# Remarks on the ethnonym Khitan

The form, the functions and the usage of the ethnic name Khitan, on which Kane wrote very conclusive comments (Kane 2009, 162-165), seemed to be one of the few problems already solved by the latest research. The name as ethnic and dynastic denotion is written in the Khitan Small Script (KSS) as 𐲎𐲅(365.144) and Romanised usually as <qid.ún> (K79, EX11). The name occurs also as 𐲎𐲅𐲁 (365.144.339) <qid.ún.i> (JU2-2, JU12-8) and 𐲎𐲁 <qid.i> (K165, D2-21, X9-20, Y1, KL2-2, KL1-4, JU23-6, JU1-4, KC1-4, HU1-3), the latter two, according to Kane in genitive case, according to Wu—Janhunen (2010,58) the final *–i* is a suffix with attributive function[1].

There are, however, some unsolved problems. Firstly: why has the name of the Khitans a transcription, Romanised as qid*un*, while nowhere do we find the name *Khitun, *Khidun or the like. The Chinese transcription is *Qidan*, 契丹 LMCh *khjiaj*, EMCh *khɛj* and LMCh, EMCh *tan.* The Old Tibetan sources have *ge-tan* and *ge-tang* (Pelliot No. 1283, L 559)[2], *Ge* is a possible transcription of a foreign back vocalic /qï/. In Tangut we find *ɕhji' tā'* (Jaques 2010 163). This is pointing to a rather palatalized initial /q'/, and a nasalized final /tã/. The Jurchen name of the Khitans is *hi.tan* (Kane 2009, 163). To the Middle Mongolian name *qitad* I will come back.

The name is of Turkic origin, or at least was used by the Old Turks. From the time of the Orkhon inscriptions almost two hundred years elapsed until the foundation of he Liao-Khitan Empire in 907. Theoretically during these years the name may have had changed its proper meaning and represent another ethnic group. But this is unlikely, most probably the name Qitań denoted already in the 8th century the same ethnic unit as later from the 10th century on.The name is written in the OT inscriptions 𐰴𐰚𐰇𐰃 QITŃ with letters used only in back vocalic words. The intial is the special graph 𐰃 for /ïq/ and /qï/, 𐰇<i> is neutral because the Old Turkic script had only one sign for /i/ and /ï/, 𐰚<t> is a graph for /t/ used only in back vocalic words, and 𐰴 <ń> is neutral to the front:back opposition. This rare sign appears also in the name of Tonyuquq [Tońuquq]. The name Qïtań occurred in the Köli Chor (AD 720-725), the Tonyukuk (AD 726), the Kül Tegin (AD 732), the Bilge Kagan (AD 734/735), and the Shine Usu (AD 759) inscriptions (see T. Tekin, 1968, 345, Berta 2004). This /ń/ sound changed in most Old Turkic dialects to –y, hence the name form *Qïtay* which later became, as it is well known, the East Slavic name of China. In some other OT dialects it was depalatalized and became *–n*, hence the

[1] They suppose that the genitive –i may be the same as the attributive –i.

[2] URL1http://otdo.aa.tufs.ac.jp/search/kwic.cgi, I owe many thanks for this reference to Tsuguhito Takeuchi. The Text is well known, the Report of the five Uighur envoys, published first by Bacot (1956), later by Moriyasu (1977,1980) and commented by Ligeti (1971) and others. The text runs: /(1559)… ge tang zhes bgyi ba mchiste / rgyal po ge tan gyi kha gan (1560)zas dang chos gyang/. As we see the name occurs in two forms, with final –n and –ng.

name form *Qïtan.* The history of the final can be observed also e.g. in the case of the Old Turkic name of the 'sheep' *qoń*. The word *qoń* occurs in this form in the Köl tegin, Bilge kagan, the Ongin, the Suji inscriptions and the Irk Bitig. The form *qoy* appears as early as the Old Uighur texts. Kāshgrī remarked that in Argu the word was *qon* while in all other Turkic dialects *qoy* (ed Dankoff—Kelly II, 1982, p. 219). In his Introduction Kāshgarī adds other similar Argu words as *čigan* 'a poor man', *qanu* 'which thing?' instead of *čigay* and *qayu* (*op.cit*. p.84). From these dates we can conclude, that the original final *–ń* and its dialectal equivalents *–y* and *–n* existed in Old Turkic at least from the 9th century on.[3] On the Mongolic side we meet *qonin* with loss of the second *–n* in East Yugur and all Shirongol languages. Dagur has *xɔn*$^{y}$ (HN 419). The original final *–ni* is a reflex of the Turkic *ń.*

