The Middle Mongol Zodiac in Georgian Transcription

Journal:	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*
Manuscript ID	BSOAS-2022-0069
Manuscript Type:	Article
Keywords:	Middle Mongol language, Mongol Empire and its successor states, Mongol invasion of Georgia, medieval Georgian transcriptions of foreign languages, historical-comparative linguistics, Žamtaaγmc'ereli, ასწლოვანი მატიანე Asc'lovani Mat'iane (Chronicle of One Hundred Years)

Abstract:	This paper presents linguistic and philological analyses of glossed medieval Georgian transcriptions of the Middle Mongol zodiac terms in the 14th-century anonymous ასწლოვანი მატიანე Asc'lovani Mat'iane (Chronicle of One Hundred Years), revealing unique details on Middle Mongol as attested in medieval Georgia. This is the first instalment of the authors' joint research on this vastly important, largely untapped contemporaneous Georgian source on medieval Mongol language, culture and history.

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

The Middle Mongol Zodiac in Georgian Transcription[1]

Author Name
Author Affiliation
Author E-mail Address

Author Name
Author Affiliation
Author E-mail Address

Abstract

This paper presents linguistic and philological analyses of glossed medieval Georgian transcriptions of the Middle Mongol zodiac terms in the 14th-century anonymous ასწლოვანი მატიანე *Asc'lovani Mat'iane* (*Chronicle of One Hundred Years*), revealing unique details on Middle Mongol as attested in medieval Georgia. This is the first instalment of the authors' joint research on this vastly important, largely untapped contemporaneous Georgian source on medieval Mongol language, culture and history.

Keywords

Middle Mongol language — Mongol Empire and its successor states — Mongol invasion of Georgia — medieval Georgian transcriptions of foreign languages — historical-comparative linguistics — Žamtaaγmc'ereli — *Chronicle of One Hundred Years*

For Peer Review

1 Introduction

As a result of the Mongol conquests, the kingdom of Georgia was under heavy Mongol influence from the 1230s until the reign of George V the Magnificent (r. 1314-1346) (*Nark'vevebi* 1979: 623-629), who liberated Georgia from Mongol rule and created a very strong state. The most important source on this period of Georgian history is the anonymous 14th-century ასწლოვანი მატიანე *Asc'lovani Mat'iane* (*Chronicle of One Hundred Years*),[2] which, as a legacy of the Mongol domination, attests numerous Old Georgian transcriptions of Middle Mongol in its extant manuscripts. Some of these transcriptions were studied in 1917 by Boris Jakovlevič Vladimircov (1884-1931), but these transcriptions, and Vladimircov's pioneering work on them, have been nearly completely forgotten by Mongolistic scholarship. A new, modern study of this important

[1] [**Names and acknowledgements to be added later**]. Any errors in our paper are solely our responsibility. For the transliteration of Georgian, we follow the Trubeckoj-Vogt system (H. Vogt, *Grammaire de la langue géorgienne*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1971, 6), adopted by the *Revue des études géorgiennes et caucasiennes*. See *RÉGC* 1 (1985), 3-4. The same system is applied to the surnames of Georgian scholars in bibliographic references, while in the main text they are transcribed according to the system codified in 2002 by the State Department of Geodesy and Cartography of Georgia. For the transliteration of Russian, we employ the scientific transliteration of Cyrillic. Kitan text is given in Andrew West's freeware Babelstone fonts.

[2] On the historical and philological issues of this work, see Ǯavaxišvili 1977: 246-266; *AM.Ž*, 10-34.

data needs to be undertaken on the extant manuscripts, as Vladimircov dealt with only a small fraction of the Mongol data contained therein.

It is with this goal that we began collaborating on a joint study examining the Georgian transcriptions of Middle Mongol contained in this important text, and on the historical and cultural value of this source.[3] In this paper, we present a small selection of our joint work—a preliminary analysis of the Georgian transcriptions of the Middle Mongol zodiac animal names from the point of view of Mongolian and Georgian philology and historical linguistics.

2 The Data

The glossed Georgian transcriptions of the 12 animals of the Middle Mongol zodiac occur in a complete list in the following passage:

Georgian original	Our English translation
და ეგრეთვე ესე თორმეტ წლად გააწევს, რომელსა უწოდენ სახელად ესრეთ: ყალღუნჯილ, უქურჯილ, ფარსინჯილ, თავლაინჯილ, ლუილჯილ, მოღილჯილ, მორინჯილ, ყონიჯილ, მეჩინჯილ, თაღანჯილ, ნოხინჯილ, ყაყაინჯილ. ესე არს სახელი ათორმეტთა ცხოველთა, რომელთა მისცეს მთავრობა თჳთოსა წლისა თჳთოსა პირუტყუსა,	So too do these twelve years finish. They call them in the following way: *q'alγunžil, ukuržil, parsinžil,* *tavlainžil, luilžil, moγilžil,* *morinžil, q'onižil, mečinžil, taγanžil,* *noxinžil* [and] *q'aq'ainžil*. These are the names of the twelve animals, to each of which the government of each year have been given.
რომლისა პირველად თავ ყვეს ყალღუნ, რომელ არს თაგუ, მერმე ზროხა, ავაზა,კურდღელი, ვეშაპი, გუელი, ცხენი, ცხოვარი, ყაპუზუნა, ქათამი, ძაღლი, ღორი.	As the first at the beginning of these, they established *q'alγun*, which is a mouse, then a bovine, a cheetah, a rabbit, a dragon, a snake, a horse, a sheep, a monkey, a chicken, a dog [and] a pig.
ესენი აქუნდეს წელიწადის სათუალავად, ვითა ჩუენ ქართველთა ქორონიკონი. *AM*.Ž 45	They have them to count the years, as we Georgians have the *koronik'on*.[4]

2.1 The Middle Mongol Names of the Zodiac Animals in Georgian Transcription

In this section we shall deal with phonological, phonetic and morphological issues of how the author of the 14th-century anonymous *Chronicle* rendered Middle Mongol words and expressions into Georgian, and how to reconstruct the original Mongol forms.

[3] Our joint study of the historical background of this fundamental Georgian source on the Mongols, its glossed Georgian transcriptions of Middle Mongol and their value for the study of Mongolian philology, linguistics and history is currently in progress (**Author names to be added later**). Moreover, **[Author Name]** is preparing a new edition of the text, with the translation into English, philological and historical commentary.

[4] Georgian ქორონიკონი *koronik'oni*, derived from the Greek word χρονικόν, is a cycle in the traditional Georgian calendar consisting of 532 years. See K'ek'elize 1945: 327-335; Grumel 1958: 151-153.

Cambridge University Press

2.1.1. Morphological Structure of the Animal Years

The Georgian transcriptions of the Middle Mongol animal years of the zodiac are attested in the following two morphosyntactic constructions:

	morphological structure	animal years
1.	{[ANIMAL] + [YEAR]}	mouse, ox, horse, sheep
2.	{[ANIMAL]-GENITIVE + [YEAR]}	cheetah, rabbit, dragon, snake, monkey, chicken, dog, pig

The {[ANIMAL] + [YEAR]} construction is attested throughout Middle Mongol records and in modern Mongolian. As we shall demonstrate below, the {[ANIMAL]-GENITIVE + [YEAR]} construction reflects non-native morphosyntactic order, undoubtedly influenced by Georgian syntax.

