

Two Rhyming Mongolic Words in Kitan Assembled Script

GYÖRGY KARA*

Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana

Received: June 6, 2020 • Accepted: June 8, 2021

© 2021 Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest



ABSTRACT

This note discusses the reading, the meaning and the history of two Mongolic words, *šawa* ‘bird of prey’ and *čala* ‘stone’ of the Kitan language written in the second of the two writing systems of the Kitan Liao Empire, the assembled, or composite, or as commonly called, ‘small’ script.

KEYWORDS

Liáoshǐ, Kitan language, etymology

* Corresponding Author. E-mail: gkara@indiana.edu

It is well-known from Tuōtuō/Toqto's¹ 脱脱 *Liáoshǐ* 遼史, *History of the Liao*, that Kitan has šawa 'bird of prey', a word cognate of Mong. *sibayun* 'bird'. This Mongol word also means a bird of prey, a hawk or falcon, for instance, in the famous *jataka* of Prince Mahāsattva and the starving tigress in Shes-rab Seng-ge's Middle Mongol translation of the longest version of the *Sūtra of Golden Beam* (*Suvarṇaprabhāsottama-sūtrendrarāja*),² just as Daur šogō. In his last book (1986), summarizing his lifelong work on the pre-ninth-century and pre-Ottoman Turkic elements of Hungarian (p. 428), L. Ligeti reconstructed Kitan šowa 'falcon' from the *Liáoshǐ* transcription *shàowā* 稍瓦,³ also citing šobō and šoyō from his own unedited Daur records. Martin's (1961: 218) record of Urgunge Onon's Hailar Daur shows *sho(u)oo*; Russian-script Daur šogoo and Engkebatu's IPA records also indicate a long vowel in the second syllable (see also Kane (2009: 93, 97), quoting Daur *foyoo, fowoo*).

In another, earlier, important paper about the Middle Mongol fragments of a Square Script print of Sonom Gara's *Erdeni-yin sang*, and the relation of Pre-Classical and Middle Mongol, Ligeti (1964) discussed several Kitan words found in Chinese transcription in the *Liáoshǐ* and other sources: *jau* 'hundred', *čaur* 'battle, campaign', *taul* 'hare', *šawā* 'falcon' (p. 288) and *šawāji* 'falconer'. For 'falcon', he quotes MNT *šibawun* 'bird; falcon', *šibawula-* 'to hunt with falcon(s), to go hawking', other Middle Mongol data from Sino-Mongol glossaries and vocabularies in Arabic script, living forms from his Daur and Moghol records, Minhe Monguor *šū* (De Smedt and Mostaert 1933: 383) and for the rest, he refers to Poppe's *Comparative Studies*. From his Arabic-script Middle Mongol data, Ibn Muḥannā's *šibān* is the most interesting, because of its unrounded second syllable, a form also found in his own Marda Moghol record *šibān*. This occurs in the compound *keu šibān* 'garçon, gosse'.⁴ After Ivanovskij's šoyó, Ligeti quotes his own record of Hailar Daur šowō and Qiqihar Daur šobō, šoyā (the latter is probably for šoyō). It may be added that now in Daur, 'bird' is *dəgi*, an Ewenki element, see Ewenki *dəgi, dəgi* 'bird; waterfowl', in some dialects 'duck', derived of *dəg-* 'to fly' (see Cincius, 1975, v. I, 228b–229b, s.v. *dəg-, dəγ-, dəyi, dəgi; dəgdə-* etc.), also *dəgdə-* 'to rise' and Daur *dərdə-* 'to fly' < Mong. *degde-* 'to fly up, to rise, to float', cf. *deg* and *dege-* of *degedü* 'upper, supreme', etc., Manchu *de-* in *den* 'high', *dele* 'top', *dergi* < *de+ergi* 'upper', etc., and Turkic *yəg* 'upper'.⁵

¹ This author's name is most probably a form of the verb *toyto-/toyta-*, Middle Mong. *toqta-/toqto-* 'to be(come) firm/stable, to be established'. The reading proposed here is an imperative name, 'be stable!' or 'remain alive!', similar to Khalkha *Soli* 'Change!', a name given to a daughter in a novella of Cendiin Damdinsüren, with the parents' wish to change the course of having too many daughters. Shimunek (2017: 486) reconstructed Toqto'a, a name attested in the *Secret History*, which is the imperfective verbal noun of the same verb, meaning 'stable, steady, long-standing' or the imperative of the transitive verb *toytoya-* from the same stem, as in Rybatzki 2006: 354–355. See Toqta/Toqto, an imperative name, in Rásonyi and Baski 2007/II: 769–770.

² See Kara 1979: 59–63.

³ It was also used as personal name; see *Liáoshǐ*, ch. 15 (Wittfogel and Fêng 1949: 587).

⁴ Cf. Mostaert 1941–1944: 435b, Ordos *küüked šuuxat* and *küüked šiwuu* 'les enfants, enfant', with Huā Yí yiyù *kō'ün šiba'un*; see also Khalkha *xüüxed šuuxad* 'children' < **köbögüked sibayuaqad*, and MKiT, 600b: *keüked siuqaq*, *k. sibayu*.

⁵ Add also Urgunge Onon's Hailar Daur *šo(u)oo* 'falcon' (Martin 1961: 218), Yogur *f.u:n* 'bird' (Bulučilayu 1984: 109); Huzu Mgr. *əau* 'bird' (Qasbayatur 1986: 147) and the data from Sun Zhú 1990: 725, where we find the following equivalents of Mong. *sibayun* 'bird': Chahar, Baarin, Khorchin, Kharachin, Sönit, Ordos/Otok, Oirat/Alashan *fubu:* (but according to Qinggertai 1959, text no. 3, Baarin has [ʃʊvo:]), Oirat/Dulan (Kukunor) *fubu:n*, Oirat/Jungar *jobu:n*, Buriat *fubu:ŋ*, Yogur *f.u:n*, Monguor *əau*, Bao'an *əaji* (also in Čen Nai Siüng 1985: 137–139, *əa* with reference to Tibetan *bya* 'bird', also *əaji* id., cf. (Amdo) Tib. *bya-gzī'u; ərətɕ* 'airplane' < (Amdo) Tib. *bya-gru*, and *əazila* 'little children' (cf. above Mong. *köbögün sibayun*; not in Bùhé [Böke] & Liú Zhàoxióng, 1982); Santa *bunɕu* < Mong. *boljimur*, and Daur with the Tungus *dəgi*. Yu Wonsoo et al. (2008: 105) recorded Tacheng Daur *dəgi*. Yu



Činggeltei & Wu (2002) had not yet listed 𠵹𠵹𠵹 *š.au.a*. This word has been identified later in the monuments of the Kitan assembled, or composite, or ‘small’ script by Mongol, Manchu and Chinese scholars of China.