Turning now to the first syllable, Chinggeltei (2002, 29) read the graph 𘖵 (365) as *qït*, Kane (2009,78-79) as *qid*, Wu and Janhunen (2010, 269) as *qid*, Aisin Gioro (2012) as *qita.*

The reading of 𘖵(365) with *–d*, based on the present Chinese transcription of the name is unfounded. The Early and Late Middle Chinese reading of 丹 is with a non-aspirated /t/[4]. Thus Chinggeltei and Aisin Gioro were right, 𘖵(365) has to be read either as **qit** or **qita.**

Kane (163) wrote, that 𘖵(365) is apparently a combination of 𘖖 (373) 'GREAT' and 𘖗 (243) HEAVEN. which are perhaps derived from Chinese *da* 大 'great' and *tian* 天 'heaven'. This is not impossible, but in any case it would be an exception, since the KSS graphs are otherwise never derived from Chinese characters, or if the similarity is great, neither the phonetic nor the semantic part of the Khitan graph is the same as those of the Chinese „original".

Controversial is the reading of the second syllable 𘖘(144). Kane (K51) summarized the earlier readings which include <u>, <da>, <in> and <en>, <ən>. The reading <ún> seems to be ensured by such equivalencies as 𘖚𘖘 (311.144) <b.ún> = 𘖙 (288) <bun> in **Holebun**, **Allebun**, **ciisdebun**, and **Dorolebun**, all four written in two ways, with <b.ún> and <bun>. The marker of the past tense –bUn (Kane 147) is also sometimes written as <b.ún>, in other cases as <bun>, or <b.ń>. 𘖘(144) is read as <ún> also in **üne** <ún.e>𘖘𘖍(144.348), 𘖘𘖎 (144.109) 'now, present'[5]. The word **ünen** 𘖘𘖌 <ún.n> (144.251) is not a genitive case of *üne*, but cognate of Mo *ünen* 'true, truth'[6].

On place of (144) 𘖘<ún> we would expect one of the graphs <an>𘖕 (011), <an> 𘖐(127) or <án> 𘖓 (290). One way out would be, if we would read the two graphs 𘖚𘖘 (311.144) not as

[3] Erdal dealt with the problem of /ń/ in Old Tirkic in detail (Erdal 2004, 71-75).

[4] The Chinese opposition aspirated:not aspirated was different from the Mongolic opposition. I will come back to this question.

[5] **ünen, üne** 𘖎𘖌/𘖍 (144.251/348) <ún.n/e> 'now, present' (K24, 109), Mo *egün* 'oblique stem of the demonstrative pronoun *ene*, e.g. *egüne* ' dative-locative, 'therefore', HN s.v. *ene,* only in EYu ~~*ün-*~~.

[6] **ünen** 𘖘𘖏 (144.361) <ún.én>'truth, truthful' (D32-16, 34-26) |Mo *ünen* 'truth, justice, true, real', HN *ünen*. DaE *unun.*

<b.ún> but as <bu.n>. This would open the possibility that in 𘲢𘲡(365.144) we have to read <qita.n>, that is **qïtan**.

A similar case occurs with the word *qatun*. It is the logograph 𘲠(333) 'QUEEN' and read as **qatun**. But we find 𘲠𘲡𘲤(333.144.251) <qatun.ún.n> (K52), which has to be in genitive case. Most probably it has to be read as <qatu.n.n>. This would mean that 𘲡(144) has to be read, if in final position and after an open syllable, as *–n* or as an *–n* with a *shwa* before *-ᵊn*.

