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A Unique Tangut Primary Reader
Brief Collection by Taizong kept in the IOM RAS

Abstract: The previously undesiphered manuscript inv. № 5875 preserved in the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, Russian Academy of Sciences, proves to be the Tangut version of a primary reader. Its Chinese original is an inconsistently miscellaneous compilation of ancient literary allusions and contemporary folk maxims. The text is composed by different literary style of antithetical couplet and ordinary prose without a consistent subject. Although its Chinese original has not been found yet and the whole text has not been thoroughly deciphered so far, narrations and translations may be provided as many as possible in the present paper in order to lay a foundation for further studies.
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Introduction

The Tangut manuscript introduced here was found by Kozlov expedition in Khara-khoto and now preserved in the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, Russian Academy of Sciences, with its inventory number 5875. It was first reported by (GORBACHEVA and KYCHANOV 1963, 24) as Taizu Jiqian Wen 太祖繼遷文 (A book of Jiqian, the First Emperor) and was characterized as a record of some government affairs about the first founder of the Xixia Dynasty, Jiqian (963–1004). The manuscript has not been put into any descriptive catalogue so far because its text seems too difficult to be deciphered. The facsimile of the Tangut original was published with the title Taizong Zeyao Wen 太宗擇要文 (A book of brief collection by Taizong, the Second Emperor).1 (NISHIDA 1999, 12) translated the first two sentences
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1 See Ecang Heishuicheng Wenxian 俄藏黑水城文獻 (Heishuicheng manuscript collected in Russia) vol. 11, p. 112–116, Shanghai: Shanghai Chinese Classics Publishing House, 1999.
into Japanese and pointed out that the text was by no means related to historical facts about Jiqian, but the nature of the whole booklet remains unknown. Although ten couplets were translated and commented later (Nie 2012), we are still not able to solve the problem completely. Because it has been said that this manuscript is one of the most puzzling texts for Tangutologists to read over, the present paper intends to provide the translations and narrations as more as possible in order to lay a primary foundation for further studies.

The manuscript in question consists of ten folia, fragmentary from the fifth folio on. The first six folia are written in comparatively structured running hand, but the following are in illegible cursive hand. The calligraphic style shows that the original was not transcribed by one and the same person. At the beginning of the booklet there are no colophons by authors or dates, but only a Tangut title thej tsụ tshji tsji r·jwɨr 知凭扼蝡蒾 on the first line, which was translated into Chinese by Nishida as Dazu Yaoxuan Wen 大祖要選文 (A book of important collection by the First Emperor). Of course the actual meaning of the title remains unclear to us, but we can definitely say that the Tangut proper noun thej tsụ should be translated into Chinese as taizong 太宗 (the Second Emperor), not taizu. We base on that the word thow thej tsụ 知憑 is used for Emperor Tang Taizong 唐太宗 (598–649) in the Tangut version of the Commentaries of Sunzi’s Art of War (Li 1997, 789). Another character needs to be mentioned is ·jwɨr 蒾 (writing, book), which is used here as a suffix of book title beyond its lexical meaning, for this reason we should better translate the title as “Brief Collection by Taizong” (hereafter BCT).

According to the parts I am able to read, it may be said with certainty that the BCT is a compilation inconsistently miscellaneous of ancient literary allusions and contemporary folk maxims. Plentiful ancient Chinese literary allusions show that the text must have been translated from Chinese, but so far nobody have found its Chinese original in any materials available, so we have to work out some tentative reconstruction of the Chinese contents. Needless to say, no matter how we try our best on making the reconstructions closer to the ancient literary style, it is impossible for us to reconstruct the Chinese original exactly, especially to reconstruct the folk maxims.

---

2 It seems to be a traditional custom that Non-Chinese people take a word of the same usage attached to a book title, e.g., bitig (writing, book) in Uyghurian and bithe (writing, book) in Manchu.
Narrations and translations

The BCT text begins with emphasizing the importance of sages to assist their rulers, and with two ancient monarchs mentioned. The second one, xā kew tsu 猿猴疏, was correctly recognized by Nishida as Han Gaozu 漢高祖, whereas the first one, sju·njij 猿猴之, was reluctantly translated as a certain yanwang 燕王 with the first character sju unsolved. Now we can assume that the name actually indicates Xu Yanwang 徐偃王, a legendary moral King of the State Xu in the Spring and Autumn Period (770–476 BC.). Here is the relevant couplet (fig. 1):

Folio 1, line 2–3:

徐偃王處漢東，地方五百里，行仁義，割地而朝者三十有六國；

[King Xu Yanwang possessed kindness and morality, but lost the state for lacking persons as legs and shoulders3 at left and right; Emperor Han Gaozu abandoned institution and politeness, but flourished the imperial power for having ministers as joints4 inside and outside.]

Chinese tentative reconstruction:

徐偃王有仁德，卻無左右股肱之人而國土喪；
漢高祖失禮義，實有內外肯綮之臣而帝道昌。

The author states that a ruler will not succeed without assistance of eminent ministers around him. The story concerning Xu Yanwang is recorded in chapter 49 of Hanfeizi:5

King Xu Yanwang had his state of five hundred square li6 located in Handong7. Because of his kind and polite behavior, 36 states had audiences with him by ceding their territory. King Jing Wenwang8, being afraid of

3 Persons as legs and shoulders (Tang. khji lâ sju dzjwo 猿猴之) here is a Chinese metaphor for indispensable assistants.

4 Ministers as joints (Tang. tsewr yâ thwu bji 猿猴之) here is also a Chinese metaphor for pivotal assistants.

5 Chinese original: 徐偃王處漢東，地方五百里，行仁義，割地而朝者三十有六國。楚文王恐其害己也，舉兵伐徐，遂滅之。故文王行仁義而王天下，偃王行仁義而喪其國。(韩非子·五蠹).

6 Li is a traditional Chinese unit of measure (= 400 meters at that time).

7 Handong, an ancient name of a certain place, perhaps was located to the east of the Hanshui River, now Hubei Province.

8 Jing Wenwang, i.e., Chu Wenwang 楚文王 (?–675 BC.), named Zi 费, was the King of State Chu (now Hunan and Hubei Province), ruling the state from 690 to 675 BC.
danger to himself, sent troops to attack the State Xu and destroyed it. Therefore King Wenwang\(^9\) reigned over the world by his kind and polite behavior, while Yanwang lost his state also by his kind and polite behavior.

Han Gaozu indicates the founder of Han Dynasty, Liu Bang 劉邦 (256–195 BC.). As for the story concerning his arrogance, see his biography in volume 8 of *Shiji*:\(^10\)

The emperor said: “Each nobleman and general dare not hide from me, all tell me the case: What is the reason why I acquire the world? What is the reason why Xiang Yu\(^11\) loses the world?” Gao Qi and Wang Ling answered: “Your Majesty insults others arrogantly, while Xiang Yu respects others kindly. Your Majesty ordered others to capture cities and territories, then gave them as awards, enjoying the benefits with the world. Xiang Yu did not take this way; he injured heroes, suspected sages. This is the reason why he lost the world”.

The subject of the following couplet is not related to the previous one and advises people not to be addicted to gambling games. It mentions two names: Liu Yi 劉毅 and Tao Kan 陶侃 in Jin Dynasty.

**Folio 1, line 3-4:**

劉毅穀苑軾翎韓鷹，
陶鹹殼芻按鱉我鰾。

[Liu Yi got a capital crime for concentrating himself on *chupu*,\(^12\) Tao Kan distinguished himself for throwing the gambling devices\(^13\) into river.]

