The authors review the past century of Khitan studies in Hungary and introduce the latest achievements in this field in China, the country that has become the centre of academic scrutiny for the decipherment of Khitan script in recent decades. Arranged in a chronologic order for the first time, an exhaustive list of the main known Khitan Small Script monuments is also included, followed by a selected bibliography of essential pieces on Khitan studies.
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Ever since the publication of Louis Kervyn’s articles (1923a, 1923b) about the discovery of Khitan language inscriptions, the decipherment of the scripts of the founders of the Liao dynasty has been in the foreground of Asian studies. The past almost hundred years of their study have seen climaxes and low points, but much to the de-

---

* The authors wish to express their gratitude to Professors András Róna-Tas and Mária Ivánics for making their visits to China possible, Professors Wu Yingzhe, Sun Bojun, Nie Hongyin, Bayartu, Yao Kecheng, Sechenbaatar for their invaluable help and advice during the visit and last but not least to Ms. Peng Daruhan, Mr. Jiruhe and Mr. Manduhu for their keen and tireless assistance.

1 As Daniel Kane pointed out in his overview of Khitan studies (2009b), Kervyn was lucky enough to be at the right place at the right time when the findings he described were unearthed. The scholar, however, who made the first steps in the scholarly processing of these findings was Joseph Mullie (1922). A century earlier eighteen Khitan words with mostly doubtful readings and erroneously offered cognates were published in the famous *Asia Polyglotta* by Julius Klaproth (1823, pp. 294–295).

2 There is an ongoing informal debate among scholars which English orthographic form of this ethnonym should be used in academia. Some vote for *Kitan*, others for *Khitan* and yet others for the pinyin *Qidan*. All these forms can be justified on different grounds; we are using here the Khitan form that, used in English orthography, probably stands closest to the assumed phonologic manifestation of the word.
light of the philologists of the 21st century, the scrutiny of texts found earlier and in the recent decade has taken an ascending course. Khitan studies have come a long way from a time when the mere identification of the language behind the script was not a trivial task, through stages when the Khitan Small Script was thought to be related to Uighur script\(^3\) and scholars had only scattered information on the language with glosses embedded in Chinese works. During the first fifty years of research quite a large number of smaller discoveries were made by mostly Japanese, Russian and Chinese scholars, whose enumeration would reach far beyond the limits of this paper.

The “Great leap forward” in this field in the 1970s by groups of Chinese researchers, hallmarked by the names of Professors Chingeltei and Liu Fengzhu, led to the first actual emendations retrieved from Khitan Small Script. Khitan data and corpus have been growing continuously until the present day, and in the past decades more and more studies have come to light with a goal to give a linguistic analysis to them. The amount of partially or nearly completely deciphered texts have indeed reached a critical mass, allowing experts to begin a more profound investigation of the language itself, and thus we have now theoretical conclusions, some of them more convincing than others, on the phonology, morphology and syntax of Khitan. With a number of recent works like that of Shimunek (2007), Kane (2009a), Wu–Janhunen (2010), Vovin (2011), Janhunen (2012), Zajcev (2011), Róna-Tas (2016a, 2016b) summarising our knowledge on the topic and the history of research, as well as contributing much to the “cracking” of the Khitan enigma, we now have a much more comprehensive view about Khitan language and writing than even a couple of decades ago.

This situation certainly encourages scholars to once again be preoccupied with the reading attempts of the extant data that have been put aside for some time. This trend is also accelerated by the turning up of newly discovered pieces of Khitan literacy sometimes pregnant with debates about the originality of some, but even counterfeited items – some of them produced with real craftsmanship – may be of value if they are handled with care and set serving the greater cause of academic knowledge.

Hungarian scholarship has traditionally been interested in and contributing to various fields of East-Asian philology, with a clear focus on, inter alia, historical linguistic research of the languages of the steppe area what is now belonging to Northern China and Southern Mongolia. At the dawn of the scholarly Khitan studies Professor Ligeti had summarised the contemporary knowledge and speculations on Khitan people and language in 1927\(^4\) and he also reported about the initial phases of the archaeological discoveries of Kervyn he got familiar with during his expeditions to the republican China between 1928 and 1931 (Ligeti 1933). During his long and fruitful academic activity Ligeti had always kept an eye on Khitan studies and from time to time returned to the topic (Ligeti 1950–1951, 1955, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1970). His disciples György Kara and András Róna-Tas have also contributed to the understanding of Khitan script and language. Kara’s articles (1975, 1977, 1987, 1988, 2000,

---

\(^3\) The identification of the two Khitan scripts was only done in the middle of the 1960s by Jin (1962) and Toyoda (1964).

\(^4\) That time, due to a misinterpreted sentence of the Liao shi, Khitan Small Script was thought to be identical with Uighur script and this opinion is reflected in the work of Ligeti (1927).
Recent Developments on the Decipherment of the Khitan Small Script

2005) helped taking a position to ascertain the Mongolic nature of Khitan. In 1996 he introduced the then accepted standpoints about Khitan literacy for the general public (Kara 1996). Róna-Tas (1999) in his inaugural lecture before the Hungarian Academy of Sciences analysed the parallels of the Khitan and the Hungarian social structures in the process of their settling down in the 10th century, later he identified a Khitan word of Tibetan origin (Róna-Tas 2004). His latest papers (Róna-Tas 2016a, 2016b) are providing new insights into the characteristics of the dotted and not dotted forms, the Khitan numerals as well as those of the etymology of the ethnonym “Khitan”.

