

WESTERN INFORMATION ON THE KITANS AND SOME RELATED QUESTIONS

DENIS SINOR

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

By making use of hitherto mostly untapped sources and the testimony of onomastic material, the present paper attempts to document the survival of Kitan and Karakitay groups in Siberia and in European Russia following the dissolution of the Karakitay empire in 1218.

WHILST MAINTAINING THEIR FEELING OF IDENTITY, over a period of about eight centuries the Kitans twice underwent a remarkable cultural and linguistic metamorphosis. They played a major role on three different regional stages: first in Manchuria (from about the 8th to the 12th century), then in China, under the dynastic name of Liao (907–1115), and finally in Central Asia where, fugitives from China, they succeeded in establishing a third empire, known as Karakitay (the Black Kitay), which lasted for about a century, until 1218.

It cannot be my aim to present here, in a capsule, a history of the Kitans; rather, a few remarks pertaining to the disintegration of the Karakitay state should be made. Some modern historians, including myself (1971: 130–31) and Bosworth (1978: 583) have tended to present this event as the result of simultaneous attacks by the Naiman prince Küchlüg and Muhammad, Sultan of Khorezm. This view is in need of revision. It is based on Juvaini's statement (Boyle 1958: 64) that "[Küchlüg] fell upon him [the gürkhan] like lightning from a cloud, and taking him by surprise made him prisoner and seized his kingdom and his army." What in fact happened was that, to escape Chinggis Khan's wrath, in 1208 Küchlüg took refuge with the Karakitay, married the gürkhan's daughter, converted to Buddhism, and in 1211 dethroned the gürkhan Chih-lu-ku. Küchlüg staged a palace coup and it was certainly not his intention to destroy the Karakitay state, over which he had just assumed power. The Taoist sage Ch'ang-chun, travelling through the land in 1219, noted that the Naimans "seized the land that had sheltered them" (Waley 1931: 89). In the words of the *Liao-shih*, Küchlüg "assumed the title gürkhan, adopted the dress and customs of Western Liao and made Chih-lu-ku the imperial father and his wife the empress dowager. As long as they lived he attended them every morning and evening [like a respectful son]" (Wittfogel 1949: 652). Chih-lu-ku died a

natural death in 1213. Peaceful Kitay-Naiman cooperation is implied also by the Franciscan John of Plano Carpini, according to whom (Menestò, in *Pian di Carpini*: 254) the Naimans and the Karakitay were allies who had been defeated by the Mongols. The date of the end of the Karakitay empire could be set in 1218, when the fleeing Küchlüg was killed by the Mongols. This is the date given also by Paolo Daffinà in his commentary on Plano Carpini's text (Menestò, in *Pian di Carpini*: 430). This was the beginning of the Kitan diaspora, which is the subject of this investigation.

As could be expected, the remnants of the Naimans, principal targets of Mongol hostility, were also dispersed and there is evidence that a strong link continued to exist between the two groups. As shown by Kuzeev (1974: 227 et passim), the *tamgas* (property marks) of the two groups are identical. The name of the Naimans has been preserved in a number of toponyms as far west as the Crimea, in a variety of combinations which include a place called "Ktay-Naiman" (Kuzeev 1974: 228).

Following their triple avatar, the Kitans or, at least, their name, had a varied, long, in fact still continuing, afterlife. The name Cathay, as applied to China, is so well known and has been studied so thoroughly that I will not elaborate its history. Also well known, but more obscure, is the still unresolved question of the Kitan origin of the Prester John legend, a topic I will also bypass in this short presentation.¹

In what follows I will examine, first, the names of the Kitans and the Karakitays as they appear in European

¹ A recent, scholarly survey of the question is given by Knefelkamp. Gumilev's book on the same subject is, at best, a historical novel. I refer to my review of it in *The English Historical Review* 106 (1991): 155–57.

sources, and, second, the groups' location following the disintegration of the Karakitay state.

THE NAME

Graphic variations notwithstanding, in various sources the name appears in four basic forms: *Kitan*, *Kitay*, *Katay*, *Katan*.²

Kitan. This reading is vouchsafed by the Chinese, Tibetan and Türk transcriptions of the name. To be more precise, the Türk form as it appears in the inscriptions has a palatalized *k* sound. In the *Secret History of the Mongols*, written in the middle of the thirteenth century, the name appears only in the plural form *Kitai/Kitad*, which suggests a singular *Kitan* form. It should be noted that in this text *Kitai* refers to the Jurchen, i.e., to China then under Jurchen rule. In the same text the Karakitay are called *Karukidai* or *Karakitai*. The name *Kitad* appears but rarely in pre-classical Mongol texts: one occurrence, possibly the earliest, is in the Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1338, where it is applied to the Chinese (Cleaves 1951: 56).