---

\(^9\) Wenwang here indicates Zhou Wenwang 周文王 (approximately 1152–1056 BC.), named 姬昌, the founder of Zhou Dynasty.

\(^10\) Chinese original: 上曰: “列侯，諸將毋敢隠朕，皆言其情：我所以有天下者何？項氏之所以失天下者何？高起，王陵對曰: “陛下慢而侮人，項羽仁而敬人。陛下使人攻城掠地，因以與之，與天下同其利；項羽不然，有功者害之，賢者疑之，此所以失天下也。” (史記·高祖本紀)

\(^11\) Xiang Yu 項羽 (232–202 BC.), generally called Xichu Bawang 西楚霸王, was a leader of uprising against Qin Dynasty, being defeated by Liu Bang at last.

\(^12\) *Chupu* 樗蒱 (Tang. *thja wju lu* 馳 霸敟, gamble throwing) is an ancient dice game with five small wood blocks, coloring black on one side and white on the other. According to the combination of different colors, the awards are divided into five grades: The first grade award is called *lu* 蘆 (all black), the second *zhì* 雉 (pigeon, four black and one white), those beside the two (including *heidu* 黑犢, black calf) came to nothing.

\(^13\) Gambling device (Tang. *khe jihor* 瑦 箫, game table) here might be basin of the dice.
Liu Yi (?–412), a general of Song Dynasty in the Southern Dynasties Period, was known for his insolence. He prepared to launch an insurrection against Emperor Wudi (Liu Yu), but was defeated ahead of time. The story may be found from his biography in volume 45 of *Jinshu*: 14

After then they gathered together at the eastern mansion for an unrestrained dice gambling with millions of money per game. When others played *heidu* and went back, only Liu Yu and Liu Yi left behind. Yi played a *zhī* and then lifted his clothes and walk around the stool with a great rejoicing, calling Yu to sit together and said: “It is not that I am unable to get a *lu*, merely I do not want to play that.” Yu disliked his words, so he grasped the five wood blocks for a long while and said: “As the elder brother, let me answer you.” Soon afterwards, four blocks were black but one kept turning. Yu shouted harshly and it immediately became *lu*. Yi felt extremely unpleasant, his face turned as black as iron, but he said calmly: “I already know that you will not coordinate with me!” After he went to the western defense, although he was back to share the responsibility for governing Shan Prefecture, he immediately lost the authority in royal court. Considering his limited transaction and position, he intended to await an opportunity to overturn Yu by his powerful force, but failed at last.

Tao Kan (259–334) was a famous minister and general of the Eastern Jin Dynasty. The relevant story comes from his biography in volume 66 of *Jinshu*: 16

Tao Kan was intelligent by nature, diligent in official jobs, courteous and polite, obeying human relations … Once there were assistants who delayed their affairs by chatting or gambling, he ordered someone to take back their liqueur sets and gambling devices and then throw them into river. General assistants were punished. He said: “Chupu is merely a game for swineherds!”

---

14 Chinese original: 後於東府聚樗蒱大擲，一判應至數百萬。余人並黙以還，唯劉裕及毅在後。毅次擲得雉，大喜，褰衣繞床，叫謂同坐曰：“非不能盧，不事此耳。”裕惡之，因挼五木久之，曰：“老兄試為卿答。”既而四子俱黑，其一子轉躍未定。裕厲聲喝之，即成盧焉。毅意殊不快，然素黙，其面如鐵色焉，而乃和言曰：“亦知公不能以此見借！”

15 Liu Yu (363–422), i.e., Song Wudi, was the founder of the Song Dynasty in Southern Dynasties Period.

16 Chinese original: 侃性聰敏，勤於吏職，恭而近禮，愛好人倫 … 諸參佐或以談戲廢事者，乃命取其酒器蒱博之具，悉投之江，吏將則加鞭撲，曰： ‘樗蒱者，牧豬奴戲耳!’ (晉書・陶侃傳)
Fig. 1
The first folio of *Brief Collection by Taizong*
Fig. 2
The second folio of *Brief Collection by Taizong*
Many key words in the next three couplets are written so perfunctorily that the characters cannot be recognized one by one. What may be read is a story of a certain person in Jin Dynasty who entertained himself without stop even when his mother was dying. These three couplets are followed by the story of how Emperor Yao 堯 (jiw 鬱) examining Shun 舜 (sjwɨ 萬) to be his successor.

**Folio 1, line 8 — Folio 2, line 1 (Fig. 2)**

奶腲颊炽，婼 จากนั้น 砃茪>s繰臡袭□□□絥；
萠索世界，勝皛笘礿睫聴谁。

[King Yao got false accusation when Shun collected firewood\(^{17}\) and drew water\(^{18}\) he harmed ……

Emperor Shun was reported benevolence and selected as a sage when he lifted a flag in pasturage\(^{19}\) and fields.]

Chinese tentative reconstruction:

堯王得讒，塗廩穿井時害…
舜帝告善，巡狩耕田中拔擢智人.

The above narration of Yao and Shun, who were legendary Chinese sage emperors, might have been deduced from the first volume of *Shiji*,\(^{20}\) but with some serious errors caused by the compiler or Tangut translator’s misunderstanding of Chinese classics:

Shun ploughed at the Mount Lishan … Gusou\(^{21}\) still wanted to murder him. Gusou ordered Shun to climb up for mending a granary, then he set fire below to burn the granary. Shun protected himself with two bamboo hats, getting down and leaving, so he got survived. After that Gusou ordered Shun to dredge a well, and Shun dug a hiding hole with an exit on a

\(^{17}\) Tangut *sji śjɨ tśhjij kjwi* 奶腲 麗 (collecting wood and grass = collecting firewood) is the misunderstanding of Chinese *tulin* 塗廩 (mending a granary).

\(^{18}\) Tangut *zjɨ kha* 竣穃 (drawing water) is the misunderstanding of Chinese *chuanjing* 穿井 (dredging a well).

\(^{19}\) Tangut *gwi tējī sju lhew* 奶萏 麗 (lifting a flag in pasturage) is the misunderstanding of Chinese *sunshou* 巡狩 (inspection tour), a rite for an emperor just acceded to the throne.

\(^{20}\) Chinese original: 舜耕歷山 … 瞽叟尚復欲殺之，使舜上塗廩。瞽叟從下縱火焚廩，舜乃以兩笠自扞而下，去，得不死。後瞽叟又使舜穿井，舜穿井為匿空旁出。舜既入深，瞽叟與象共下土實井，舜從匿空出，去 … 堯老，使舜攜行天子政，巡狩。 (史記·五帝本紀).

\(^{21}\) Gusou, meaning “old blind man”, is the name of Shun’s father. He disliked Shun and plotted murdering him repeatedly but failed at last.
side wall. When Shun went deep, Gusou and Xiang filled in the well with dirt, but Shun went out through the hiding hole and left … Yao, in his old age, let Shun act temporarily for the government affairs as an Emperor, engaging in an inspection tour.

The following sentences continue the subject of Yao and Shun, in which the stories concern Ji Kang 嵇康 (khji khow 嵇康), Liang Hong 梁鴻 (ljow xū 羅鴻), Zhao Qi 趙岐 (tśhjiw khji 徽養) and Taigong 太公 (thej kow 蒼公), who suffered hard lives before they became famous for their moral qualities.

**Folio 2, line 1–2:**

嵇康鍛鐵，梁鴻賃舂；
趙岐販餅，太公賣麵．

[Moral persons sought benefit:][23]

Ji Kang hammered iron, Liang Hong was employed for pounding grain; Zhao Qi sold pancakes, Taigong sold flour.