With a solid record like that it was an evident endeavour to establish a more-or-less steady body in Hungary for the investigation of Khitan documents promoted by Professor András Róna-Tas. According to the plan, an independent research group of invited experts working on a voluntary basis will be set up under the aegis of the University of Szeged to concentrate on the collection, documentation and conservation of the data, providing access to them for researchers and making the synergy of their extensive expertise exploitable. For practical reasons, due to the differences in the specific characteristics of Khitan Large and Small Scripts described by Janhunen (2012, pp. 108–109), the Khitan Large Script is excluded from the scope of investigation as of now, and the research is mainly concentrated on Khitan Small Script.

As a first step towards the realisation of this plan, a temporary group has been formed of linguists (Sinologists, Mongolists, Turkologists and general linguists) to fulfil the purpose of a preparatory project, in which phase all the available data and specific literature are gathered. To facilitate this effort, the group has set up ties with the Centre for Mongolian Studies at the Inner Mongolia University, probably the largest institution in the world whose scholars are engaged with Khitan studies and which has the latest possible information about recent archaeological findings. In December 2015 the authors of this report visited the colleagues in Beijing and Huhehaote to exchange views on the current issues in the field, making photocopies of inscription rubbings, as well as to collect the most important Chinese publications issued during the past decade. Professors Sun Bojun and Nie Hongyin kindly introduced us to the collection of Khitan rubbings at the Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (中国社会科学院民族学与人类学研究所). Although during the past few years the institute’s main interest turned towards another difficult case, Tangut script namely, their impact on modern Khitan Studies should definitely be mentioned. In Huhehaote we could get an even more comprehensive insight into the frontline of the current accomplishments in this field. Under the leadership of Professor Wu Yingzhe, the pace of the emergence of new results in Khitan Studies has accelerated. The first-hand processing of the newly found Khitan texts and fragments made the Center for Mongolian Studies of Inner Mongolia University a leading authority in the decipherment of Khitan Small Script (henceforth abbreviated as KSS). A conspicuous observation we had a chance to make concerned the surprisingly young age of the scholars involved in this research, strengthening our conviction that the productive work they are doing is done by an apparently energetic and well prepared academic staff.
As a follow up to our first visit was our participation in the work of the First International Symposium on Ancient Scripts of Northern Nationalities (首届北方民族古文字研究国际学术研讨会) in December 2016 hosted by the Inner Mongolia University. This event was organised to commemorate the inauguration of the similarly named institution established to research the above-mentioned scripts. Some sixty scholars from around the world gathered for the symposium the main topic of which was the scrutiny of Khitan inscriptions with some intriguing new thoughts and suggestions on the reading of some sources.

Following our fruitful visits, in this paper we would like to offer a short summary of the Chinese achievements made after 2010, as the previously mentioned works contain detailed descriptions of those published before that year.5

* In 2010 Wu Yingzhe 吴英喆 co-authored a book with Juha Janhunen dedicated to the critical edition of two previously found epigraphic texts, the Xiao Dilu and the Yelü Xiangwen inscriptions (Wu–Janhunen 2010). This was the first time when Khitan texts were subject to a comprehensive analysis in the form of a critical edition. In the same year Wu Yingzhe published an article on the same text together with Baoyinde-ligen 宝音德力根 and Jiruhe 吉如何:《关于新发现的几件契丹文墓志》[About several recently discovered Khitan epitaphs and previously published Khitan materials]. The authors give a detailed description of the epitaphs in Nie–Sun (2010, pp. 399–403).6

Liu Fengzhu 刘凤翥 in his article《契丹小字〈耶律宗教墓志铭〉考释》[A philological study on Yelü Zongjiao’s Khitan Small Script epitaph] (Wenshi 文史 2010/4) provided a reinterpretation of the Yelü Zongjiao 耶律宗教 epitaph.

Using the Jurchen data Sun Bojun (2010) 孙伯君 in her article《契丹小字解读新探》[A new attempt at reading the Khitan Small Script] tried to reinterpret sound values and the grammatical role of some original KSS characters in the Langjun inscription.

In 2011 Wu Yingzhe issued an article《契丹小字〈迭剌部〉考释》[A textual study on the tribal name Diela in the Khitan Small Script] (Wu 2011a) in which he discussed topics of the representation of the character 部 ‘tribe’ in KSS, combining it with statements on the sound value system of the newly found Khitan Diela 迭剌 epitaph text, as well as on its contents. Speaking of the latter he argued that the 佚介 (ñ.ő.ur), 佚介 (ñ.ő.ur), 佚介 (ñ.ő.ur), 佚介 (ñ.ů.ur) KSS representation

5 The outline of this introductory part was first sketched with the kind assistance of Ms. Peng Daruhan at the Centre for Mongolian Studies, Inner Mongolia University. The list is far from being exhaustive, it rather reflects the opinion of Chinese scholars about what pieces of literature are thought to be important among them. The list was closed early 2015.

