Werk

Titel: Remarks on the ethnonym Khitan

Autor: Róna-Tas, András

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2016

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0020|LOG_0025

Kontakt/Contact

Remarks on the ethnonym Khitan

András Róna-Tas

The paper deals with the Old Turkic and other forms of the ethnonym Qïtan. In some recent works the ethnonym of the Khitans occurring in the Khitan Small Script is transcribed as <qid.un>. The author claims that in Khitan there was a tripartite opposition for nouns denoting living things: singular, collective unit, and plural. The ethnonym accordingly had three forms, *qïta, qïtan* and *qïtas*. The plural in *-s* is different from the Middle Mongolian form *qïtad,* but is in accordance with other Khitan plurals in *-s*.

András Róna-Tas, Csörsz u.1, H-1123 Budapest, Hungary. E-mail: aronatas3@t-online.hu

The form, functions and usage of the ethnic name Khitan, on which Kane has written very authoritative comments (Kane 2009, 162–165), appears to be one of the few problems conclusively solved by recent research. When used as an ethnic and dynastic denotation, the name is written in the Khitan Small Script (KSS)[1] as 求叐 (365.144) and is usually Romanised as <qid.ún> (K79, EX11). The name also occurs as 求叐关 (365.144.339) <qid.ún.i> (JU2-2, JU12-8) and 求关 (365.339) <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 are in genitive case, and according to Wu & Janhunen (2010: 58) the final *-i* is a suffix with attributive function.[2]

There are, however, some unsolved problems. Firstly: why has the name of the Khitans, a transcription, been Romanised as qid*un*, while we nowhere find the name *Khitun, *Khidun or the like. The Chinese transcription is *Qidan*, 契 丹 LMCh *k^h it*, EMC *k^h it* and LMCh, EMCh *tan*. The Old Tibetan sources have *ge-tan* and *ge-tang* (Pelliot No. 1283, L 559).[3] *Ge* is a possible transcription of a foreign back vocalic

---

2   They suppose that the genitive *-i* may be the same as the attributive *-i*.
3   URL1 http://otdo.aa.tufs.ac.jp/search/kwic.cgi. I owe many thanks for this reference to Tsuguhito Takeuchi. The text, the Report of the five Uighur envoys, is well known and was first published by Bacot (1956), then by Clauson (1957), and by Moriyasu (1977, 1980) and commented upon by Ligeti (1971) and others. The last paper on the text is by

/qï/. In Tangut we find *tɕhji ' tā '* (Jacques 2010: 163). This points to a rather palatalised initial /q'/, and a nasalised final /tã/. The Jurchen name of the Khitans is *hi.tan* (Kane 2009: 163). I will return later to the Middle Mongolian name *qitad*.

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 before the foundation of the Liao-Khitan Empire in 907. Theoretically, during these years the name may have changed its proper meaning and come to represent another ethnic group. But this is unlikely; most probably the name Qitań already denoted in the 8th century the same ethnic unit as it did later, from the 10th century on. The name is written in the OT inscriptions ꓱꙅꓡꓯ QITŃ with letters used only in back vocalic words. The initial sign is the special graph ꓯ for /ïq/ and /qï/, ꓡ <i> is neutral because the Old Turkic script had only one sign for /i/ and /ï/, ꙅ <t> is a graph for /t/ used only in back vocalic words, and ꓱ <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 Küli Chor (720–725), the Tonyukuk (726), the Kül Tegin (732), the Bilge Kagan (734/735), and the Shine Usu (759) inscriptions (see 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 is well known, the East Slavic name of China. In some other OT dialects it was depalatalised and became -*n*, hence the name form *Qïtan*. The history of the final can also be observed in the case of the Old Turkic name for 'sheep', *qoń*. The word *qoń* occurs in this form in the Kül tegin, Bilge kagan, the Ongin, the Suji inscriptions and the Irk Bitig. The form *qoy* appears as early as the Old Uighur texts.[4] Kāshgharī remarks that "in Argu" the word was *qon* while in all other Turkic dialects *qoy* (Dankoff & Kelly (eds.) 2, 1982: 219). In his Introduction Kāshgharī 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.[5] On the Mongolic side we meet *qonin* 'sheep' and, with loss of the second -*n*, in East Yugur and all Shirongol languages. Dagur has *xɔnʸ* (HN 419). The original final -*ni* is a reflex of the Turkic *ń*.