Chinese tentative reconstruction:

德者尋利：
嵇康鍛鐵，梁鴻賃舂；
趙岐販餅，太公賣麵．

Ji Kang (224–263), as an outstanding ideologist and literati in the Wei-Jin Period, was one of the famous “Seven sages in bamboo grove” (Chin. zhulin qixian 竹林七賢) and the founder of the Metaphysic School. His anthology has been preserved till nowadays. The story of hammering iron comes from his biography in volume 49 of Jinshu:[24]

Ji Kang, living a poor life in his early years, hammered iron for self-supporting together with Xiang Xiu under a big tree. Zhong Hui from the Yingchuan Prefecture, a noble junior of keen-witted competence and talented eloquence, went to meet him. Kang did not receive him politely and hammered without stop.

---

22 Xiang was the younger son of Gusou and was indulgent by his father.
23 “Seeking benefit” (Tang. gjịj ju 竟蘞) here means “finding some way to support one’s life”.
24 Chinese original: 初，康居貧，嘗與向秀共鍛於大樹之下，以自賃給。潁川鍾會，貴公子也，精練有才辯，故往造焉。康不為之禮，而鍛不輟。（晉書·嵇康傳）
25 Xiang Xiu (approximately 227–272), a literati in the Wei-Jin Period, was one of the famous “Seven sages in bamboo grove” in accompany with Ji Kang.
26 Zhong Hui was a famous minister in State Wei of the Three Kingdom Period, one of the chief commanders in the war to destroy State Shu.
Liang Hong, lived in the 1st c. AD, was a poor hermit in the Eastern Han times and became famous with his wife through the idiom *ju an qi mei* 舊案齊眉 (raising a serving table to brow). The story of pounding grain comes from his biography in volume 83 of *Houhanshu*.

Liang Hong then arrived to Wu Prefecture and served to a rich man Gao Botong, living at a side room and being employed for pounding grain. Whenever back at home, his wife prepared food for him by raising a serving table up to her brow and dared not look up in front of him. Botong found this with a surprise and said: “That servant should not be an ordinary person because he makes his wife to respect him like this.” Thus he let Hong live in the main house.

Zhao Qi 趙岐 (?–201), also written Zhao Qi 趙岐, a scholar at the end of the Eastern Han Period, was framed and had to leave his official position to a remote area where he wrote his famous commentaries to *Mencius*. The relevant story may be found in his biography in volume 64 of *Houhanshu*.

At the end of Han Dynasty, Zhao Qi went to Hejian Prefecture escaping from calamity, where nobody knew his name. Then migrating to Beihai Prefecture, he often wore a cotton trouser to sell pancakes at the market. Sun Binshuo, in his twenties at that time, entered the market in an ox cart and accompanied by two guardsmen on horse. Seeing Qi, he expected that he was not an ordinary person, and asked him: “Are the pancakes cooked by yourself?” Qi said: “I resell them.” Binshuo said: “For how much money do you buy it? For how much money do you sell it?” Qi said: “Thirty for buying, also thirty for selling.” Binshuo said: “Your intellectual feature shows me that you are not a pancake seller. There might be a reason.” Then he opened the back door of the cart and turned back to the two guardsmen, ordering them to get down from their horses and help Qi to get on the cart.

Taigong, i.e., Jiang Taigong 姜太公 (approximately 1156–1017 BC.), named Lü Shang 吕尚 or Lü Wang 吕望, also called Taigong Wang 太公望, was an outstanding politician and strategist who directed Emperor Zhou...
Wuwang to overthrow Shang Dynasty thus became the founding father of Zhou Dynasty. As for the legend of his early years, we can only find the reference in two commentaries of Shiji. One is attached to the text “Lü Shang was trapped in Jijin” (呂尚困於棘津) by Zhang Shoujie, and the other is recorded by Sima Zhen in his commentary to “Lü Shang was already poor and old at that time” (呂尚蓋嘗窮困年老矣) in volume 32 of Shiji.

Taigong Wang sold foods in Jijin in nearly seventy years of age.

“Selling foods in Jijin” was recorded by Sima Zhen as “selling drinks in Mengjin” in his commentary to “Lü Shang was already poor and old at that time” in volume 32 of Shiji. It is noticeable that the canonical histories only mentioned selling foods or drinks but not “selling flour”. The story of Taigong selling flour is widely spread among the people nowadays might be deduced by later generations.

The following couplet says that farming should be the basis for rulers in governing a country. Three names are mentioned there: Lu Xigong (魯僖公), Shun (舜) and Yu (禹).

Folio 2, line 3–4:

[That King Lu Xigong engaged in farming led the state abundant,  
That Emperor Shun and Yu based on agriculture led the masses peaceful.]

Chinese tentative reconstruction:

魯僖公務稼穡而國阜,  
舜禹帝本農耕而民安.

Lu Xigong (?–627 BC.), named Ji Shen, was the 18th monarch of State Lu in the Spring and Autumn Period, reigning for 33 years. The relevant story comes from chapter The 21st year of Xigong in Zuozhuan.

---

30 Chinese original: 太公望行年七十, 賣食棘津云. (史記正義·游俠列傳).
31 Chinese original: 賣飲於孟津. (史記索隱·齊太公世家).
32 An untraceable folk legend said that Taigong was extremely unlucky in his early years. When he sold flour, wind blew his flour away; when he sold salt, rain melted his salt away.
33 Tangut njij (king) is used here to render Chinese gong 公 (Duke), because Tanguts had not the conception of Five Titles for Nobles (gong 公, hou 侯, bo 伯, zi 子, nan 男) of Pre-Qin Period. Of course it will be better if the Tangut phonetic transcription kow 恒 is used in Huangong 恒公 as shown below.
There was a bad drought in summer. The King intended to burn down a witch Wang.\textsuperscript{35} Zang Wenzhong\textsuperscript{36} said: “This is not the way for restraining drought. What should be done is to mend city walls, economize foods and expenses, engage farming and advise to alms. What use is it to burn down a witch Wang? If the Heaven intends to kill the masses, they should not be born; if a witch can bring drought, things should be even worse after burning her down.” The King followed his expostulation. That year there was poor harvest but not disastrous.

Shun, as one of the ancient “Five Emperors” in legend, was venerated as the originator of morality in China. The story of his farming can be seen in the first volume of \textit{Shiji}.\textsuperscript{37}

When Shun ploughed at the Mount Lishan, all people at Lishan vacated their field boundaries; when he fished on the Lake Leize, all people on Leize vacated their locations; when he made potteries beside river, there were not any defective items beside the river. His residence became a village in the first year, became a town in the second year and became a metropolis in the third year.

Yu was the founder of Xia Dynasty, being famous for his taming the flood and establishing the institution of the Nine Administrative Divisions (Chin. \textit{Jiuzhou} 九州). The story of his farming can be seen in Chapter 14 of \textit{Quotations of Confucius}:\textsuperscript{38}

Yu\textsuperscript{39} was good at archery, Ao\textsuperscript{40} was good at punting, but both of them did not die a natural death. Yu and Ji\textsuperscript{41} obtained the whole world by farming personally.

The following subject turns to liquor commandments, in which the two names are mentioned Zifan 子反 (tsʉ xiwã 蟲獻) and Bi Zhuo 畢卓 (pji tśiow 值灼).