The Mongol word for 'year' is consistently phonetically transcribed in Georgian script in these zodiac constructions as ჯილ *ǯil* 'year'.[5] It is cognate to eastern MMgl 真勒 ~ 只勒 *ǰil* [ʧil] 'year (年)' (*SHM* §141, §153, etc.), which is a loan from Turkic.[6] Mongol *ǰ* represents voiceless unaspirated [ʧ] or voiced [ʤ] depending on the dialect. In Georgian, the grapheme ჯ indicates a voiced post-alveolar affricate phoneme /d͡ʒ/. The voicing of this initial consonant is interesting to note, since in most eastern varieties of Middle Mongol the corresponding consonant is voiceless unaspirated. In Persian and Arabic transcriptions of this segment, it is voiced, suggesting that western Middle Mongol was characterised by voiced *ʤ, e.g., western MMgl جيْل *ǰil* [ʤil] 'year' (*Leid.* 71a-03-6). The Georgian evidence further confirms that western Middle Mongol was characterised by voiced consonants.

2.1.2. Transcriptions of the Animal Names

The Middle Mongol animal zodiac as attested in Georgian transcription follows the traditional order still employed in Mongolia today, i.e., MOUSE, OX, TIGER or CHEETAH, HARE or RABBIT, DRAGON, SNAKE, HORSE, SHEEP, MONKEY, CHICKEN, DOG, and PIG (quoted here not in their Chinese, but Mongolian values).[7] We follow this order in presenting the transcriptions of zodiac animals below. Headwords below are cited below first in romanization (in bold) of the Georgian transcription, followed by the Georgian script original, an English translation and original Georgian form of its accompanying semantic gloss, and attested page(s) in *AM.Ž*, followed by our discussion and reconstructions.

THE MOUSE

[5] Vladimircov treats this as "ɥил" (BYV 1488, 1489, 1490, 1491, 1492).

[6] Cf. Middle Turkic *yïl* 'year' (Kara 2009: 134) and 14th c. Volga Bulgar Turkic جال *jāl* 'year' (Róna-Tas 1976).

[7] The Mongolian values of the zodiac animals are notably different than the Chinese ones. For example, in this calendrical context, Chinese 虎 'tiger' corresponds to eastern Middle Mongol 'tiger' but western Middle Mongol 'cheetah' or 'leopard', and Chinese 羊 'sheep, goat' and 鼠 'rat, mouse' correspond unambiguously to Mongol 'sheep' and 'mouse', respectively.

Cambridge University Press

For Peer Review

q'alγun ყალღუნ ‘mouse (თაგუ)’, attested in the word ყალღუნჯილ *q'alγunžil* ‘Year of the Mouse’ (*AM.Ž* 45).

Some manuscripts have ყურყუნ *q'urq'un* ‘mouse (თაგუ)’ in the words ყურყუნიჯელ *q'urq'unižel* and ყურყუნიჯლ *q'urq'unižl*. Given these variants and the transcriptions of Middle Mongol attested in other sources (*q.v. infra*), the original Georgian transcription was undoubtedly *ყულღუნ **q'ulγun* ‘mouse’[8] + ჯილ *žil* ‘year’, cognate to eastern MMgl 忽鼈中合納 ~ 忽魯中合納 *quluqana* [qʊlʊqana], glossed as ‘mouse, rat (鼠)’ (*SHM* §111 etc.; *HYYY* §1.06a7). In other sources on western Middle Mongol, the word appears as قُلقُنَا *qulquna* [qʊlqʊna] ‘mouse’ (*Leid.* §66b-09-5) and in the *Muqaddimat al-Adab* as قولغونه *qulγuna* ‘mouse’ (*MAA*: Poppe 1938: 309). The Middle Mongol word is also attested as a loanword in New Persian in the form قولقنه *qūlquna* “Maus” and as a loanword in certain Ewenki and Turkic dialects (*TMEN* I: 440 §308).

Unlike the ambiguous Chinese gloss ‘mouse, rat (鼠)’ in the Chinese sources on Middle Mongol, the unambiguous translation of Mongol *qulquna* into Georgian as თაგუ *tagu*, which only means ‘mouse’ and not ‘rat’, makes it very clear that this Middle Mongol word—like its modern Khalkha Mongolian reflex **хулгана** [ˈχuɮʁəŋ ~ ˈhuɮʁəŋ]—denotes a ‘mouse’ and not a ‘rat’. Thus, in the Mongolian zodiac, in both medieval and modern times, this is the ‘Year of the Mouse’.

THE OX

ukur უქურ ‘bovine (ზროხა)’, attested in the word უქურჯილ *ukuržil* ‘Year of the Bovine’ (*AM.Ž* 45),[9] parsable as უქურ *ukur* ‘bovine (ზროხა)’ + ჯილ *žil* ‘year (წელი)’.[10]

This word is cognate to eastern MMgl 忽客舌児 *hüker* [hukʰər] ~ 忽格児 *hüger* [hugər] ‘ox (牛)’ (*SHM* §121 etc.; *HYYY* §1.05b1).[11] In the *Muqaddimat al-Adab*, a western Middle Mongol form اوكر *üker* is given (*MAA* 377). Other attested western varieties of Middle Mongol exhibit a phonological form similar to the eastern dialects, e.g., هُوكُرْ *hüker* [hukər] ‘cow (گاو)’ (*Leid.* §66b-03-1). The Georgian transcription is remarkable in its deletion of the initial laryngeal fricative /h/ in this word. As Georgian always maintains initial /h/ in native and loaned words, this transcription may indicate a dialectal Mongol form. Examination of the other Mongol words in *AM.Ž* will help to determine whether this western Mongol dialect lost /h/. Another possibility is that the author was influenced by Literary Mongol orthography, as he was clearly both fluent and literate in Mongol (q.v. *AM.Ž* 44-45). In spoken Middle Mongol, this word has an initial /h/, but in Literary Mongol it is written *üker* as Literary Mongol is a borrowed script which offers no grapheme for the Mongol phoneme /h/.[12]

The Middle Mongol word is also attested as a loanword in New Persian هوكر *hūkär* ~ هوكار *hūkār* ~ هوكير *hūker* “Rind, Stier” (*TMEN* II: 538 §397) and as a loanword in Turkic and other languages (*TMEN* II: 539-540).

This word is widely attested in Mongolic daughter languages. In modern Literary Oirat, there are two reflexes of this word, *üker* and, with progressive rounding assimilation, *ükür* ‘ox’ (*IDWO* 483). Note also Daur *xukur*, Shira Yoghor *hogor*, Mongghul *fuguor* and Hungarian *ökör* ‘id.’ (Kara

[8] Vladimircov is essentially correct in reconstructing the word as “*кулӈун” (1917: 1488).
[9] The name of the year in some manuscripts is corrupted to უქრჯალ *ukržal* and უქრიჯალ *ukrižal*.
[10] Vladimircov transcribes the word as “уḱур” (1917: 1488).
[11] In philological transcriptions of Middle Mongol, *ö* denotes IPA /o ~ ɵ/, *ü* denotes IPA /u/, *o* is IPA /ɔ/, and *u* is IPA /ʊ/ (*LASM* xliv).
[12] On the Literary Mongol script and its divergence from spoken Middle Mongol, see Kara (2005).

Cambridge University Press
For Peer Review

2009: 315), the latter of which is widely believed to be a loanword from an early variety of western Old Turkic, perhaps ultimately from Indo-European.[13]

THE TIGER/CHEETAH

pars ფარს 'cheetah, Acinonyx jubatus (ავაზა)', attested in the word ფარსინჯილ *parsinǯil* 'Year of the Cheetah' (*AM.*Ž 45).

