimes for 22 = **two** addressees only, usually (but not always) followed by liaŋgo 'two' or ř$_2$řin 'two people', e.g. in (II. 36a; 93.18), (III. 23a; 113.5) (liaŋgo), (IX. 26b; 219.22), (XI. 34a; 255.18, 21) (ř$_2$řin); also in (IX. 7b; 212.2), (IX. 26b; 219.3), (ni fu$_3$z (mui) 'you (two) father and son'), and in (IV. 21a; 136.21), (VI. 38a; 179.29) with only contextual indication that two addressees are referred to. nimui, nim and nimmui are contextually identical (except for doubtful occurrences of nim, above), occurring 14, 53 and 5 times respectively. řu$_3$ occurs once (XI. 17b; 22.21) as 2, actually singling out one of three possible addressees.
16. All pronominal reference in this system in the "Secret History" is to persons. In Modern Pekingese pronominal reference to inanimate objects is infrequent.
17. ta is used sometimes for 33 = **two** persons only, e.g. in (VI. 37b; 179.19), (VI. 43a; 181.17) (ta liaŋgo), (VII. 4b; 187.13) (ta ř$_2$řin). bi occurs once (IV. 44b; 145.43) as 33 with contrasting reference to that of tamui in the same sentence. ji$_3$ occurs nine times, always postverbally, with reference (3 or 33) to a noun in the previous clause of the same sentence or in the previous sentence: (IV. 48b (198b); 146.21), (VII. 20a; 191.13), (XII. 25a; 272.8, 12, 13 (?), 15, 20, 21), (XII. 26b; 273.5).
18. Wang Ching-Ju, (1935) gives the following comparison of personal pronouns of the "Secret History" and Modern Pekingese:

Secret History	Modern Pekingese
wuo	wuə
za	zamən
ŋam	wuəmən
ni	ni
nim	nimən
ta	ta
tamui	tamən

regarding tamui as the only pronoun regularly found with -mui, thus ignoring wuomui, nimui and nimmui, and suggesting that the -mui in zamui and ŋammui was added later. But there are only 12 occurrences

of tamui, with 389 of ta; zamui, nimui occur 18 and 14 times respectively. (See tables in Appendix C.) Wang's reason for regarding tamui only as regular is no doubt that no mono-syllabic third person plural (33) form corresponding to ŋam, nim exists; 33 reference is rare altogether (in fact both ta and tamui are almost exclusively confined to the passages of dialogue, rarely occurring in the narrative). Lü Shu-hsiang (1940a and 1940b) agrees in regarding tamui as the primary pronominal use of –mui, extended by analogy to ni and wuo. Ōta (1953) gives the complete list of personal pronouns from the "Secret History" and contrasts the total of 12 with 37 found in the Yüan drama and only eight (wuo za ni ta, each with plural -mun) in Rōkittai (Lao-ch'i-ta (38)), a Chinese textbook published in Korea in 1423–34.

Of historical interest is the alternance in the "Secret History" system of syllabic and non-syllabic -m (–) in plural forms (ŋam, nim are both -m in Chung-yüan yin-yün (37), 1324), the syllabic forms alone remaining (as in Modern Pekingese) when -m disappears from the final nasal system, though nin, ŋan remain dialectally with -n, no longer plural. Possibly syllabic -m– is an archaism (cf. Demiéville (1951)) even though the origin of the non-syllabic -m may itself be syllabic (mui or some other syllable). Compare the alternance in interrogative words in the "Secret History": see 6C.3.16. Lü Shu-hsiang notes that ŋam is often exclusive; it is in fact (in spite of two definitely **inclusive** occurrences: see above, n. 6) **opposed to** za in the system; contrast Modern Pekingese where zaməŋ is inclusive, wuəməŋ neutral. On the origin of za, Lü suggests it is derived from $z_2$gia; for the relation between pronoun za and (imperative) particle za in the "Secret History" see 6C.2.6.2.