\textsuperscript{35} Burning somebody to death is a method to prevent disasters in ancient China.  
\textsuperscript{36} Zang Wenzhong (71–617 BC.) was an enlightened minister assisting four monarchs of State Lu.  
\textsuperscript{37} Chinese original: 舜耕歷山，歷山之人皆讓畔；漁雷澤，雷澤上人皆讓居；陶河濱，河濱器皆不苦窳。一年而所居成聚，二年而成邑，三年而成都。（史記•五帝本紀）  
\textsuperscript{38} Chinese original: 羿善射，奡蕩舟，俱不得其死然。禹稷躬稼而有天下。（論語•憲問）  
\textsuperscript{39} Yi, usually called Hou Yi 后羿 (King Yi), was a legendary hero in archaic times. As a skillful archer, he shot down nine of the ten suns in severe heat weather but was killed by his apprentice at last.  
\textsuperscript{40} Ao was a legendary figure in Xia Dynasty. He was able to punt a boat on the ground with his unusual strength, but at last was killed by the seventh generation from Yu.  
\textsuperscript{41} Ji 稷, usually called Hou Ji 后稷 (King Ji), was venerated as the ancestor of farming and the deity of grains in Chinese legend.
Folio 2, line 4–5:

[General Zifan of the King of State Chu killed himself for being drunken by accident and being defeated;
Minister Bi Zhuo of Jin Dynasty was captured for stealing liquor when he was drinking excessively.]

Chinese tentative reconstruction:

楚將子反，誤醉戰敗而自盡；
晉臣畢卓，盜酒造飲以遭擒．

Zifan (?–575 BC.), named Ce 側, was the commander in chief of the troops of State Chu in the Spring and Autumn Period. His story of drinking comes from chapter The 16th year of Chenggong in Zuozhuan:42

Guyang Shu43 offered liquor to Zifan, Zifan was drunk and could not meet the King. The King said: “The Heaven will destroy the State Chu. I cannot stay here.” Then he fled at night … When the troops went back to Xia, the King ordered someone to tell Zifan: “Earlier you, my senior minister, lost the troops because the King was absent. Please do not think it as your fault, it is my guilt.” Zifan saluted twice and said: “If the king grants death to a minister, he will be immortal. My soldiers really fled, it is my guilt.” Zizhong44 told Zifan: “It is already known that you lost your troops before. Why do not you find some way?” Zifan answered: “Although there were few ministers doing so before, as a minister assisting the King, how dare I do anything injustice? A minister lost the King’s troops, how dare I escape the death?” The King ordered somebody to stop him, but he died before the messenger’s arrival.

---

42 Chinese original: 谷陽豎獻飲於子反，子反醉而不能見．王曰："天败楚也夫! 余不可以待．" 乃宵遁．楚師還，及瑕，王使謂子反曰："先大夫之覆師徒者，君不在．子無以為過，不穀之罪也．" 子反再拜稽首曰："君賜臣死，死且不朽．臣之幸實奔，臣之罪也．" 子重復謂子反曰："初隕師徒者，而亦聞之矣! 盍圖之？" 對曰："雖微先大夫有之，大夫命側，敢忘其死？側亡君師，敢忘其死？" 王使止之，弗及而卒．(左傳・成公十六年).

43 Guyang Shu, named Guyang, was a close servant of Zifan. The word shu 竖 (mean guy) is a derogatory term attached by traditional historians for his entrapping the host by liquor.

44 Zizhong (?–570 BC.), named Yingqi 嬝齊, Zifan’s brother, was also a minister in State Chu.
Bi Zhuo, lived in the first part of the 4th century, was an officer in Ministry of Personnel in the Eastern Jin Dynasty, being famous for delaying his jobs by drinking. The story of his stealing liquor may be found in volume 49 of Jinshu.45

Bi Zhuo, as an official in the Ministry of Personnel, often postponed official jobs by drinking wine. A neighbor official brewed wine, drunken Zhuo went among the jars at night to steal and drink it, but was caught by wine guards. Next morning, when the guards had found that it was Bi from the Ministry of Personal, the guards unbundled him hastily. Then Zhuo led the host to drink beside the jars, and after that he became drunken and left home.

The next two stories, essentially showing the uninhibited life of intellectuals in Wei-Jin Period, seem to be lend for liquor commandments here, in which the second person name mentioned is undoubtedly Liu Ling 刘伶 (ljiw lhev 虬櫉), the first name should be Ziquan 子泉 (tsu tshjwã 蜙雐) but the second character was written as to 鬃 by a slip of pen.46

Folio 2, line 5–7:

子泉嗜酒，臨卒彌留，願葬陶家之側；
劉伶好鹿，尋酒富家，一斛一飲解酲.

Ziquan, generally called by his surname Zheng Quan 鄭泉 (tśhjij tshjwã 蜂雐) in the Tangut version Forrest of Categories (Shi ET.AL. 1993, 183), was a minister Taizhong Dafu 太中大夫 of State Wu in the Three Kingdoms

45 Chinese original: 卓 … 為吏部郎，常飲酒廢職。比舍郎釀熟，卓因醉夜至其壇間盜飲之，為掌酒者所覺，明日視之，乃吏部也，遂釋其縛。卓遂引主人宴於壇側，致醉而去。(晋書•畢卓傳).
46 Tangut to 鬃 is never used for phonetic transcription.
47 Hu斛 is an ancient Chinese unit of measure (~ 20 liters).
Period. He was often sent to State Shu as an envoy for negotiation but merely being famous as a liquor mania. His story comes from *Wushu* 吳書 quoted by Pei Songzhi 貝松之 in his commentary attached to “Zheng Quan interviewed Liu Bei in Baidi City” (Zheng Quan pin Liu Bei yu Baidi 鄭泉聘劉備於白帝) in volume 47 of *Sanguo Zhi*.

Zheng Quan, a given name Wenyuan, from Chenjun Prefecture, was erudite and unusually ambitious but fond of liquor in nature … On his deathbed, Quan told his relatives: “Do bury me beside a pottery workshop. Maybe I shall turn into soil after one hundred years and fortunately be taken for making wine jars. So it will really satisfy my heart.”

Liu Ling lived in the 3rd c. and was one of the “Seven sages in bamboo grove”, being famous for his uninhibited attitude to reclusion. The well known story of him comes from volume 49 of *Jinshu*:

Liu Ling … often travelled on a deer cart with a pot of wine and ordered someone to follow him with a spade, telling: “Bury me if I die.” He disregarded his body like this. Once he was very thirsty and asked his wife for wine. His wife poured out wine and destroyed the drinking set, admonishing with tears: “Drinking too much is not the way for keeping health. You must quit it down.” Ling said: “Well, but I cannot quit it by myself except giving an oath to ghosts and gods. So you may prepare wine and meat.” Then he took wine and meat, and was drunken highly again.

The following subject emphasizes that natural disaster cannot be withstood merely by a king’s ability and morality. Two names are mentioned there: Tang 湯 (thow 硐) and Yao 堯 (jiw DBNull).
Folio 2, line 7–8:

湯有睿智，卻為七年大旱；
堯非仁德，何泛九載洪災？

Evidently the above couplet is derived from a famous statement by a Han minister Chao Cuo 晁錯 (200–154 BC.) in volume 24 of Hanhu:

The reason why there were not starvations during nine years flooding in Emperor Yao or Yu’s times and seven years drought in Emperor Tang’s times is that there were lots of accumulations and prearranged preparations.

It is inexplicable that in a few parts of BCT there are not any stories of the ancients and their literary style are not consistent with the context. Obviously these statements are not historical quotations, but folk maxims which are irrelevant with the subject and their sources cannot be found in any traditional Chinese records. It is reasonable to suspect that these couplets might not have come from traditional classics, but blends inserted by later authors or transcribers. The following couplet is a metaphor to emphasize that hard environment helps one to be strong and comfortable condition makes one to be weak.