The Georgian rendering of this Mongol phrase[14] is a non-native attempt to transcribe a phonologically progressive spoken western Middle Mongol dialectal **pars-in ǰil* (cheetah-GEN year), which is a logically possible, but unattested phrase.[15] Judging from the animal years attested in other Middle Mongol sources, this form is also stylistically non-native. In other Middle Mongol texts and in modern Mongolian, as mentioned above, the animal years are expressed as [ANIMAL NAME] + *ǰil* 'year'. As for this concrete case, in the *Secret History of the Mongols*, the Year of the Tiger is attested in the form 巴𠯿児思 只勒 *bars ǰil* (*SHM* §202) and in modern Khalkha Mongolian as **бар жил** 'Year of the Tiger', both literally 'tiger year'. The non-native Mongol grammar of the Georgian rendering ფარსინჯილ *parsinǯil* indicates that the author of the *Chronicle* was a fluent, albeit non-native, speaker of Mongolian, and that most of the Mongolian words and expressions in this book were personally written down by him from memory. This particular error indicates that the author of the *Chronicle* had good grammatical knowledge of Mongolian (i.e., morphosyntactically correct grammar), but he seems to have been influenced by his native language here, which would use the genitive.[16]

The transcription of ფ *p* /pʰ/ instead of the expected *b* (which would be easily represented in Georgian with the letter ბ *b*) is worth discussion. Comparison with Ottoman Turkish *pars* 'leopard, panther',[17] which is historically related to, although semantically and phonologically distinct from, the eastern Middle Mongol word *bars* 'tiger', suggests that the Georgian transcription of the western Middle Mongol dialect word *pars* 'cheetah' is phonetically influenced by western Turkic *pars* or New Persian پارس *pārs* 'leopard, panther'. Western Middle Mongol ფარს *pars* 'cheetah (ავაზა)' can thus be seen as a then-recent Turkism (or less likely, a Persianism) in the Georgian transcriptions of Middle Mongol.[18]

It is well known that the Mongol Empire and its successor states were characterised by widespread bilingualism in Mongol and Turkic. In the western regions of the empire, Turkic was

[13] On the Turkic etymology of Hungarian *ökör*, see Róna-Tas & Berta (2011). Róna-Tas (1974) compares the Turkic and Mongol words to Tokharian B *okso* 'ox', from Proto-Indo-European.

[14] This is a Mongol phrase transcribed in Georgian as if it were a single word, i.e., as a single orthographic sequence in Georgian.

[15] Vladimircov proposes the same morphological analysis but makes no comment on the non-nativeness of the expression (1917: 1488-1489). Vladimircov does not recognise this as a Turkism.

[16] Compare modern Georgian ვეფხვის წელი *vepxvis c'eli* 'Year of the Tiger', derived from *vepxv* 'tiger' (root form) + *-is* 'genitive case suffix' + *c'eli* 'year'.

[17] Cited here from Clauson, who considers Ottoman Turkish *pars* 'leopard' to be a "recent borrowing" from Persian (1972: 368). The earliest Turkic variant is *bars*, occurring in personal names in the Old Turkic inscriptions of Mongolia, where it undoubtedly is the zoonym 'tiger', and *bars* with the meaning 'tiger' occurs in other early Turkic texts (q.v. *DTS* 84). Clauson (1972: 368) considers Mongol *bars* 'tiger' to be a borrowing from early Turkic *bars* 'tiger', itself a borrowing from an early Iranic language. Alternatively, Wilkens treats Old Uygur *bars* 'tiger' as a borrowing from Tokharian A *pärs* "bunt" (2021: 144b), although this seems unlikely for both phonetic and semantic reasons, as Tokharian *ä* denotes /ɨ/ and 'tiger' is semantically quite far from 'colourful'.

[18] Other Turkisms exist in this text, as we shall demonstrate in a separate paper (**Authors' names removed for peer review**).

Cambridge University Press

For Peer Review

even more actively used. This can be observed in the numerous Turkisms among the Mongol lexical data in the *Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh* of Rashīd al-Dīn Faḍllullāh, and in languages resulting from intense Mongol-Turkic language contact, such as Chaghatai Turkic and the Kipchak (Qïpčaq) languages.[19] Such Turkisms are also commonly found in the medieval Latin accounts of William of Rubruck, John of Plano Carpini and Marco Polo.[20]

The semantic value is also significant: In most Middle Mongol sources, the word *bars* is glossed as 'tiger', but the Georgian transcription is glossed in Georgian as ავაზა *avaza* 'cheetah'. Although the cheetah is now restricted to a small and dwindling population in Africa, in earlier times it had a vastly wider geographic distribution, including Georgia.[21]

The clear geographic distribution of the 'cheetah' ~ 'leopard' vs. 'tiger' glosses suggests a semantic isogloss: In the eastern Middle Mongol dialects, *bars* denoted 'tiger', whereas in the western dialects, *bars* ~ *pars* indicated 'cheetah' or 'leopard' as summarised in Table 1 below:

Table 1. Isogloss of 'cheetah' ~ 'leopard' and 'tiger' in Middle Mongol dialects

Western Middle Mongol 'cheetah' ~ 'leopard'	**Eastern Middle Mongol 'tiger'**
pars ფარს 'cheetah (ავაზა)' (*AM*.Ž)	*bars* 巴児思 'tiger (虎)' (*SHM* §78)[22]
bars بَرْس 'cheetah (يُوْز)' (*Leid*. 66b-07-3)[23]	
bars پارس 'leopard' (*IM*)	

Doerfer identifies New Persian پارس *bārs* "Gepard, Cynailurus jubatus L." as a borrowing from Turkic *bars* "Panther, Felis panthera, später auch 'Gepard' " (*TMEN* II: 235). Note also Russian **барс** (*bars*) 'leopard', borrowed from a Turkic language.[24]

THE HARE/RABBIT

tavlai თავლაი 'rabbit (კურდღელი)', attested in the word თავლაინჯილ *tavlainǯil* 'Year of the Rabbit' (*AM*.Ž 45).

[19] For a bibliographic listing of Middle Mongol loanwords in Turkic languages, see Csáki (2006).

[20] See Sinor (1970), Clark (1973) and Pelliot (1959) for Turkic elements in the accounts of Carpini, Rubruck and Marco Polo. For notes on the rich admixture of Turkic and Mongol elements in the New Persian text of the *Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh*, see Thackston (2012, *passim*). The lexicon of Chaghatai Turkic is another product of the convergence of Mongol, Turkic and New Persian in the successor states of the Mongol Empire; see Clauson (1972 *passim*) and *MAA*.

[21] Due to its docile character and speed, it was the favourite hunting animal at the royal court and that of the great feudal lords in medieval Georgia (Gegechkori 2010: 70-75). The Old Georgian translation of the anonymous *Physiologus* (CPG 3766), attributed to Epiphanius of Cyprus (ca. 310-403), handed down from a manuscript from the end of the 10th century, contains a detailed description of the cheetah (*Šat'berdis k'rebuli* 1979: 183-184).

[22] On the medieval Turkic origin of this Middle Mongol word, see Kara (2001: 83) and *TMEN* II: 236-237.

[23] The *kasrah*, i.e. short *i*, in the Leiden Manuscript transcription بَرْس *barsi* is probably superfluous, perhaps as a result of a non-native scribe analysing the genitive form برسين *barsin* (*Leid.* 74b-13-2-1) as ✗*barsi* + ✗*-n* when compiling the text. The correct analysis should be *bars* 'tiger' + *-un* 'genitive suffix' or **-in* 'spoken genitive suffix'.

[24] The variation in New Persian between the forms پارس *pārs* and پارس *bārs* 'leopard, panther' at first seems of relevance here, but the fact that Middle Mongol does not have the phoneme /*p*/ except in contemporaneous loanwords indicates that the Middle Mongol dialect form *pars* 'cheetah' transcribed in Georgian is a contemporaneous borrowing from Turkish. Note that Common Serbi-Mongolic and Proto-Mongolic */p/ (i.e., *[pʰ]) regularly lenited to Middle Mongol *h* (q.v. *LASM* 290, 361-363).