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

Venturi, F. (2008). 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*. The ethnonym Khitan is later rendered in Tibetan sources as *Khyi-tan*, *Khri-tan*, *Khri-gdan* and *Khri-thang*. This has then been distorted to *Gri-bdag* 'knife-lord'; see Kværne (1980: 99) and Martin (1994: 530).

4   For the most recent investigations on the Runic sign, see Guzev & Telicina (2016).
5   Erdal has dealt with the problem of /ń/ in Old Turkic in detail (Erdal 2004: 71–75).

The reading of 𐰬 (365) with a final -d confronts us with some problems. The contemporary Chinese segmented the name as *qi-tan*. 契 丹 LMCh, EMCh *kʰit*[6] and LMCh, EMCh *tan*. Here the dental stop /t/ of the initial of the second syllable is a non-aspirated obstruent. This initial /t/ later coincided with the /tɕ/ but remained in opposition with /tʰ/.[7] In the unlikely case that the Khitan scribes analysed the name as *kit-an*, the dental stop was in the syllable-final position. In Mongolic (and also in Middle Chinese) there was no phonemic opposition of -t: -d in final position. In this case we have to read the graph 𐰬 (365) as *qit*, and this was the reading of Chinggeltei (2002: 29). Finally it is possible that the Khitan scribes considered the graph 𐰬 (365) as a logograph and read it *kita*. This is the reading of Aisin Gioro (2012). Whatever the case may be, the reading /t/ in the Khitan word is secured by the Runic 𐱃 <t>, further by the Tibetan, Tangut and Arabic transcriptions which all would have had possibilities to write <d>. Thus the graph has to be read either *qit* or *qita* and not *qid*.

Kane (163) wrote, that 𐰬 (365) is apparently a combination of 又 (373) 'GREAT' and 矢 (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 as a rule not 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".

The reading of the second syllable 叉 (144) is controversial. Kane (K51) summarised the earlier readings, which include <u>, <da>, <in> and <en>, <ən>. The reading <ún> seems to be ensured by such equivalencies as 丹叉 (311.144) <b.ún> = 屮 (288) <bun> in the clan names *Holebun, Allebun, Dorolebun* and in *ciisdebun* 'the relatives by blood', 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>. 叉 (144) is read as <ún> also in *üne* <ún.e> 叉茶 (144.348), 叉夯 (144.109) 'now, present'.[8] The word *ünen* 叉公 <ún.n> (144.251) is not a genitive case of *üne*, but a cognate of Mo *ünen* 'true, truth'.[9]

Instead of (144) 叉 <ún>, we would expect one of the graphs <an> 釆 (011), <an> 奀 (127) or <án> 屮 (290). One way out would be if we would read the two graphs 丹叉 (311.144) not as <b.ún> but as <bu.n>, in other words the vocalisation

---

6   The Chinese 契 has also a reading LMCh *khjiaj* and RMCh *khɛjh*.

7   The two stops /t/ and "t with a voiced aspiration" /tɦ/ were most probably unvoiced weak stops.

8   *ünen, üne* 叉屿 (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 *ɯn-*.

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

here would pertain to the reading of the graph 冉 <b>-. This would open the possibility that in 关王 (365.144) we have to read <qita.n>, that is *qïtan*.

