Addenda et Corrigenda — post publication
(revised by the author 2018/1/20)

Andrew Shimunek
Languages of Ancient Southern Mongolia and North China
Tunguso-Sibirica Band 40
Harrassowitz Verlag, 2017

How to cite this document:
Shimunek, Andrew 2018. Post-publication Addenda et Corrigenda to *Languages of Ancient Southern Mongolia and North China*. Revised by the author January 20, 2018. <academia.edu/…>.

Page	**Original**	**Correction (C) / Addition (A)**
p. xi	8.4.3.	**C:** 8.4.**1.**3.
p. xix	Kiyose N. Gisaburō	**C:** Gisaburō N. Kiyose
p. xxv, *l.* 12		**A:** OMgl Old Mongol (ca. late 10th-12th c.)
p. xxix, *l.* 3	… Company.	**A:** … Company**, 2000.**
p. xxix		**A:** *DTB* *A Dictionary of Tocharian B* by Douglas Q. Adams. Retyped online at <https://www.win.tue.nl/~aeb/natlang/ie/tochB.html>. Accessed September 26, 2017.
p. xxix		**A:** *BH* Gregory Bar Hebraeus (*Griɣōriōs Bar ʕevrāyā?*). *Chronicon Syriacum* (*Maχtəvānūθ Zabanē?* ܡܚܬܒܢܘܬ ܙܒܢܐ), ed. by Bedjan. Paris, 1890.
p. xxix		**A:** *CAL* *The Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon*. Hebrew Union College Jewish Institute of Religion. <cal1.cn.huc.edu>.

Page	Original	Correction (C) / Addition (A)
p. xxix		**A:** *IB* *Irk Bitig* (*Ïrq Bitig*). <bitig.org> and <idp.bl.uk>. Accessed November, 2017.
p. xxix		**A:** *JDB* Omodaka et al. *Jidaibetsu Kokugo Daijiten: Jōdaihen* 時代別国語大辞典上代編. Tokyo: Sanseidō, 1967.
p. xliii	*ḥēth* and *gāmal*	**A:** *ḥēth* 𐰴 and *gāmal* 𐰓
p. 1, n. 2, *l.* 10	idioms	**C:** idiomes
p. 5, *l.* 11		**A:** [footnote] As philological data attesting Archaic Turkic initial *ð or *ð(y), note the Byzantine Greek transcriptions [**δόγια**], for ATrk *ðoʁ ‘funeral’, and [**διαρίχια**], for ATrk *ð(y)arɨq ‘body armor’ (cf. Moravcsik 1983 II: 118, 119; Doerfer 1973: 43; and *EDT* 895, 962).
p. 5, *l.* 12		**A:** [footnote] In 8th century runiform inscriptions, OTrk *yüz* is written 𐰋𐰺𐰇.
p. 5, *l.* 14		**A:** [footnote] In the runiform inscriptions of the 8th century, this is written 𐰃𐰍𐰃𐰉.
p. 5, *l.* 17		**A:** [footnote] In the 8th century Toñuquq Inscription, this is written as 𐰆𐰍𐰍𐰖𐰔.
p. 6, *l.* 4		**A:** [footnote] In 8th century runiform inscriptions, OTrk *boz* is written 𐰋𐰴𐰖.
p. 6, *l.* 5	MTrk *buzaʁu*	**A: OTrk *buzaʁu* (*IB*),** MTrk *buzaʁu*

Page	Original	Correction (C) / Addition (A)
p. 6, *l.* 12		**A:** [footnote] In 8th century runiform inscriptions, this Old Turkic form is written 𐰋𐰃𐰆.
p. 8, n. [23], *l.* 2		**A:** Gregory Bar Hebraeus, writing in Syriac ca. 1286, explicitly states in his *Maχtəvānūθ Zabanēʔ* ܡܚܬܒܢܘܬ ܙܒܢܝ (*Chronicon Syriacum*) that the Mongols acquired Uygur writing when Chinggis Khan (in Syriac, *čangez χāʔn*) commanded Uygur scribes to write Mongol speech in Uygur writing (*BH* 411). Although this is undoubtedly correct, the specific historical circumstances, and the specific people with Uygur scribes or Uygur-based writing from whom the Mongols acquired the Uygur script remain unclear and open to interpretation.