Cambridge University Press
For Peer Review

The name of this year in some manuscripts is altered to თავლაინჯალ *tavlainǯal*, თვლა ინჯლ *tvla inǯl*, or თვალინჯალ *tvalinǯal*,[25] but the corruption of the Mongol word *taulai* could be considered as a kind of *lectio facilior*: it seems that the copyists did not understand the word თავლაი *tavlai* and replaced it in the second case with the Georgian verbal noun[26] თვლა *tvla* "to count" and in the third with the Georgian noun თვალი *tvali* "eye". Moreover, in the expression თავლაინჯალ *tavlainǯil* we can observe the same type of error as in the case of ფარს *pars* (see above), in which the first noun of the compound word is declined in genitive case. The sequence *av* (ავ) in the Georgian transcription renders Middle Mongol *au*. Thus, the transcription indicates Middle Mongol *taulai* in Georgian phonetic transcription as თავლაი *tavlai* 'rabbit (კურდღელი)'.

This word is cognate to eastern MMgl 討來 *taulai* [tʰaʊ̯laɪ̯] ~ 塔兀來 *ta'ulai* [tʰaʔʊlaɪ̯] 'rabbit, hare (兔, 兔児)' (*SHM* §257, §272, §239; *HYYY* §1.06a2). Note also western MMgl تاولاي *taulai* [taʊ̯laɪ̯] ~ تُولَایْ *tūlai* [tuːlaɪ̯] (Ligeti 1962: 68, 70) and in Armenian transcription as թուլայ *t'ulay* (phonetically [tʰulay]) 'id.' (Ligeti 1965: 283.28).

Middle Mongol *taulai* was borrowed in New Persian, attested as *taulai* "Hase", and as a loanword in Tibetan, Russian dialects, and in certain Tungusic languages.[27]

The ვ *v* in the Georgian transcription deserves discussion. In late Middle Mongol, including other western sources contemporaneous to the Georgian transcriptions, the first syllable in the Mongol word was a diphthong [aʊ̯] or vowel + glide sequence [aw].[28] Accordingly, the Georgian transcription of Mongol *au* as ავ *av* assumes an intermediate step *აჳ *aw*. The now-obsolete Georgian letter ჳ was created to render Greek ὖ ψιλόν. Although Greek υ denotes the front rounded vowel [ü], Georgian ჳ renders its Georgian phonetic approximation [wi] (Gamkrelidze 1990: 146). As for Greek diphthongs such as αυ or ευ, the letter υ signifies a [w] glide. An analogous use of ჳ is observed in Old Georgian texts as early as the 5th to 7th centuries, where [w] is sometimes transcribed in Georgian with ჳ *w* and sometimes with ვ *v* (Sarǯvelaʒe 1984: 292; Gamkrelidze 1990: 147). Thus, by replacing the letter ჳ *w* with ვ *v*, on the one hand, the copyist attested the existence of the diphthong in the Mongolian archetype, and on the other hand, he did justice to Georgian phonology by recording the letter corresponding to the phoneme that was actually pronounced in Georgian.

The earliest attested Serbi-Mongolic cognate of this word is Middle Kitan *tawlya 'rabbit, hare'.[29] Old Turkic *tabïšγan* 'rabbit, hare' is widely believed to be related, although by convergence (*LASM* 5-6).

THE DRAGON

lu ლუ 'dragon (ვეშაპი)', attested in the phrase ლუილჯილ *luilǯil* 'Year of the Dragon' (*AM*.Ž 45).

[25] Vladimircov gives the variant "ґавлін цілґ" (1917: 1489), which we have been unable to confirm in the manuscripts available to us at the time of writing.

[26] I.e., *sac'q'isi* in Georgian grammatical terminology, corresponding to *maṣdar* in the Arabic grammatical tradition.

[27] *TMEN* I: 276-277 §144.

[28] In earlier, 13th-century eastern Middle Mongol, there are two forms: one with a diphthong [aʊ̯], *taulai*, and another with a VCV sequence [aʔʊ], conventionally written *ta'ulai* in Mongolistic philological tradition. The latter is probably the primary form, historically going back to Common Serbi-Mongolic *tʰaɣʊlya 'hare, rabbit' (corr. *LASM* 373). In later Middle Mongol and modern Mongol, this sequence is realized as a monophthong [uː].

[29] KAS 乏夭为 ‹tau.li.a›, KLS 五나 ‹tau.lia› ~ 吾 ‹taulia› (KLS orthographic forms from Liu Fengzhu 1998 and Kane 2009; phonetic readings from *LASM* 373).

Cambridge University Press

For Peer Review

The word has no variants in the manuscripts. This is clearly a copyist's error for *ლუინჯილ **luinžil*,[30] undoubtedly another non-native attempt to write the year name as [ANIMAL NAME] + *-*(y)in* 'spoken genitive case suffix' + *ǰil* 'year', i.e., ლუ *lu* 'dragon' + *-ინ *-(y)in* 'spoken genitive case suffix' + ჯილ *ǯil* 'year' (see entry for ***pars*** above for discussion of a similar error). This year name is attested in other Middle Mongol sources as 祿丁真 *lu ǰil* 'dragon year (龍年)' (e.g., *HYYY* 3.04b3) and in spoken modern Khalkha as **луу жил** [ɬɔː ʧiɮ] 'id.', i.e., 'dragon' + 'year'.

Western Middle Mongol ლუ *lu* 'dragon' is cognate to eastern MMgl 祿 *lu* [lʊ] 'dragon (龍)' (*HYYY* §1.05a3) and western MMgl لو *lu* 'dragon' (Golden 2000: 199c.12). It is ultimately a loanword into Old Turkic *lu ~ ulu ~ lü ~ lüi* 'dragon' and Mongolic from a Middle Chinese dialect form of 龍 'dragon' (Kara 2009: 170). The word is attested in Serbi-Mongolic as early as Middle Kitan *lu 'dragon'[31] (*LASM* 86, 433).

THE SNAKE

moγi მოღი 'snake (გუელი)', attested in the word მოღილჯილ *moγilǯil* 'Year of the Snake (*AM*.Ž 45).[32] In some manuscripts, the phrase is given as მოღიჯილ *moγiǯil*, which has been interpreted by the editors of the *Chronicle*[33] as a corruption, but from the Mongolistic point of view, this is clearly the correct form, as the usual form of this year name in other Middle Mongol sources is 抹中孩丁真 *moqai ǰil* 'Year of the Snake (蛇児年)' (literally: 'snake year', e.g., *HYYY* 3.14a5). As Georgian phonotactics do not usually allow diphthongs, Middle Mongol *ai* is reduced to Georgian ი *i* in this Georgian transcription.

Alternatively, based on the pattern above, we may hypothesise that the *Chronicle* recorded the expression with the structure {[ANIMAL]-GENITIVE + [YEAR]}. In this case, as with *ლუინჯილ **luinžil* 'year of the dragon' above, the expression *მოღინჯილ **moγinžil* (rendering spoken MMgl dial. **moγ(a)i-n ǯil* 'snake-GEN year') would have been altered by the copyists to მოღილჯილ *moγilǯil*.

This Middle Mongol *moγ(a)i* 'snake' is cognate to eastern MMgl 抹孩 *moqai* [mɔqaɨ̯] 'snake (蛇)' (*HYYY* §1.06b4, §3.14a5), western late Middle Mongol موغاي *moʁay* 'snake', and to Middle Kitan *mɔʁɔ 'snake',[34] all ultimately from Common Serbi-Mongolic *mɔga ~ *mɔgɔ 'snake' (*LASM* 353 and n. 307).

The Mongol word was borrowed into New Persian as موغای *mōγāi* ~ موغا *mōγā* "Schlange" and was also borrowed into certain Turkic languages and Russian dialects.[35]

THE HORSE

[30] Vladimircov proposes a similar analysis (1917: 1490) but does not make note of the non-native morphosyntax of this reconstructed form.

[31] KAS 攴 ‹lu›, KLS 妄 ‹lu› (KLS orthographic forms from Liu Fengzhu 1998 and Kane 2009; phonetic readings from *LASM* 86, 433).