6 Liu Fengzhu, based on the names of the dynastic periods and that of the numerals in the texts, disputed the originality of these epigraphs in three articles (2011a, 2011b, 2011c), arguing that they were probably counterfeited. A reply from Wu Yingzhe (2011b) refuted Liu’s arguments.

7 Transcriptions for Khitan graphs if otherwise not indicated are according to Wu–Janhunen (2010), any alterations from them were either suggested by Mr. Jiruhe during our personal meeting in Hohhot in December 2016, for which help we are very thankful, or were the actual contributions of the cited work.
of *bu* 部 and *lu* 路 should be read as *niur*, whereas the forms 佢佢 (nǐ).li), 佢佢 (nǐ).li), 佢佢 (nǐ).úr.en), 佢佢 (nǐ).úr.s.er) represent the plurals or additional elements to the plurals of *bu* 部 and *lu* 路. The forms 佢佢 (nǐ).ú.d), 佢佢 (nǐ).ú.r) represent locatives of *bu* 部 and *lu* 路. In Wu’s opinion the glyph 佢 (SOUTH.en) ‘compatriot’ probably reflects linguistic relation, too. He further stated that 佢佢 (d.ra.qo) etc. equals to 佢佢 (SOUTH.hu), with a reading *delag*, and the separate forms of 佢 (te.le) are 佢佢 (de.le) 佢佢 (te.le) 佢佢 (t.ie.ra/d/t.ie.la.d), where 佢 is to be read *la* or *le*. The sequence 佢佢 佢佢 (GREAT m.qu.ui sh.ri.e) stands for ‘Da Miegu Shilie’ 大蔑孤石烈. Another remarkable conclusion of this paper is that in KSS the phenomenon of consonant omission can be observed: 佢佢 (ñ.ó.li) + 佢佢 (niur), whereas the forms 佢佢 (ñ.ó.úr.en), 佢佢 (ñ.ó.úr.s.er) represent the plurals or additional elements to the plurals of *bu* 部 and *lu* 路. In Wu’s opinion the glyph 佢 (SOUTH.en) ‘compatriot’ probably reflects linguistic relation, too. He further stated that 佢佢 (d.ra.qo) etc. equals to 佢佢 (SOUTH.hu), with a reading *delag*, and the separate forms of 佢 (te.le) are 佢佢 (de.le) 佢佢 (te.le) 佢佢 (t.ie.ra/d/t.ie.la.d), where 佢 is to be read *la* or *le*. The sequence 佢佢 佢佢 (GREAT m.qu.ui sh.ri.e) stands for ‘Da Miegu Shilie’ 大蔑孤石烈. Another remarkable conclusion of this paper is that in KSS the phenomenon of consonant omission can be observed: 佢佢 (ñ.ó.li) + 佢佢 (niur) = 佢佢 (ñ.ó.li); 佢佢 (go.er) + 佢佢 (t) = 佢佢 (go.t).

In the Master’s thesis of Yirigui (2011)《契丹小字<耶律副部署墓志铭>与契丹大字<耶律祺墓志铭>比较研究》[Comparative study of the Khitan Small Script Epitaph of Deputy Administrator Yelü and the Khitan Large Script Epitaph of Yelü Qi], the author made a deeper analysis of the vowel attachment, the possessive case and of the grammatical gender in Khitan.

In his monograph 《谜田耕耘—契丹小字解读续》[Thorough processing of a riddle – continuing the decipherment of Khitan Small Script], Ji Shi (2012) 即实 has cleared up the meaning of the following KSS words and expressions: 佢佢 (ng.iau.u), 佢佢 (sh.ü.en), ‘Yao and Shun 堯舜 (legendary sage leaders; a sage person)’, 佢佢 (ca.au), 佢佢 (x.iú) ‘Chao and Xu 巢許 (legendary hermits; a hermit)’, 佢佢 (s.iú) ‘Zi Yu 子舆 (legendary official of the Spring and Autumn period)’, 佢佢 (dau.u jï.gu) ‘Dao Zhi 盜跖 (legendary bandit of the Spring and Autumn period)’, 佢佢 (g.mu au) ‘husband’s parents’, 佢佢 (is.d.hu) ‘nine times’, 佢佢 (p.i.is) ‘imperial guard of the Liao state’, 佢佢 (sh.ang sh.i gu.iú shï <尚食局使>) ‘officer of the imperial food service’. Wu Yingzhe (2012a) in his book 《契丹小字新発見資料釈読問題》[Interpretation problems of the newly-discovered Khitan Small Script materials] investigated the following texts: *Yelü Jue muzhiming* 耶律玦墓誌銘, *Xiao Huilian muzhiming* 蕭回璉墓誌銘, *Xiao Hudujin muzhiming* 蕭胡睹堇墓誌銘, *Yelü Pusuli muzhibeiming* 耶律蒲速里墓誌碑銘. According to his textual criticism, *Xiao Hudujin* 蕭胡睹堇 was the elder brother of the owner of the *Xiao Huilian* 蕭回璉 tomb, while *Xiao Hudujin* 蕭胡睹堇 and *Xiao Huilian* 蕭回璉 were the uncles of *Xiao Dihu* 蕭敵魯. This book was the first to present the full text of the *Yelü Jue muzhiming* 耶律玦墓誌銘, the *Xiao Huilian muzhiming* 蕭回璉墓誌銘, the *Xiao Hudujin muzhiming* 蕭胡睹堇墓誌銘, and *Xiao Dihu muzhiming* 蕭敵魯墓誌銘.