Wu Yingzhe & Juha Janhunen (2010: 162) write: ‘a group that is identified as the *sh.au.a*. 𠵹TENT 伏𠵹 𠵹 *n.ú.úr* ‘tribe’ [5–19]. The name *sh.au.a*.TENT, with the character 𠵹TENT probably indicating a suffixal element, must correspond to the ethnonym *Shaowa* 稍瓦, as attested in Chinese sources (*Liáoshǐ*). Of this particular tribe it is known that it was specialized in ‘catching birds’ (Wittfogel & Fêng 1949: 89), that is, in trading in hunting falcons, and that the name *Shaowa* itself denoted ‘falcon’ (Kane 2009: 97 §3.068). Since this is so, it is very possible that the root 𠵹𠵹𠵹 *sh.au.a* is a cognate of Mongolic **siba-xu/n* ‘bird’. There might also exist an ethnonymic connection with the *Shibe* tribe, which in later history is Jurchen-Manchu speaking, but which in Liao times very probably spoke Khitan.⁶

Liu and Kang (2014: 43) have eleven quotations of the stem form:

(Xing 1055) Xingzōng 興宗³⁰⁻¹⁷

(Xian 1072) Yēlù Rénxiān 耶律仁先 𠵹𠵹 *mo.ri*⁴⁷⁻⁵¹ 𠵹𠵹 *š.au.a* 𠵹𠵹 *k/x.ui* 𠵹𠵹 *九百 k/x.l.g.y* ‘horse(s) and falcon(s)’; 𠵹𠵹 *š.au.a*;

(Han 1078) Xiāo Tèměi 蕭特每 fūrén 夫人 Hán shí 韓氏 𠵹𠵹 *š.au.a*;

(Ci 1082) Yēlù Cítè 耶律慈特 𠵹出 𠵹 *m.án.ir*¹⁴⁻¹⁹ 𠵹𠵹 *š.au.a* 𠵹 *po* ‘the hunting falcon(s)’ time’;

(Qing 1095) General Xiāo Tàishān 蕭太山 Yǒngqīng 永清 jūnzhǔ 郡主: 𠵹出 𠵹 *m.án.ir*¹⁷⁻⁷ 𠵹𠵹 *š.au.a* ‘hunting falcon’;

(Fu 1102) Yēlù Wùméi fùshǔ 耶律兀没副署: 𠵹𠵹 *xəu.úr*²⁹⁻¹⁹ 𠵹𠵹 *š.au.a* 公乃 𠵹 *n.am.úr* 伏𠵹 𠵹 *n.an.de* ‘in springtime (hunting with) falcon(s), in fall (...?)’¹⁰;

Wonsoo 2011: 169 has Khamnigan Mongol *šubuunee üür* ‘bird’s nest’ and *šubuunee xušuu* ‘beak’. – While writing this paper, I unfortunately had no access to Stanisław Kałużyński’s works on Muromskij’s Dager and Shibe materials.

⁶ There is at least one phonetic difficulty for the last assumption, namely the difference in the vowel harmony of the two words: *sibayun* is a back-vowel word, while *sibē* has front vowels. Cf. Mong. *sibegen*, Middle Mong. *šibē’e*, Khalkha *šiwēe* ‘pallisade’? – As to Kitan assembled script 𠵹TENT, its phonetic value proposed in Qing–Wu–Ji is *aju*. If it were *ju*, it could be compared with Ewenki *jū* ‘hut, tent; home’ – *une hypothèse gratuite*.

⁷ Here *š.au.a* appears in a four-word line of a quatrain; it follows an attribute, 𠵹𠵹 𠵹𠵹 *ja.ga.ai.l.gu*, certainly a verbal noun, and it is followed by a parallel phrase consisting of a similar verbal noun 𠵹𠵹 𠵹𠵹 *x/k.ʔru.l.gu* as attribute to 𠵹𠵹 *š.úr*, a noun, which may mean ‘goodness, skill, aptitude’ (善) or ‘power, strength’ (权/權). For these and more, see Kim & Kim 2019: 65a.

⁸ This word *m.án.ir* is translated as *liè* 獵 ‘hunt(ing)’ in the bilingual Langjun Xingji 郎君行記 inscription of 1334. As to 𠵹, I follow the reading according to Qing–Wu–Ji, but the reconstruction is not certain, and the presence of a nasal instead of the vibrant seems more probable. For the proposed different reconstructions, *n*, *ən*, *in*, *un*, *ún*, *ir* see Kim & Kim 2019: 19, character no. 144. See also Shimunek 2017: 318, 420, etc.

⁹ The word is indisputably a cognate of Mong. *qabur*, but the reading of its first character, a CVV-type syllabogram, is disputable. It transcribes Chin. *hou* 后 ‘empress’, see Kane 2009: 96, 119; Qing–Wu–Ji III, 2073, entry no. 6688, character no. 250, esp. Ren 8–3, reading *heu*. With no. 273 *un*, it forms the genitive *xəu.un* = *xəwun* ‘of the empress’. Toyoda (2015: 189) read *you*, Takeuchi (2011: 21) reconstructs *qau*, which is nearer to what is expected in the cognate of Mongol *qabur*. Old Mandarin in ‘Phags-pa script reads *yiw* (see Coblin 2007: 159, no. 617, Xiw [yiw]); in Uyghur script, this type of Old Mandarin syllable appears as *qyw* (= *xiu* or *yiu*). See also *hiu/qiu*, Rybatzki 2006: 483 (*ngrim qiu*).

¹⁰ Cf. *Liáoshǐ*, ch. 32 (translation in Wittfogel and Fêng 1949: 133), about the imperial hunting at the autumn camp: waiting in the night when deer come to drink at the pond of the Forest of Vanquished Tigers, ‘[h]unters were ordered to blow horns and imitate the cry of the deer which were shot ...’ The Kitan term for the seasonal camps of the sovereign appears transcribed in Chinese as *nābō* 捺鉢, Yuan-time *nābāo* 納寶, *lābō* 刺鉢, etc. see Wittfogel



(Lie 1102) Yèlù/Hán Díliè 耶律/韓迪烈: 爻出爻 *m.án.ir*¹⁴⁻¹² 爻爻为 *š.au.a* ‘hunting falcon’; 伏为 *ñ.q.*¹¹ 20-43 爻爻为 *š.au.a* ‘dog(s and) falcon(s)’; 25-14 爻爻为 *š.au.a* ‘falcon’;
 (Huang 1110) Huáng tàishūzǔ àicè 皇太叔祖哀册 10-29 爻爻为 *š.au.a*³⁰ 爻化必 *m.ri.er* 丕丕平矢
 **naima.u.u.de* ‘falcon(s), horse(s)+suffix eight together+dative-locative suffix’.

Moreover, Liu and Kang have four other, longer sequences with the same stem. One of them is 爻爻为艾, possibly *š.au.a.ju* ‘falconer’ in Yèlù Rénxiān’s inscription (58–56; see Liu–Kang, 2014: 63; Kim & Kim 2019: 67; Qing–Wu–Ji III, 1674, no. 741, quoting (Yu) Yèlù Rénxiān⁵⁸⁻⁸⁴ and (Xiang 1099) Yèlù Nùxiángwěn 耶律奴詳穩¹¹⁻¹⁵, and reading *sha-au-a-aju*). The last character, 艾 (no. 82.1), according to Wu and Janhunén (2010: 46 and n. 449), also a logogram for ‘tent’, is treated as the undotted pair of 艾 *üe*, but it is a different grapheme, not related to 艾 ‘moon; lunar month’.