We remember that in the Orkhon inscriptions the final of the name was a palatalised <ń>. KSS has the signs 𘲛(221), 𘲜 (222) for <ń> <ńi>, <iń> but they are not used to render the name of the Khitans, however I assume that this is due to a secondary change. Final –ń was on the way of disappearing in Khitan. In some cases there can be observed alternations pointing to this fact[7].

Wu and Janhunen (WJ 58, 158) claimed that the final -i in 𘲢𘲣 (365.339) <qita.i>, and in 𘲢𘲡𘲣 (365.144.339) <qita.n.i> may be a marker of attributive function, and not the marker of the gentive case. In line 9 of the inscription X we have <qita.i jau.qu.ui us.g> 'Khitan and Chinese script/language[8]', where the form 𘲢𘲣 (365.339) may be read as **qita-i** and 𘲢𘲡𘲣 (365.144.339) as **qitan-i.**

In the Zhong inscription (line 6, Kane 136),𘲢𘲡𘲣 𘲦𘲧𘲨𘲩𘲪(366.144.339 334.097.140 068.334) <qita.n.i g.úr.én us.gi> ' the script of the Khitan State', Qitani is the qualifier of the word State (**gür**) which is in genitive case.

In the newly published Yelü Jue inscription ( AD 1071, JU) we find 𘲢𘲫 (365.244) (Wu 2012, 169, JU 24-14, also K 141). The second graph 𘲫(244) is Romanised as <s>, sometimes read with <e> or <ə>. Kane (141) read <qid*:se*> 'the Khitans'. The plural suffix **–se** occurs in **gürse** 'countries', **nonse** 'generations'. In these cases the suffix follows a consonant. But in the case of Khitan **ay** 'year' we find the plural **ayis.**

**ay**[1] 𘲬(122) 'year'<ai> (K:128), <αi> (C:107), pl. **ayis** 𘲬𘲫 (122.244) <ai.s>, <SIX ai.s> 'six years' (K204), (X14-24, 35-22), Sh2 | Mo *oi* 'full year, anniversary, birthday, while 'father ' has the plural **ayid:**

**ay**[2] 𘲬 (122) <ai> 'father' (K:97), <αi> (C:107), pl. **ayid** 𘲬𘲭 (122.254) <ai.d> (C:107, X3-29, 6-16, 14-29,17-33,19-15,32-34).[9]

In Mongolic there exists a plural in *–s* which is joining a category of nouns ending in vowels or i-diphthongue (Poppe 1964, 70). In LM there is only one exception, *kümün* 'man' which has the plural *kümüs* and not **kümüd.* The word is present also in Khitan

[7] In some cases final *-n* and final -ń are alternating as in the suffix of the past tense or nominaliser *–boń* and *–bon*.

[8] Though Khitan **üsüg,** an Uighur lonword ultimately of Sogdian origin, had the original meaning 'letter, script' in Khitan it got also the meaning 'language'.

[9] WJ p. 109 <ai.s> 'fathers' in error.

**kū, 几**, (178) <ku> ‘man, person’ genitive case **küwün 几只火**(178.372.273) <ku.u.un> (K56, WJ75) |PMo **kümün* > **kü'ün*[10] > **kü/n,* Da *huu*, dial *kuu* ‘person’, HN *küün,* DaE *xu:*, Sh 101: *küwün.* The word is frequent in Khitan but until now no plural form appeared[11].

The plural –s of clan or ethnic names was frequent in Middle Mongolian. In the SH we find Barula (§ 46) and Barulas (§§ 46, 120), further Činos (§§ 129,207), Geniges (§ 47, 122, 210), Hindus (§§ 261, 264), Uvas/Huvas (Merkit) (§§ 102, 105, 109, 111, 117), Ikires (§§ 120, 129, 141, 202). Qabqanas (§ 239), Qabturgas (§2 47), Qorulas ((§§ 120, 141, 182), Solongkas (§274), Tubas (§ 239). Most of the Mongolian words which have an *–s* plural are denoting living creatures exceptions as *agula, agulas* ‘mountain’, *üge, üges* ‘word’ are rare[12].