8 For the last graph see Aisin Gioro (2012).
9 The transcription of this graph is not given in Wu – Janhunen (2010).
In 2013 Wu Yingzhe and Tang Jun 唐均 edited a collection of Khitan studies in the 8th issue of Acta Linguistica et Litteraturaria Sinica Occidentalia (Huaxi yuwen xuekan 华西语文学刊) (Wu – Tang 2013), containing more than 30 articles on Khitan language and script, Liao and Khitan history, archaeology and culture, as well as interviews with scholars who dedicated their careers to the research of the Liao Khitan cultural history, reviews of books and a sum-up of the 1st and 2nd International Seminar of Khitan Script and Related Academic Fields.


In the article 《内蒙古大学所藏契丹字文献资料》 [Khitan Script materials preserved by the Inner Mongolia University] Gaowa (2014) 高娃 gives an introduction to the KSS inscriptions conserved by the Inner Mongolia University. Discussing some details, she argues that Shuyinu 淑儀奴, the author of the Xiao Dílu 蕭敵鲁 epitaph, was not the son-in-law of the tomb owner’s nephew, but probably the husband of the owner’s daughter called 丸化丸 (mó.ur.û.én). She also compares the 4th line of the epitaph: 兀失兀于 歙列乐 (x(s).de.g(i).h MOUNTAIN.hu qa) with the 2nd line 兀失兀于 待列博力 (x(s).de.g(i).h qar.hu qa.ha.an) of Yelü Jue 耶律玦, and comes to the conclusion that 歙列 (MOUNTAIN.hu) and 待列 (qar.hu) are alternative names of Hendejin khan 痕德堇可汗, and with regard to the 15th line of the Epitaph of General Xiàn wu 顯武將軍 (that is the Xiao Jushi 蕭居士 epitaph), 歙列 (horu) is speculated to be an alternative writing method for 待列 (qar.hu) and 歙 should read hara.
This, according to the paper, implies a connection between 𢏊𢏋 (horu) and the origin of the Middle Mongolian haran ‘people’ and qara ‘black’. The graphs 𢏊 and 𢏋 may have been pronounced as har or hara. The substitute graph 𢏋 may also have had a similar har or hara reading (Gaowa 2014, pp. 151–152).

In their article 《辽<高玄圭墓志>考释》 [A philological investigation of the eulogy of Gao Xuanui of Liao] Kang Peng 康鹏, Zuo Lijun 左利军 and Wei Cong-cong 魏聪聪 (2014) stipulate that the Gaoshi 高氏 family was moved to the court at the time of its establishment at the Liao Zhongjing 中京. Another statement of this article is that Xingyunshan 興雲山 in the Liao epitaphs equals to Qingyunshan 慶雲山 in the Liaoshi. About the genealogy of the Gaoshi family they ascertain that the father of Gao Xuanui 高玄圭 was Qing Ting 慶廷, his mother was Zhao Shi 趙氏, and they had four children: Shi Lin 士林, Liu Shi 留士, Yu Ge 雨歌 and Shi Ning 士寧, as well as five grandsons Bing Wen 秉溫, Bing Liang 秉良, Bing Gong 秉恭, Bing Jian 秉儉, Bing Rang 秉讓 and four granddaughters.

APPENDIX

The currently available corpus of KSS inscriptions consists of the following main scripts and fragments. The fact that seventeen years ago there were only 21 pieces known (Liu Fengzhu 1999, pp. 160–165) shows that the occurrence of archaeological findings of Khitan material has accelerated since then.

A Chronologic List of Extant Khitan Small Script Monuments

**Abbreviations**

K  Kane (2009a)
KSS  Khitan Small Script
L  Literature
LIU  Liu Fengzhu (1999)
WU  Wu (2012a)

1053 | Zongjiao | 宗教 | Epitaph of Yelü Zongjiao | Da Qidanguo Guangling jun wang muzhimingji | 大契丹國廣陵郡王墓誌銘記.
Discovered: Gaoqi Village, Beining, Liaoning (遼寧省北寧市鮑家鄉高起村) 1991.
Kept in Beining Cultural Relics Office (北寧市文物管理處) | 33 lines, 935 characters.

10 Detailed descriptions of the items are not given here as they are readily available in the cited sources. We found it useful, however, to present a chronologic enumeration of the known sources to facilitate further research. All data are according either to LIU (Liu Fengzhu 1999), K (Kane 2009a), WJ (Wu – Janhunen 2010), or WU (Wu 2012a).