Qing–Wu–Ji (III, 1674), list the same eleven quotations of the stem form 爻爻为 *š.au.a* (their abbreviations for the inscriptions are not always the same as those in Liú and Kāng 2014): Xing 30-1²; Yu (= Xian)⁴⁷⁻⁵² 67-60²; Di (= Lie)¹⁴⁻¹² 20-42² 25-14²; Tai (= Huang)¹⁰⁻²⁹; Qing¹⁷⁻⁷; Han²³⁻¹⁹; Chao (= Ci) Yèlù Chāozhī 耶律抄只¹⁴⁻²⁰; Wu (= Fu)²⁹⁻²⁰, adding (Pu 1105) Yèlù Pūsūlǐ 耶律蒲速里 tàifū 太傅¹⁹⁻¹: 爻爻为 *š.au.a* 爻出爻 *m.án.ir ui.de* ‘in the business of hunting with falcons’, (Cha 1113) Xiāo Chálá 蕭查刺 (in Kitan 为 *čal.a*) xiànggōng 相公 (in Kitan 今译 *s.iang* 兀太 *g.ung*)¹⁴⁻²⁹ 爻出爻 *m.án.ir* 爻爻为 *š.au.a* ‘hunting falcon’, and five more, longer, sequences with syntactic or derivative suffixes: *š.au.a.an* (Qing¹⁸⁻²¹); (Ba 1₂₋₆); *š.au.a.ad*^{12b} *te*₂ (Dao¹⁹⁻¹⁴); *š.au.a.aju* (Yu⁵⁸⁻⁵⁴), (Xiang¹¹⁻¹⁵); *š.au.a.ar* (Nu³²⁻¹⁴); *š.au.a.iú* (Jue = Yèlù Juéchǎngwěn 耶律决敞穩⁶⁻³⁶); (Hui^{12-19, 12-16}). See also Qing–Wu–Ji I, 369, quoting *š.au.a* ‘bird of prey’ (Yu⁶⁷); *sh.au.a.aju n.ú.úr* [or *ñ.ú.úr?*] ‘the Shaowa tribe’ (Xiang¹¹); and *š.au.a.iú* ‘bird of prey’ (+ suffix) (Jue⁶).

Shimunek (2017: 221, 370) reads both the *Liáoshǐ* gloss *sháowā* 杓窩 and the Kitan assembled script 爻爻为 *š.au.a* as *šawa*, supposing that the second syllable is short, that is, the last syllable of Mong. *sibayun* is a suffix, not present in the Kitan word. He postulates a Common *Serbi-Mon-

and Fêng 1949: 131; Kane 2009: 46, entry 2.099. It is identified in Qing–Wu–Ji I, 444 with 公亦列 and 公亦生亦, read in III, 2076, words nos. 6719 and 6720, as *n.ad.bot* and *n.ad.abu.ad*; Kim & Kim (2019: 308b) read *n.ad.bu* and *n.ad.bu.ad*. The reading *ad* seems to be based on the Middle Chinese value of *nat* 捺, Sino-Japanese *natsu*, Sino-Korean *nal* (as in *nal.in* 捺印 ‘affixing a seal’, Martin, Lee and Chang 1967: 305; in Middle Chinese, 刺 had a *t*, 纳 a *p* coda), but certainly not in Chinese used in the Liao Empire. The character 亦 does not appear in known Kitan transcriptions of Chinese syllables. In Chinggeltei and Wu 2002: 46–47, this character reads as *w*, and 公亦生亦 as *nowbow*. The etymology, connecting this word with Mongol *negü-* ‘to move; to change (pastures)’ and *bayu-* ‘to descend, to settle’ (cf. the Mongol nouns *negüdel*, *bayudal*), quoted from Wang 1990: 62, is unlikely.

¹¹ It is certainly a cognate of Mong. *noqai* ‘dog’, Manchu *niyexe* ‘puppy’, but the reconstruction of the exact phonetic shape (esp. the vowels) of this Kitan word is still problematic. In the transcription of 力, *q* indicates the presence a strong velar stop or spirant, just as in the word 令力为 *t.q.a* ‘chicken’, with similar problems, cognate of Mong. *takiya* (with many other forms), Jurchen *tiqo*, Manchu *čöxo*, and Turkic *tawuq*, etc. Qing–Wu (2002: 60) reconstruct *t’-xai-a* or even *t’axia*, but Chinggeltei (2002: 107) gives *t-qo-a*. Róna-Tas suggests **tiko*a (Róna-Tas–Berta 2011, II:1493), but with the same *elan*, one could risk the reading **tiqa*, **taqa*, or **tiqaa*, and, for the ‘dog’, **naqa*. Cf. Qing–Wu–Ji III, 2047, word no. 6307, characters 247+ 168+169, *t-qo-a*; p. 1967, word no. 5121, characters 222+168, *ñ-qo*; Shimunek 2017: 372 **t.aq.a* and 356 etc. **ñaq*; Kim & Kim 2019: 202b read *t(d).aqa.a* and *η(ni).aqa* (here *η* is perhaps for *ŋ*). According to Qing–Wu–Ji (III, 1906), 力 also occurs alone, and this may suggest that it is a CV or VC type syllabogram, but in fact, line 50 (just as line 49) of Yèlù Wùméi’s epitaph (Wu = Fu 1102) is written in linear style, and there 力 follows 毋, forming part of the word *b.q.* ‘child’ (characters nos. 311+168, read *b-qo* in Qing–Wu–Ji III, 2192–2195, word no. 8576). It does not appear in Kitan transcriptions of Chinese words. Qing–Wu–Ji (III, 1906–1907, character no. 168), reads *qo*; it begins words nos. 4221–4228.

¹² Reading uncertain.



golic **siba*¹³ ‘bird, eagle, hawk’. One could add ‘falcon’ or write simply ‘bird of prey’.¹⁴ It is unknown when the suffix *-gun* appeared in Ancient Mongol(ic), nor if ‘bird’ was the primary meaning and ‘bird of prey’ was secondary, although the latter, a restriction of the meanings, seems more likely. It is known, however, that in Middle Mongol, initial *si-* and *ši-* still alternated, as it is discussed by Ligeti in his notes on the Arabic-script Mongol Vocabulary of Istanbul (1963: 173–174) with other Middle Mongol and Moghol data. MNT has *šibawula-* ‘to hunt with a bird of prey’, but *sisgei* ‘felt’ as in MA *sisgei*, *sisügei*, Moghol *siskei*, etc. Let us add that onset *s-* is also preserved in Daur *suidar* ‘dew’, a back vowel form, vs. MNT *ši’üder*, and in Daur *see-* ‘to urinate’ (Martin 1961: 206; Engkebatu 1984: 216) vs. Mong. *sige-* etc.

Kim & Kim (2019: 67b), reconstruct [shauwa], compare it with Mongol forms and quote, among other occurrences, [m.an.ir.j.au.a] ‘hunting bird’ and [j.au.aɟu] ‘one who tames a bird of prey; falconer’, also the name of a tribe or clan, identified by Wu Yingzhe. It should be a cognate of Mongol *sibayuči(n)* ‘falconer’.¹⁵

Liu–Kang (2014: 238–239) list six words beginning with the character no. 183 𠵹; five of them have the stem 𠵹力 with or without additional characters. 𠵹力 is safely identified by Ji Shí 既实 1990 with the proper name that appears in Chinese transcription as Chálá 查刺, a proper name. Four words beginning with the sequence of characters nos. 390 and 189 𠵹 are quoted on p. 533, two of these were also identified with the personal name Chálá.¹⁶ This suggests that characters nos. 183 and 390 (= Qing–Wu–Ji: no. 183.1) should have the same phonetic value; they are allographs.

Qing–Wu–Ji I, 413, list 𠵹 and its dotted form as nos. 183 and 183.1, and quote more words beginning with characters no. 183 and no. 183.1.¹⁷ According to Qing–Wu–Ji (I, 243–244), character no. 183 𠵹 is ʃar or ʃal (that is, ʃar or ʃal?) as well as ʃʰar, that is, ʃar, based on the assembled script word 183+189 𠵹力 and on the Chinese transcription of the personal name, also Yèlù Rénxiān’s ‘lesser name’ in the *Liáoshǐ*. The syllabic value of the first character 查 is and was *chá* [tʂʰa], rendering here Kitan *ča* [ʧʰa]; its another Modern Chinese reading is *zhā* [dʒa], a clan name or surname, also used for the homophonous 楂 and 樵, name of a tree.

¹³ This **siba* and MNT *šiba* ‘ricochet’ in §198 *šibayin sumun, luànjiàn* 亂箭 lit. ‘erring arrow’ as well as Mong. *siba* are but homonyms.