Folio 2, line 8 — Folio 3, line 2: (Fig. 3)

罕屔眾屔，駱駱衆屔，駱駱屔毅毅；
駱駱屔毅毅，駱駱屔毅毅，駱駱屔毅毅．

[The branches of a pine at bottom of the valley are not withered in cold, because the growing place makes it forceful; The leaves of a willow in the garden fall of meeting dew, because the planting place results it in failure.]

51 Chinese original: 堯禹有九年之水，湯有七年之旱，而國無捐瘠者，以畜積多而備先具也． (漢書．食貨志下).

52 According to the common sense, here the word “dew” (Tang. wər 倉) might be a miswritten “frost” (Tang. nja 蟲).
This topic is objected in the next couplet, where the support from the bigwigs is regarded as the essential condition for succeeding.

**Folio 3, line 2–3:**

畏統鍵舦襲脜絅，
铁粔蓑甚；
盝葇砃榴箙砓瞭，
絶茦悄镰.

[Growing in dung, the flowers of hibiscus bloom in the morning and fall in the evening; Growing in front of a palace, the mingjian grass blooms in one day and wither after a month.]

Chinese tentative reconstruction:

木蓮花糞中生，故朝開夕落，
明見草殿前長，故日放月枯。

The next subject turns unaccountably to calling for humility:

**Folio 3, line 3:**

竭庭萅聴城例，
眛册订氢窾凉。

[A virtuous man will be excellent when praised by others, A beautiful woman will be ugly if boasting herself.]

Chinese tentative reconstruction:

男行人譽則妙，
女美自誇則醜。

---

53 The flowers of hibiscus (Chin. mulian 木蓮 or mufurong 木芙蓉) bloom only for a very short time, but I do not know whether ancient people believed that they grow in dung.

54 The real meaning of the Tangut word mjij kja is unknown. Here I transcribe it as mingjian phonetically because in China it was a sort of grass used for flowering lawn. Perhaps people think that it may be planted on the ground in front of a mansion.
Fig. 3
The third folio of *Brief Collection by Taizong*
The following couplet turns back to the previous style, which tells the stories of civilians how to catch an eye of noblemen and get promoted. Two persons are mentioned: Feng Xuan (馮諼) and Ning Qi (寗戚).

**Folio 3, line 3-4:**

劳苦悲傷，

Feng Xuan claimed necessities by rapping on the sword,
Ning Qi hoped to be interviewed by knocking an ox horn.

**Chinese tentative reconstruction:**

馮諼彈鋏以望所需，
寗戚擊角而求得見。

Feng Xuan, also written Feng Huan (馮驩), was a sponger (Chin. shike 食客) of Mengchang Jun during the Warring States Period. He excessively asked for many privileges, but helped his host a lot with prestige and political safety. The relevant story comes from volume 11 of *Zhanguo Ce*:

There was a man in State Qi, Feng Xu an, poor and not able to support himself. He asked someone to entrust Mengchang Jun for allowing him to be a house guest. Mengchang Jun asked: “What is the guest good at?” He said: “The guest is good at nothing.” Menchang asked: “What he can do?” He said: “He can do nothing.” Mengchang Jun received him with a smile and said: “Well.” People around thought that Mengchang Jun looked at him as worthless and then gave him poor food. After some time, Feng Xuan leaned to a column and rapped his sword, singing: “Long scabbard, let us come back!”

---

55 Tian Wen (田文 (?–279 BC.), titled Mengchang Jun (Viscount Mengchang), was a nobleman in State Qi. As one of the “Four lords of the Warring States period”, He was famous for adopting talents, and then became the Prime Minister of the State Qi and Wei in succession but was out of political jam at last.

56 Chinese original: 齊人有馮諼者，貧乏不能自存，使人屬孟嘗君，願寄食門下。孟嘗君曰：“客何好?”曰：“客無好也。”曰：“客何能?”曰：“客無能也。”孟嘗君笑而受之曰：“請。”左右以君賤之也，食以草具。居有歲，倚柱彈其劍，歌曰：“長鋏歸來乎! 食無魚。”左右以告。孟嘗君曰：“食之，比門下之客。”居有歲，復彈其劍，歌曰：“長鋏歸來乎! 兩無車。”左右皆惡之，以為貪而不知足。孟嘗君問：“馮公有親乎?”對曰：“有老母。”孟嘗君使人給其食用，無使乏。於是馮諼不復歌。(戰國策·齊策四)
leave! There is no fish for eating.” People around reported that. Mengchang Jun said: “Give him fish, as to guests in my place.” After some time, Feng Xuan rapped his scabbard again and sang: “Long scabbard, let us leave! There is no cart for going out.” All people around laughed at him and reported that. Mengchang Jun said: “Give him a cart, as to guests in my place.” Thereafter Feng Xuan raised his sword in the cart and met his friend, saying: “Mengchang Jun treated me as a guest.” After some time, he rapped his scabbard again and sang: “Long scabbard, let us leave! There is nothing to support my family.” All people around hated him for his greed and insatiate demands. Mengchang Jun asked: “Has Mister Feng relatives?” They answered: “He has an old mother.” Mengchang Jun ordered someone to support her accommodation. Thereupon Feng Xuan did not sing again.

Ning Qi in the Spring and Autumn Period, lived in the second half of the 7th c. BC., was frustrated in his early years but became one of the major ministers and finally assisting King Qi Huangong.57 The story comes from volume 5 of Xinxu:58

Ning Qi fed an ox under the hackery, feeling grief when catching sight of Huangong. Then he knocked the ox horn and immediately sang a song of Shang.59 Huangong heard him and grasped his servant’s hand, saying: “I am so amazed that the singer must not be an ordinary person!” Huangong ordered the cart behind to carry him back. The servant asked for instruction, Huangong said: “Give him clothes and hat, I shall interview him.” Ning Qi was then interviewed and talked to Huangong how to govern within the border. When being interviewed the next day, Ning Qi talked to Huangong how to possess the world. Huangong was particularly pleased and willing to promote him.

There are not any stories in the following sentences, which merely tell the restraint and leadership of monarchs on the masses.

57 Huangong (?–643 BC.), named Xiaobai 小白, as the King of State Qi, was one of the “Five Hegemons” in the Spring and Autumn Period.
58 Chinese original: 寧戚飯牛於車下，望桓公而悲，擊牛角，疾商歌，桓公聞之，扶其僕之手曰：“異哉！此歌者非常人也。”命後車載之，桓公反至，從者以請。桓公曰：“賜之衣冠，將見之。” 寧戚見，說桓公以合境內，明日復見，說桓公以為天下。桓公大說，將任之。 (新序•雜事五)
59 Shang (approximately 1060–1046 BC.) is the second Dynasty in archaic Chinese History.
Folio 3, line 4–5:

Monarchs are like containers, masses are like water.
If the container is round, water will be round; if the container is quadrate, water will be quadrate.

Chinese tentative reconstruction:

君者器也，民者水也。
器圆则水圆，器方则水方。

Here the word “container” is used as a general term for both plate and pot. This maxim first appears in the chapter 12 of *Xunzi*, reading: “Monarchs are like plates, if the plate is round, water will be round; Monarchs are like pots, if the pot is quadrate, water will be quadrate.”

By contrast, a quotation in volume 73 of the *Yiwen Leiju* is much closer to that in BCT, which reads: “Monarchs are like plates, masses are like water. If the plate is round, water will be round; if the plate is quadrate, water will be quadrate.”