In normal case nouns ending in *-n* take the plural *–d* as *qaġan* > *qaġad*. This is also the case in Khitan. The plural of *qaġan* is **qaġad 巫 业 丈** (053.051.099) <qa.ha.ad> (K140).

The phrase in which the form **qita-s** occurs is the following (JU24-14/16):

**qitas jien yu ciauqu dz jien liu šin šitülge'e**

**买 仝 犵 礻 兴 永 号 丈 支 犵 礻 屮 丙 爻 雨 爻 村 屮 本 夯**

(365.244 152.140 289 162.362.118.104 152.140 261.019 028.018 028.058.261.112.109)

<qita.s ji.en iú c.iau.qú°.dz$_2$ ji.en l.iu š.in š.mi.l.ge.e$_2$>

Khitan **jien** has the meaning ‘among’, (X2-22, 12-17, 4-24, 28-22, WJ 141, 146).

Khitan **yu** has the meaning ‘is not, was not’ (K37). It is the base of the word **yucen 万 兴 尘** (020. 289.156) <y.iú.cen> ocurring in the L inscription (K 188, Line 5, Sh2, p. 102). The translation of Shimunek ‘collapse’ is acceptable, perhaps ‘going to ruin, got annihilated’.

**cauqu** c.iau.qu **永 号 丈**(162. 362.118) (L12, JU 24-17), **邪 余 火** <jau.qú.ui> (015.246.262) (X9-21) ‘Chinese’, the origin of the Khitan word is most probably Chinese *zhongguo* 中國, according to Shimunek (Sh2 114) the Khitan form is an Old Manchu dialectal form of the name[13]. It is true that in normal case Chinese final *–ng* is preserved in Khitan. In the transcription of the Chinese title *dianzhongshi* the syllable *zhong* is transcribed as <ju.uŋ> **子 火** (149.345) (K262). On the other hand we know that the final –ŋ disappeared as early as the Late Tang times in some North-Western Chinese dialects (already so Maspero 1920, recently see Kane K232). The nasal finals disappeared in the Xixia transcriptions leaving behind a nasalised vowel (K237). The Chinese final *–ŋ* is disappearing in certain positions also in the Uighur transcriptions (Csongor 1952, 93-95, 1955, 254-255), which is different in the Tibetan transcriptions (Takata 1988, 414). However, as Professor Zieme in a letter of 2016.06.21 wrote me, the normal Uighur transciption of Chinese

[10] The reconstruction of the original second consonant may be *–b-* cf. *köbegün* ‘boy’, and the original change may have been *b>w>m* the nasalisation was due to the final –n.

[11] May be that in some cases <ku.u.un> is a collective unit and not a genitive case.

[12] It is not impossible that *agula* was supposed to be equal with the spirit of the mountain, and *üge* was the living word e.g. of the khan.

[13] On the final of *zhong* see Baxter 1992,525, Baxter—Sagart, 2014, 155.. The Jurchen and Manchu name of the Chinese is *nikan*. Kane 1989, 281, Norman 1967, 301.

*zhong* 'middle' is *cwnk,* that is in this category the final *–ng* was preserved in the Uighur transcriptions of contemporary Chinese. In any case the Khitan transcription <ciau>, <jau> has to reflect a NW Chinese dialect where the final *–ng* was lost. That this form came directly from Chinese or through a mediation of a third language as e,g, Tangut has to be investigated in the future.

The Chinese word *guo* 國 had a final *–k* in EMch and LMCh, but later this changed to an*–ui* final, which is reflected by the Khitan transcription. The „normal" Khitan transcription of Chinese *guo* is 𘥁𘤪 (334.262) <g.ui> (K254, WJ141). This means that the form cited above 𘠽𘠈𘤪 <jau.qú.ui> (015.246.262) (X9-21) is a precise rendering of the Liao-Chinese pronunciation of the second consituent, but not of the first. More problematic is the last part of another rendering of the name of the Chinese: **cauqu** <c.iau.qu> 𘦂𘠰𘥑 (162. 362.118) (L12, JU 24-17). In Khitan –<qu> is a marker of adjectives. It occurs at the end of the names for colors (**liauqu** 'red', **siauqu** 'blue', **nigu** 'yellow, gold(en)') and also in other cases as e.g. **masqu** 'first'or SMALL.qu 'young'. Thus the second part of **cauqu** <c.iau.qu> 𘦂𘠰𘥑 may be an adjectiviser, and not the reflex of Chinese *guo*.