As we shall see, the form *Kitan* appears also in Old Russian texts, and in a number of interdependent Hungarian chronicles, written in Latin in the fourteenth century but clearly based on earlier texts. Interestingly enough, the Old Russian as well as the Hungarian chronicles render the original name of the Kitans.

Kitay. In Muslim sources the Kitans who migrated to the west appear under the name of Kara, i.e., "Black" Kitay. A *-y* replaced the final *-n* of *Kitan*. It so happens that in the language of the Turks of eastern Turkestan, as represented for instance by their Buddhist texts, a final *-y* corresponds to the *-n* or *-ñ* of the Old Turkic inscriptions.³ Most probably the populations of western

Turkestan became acquainted with this name through the intermediary of the Turks of the Tarim Basin and adopted the form there used.

The earliest mention of the *Kitay* form in a Latin text is probably that made by the Franciscan John of Plano Carpini, who travelled to Mongolia in 1245–47 and who speaks of both the *Kitay* and the *Nigri* (i.e., Black) *Kitay*. All the numerous manuscripts of Plano Carpini's account spell the name with an *i* in the first syllable and with a final *-y*.⁴ The form *Charakitay* appears also in the *Speculum historiale* of Vincent of Beauvais (lib. XXXI, cap. 8).

Pelliot's suggestion (1959: 220) that the forms with *i* used by Plano Carpini can be explained by his reliance on Russian interpreters cannot be accepted. This thinking puts the cart before the horse. The Russian name of China is indeed *Kitay*, but this only shows that the name came into Russian through Turkic where the original first-syllable *i* was maintained.

Most interestingly, the form *Kitay* appears also in a document not yet accessible to Pelliot, namely the Latin version of a letter sent by the il-khan Hülegü to Louis IX of France in 1262. Among the conquests he claimed to have achieved, the il-khan mentions "regi Kytayorum."⁵ Clearly, Hülegü could not have taken cognizance of the name through Russian intermediaries.

Katay. The Franciscan William of Rubruck, who travelled to Mongolia somewhat later than Plano Carpini, in 1253–55, also speaks of the Black *Katay*, spelling the name with a final *i* or *y* but giving an *a* as the first vowel. He is the first in the west to apply the name Cathay to China, but he knows also of the "Caracatai," and gives a correct translation of the name: "[it] means Black Catai. This term is used to distinguish them from the Catai to the east, by the ocean" (Jackson and Morgan 1990: 121–22).

The use by Rubruck of *a* in the first syllable (Catai) is in need of some explanation. First, it should be mentioned that the spelling, though first used in the West by Rubruck, is not particular to him. Other travellers, such as John of Monte Corvino, Odoric of Pordenone, and John of Marignolli used the same form to refer to China. All of these men travelled in the fourteenth century but their use of this form cannot be traced to Rubruck. In fact, among the earliest thirteenth-century sources, only Plano Carpini, his travel companion Benedict the Pole, and C. de Bridia, in his version of Plano Carpini's travels (Önnerfors 1967: 6) spell the name with an *i* in the first syllable, whether it refers to

² The most detailed and masterly study of the name *Kitay* and its variants is that to be found in Pelliot 1959: 216–29. Unfortunately, because of a misprint, the text gives a non-existing "Qitay" (e.g., on p. 218) as the Old Turkic form, instead of the correct "Qitai." Probably under the influence of this misprint, Herbert Franke 1990 (e.g., p. 402) gives "Qitay" as the form under which the name appears in the Orkhon inscriptions.

³ A very long time ago, I pointed out (Sinor 1939: 561–67) what was wrong in the conventional attribution to the Uighurs of the Turkic dialect used by the majority of the texts found in the Turfan region. My view that the *ayiy* dialect was not that of the original Uighurs, though clearly correct, went too much against ingrained habits to be generally accepted. I myself have gotten tired of consistently making the differentiation between it and the language of the Turks of the Tarim Basin.

⁴ See Menestò's edition, *Pian di Carpini* 1989: 289.

⁵ See Meyvaert 1980: 254. On the same document see also Richard 1979 and Ligeti 1981.

China or to the Karakitay. Vincent of Beauvais simply followed Plano Carpini.