Acta Orient. Hung. 70, 2017
1055 | **Xingzong** | 興宗 | *Eulogy for Emperor Xingzong* | Xingzong huangdi aice | 興宗皇帝哀冊.
Discovered: Mausoleum of Emperor Xingzong, Barin Right Banner, Inner Mongolia, (內蒙古赤峰市巴林右旗白塔子) June 1922. The original stele is still in the Yongxing tomb (永興陵), buried in an unknown location at the Imperial Mausoleum (遼慶陵). Only a handwritten copy is available | 36 lines, 861 characters.
L: Kervyn (1923a; 1923b), Mullie (1933), Jin Yufu (1934) [K 23; WJ 1; WU 01]

1057 | **Xiao Linggong** | 蕭令公 | *Damaged epitaph of Xiao Linggong* | Xiao Linggong muzhiming canshi | 蕭令公墓誌銘殘石.
Discovered near Xishan Village, Qinghemen district, Fuxin, Liaoning (遼寧省阜新市清河門區西山村) in 1950. Kept in Liaoning Provincial Museum (遼寧省博物館) | 32 lines, 594 characters.
L: Li Dingkui (1954), Li Wenxin (1954) [K 14; WJ 7; WU 06]

1068 | **Tuguci** | 圖古辭 | *Epitaph of Xiao Tuguci* | Xiao Tuguci muzhiming | 蕭圖古辭墓誌銘.
Discovered in Fuxin Mongol Autonomous Prefecture, Taipingxiang dadaocun sijia zitun (阜新蒙古族自治縣太平鄉大道村四家子屯) in 2000. Kept in Liaoning Provincial Institute of Cultural Relics and Archaeology (遼寧省文物考古研究所) | 26 lines, 740 characters.
L: Liang (2003) [K 22; WJ 27; WU 22]

1071 | **Yelü Jue** | 耶律玦 | *Epitaph for Yelü Jue (1014–1070)* | Yelü Jue muzhiming | 耶律玦墓誌銘.
Time and place of discovery are unknown. Kept in Aohan Banner, Xinzhou Museum (敖漢旗, 新州博物館) | 46 lines, 2530 characters.
L: [WU 36]

1072 | **Renxian** | 仁先 | *Epitaph of Yelü Renxian* | Da Liao guo shang fu yu Yue Song wang muzhiming | 大遼國尚父於越宋王墓誌銘.
Discovered in Dongshan Village, Xiao tazi township, Beipiao prefecture, Liaoning (遼寧省北票縣小塔子鄉東山村) in 1983. Kept in Liaoning Provincial Institute of Cultural Relics and Archaeology (遼寧省文物考古研究所) | 70 lines, approx. 5000 characters.
L: Han (1991), Ji (1991) [K 16; WJ 10; WU 10]

1076 | **Renyi** | 仁懿 | *Eulogy for Empress Renyi* | Renyi huanghou aice | 仁懿皇后哀冊.
Discovered together with the Xingzong inscription at the Mausoleum of Emperor Xingzong, Barin Right Banner, Inner Mongolia (內蒙古赤峰市巴林右旗白塔子) in June 1922. The original stele is still in the Yongxing tomb (永興陵), buried in an unknown location at the Imperial Mausoleum (遼慶陵). Only a handwritten copy is available | 32 lines, 575 characters.
L: Kervyn (1923a), Kervyn (1923b), Mullie (1933), Jin Yufu (1934) [K 17; WJ 2; WU 02]

*Acta Orient. Hung. 70, 2017*
1078 | Temei | 萧每 | or | Hanshi | 韓氏 | Epitaph of Mme. Han, second wife of the imperial son-in-law Xiao Temei-Kuoge | Xiao Temei-Kuoge fuma di’er furen Han shi muzhiming | 萧特每-閭哥驸馬第二夫人韓氏墓誌銘. Only rubbings extant (found in 2004) | 32 lines, 810 characters. 
L: Liu Fengzhu (2005a) [K 21; WJ 32; WU 26]

1080 | Xiao Huilian | 蕭回璉 | Epitaph of Xiao Huilian | Xiao Huilian muzhiming | 蕭回璉墓誌銘. Time and place of discovery are unknown, assumed place of origin is the vicinity of Taipingxiang, Fuxin Mongol Autonomous Prefecture (阜新蒙古族自治縣太平鄉). Kept in Imperial Examination Museum (北京科舉匾額博物館) | 3 lines, 14 characters (lid), 32 lines, 840 characters (text). 
L: [WU 38]

1082 | Cite | 慈特 | or | Wuluben | 烏盧本 | Epitaph of Yelü Cite | Yelü Cite muzhiming/Yelü Wuluben muzhiming | 耶律慈特墓誌銘 / 耶律烏盧本墓誌銘. Discovered near Baiyinwendu sum, Ar Horchin Banner, Inner Mongolia (內蒙古赤峰市阿魯科爾沁旗白音溫度蘇木) in 1997. Kept in Ar Horchin Banner Museum (阿魯科爾沁旗博物館) | 2 lines, 15 characters (lid), 28 lines, 915 characters (text). 