A similar case occurs with the word *qatun*. It is the logograph 乐 (333) 'QUEEN' and read as *qatun*. But we find 乐王公 (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 王 (144) has to be read, if in final position and after an open syllable, as -*n* or as an -*n* with a *shwa* before -ᵊ*n*.

We should recall that in the Orkhon inscriptions the final of the name was a palatalised <ń>. KSS has the graphs 伏 (221), and 伏 (222) for <ń> <ńi>, <iń>, but they are not used to render the name of the Khitans. I assume that this is due to a secondary change, namely that final -*ń* was on the verge of disappearing and merging with -*n* in Khitan. In some cases <ń> ~ <n> alternations can be observed, pointing to this fact.[10]

Wu & Janhunen (2010: 58, 158) claim that the final -*i* in 关关 (365.339) <qita.i>, and in 关王关 (365.144.339) <qita.n.i> may be a marker of attributive function, and not the marker of the genitive case. In line 9 of the inscription X we have <qita.i jau.qu.ui us.g> 'Khitan and Chinese script/language',[11] where the form 关关 (365.339) may be read as *qita-i* and similarly 关王关 (365.144.339) may be read as *qitan-i* as in the following case.

In the Zhong inscription (line 6, Kane 136), *qitan-i gür-en üsüg* 关王关 兀夾和共九 (365.144.339 334.097.140 068.334) <qita.n.i g.úr.én us.g> '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 关今 (365.244) (Wu 2012, 169, JU 24–14, also K 141). The second graph 今 (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* 'years' in opposition to *ay* 'father' which has the plural marker -*d*:

ay¹ 丰 (122) 'year'<ai> (K:128), <αi> (C:107), pl. *ayis* 丰今 (122.244) <ai.s>, <SIX ai.s> 'six years' (K204), (X14-24, 35-22), Sh2 | Mo *oi* 'full year, anniversary, birthday'.

ay² 丰 (122) <ai> 'father' (K:97), <αi> (C:107), pl. *ayid* 丰公 (122.254) <ai.d> fathers' (C:107, X3-29, 6-16, 14-29, 17-33, 19-15, 32-34).[12]

---

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

11 Though Khitan *üsüg*, an Uighur loanword ultimately of Sogdian origin, had the original meaning 'letter, script', in Khitan it also developed the meaning 'language'.

12 WJ p. 109 <ai.s> 'fathers' in error.

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

kū, 几 (178) <ku> 'man, person' genitive case *küwün* 几尺火 (178.372.273)
<ku.u.un> (K56, WJ75) |PMo **kümün* > **kü'ün*[13] > **kü/n,* Da *huu,* dial *kuu* 'per-
son', HN *küün,* DaE *xu:,* Sh 101: *küwün.* The word is frequent in Khitan, but until
now no plural form has appeared. It may be possible that in some cases *küwün*
几尺火 (178.372.273) <ku.u.un> is not in genitive case, but appears as a collective
unit, and the marker being -*n*. This is the case in *ay mo-n* 羊丙公 (122.021.251)
'parents' (D17-10), where -*n* is not the suffix of the genitive case, but the marker of
the collective unit.

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 (§247),
Qorulas ((§§ 120, 141, 182), Solongkas (§274), and Tubas (§ 239). Most of the
Mongolian words with an -*s* plural denote living creatures; exceptions such as *agula,
agulas* 'mountain', *üge, üges* 'word' are rare.[14]

Normally Mongol nouns ending in -*n* take the plural -*d*, such as *qaġan > qaġad,
morin* 'horse' > *morid*. This is also the case in Khitan. The plural of *qaġan* is *qaġad*
坐坐方 (053.051.099) <qa.ha.ad> (K140); the plural of *miŋan* 'thousand (as a mili-
tary unit)' is *miŋad* 癸方 (207.099) <miŋ.ad>.