¹⁴ As the *Guóyǔjiě* 國語解 says: *zhìniǎo zǒngchēng* 驚鳥總稱 ‘a general term for birds of prey’, and explains that in the compound 杓窠印 *sháowāyīn* ‘seal of the shape of a bird of prey’, the bird is a symbol of swiftness. Cf. also *Liáoshǐ*, ch. 57 (translation in Wittfogel–Fêng 1949: 168).

¹⁵ See Ordos *šiwuūci* and *šiwüčün* ‘oiseleur’, *šiwüči*“ *gitad* ‘Chinois qui viennent prendre des oiseaux de proie en Mongolie pour en utiliser les penne’, *šiwüčün* nom de clan (Mostaert 1941–1944: 626a); Kalmyk *šowüči* ‘Vogel-fänger; Aufseher der Jagdfalken’ (Ramstedt 1935: 266b), also in the 17th century, in Sagang Sechen’s *Erdeni-yin tobči*, as common word *sibayuči* (f. 18b27, s. • *noqai-či* • • *yaqai-či yurban ijayur-tan*) and as ethnonym *Sibayučin* (f. 63b5, *Sibayučin-u Boljomur neretü kümün*; f. 69b11, *barayun yar-un gegüđ Sibayučin* • • *Urad* • • *Tangyud qoyar degere* • • See also ff. 18b13, *yeke aq-a inu Sibayuču*[=i] • • *Ningbu-yin yajar-a*; f. 24b1, *Boy*[=r] *aču* • *Sibayuču*[=i] • *Börte čino-a kemekü yurban köbegün*; different in the Manchu translation: *Boroja* • *Jiyači* • *Burtečino axón deo ilan nofi* ... ‘Boroja, Jiyači, Burtečino, (these) three brothers ...’ (Haenisch 1932: 32). The parallel passage in the Shorter *Altan tobči*, f. 3b22–24, reads *aq-a inu Boroču* • • *ded inu Sibayuči* • • *odqan inu Börte* [MS: *bwyrvn*] *čino-a buyu* • • (ed. Čoimaa, f. 36a22). – In the MNT, the *-čin* forms are plural; later, as in Khalkha *angčün* ‘hunter’, *daičün* ‘valiant’, *gatalčün* ‘shoemaker’, *jočün* ‘guest’, vs. *emč* ‘physician’, *joloč* ‘driver’, *togoč* ‘cook’, *mongolč* ‘Mongolist’, etc., this strict difference gave place to alternation, though not a free alternation, of the *-či* and *-čin* forms as singular vs. *-čid* as plural. It is not self-evident that the Tabgach words of professionals with *-čin* are plural.

¹⁶ Another Chinese transcription of presumably the same personal name Čala occurs in *Liáoshǐ*, ch. 28: scribe (*línýá* 林牙) Xiāo Chálá 蕭察刺, see Wittfogel and Fêng 1949: 596.

¹⁷ The latter is no. 390 in the list of Liu and Kang.



(Cha 1113) Xiāo Chálá 蕭查刺 (in Kitan 为 *čal.a*) xiànggōng 相公 (in Kitan 今并 *s.iang* 九水 *g.ung*)¹⁴⁻²⁹ 又出又 *m.án.ir* 又为 *š.au.a* ‘hunting falcon’.

Qing–Wu–Ji (III, 1923–1924), reconstruct the phonetic value of characters nos. 183 and 183.1 as *car* (transcribing 183.1, the dotted one, as *car^o*); the sequence of characters nos. 183 𠄎 (or 183.1) + 为 189, read *car-a* and *car^o-a*, respectively, occurs in forty-three words, with or without additional characters for bound morphemes. The meaning of 𠄎为 *car-a* is given as personal name (as already in Qing–Wu 2002: 64), the sequence *čar^o.a* renders the same personal name as *car-a*, while 为𠄎 *car^o.a.an* 𠄎九 is defined as ‘stone characters/inscription’. (Qing–Wu–Ji I, 413). This lead me to the assumption that the personal name and the common word are the same, and to the reading *čal.a* ‘stone’, with strong affricate (ʧ^h).

See also Kim & Kim 2019: 212, with the reproduction of the relevant part of the rubbing of Yèlù Rénxiān’s inscription. They only have the undotted no. 183, read ʧal.ai with the weak affricate, and quote two words, ʧal.ai and ʧal.a, the latter interpreted in Korean as *cwul thong*, in Chinese as *jiūzūn* 酒樽 ‘wine cup’, quoting Bào Yǔzhū 2005. In fact, a possible Mongol equivalent, *čara* is a shallow plate, not a cup. The interpretation rests upon a passage in the biography of Yèlù Xiénièchì 耶律斜涅赤, whose second adult given name (*zi* 字) is Sālā 撒刺, meaning ‘wine cup’ in the language of the Liao (*Liáoshǐ*, ch. 73). The word may be reconstructed as *sara*, but not *čara*. The word *sara* is not attested in the known monuments of Kitan assembled script, but it may have been written as *s.ar.a*, as the attested personal name Saran, written as 今本为出 *S.ar.a.an* on his epitaph of 1100, suggests.¹⁸

Here are some of the main instances:

Čala = 为 *čal.a* (Zhi₁₀), 为𠄎 *čal.a.an*, 𠄎为出 *čal.a.án* (Gu₂₄₋₃; Song₂₄₋₁₁; Liang₁₅; Chao = Ci₁₂₋₂₇), 𠄎为𠄎 *čal.a.iú*, (Hong₃₁), personal name, stem occurring without and with syntactic suffixes.

为𠄎 *čal.a.an* 𠄎九 (no. 68).+ *g* (no. 334), its meaning is identified in Qing–Wu–Ji II, 1312, as Chin. *shízi* 石字 ‘written character (carved in) stone’ in (Song_{24-11,24-12}) Sòng Wèi guó fēi’s 宋魏國妃 epitaph (1110).¹⁹

On the epitaph of Shàngshí júshǐ Xiāo gōng 尚食局使蕭公 = Xiǎnwù gōng Bálì 顯(/显)武公拔里 [= 丹在 B.ar] jiāngjūn 蔣軍 (Shang = Xian 1175), reads 今考𠄎 244+362+246/118 *s.iau.qu*³³⁻¹⁸ 为𠄎 *čal.a.an*, interpreted as *qīng shí* 青石 ‘blue/green²⁰ stone’ (QingWuJi II, 1447).

The inscription in memory, *āicè wén* 哀冊文 (Kitan 九和又 *g.en.ir č.ai wu.un* [= *čaiwun* < 冊文]) of Empress Xuānyì 宣懿 (Kitan 今𠄎𠄎𠄎𠄎 *S.iue.en i.i*), Xiāo Guānyīn 蕭觀音 (d. 1075), Kitan text written by Yèlù Gù 耶律固 after 1101, line 29, has 𠄎为𠄎 *čal.a.iú* ‘stone (+ suffix)’ 𠄎九当 ‘inscription’ (?); the latter word usually corresponds to Chin. *zhì* 志 ‘annals; records, epitaph’.

¹⁸ Cf. note 19 below.

¹⁹ For the phrase ‘written character (carved in) stone’, cf. Sagang Sechen’s *Teachings*, strophe 27, line b: *kürü-dür čabčiju talbiysan bičig metü* ‘like an inscription carved in stone’ and Khalkha *xöšöönii bičees*, and the place name *Bičigt Šurguulga*, etc. Cf. also Qing–Wu–Ji I, 779, where in the title of the epitaph of Sālān Shilü tàishǐ 撒懶室魯太師 (1100) = Saran Shilu taishi (今本为出 *S.ar.a.an* 又用𠄎 *š.il.u* 𠄎九 *tai.šǐ*), the word 𠄎𠄎 *b/p.i*, most probably *bu.i*, transcribes Chin. 碑, modern *bēi* ‘stone with memorial inscription’ (Middle Mongol has the Sino-Turkic *bui taš* and *bii taš* in Uyghur script, Yuan North Chinese has *buē* in ‘Phags-pa’s square script).