The aim of the next couplet is to specify the above metaphor, in which the two figures concerned are Huangong桓公 (*xwã kow 禰��*) and Zoujun邹君 (*tshew njij 繣腲*) respectively.

Folio 3, line 5–7:

Huangong was fond of wearing purple clothes, therefore all the masses wore so.
Zoujun was fond of wearing feather hat, therefore all the officials wore so.

Chinese tentative reconstruction:

桓公好服紫而民庶人人尽服，
邹君好冠纓而臣宰所在皆冠。

60 Chinese original: 君者，盤也，盤圓則水圓；君者，盂也，盂方則水方。(荀子•君道).
61 Chinese original: 荀卿子曰：君者盤也，民者水也，盤圓則水圓，盤方則水方。 (藝文類聚，卷七十三).
62 There might be a slight error of Tangut transcription, for the Chinese zou 鄒 should be pronounced *tšew*, not *tshew* in Tangut.
63 Tangut 簡 (feather) is a misunderstanding of Chinese *yîng* (hatband).
Both stories come from chapter 32 of Hanfeizi.\textsuperscript{64}

King Qi Huangong was fond of wearing purple clothes, therefore people of the whole state were in purple. At that time, five plain color clothes were not equal to one purple in price. Huangong worried about that and said to Guan Zhong\textsuperscript{65}: “That I am fond of wearing purple makes purple extremely expensive and the people of the whole state are fond of purple endlessly. How can I face stop this?” Guan Zhong said: “If intending to stop this, why does not Your Majesty try to give up wearing purple? Telling servants around: I dislike the smell of purple.\textsuperscript{66} Just when people around coming in purple, you have to say: Draw back a little, for I dislike the smell of purple.” Huangong said: “Well.” In one day there were not any officials wearing purple, in the next day nobody wore purple in the capital, after three days nobody wore purple within the borders.

That Monarch Zoujun\textsuperscript{67} was fond of long hatband and all people around wore it and it made a long hatband very expensive. Zoujun worried about that and asked people around. People around said: “The reason of expensiveness is that Your Majesty is fond of wearing it, so the masses wear it as well.” After that, Zoujun shortened his hatband and went out, thus nobody wore long hatbands within the state.

The following two lines on folio 3 are beyond my ability to decipher word by word. What follows in folio 4 (Fig. 4), not in connection in context with the previous folio, is a folk maxim without rhythm, telling not to be hypercritical too much.

\textsuperscript{64} Chinese original: 齊桓公好服紫，一國盡服紫。當是時也，五素不得一紫。桓公患之，謂管仲曰：‘寡人好服紫，紫貴甚。一國百姓好服紫不已，寡人奈何?’ 管仲曰：‘君欲止之，何不試勿衣紫也？謂左右曰：吾甚惡紫之臭。於是以，左右適有衣紫而進者，公必曰：少卻，吾惡紫臭。’公曰：‘諾。’於是以，國中皆不衣紫也。

\textsuperscript{65} Guan Zhong (approximately 723–645 BC.), named Yiwu, as the Premier of State Qi, was the most outstanding politician in the Spring and Autumn Period. He assisted King Qi Huangong in reform to make his State rich and its military force efficient. Under his instruction, Qi became the most powerful State at that time.

\textsuperscript{66} It is said that the purple dyestuff was extracted from the root of comfrey and there was a frowzy smell brought about in the process of extraction.

\textsuperscript{67} State Zou is generally called Zhu, was a small dependent state to State Lu in the Spring and Autumn Period. The monarch of State Zou mentioned here remains unknown except his surname Cao.
In the following, the literary style returns to the antithetical couplet. First, the regularity of natural world is emphasized.

**Folio 4, line 2–3:**

四季更迭，春秋有生滅之理；
五行相襲，水火顯柔和之性。

According to natural regularities, monarchs should govern all things on earth by their virtue and morality.

**Folio 4, line 3–4:**

It seems that this metaphor is derived from the Chinese idiom *chui mao qiu ci* (seeks a flaw by blowing the fur), which means one constantly focused on the smallest defects of others.

“Five Elements” in traditional Chinese philosophy, including metal, wood, water, fire and earth, are said to be the basic factors to form all the matters in the universe.
[It is a devotion to breed Five Cereals,\(^{70}\)
It is a merit to manage all things.]

Chinese tentative reconstruction:
養五榖為信,
治萬物成功.

**Folio 4, line 4–5:**

養五穀為信,
治萬物成功.

[Wind and rain depend on benevolence, \(yin\) and \(yang\)\(^{71}\) accord with virtue.
Governing affairs depends on \(yin\) and \(yang\), enlightening multitude relies on benevolence.]

Chinese tentative reconstruction:
風雨依乎仁,
陰陽合於德.
依陰陽治諸事，以仁義化庶民.

The following topic turns back to telling historical stories, emphasizing the importance of governing the country by law at first. The figures mentioned are Zhengshu 鄭叔 (tśhijj shio) and Guanghan 廣漢 (ko xà).

**Folio 4, line 5–7:**

養五穀為信,
治萬物成功.

[Because Minister Zhengshu made the laws lenient, many bandits gathered in bush;
For Eastern\(^{72}\) Guanghan had a severe majesty, all bullies within Jingzhao City\(^{73}\) were wiped out.]

\(^{70}\)“Five Cereals” is a Chinese joint name for grain crops, including rice, millet, barley, wheat and bean.

\(^{71}\) \(yin\) and \(yang\), as the fundamental of ancient Chinese philosophy, indicate the negative and positive which constitute the universe and determine the cosmic order by their combination.

\(^{72}\) Tangut word \(njjj dzji\) 藕 (east-cover) is inscrutable to decipher. Here I tentatively translated it as “eastern” by considering that Guanghan was a native of Zhao Prefecture 涼都 (now in Hebei Province) which located to the east of the Capital Jingzhao.

\(^{73}\) “Jingzhao”, now Xi’an City, was written mistakenly as tśhijw kijj 碁京 (Chin. zhaojing 兆京) by a careless Tangut transcriber.
Chinese tentative reconstruction:

大臣鄭叔律令寬鬆，而草莽之中盜者多集；
東方廣漢威儀剛猛，故京兆城內豪強盡絕。

Zhengshu, also called Taishu, a minister of State Zheng, was the son of Zichan. Zichan, named Gongsun Qiao, as Prime Minister of State Zheng, was one of the most outstanding politicians in the Spring and Autumn Period. The story about his son comes from chapter The 20th year of Zhaogong in Zuozhuan.⁷⁴

Zichan of State Zheng was ill, he told his son Taishu: “After I die, you for sure will administrate the politics. Only a virtuous leader can govern the masses by lenience, and do not exceed severity. Fire is severe; the masses look out and fear it, so few of them die there. Water is weak, the masses go close and disregard it, so lots of them die there. For this reason, lenience is more difficult.” After several months Zichan died of illness. When Taishu became the administrator, he did not care severity, but took lenience, then bandits increased in State Zheng.

Guanghan, having his surname Zhao, lived in the first century BC., was the governor of the capital and one of the most famous upright officials in Western Han Dynasty. The relevant story comes from his biography in volume 76 of Hanshu:⁷⁵

Guanghan was a man of force, being proficient in official affairs. In meeting officials or masses, sometimes he did not sleep until daybreak … As the governor of Jingzhao Prefecture, he ruled clever and honestly, severely restraining bullies and giving official position to ordinary people. The masses have thought back of him and have praised him so far.