[32] Vladimircov recognises the "л" in "могіл" (i.e., *moγil* მოღილ) as an error for "н" (1917: 1490). This indicates that he assumes that the transcription should be emended to *მოღინჯილ **moγinžil*, implying *moγi* 'snake' + *-n* 'genitive' or 'attributive' + *ǯil* 'year'. This analysis is undoubtedly correct in terms of reconstructing the *Chronicle*'s archetype, but this is non-native style (see discussion in the entry for ფარს *pars* 'leopard' above).

[33] Both Simon Q'auxčišvili (1959: 159) and Revaz K'ik'naʒe (*AM*.Ž 45) considered *moγilǯil* as a genuine variant and *moγiǯil* as a corruption.

[34] KAS 仕圵及 ‹m.oγ.o›, KLS 皁 ‹moγo› (KLS orthographic forms from Liu Fengzhu 1998 and Kane 2009; phonetic readings from *LASM* 353, 357n.343, 421).

[35] Doerfer (*TMEN* I: 508-509 §375).

Cambridge University Press

For Peer Review

morin მორინ ‘horse (ცხენი)’, attested in the word მორინჯილ *morinžil* ‘Year of the Horse’ (*AM*.Ž 45).[36]

This word is cognate to eastern MMgl 秣舌驎 *morin* [mɔrin] ‘horse (馬)’ (e.g., *SHM* §31) and western MMgl مُوري *mori* (*Leid.* 66a-13-1) ~ مُوريْن *morin* ‘horse’ (*Leid.* 75a-10-3-1, 75a-12-1-1), also attested in Armenian phonetic transcription as մօրի *mori* ‘horse’ (Ligeti 1965: 281.21). The Mongol forms are cognate to Middle Kitan *mir ‘horse’,[37] from Common Serbi-Mongolic *mɔrɪ ‘horse’ (*LASM* 352-353), itself a culture word with comparanda in Old Chinese, Koreanic, Tungusic, Japanese-Koguryoic, Old Tibetan, Nivkh, and other languages.[38]

THE SHEEP

q’oni ყონი ‘sheep (ცხოვარი)’, attested in the word ყონიჯილ *q’onižil* ‘Year of the Sheep’ (*AM*.Ž 45).[39]

This word is cognate to western MMgl قُني *qoni* ‘sheep’[40] (*Leid.* 66b-03-3) and eastern MMgl 中豁紉 *qonin* [qɔnin] ‘sheep (羊)’ (*SHM* §19 etc.; *HYYY* §1.05b1), i.e., *qoni-n* at the morphological level.[41] The Mongol forms are cognate to Late Kitan 唇 (probably rendering *qɔñ) ‘sheep’, all ultimately from Common Serbi-Mongolic *kʰɔnɪ ‘sheep’ (*LASM* 365), undoubtedly related to Old Turkic *qoñ* ‘sheep’ via a loanword relationship (*LASM* 365 n. 425).[42]

THE MONKEY

For Peer Review

[36] A similar analysis is offered by Vladimircov, who gives “моріи цил” (1917: 1490), noting that in some manuscripts, the corrupted variant “моріл” occurs (1917: 1490 n. 6), which should be მორილ *moril* in Georgian transcription. We have been unable to verify this latter form in the manuscripts used in the critical editions of the *Chronicle* and in the manuscripts available to us at the time of writing. Moreover, it is not plausible to hypothesise that Vladimircov, who did not know Georgian, had access to manuscripts of the *Chronicle* other than those employed in the critical editions of Q’auxčišvili (1959) and K’ik’naʒe (1987).

[37] KAS 又仜 ‹m.ir›, KLS 馬 ~ 丐 ‹mir› (KLS orthographic forms from Liu Fengzhu 1998 and Kane 2009; phonetic readings from *LASM* 352-353).

[38] *LASM* 353 n. 305; see also Beckwith (2009: 402 n. 45). As shown by Doerfer, the Middle Mongol word was borrowed into New Persian, attested as مورين *mōrīn* and as مرى *mori* “Pferd”, and it was also borrowed into certain Tungusic languages, Turkic languages and Russian dialects (*TMEN* I: 507-508). Doerfer treats Korean 말 *mal* ‘horse’ as a loanword from Mongolian (*TMEN* I: 508), but this is unlikely. The Korean word is indeed ultimately related to similar words in Serbi-Mongolic, Japanese-Koguryoic, Old Tibetan, Chinese and other neighbouring languages, but as a widespread culture word and not as a direct loan from Middle Mongol (*LASM* 353 n. 305). This is easily demonstrated, as the Korean word is attested in Early Middle Korean as 末 *mʌr ‘horse (馬)’ in the 12th-century 鷄林類事 *Jilin Leishi (Kyerim Yusa)*, around a century before the Mongols entered the Korean Peninsula in the early 13th century.

[39] Vladimircov cites a variant “кɔин” (1917: 1491), which would hypothetically be *ყოინ **q’oin*. We have been unable to confirm this form in the critical edition nor in the manuscripts.

[40] The word is glossed in New Persian as كوسفند *kusfand* (*Leid.* 66b-03-3), which is clearly an error for گوسفند *gusfand*. On instances of ك *k* for expected گ *g* in the New Persian glosses in the Leiden Manuscript, also see footnote 50 below in the entry for ნოხი *noxi* ‘dog’.

[41] The Middle Mongol word is also attested as a loanword in New Persian قونين *qōnīn* ~ قونن *qōnin* “Schaf” (*TMEN* I: 442 §312).

[42] In the Kitan zodiac, the corresponding year is literally the ‘Goat Year’, represented by the zoonym *ɛma ‘goat’, written KAS 仝为 ‹êm.a› and KLS 寻 ‹êma›, cognate to MMgl *ima’a-n* ‘goat’, from Common Serbi-Mongolic *ɪma ‘goat’ (*LASM* 339); for the KLS form, see Liu Fengzhu (1998) and Kane (2009).

Cambridge University Press

mečin მეჩინ ‘monkey, ape (ყაპუზუნა)’, attested in the word მეჩინჯილ *mečinǯil* ‘Year of the Monkey’ (*AM*.Ž 45).[43]

This word is cognate to MMgl **meči-n* ‘monkey, ape’, attested not on its own, but as a component morpheme of western MMgl سُرمجی *sormeči* ‘monkey, ape’ in the glossary of Ibn Muhannā (Poppe 1938: 446), a blend of **sor*, from Late Old Chinese 猿 **zuar ‘monkey, ape’, and **meči-n* ‘monkey, ape’, the latter ultimately a loanword from Old Turkic *bičin* ‘monkey, ape’ (the alternation between *m* ~ *b* in early Turkic-Mongolic loanwords is well known).[44] The Old Turkic word in turn is likely to be a borrowing from Iranic, perhaps related to New Persian بوزینه *būzīna* ‘monkey, ape’ (*EDT* 295b). The modern Khalkha reflex of this Middle Mongol word is **мич** [mitʃʰ] ‘monkey, ape’ (almost exclusively in its calendrical usage), sometimes also as **бич** [pitʃʰ] ‘id.’[45]

The Turkic form was borrowed into New Persian (see *TMEN*).

THE CHICKEN

taγa თაღა ‘chicken (ქათამი)’, attested in the word თაღაჯილ *taγanǯil* ‘Year of the Chicken’ (*AM*.Ž 45).[46]

This word is cognate to eastern MMgl 塔乞牙 *takiya* [tʰakʰija] ‘chicken (雞児)’ (*SHM* §141, §264) ~ 塔乞牙 ‘chicken (雞)’ (*HYYY* §1.07a7) and attested western MMgl طاقیه *taqi’a* [taqija] ‘chicken’ (*MAA* 341). The Georgian transcription perfectly matches western MMgl *taγa* ‘chicken’ in Persian and Arabic phonetic transcription, attested in the plural form تاغااوُتْ *taγa-wut* ‘hens’ ~ ‘roosters’ (*Leid*. 68b-12-5, 68b-13-2-2). Also note the Armenian phonetic transcription թախեա *t‘axea* (phonetically [tʰaxea]) ‘chicken’ (Ligeti 1965: 285.29).