  1. The phrase in which the form *qita-s* occurs is the following (JU24-14/16):
qita-s jien yu ciau-qu dz jien liu šin šitülge'e
吴仐 �苟为 兴朵号夬夊玴为屮丙爻雨爻利屮�export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°.dz₂ ji.en l.iu š.in š.mi.l.ge.e₂>
Khitan *jien* has the meaning 'among' (X2-22, 12-17, 4-24, 28-22, see WJ 141,
146).
Khitan *yu* has the meaning 'is not, was not' (K37).[15]

---

13 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 being due to the final -*n*.
14 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.
15 Wu (2012: 258) reads a Chinese name Wu 烏, but <yu> cannot be the transcription of *wu*,
   which had a glottal stop as initial in LMCh and EMCh. <yu> is the base of the word
   yucen 万兴尘 (020. 289.156) <y.iú.cen> occurring in the L inscription (K 188, Line 5,
   Sh2, p. 102). The translation of Shimunek 'collapse' is acceptable, or perhaps 'going to
   ruin, being annihilated'.

following: "I came across Pelliot's analysis of the Mongol term 'Jauqut' in Notes on Marco Polo 1 (228–229). Pelliot did not know at the time that Khitan 'Cauqu' is very likely the source of 'Jauqut', which has essentially the same meaning. Pelliot does note that in the Secret History of the Mongols, there is a Mongol word that is twice transcribed into Chinese as 'Zhaoguan' 趙官 and translated as 'Song' (i.e. the Song dynasty). He suggests that 'Jauqut' is the plural form of a Mongolic transliteration of 'Zhaoguan', i.e., '*Jaugon', and that both this transliteration and its plural form date from the time of the Northern Song and are therefore Khitan in origin. If Pelliot is correct, then one could argue for: 'Zhaoguan' => '*Cauqun' => 'Cauqu/Cauqui' => '*Cauqut' (plural) => 'Jauqut'".

Beyond any doubt Pelliot was the first to point to the possibility that *jau* may come from the surname of the Southern Song dynasty. The name of the ruler of the Southern Song dynasty in fact occurs in §251 of the SH in the form *Jau Gon*, or more precisely *Jao Gon*. This is the name of Emperor 寧 宗 *Ning Zong* (r. 1195–1224). The name and its various transcriptions have been dealt with by de Rachewiltz (2004: 908–909). The MMo form is a transcription of Chinese *Zhao guan* 趙官, 'the Zhao in-office, the Emperor Zhao'. Rachewiltz remarks that *guan*, which usually has the meaning 'office, official', is used in the given context as meaning 'emperor', which is probable. The idea, however, that a Mongolian form of the name of the Song Emperor became the Khitan name of the people of (South) China is unusual. Aisin Gioro's suggestion that *jau/cauqu* may go back to "Zhaoguo" 趙國, that is, 'the State of Zhao' also raises problems.

The Chinese word *guo* 'country' 國, as we have seen above, had a final -*k* in EMCh and LMCh, but this later changed to an -*ui* final. The "normal" Khitan transcription of Chinese *guo* 國 is 九火 (334.262) <g.ui> (K254, WJ141). This means that the form cited above 禿余火 <jau.qú.ui> (015.246.262) (X9-21) may have been a precise rendering of the Liao-Chinese pronunciation of the second constituent. More problematic is the last part of another rendering of the name of the Chinese: *cauqu* <c.iau.qu 朱芍关(162. 362.118) (L12, JU 24-17). In Khitan -<qu> is a marker of adjectives. It occurs at the end of the names for colours (*liauqu* 'red', *siauqu* 'blue', *nigu* 'yellow, gold(en)') and also in other cases such as *masqu* 'first' or SMALL.qu 'young', *qigu* 'demonstrative distant pronoun, adjective form'. Thus the second part of *cauqu* <c.iau.qu> 朱芍关 may be an adjectiviser and not the reflex of Chinese *guo*.