What appears synchronically as the plurality of forms in the personal pronoun system of the "Secret History" having the same contextual reference suggests diachronically a 'fluid' state of the system. It may possibly be helpful to recognize 'transitional systems' in historical studies, regarding a particular state of affairs as (relatively) unstable, a sort of intermediate stage in the replacement of one system by another.

19. Further reduction is possible if two or more exponents of a term in one system are identified with the exponent of an exactly coextensive term in the other: nim, nimui and nimmui will then be identified with nimə, giving a further reduction of three. If on the same basis za and zamui are identified with zaməŋ, even though wuəməŋ includes all references of zaməŋ, there is a further reduction of two terms. The final degree of relationship would then be high. If this is to be done, however, it would be preferable that two or more terms with identical reference in the same system should be identified as one; nim, nimui and nimmui in the "Secret History" would then be considered as one term, and we should have two seven-term systems reduced in the comparative statement to one of eight terms: degree of relationship 4/7. Otherwise (if nim, nimui and nimmui

exclusively with verbs of one or the other aspect. While Maspero considers aspects as undetermined and expressing shades of verbal meaning, Frei regards them as determined, though aspective particles may sometimes perform modal function.

(iii) Průšek (1950), who in this article is discussing the language of the colloquial novel *Lao Ts'an Yu Chi* (40) of 1907, considers aspects to be a special instance of the Chinese tendency of "élargissement des mots" by which the second element of a compound verb, forming a bridge between the general sense of the verb and its concrete application, expresses the outcome of an action and becomes aspective: this applies both to elements retaining a lexical meaning (my "postpositive verb") and to those becoming purely grammatical. Syntactically the function of aspect is to subordinate one clause to the next (cf. my "related context"); jə (jo) is especially common in this function, from which is derived its use with prepositions (cf. my "prepositve verb plus jo" 6C.3.4.1). Further, the aspective particle is much more frequent with simple than with compound verbs (cf. my liau, jo with monosyllabic verbs, below).

(iv) Wang Li (Wang Liao-i) (1946–7, 1947), drawing his examples from the eighteenth-century colloquial novel *Hung Lou Mêng* (41) ("The Dream of Red Chamber"), regards aspect as a category of the clause ("aspect in Chinese cannot be considered as directed to the verb or the narrative; it can only be considered as directed to the whole narrative predicate, since the aspective element does not necessarily follow directly after the narrative") (p. I. 297). From aspect, which is concerned with time reference other than simple past, present or future, should be distinguished the "causative form" (*shih-ch'êng-shih* (42) my "free verb plus postpositive verb") which, while historically the origin of aspect, indicates the result, extent or condition of an action (though also indicating ***perfective*** aspect, e.g. guə). Seven aspects may be distinguished, each with clearly defined time reference.

(v) Lü Shu-hsiang, (1947), and Kao Ming-k'ai (1948). Lü and Kao both recognize aspect, distinguishing various aspective categories; Wang's "causative form" is considered by Kao to be "resultative aspect".

35. But note that final jo occurs in the text as a variant of je in imperative clauses (always sentence-final).
36. See 6C.2.5.2. There is actually one such occurrence in the "Secret History", in (VII. 26a; 193.35); here in the "Secret History" only non-final liau would be expected, though both would be expected in a Modern Pekingese rendering.
37. Contrast nan, as free verb = "difficult, unpleasant", with the formal identity of the first syllable of $madau_3$ and interrogative particle ma. One could translate analytically $nandau_3$ = "unsayable" (cf. "unthinkable" in this use, and "unspeakable" with different use), $madau_3$ "what (do you) say?". For

ma = "what?", cf. 6C.3.17. Haenisch points out that in the Gloss madau$_3$ is regularly the equivalent of Mongolian kemen, kemeku marking the closing of direct speech, and is thus quite "un-Chinese". It seems, however, that the use of madau$_3$ in the Chinese version, which is much less frequent, should be clearly distinguished as operating within the Chinese interrogative system. Moreover in (II. 2a; 70.9) and (II. 3a; 71.4) madau$_3$ occurs in the Chinese version but not in the Gloss. References to Haenisch (1931) throughout this section are to Section VIIIB (pp. 72–97).