The Mongol forms are cognate to Middle Kitan *taqa ‘chicken, hen’[47] (*LASM* 372). These forms are related to Middle Turkic *takagu* ‘hen’, undoubtedly as a loanword, the directionality of which remains to be determined (*LASM* 372 n. 472). Certain neighbouring languages, such as Korean, Hungarian and Jurchen-Manchu exhibit phonetically similar words for ‘chicken’ (see *LASM* 372 n. 472; Ligeti 1986: 43; Kara 2005: 13-14; Kane 2009: 88; Aisin Gioro 2004: 96: §50).

THE DOG

noxi ნოხი ‘dog (ძაღლი)’ attested in the word ნოხინჯილ *noxinǯil* ‘Year of the Dog’ (*AM*.Ž 45),[48] rendering spoken MMgl dial. **nox(a)i-n ǯil* ‘dog-GEN year’.

[43] Vladimircov: “мечін цил” (1917: 1491).

[44] For the etymology of the Old Turkic *bičin* ‘monkey’ see *LASM* (400-402). Late Old Chinese form cited from Kiyose & Beckwith (2008: 11-12). See Kara (2001: 83) for the Turkic etymology of Middle Mongol and Preclassical Literary Mongol *bečin* ~ *bičin* ~ *mečin* ‘ape, monkey’. Wilkens (2021: 161a) also compares the Old Uygur and Mongol forms.

[45] The generic word for ‘monkey, ape’ in modern Khalkha is **сармагчин** [ˈsarmăxtʃʰĭŋ], a reflex of Middle Mongol *sormeči-n* ‘monkey, ape’ resulting from analogical change whereby the final element was reanalyzed as *-gčin* ‘zoonym suffix’ (*LASM* 400-402).

[46] Vladimircov: “ťаґан цил” (1917: 1491).

[47] KAS 令勿方 ‹t.aq.a›, KLS 党 ‹taqa› (KLS orthographic forms from Liu Fengzhu 1998 and Kane 2009; phonetic readings from *LASM* 372).

[48] Vladimircov: “нохін цил” (1917: 1491).

Cambridge University Press

For Peer Review

This word is cognate to eastern MMgl 那中孩 *noqai* [nɔqaị] ‘dog (狗)’ (*SHM* §78 etc.) and western MMgl نوُقَايْ *noqai* ‘dog’[49] (*Leid*. 66b-09-3). In Armenian script, this Mongol word is phonetically transcribed նուխա *nuxa* ‘dog’ (*HNA*), suggesting a Middle Mongol dialect form *[nɔχa] ‘dog’. Other Armenian sources give the transcription նօխայ *noxay* ‘dog’ (Ligeti 1965: 282.24), i.e., MMgl [nɔχaị] ‘dog’. The Middle Mongol word was borrowed into New Persian as نوقاي *nōqāi* ~ نوقا *nōqā* “Hund” (*TMEN* II: 520 §386) and was also borrowed into Turkic and possibly Samoyedic (*TMEN* II: 520-521 §386). The Mongol forms are cognate to Middle Kitan *ñaq ‘dog’[50] and to Taghbach *ñaqañ ‘dog’, ultimately going back to Common Serbi-Mongolic *ñɔkʰañ ‘dog’ (*LASM* 356).

THE PIG

q’aq’ai ყაყაი ‘pig (ღორი)’, attested in the word ყაყაინჯილ *q’aq’ainǯil* ‘Year of the Pig’ (*AM.Ž* 45).[51]

This word is cognate to eastern MMgl 中合中孩 *qaqai* [qaqaị] ‘pig (豬児)’ (*SHM* §166, §268), and western MMgl غَاقَايْ *qaqai* ‘pig (خُوك)’ (*Leid.* 66b-07-5) and غاقای *ɣaqai* ‘id.’ (*MAA*: Poppe 1938: 175).

The Middle Mongol form is also as a loanword in New Persian, attested as قاقا *qāqā* “Schwein”, and as a loanword in certain Turkic languages (*TMEN* I: 382 §259).

2.2 Reconstructed Middle Mongol Genitive Case Morphemes in Georgian Transcription

The animal zodiac constructions above provide evidence of two allomorphs of the Middle Mongol genitive case suffix:

*-in -ინ (Geo -*in*)[52] ~ *-n -ნ (Geo -*n*)[53] ‘genitive case suffix allomorph’, cognate to eastern Middle Mongol -*yin* ‘id.’

3 Reconstructed Western Middle Mongol Words in Georgian Transcription

The tentative reconstructions of western Middle Mongol forms discussed above are presented in alphabetical order below:

*ʤil ჯილ (Geo *ǯil*)[54] ‘year’.
*lʊ ლუ (Geo *lu*)[55] ‘dragon (ვეშაპი)’.

[49] The New Persian gloss is سکْ *sak* (*Leid.* 66b-09-3), which is a scribal error or dialectal variant for سگ *sag* ‘dog’. As demonstrated by Yoshio Saitô (2006: v-viii), the New Persian and Arabic data in the Leiden Manuscript are characterised by numerous scribal errors and dialectal forms. Note also ک *k* for expected گ *g* in the manuscript’s New Persian gloss for ‘sheep’ (q.v. the entry for *q’oni* ყონი ‘sheep’ above).

[50] KAS 伏力 ‹ñ.aq›, KLS 兀 ‹ñaq› (KLS orthographic forms from Liu Fengzhu 1998 and Kane 2009; phonetic readings from *LASM* 356).

[51] Vladimircov: “ќаќаін” and “ќаќан цілл” (1917: 1492). In the text variants available to us at the time of writing, we have been unable to confirm Vladimircov’s variant “ќаќан цілл”, which would be ყაყანჯილ *q’aq’anǯil*.

[52] Cf. “-ін” (BYV 1488, 1501).

[53] Cf. “-н” (BYV 1489, 1491, 1492).

[54] Cf. “цілл” (BYV 1488, 1489, 1490, 1491, 1492).

[55] Cf. “лу” (BYV 1490, 1500).

For Peer Review

*məʃin მეჩინ (Geo *mečin*)[56] ‘monkey (ყაპუზუნა)’.
*mɔʁ(a)i მოღი (Geo *moγi*)[57] ‘snake (გუელი)’.
*mɔrin მორინ (Geo *morin*)[58] ‘horse (ცხენი)’.
*nɔχ(a)i ნოხი (Geo *noxi*)[59] ‘dog (ძაღლი)’.
*pars ფარს (Geo *pars*)[60] ‘cheetah, Acinonyx jubatus (ავაზა)’.
*qaqai ყაყაი (Geo *q’aq’ai*) ‘pig (ღორი)’.[61]
*qɔni ყონი (Geo *q’oni*) ‘sheep (ცხოვარი)’.[62]
*qʊlʁʊn *ყულღუნ (Geo **q’ulγun*)[63] ‘mouse (თაგუ)’.
*taʁa თაღა (Geo *taγa*)[64] ‘chicken (ქათამი)’.
*taulai თავლაი (Geo *tavlai*) ‘rabbit (კურდღელი)’.[65]
*ukur უქურ (Geo *ukur*) ‘bovine (ზროხა)’.[66]

4 Concluding Remarks

As our analyses above indicate, the 14th-century anonymous Georgian author, conventionally known as Žamtaaγmc’ereli, demonstrates surprising accuracy in the phonetic transcription of Mongol phonemes. This Georgian source proves very important for the history of the Mongolian language, because a careful examination of the Georgian transcriptions of medieval Mongol zodiac calendrical terms in it allows us to:

1) identify the specific Mongol dialect of the transcriptions as a western dialect of Middle Mongol exhibiting certain phonetic similarities to other varieties of Middle Mongol in Persian, Arabic, and Armenian phonetic transcription;
2) reconstruct Middle Mongol dialect forms which are phonetically distinctive from other sources (e.g., western Middle Mongol *taʁa ‘chicken’ and *qʊlʁʊn ‘mouse’);
3) clarify the precise semantic values of certain Middle Mongol words which are ambiguously glossed in Chinese (e.g., *qʊlʁʊn, glossed as ‘mouse’ in Georgian, but ambiguously glossed in Chinese as ‘rat, mouse’); and
4) uncover an informative semantic gloss providing insight on cheetahs in Georgia at the time of Mongol domination and thereby also identify a semantic isogloss between eastern and

[56] Cf. “мечин” (BYV 1491, 1500).
[57] Cf. “моґі” (BYV 1490, 1500).
[58] Cf. “морін” (BYV 1490, 1500).
[59] Vladimircov gives “нохі” (BYV 1491) and “нохаі” (BYV 1500).
[60] Cf. “пʹарс” (BYV 1488).
[61] Vladimircov gives “кʹакʹаі” (BYV 1492, 1500) and “кʹакʹа” (BYV 1492, 1500).
[62] Vladimircov gives “кʹоні” (BYV 1491, 1500) and “кʹоін” (BYV 1491, 1500).
[63] Cf. “кʹурґун” (BYV 1488, 1500).
[64] Cf. “тʹаґа” (BYV 1491, 1501).
[65] Vladimircov gives “тʹавлаі” (BYV 1489, 1501) and “тʹавлі” (BYV 1489).
[66] Cf. “укʹур” (BYV 1501).

western Middle Mongol dialects (i.e., western Middle Mongol *pars* ~ *bars* 'cheetah, leopard' vs. eastern Middle Mongol *bars* 'tiger').

The *Chronicle* offers a wealth of data on other aspects of medieval Mongol language, culture and history which we plan to address in future studies.

Abbreviations and Sigla

AM.Ž	Žamtaaγmc'ereli, *Asc'lovani mat'iane* (1987, edited by R. K'ik'naʒe)
BYV	Vladimircov (1917)
corr.	correction of
CPG	*Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, 1-5, cura et studio M. Geerard, Turnhout: Brepols 1974-1987 (Corpus Christianorum); *Supplementum*, cura et studio M. Geerard et J. Noret, Turnhout: Brepols 1998 (Corpus Christianorum).
EDT	Clauson, *Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth Century Turkish* (1972)
Geo	Georgian
HNA	Blake et al., *History of the Nation of the Archers* (1954)
HYYY	*Hua-Yi Yiyu* (Kuribayashi 2003)
IDWO	*Integrated Dictionary of Written Oirat* (Kuribayashi 2017)
KAS	Kitan Assembled Script[67]
KLS	Kitan Linear Script[68]
IM	*Ibn Muhannā* (Poppe 1938)
LASM	Shimunek (2017)
Leid.	*The Leiden Manuscript*, i.e. *Kitâb Majmû' Turjumân Turkî wa-'ajamî wa-Muğalî* (SAITÔ 2006)
MAA	*Muqaddimat al-Adab* (Poppe 1938)
MMgl	Middle Mongol
ms.	manuscript
mss.	manuscripts
RÉGC	*Revue des études géorgiennes et caucasiennes*
SHM	*Mongqol-un Niuča To[b]ča'an* (*Secret History of the Mongols*, quoted from Kuribayashi 2009)
TMEN	Doerfer, G., *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*.

Symbols

*	scientific reconstruction based on mainstream historical-comparative linguistic methods
✗	erroneous form or scribal error
/ /	phonemes
[ ]	phonetic transcription (in IPA or other writing systems)
-	morpheme boundary
~	linguistic variation between two or more forms (free or conditioned)

Primary Sources

Žamtaaγmc'ereli [14th c.], R. K'ik'naʒe (ed.) 1987. *Asc'lovani mat'iane* ასწლოვანი მატიანე [*Chronicle of One Hundred Years*], ტექსტი გამოსაცემად მოამზადა, გამოკვლევა, შენიშვნები და ლექსიკონი დაურთო რ. კიკნაძემ t'ekst'i gamosacemad moamzada, gamok'vleva, šenišvnebi da leksik'oni daurto R. K'ik'naʒem [text prepared for print, introduction, commentary and dictionary by R. K'ik'naʒe]. (საქართველოს ისტორიის წყაროები Sakartvelos ist'oriis c'q'aroebi [Sources on the history of Georgia], 48; ქართული საისტორიო

[67] 'Kitan Assembled Script' or 'Composite Script' denotes the putative 小字 'Small Script' (Kara 1987, 2005; *LASM* 210 n.58).

[68] 'Kitan Linear Script' denotes the putative 大字 'Large Script' (Kara 1987, 2005). KLS orthographic forms are cited from Kane (2009). The phonetic values are cited from *LASM*.

Cambridge University Press

For Peer Review

მწერლობის ძეგლები Kartuli saist'orio mc'erlobis ʒeglebi [Monuments of Georgian Literature], 6). Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
Blake, Robert P., Richard N. Frye & Francis Woodman Cleaves (trans.) 1954. *History of the Nation of the Archers (The Mongols) by Grigor of Akanc'*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard-Yenching Institute, Harvard University Press.
Golden, Peter B. 2000. *The King's Dictionary: The Rasulid Hexaglot: Fourteenth Century Vocabularies in Arabic, Persian, Turkic, Greek, Armenian and Mongol* (Leiden: Brill, 2000).
Kuribayashi, Hitoshi 栗林均 2003. *Ka-i yakugo (kōshubon) Mongorugo zen tango, gobi sakuin* 「華夷訳語」(甲種本) モンゴル語全 語・語尾索引. Sendai: Tōhoku Daigaku Tōhoku Ajia Kenkyū Sentā.
Kuribayashi, Hitoshi 栗林均 2009. *Genchō hishi mongorugo kanji on'yaku, bōyaku kango taishō goi* 「元朝秘史」モンゴル語漢字音訳・傍訳漢語対照語彙. Sendai: Tōhoku Daigaku Tōhoku Ajia Kenkyū Sentā.
Ligeti, Louis & Kara, György 2012. Vocabulaires mongols des polyglottes de Yemen. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 65 (2): 137-221.
Ligeti, Louis 1965. La lexique mongol de Kirakos de Ganzak. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 18: 241-297.
Ligeti, Louis 1962. Un vocabulaire mongol d'Istanboul. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 14: 1-99.
Poppe = Поппе, Н. Н. 1938. *Монгольский словарь Мукаддимат ал-Адаб*. Часть I-II. Труды Института Востоковедения, XIV. Москва: Издательство Академии Наук.
Saitô, Yoshio 2006. *The Mongolian Words in Kitâb Majmû' Turjumân Turkî wa-'ajamî wa- Muğalî: Text and Index*. Kyoto: Shoukadoh.
Šat'berdis k'rebuli 1979 = შატბერდის კრებული X საუკუნისა *Šat'berdis k'rebuli X sauk'unisa* [*Šat'berdi Homiliarium from the 10th century*], გამოსაცემად მოამზადეს ბ. გიგინეიშვილმა და ელ. გიუნაშვილმა gamosacemad moamzades B. Gigineišvilma da El. Giunašvilma [edited by B. Gigineišvili and El. Giunašvili]. (ძველი ქართული მწერლობის ძეგლები Ʒveli kartuli mc'erlobis ʒeglebi [Monuments of Georgian Literature] 1). Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
Vladimirtsov = Владимирцов, Б. Я. 1917. Анонимный грузинскій историкъ XIV вѣка о монгольскомъ языкѣ. *Извѣстія Россійской Академіи Наукъ (Bulletin de l'Académie des Sciences de Russie)*, pp. 1487-1501.