Pelliot tried to explain (1959: 216, 219–20) the form "Cathay" used in the Occident as a distortion caused by the intermediary of the Arabic script in which the first vowel was omitted. The Arabs often read the name as *Xatai*. One always hesitates to take issue with any of Pelliot's opinions but—with due respect and bearing in mind that the relevant opinions were published posthumously—his view is untenable. For one; it does not explain Rubruck's use of the form. He must have heard the name often enough to vocalize it correctly, and it would be nonsensical to believe that he became acquainted with it through the intermediary of the Arabs.

But there are other, weightier, arguments against the theory of Arab transmission of the name. We shall see that *Katan* and *Katay* forms appear in environments which exclude the hypothesis of the bookish transmission of the Arabic forms.

The explanation of the *Kitay*–*Katay* dichotomy may lie in the phonetic development either of Turkic or Mongol. The primacy of the first-syllable *i* is vouchsafed by the earliest Chinese, Turkic, and Tibetan transcriptions of the name. An *a*–*i* alternation is not unknown in Turkic but it usually appears in the second syllable. The situation is different in Mongol. It is well known that a first-syllable *i* of Classical or Middle Mongol, in the later, spoken languages, often became assimilated to the vowel of the second syllable of the same word. Thus, e.g., Modern Mongol *max(an)*, *ṣad* (=j), *zagas* correspond to Classical Mongol *miqan* 'meat', *jida* 'spear', *jīyasun* 'fish', respectively. The exact date when these and similar vowel assimilations occurred cannot be established but it is usually assumed that the changes began at the end of the Middle Mongol period, i.e., in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.⁶ We can hence conclude that the form with the first syllable *a* is a dialectal variant which, with the passing of time, became more general in the spoken Mongol languages. This tentative explanation presupposes that the *-n* > *-y* change preceded the *i* > *a* change, and that a *Kitan* > *Kitay* > *Katay* development occurred. It appears unlikely that, in the course of the few years that separated Rubruck's trip from that of Plano Carpini, the first syllable vowel should have shifted from *i* to *a*, but the existence of an *i*–*a* alternation can justifiably be assumed. Most probably, in the 1240s and 1250s, the two forms *Kitay* and *Katay* co-existed within the vast Mongol Empire, through which Plano Carpini and Rubruck had to travel. It could even

be that the *i*-form was used by the Turkic-, the *a*-form by the Mongol-speaking population of the land.

Katan. This hybrid form occurs only in a well-defined area. The final *-n* is that of the Kitans' original name, but the first-syllable *a* suggests that the name did undergo the aforementioned *i* > *a* change. In the shape of *xadai*,⁷ with dialectal variants, it appears only in the Finno-Ugric languages of the north-Siberian Ostiaks and Voguls (called collectively the Ugrians of the Ob river), where it is the name given to the Tatars.

THE LOCATION

Let us now examine some information concerning the location of the Karakitay splinter groups in the period following the disintegration of their state. To begin with, the aforementioned Ostiak and Vogul data provide also some historical information on the whereabouts of the Kitans. The name *Kitan* appears in Ob-Ugrian heroic poetry which, though noted down in the nineteenth century, contains much archaic information. One can but speculate about the region in which *Kitan* Ugrian contacts may have taken place. There are far too many unknown elements—such as the earlier abodes of the Ugrians of the Ob, the period mirrored in their heroic poetry—to allow a reliable localization of these contacts. In a Vogul hymn in honor of the sun-god it is said: *xadai xum xäl-max xum xäläng ta'il masäl'n* "don the black dress of the *Kitan* man, of the *Kalmuck* man" (Munkäsi 1892: 321), a reference which might reflect trade relations with both, probably neighboring, peoples.

The Vogul and Ostiak texts in which the names *Katan* and *Kalmuck* appear side-by-side were collected in Siberia, in the region of the river Ob, in the second half of the nineteenth century. In modern times the *Kalmucks* occupy the territory lying to the west of the lower reaches of the Volga and northwest of the Caspian Sea. The *Kalmucks* moved to this region only at the beginning of the seventeenth century, at the end of a migration which took them from *Dzungaria* across Siberia. It was there that contacts between them and the Ugrians of the Ob could have taken place, in the region where, as we shall see, *Kitan* presence can also be detected.

In his *Rerum Moscoviticarum Commentarii*, first published in 1549, Sigismund von Herberstein, ambassador to Russia of Emperor Maximilian II, speaks of a "Lake *Kitay*," from which flows the river Ob, where the Voguls and the Ugrians live.⁸ The map included in Herberstein's

⁷ See Karjalainen 1948: 362. Modern, literary Vogul has *xadai* (Baladin 1958: 136).