²⁰ The same line 33 begins with the words read as 今考𠄎 *s.iau.qu* 伏𠄎 *n.ar*, and interpreted as *qīng sōng* 青松 ‘green pine’ (cf. Mong. *narasun*). The title or heading of the inscription was carved on light green sand stone.



In Xiāo Huiliān lángjūn's 蕭回璣郎君 epitaph (Hui 1080), line 27, it reads 公石有 *n.ar/ra.ən* 'tomb' (+ suffix), 石为火 *čal.a.iú* 'stone' (+ suffix) 午列中 *tal.gu.ai* 'stela, monument' (?) 全为亦立为石 *s.a.ad.ga.a.ar* 'erected' (?).

If this is right, the first word should be a cognate of the stem of Mong. *čilayun*,²¹ similar to Kitan *šawa* cognate of *siba*, the stem of Mong. *sibayun*, discussed above. According to Qing-Wu-Ji (2018), there is a dotted form of 璣, no. 183. Actually, both occur in the assembled script Kitan equivalents of the personal name transcribed in Chinese as Chala. The function of the dot is still not clear; it certainly does not indicate a reading of a Chinese word, synonymous with the Kitan one, as in the case of Kitan 艾* *sair* 'moon' and 英* *üe* or **iue/io* for Chinese 月 (Modern Northern Chinese *yuè*) 'moon' and its homonyms (cf. Kim & Kim 2019: 118–119, nos. 81–82, *sær* and *jue/jo*). Here the dot of the syllabogram no. 183.1 is placed inside and seems to be the same as in the Chinese character 玉 (Modern Northern Chin. *yù*) 'jade', while in 璣, the lower part is the same as the Chinese character 王 (Modern Northern Chin. *wáng*) 'king, prince'.

These two words, Kitan *čala* 'stone', equivalent of Mong. *čilayun* 'stone' from an Ancient 'Ogur' Turkic form **tila* < **tīla* of Old Turkic *tāš*, and Kitan *šawa* 'falcon', cognate of Mongol *sibayun* 'bird', Middle Mongol *sibawun*, *šibawun* etc., also 'falcon', suggest that

(1) the back *ī* has merged with the front *i*, and as such,

(2) it palatalized the preceding consonants, resulting a *t* > *č* (if Kitan *čal.a* is not borrowed from an 'Ogur' *čala* < *tila* < *tīla*)²² and an *s* > *š* development, already in the Ancient Mongol period, that is, long before the 13th century; while Jurchen has *bitexe* (see its logogram in Kiyose 1977: nos. 216, 277) or *bitxe* (< *bitexe* < **bitixe*) > Manchu *bitxe*, Spoken Manchu/Enhebatu *bitk*, *bitku*, *bi:tku*. These forms in which the *t* is retained as a result of the elimination of the second *i*; so it is more archaic than Mongol *bičig* < **bitig* 'writing';²³

(3) that the regressive assimilation of the first syllable *i* was full in these Kitan words, though Middle Mongol monuments still have *siba'un*, *sibawun* and *šiba.un*, as well as *čila'un*, *čilawun*;

(4) that the intervocalic stop *b* was substituted with a bilabial fricative or glide much earlier than in any other known Mongolic language; and

(5) that the third syllable, *-gu.n* of the Middle Mongol forms of both words is, in all probability, a compound suffix, not present in Kitan.

²¹ Middle Mongol MNT *čila'un*, *čilawun*, ZhiyuanYiyu, Hua Yi Yiyu, Yiyu *čilawun*, Yemen *čilau*; Clear Script Oirat *čiloun*; Khalkha *čuluu*. Sún Zhú's modern language data (p. 582): Chahar, Baarin, Kharachin, Sönit *fulu*: (= [ʃ'olo:]). Bargu, Khorchin *fulu*; Buriat *fulu:ɣ*, Ordos/Otok *fulu*.; Oirat/Alashan and Oirat/Dulan (Kukunor) *fulu*.; Oirat/Jungar *fulu:n*, Daur *fjolo*.; Yogur *fjalu*.; Monguor, Santa and Bao'an have forms borrowed from Turkic *tāš*. See also Apatóczky 2009: 86, and Kangjia *fjilo* (Sečenčogtu 1990: 301a). I did not find Moghol data.

²² Kitan still had *di* sequences as the Chinese transcriptions of personal names such as Dilie and Diligu show.

²³ For *bitig*, see Hungarian *betű* in Róna-Tas-Berta 2011: I/122–125. For Tabgach **bitekčün* 'scribe' (cf. Middle Mongol *bičēči* 'scribe, secretary'), see also Shimunek 2017: 156–157, who interprets the final *n* as a plural, as in Middle Mongol *keremüčün* 'sable-hunters' (MNT), accepts Denis Sinor's view that *biti-* is possibly a back formation of *bitig*, and may be a loan from Greek through Syriac. Cf. also Old Turk. *bitkä* in *bitkäči* 'scribe' (DTS 104a; Clauson 1972: 304a). The phonetic value of the compound 𐰽𐰺 [...]g remains uncertain. There is no enough proof for its identification with Mongol *üsüg/üjüg* 'letter, written sign, writing system' or with *bičig* 'writing, writing system, written text' (cf. Wu 2018: 391). Manchu *bitxe* 'writing' < **bitexe* (> Daur *bitäg* 'writing, book'), with its archaic *t*, may come from another pre-thirteenth century Mongolic, Xianbi or Shiwei, language, not from Kitan. Cf. more Tungusic cognates, including Negidal *bitaxə* and Nanai *bičxə* (in Cincius 1975: v. I, 86a). In the Sino-Jurchen vocabulary without Jurchen script this word occurs as *bite* and *biteè*, reconstructed in Kane 1989, nos. 658, 873, 1090, 1093, 1094, 1096 as *bit[h]e* and *bit[h]eè*, its derivation is *biteši* 'clerk' (Kane 1989, no. 658: *bit[h]eši*) || Manchu *bitxesi*, Spoken Manchu/Enhebatu *bitkušy/bitkužy*, cf. Daur *bityā:fin* 'scribe, clerk, scholar'. Is it possible that Jurchen had *biteè* (*biteye*) > *bitè*?