The Khitan <dz₂> 夂 (104) and its allograph 夂 (354) <dz> normally transcribe Khitan /j/, as in *dzigen* 'right side' or *dzürer* 'second', also written with 朱 <c->. I assume that Khitan <dz₂> 夂 (104) is here the transcription of Chinese *zhi* 職 'office' which is also transcribed by Khitan 友 (087) <jï> (K258).[20] It is possible, that the graph 友 (087) is only an allograph of 夂 (104).

---

20 See Chinese *chengzhi* 承旨 Khitan 朱仈夂 (162.264.354) <ci.ŋ dz>.

Khitan 㐅丙 *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 ten times in the Inscriptions JU, KL, PU, HU.

šin 㐅丙 (028.018) <š.in>may be the transcription of Chinese *shen* 'spirit, god, divine' 神 LMCh *şhin,* or rather a Chinese loanword in Khitan.[21]

*šimilge'e 㐅利卆杢夯 (028.058.261.112.109) <ši.mi.l.ge.e₂> 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 利 (058). Only Kane reads this graph as <mi>, without any evidence or examples (K41). Chinggeltei, Wu & Janhunen, Aisin Gioro consider it as not deciphered.[22] An interesting feature is the vertical line on the right side, which is not an isolated case. We find <ju> 子 (149) and <ja> 利 (150), <?> 女 (271) and <bú> 刳 (176), <bú₂> 刈 (272), <?> 利 (177), <a> 为 (189) and <á> 利 (190). These examples suggest that the vertical line has a diacritic function, maybe signalling another shade of the vowel. The graph in question is 木 (054) and to this was added the vertical line: 利 (058). Unfortunately the graph (054) is also problematic. It was only Kane who read it as <mu> with a ? mark. On (K41) he remarked, that 木 (054) is a "mnemonic" for Chinese *mu* 木 'tree'. It looks as if 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 expression 扑朱 (279.217) <po.do> '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), 利 (058) and 朱 (217) belonging 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 was *sitülge'ey* 'being worshiped' (see Mo. *sitülge* 'faith, belief, object of worship'). This is one of the oldest known Mongolic words.

In the Beishi[23] (written around AD 629) in the report on the Ruanruan it is described that in the time of the Emperor Nuogai 那蓋, Fu-tu 伏圖 married the wife of the former kagan Doulun 豆蕎. She bore six children, among them Chounu 醜奴. Chounu (r. 508–521) had a son Cuhui 粗惠, who got lost and disappeared. The wife

---

21 According to Wu (2012: 258) <š.in> or more precisely <l.iu š.in> is a name, Liu Shin, occurring in the Liao shi.

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

23 I have used the translation published by Csongor (1993).

of a noble Ruanruan person by the name of Shidouhun Diwan 是豆渾 地萬, pretending that she had a good connection with the spirits in heaven, received an intimate position in the house of Chounu. She claimed that the boy was in heaven, but that she could get him back. After two years she built a tent and fasted seven days to purify herself, and the next morning the boy, Cuhui, was found in the tent. The boy later admitted that he had been hidden in the tent of the shamaness the entire time. The mother of the boy revealed the story to Chou 國 nu, but Chounu defended the shamaness and had the boy killed. We are here interested in the name of the shamaness. Her name can be reconstructed as *šitügen*[24] 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 binomial construction where the first member is a Chinese and the second a Khitan word. This type of word pair is common in contemporary Uyghur.

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 officers was anybody more excellent/divine/sacred than Liu".

Thus the plural of the ethnonym Khitan was *qitas*, or perhaps *qïtas*. The case 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, the name of whom occurs in the SH in a few cases also as *Jürced*. As a plural form, *qitas* may pertain to a singular *qita* or *qitan*.