⁸ *Hunc quoque Vuogolici & Vgritzchi gentes accolunt*, P. 82 of the 1571 edition (Basel), to which at present I have access.

⁶ On this question see: Poppe 1955 and 1956, Sanzhev 1953 and Janhunen 1990.

book reflects this view. It shows the Ob originating in "Kithay lacus" and indicates east of the river "Ivhra inde Ungarorum origo," i.e., suggests a link between Ugrians and Hungarians.⁹ The map *Tartariae sive Magni Chami Regni Typus*, included in Abraham Ortelius' *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum*, published in 1570, also indicates a "Kýtaia lacus," from which, according to the map, originates the river Ob, flowing to the Arctic Ocean. At least two other maps of the second half of the sixteenth century, one based on information provided by the English merchant Anthony Jenkinson and the other, the Van Deutecum map, based on combined information culled from Jenkinson and Herberstein, show a "Kitaia lacus" as the headwater of the Ob, which flows into the Arctic Ocean, called either "Mare Glaciale" or "Mare Septentrionale." On all these maps Lake Kitay is located just south of Yugria, i.e., the land of the Ugrians. Without giving its exact location, Anthony Jenkinson mentions twice Lake Kitay. According to him, the lake was fed by the river Ardoh, a continuation of the Oxus, which reaches the lake after an underground passage of five hundred miles.¹⁰

A curious piece of information concerning the Ob is reflected in the description of Muscovy written in 1578 by Heinrich von Staden and splendidly edited by Fritz Epstein. According to von Staden the Ob (which he calls Oba) originates "aus dem stehenden mehr [sic!] Kithaia," and suggests that "man von Oba den fluß in Americam hinein und die Tartarey schiffen kan." He estimates that departing from the Ob or the Kola peninsula two trips to America could be completed in the time it would normally take to reach it from Spain.¹¹

The fact that Lake Kitay has never existed is irrelevant for our purposes; what is of interest for us is that these documents make the name "Kitay" appear in western Siberia. Confusion with China proper is excluded, since on Herberstein's map China is located at a distance of thirty days' journey further east. It should be noted that in the Ob basin, more specifically in the Kemerovskiy oblast, two tributaries of the Yaya river carry to this day the name "Kitat": the right tributary is the Zolotoy (Golden) Kitat, the left tributary is called the Mazalovskiy Kitat. While it seems unlikely that the imaginary Lake Kitay owed its appearance on the map to the existence of these two rivers (the divergent end-

ings -y, -t render this hypothesis most unlikely), the fact remains that the Kitan name is thus attested in the hydronyms of the Ob basin. In the Ostiak dialect spoken along the Vasyugan river, the name of the Irtysh is *Katañ äs* 'Katan river'. (Note the first syllable a!)¹²

According to the testimony given to the Venetian geographer Ramusio by an otherwise unidentified "gentleman" who recalled a conversation he had had with a Russian ambassador, the region of this lake was the first habitation of the Tartars, who "pay tribute to the Great Khan of Cathay [!]."¹³

An altogether different picture emerges from a letter, written on February 20, 1581 by a John Balak to Gerardus Mercator, the famous cartographer. Balak is sending the letter with a messenger called Alferius, a Dutchman who had travelled extensively to the Ob "both by land, through the countreys of the Samoeds, and of Sibier, and also by Sea, along the coast of the river Pechora Eastward." According to Balak, who seems to summarize Alferius' information, the inhabitants of the region "call that river [the Ob] Ardoh, which falleth into the lake of Kittay, which they call Paraha, whereupon bordereth that mighty and large nation which they call Carrah Colmak, which is none other than the nation of Cathay."¹⁴

We can safely disregard the speculative identification of the Carrah Colmak with the Chinese, and retain the indigenous names Ardoh and Paraha (neither of which I can at present explain). It is also clear that, in this text, Lake Kittay is thought of as a widening of the Ob, not unlike the Lake of Geneva is of the Rhône. Obviously, Carrah Colmak stands for Qara Qalmak, i.e., the Black Kalmucks, mentioned also in Jenkinson's report in 1558 as being distinct from the Cathay (the Chinese). Jenkinson's mention of the Black Kalmucks is an early example of the Russian usage generalized in the 17th and 18th centuries. The "Black" Kalmucks were the "real," i.e., Mongol-speaking Kalmucks, to be distinguished from the "White" Kalmucks, a name applied to the Turkic speaking Teleuts.¹⁵ A small group of Oirats called "Kara Kalmak," now settled in the Issik kul region in Kyrgyzstan, moved there from the Tekes and Ili valleys in 1864 and subsequently lost its Mongol language.¹⁶

A curious passage by Herberstein may, however, be linked with these "Black" Kalmucks. In speaking about Lake Kitay, Herberstein mentions "black men" coming

⁹ The question of the relationship between the term "Yugria" and the Hungarians is most involved. A good survey is given and a new solution proposed by Vášáry 1982.