L: Zheng Xiaoguang (2002) [K 26 and 27; WJ 16; WU 19]

1091 | Shizhong | 侍中 | Epitaph for Gu Shizhong (1015–1090) | Gu Shizhong muzhiming | 故侍中墓誌銘. Time and place of discovery are unknown, acquired by Inner Mongolia University in 2009, kept in the Center for Mongolian Studies of Inner Mongolia University (蒙古學學院) | 33 lines, 1700 characters. 
L: [WU 40]

1091 | Hudujin | 胡睹堇 | Epitaph for Hudujin Shenmi or Xiao Hudujin (1041–1091) | Xiao Hudujin Shenmi muzhiming | 蕭胡睹堇審密墓誌銘. Time and place of discovery are unknown, assumed place of origin is the vicinity of Taipingxiang, Fuxin Mongol Autonomous Prefecture (阜新蒙古族自治縣太平鄉). Kept in the Khitan Museum, Chifeng, Barin Left Banner, Inner Mongolia (內蒙古赤峰市巴林左旗契丹博物館) | 39 lines, approx. 1480 characters. 
L: [WU 35]

---

This single inscription is listed as two, namely Yelü Langjun canshi 耶律郎君殘石 and Yelü Yongning langjun muzhiming canshi 耶律永寧郎君墓誌銘殘石 in Kane (2009a).

*Acta Orient. Hung.* 70, 2017
Xiangwen | 謹穏 | Epitaph for Yelü Xiangwen (1010–1091) | Yelü Xiangwen muzhi | 耶律詳穏墓誌.

Time and place of discovery are unknown, acquired by Inner Mongolia University in 2007, kept in the Center for Mongolian Studies of Inner Mongolia University (蒙古學學院) | 39 lines, 1440 characters (front), 9 lines, 190 characters (back).

L: [WU 34]

Dilie | 迪烈 | Epitaph of Yelü Dilie | Nanzhanbuzhou Da Liao guo Gu Dilie wang muzhiwen | 南瞻部洲大遼國故迪烈王墓誌文.

Discovered near Gahaitu Township, Jarud Banner, Inner Mongolia (內蒙古扎魯特旗嘎亥圖鎮) in 1995. Kept in Liao and Jin City Wall Museum, Beijing (北京遼金城垣博物館) | 32 lines, approx. 1690 characters (front), 9 lines (lid).


Zhixian | 智先 | Epitaph of Yelü Zhixian | Yelü Zhixian muzhiming | 耶律智先墓誌銘.

Discovered at Dongshan Village, Xiaotazi township, Beipiao county, Liaoning province (遼寧省北票縣小塔子鄉東山村) in 1998. Kept in Beipiao Museum (北票市博物館) | 27 lines, approx. 1000 characters.

L: Zhao Zhiwei – Bao (2001) [K 30; WJ 24; WU 18]

Yongqing (永清) | Epitaph of Princess Yongqing | Yongqing gongzhu muzhiming | 永清公主墓誌. (Also known as Xiao Taishan he Yongning gongzhu muzhiming 蕭太山和永清公主墓誌銘).

Discovered broken into two pieces near Songjialiang tun, Ahantu village, Pingandi township, Fuxin Mongol Autonomous Prefecture (阜新蒙古族自治縣平安地鄉阿漢土村宋家梁屯) in 2003. Kept at the Fuxin Prefecture Cultural Relics Management Bureau (阜新蒙古族自治縣文物管理所) | 32 lines, approx. 1330 characters.

L: Yuan – Liu (2005) [K 28; WJ 30; WU 25]

Yełü Nu | 耶律奴 | Epitaph of Yełü Nu (1041–1098) | Yełü Nu muzhiming | 耶律奴墓誌銘.

Discovered near Yaoyamen Village, Fuxin Mongol Autonomous Prefecture, Liaoning (阜新蒙古族自治縣大板鎮腰衙門村) in 1999. Kept in Fuxin City Museum (阜新市博物館) | 48 lines (24 front, 24 back), approx. 1270 characters.

L: Shi – Yu (2001) [K 15; WJ 25; WU 17]

Yełü Wotelan | 幹特懶 | Epitaph for Prince Wotela (1073–1099), the grandson of Gu Shizhong | Yełü Wotelan langjun muzhiming | 耶律幹特懶朗君墓誌銘.

Time and place of discovery are unknown (only the inscription was found, whereabouts of the lid is unknown). Acquired by Inner Mongolia University in 2009, kept in the Center for Mongolian Studies of Inner Mongolia University (蒙古學學院) | 22 lines, approx. 1000 characters.

L: [WU 41]
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1100 | Hongyong |弘用 | Epitaph of Yelü Hongyong (1054–1086) (also known as the Wurigentala Inscription – Epitaph of Yelü Hongbian) | Yelü Hongyong muzhiming |耶律弘用墓誌銘.


1100 | Shilu |室魯 | Epitaph of Shilu taishi | Shilu taishi muzhi bei |室魯太師墓誌碑.

Discovered in Shuiquangou, Yihebei Village, Jarud Banner, Inner Mongolia (内蒙古扎魯特旗伊和背郷水泉溝) in 2000. Kept in the Liaozhongjing Museum of Ningcheng county (寧城縣遼中京博物館) | 2 lines, 6 characters (back), 13 lines, 154 characters (inscription).

L: Liu Fengzhu – Dong (2007) [K 18; WJ 26; WU 29]

1101 | Taishi |太師 | Epitaph for Yelü Taishi (1038–1101), the son of Yelü Xiangwen | Yelü Taishi muzhiming |耶律太師墓誌銘.

Time and place of discovery are unknown. Acquired by Inner Mongolia University in 2009, kept in the Center for Mongolian Studies of Inner Mongolia University (蒙古學學院) | 26 lines, approx. 1040 characters.