The reading *qita* appears in the Sino-Mongol wordlist, the *Hua yi yiyu* (Hy ed. by Mostaert & Rachewiltz & Schönbaum 1977). The name was glossed with *hanren* 漢 人,[25] 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 had already lost its final consonant and the Yuan pronunciation was /tʰa/. 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*, compiled in the 16th century and edited by Apatóczky (2009), the bisyllabic transcription of the name occurring

---

24 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 *dziə̆/dzi* and in this case the name has to be reconstructed as *jitügen* 'the second wife, etc.'; see my remarks in *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* (Róna-Tas 2016: 127). The initial became *šħi* in Late Middle Chinese. I assume that there is a wordplay among the two words *jitügen* and *šitügen*.

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

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 also occurs in the sources written in Arabic or Persian. These data have been collected by Pelliot (1959: 216–229). The earliest form written as *Chata* occurs in a 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* 2, 50). The name refers to the Khara Khitans. The next instance of *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 خط or Ḫṭay خطای and also Qtā قتا (Pelliot 1959: 220). Until now these shorter forms has been treated as orthographical variants.

To summarize, the Khitans did not call themselves *Qidun*. The singular form of the ethnonym was *qïta*. It 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 *kū.* *Qitan,* or more precisely *Qïtan,* is the self nomination as a collective unit.[26] *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.[27] In any case we have to state that until the present no plural form in *-d,* i.e. **qitad* has appeared in the Khitan texts. In this respect Middle Mongolian *Qitad* reflects 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 distinct class suffixes". What we see here in the case of the name Khitan is the three-fold opposition singular—collective unit—plural. This may have been a system originally used with the class of living beings.

Abbreviations

D =	*Xiao Dilu* inscription (AD 1114) in WJ,
Da =	Dagur acc. to Martin 1961
DaE =	Dagur acc. to Enkhbat (in HN)
EMCh =	Early Middle Chinese according to Pulleyblank (1991)
EX =	*Eulogy for Empress Xuanyi,* (AD 1101), in K 214–223

26 The final *-n* marking a collective unit is only one type of the *-n* finals in Mongolian.

27 In a recently published paper, Atwood (2015) points out that in Middle Mongolian there existed a tripartite opposition *-0, -i, -n* as in *magu, magui, magun* and quoted also the ethnonym Khitan, which occurs as "*Kitan, Khitay and Khat*". The recognition of the tripartite system is important; however *qitai* and *qitan* are reflecting two Old Turkic dialects.

Hy =	The Sino-Mongolian 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)
LMo =	Literary Mongolian
OT =	Old Turkic
PU =	The *Yelü Pusuli* inscription(1105) in Wu 2012
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 2009. 愛新覺羅烏拉熙春女真契丹學研究 [Jurchen and Khitan Studies]. Kyoto.: Shokado shoten.

Aisin Gioro 2012. 契丹小字の音価推定及び相関問題 Kittan koaza no onga suitei oyobi sōkan mondai [Reconstruction of phonetic values of Khitan small scripts and relevant problems]. *Ritsumeikan bungaku* 2012, 07, 1–28 (In Japanese). 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: Global Oriental Ltd.

Atwood, Ch. P. 2015. The Qai, the Khongai and the names of the Xiōngnú. *International Journal of Eurasian Studies* 7, 35–63.

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: Mouton de Gruyter.

Baxter, W. H. & Sagart, L. 2014. *Old Chinese reconstruction. Version* 1.1. (20 September 2014).URL1. http://ocbaxtersagart.lsait.lsa.umich.edu/BaxterSagartOCbyMandarinMC 2014-09-20.pdf

Berta, Á. 2004. *Szavaimat jól halljátok...*[Listen well to my words]. Szeged: József Attila Tudományegyetem.

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: Research Institute for Language and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.

Clauson, G. 1957. A propos de manuscrit Pelliot tibétain 1283. *Journal Asiatique* 245, 11–24.

Cleaves, F. W. 1951. The Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1338 in memory of Čigüntej. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 14: 1–2, 1–104. 32 t.

Csongor, B. 1952. Chinese in the Uighur script of the T'ang-Period. *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 2, 73–121.