¹⁰ Hakluyt 1907: 448, 451.

¹¹ Epstein 1964: 213-14, 217. Almost a century and a half had to pass before Vitus Bering could conclude that Siberia and America were not joined.

¹² Cf. Tereshkin 1981: 158.

¹³ On all this, see Baddeley 1919, I:364-67.

¹⁴ Hakluyt 1907, II:364-67. I have not been able to establish the identity of Balak.

¹⁵ Potapov 1953: 9-12.

¹⁶ See Zhukavskaya.

from the lake region, said to be familiar with the local language and carrying all sorts of goods such as onions and precious stones.¹⁷ John F. Baddeley¹⁸ saw in these "black men" Sarts from Bukhara, but this identification rests on nothing more than our knowledge that Bukharan traders maintained lively commercial relations with Siberia.¹⁹

We thus could trace Kitans, over three hundred years after the disintegration of the Karakitay Empire, in western Siberia in the Ob region. Hungarian chronicles place the Kitans even further west, in the lower region of the Don in the proximity of the Caspian Sea and the Alans. The information appears in several chronicles, but I cite the relevant passage according to the version preserved in the so-called "Illuminated Chronicle," written in the mid-fourteenth century:

Don grandis fluvius est, in Scythia oritur, ab Hungaris Etul nuncupatur, et ibi montes niveos qui Scythiam cingunt, transcurrent, amisso nomine Don vocatur. Circa enim meridiem iuxta ipsum iacet gens Kytanorum et gens Alanorum, tandem in mare cadit Rotundum tribus ramusculis.

The Don is a great river that originates in Scythia and is called Etul by the Hungarians. As it crosses the snowy mountains surrounding Scythia it changes its name and is called Don. To the south of it live the peoples of the Kytans and the Alans; it flows into the Sea of Azov in three branches. (Szentpétery 1937-38: 253)

Contrary to Zoltán Gombocz (1917), who thought that the Hungarian chronicler culled this information from as yet unidentified Western sources, I feel certain that it reached the Hungarians through Russian channels, literary rather than oral. It is likely that the Mongol armies that invaded Hungary in 1241 included some Kitan—

though, probably rather Kara Kitay—soldiers but it seems most unlikely that their presence on Hungarian soil should have influenced the Hungarian chronicler. Contrariwise, both the Lavrentiev and the Hypatian chronicles mention the Kitans (with final *-n* in the name).²⁰ In both of them appears also the personal name "Kitanopa," first mentioned in the Lay of Igor's Campaign (1185-87).²¹ It is a compound of the name Kitan and *oba* 'tribe'.²²

We might then conclude that the original, Mongol, form of the Kitan name reached the West by the end of the twelfth century, i.e., at a time when the Karakitay Empire was still in its bloom. Most puzzling in this respect is the name "Qitan" borne by a Cuman emissary sent to Vladimir Monomakh, great prince of Kiev, in 1095,²³ that is, at a time when the Kitans were still firmly established in northern China. The relationship, if any, between Kitans and Cumans is shrouded in mystery, which this datum is not likely to dispel.

The presence of Kitans in European Russia is attested also at a much later date, probably the seventeenth century, in a "History of the Kalmuck Khans" in which the "Qatay" appear in a list of various Tatar tribes located to the west of the Ural river.²⁴

Ethnonyms and toponyms bring massive evidence of the survival of Kitan elements in European Russia. Tribal names, indicating lineages, are usually most conservative. Thus, for example, in the seventeenth century, one of the Evenki tribes in the Amgun river region still bore the name Kidan.²⁵ While the survival of the ethnonym in, or close to, the Kitan homeland is not particularly surprising, the appearance of the name *Katay* in the tribal nomenclature of the Bashkirs on both sides of the Ural mountains is unexpected. According to Khisamitdinova,²⁶ in Bashkiria nineteen toponyms include the "Katay" element, represented also among the hydronyms of the region, e.g., the rivulets Katay, Erkle-Katay, or the lake Katay.