Page	Original	Correction (C) / Addition (A)
p. 19, n. 64		**A:** My reconstructions assume that most of the transcriptions in *Kyerim Yusa* were not made by the Sung envoy Sun Mu 孫穆 himself, but are instead in Koryŏ Sino-Korean, although several variant transcriptions indicate that certain transcriptions were probably indeed in Sung Early Old Mandarin. I also assume that Koryŏ Sino-Korean was relatively conservative and that it closely resembled Korean Peninsular Early Middle Chinese—the transcriptional language in which the speech of the previous northern kingdom of Koguryŏ was transcribed—although undoubtedly with certain phonological innovations which have yet to be determined. Certainly, the transcriptions cannot be read in *modern* Sino-Korean, and reading them in the dominant tradition-based reconstructions of Middle Chinese is also misguided. My reconstructions of Early Middle Korean here should not be seen as definitive, but rather as exploratory.
p. 21, n. 74, *l.* 1	LMC,	**C:** LMC

Page	Original	Correction (C) / Addition (A)
p. 23, *l.* 1	Syriac *nwm*	**C:** Syriac ‹nm-› (*nām-*) ~ ‹nwm-› (*nōm-*) **A:** [footnote]: Note attested Syriac ܢܡܘܣܐ ‹nmwsʔ› (*nāmōsā*) ‘law, custom’ (← Greek) and the derived forms ‹nwmyq› (*nōmīq*) ‘jurist, official’ (← Greek **νομικός**), ‹nwmyqy› (*nōmīqāy*) ‘pertaining to law’, and ‹nwmyqwtʔ› (*nōmīqūtā*) ‘experience in law’; these Syriac forms are from *CAL*, accessed August 20, 2017. Note also Bar Hebraeus’ glossed Syriac transcription of 13th century Middle Mongol [ᠨᠣᠮ] ‹nᵒ̈wm› ‘book (ᠬᠣᠪᠢᠲᠤ)’ (*BH* 412, *l.* 25), which is not a genuine Syriac form but a transcription rendering spoken MMgl *[nɔm] ‘book’ or, less likely, a western Middle Mongol dialect form *[nawm].
p. 35, *l.* 4	Tibeto-Burman → Serbi-Mongolic ← Japanese-Koguryoic, Late Old Chinese	**C:** Tibeto-Burman ↔ Serbi-Mongolic ↔ Japanese-Koguryoic, Late Old Chinese
p. 35, *l.* 19	Shirwi† Proper	**A:** Shirwi† Proper ← **OTrk**
p. 35, *l.* 21	Old Mongol† … Middle Kitan†	**A:** Old Mongol† ← **OTrk/MTrk** → Middle Kitan†
p. 45, n. 39, *l.* 10		**A:** The *-lag element closely resembles OTrk *-lVG* ‘having N’ and WMgl *-lig* ~ *-liγ* ‘id.’ The hydronym *ñawlag may thus mean ‘Having Lakes’.
p. 51, n. 71, *l.* 7	modern	**C:** [delete]

Page	Original	Correction (C) / Addition (A)
p. 51, n. 71, *l.* 8	… quarrel with others’;	**A:** … quarrel with others’**, first attested in the Preclassical Written Mongol *Twelve Deeds of the Buddha*, a 17th c. manuscript from an early 14th c. original, in the clause *ǰarim-ud anu sidün-iyen qabirqun* ‘some of them grind their teeth’ (*Bur.* 17b)**;
p. 51, n. 71, *l.* 11	, and since *qabir-* is only attested in *modern* Written Mongol,	**C:** [delete]
p. 53		**A:** Chen Sanping (2012: 8 et seq.) provides arguments supporting the claim that the early T’ang was a mixed Serbi-Chinese state.
p. 54, n. 83, *l.* 3	…dialects, that is, unless	**C:** …dialects. That is, unless…
p. 56, *l.* 6		**C:** [add blank line after line 6]
p. 65, *l.* 13		**A:** [footnote]: On Jurchen numerals of Shirwi origin, Shirwi *χɔn ‘ten’ (← OTrk dial.), and the language of the Shirwi Proper, see Shimunek (forthcoming, c).
p. 68, *l.* 2		**A:** See also Atwood (2004: 319a)
p. 69, n. 156, *l.* 2		**A:** See also Wittfogel & Fêng (1946: 592) and Atwood (2004: 389).
p. 76, *l.* 8	…to ca. 7th c. A.D.	**C:** …to ca. **6th** c. A.D.
p. 76, *l.* 9	ca. 7th…	**C:** ca. **6th**…
p. 80, *l.* 12	(Tak.LS)	**C:** (Tak.LS **341(40), *l.* 243**)