The Khitan <$dz_2$> 𘥈 (104) and its allograph 𘤅 (354) <dz> is normally transcribing Khitan /j/ as in **dzigen** 'right side' or **dzürer** 'second', written also with 𘦂<c->. I assume that Khitan <$dz_2$> 𘥈 (104) is here the transcription of Chinese *zhi* 職 'office' which is otherwise transcribed by Khitan 𘥋 (087) (K258). It is possible, that the graph 𘥋(087) is only an allograph of 𘥈(104).

Khitan 𘠞𘡜 **Liu** (261. 019) <l.iu > is a name. Liu occurs in several transcriptions of Chinese names, as in D1-24 Sie Liu, X9-10 Ong Liu, X10-3 Ngu Liu and in the Inscriptions JU, KL, PU, HU ten times.

**šin** 𘤇𘡖(028.018) <š.in>may be the transcription of Chinese *shen* 'spirit, god, divine' 神 LMCh *ṣhin,* or rather a Chinese loanword in Khitan, see also Wu (2012, 258 gloss).

***šimilge'e** 𘤇𘠋𘠞𘣱𘥌(028.058.261.112.109) <ši.mi.l.ge.$e_2$> is occurring in Y9: <ši.mi.l.er.ei>, Y14: <ši.mi.le.ge.er>, Y28: <ku.ū.un ši.mi.le.g.er>, Y29: <ši.mi.le.ge.ei>. further in JU5-18 <š.mi.le.g.ey>, in HU 12-38: <ši.mi.le.g.er> and JU9-17: < š.mi.l.g.én>. The basic word would be **šimi-*, - *lege* or *-lge* is a factitive suffix, and the verb occurs as converb in *-ei* or in past tense in *–er*. The first problem is the reading of 𘠋 (058). Only Kane reads this graph as <mi> without any evidence, or example (K41). Chinggeltei, Wu—Janhunen, Aisin Gioro consider it as not deciphered[14]. Interesting is the vertical line on the right side, which is not an isolated case. We find <ju> 𘠈(149) and <ja> 𘠉 (150), <?> 𘠊(271) and <bú> 𘠋 (176), <$bú_2$> 𘠋 (272), <?> 𘠋 (177), <a> 𘠌(189) and <á> 𘠍 (190). These examples point to the fact that the vertical line has a diacritic function, maybe signalising another shade of the wovel. The

[14] The graph (058) is not very frequent. It occurs in Wu 2012 once in the text HU20-42 as an isolated word after <gi> and before <xe.zu.ge.en>.

graph in question is 木(054) and to this was added the vertical line: 朱 (058). Unfortunately the graph (054) is also problematical. It was only Kane, who read it as <mu> with a ? mark. On (K41) he remarked, that 木(054) is 'mnemonic" for Chinese *mu* 木 'tree'. It looks like, that the reading <mi> was based on the reading of Chinese 木, but this is unusual. We have one more graph which may pertain to this group, namely 朱 (217), which was read as <do> by Chinggeltei, Kane, Wu—Janhunen and as <od> or <do> by Aisin Gioro. It occurs in the expresion 非朱 (279.217) 'in the time' where <po> is 'time' (Mo *on* < *hon* < **pon*) and <do> is the dative-locative suffix used as a temporal marker (Mo *–dur*). If 木(054), 朱 (058) and 朱 (217) pertain together then the three graphs may have an oral, dental stop in common that is either /d/ or /t/. If this can be corroborated by other data, then the basic word would not be **šimi-**, but e.g. **šitü-.** The word may be connected with Mo *sitü-* 'to worship, to believe in, to trust, to rely on, depend on'. The actual verbal derivate was **sitülge-** or **šitülege-** and its converbal form **sitülge'ey** 'being worshiped' (see Mo. *sitülge* 'faith, belive, object of worship'). This word is one of the oldest known Mongolic word.