L: [WU 39]

1101 | Yelü Han |耶律韓 | Epitaph of Yelü (Han) Dilie (also written as Dilie 敌烈) | Yelü (Han) Dilie muzhiming |耶律(韓)迪烈墓誌銘.

Discovered at Sifangcheng township, Barin Left Banner, Inner Mongolia (內蒙古巴林左旗四方城鄉) in 1996. Kept in Liao Shangjing Museum (遼上京博物館) | 34 lines, approx. 1350 characters.


1101 | Daozong |道宗 | Eulogy for the Emperor Daozong | Daozong huangdi aice |道宗皇帝哀冊.

Excavated in 1930 from the Yongfu tomb of the Imperial Mausoleum (遼慶陵, 永福陵). Kept in the Liaoning Provincial Museum (遼寧省博物館) | 6 lines with 36 characters (lid) and 37 lines and approx. 1130 characters (stone).

L: Meng (1932), Wang Jingzu (1933), Jin Yufu (1934) [K 3; WJ 4; WU 04]

1101 | Xuanyi |宣懿 | Eulogy for Empress Xuanyi | Xuanyi huanghou aice |宣懿皇后哀冊.

Excavated in 1930 from the Yongfu tomb of the Imperial Mausoleum (遼慶陵, 永福陵). Kept in the Liaoning Provincial Museum (遼寧省博物館) | 4 lines with 16 characters (lid) and 30 lines and approx. 620 characters (stone).

L: Meng (1932), Wang Jingzu (1933), Luo (1933), Jin Yufu (1934) [K 25; WJ 5; WU 05]
1102 | **Fubushu** | 副部署 | *Epitaph of Deputy Administrator Yelü* | Yelü fubushu muzhiming | 耶律副部署墓誌銘.
Discovered at Tsogt Mountain near Guriban Hushu Gacha, Han sumu, Ar Horchinh Banner, Inner Mongolia (內蒙古阿魯科爾沁旗罕蘇木古日班呼碩嘎查, 朝克圖山) in 1996. Kept in the Inner Mongolia Museum, Huhehaote (呼和浩特市內蒙古博物院) | 27 lines (lid) and 27 lines (stone), approx. 2000 characters.
L: Gai–Qi–Liu (2008) [K 5; WJ 17; WU 30]

1102 | **Diligu** | 迪里姑 | *Epitaph of Yelü Diligu* (also known as the *Epitaph of Yelü Gia* 耶律貴, 1061–1102) | Yelü Diligu muzhiming | 耶律迪里姑墓誌銘.
Time and place of discovery are unknown. Acquired in 2002 and kept in Liao Shangjing Museum (遼上京博物館) | 31 lines, approx. 1020 characters.
L: Liu Fengzhu–Tang–Gao–Li (2006) [K 8; WJ 29; WU 27]

1105 | **Xuguo** | 許國 | *Damaged epitaph of Prince Xu* | Liaoguo xuwang muzhi canshi | 遼國許王墓誌殘石.
Discovered at Baitaigou village, Wofenggou township, Fuxin Mongol Autonomous Prefecture, Liaoning province (阜新蒙古族自治縣臥風溝鄉白台溝村) in 1975. Kept in Fuxin City Museum (阜新市博物館) | 30 lines on both the front and the back of the stone, and 4 lines of Khitan and five lines of Chinese script on the sides, approx. 2750 characters. Both the stone itself and the lid are corrupted.
L: Fuxin (1977), Ji (1996, pp. 139–179) [K 24; WJ 9; WU 08]

1105 | **Pusuli** | 蒲速里 | *Epitaph of Yelü Pusuli* | Yelü Pusuli muzhibeiming | 耶律蒲速里墓誌碑銘.
Time and place of discovery, as well as the actual whereabouts of the inscription are unknown | 2 lines 15+11 characters (lid), 25 lines, approx. 800 characters.
L: [WU 37]

1107 | **Liang guowang** | 梁國王 | *Epitaph for the Prince of Liang* | Liang guowang muzhiming | 梁國王墓誌銘.

1108 | **Cishi** | 刺史 | *Epitaph of the Prefect of Zhuozhou* (Also known as the *Epitaph of the Prefect of Zezhou* 澤州刺史墓誌) | Zhuozhou Cishi muzhi canshi | 涿州刺史墓誌殘石.
Discovered in Sanshan township, Chifeng city, Barin Left Banner, Inner Mongolia (赤峰市巴林左旗三山鄉) in 1994. Kept in Liao Shangjing Museum (遼上京博物館) | 26 lines, approx. 230 characters, top right of the inscription is missing due to damage to the stone.
1110 | **Taishuzu** | 太叔祖 | **Eulogy for the Imperial Grand Uncle** (Also known as the Huang taishuzu aice 皇太叔祖哀冊) | Gu Taishuzu aice | 故太叔祖哀冊.
Discovered in the Western part of the Yongxing tomb (永興陵) of the Imperial Mausoleum (遼慶陵), Baitazi, Barin Right Banner, Inner Mongolia (巴林右旗白塔子) in 1997. Kept in Barin Right Banner Museum (巴林右旗博物館) | 25 lines, approx. 795 characters.
L: Chengel–Liu (2003) [K 20; WJ 21, WU 23]

1110 | **Song Wei** | 宋魏 | **Epitaph of the Imperial Consort of Song and Wei** | Gu Song Wei Guo fei muzhiming | 故宋魏國妃墓誌銘.
Discovered together with the Taishuzu aice in the Western part of the Yongxing tomb (永興陵) of the Imperial Mausoleum (遼慶陵), Baitazi, Barin Right Banner, Inner Mongolia (巴林右旗白塔子) in 1997. Kept in Barin Right Banner Museum (巴林右旗博物館) | 24 lines, 642 characters.