¹⁷ Herberstein (p. 82): *Ab hoc lacu plurimi homines nigri, communis sermonis expertes, ueniunt: merces uarias, in primis autem uniones, lapidem preciosos, secum adferentes.* Bukharan onions were of a high quality and were exported also to Persia (Burton 1993: 22). The "precious stones" mentioned by Herberstein may have been only colored glass, imported by Bukharans from China (ibid., 40).

¹⁸ I:1xxii; II:24.

¹⁹ On these: Burton 1993, especially pp. 66-85. The Bukharan traders maintained close commercial relations with the Kalmucks. A small Kalmuck group still lives in Bukhara (Zhukavskaya 1985: 102). At the end of the nineteenth century a group of Kara Kalmaks was renamed Sart Kalmak by the Russian authorities. (Cf. Aubin 1985: 83.)

²⁰ See Zajaczkowski 1949: 37-38.

²¹ See Baskakov 1985: 84.

²² See Baskakov 1984: 6. Golden 1986/87: 19 lists other personal and tribal names with *oba* as a component.

²³ Golden 1987/91: 67.

²⁴ Halkovic 1985: 42. Oirat text, p. 104. I owe this reference to Dr. Junko Miyawaki.

²⁵ Vasilevich 1958: 579. According to Cincius 1975, II:391, the Kitans appear also in Evenki and Even folklore. The fact is not surprising but this is not the place to pursue the matter.

²⁶ 1991: 68. For an alphabetic listing of these data: Khisamitdinova 1994.

The Katay Bashkirs constitute an important component in the Bashkir tribal structure; in the eighteenth century six clans (*rod*) bore this name. Among them, the western or mountain-forest group had three: Inzer Katay, Kuzgun Katay, and Idel Katay. Three other clans, namely the Ulu Katay, Bala Katay, and Yalan Katay belonged to the eastern, Trans-Uralian group which lived along the rivers Sinar, Techa, and Karabol.²⁷ The Bala Katay clan belongs to the tribe Salyut,²⁸ which clearly descends from the Salji'ut, a Mongol-speaking people very much involved in the early history of Chinggis khan. The question whether their language was Mongol proper (as that which we attribute, for instance, to the Mongols of Chinggis khan) or perhaps Kitan cannot be answered. Most of the Salyut live east of the Ural Mountains in the Chelyabinsk oblast. To this day, the vocabulary of their Turkic Bashkir dialect carries a substantial number of Mongol words.²⁹

It is quite clear that in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, if not earlier, the Bashkirs incorporated in their tribal structure a substantial Mongol element, and it seems logical to assume that at least part of this inheritance may have been transmitted by Kitan tribes.

Tribal or clan names with a "Kitay/Katay" component are ubiquitous over a large area. The White Nogays have a clan Kitay. Even among the Tatars of the Crimea the "Kitay" component appears in tribal names: Karača-Kitay and Orta-Kitay.³⁰ The very extended Uzbek tribal system includes a Kitay tribe.

On the steppe of southern Moldavia, formerly inhabited by Kipchak tribes, several toponyms indicate the former presence of Kitans: Kitay, Kara-Kitay, Kod-Kitay, Shikirli-Kitay refer to settlements; Kirgiz-Kitay is the name of a river.³¹ In the Danube delta, close to its

northern branch, called Kilia, can be found Rum Chitay, the Kitay Lagoon which receives a minor river called Kitay.³²

The material presented allows two conclusions to be drawn.

The first of these is rather obvious. According to Plano Carpini, the majority of the Karakitay defeated by the Mongols were killed, while others, unable to flee, were reduced to servitude. In other words they were incorporated into the Mongol Empire and dispersed over the immense territory it covered. All the place and tribal names "Kitay" or "Katay" (with phonetic variants) bear witness to this diaspora.

The second conclusion is that the survival of a "Kitan" form among the Ugrians of the Ob and in the Russian and Hungarian chronicles presents an unresolved historical mystery. How do we explain that the original Mongol name should emerge thousands of kilometers away from the Kitan homeland, on the western edge of the Central Eurasian world? Moreover, how do we account for the presence in Russian sources of the "Kitan" name (with the final -n), well before the foundation, let alone the fall of the Karakitay Empire?