In the Beishi[15] (written around AD 629) in the report on the Ruanruan it is described that in the time of the Emperor Nuo-gai 那蓋 Fu-tu 伏圖 married the wife of the former kagan Dou-lun 豆崙. She bore six children among them Chou-nu 醜奴. Chou-nu ( r. 508-521) had a son Cu-hui 粗惠, who got lost and disappeared. The wife of a noble Ruanruan person by the name Shi-dou-hun diwan 是豆渾 地萬, pretending that she has a good connection with the spirits in the heaven, got an intimate position in the house of Chou-nu. She claimed that the boy is in the heaven, but she can get him back. After two years she built a tent, fasted seven days to purify herself and in the morning the boy, Cu-hui, was in the tent. The boy later admitted that he always was hidden in the tent of the shamaness. The mother of the boy revealed the story to Chou-nu, but Chou-nu defended the shamaness and let kill the boy. We are here interested in the name of the shamaness. Her name can be reconstructed as *šitügen*[16] while *diwan* may have sounded something like **teimuan* which is not clear for me. Its Chinese meanings 'earth, ground' and 'ten thousand' make no sense. In any case the name or the title of the shamaness may have been *Sitügen*, the sacred, the saint, i.e. the Shamaness.

The expression **šin šitülge** then is a binom where the first member is a Chinese and the second a Khitan word. This type of word pairs is common in contemporary Uyghur.

[15] I have used the translation published by B. Csongor (1993)

[16] I have dealt with this name in my unpublished Introduction to Mongol Linguistic History. The Early MCh pronunciation of the first syllable may have been *dʐiə̆/dʐi* and in this case the name has to be reconstructed *jitügen* 'the second wife etc.' see my remarks in *Acta Orientalia Hung*. 2016, p 127. The initial became ʂʱi in Late Middle Chinese. I assumed that there is a wordplay among the two words *jitügen* and *šitügen*.

If the reconstruction of the Khitan word as **šitülge'e** instead of **šimülge'e** is correct, we can translate the above sentence as: "neither among the Khitans, [nor] among the Chinese officiers was anybody more excellent/divine/sacred than Liu".

Thus the plural of the ethnonym Khitan was **qitas**, or perhaps **qïtas**. This is different in Middle Mongolian. In the Secret History of the Mongols (SH) the name occurs eight times (§§ 53,132,247, 250, 153, 266, 271, 272), always as *kitad.* In all cases it denotes the Jürchens, a group of which occurs also in the SH as Jürced. The form **qitas** as a plural may pertain to a singular **qita** or **qitan**.

The reading **qita** is appearing in the Sino-Mongol wordlist, the Hua yi yiyu (Hy ed. Mostaert/ Rachewiltz--Schönbaum 1977). The name was glossed with *hanren* 漢 人[17], and was written with two Chinese characters *qi* 乞 and *ta* 塔. Though the character *ta* was read in MCh with a final –*p*, in the time of the Hy (1389) it already lost its final consonant and the Yuan pronunciation was /$t^h$*a*/, thus this Yuan name form has to be read as **qita.** The plural form is transcribed as *qitati* 乞塔 惕. and the pronunciation was **kitat.** The genitive case of the plural is written *qi ta dun* 乞塔敦 read **qitad-un.**

In a later Sino-Mongolian Glossary, the *Beilu yiyu*, compied in the 16th century and edited by Apatóczky (2009) the bisyllabic transcription of the name occurring in the Hy is repeated. Apatóczky (2009, 119) remarked that this "...form seems to be incomplete... „. This may be possible, but perhaps there is another solution.