Page	Original	Correction (C) / Addition (A)
p. 87, *l.* 13		**A:** Note also Old Tibetan *stag* ‘tiger’ ← 虎 LOC *stâʁ(ă) ‘tiger’ (Beckwith 2008b) → PTung > JM *tasʁa* ~ *tasχa* ‘tiger’ (Shimunek 2012).
p. 123, n. 5		**A:** See Chen Sanping (2005: 164-165) for a similar categorization of methods employed in sinicizing Taghbach names. Although I do not agree with Chen’s conclusion that Taghbach was a Turkic language, or with the methodology he employs to reach this conclusion, I generally agree with his categorization of methods employed in sinicizing Taghbach names in the *Wei Shu*.

Page	Original	Correction (C) / Addition (A)
p. 132, *l.* 18		**A:** I-chan *shih* (乙旃氏) NWei ☆ɦirtśiaɾ *shih* is glossed Shu-sun *shih* (叔孫氏) 'Descendants of the Paternal Uncles clan' (*WS* 113: 3006). Boodberg proposed a connection with Turkic *äči ~ ičі* (1936: 178) and Chen Sanping (2012: 64) follows. The Old Turkic form is transcribed *äči* and glossed 'paternal uncle, elder brother' by Tekin (*GOrkT* 324). Although I basically agree with the lexical correspondence proposed by Boodberg and Chen, the Chinese transcription clearly indicates coda *r in the first syllable, and the final syllable ends in a word-final *-r, *-ñ, *-n, or *-ŋ. Although this would initially appear to be problematic, it is worth noting that in attested 8th-century runiform Old Turkic, there appear to be no instances of *[rč] clusters in monomorphemic roots, although Tekin attests a single instance of *rč* across a morpheme boundary, i.e. *yerči* 'guide' (*GOrkT* 401), composed of *yer* 'land' and *-či* 'occupational suffix'. It is thus likely that this Taghbach word was borrowed into an unattested Archaic Turkic dialect which retained *[rč] clusters in monomorphemic roots. These clusters then simplified to *č* in attested Old Turkic. The final segment in the Taghbach form is probably *-n 'plural suffix' (see p. 318). I thus propose the following etymology: Taghbach ☆ɦirče/☆ɦirča 'paternal uncle' → unattested ATrk *(h)irči > attested OTrk *äči* > *ičі*.

Page	Original	Correction (C) / Addition (A)
p. 135, n. 38, *l.* 1	[par]	**C:** [pʰar]
p. 156, n. 120		**A:** OTrk *qatun* is attested in runiform script as 𐰴𐰇𐰣.
p. 157, n. 126		**A:** Specifically, Old Turkic *biti-* ‘write’ is a back-formation from OTrk *bitig* (𐰘𐰃𐰍𐰆) ‘writing, document, script’ (first attested 8th c.), which in turn is a loanword from Syriac *pitqā* (ܦܬܩܐ) ‘document, certificate’ ← Greek *πιττάκιον* ‘writing tablet’; these Syriac and Greek forms are from *CAL*, accessed July 1, 2017.
p. 162, *l.* 15		**A:** [footnote]: See Chen Sanping (2012: 1, 193) on the discovery of the Serbi Cave Inscription, although I respectfully disagree with his claim that “the long-speculated existence of a Xianbei script must be largely abandoned after the discovery of the Xianbei cavern” (36). The fact that the Serbi Script has not yet been discovered does not mean it did not exist. On the contrary, as Ligeti (1970a) noted, the *Sui Shu* lists at least 12 lost texts on Middle Serbi or written in the Serbi Script (see §5.1, p. 112 above for details).
p. 162, *l.* 19	☆kʰaʁɣan	**C:** ☆kʰaʁɣaɾ̃
p. 163, *l.* 22		**C:** [remove space]