1114 | **Xiao Dilu** | 蕭敵魯 | **Epitaph for Xiao Dilu** | Xiao Dilu muzhiming | 蕭敵魯墓誌銘.
Time and place of discovery are unknown, the assumed place of discovery, however, is the vicinity of Fuxin Mongol Autonomous Prefecture, Taipingxiang (阜新蒙古族自治县太平乡附近挖掘). Acquired by Inner Mongolia University in 2007, kept in the Center for Mongolian Studies of Inner Mongolia University (蒙古學學院) | 25 lines and 580 characters (lid), 26 lines and 520 characters (stone).
L: [WU 33]

1115 | **Gu Yelü** | 故耶律 | **Epitaph of the Late Mme. Yelü** | Gu Yelü shi mingshi | 故耶律氏銘石.
Discovered in the Liao tomb of Maobulagou, Shanzuizi, Ongniud Banner, Chifeng City, Inner Mongolia (赤峰市翁牛特旗山嘴子毛布拉溝遼代墓) in 1962. Kept in the Chifeng City Museum (赤峰市博物館) | 25 lines, 695 characters.
L: Zhaowuda–Wengniute (1981), Liu Fengzhu–Yu (1981b) [K 7; WJ 8; WU 09]

1134 | **Langjun** | 郎君 | **Record of the Journey of the Younger Brother of the Emperor of the Great Jin Dynasty** | Da Jin huang di dutong jinglüe langjun xingji | 大金皇弟都統經略郎君行記.
The only extant Khitan–Chinese bilingual inscription was engraved on a stele in front of the Tang Qianling tomb of Empress Wu Zetian of the Tang in Qian county, near Xi’an, Shaanxi province (陝西省乾縣唐乾陵) | 5 lines and 96 characters (Khitan text) and 6 lines and 108 characters (Chinese text).
L: Haneda (1925), Jin Yufu (1934) [K 12; WJ 3; WU 03]

1150 | **Xiao Zhonggong** | 蕭仲恭 | **Epitaph of Xiao Zhonggong** | Xiao Zhonggong muzhiming | 蕭仲恭墓誌銘.
Discovered near the location of the later Yanzhangzi commune Zimu linzi village, Xinglong County, Hebei (河北省興隆縣閣杖子公社梓木林子村) in 1942. Kept by the Hebei Province Office of Cultural Relics (河北省保定市文物管理處) | 50 lines and 2490 characters (stone) and 3 lines and 9 characters (lid).
Zheng Shaozong (1973), Liu Fengzhu–Yu (1981a), Kara (1975) [K 31; WJ 6; WU 07]

1170 | Zhenguo | Epitaph of the Supreme General of Zhenguo (Also known as the Epitaph of the Defense Commissioner of Bozhou of the Jin Dynasty) | Zhenguo Shangjiangjun muzhiming | Zhenguo 上將軍墓誌銘.

Discovered near Songjialiang tun, Ahantu village, Pingandi township, Fuxin Mongol Autonomous Prefecture (阜新蒙古族自治縣平安地鄉阿漢土村宋家梁屯) in 2004. Kept at the Fuxin Prefecture Cultural Relics Management Bureau (阜新蒙古族自治縣文物管理所) | 2 lines and 13 characters (lid) and 33 lines and approx. 1350 characters (stone).

Unknown date:

| Haitangshan | 海棠山 | Damaged epitaph found near Haitangshan | Haitangshan muzhi canshi | 海棠山墓誌殘石.
Discovered in Moya zaoxiang qun, Fuxin Mongol Autonomous Prefecture, Liaoning (阜新蒙古族自治縣大板摩崖造像群) in 1991. A large part of the stone is missing. Kept at the Fuxin Prefecture Cultural Relics Management Bureau (阜新蒙古族自治縣文物管理所) | 13 lines, 300 characters.

| Gaoshi | 高十 | Epitaph of Yelü (Han) Gaoshi | Han (Yelü) Gaoshi muzhiming | 韓(耶律)高十墓誌銘.
Discovered in the Han family tombs at Baiyinhan Mountain, Baiyinwula township, Barin Left Banner (巴林左旗白音烏拉鄉白音罕山韓氏家族墓誌群) in 1995. The text of the inscription is incomplete and the lid has not been found | 26 lines, approx. 750 characters.
L: Liu Fengzhu (2002) [K 6; WJ 15; WU 20]
References and a Selected Bibliography on Khitan

As the volume of scholarly works on Khitan has increased in the past hundred years, it is impossible—and unnecessary—to strive for a complete bibliography about the topic (hundreds of articles on it are issued yearly in China alone). It may be useful, however, to present here a selected list of the probably most important pieces of literature that have led us to our present understanding of the KSS and the language of the Khitan people.
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