A folk maxim about not taking ill-gotten gains is inserted between the contexts.

Folio 4, line 7:

箴 箴箴箴箴箴，
箴箴箴箴箴箴?
[It is not obtaining to get a sword on the roadside,
Is it stashing to hide properties into the tomb?] ⁷⁶

---

⁷⁴ Chinese original: 鄭子産有疾，謂子大叔曰: “我死，子必為政，唯有德者能以寬服民，其次莫如猛。夫火烈，民望而畏之，故鮮死焉。水懦弱，民狎而翫之，則多死焉，故寬難。”

⁷⁵ 今漢為人強力，天性精於吏職。見吏民，或夜不寢至旦 … 為京兆尹康明，威制豪強，小民得職。百姓追思，歌之至今。(漢書·趙廣漢傳).

⁷⁶ Chinese original: 鄭子産有疾，謂子大叔曰: “我死，子必為政，唯有德者能以寬服民，其次莫如猛。夫火烈，民望而畏之，故鮮死焉。水懦弱，民狎而翫之，則多死焉，故寬難。”
Chinese tentative reconstruction:

道旁得劍不為取，
墓裏有財豈為藏？

The following couplet emphasizes that extravagance will definitely lead the country to decline and fall, in which the two figures mentioned are Lu Zhuanggong 魯莊公 (lu tśiow kow 戰 公) and Xia Kangdi 夏康帝 (xia khow dzjwi 戰 帝):

Folio 4, line 8 — Folio 5, line 1:

[It is because Lu Zhuanggong’s palace was gorgeous that the state became weak and disordered at last.
Emperor Xiakang’s palace was beautiful that the masses became indigent and perished.]

Chinese tentative reconstruction:

魯莊公殿堂華美，故國家衰弱至於亂；
夏康帝宮室莊嚴，故民庶匱乏致滅亡。

Lu Zhuanggong (706–662 BC.), named Ji Tong 姬同, was the 16th monarch of State Lu in the Spring and Autumn Period. The Tangut word pjų rjɨr 暱 （palace) seems to originate from Chinese tai 台 (tower, high platform), see chapter The 32nd year of Zhuanggong in Zuozhuan. 76

King Zhuanggong built a tower close to the Zhangs 77, where he saw Mengren 78 and intended to fornicate with her but was refused. Then he got her promise to be his concubine and took an oath by cutting arms.

According to Zuozhuan, the later political turmoil in State Lu was caused by the feuding among Zhuanggong’s three younger brothers, which was irrelevant to building the gorgeous palace.

Xiakang, generally called Taikang 太康, was the second emperor of Xia Dynasty in legend. It was said in Lisao 離騷 by Qu Yuan that he lost the country for his indulgent amusement: Xiakang yu yi zizong 夏康娛以自縱 (Xiakang amused himself with indulgence).

76 Chinese original: 公築臺臨黨氏，見孟任，從之閭。而以夫人言，許之，割臂盟。（左傳•莊公三十二年）
77 “Zhangs” here indicate the family of minister surnamed Zhang.
78 Mengren was the firstborn daughter of minister Zhang.
Fig. 5
The fifth folio of *Brief Collection by Taizong*
Fig. 6
The sixth folio of *Brief Collection by Taizong*
The next couplet follows the former subject of advocating a simple life and objecting to luxury, in which the first figure mentioned is Yao 堯 (jīw jiā) but the second one, tsow wē tśhjow 芬縑 瞣, is quite incomprehensible. Here, I believe that the second character of the name is a mistake caused by the similarity of two Chinese characters. Considering the Tangut wē 縑 is always used to transcribe Chinese wen 文 which is similar to tai 太 in appearance, especially shown in cursive handwriting, we may decide that the original must have been Zuo Taichong 左太沖 under the help of Chinese classics.

Folio 5, line 1–2:

奶聻紗洪番砃 屬，烁坯驳氢两筟；
芬縑瞼瀑棍册 肔椂 鞑惠犠

[The masses heaped praise on Emperor Yao for he made soil steps and thatched huts.
Family members heaped irony to Zuo Taichong for he complimented luxury buildings.]

Chinese tentative reconstruction:

堯天子造土階茅茨，民庶齊聲讃歎；
左太沖愛屋舍莊嚴，鄉人交口譏訾.

The legend about Yao making soil steps and thatched huts for himself to live in can be found in volume 74 of Jiutangshu:79

In the past Tang Yao lived in a thatched hut with soil steps, Xia Yu wore poor clothes and ate simple food. I know that things like these cannot reappear nowadays.

Zuo Taichong, i.e., Zuo Si 左思 (approximately 250–305), was one of the most famous writers in Western Jin period. His literary work Sandu Fu 三都賦80 was spread widely at that time, but it seems that there were people who sneered at him, as recorded in the second volume of Shishuo Xinyu:81

When Zuo Taichong just finished his work Sandu Fu, somebody at that time heaped irony to him.

79 Chinese original: 昔唐堯茅茨土階，夏禹惡衣菲食。如此之事，臣知不可復行於今。(舊唐書•馬周傳).
80 Sandu Fu 三都賦 is a joint title of his antithetical prose for the capitals of Wei, Shu, Wu in the Three Kingdoms Period. In these works the prosperity of the cities are excessively complimented by flowery rhetoric.
81 Chinese original: 左太沖作三都賦初成，時人互有譏訾。(世說新語•文學四).
The next two sentences, not in antithetic genre, are metaphors comparing to the advice that it should not treat noblemen as common people.

**Folio 5, line 2–4:**

[To feed a swift horse as precious jade, is it the way to go together with the horses before or after it?
To treat a sword equal to gold of ten thousand liang\(^2\) in price, is it used as a tailor’s needle?]

Chinese tentative reconstruction:

餵養千里寶玉馬，豈與首尾之馬並馳？
萬兩金價劍，豈同裁縫之針？

In the following there come two famous stories of Emperor finding sages at unobserved places, but some characters on the original are lost:

**Folio 5, line 4-6:**

[Taigong, as a fisher beside the (Weishui) River, was invited to be Prime Minister by Zhou Wenwang;
(Fu Yue), as a walling worker in…, was promoted directly to be a minister by Yin Gaozong.]

Chinese tentative reconstruction:

太公，渭水河濱捕魚者也，周文王請而為丞相；
傅說，□□□中版築之人，殷高宗巡覲為大夫。

The legend of Jiang Taigong Lü Shang’s fishing recorded in volume 32 of *Shiji*,\(^3\)

---

\(^2\) *Liang* 兩 is a Chinese unit of measure (≈ 14 grams at that time).

\(^3\) Chinese original: 呂尚蓋嘗窮困，年老矣，以魚釣奸周西伯。西伯將出獵，卜之，曰：“所獲非龍非觽，非虎非狸，所獲王者之輔。”於是周西伯獵，果遇太公於渭之陽。與語，大說，曰：“自吾先君太公曰：當有聖人適周，周以興，子真是邪？昔太公望子久矣。”故號之曰太公望，載與俱歸，立為師。 (史記·齊太公世家)
Lü Shang, being destitute in his early age, came into contact with Zhou Xibo\(^84\) by fishing when he was old. Xibo would go hunting and divined for it, the answer was: “The proceeds will be neither dragons, nor a tiger, nor a bear, but an assistant for ruling the state.” Then Zhou Xibo went hunting and really met Taigong on the north bank of the Weishui River\(^85\), talking with him and being greatly delighted, he said: “My ancestor monarch Taigong\(^86\) said that there should be a sage coming to Zhou and Zhou Dynasty would be prosperous with him. It is really you? My Taigong has expected you for a long time.” For that, Xibo named him Taigong Wang, went back with him in a cart and appointed him as preceptor.