Page	Original	Correction (C) / Addition (A)
p. 169, *l.* 10		**A: [footnote]:** Jo-luo-kuei 若洛隗 (NEMC *ñiaglagkwəy) is reconstructible as *ñaglagay or, more likely *ñaʁlaʁay, and is probably based on the root *ñaglag, a Serbi name for the Jao-le River (see p. 58, Table 8 for attested late Serbi forms of this hydronym).
p. 178, n. 37		**A:** The Middle Mongol word is also the loansource of certain Volga Kipchak Turkic words for 'lynx', e.g. Tatar *seläüsen* and Bashkir *seläü* ~ *heläüśen* 'lynx', as well as Chaghatai and Cuman (Csáki 2006: 14, 172-173).
p. 183, n. 58, *l.* 6		**A:** Note also ca. 9th c. OTrk *toʁan* 𐱅𐰇𐰼𐰣 'falcon' (*IB*).
p. 184, *l.* 19	provides	**C:** provide
p. 187, n. 71, *l.* 5	Anther	**C:** Another
p. 201, n. 12		**A:** The word *erklig* 'powerful, authoritative, mighty' is first attested in 9th c. Old Turkic (*IB*).
p. 220, *l.* 6	… Booŋan, Mongghul …	**A:** … Booŋan, **Baonang, Shira Yoghor,** Mongghul …
p. 254, n. 240, *l.* 3		**C:** [delete space before "and"]
p. 294, *l.* 12	MMgl *nayima*	**C:** OMgl **nayima* > attested MMgl *naima*
p. 312	8.4.3.	**C:** 8.4.**1.**3.
p. 314, *l.* 23	two	**C:** three
p. 316, [n. 54], *l.* 8	OTrk *tut-*	**A:** OTrk *tut-* 𐰚𐰇𐰚

Page	Original	Correction (C) / Addition (A)
p. 317, [n. 55], *l.* 12		**A:** Note also Tibetan *khathun* (ཁ་ཐུན་), which Tóth analyzes as a loanword from Mongol (2008: 26).
p. 326, n. 123		**A:** … and 9th c. OTrk *aʁıl* ‘pen’ (*IB*)
p. 327, n. 132, *l.* 2	OJpn ☆waka- ‘young’ (the superscript star ☆ is my addition)	**C:** OJpn *waka- ‘young’
p. 327, n. 132, *l.* 4, 9	☆waka-	**C:** *waka-
p. 327, n. 132, *l.* 7, 8	☆wi	**C:** *wi
p. 327, n. 132		**A:** The Old Japanese form is attested as *waka- [倭柯] ~ [和可] ‘young’ (*JDB* 813c).
p. 328, [n. 135], *l.* 4-5	The ultimate relationship among the Middle Kitan, Middle Mongol, and Middle Turkic forms requires further study.	**C:** Given the transparent etymology in Turkic, and the prominent political role the Uygurs and other Middle Turkic-speaking peoples played at this time, this is probably a Middle Turkic loanword into Middle Kitan and Middle Mongol.
p. 339, n. 214, *l.* 8		**A:** In fact, even Late Middle Korean exhibited variation in rendering foreign [e ~ ɛ]. As noted by Lee & Ramsey, “Korean did not then have the sound [e]” (2011: 158).
p. 339, n. 216, *l.* 15-16	…attested in Middle Turkic, i.e. approximately contemporaneously with the Middle Kitan word: MTrk…	**C:** …attested in 9th c. OTrk as ‹mγa› () in the *Ïrq Bitig*, usually read as *amγa* (i.e. *amʁa*), although the reading *ımʁa* is more likely given MTrk…

Page	Original	Correction (C) / Addition (A)
p. 340, *n.* [216], *l.* 16		**A:** The Serbi-Mongolic form superficially resembles Aramaic ‹ʔmrʔ› ܐܡܪܐ [imrā] ‘lamb’ (*CAL*), but a connection, if any, remains to be demonstrated.
p. 341, n. 228, *l.* 5		**A:** There is a high likelihood that the Common Serbi-Mongolic form is a loanword from Hsiung-nu. Pulleyblank treats Old Chinese 穹廬 ‘yurt’ as a loanword from Hsiung-nu (1962b: 242). Following a Northern Late Old Chinese reading of these characters, I reconstruct the original Hsiung-nu form as *k^{h}ur̥ ‘yurt’, which closely resembles Pashto *kor* ‘house’.
p. 343, n. 238, *l.* 10		**A:** Tibetan *’jammo* འཇམ་མོ་ ‘út, útvonal’ is a loanword from Middle Mongol (Tóth 2008: 28).
p. 357, *l.* 14	…daughter’,[344] …	**C:** …daughter’, …
p. 358, n. 348		**A:** This Middle Mongol word, or a later reflex of it, is the loan source of Tibetan *no’ur* ནོ་འུར་ ‘tó’, a word of limited distribution, appearing in such toponyms as *Khukhe No’ur* ཁུ་ཁེ་ནོ་འུར་ (Tóth 2008: 32).