Csongor, B. 1954. Some more Chinese glosses in Uighur script. *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 4, 251–257.

Csongor, B. 1993. *Kínai források az ázsiai avarokról* [Chinese sources on the Asian Avars]. Budapest: Orientalisztikai Munkaközösség.

Dankoff, R. & Kelly, J. 1982–1985. Mahmūd al-Kāšγar: *Compendium of the Turkic dialects* 1–3. Duxbury: Harvard University Printing Office.

Erdal, M. 2004. *A grammar of Old Turkic*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Guzev, V. G. & Telicina, L. L. 2016. O fonemnom značenii znaka Ǝ v runičeskix tjurkskix nadpisjax. In: Telicina, N. & Šena, N. (eds.) *Aktualnye voprosy tjurkologičeskix issledovanij. K 180 letiju kafedry tjurkskoj filologii Sankt-Petersburgskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta.* Saint Petersburg: Sankt-Petersburgskij Gosudarstvennyj Universitet. Kafedra Tjurkskoj Filologii. 45–49.

Janhunen, J. 2003. *The Mongolic languages*. London & New York: Routledge.

Jacques, G. 2010. Review on Kane 2009. *Diachronica* 27, 157–165.

Kane, D. 1989. *The Sino-Jurchen vocabulary of the Bureau of Interpreters*. Bloomington: Indiana University. Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies.

Kane, D. 2009. *The Kitan language and script*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Kværne, P. 1980. Mongols and Khitans in 14th century Bonpo texts. *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 14, 85–104.

Ligeti, L. 1971. Á propos du "Rapport sur les rois demeurant dans le nord". *Études tibétaines dédiées á la mémoire de Marcelle Lalou*. Paris: Libraire Adrien Maisonneuve. 166–189.

Martin, D. 1994. Tibet at the Center: A historical study of some Tibetan geographical conceptions based on two types of country-lists found in Bon histories. *Tibetan Studies. Proceedings of the 6th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Fagernes 1992*, 1. Oslo: The Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture. 517–532.

Maspero, H. 1920. La dialecte de Tch'ang-ngan sous les T'ang. *Bulletin de l'École française 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 tibétains: 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 Hungarica* 34, 171–184.

Mostaert, A. 1977. *La matériel mongole du Houa I I iu* 華 夷 譯語 *de Houng-ou* (1389). Ed. by Rachewiltz, I. de & Schöhnbaum, A. Bruxelles: Institute Belge des Haute Études Chinoises.

Norman, K. 1967. *A Manchu—English dictionary*. Taipei: No publisher.

Nugteren, H. 2011. *Mongolic phonology and the Qinghai-Gansu languages*. Utrecht: LOT.

Pelliot, P. 1959. *Notes on Marco Polo* 1–2. Paris: Librairie Adrien-Maisonneuve.

Poppe, N. 1964. *Grammar of Written Mongolian.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Pulleyblank, E. G. (ed.) 1991. *Lexicon of reconstructed pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese and Early Mandarin.* Vacouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Rachewiltz, de, I. 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* 1–2. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Róna-Tas, A. 2016. Khitan studies 1. The graphs of the Khitan Small Script 1. General remarks. Dotted graphs, numerals. *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 69: 2, 117–138.

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: Sobunsha. (In Japanese).

Tekin, T. 1968. *A grammar of Orkhon Turkic.* Bloomington: Mouton and Co.

Venturi, F. 2008. An Old Tibetan document on the Uighurs. A new translation and interpretation. *Journal of Asian History* 42: 1, 1–35.

Wu Yingzhe 2012. *Interpretation problems of the newly discovered Khitan Small Script materials.* Tokyo: Research Institute for Language and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies. (In Japanese).

Wu Yingzhe & Janhunen, J. 2010. *New materials on the Khitan Small Script. A critical edition of* Xiao Dilu *and* Yelü Xiangwen. Folkestone: Global Oriental Ltd.