The bisyllabic form occurs also in the sources written in Arabic or Persian. These data have been collected by Pelliot (1959, 216-229). The earliest form written as *Chata* occurred in the document describing the Mongol campaign against the Musulmans which was translated from Arabic into Latin at Damietta in 1221 (Pelliot 1959, 216 cites the edition of Zarncke, *Der Priester Johannes*, II, 50). The name refers to the Khara Khitans. The next data occurring as *Chata* or *Chatha* is from 1248 and denotes North China (Pelliot, 1959, 216). The form *Hata* occurs in the *Gestes des Chiprois* (Pelliot, 1959, 216). The various forms in Arabic script were written as Ḫṭa خطا or Ḫṭay خطای and also Qtā قتا (Pelliot 1959, 220). Until now these shorter forms were treated as orthographical variants.

To summarize: The Khitans did not call themselves *Qidun. The ethnonym occurs in the Khitan texts in the forms **qitan**, **qitai** and **qitas**. Qita may have been the singular. This is similar to Mo *kümün,* pl. *kümüs*, which has a singular **kümü* and this is present in Mongolian as *küü*, *keü* 'boy, son' and in Khitan as **kǖ**. Qitan, or more precisely Qïtan is the self nomination as a collective unit Qïtai is the Uighur name of the Khitans, but it is also used by the Khitans in attributive function, and Qitas is the plural form. In any case we have to state, that until present

[17] The earliest occurrence of the ethnonym *Khitad* for the Chinese in a Mongolian text occurs in the Inscription of Jigüntei, dated of 1338, edited by Cleaves 1951, l. 36:*Qitad-un ayalgus-ača Monggol-un ayalgus-tur nayiragulgan orčilugad…*

no plural form in *–d*, i.e. **qitad* appeared in the Khitan texts. In this respect Middle Mongolian Qitad is reflecting a different structure.

Janhunen (2003, 13) has remarked that cases like *morin* 'horse' pl. *morid* and *noqai* 'dog', pl. *noqad* „...suggest that plural formation may originally have been part of a more general system of nominal classes, in which both the singular and the plural were marked by distict class suffixes." What we see here in case of the name Khitan is the opposition singular: collective unit : plural. This may have been a system used originally with the class of livings.

## Abbreviations

D = *Xiao Dilu* inscription (AD 1114) in WJ,

EMCh= Early Middle Chinese according to Pulleyblank (1991)

EX= *Eulogy for Empress Xuanyi*, (AD1101), in K 214-223

Hy= the Sino-Mongol ian Glossary *Hua yi yiI yu* according to Mostaert (1977)

HN= H. Nugteren (2011),

HU = The *Xiao Hudujin* inscription (1091), in Wu 2012

JU= the *Yelu Jue* inscription (AD 1071), in Wu (2012)

K = Kane 2009

KC =The cover of the *Xiao Huilian* inscription (AD 1080) in Wu 2012

KL = The Xiao Huilian inscription (AD 1080), in Wu 2012

KSS= Khitan Small Script

L = The *Langjun* inscription in K, L2=The Langjun inscription according to Sh2,

LMCh=Late Middle Chinese according to Pulleyblank (1991),

OT = Old Turkic

SH=The *Secret History of the Mongols* (cited after Rachewiltz 2004)

Sh=Shimunek (2011),

Sh2 =Shimunek (2014),

WJ = Wu Yingzhe – J. Janhunen (2010),

X=the *Yelü Xiangwen* inscription (AD 1091) in WJ

Y=the *Yelü Dilie* inscription (AD 1092) in K.

## References

Aisin Gioro ( 2012): Reconstruction of phonetic values of Khitan small scripts and concerning problems, *Ritsumeikan bungaku*, 2012-07, 1-28. http://www.ritsumei.ac.jp/acd/cg/lt/rb/627/627PDF/yosimoto.pdf

Apatóczky, Á. B.(2009): Yiyu 譯 語 (Beilu yiyu 北盧譯語 ), An Indexed Critical Edition of a Sixteenth-century Sino-Mongolian Glossary, Folkeston.

Bacot, J. (1956):Reconnaisance en Haute Asie septentrionale par cinq envoyés ouïgours au VIIIe siècle, *Journal Asiatique* 244, 137-153.

Baxter, W. H. (1992): *A Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology*, Berlin – New York.

Baxter, W. H. —L. Sagart (2014): *Old Chinese reconstruction, version* 1.1 (20 September 2014), URL1

Berta, Á. (2004): *Szavaimat jól halljátok...*[Listen well to my words], Szeged.