Page	Original	Correction (C) / Addition (A)
p. 359, *l.* 3		**A:** [footnote]: Ozawa proposes a connection between OJpn *ömö [意母] ‘mother (母)’ (reconstructed *əmə by some scholars) with MMgl *eme* ‘female’ (Ozawa 1968: 61-63). This correspondence is striking and deserves careful consideration; however, it should be noted that terms for ‘mother’ are often phonologically similar in many unrelated languages around the world.
p. 361, *l.* 9		**A:** [footnote]: This form bears similarity to Tokharian B *pär-* *[pɨr-] ‘bear (away), carry (off), take up, wear’ (*DTB*) < PIE *bher- ‘carry, bear’ (*AHD* 10).
p. 364, n. 412, *l.* 11		**A:** Tibetan *han* ཧཱན་ ’czászár’ is a late loan from Mongol (Tóth 2008: 27), probably from Early Modern Mongolian.
p. 373, n. 480, *l.* 2		**A:** Tibetan *tula* ཏུ་ལ་ ‘nyúl (Lepus)’ is a loanword from a later reflex of this Middle Mongol word (Tóth 2008: 20).
p. 376, n. 498, *l.* 7	first attested ca. 11th c.	**C:** first attested **ca. 9th c. in OTrk as ‘crop’ (*IB*) and later attested in MTrk ca. 11th c.** …
p. 376, n. 498, *l.* 9	unattested OTrk	**C: attested** OTrk
p. 391, *l.* 12	*kutu ‘boots, shoes’	**A:** *kutu [久都] ‘boots, shoes’ (*JDB* 262c)
p. 391, n. 40	… Martin (1987: 467) …	**A:** and *JDB* (262c)

Page	Original	Correction (C) / Addition (A)
p. 394, *l.* 9		**A:** [footnote]: The correspondence of MMgl *γutusun* 'boot' to OJpn *kutu [久都] 'boot' was first identified by Ozawa (1968: 89-91). I independently came to the same conclusion, and only learned about Ozawa's important study after the publication of the first edition of my book.
p. 395, *l.* 5	*adi-suki	**C:** *a^{n}ti *suki [阿泥素企]
p. 395, *l.* 5	*anti 'good plough'	**C:** *anti 'plough'
p. 395, n. 71	Starostin…	**C:** [delete] **A:** See Ozawa (1968: 312-313) for the correspondence of the OJpn and MMgl forms. Ozawa also gives the form [婀膩須岐] which I reconstruct the same as above, i.e. *a^{n}ti *suki. The *Jidaibetsu Kokugo Daijiten Jōdaihen* 時代別国語大辞典 上代編 does not attest the semantic value 'plough' or 'good plough'. According to Ozawa, it is attested in *Nihon Shoki* 日本書紀. The original *Nihon Shoki* needs to be carefully checked before accepting his proposal and my reinterpretation of it.
p. 395, *l.* 7	*adi-suki	**C:** *a^{n}ti *suki
p. 398, *l.* 2	Middle Turkic	**C: Old Turkic**
p. 398, *l.* 8	Middle Turkic	**C: Old Turkic**
p. 398, *l.* 11	MTrk *toz* 'dust' < unattested OTrk	**C:** MTrk *toz* 'dust' < **attested** OTrk ***toz* 'id.'**
p. 398, n. 81		**A:** OTrk *toz* 'dust' is first attested ca. 9th c. in *Irq Bitig* (*IB*).