About eighty years ago Marquart (1912-14: 137) suggested that around 1120 in the region of the Ural Mountains appeared a Mongol people, related to the Kitan, subsequently absorbed and turkicized by the Kipchaks. In his classic review of this study Pelliot (1920: 149) seems to have approved this idea; at any rate he did not contradict it. It could well be that we have here one of Marquart's ideas qualified by Pelliot (1920: 129) as "les éclairs d'une véritable divination." At any rate, some of the data I have adduced seem to bring belated support to Marquart's hypothesis.

What can safely be said is that the Kitay people survived the disaster of 1218. A protagonist no more, in the shadow of history, it had, as it were, a political afterlife which, with the help of Western sources, we may attempt to sketch. These few remarks were aimed at providing some material to such an undertaking.

³² As mentioned in *The Columbia Lippincott Gazetteer of the World*, New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1962.

REFERENCES

- Abramzon, S. M. 1971. *Kirgizy i ikh étnicheskie i istoriko-kul'turnye svyazi*. Leningrad.
- Aubin, Françoise. 1985. À propos des Kalmak ou Sart-Kalmak de l'Issyk-kul. *Études mongoles* 16:81-89.
- Baddeley, John F. 1919. *Russia, Mongolia, China*. London. Reprint New York: Burt Franklin, n.d.
- Baladin, A. N., and M. P. Bakhrusheva. 1958. *Mansiysko-russkiy slovar'*. Leningrad.

- Baskakov, N. A. 1964. Rodo-plemennye nazvaniya kipchakov v toponimii yuzhnoy Moldavii. In *Toponimika Vostoka: Novye issledovaniya*, ed. Redkollegiya. Pp. 46-51. Moskva.
- _____. 1984. Imena polovcev i nazvaniya poloveckikh plemen v russkikh letopisyakh. In *Tyurkskaya onomastika*, ed. A. T. Kaydarov. Pp. 48-77. Alma-Ata.
- _____. 1985. *Tyurkskaya leksika v "Slove o polku Igoreve."* Moskva.
- Bosworth, C. E. 1978. Kara Khitay. *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*. Vol. IV, pp. 580-83.
- Boyle, John Andrew. 1958. *The History of the World-Conqueror by 'Ata-Malik Juvaini*. Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press.
- Burton, Audrey. 1993. *Bukharan Trade 1558-1718*. Papers on Inner Asia, no. 23. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies.
- Cincius, V. I. 1975. *Stravnitel'nyy slovar' tunguso-man'chzhurskikh yazykov*. 2 vols. Leningrad.
- Cleaves, Francis Woodman. 1951. The Sino-Mongolian Inscription of 1338 in Memory of Jigünte. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 14:1-104.
- Epstein, Fritz T. 1964. *Heinrich von Staden: Aufzeichnungen über den Moskauer Staat*. 2nd ed. Universität Hamburg. Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der Auslandskunde, Bd. 34. Hamburg: Cram, de Gruyter & Co.
- Franko, Herbert. 1990. The Forest Peoples of Manchuria: Kitans and Jurchen. In *Sinor 1990*. Pp. 400-423, 492-94.
- Golden, Peter. 1986/87. Cumanica II. *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 6:5-29.
- _____. 1987/91. Nomads and Their Sedentary Neighbors in Pre-Chinggisid Eurasia. *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 7:41-81.
- Gombocz, Zoltán. 1917. A magyar őshaza és a nemzeti hagyomány. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 45:123-93.
- Gumilev, L. N. 1987. *Searches for an Imaginary Kingdom: The Legend of the Kingdom of Prester John*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Hakluyt, Richard. 1907. *The principall Navigations of the English Nation as published in Richard Hakluyt Voyages*, vol. I. London: Everyman's Library (no. 264).
- Halkovic, Stephen A., Jr. 1985. *The Mongols of the West*. Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Series 148. Bloomington, Ind.
- Jackson, Peter, and David Morgan. 1990. *The Mission of Friar William of Rubruck*. London: The Hakluyt Society.
- Janhunen, Juha. 1990. On Breaking in Mongolic. In *Altaica Osloensia: Proceedings from the 32nd Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference*, ed. Bernt Brendemoen. Pp. 181-91. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Karjalainen, K. F. 1948. *Ostjakisches Wörterbuch*, bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Y. H. Toivonen, I-II. Helsinki: Suomalais-ugrilainen Seura.
- Khisamitdinova, F. G. 1991. *Bashkirskaya oikonomiya XVI-XIX vv.* Ufa.
- _____. 1994. *Geograficheskie nazvaniya Bashkortostana*. 2nd ed. Ufa.
- Knefelkamp, Ulrich. 1986. *Die Suche nach dem Reich des Priesterkönigs Johannes, dargestellt anhand von Reiseberichten und anderen ethnographischen Quellen des 12. bis 17. Jahrhunderts*. Gelsenkirchen: Andreas Müller.
- Kuzeev, R. G. 1959. Rodo-plemenny sostav bashkir v XVIII veke. In *Voprosy bashkirskoy filologii*. Pp. 60-71. Moskva.
- _____. 1974. *Proiskhozhdenie bashkirskogo naroda*. Moskva.
- Lezina, I. I., and A. V. Superanskaya. 1984. Ob étnotoponimakh Kryma. In *Tyurkskaya onomastika*, ed. A. T. Kaydarov. Pp. 77-89. Alma-Ata.
- Ligeti, Lajos. 1981. Joannes Ungarus és az 1262. évi mongol követjárás. *Magyar Tudományos Akadémia I. osztály közleményei* 32:117-37.
- Maksyutova, N. Kh. 1976. *Vostochnyy dialekt bashkirskogo yazyka*. Moskva.
- Marquart, J. 1912-14. Über das Volkstum der Komanen. *Abhandlungen der königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, phil.-hist. Kl., n.F. XIII*, no. 1:25-238.
- Menestö, E. See Pian di Carpine.
- Meyvaert, Paul. 1980. An Unknown Letter of Hulagu, Il-Khan of Persia to King Louis IX of France. *Viator* 11:245-59.
- Munkácsi, Bernát. 1892. *Vogul népköltési gyűjtemény*, II.1. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.
- Önnorfors, Alf. 1967. *Hystoria Tartarorum C. de Bridia Monachi*. Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen 186. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Pelliot, Paul. 1920. À propos des Comans. *Journal asiatique* 1:125-85.
- _____. 1959. *Notes on Marco Polo*, I. Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve.
- Pian di Carpine. 1989. *Storia dei Mongoli a cura di P. Daffinà, C. Leonardi, M. C. Lungarotti, E. Menestö, L. Petech*. Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo.
- Poppe, Nicholas. 1955. *Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 110. Helsinki.
- _____. 1956. On the so-called breaking of *i in Mongolian. *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 28:43-48.
- Potapov, A. P. 1953. *Ocherki po istorii altaycev*. Moskva-Leningrad.
- Richard, Jean. 1979. Une ambassade mongole à Paris. *Journal des Savants*, 295-303.
- Sanzheev, G. D. 1953. *Stravnitel'naya grammatika mongolskikh yazykov*, I. Moskva.
- Sinor, Denis. 1939. A propos de la biographie ouïgoure de Hiuan-tsang. *Journal asiatique*, 543-90.
- _____. 1971. *Inner Asia: History—Civilization—Languages*. 2nd ed. Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Series, vol. 96. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University.