The syllabogram *čal*, that renders a sequence of vowel-consonant consonant unknown in the Chinese language of the Northeast under the Liao, makes also clear that the Kitan assembled script was not ‘tailored’ along the Chinese transcription of Kitan words and the Chinese system of syllables of the time as some researchers imagined. Kitan assembled script transcriptions of Chinese words clearly show that contemporary Chinese phonotactics had no more any oral stop or liquid codas, only nasals (*ng*, *n*, *m*). It is obvious that the Kitan ‘small script’ is a mixed writing system of logograms or ideograms, CV, VC and CVC syllabograms and V and C phonograms (here V = monophthongs or diphthongs), whereas logograms may be used as syllabograms, for instance, 主 *xuang* ‘imperial’ (both graph and word < Chin. *huáng* 皇) for the Chinese family name *Huáng* 黃, and those of the numerals 五 *tau* ‘five’, 九 *š/š* ‘nine’ and 百 *ǰau* ‘hundred’, as in 五 亥 力 *tau*. **li.a* ‘hare’, 百 亥 *ǰau.tau*, from Chin. *zhāotǎo* 招討 ‘punitive official, a title, or 今 亥 伏 *pu.š*.*ñ*, borrowed just as Middle Mongol *ūjin* from Chin. *fūrén* 夫人 ‘lady’. Frequent is the Chinese *fānqiè*-type 反切 notation, as for instance, 非 尔 *po-on* = *pon* ‘year’²⁴. Moreover, in Kitan assembled script, a syllable may be written in a ‘redundant’ way, as in 力 力 央 *š.a.an*, transcription of Chin. *shān* 山 ‘mountain’²⁵, *a.an* transcribing Chin. *ān* 安 ‘quiet’²⁶, or 力 力 央 *b.ar.a.an* (or *b(a).ra.a.an*?) ‘right (hand side)’²⁷, another Kitan word without the suffix *-gun*, see Daur *baran*, vs. Mong. *barayun*.²⁸ It seems that some graphemes representing a combination of a consonant and a vowel, may be used in both ways, CV or VC, and it may be the case with the logogram ‘9’ used as syllabogram for *š/š*/*si* or *iš/is*.²⁹ *Yělü* appears in the ‘small script’ inscriptions as 力 力 央 火 *y.ar.u.ud* (or *y(i).ra. ...?*).³⁰ The *Guóyǔjiě* 國語解 ‘Explaining (terms in) the Language of the Empire’ (*Liáoshǐ*, ch. 116) also mentions *Yílà* 移刺 as a transcription of the Kitan form of *Yělü*, and renders the Kitan words in Chinese transcription *yēlūwǎn* 耶魯盃 and its synonym *pūsùwǎn* 蒲速盃 with Chinese *xīngwàng* 興旺 ‘prospering, flourishing; prosperity, florescence’, the first could be compared with Mong. *irayu* ‘harmonious, beautiful’, but the semantic difference is too great. As for the second word, that

²⁴ Just as *fo.on* = *fon* < **pon* in the later Jurchen linear script (inspired by the Kitan ‘large script’), see *fon* in the locative *fondo* (*fō.on.do*), Kiyose 1977: 101, also quoting Ligeti’s (1953: 225) reconstruction in ‘Note préliminaire sur le déchiffrement des “petits caractères” joutchen; etc. It is unknown if the vowel of Kitan *po*, a cognate/source of this Jurchen word was long or short (Daur has *hoon*) and if Kitan had the contrast of short and long vowels, or if the Kitan scripts indicated such a difference as well as the contour, pitch and duration of contemporary Chinese tonemes.

²⁵ In the Langjun inscription of 1134.

²⁶ In Xiāo Chálǎ’s epitaph, Cha 1113, line 6, word 11.

²⁷ For instance, in the epitaph of Xiāo Zhònggōng of 1150, see Liu–Kang, 2014: 452; according to Kim & Kim 2019: 377b: *b.ar.a.an*.

²⁸ See also in the Vocabulary of Istanbul, Ligeti 1962: 18–19: *bara’un* (or *barawun* ?) with Ibn Muḥannās’s *barān* etc., stating that the form *barān* ‘est normale et caractéristique à certains dialectes mongols occidentaux’, that is, for some Western Middle Mongol dialects. Doerfer, *TMEN* I, 206–208, no. 84, has *barān/bara’un ġar* ‘rechte Flügel des Heeres’, quotes MA بران غار *baran ġar* (cf. also MA *barawun*) He suggests that *barayun* which also means ‘west’ if front is south, is derived from *bara-*, applied for the sinking sun, a witty idea, but what about *jegün* ‘left (direction)’ and, if front is south, ‘east’? Shimunek (2017: 328) also quotes Otgon’s Baarin [parān]. Chinggeltei 1959: (wordlist) 2 and Sun 1990: 145 have Baarin *barō:n*.

²⁹ This ideogram/logogram occurs in the assembled script form of the Kitan word *pušin* ‘lady, dame’ borrowed from Late Middle Chinese *pyu žin* or Old Mandarin *fuzhen*, modern Chin. *fūrén*, discussed in Kane 2004: 224, n. 3. As to the explanation of the phonetic difference, it is known that the Kitan language did have an alveolo-palatal affricate without aspiration (see, for instance, *ǰau* ‘hundred’) which could substitute a Middle Chinese affricate without aspiration. It is also known that the assembled script has a grapheme for the non-Kitan phoneme ʒ as in the name of Empress Rényi 仁懿. This phonogram ʒ is modified from ʒ the phonogram of the voiceless sibilant š.

³⁰ Cf. Shimunek 2017: 67, 198.



appears in the ‘small script’ as 今卡尺伏 *pu.su.wa.ñ* ‘proper name; name of a tribe’ in *Liáoshǐ*, ch. 31, and, according to Wittfogel and Fêng (1949: 543), ‘development’, connecting it with Manchu *fusen* ‘propagation’ etc. However, the Kitan word has back vowels,³¹ while Manchu *fusen* has *fuse-*, a front vowel stem.

Despite the great progress achieved by Chinggeltei, Liu Fengzhu, Daniel Kane, and many other devoted scholars³² in the decipherment of Kitan written monuments there are still too many ambiguous readings, dubious etymologies,³³ hasty or desperate identifications. I hope my present experiment with Kitan ‘stone’ and ‘bird of prey’ is not one of them. Although a good deal is done, a good deal remains to be done in this very complex but fascinating field of Kitan language, culture and history.³⁴

³¹ It is sure that Kitan had a kind of vowel harmony, but some details remain to be clarified. For instance, the character 矣 *úr* occurs in words of back and front vowels, such as *n.am.úr* ‘autumn’ and *úr.ge* (cf. Kim & Kim 2019: 129a), or the character 干 *ul* in 亥干 *u.ul* ‘winter’ (Mong. *ebül*) and 干並 *ul.ga.ai*. This may remind us of the multiple function of the Manchu grapheme *u* as well as the digraph *waw+yod ü* (Ligeti’s *ö*) in words like *χūsun* ‘force’, *üren* ‘memorial tablet, (religious) image’, *ülen* ‘house’, and *Ület* ‘Ölöt’. Cf. also the restricted vowel harmony of Daur.

³² See the extensive bibliography of authors and publications that appeared in the twentieth century on Liao and Jin history in Liu Pujiang 2003, the reference list in Qing–Wu–Ji, I, 50–81 (here Zaitsev’s nationality should be changed from ‘Soviet’ to Russian), and Kim & Kim 2019: 473–501 (in the latter, Juha is not the surname, but the given name of Janhunen).

³³ For instance, 伏考 *ñ.iau*, read **ñaw* ‘sibling, child’ || Mong. *nuyun* ‘(male) child’ (Shimunek 2017: 290 etc.), semantically dubious; the Kitan word means ‘sibling, brother or sister’ only (Daur *noon/nion* ‘male child’ || Mong. *nuyun*; Daur *ninio/nioonio* ‘baby, small child’ < Manchu *nionio* ‘pupil of the eye’ also an expression of affection used by adults to small children’, cf. also Cincius 1975: v. I, 644a, ‘зрочок, зеница ока; глазочек мой, деточка, крошка (ласковое обращение к очень маленьким детям)’. If ‘baby’ is the primary meaning, the Manchu word is semantically comparable to Mong. *keiken cēcegei*, *keiken nidün*, Buriat *xiüügen nūden*, and Khalkha *xiüüxen xaraa* ‘pupil of the eye’; ‘child’ is *b.q.*, compared with Mong. *baya* ‘little’, a plausible conjecture, cf. Bur. *baga* ‘malyš, baganar / malyši, deti, detvora’ (Čeremisov 72 a, b); Modern Mong. (*xiüxed*) *bayačūd* ‘children’ and Ulaanbaatar slang *bayā*, vocative, ‘hey, you kid!’ Phonetically and semantically dismissible is the comparison of *l.iu-* ‘to die’ with Turk. *öl-* ‘to kill’ and Mong. *ölbere-* ‘to starve’ (Róna-Tas 2017: 195), for this Mongol word, cf. also Mongol *ölös-* ‘to be hungry’ < *öl* ‘food’ etc., with the privative suffix *-s*, as in *umdayas-* ‘to be thirsty’ < *umdayan* ‘beverage’. (The honorific verb for an emperor’s death is read as *l.iu.rén* by Kane 2009: 91. Shimunek 2017: 246–247 reconstructs the stem as *liwr-*.) In Kara 2005: 18, I too, though more or less rightly read 矣 as *uei*, based on the Kitan transcription 九矣 *g.ui* of Chin. 國 *guó*, Old Mandarin *gue*, in ‘Phags-pa script *kué*, in Uyghur script Middle Mongol *gui*, but wrongly interpreted it as a negative noun, cognate to Daur *uwei*, Mong. *ügei*, instead of reading **ui* or *üi* ‘action, deed’ that reads in the phrase 矣 矣 伏 *ui eu.ñ*, Chin. 無事 *wú shì* ‘without business, at leisure’, of the Langjun Xingji inscription (1134). For this Kitan negative word, cf. also Shimunek 2014: 97; Wu 2018: 391; Kim & Kim 2019: 105a.