Page	Original	Correction (C) / Addition (A)
p. 400, n. 91		**A:** Ozawa was the first to connect OJpn *saru [佐流] ‘monkey (猿)’ with Middle Mongol (1968: 96-99). Note attested late Old Japanese *saru [佐留] ‘monkey (猴)’ ~ [左留] ‘macaque (獼)’ (*JDB* 343c-d).
p. 401, n. 98		**A:** This Turkic word is ultimately a loanword from Iranic, cf. New Persian *būzīna* بوزینه ‘ape’ (*EDT* 295).
p. 402, *l.* 1, 4	OJpn *saru*	**C:** OJpn *saru
p. 404, *l.* 4	*kübü’ü-n*	**C:** *kübe’ün*
p. 404, *l.* 11	Old Japanese *ti	**A:** late Old Japanese *ti [知] ‘blood (血)’ (*JDB* 452a).
p. 406, *l.* 10		**A:** [footnote] Note also 8th c. Old Turkic 𐱅𐰇𐰼𐰰 *yägün* ‘younger brother’ (*GOrkT* 399), which is probably a loanword from an early Serbi-Mongolic dialect.
p. 406, n. 118		**A:** Note OJpn *kir- ‘cut’, attested as early as the 8th century in *Kojiki* 古事記 and *Man’yōshū* 万葉集 (*JDB* 249b).
p. 410, n. 131		**A:** The Old Japanese form is attested in transcription as *wi [偉] ~ [為] ‘pig, boar (猪)’ (*JDB* 824b-c).
p. 410, n. 131		**A:** Vovin (2004: 112, n. 8) also notes this Japanese-Kitan lexical correspondence.

Page	Original	Correction (C) / Addition (A)
p. 411, n. 411, *l.* 6		**A:** Note also the 13th c. Syriac transcriptions of Middle Mongol *χān* [خَيْ] ‹χᵃʔn› ~ *qān* [قَيْ] ‹qᵃʔn› (*BH* 411).
p. 412, *l.* 21	the Mongolian plateau	**C:** the Mongolian Plateau
p. 414, *l.* 13-14	the assumed (although not yet demonstrated) Tungusic homeland in northeastern China	**C:** the Tungusic linguistic homeland in the Amur region and northeastern China. **A: [add footnote]:** Pevnov has demonstrated the Tungusic linguistic homeland as the mountainous and forested areas of the Central Amur region, including the Bureinsky Range and extending south into the Lesser Khinggan (2012: 36). The existence of the Tungusic hydronym Selengge in the 8th century runiform Old Turkic inscription of Bilge Qaγan as 𐰴𐰍𐰇𐰃 *säläŋä* (*GOrkT* 367) or *seleŋe*, transcribing early Tungusic *sələŋgə ‘having iron’, suggests that Tungusic speakers lived in northern Mongolia along the Selengge River at least as early as the 8th century A.D. On the Tungusic etymology of this hydronym, see Rinchen (1969: 88); the phonological reconstruction above is my own.
p. 427		**C:** [move “east” one column to right]

Page	Original	Correction (C) / Addition (A)
p. 433, #187		**A: [footnote]:** MKit *tum ‘ten thousand’ and MMgl *tümen* ‘ten thousand’ are loanwords from Old Turkic or Middle Turkic. The Turkic word is a well-known borrowing from Tokharian, cf. TokhA *tmāṃ* [tman] ‘id.’ (*EDT* 507).
p. 437, #312		**A: [footnote]:** See footnote for #187 above.
p. 440, #379		**A: [footnote]:** MKit *qutuq and its cognate MMgl *qutuq* ‘good fortune’ are loanwords from Old Turkic ***qut-uʁ*** (i.e. 𐰴𐰺𐰍 *qut* ‘good fortune’ with the accusative suffix 𐰺𐰼 ***-uʁ***, a rounded allomorph of /-*VG*/) reanalyzed as a single morpheme. A likely route for this borrowing is OTrk ***qut-uʁ*** → MKit → OMgl > MMgl. Compare the Old Turkic rounded-vowel accusative case forms *tutuq-uʁ*, *bodun-uʁ*, *buluŋ-uʁ, buq-uʁ*, *čor-uʁ*, *oʁuz-uʁ* etc. (examples from *GOrkT* 127-128).
p. 443, *l.* 12		**A:** ‹nigu› 285
p. 447, *l.* 8	Mongol; and …	**A:** Mongol**; Syriac glossed transcriptions of Middle Mongol**; and …