38. The two never occur in the same clause. Personal pronoun za (reference 12, etc.: see above, 6C.1.5.1) is rarely post-verbal. In (V. 35a; 163.3) which is translated as (unmarked, i.e. second person) imperative in English, za occurs in clause-final position apparently as pronoun with reference 133, value N$_2$; this might be regarded as an instance of imperative za; it seems in fact to be intermediate between the two regular forms, the reference being the reverse of that which is normal in either. There is one instance of za following first person wuo (IX. 22b; 218.8).
39. Plus a small number of formally ambiguous instances where ǰo is both final and directly post-verbal; these have been assigned on statistical grounds (of frequency) to imperfective aspect, though some (e.g. (XII. 25b; 272.32), where there is collocation with giau "tell, order") require imperative in translation.
40. Once where a first person imperative seems required and four times in exhortations which could be rendered in the second person. Exhortations (as here to heaven and to the emperor) may well, however, be considered as, and translated in, third person; and in the former instance (VIII. 23b (379b); 201.35) yieǰe follows wuo s$_3$ heu "let me, after I die", which could well be rendered as "let my spirit . . .". Haenisch points out the imperative use of ǰe in the "Secret History", regarding this, together with the "voluntative" yieǰe, as a Mongolism; he compares Mongolian verb-termination ǰa ("voluntative"). There is no exact correspondence between the use of ǰe and yieǰe in the Gloss and in the Chinese, yieǰe for example being rarer in the latter but occurring nevertheless in places (for example (I. 23b; 21.13) and (XII. 31a; 275.30)) where it is absent from the Gloss. The occurrence of ǰe in imperial orders where the Mongolian has (-tuqai keyen) ǰarliq bolba is indeed frequent (see Chapter 9 of the "Secret History", passim), but it is not confined to such instances. ǰo, za as imperative particles are not mentioned by Haenisch, who regards za as a personal pronoun derived by ablaut from z$_2$.
41. In fact this only occurs once, in a paragraph-final clause (XII. 26b; 274.21) where the preverbal adverb is yi$_2$,a form taken from literary Chinese and confined to Chapter 12.
42. The conjunctive adverb does not, however, mark the previous clause as bound, since (i) this would rest on a criterion of exterior, not interior, form, which marks functions, not classes, and (ii) clauses with a conjunctive

adverb are sometimes marked as sentence-initial (so that even on this criterion of exterior form a clause preceding another containing, for example, the conjunctive adverb bian would not always be regarded as having "subordinate function").

43. But commonly in Modern Pekingese. See H.F. Simon (1953: 340). (Cf. example 6D.2.8.1, no. 4 on the CD-ROM provided.)
44. As always where a form is defined as preceding another form with given value in the structure, the latter admits direct attribution, the attributive element thus intervening. Further, between the genitival clause and the noun there may intervene (i) another genitival clause, as in (II. 36a; 93.13) or (ii) a noun (N) itself followed by genitival particle (nominal) di, as in (II. 5a; 73.3).
45. E.g. (III. 44b; 123.16) wu řin yian$_2$di$_2$mian "an uninhabited place". Attribution does not figure in the description as a function of clauses, since these recognize a bound class and attribution would be definable simply as precedence within the sentence. Note however the single instance (IV. 44b; 145.52) where, if it were not unique, ǰe$_2$ might be regarded as a formal mark of attribution (not, however, of a bound clause, since, like the conjunctive adverbs, it is outside the clause to be considered "bound" by it); compare the frequent alternance in Modern Pekingese of (nominal) di with ǰə$_2$/na ("this", "that") (with or without the auxiliary noun) especially following a pronoun.
46. Three in the more literary Chapter 12. The four are: (IV. 29b; 140.28), (XII. 28a; 274.1), (XII. 50b-51a; 279.6,25).
47. For example (VI. 11a; 171.36) "Quyildar, who was injured", or "the injured Quyildar". This is unexpected from the point of view of Modern Pekingese (cf. Chao (1948: 57)). Genitival clauses of this type, like attributes in general, are normally new, but if given may be non-restrictive (Quylidar's injury is mentioned in 171.19).
48. Two instances only: (IX. 18a; 214.19) and (XI. 27b; 254.17). There are likewise only three instances of this type of clause in sentence-final position: one is (IX. 18a; 214.19), following ši; the others, not following ši, are (III. 32a; 118.12) and (XI. 34b; 255.58).
49. Related likewise in Old Chinese, which has passive (N)wueiNsuoV (cf. (N) šiNVdi), "genitival (ii)" (suo)Vǰe. The former occurs once in the "Secret History", but in Chapter 12 (XII. 6a; 265.10).
50. These may precede a noun, in which case they resemble type (i). They are considered conditional since the preverbal adverb may be one of a number, while the genitival clause can thus be restricted to di alone; but an alternative statement would recognize these as genitival, or even consider the category of genitival clause as a type of the conditional.
51. Such as faŋ$_2$yiaŋ$_4$di "shepherd". These could be considered as genitival clauses; that they should be considered rather as compound free nouns is suggested by their possibility of combination with nominal (plural) particle