Secondary Sources

Clark, Larry 1973. The Turkic and Mongol words in William of Rubruck's Journey (1253-1255). *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 93(2): 181-189.
Clauson, Sir Gerard 1972. *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
Csáki, Éva 2006. *Middle Mongolian Loan Words in Volga Kipchak Languages.* Turcologica, Band 67. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
Doerfer, Gerhard 1963. *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen: Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung älterer neupersischer Geschichtsquellen, vor allem der Mongolen- und Timuridenzeit. Band I: Mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH.
Doerfer, Gerhard 1965. *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen: Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung älterer neupersischer Geschichtsquellen, vor allem der Mongolen- und Timuridenzeit. Band II: Türkischen Elemente im Neupersischen.* Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH.
Doerfer, Gerhard 1967. *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen: Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung älterer neupersischer Geschichtsquellen, vor allem der Mongolen- und Timuridenzeit. Band III: Türkischen Elemente im Neupersischen.* Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH.
Gamkrelidze, Thomas 1990. *C'eris anbanuri sist'ema da ʒveli kartuli damc'erloba, Anbanuri c'eris t'ip'ologia da c'armomavloba* [=] Alphabetic Writing and the Old Georgian Script: A Typology and Provenience of Alphabetic Writign Systems, with a preface by A. Shanidze, Tbilisi: Publishing House of the Djavakhishvili State University.
Gegechkori, Arnold M. 2010. ვეფხისტყაოსანი ბიოგეოგრაფის თვალით Vepxist'q'aosani *biogeograpis tvalit* [=] The Knight in the Panther's Skin *from Biogeographer's Point of View*, Tbilisi: Meridiani Publishers.
Grumel, Venance 1958. *La Chronologie* (Traité d'études byzantines, 1). Paris.
Kane, Daniel 2009. *The Kitan Language and Script.* Leiden: Brill.

For Peer Review

Kara, György 2001. Late Mediaeval Turkic elements in Mongolian. In: Louis Bazin & Peter Zieme (eds.) *De Dunhuang a Istanbul: Hommage à James Russell Hamilton*. Silk Road Studies, Vol. 5. Turnhout: Brepols. pp. 73-119.

Kara, György 2009. *Dictionary of Sonom Gara's Erdeni-yin Sang: A Middle Mongol Version of the Tibetan Sa skya Legs bshad. Mongol-English-Tibetan*. Brill's Inner Asian Library, Vol. 23. Leiden: Brill,.

Kara, György, translated by John R. Krueger 2005. *Books of the Mongolian Nomads: More than Eight Centuries of Writing Mongolian*. Bloomington: Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies, Indiana University.

Kara, György 1987. On the Khitan writing systems. *Mongolian Studies*, The Mongolia Society, Bloomington, Indiana. 10: 12-24.

K'ek'eliʒe, K'orneli 1945. ეტიუდები ძველი ქართული ლიტერატურის ისტორიიდან *Et'iudebi ʒveli kartuli lit'erat'uris ist'oriidan* [*Essays on the History of Ancient Georgian Literature*], 2, Tbilisi.

Kiyose, Gisaburo N. and Christopher I. Beckwith 2008. The origin of the Old Japanese Twelve Animal Cycle. *Arutaigo Kenkyū* アルタイ語研究 — *Altaistic Studies* 2: 1-18.

Kuribayashi, Hitoshi 栗林均 2017. *Integrated Dictionary of Written Oirat*. Sendai: Tohoku Uninversity Center for Northeast Asian Studies.

Liu, Fengzhu 劉鳳翥. 1998. Qidan dazi liushi nian zhi yanjiu 契丹大字六十年之研究 [Sixty years of research on the Kitan Large Script]. *Zhongguo wenhua yanjiusuo xuebao* 中國文化研究所學報 [*Journal of Chinese Studies*] 7: 313-338. Hong Kong: Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Nark'vevebi 1979 = *საქართველოს ისტორიის ნარკვევები რვა ტომად Sakartvelos ist'oriis nark'vevebi rva t'omad* [*Research on the History of Georgia*], 3, *საქართველო XI-XV საუკუნეებში Sakartvelo XI-XV sauk'uneebši* [*Georgia in the 11th-15th Centuries*]. Tbilisi: Sabč'ota Sakartvelo.

Pelliot, Paul 1959. *Notes on Marco Polo*. I. Ouvrage postume publié sous les auspices de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belle-Lettres et avec le concours du Centre national de la Recherche scientifique. Paris: Imprimerie nationale, Librairie Adrien-Maisonneuve.

Q'auxčišvili 1959 = *ქართლის ცხოვრება Kartlis cxovreba* [*The Life of Kartli*], 2, ტექსტი დადგენილი ყველა ძირითადი ხელნაწერის მიხედვით ს. ყაუხჩიშვილის მიერ t'ekst'i dadgenili q'vela ʒiritadi xelnac'eris mixedvit S. Q'auxčišvilis mier [text established according to all principal manuscripts by S. Q'auxčišvili], Tbilisi: Saxelgami, 1959.

Róna-Tas, András & Árpád Berta 2011. *West Old Turkic: Turkic Loanwords in Hungarian, 2 Parts*. Turcologica, Band 84. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Róna-Tas, András 1976. A Volga Bulgarian inscription from 1307. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 30(2): 153-186.

Róna-Tas, András 1974. Tocharische Elemente in den altaischen Sprachen? In: Georg Hazai & Peter Zieme (eds.) *Sprache, Geschichte und Kultur der altaischen Völker: Protokolband der XII Tagung der P.I.A.C. 1969 in Berlin*. Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR, Zentralinstitut für alte Geschichte und Archäologie. Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des alten Orients, 5. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag. pp. 499-504.

Sarʒvelaʒe, Zurab 1984. *Kartuli salit'erat'uro enis ist'oriis šesavali* [*Introduction to the History of the Georgian Literary Language*], Tbilisi Gnatleba.

Shimunek, Andrew 2017. *Languages of Ancient Southern Mongolia and North China: A Historical-Comparative Study of the Serbi or Xianbei Branch of the Serbi-Mongolic Language Family, with an Analysis of Northeastern Frontier Chinese and Old Tibetan Phonology*. Tunguso-Sibirica, Band 40. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Sinor, Denis 1970. Mongol and Turkic words in the Latin versions of John of Plano Carpini's Journey to the Mongols (1245-1247). In: Louis Ligeti, ed., *Mongolian Studies*, Budapest, pp. 537-551.

Thackston, Wheeler M., trans., Rashiduddin Fazlullah [Rashīd al-Dīn Faḍllullāh] 2012. *Classical Writings of the Medieval Islamic World: Persian Histories of the Mongol Dynasties*, Volume III. London: I.B. Tauris.

Wilkens, Jens 2021. *Handwörterbuch des Altuigurischen: Altuigurisch-Deutsch-Türkisch / Eski Uygurcanın El Sözlüğü: Eski Uygurca-Almanca-Türkçe*. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen. <https://univerlag.uni-goettingen.de/handle/3/isbn-978-3-86395-481-9>.

ǯavaxišvili 1917 = Кн. И. А. Джавахов 1917. Объ одномъ анонимномъ грузинскомъ историкѣ XIV вѣка. *Извѣстія Россійской Академіи Наукъ (Bulletin de l'Académie des Sciences de Russie)*, pp. 1483-1486.

ǯavaxišvili 1977 = ǯavaxišvili, Ivane 1977. *თხზულებანი თორმეტ ტომად Txzulebani tormet' t'omad* [*Opera omnia*], 8. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

For Peer Review

Names Removed for Peer Review Purposes

Author Name (in press). A preliminary look at Vladimircov's 1917 Cyrillic transcriptions of the 14th century Georgian transcriptions of the Middle Mongol zodiac. 5 pp. in ms.

Author Name & **Author Name** (in progress). The 14th century Georgian literary source on Middle Mongol. 36 pp. in ms.

For Peer Review