Page	Original	Correction (C) / Addition (A)
p. 448		**A:** Syriac glossed transcriptions of Mongolic words T ܕܡܟܝܢ G ‘*G*, which has been called *T*...’ (*BH* 413). ܛܐܛܪ ܗܘ ܩܪܝܢ T G ‘The Tatars [i.e. Mongols] called *G T*.’ (*BH* 410). ܩܘܪܡ T G ‘*G*, which they call *T*…’ (*BH* 410).
p. 451, *l.* 3	MTrk...	**A: OTrk,** MTrk…
p. 455, n. 11		**A:** See also the Japanese correspondence in Table 111 below.
p. 458, Table 111		**A:** OJpn *a^{n}ti < PJpn *anti ‘plough’ : PSM *anǰa ‘plough’.
p. 461		**A:** Atwood, Christopher P. 2004. *Encyclopedia of Mongolia and the Mongol Empire*. New York: Facts On File.
p. 461		**A:** Bar Hebraeus, Gregory (*Griγōriōs Bar ʕevrāyā?*) 1890. *Chronicon Syriacum* (*Maχtəvānūθ Zabanē?* ܙܒܢܝ ܟܬܒܐ ܕܡܚܬܢܝܬܐ), edited by Bedjan. Paris (original text composed ca. 1286).
p. 464		**A:** Chen, Sanping 2012. *Multicultural China in the Early Middle Ages*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Page	Original	Correction (C) / Addition (A)
p. 466		**A:** Csáki, Éva 2006. *Middle Mongolian Loan Words in Volga Kipchak Languages.* Turcologica, Band 67. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
p. 467		**A:** Doerfer, Gerhard 1973. Zur Sprache der Hunnen. *Central Asiatic Journal* 17 (1): 1-50.
p. 469		**A:** Hebrew Union College. 2017. *The Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon*. Jewish Institute of Religion. <cal1.cn.huc.edu>. Accessed July 1, 2017.
p. 474		**A**: Liang Shen-yüeh 梁沈約 1974. *Sung Shu* 宋書. Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü.
p. 477		**A:** Moravcsik, Gyula 1983 [1958]. *Byzantinoturcica*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill. Originally published 1958.
p. 478, *l.* 12	Oyuunch = Oyuunch	**C:** Oyuunch = Wu Yingzhe
p. 478		**A:** Omodaka, Hisataka 澤瀉久孝 et al. *Jidaibetsu Kokugo Daijiten: Jōdaihen* 時代別国語大辞典上代編. Tokyo: Sanseidō, 1967.
p. 478		**A:** Ozawa, Shigeo 1968. *Kodai nihongo to chūsei mongorugo* 古代日本語と中世モンゴル語. Tokyo: Kazama Shobō.

Page	Original	Correction (C) / Addition (A)
p. 479		**A:** Pevnov, Alexander M. 2012. The problem of the localization of the Manchu-Tungusic homeland. In: Andrej L. Malchukov and Lindsay J. Whaley (ed.) *Recent Advances in Tungusic Linguistics*. Turcologica, Band 89. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag. pp. 17-40.
p. 484		**A:** Shimunek, Andrew 2012. Review of *Sprachtabus in tungusischen Sprachen und Dialekten* by Michael Knüppel. *Mongolian Studies: Journal of The Mongolia Society* 34: 128-131
p. 486		**A:** T'o-t'o [Toqto'a] 脫脫 1977. *Sung Shih* 宋史. Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü.
p. 488		**A:** Tóth, Erzsébet 2008. *Mongol-Tibeti Nyelvi Kölcsönhatások*. Doctoral dissertation. [Budapest]: Eötvös Loránd University.
p. 489		**A:** Vovin, Alexander 2004. Some thoughts on the origins of the Old Turkic 12-year animal cycle. *Central Asiatic Journal* 48 (1): 118-132. **A:** Watkins, Calvert 2000. *The American Heritage Dictionary of Indo-European Roots*. Second Edition. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
p. 492	Hsiung-nu …	**A:** 341
p. 494	Syriac …	**A:** 8, 157, 411, 447, 448

Page	Original	Correction (C) / Addition (A)
p. 496		**A:** Amur, 414
p. 497		**A:** Bar Hebraeus, xxix, 8, 448 **A:** Bureinsky Range, 414
p. 498		**A:** *Chronicon Syriacum* see *Maχtəvānūθ Zabanē?* (ܡܚܬܒܢܘܬ ܙܒܢܐ)
p. 504		**A:** [ɪ], 115, 129, 147, 163, 192, 200, 213, 216, 293, 352, 367, 376
p. 505	Khinggan Range	**A:** 414
p. 507		**A:** *Maχtəvānūθ Zabanē?* ܡܚܬܒܢܘܬ ܙܒܢܐ (*Chronicon Syriacum*), xxix, 8, 411, 448
p. 511	plough	**A:** 458