mui. The assignment of some such elements must nevertheless, for lack of syntagmatic evidence, remain arbitrary.

52. A transitive verb may occur in active clause without a following noun. Such instances, actually relatively infrequent in the "Secret History", do not of course affect its place in the paradigm.
53. In Modern Pekingese this type admits a post-verbal "minor noun group" (Chao's "cognate or quantified object") but there are no instances of this in the "Secret History". There is, however, one instance (I. 47a; 66.5) of an intransitive verb followed by a noun followed by a minor noun group, where the intransitive verb da must be considered to have substantive function: da Temuǰin yisuei$_2$ "(she was) a year older than Temuǰin" (alternatively this could be analysed as da prepositive verb (only instance), yisuei$_2$ (as regularly) pro-verb).
54. The categories of "transitive" and "intransitive" are not coextensive with Chao's (1948: 48) for Modern Pekingese, since his "action verb intransitive" (e.g. lai "come"), which does not have attributive function in the "Secret History", is classified here as transitive. Such a verb combines with the following noun to form a clause (for example in (VI. 17b; 174.1), lai Činǧis ču$_2$ "came to Genghis").
55. Haenisch regards this, together with the use of yieu as postpositive verb, as a Mongolism: see 6C.3.5.5n. But the clause-final position of yieu is not confined to the "Secret History"; cf. Ōta, (1953: 11). See example 6D.3.2, no. 3 on the CD-ROM provided.
56. That is, with no intervening N. The auxiliary verb may be separated from the free verb by an adverb.
57. See especially examples 6D.3.3, nos. 1–3 on the CD-ROM provided. As in Modern Pekingese, lai and kiu as auxiliary verbs often require in English translation the infinitive form of the verb, sometimes a more specific form such as "so as to", "in order to".
58. ši as auxiliary verb does not normally figure in translation. It might perhaps best be regarded as a **marked positive** form, excluding the negative and contrasting with the unmarked positive, e.g. (V. 51.a-b; 169.24) kiaxai ti$_2$šim$_2$ ni šuo di hua ši ši$_5$ liau "I have just been able to check that what you said *was* true". See further example 6D.3.3, no. 4 on the CD-ROM provided.
59. It would be possible to regard a prepositive verb of this type as combining with **preceding** (pre-verbal) N to have adverbial value in the structure (or, where there is no pre-verbal N, as having this value alone): (N)v = A. The position would then be that of clausal adverb, as distinct from the true complex group which normally has the position of verbal adverb.
60. As an alternative form of statement, prepositive verbs of type (ii) could be regarded as free verbs with either the setting up of a separate clause or the recognition of a type of verbal clause containing two free verbs in substantive function. The objection to the former is that there is