³⁴ I am grateful to the Chinese, Mongol and Japanese scholars, among them first to the late Professor Chinggeltei (who once was my guest in Budapest and whose guest I was in Kökeqota, where in a lecture I proposed the reading *gur* ‘state, empire’ and *daur-* ‘middle’ instead of *guan* and *duan(da)*): from them I received important monographs and source materials. My thanks due also to Ms. Wen-ling Liu of the East Asian Collection, H. B. Wells Library, Bloomington, IN, for helping me obtain several Chinese papers quoted in this article. I also thank the peer reviewer’s useful corrections. I did not accept all the proposed changes, and here I try to explain why. I read **naima* with a short vowel coda for the logogram ‘8’, because it seems that Kitan had such codas in *čal.a* ‘stone’, *š.au.a* ‘bird of prey’, *t.q.a* ‘chicken’, *tau.li.a* (or *tau.il.a?*) ‘hare’, maybe, also in *ñ.qa* (if not *ñ.ag*) ‘dog’, *b.qa* (if not *b.aq*) ‘child’ (is a question if 力 had a two-way reading, *aq* and *qa*, or even *qo*), *na.ga* ‘maternal uncle’. (In Qing–Wu–Ji 2017, III, 1625, the logogram ‘eight’ is read as *naim*, in Kim & Kim 2019: 38, *niam*.) For 並 I read *ga* instead of *ha*, because I suppose that there was no phonemic difference between a weak velar stop and a weak velar spirant before a back vowel, but this is still another open question. Ákos B. Apatoczky, who has read the draft of this paper, also suggested some useful corrections. From him I learned that Ji Shi’s Mongol name is Batu, but I only added the Mongol names of authors writing in Chinese when the Chinese name transcribes a Mongol one. Andrew Shimunek was kind to read my text and offer detailed comments, proposing helpful corrections and additions, most of those I incorporated into the present version.



REFERENCES

- APATÓCZKY, Ákos B. 2009. *Yiyu. An indexed critical edition of a sixteenth-century Sino-Mongolian Glossary*. Folkestone, Kent, UK: Global Oriental.
- BǎO Yǔzhù 宝玉柱 2005. 'Qidān xiǎozì 183 hào, 227 hào yuánzì yánjiū 契丹小字183号227号原字研究 [Investigations of Kitan small script characters nos. 183 and 227]'. *Zhōngyāng Mínzú Dàxué xuébào* 中央民族大学学报 (Zhèxué shèhuì kēxué bǎn 哲学社会科学版) 2005/2: 130–136.
- BULUČILAFU *et al.* 1984. *Jėgün Yuyur kelen-ü üges* [Eastern Yogur glossary]. Kökeqota: Öbör Mongyol-un arad-un keblel-ün qoriy-a.
- BÙHÉ 布和 [BÖKE] & LIÚ Zhàoxióng 刘照雄 1982. *Bǎo'an yǔ jiǎnzhì* 保安语简志 [Concise description of the Bao'an language]. Beijing: Mínzú Chūbǎnshè.
- ČĚN Nai Siūng [陳乃雄] *et al.* 1985. *Boo An kelen-ü üges* [Bao'an glossary]. Kökeqota: Öbör Mongyol-un arad-un keblel-ün qoriy-a.
- ČEREMISOV, Konstantin M. [Черемисов, Константин М.] 1973. *Бурятско-русский словарь. Буряад-ород словарь*. Москва: Советская энциклопедия.
- CHINGELTEI/QĪNGGÉ'RTÀI, 1959. *Měnggǔ yǔ Bālin tǔyǔ de yǔyīn hé cífǎ* 蒙古語巴林土語的語音和詞法 [Phonology and morphology of the Baarin subdialect of the Mongol language]. Ed. by the Delegation of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (for the Congress of Mongolists held in Ulaanbaatar).
- CHINGELTEI 2002. 'On the Problems of Reading Kitan Characters.' *Acta Orientalia Hung.* 55: 99–114.
- CHINGELTEI [Činggeltei]/QĪNGGÉ'RTÀI 清格尔泰, LIÚ Fèngzhù 刘鳳翥, CHÉN Nǎixióng 陳乃雄, Yú Bǎolín 于寶麟, XÍNG Fùlǐ 邢復禮 1985. *Qidān xiǎozì yánjiū* 契丹小字研究 [Research into the Kitan small script]. Beijing: Zhōngguó Shèhuì Kēxué Yuàn chūbǎnshè.
- CHINGELTEI/QĪNGGÉ'RTÀI with the assistance of Wú Yīngzhé 吳英喆 [OYUNČI] 2002. *Qidān xiǎozì shìdú wèntí* 契丹小字釋讀問題 [Problems of interpreting and reading the Kitan small script]. Dōngjīng [= Tokyo]: Guóli Yà Fèi yǔyán wénhuà yánjiūsùo.
- CINCIUS, Vera I. [Цинциус, Вера И.] *et al.* 1975. *Сравнительный словарь тунгусо-маньчжурских языков*. v. I. Ленинград: Наука.
- CLAUSON, Gerard 1972. *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- COBLIN, W. South 2007. *A Handbook of 'Phags-pa Chinese*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- ČOIMA, Š. (ed.) 2002. *Qad-un ündüsün quriyangyui altan tobči* [Origin of the Rulers. The Shorter Golden Chronicle]. Ulaanbaatar: Centre for Mongol Studies. National University of Mongolia.
- DE RACHEWILTZ, Igor 1972. *Index to The Secret History of the Mongols*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.
- DE SMEDT, Albert – MOSTAERT, Antoine 1933. *Dictionnaire monguor-français*. Pei-p'ing: Monumenta Serica.
- ENGKEBATU *et al.* 1984. *Dayur kelen-ü üges* [Daur vocabulary]. Kökeqota: Öbör Mongyol-un arad-un keblel-ün qoriy-a.
- ENHEBATU 恩和巴图 1995. *Mǎnyǔ kǒuyǔ yánjiū* 满语口语研究 [Research on Spoken Manchu]. Huhehaote: Nèi Měnggǔ Dàxué Chūbǎnshè.
- HAENISCH, Erich 1933. *Monggo han sai da sekiyen. Die Mandschufassung von Secen Sagang's Mongolischer Geschichte*. Leipzig: Harrassowitz.
- HAENISCH, Erich 1955. *Eine Urga-Handschrift des mongolischen Geschichtswerks von Secen Sagang (alias Sanang Secen)*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Jì SHÍ 既实 1990. "Jiūlín mùzhì" shìdú shùgé 《九邻墳志》释读述格 [Reading the Jiulin Epitaph]. *Dōng-běi dìfāngshǐ yánjiū* 東北地方史研究 [Research on Northeastern Local History] 1991: 4 (quoted here from LIU-KANG 2014: 559).