- _____. ed. 1990. *The Cambridge History of Early Inner Asia*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Szentpétery, Emericus, ed. 1937-38. *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum*. 2 vols. Budapest: Academia Litter. Hungarica.
- Tereshkin, N. I. 1981. *Slovar' vostochno-khantyyskikh dialektov*. Leningrad.
- Vásáry, I. 1982. The "Yugria" Problem. In *Chuvash Studies*, ed. A. Róna-Tas. Pp. 247-57. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Vasilevich, G. M. 1958. *Évenkiysko-russkiy slovar'*. Moskva.
- Vinnikov, Ya. R. 1956. Rodo-plemennyi sostav i rasselenie kirgizov na territorii Yuzhnoy Kirgizii. In *Trudy Kirgizskoy Arkheologo-étnograficheskoy Ékspeditsii*, ed. G. F. Debec. Vol. I, pp. 136-88. Moskva.
- Waley, Arthur. 1931. *The Travels of an Alchemist*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Webb, John W. 1965. The Van Deutecum Map of Russia and Tartary. In *Merchants and Scholars: Essays in the History of Exploration and Trade*, ed. John Parker. Pp. 136-81. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press.
- Wittfogel, K. A., and Chia-shêng Fêng. 1949. *History of Chinese Society: Liao (907-1125)*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, n.s., 36. Philadelphia.
- Zajaczkowski, Ananiasz. 1949. *Związki językowe polowiec-kosłowińskie*. Travaux de la Société des Sciences et des Lettres de Wrocław, série A, nr. 34. Wrocław.
- Zhukavskaya, N. A. 1985. Les Kalmaks de l'Issyk-kul. *Études mongoles* 16:91-106.