Chinggeltei (2002a): On the Problems of Reading Kitan Characters. *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 55, 99-114.

Chinggeltei (2002b): *Qidan xiao zi shidu wenti* [Problems of the decipherment of the Khitan Small Script], Tokyo.

Cleaves, F. W. (1951): The Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1338 in memory of Čigüntej. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 14:1-2. 1-104. XXXII t.

Csongor, B. (1952): Chinese in the Uighur Script of the T'ang-Period. *Acta Orientalia Hungarica.* II. 73-121

Csongor, B. (1954): Some More Chinese Glosses in Uighur Script. *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* IV. 251-257

Csongor, B. (1993): Kínai források az ázsiai avarokról (Chinese sources on the Asian Avars), Budapest 1993

Dankoff, R.—Kelly, J. (1982-1985):Mahmūd al-Kāšγar*: Compendium of the Turkic Dialedcts I-III*, Duxbury.

Erdal, M. ( 2004): *A Grammar of Old Turkic*, Leiden—Boston.

Janhunen, J. (2003): *The Mongolic Languages*, London and New York.

Jaques, G. (2010): Review on Kane 2009. *Diachronica* 27, 157-165.

Kane, D. (1989):*The Sino-Jurchen Vocabulary of the Bureau of Interpreters*, Bloomington,

Kane, D. (2009):*The Kitan language and Script*, Leiden - Boston.

Ligeti, L. (1971): Á propos du »Rapport sur les rois demeurant dans le nord«. *Études tibétaines dédiées á la mémoire de Marcelle Lalou*. Paris. 197, 166-189.

Maspero, H. (1920): La dialecte de Tch'ang-ngan sous les T'ang, *Bulletin de lÉcole francçaise d'Extréme-Orient* 20, 1-119, 121-124.

Moriyasu, T. (1977):Á propos des tribus de l'Asie Centrale qui se trouvent dans les sources tibéátains:Drugu et Hor, Journal of Asian and African Studies 14, 1-48.

Moriyasu, T. (1980): La nouvelle interprétation des mots *hor* et *ho-yo-hor* dans le manuscrit Pelliot tibétain 1283. *Acta Orientalia Hung.* 34 (1980) pp. 171-184.

Mostaert, A. (1977): *La matériel mongole du Houa I I iu* 華 夷 譯語 *de Houng-ou* (1389), (eds I. de Rachewiltz—A. Schöhnbaum), Bruxelles.

Norman, K. (1967): *A Manchu—English Dictionary*, Taipei.

Nugteren, H (2011): *Mongolic Phonology and the Qinghai-Gansu Languages*, Utrecht.

Pelliot, P. (1959): *Notes on Marco Polo I-II*, Paris.

Pulleyblank, E. G. (ed.) (1991): *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese and Early Mandarin*. Vancouver.

Rachewiltz (1974): Some remarks on the Khitan clan name *Yeh-lü ~ i-la*, *Papers on Far Eastern History* 9. 187-204.

Rachewiltz, de, I. (2004): *The Secret History of the Mongols. A Mongolian Epic Chronicle of the Thirteenth Century*. Vols. 1-2. Leiden - Boston.

Shimunek, A. (2011): Review of Kane 2009. *Acta Orientalia Hungarica*, 101-111.

Shimunek, A. (2014): A New Decipherment and Linguistic Reconstruction of the Kitan – Chinese Bilingual Inscription of 1134 A.D. *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 67, 97-118.

Tokio Takata (1988): *A Historical Study of the Chinese Language Based on Dunhuang Materials*. The Hexi dialect of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries, Tokyo [in Japanese].

Tekin, T. (1968): *A Grammar of Orkhon Turkic*, Bloomington.

Wu Yingzhe (2012): *Interpretation Problems of the Newly Discovered Khitan Small Script Materials* Tokyo, (In Japanese).

Wu Yingzhe – J. Janhunen (2010): *New Materials on the Khitan Small Script,* A critical edition of *Xiao Dilu* and *Yelü Xiangwen*, Folkestone.