- KANE, Daniel 1989. *The Sino-Jurchen Vocabulary of the Bureau of Interpreters*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.
- KANE, Daniel 2004. 'Note on *Čisdeben.' *Central Asiatic Journal* 48: 223–225.
- KANE, Daniel 2009. *The Kitan Language and Script*. Leiden: Brill.
- KARA, György 1979. 'Qaradaš.' *Acta Orientalia Hung.* 33: 59–63.
- KARA, György 2005. *Books of the Mongolian Nomads. More than Eight Centuries of Writing Mongolian*. [Translated from the Russian by J. R. KRUEGER, revised and expanded by the author.] Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.
- KIM Wihyŏn 金渭顯 & KIM T'aegyŏng 金泰京 2019. *Kōran soja sajŏn* 契丹小字辭典 [Kitan small script dictionary]. Sŏul: ChosunMedia (Cosŏn Nyusi Pireisi = News Press).
- LIGETI, Louis 1963. 'Notes sur le vocabulaire mongol d'Istanbul.' *Acta Orientalia Hung.* 16: 107–194.
- LIGETI, Louis 1964. 'Les fragments du *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* mongol en écriture 'Phags-pa. Mongol préclassique et moyen mongol.' *Acta Orientalia Hung.* 17: 239–262.
- LIGETI, Lajos 1986. *A magyar nyelv török kapcsolatai a honfoglalás előtt és az Árpád-korban* [The Turkic relations of the Hungarian language before the Conquest and under the Árpád dynasty]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- LIÚ Pūjiāng 刘浦江 (ed.) 2003. *Èrshījī Liáo Jīn shǐ lùn zhù mùlù* 二十世纪辽金史论著目录 [Catalogue of twentieth century publications on Liao and Jin history]. Shànghāi: Císhū Chūbǎnshè.
- LIÚ Pūjiāng 刘浦江 & KĀNG Péng 康鹏 (eds.) 2014. *Qīdān xiǎozì cíhuì suǒyǐn* 契丹小字词汇索引 [Index of Kitan small script words]. Beijing: Zhōnghuá shūjū.
- MARTIN, Samuel 1961. *Dagur Mongolian*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.
- MARTIN, Samuel, LEE Yang Ha and CHANG Sung-Un 1967. *A Korean-English Dictionary*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- MNT = *Mongqolun Niuča Tobčaañ*, *The Secret History of the Mongols*.
- Mongyol Kitad Toli* [Mongol-Chinese Dictionary] 1999. Kökeqota: Öbör Mongyol-un yeke suryayuli-yin keblel-ün qoriy-a.
- MOSTAERT, Antoine 1941–1944. *Dictionnaire ordos* 1-3. Pei-p'ing: Catholic University of Peking; New York / London: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1968.
- PELLIOT, Paul 1930. 'Les mots mongols dans le Korye Sä.' *Journal Asiatique* CCXVII: 253–266.
- QASBAŪATUR *et al.* 1986. *Mongyor kelen-ü üges* [Monguor vocabulary]. Kökeqota: Öbör Mongyol-un arad-un keblel-ün qoriy-a.
- QĪNGGÉ'RTÀI 清格尔泰 [CHINGGELTEI], WÚ Yīng-zhé 吴英喆 [OYUNČI], JĪRÙHÉ 吉如何 [JIRÜKE] 2017. *Qīdān xiǎozì zàiyánjiū* 契丹小字再研究 [Further research on Kitan small script] I–III. Huhehaote: Shèhuì kēxué chūbǎnshè. [= QING–WU–JI 2017]
- RAMSTEDT, Gustav J. 1935. *Kalmückisches Wörterbuch*. [Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae, 3.] Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- RÁSONYI, László and Imre BASKI 2007. *Onomasticon Turcicum. Turcic Personal Names*. I–II. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.
- RÓNA-TAS, András and Árpád BERTA† 2011. *West Old Turkic. Turkic Loanwords in Hungarian*. Parts I–II. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- RÓNA-TAS, András 2017. 'Khitán Studies 1. The graphs of the Khitan Small Script, Part 2.' *Acta Orientalia Hung.* 70: 135–188.
- RYBATZKI, Volker 2006. *Die Personennamen und Titel der mittelmongolische Dokumente*. Helsinki: Yliopisto Oy.
- [SEČENČOYTU =] SĪQĪNCHÁOKÈTÚ 斯钦朝克图 1990. *Kāngjiā yǔ yánjiū* 康家语研究 [Research on the Kangjia language]. Shànghāi Yuándōng Chūbǎnshè.



- SHIMUNEK, Andrew 2014. 'A new decipherment and linguistic reconstruction of the Kitan-Chinese bilingual inscription of 1134 A.D.' *Acta Orientalia Hung.* 67: 97–118.
- SHIMUNEK, Andrew 2017. *Languages of Ancient Southern Mongolia and Northern China*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- SŪN Zhú 孙竹 *et al.* 1990. *Měnggǔ yǔzú yǔyán cídiǎn* 蒙古语族语言词典 [Dictionary of the languages of the Mongol language family]. Xīnīng: Qīnghǎi Rénmín Chūbǎnshè.
- TAKEUCHI, Yasunori 2011. 'Kitan Transcription of Chinese Velar Initials.' *Acta Orientalia Hung.* 64: 13–23.
- TUŌTUŌ/TOQTO 脱脱 *et al.* 2016. *Liáoshǐ* 遼史 [History of the Liao]. Běijīng: Zhōnghuá Shūjú.
- TOYODA Gorō 豊田五良 2015. *Kittan moji kenkyū ronshū* 契丹文字研究論集 [Collected Works of Toyoda Goro on the Khitan Script and Language]. Ed. TAKEUCHI Yasunori 武内康則. Kyōto: Shōkadō Shoten.
- WÁNG Hónglì 王弘力 1990. 'Qidān xiǎozì gōngdiàn jiě' 契丹小字宫殿解 [Explanation of the Kitan Small Script Words for 'Palace']. *Nèi Měnggǔ Dàxué xuébào* 内蒙古大学学报 (Zhéxué shèhuì kēxué bǎn 哲学社会科学版) 1990/1: 61–63.
- WITTFOGEL, Karl & Chia-shêng FĒNG 1949. *The History of the Chinese Society: Liao, 907–1125*. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society.
- WU Yingzhe [Oyunči] 2018. 'The Last Words of Xiao Chala Xianggong in Khitan Script.' In: Ákos B. APATÓCZKY, Christopher P. ATWOOD and Béla KEMPF (eds.) *Philology of the Grasslands. Essays in Mongolic, Turkic, and Tungusic Studies*. Leiden / Boston: Brill, 384–393.
- WU Yingzhe and Juha JANHUNEN 2010. *New Materials on the Khitan Small Script. A Critical Edition of Xiao Dilu and Yelü Xiangwen*. [Corpus Scriptorum Chitanorum, vol. I.] Folkestone: Global Oriental.
- YŪ Wonsoo 2011. *A Study of the Mongol Khamnigan Spoken in Northeastern Mongolia*. Seoul: Seoul National University Press.
- YŪ Wonsoo, KWON Jae-li, CHOI Moon-Jeong, SHIN Yong-kwon, BORJIGIN Bayarmend, Luwsandorj BOLD, 2008. *A Study of the Tacheng Dialect of the Dagur Language*. Seoul: Seoul National University Press.