The legend of Fu Yue’s walling recorded in volume 3 of *Shiji*:\(^87\)

Emperor Wuding\(^88\) saw a dream with a sage named Yue. He looked at all the ministers and officials for a person he saw in the dream, but all of them were not him. Thus he ordered officials to search for the sage among the civilians and then found Yue in Fuyan\(^89\) when Yue was serving sentences as a walling worker there. Wuding interviewed him and said: “It is just him.” By receiving and talking with him, Wuding found that he was really a sage, and then appointed him to be Prime Minister, bringing a great order throughout the state. Thus Wuding gave him a surname according to Fuyan and named him Fu Yue.

The upper left part on folio 5 and the upper right part of folio 6 (Fig. 6) are fragmentary, and I am not able to decipher the relevant lines word by word. What we can see with certainty is there mentioned a story of Emperor Shun and a short phrase “fearing the four knowings” (Tang. *ljɨr nwə kjạ* 防四知, Chin. *wei sizhi* 畏四知), the latter evidently comes from the story of Yang Zhen\(^90\) in volume 84 of *Houhanshu*:\(^90\)

---

\(^84\) Zhou Xibo is the title of Ji Chang 姬昌 before he overthrew Yin Dynasty and became King Zhou Wenwang. “Xibo” means “Earl in the West”.

\(^85\) Weishui 渭水 is a river near Chang’an (now Xi’an City).

\(^86\) Here the word “Taigong”, including the next one, does not indicate Lü Shang, but a certain ancestor of Xibo. “Taigong” means “grandfather”.

\(^87\) Chinese original: 武丁夜夢得聖人，名曰說，以夢所見視羣臣百史，皆非也。於是使百工營求之野，得說於傅巖中。是時說為胥靡，築於傅巖，見於武丁。武丁曰：“是也。”得而與之語，果聖人。舉以為相，殷國大治。故遂以傅巖姓之，號曰傅說。(*史記* • 殷本紀).

\(^88\) Wuding, the 23rd Emperor of Yin (Shang) Dynasty in legend, is prized to be the Lord of Resurgence at that time.

\(^89\) Fuyan is an ancient name of place to the east of Pinglu County, Shanxi Province.

\(^90\) Chinese original: 楊震 ... 當之郡，道經呂邑，故所舉荆州茂才王密為呂邑令，詣見。至夜，懷金十斤以遺震。震曰：“故人知君，君不知故人，何也?” 密曰：“暮夜無知者。”震曰：“天知，神知，我知，子知。何謂無知?” 密愧而出。(*後漢書•楊震傳)*.
When Yang Zhen went to the Prefecture via Changyi County, County magistrate Wang Mi asked for an interview for Zhen recommended him from a scholar in Jingzhou Prefecture. At night he went with ten jin of gold to present Zhen. Zhen said: “Why the old friend knows you but you do not know the old friend?” Mi said: “Nobody knows at night.” Zhen said: “The Heaven knows, the deity knows, I know and you know. What do you mean by nobody knows?” Mi was ashamed and got out.

The story of Yang Zhen’s “fearing the four knowings” must be one of the widely spread literary allusions at that time in the Silk Road, for we see it was mentioned in both Tangut versions of Forrest of Categories (SHI ET. AL. 1993) and Collection of Upright Behaviors (Sun 2011). Besides, it is also mentioned in the Tibetan version of an untitled Confucian Maxims from Dunhuang (STEIN 1992).

The sixth folio (Fig. 6) is severely damaged, in which the only complete couplet can be read over is telling how to be a wise and hard-working administrator. The two figures mentioned are Zhao Guanghan 趙廣漢 (tśhjjw ko xà 篤鴉) and Wuma Qi 巫馬期 (u big khjì 巫鸞啇):

**Folio 6, line 7–8:**

[Zhao Guanghan possesses wisdom, knowing the price of horse by asking about goat;
Wuma Qi possesses discourse, sitting in the government hall at dawn and leaving at night.]

Chinese tentative reconstruction:

趙廣漢有智，故問羊知馬；
巫馬期有語，故星入星出。

Zhao Guanghan already appeared in previous text, but here the Chinese character guang 廣 is transcribed by a homophone ko 篱 than ko 篱. There is a story of his finding reality in a roundabout way in volume 76 of Hanshu.\(^{93}\)

---

91. *jin* 斤 is a Chinese unit of measure (≈ 220 grams in Han Dynasty).

92. Here is misunderstanding of the Chinese phrase *xing ru xing chu* 星入星出 (to be back home with stars and go out with stars), i.e., he is so busy that he goes out for official affairs from early-morning to late-night without leisure.

93. Chinese original: 趙廣漢…尤善為鉤距，以得事情。鉤距者，設欲知馬賈，則先問狗，已問羊，又問牛，然後及馬。參伍其賈，以類相准，則知馬之貴賤不失實矣。 (漢書•趙廣漢傳).
Guanghan was especially good at getting realities by gouju\textsuperscript{94}. Gouju means that if anyone want to know the price of a horse, he should ask about that of a dog first, then that of a goat, then that of an ox, then that of a horse at last, weighing their prices analogically, thus he knows a real price of a horse.

Wuma Qi (521–? BC.), named Shi 施 with a given name Ziqi 子期, was one of the disciples of Confucius and famous for his diligence. His story can be found in the second volume of Hanshi Waizhuan:\textsuperscript{95}

In administrating Shanfu County\textsuperscript{96}, that Zijian\textsuperscript{97} played zither without leaving the hall brought Shanfu in order. That Wuma Qi went out and back accompanied by stars, doing everything personally without staying also brought Shanfu in order.

The last four folia of BCT are too fragmentary in illegible cursive handwriting to be recognized, in which I can only read out a character dźjwa 鐠 (finish) indicating the end of the text. After that there is a fragmentary prose which might be estimated as a postscript of the booklet, but its content remains unknown to us.

Nature of the manuscript

Although a complete satisfying translation is not given in the present paper, the above narrations and translations do not show any relations between BCT and Emperor Tang Taizong. The parallel facts may be found in folk literature of Northwestern China at that time, since we see that in materials excavated from Dunhuang there are manuscripts entitled Taigong Jiajiao 太公家教 (Family instructions by Taigong) and Wuwang Jiajiao 武王家教 (Family instructions by Emperor Wuwang) which both have nothing to do with Jiang Taigong and Wuwang in early Zhou Dynasty. Actually we all know it is a tradition in ancient China that folk authors used to insert the names of famous historical figures in the title of their own productions.

There are various primary readers excavated from the Mogao Grottoes of Dunhuang\textsuperscript{98}, in which we cannot find a creation in the same literary style.

\textsuperscript{94} Gouju 鈎距 is a sort of ancient weapon with a hook at the top of a long pole. Here it was used as a metaphor for saying something in a roundabout way.

\textsuperscript{95} Chinese original: 子賤治單父, 弹鳴琴, 身不下堂, 而單父治. 彌馬期以星出, 以星入, 日夜不處, 以身親之, 而單父亦治. (韓詩外傳卷二).

\textsuperscript{96} Ancient Shanfu County locates in today’s Heze City of Shandong Province.

\textsuperscript{97} Fu Zijian 富子賤 (?–445 BC.) was another disciple of Confucius.

\textsuperscript{98} Some of the works were selected and studied by Zheng and Zhu (2002). According their classification, perhaps our BCT might be put into the “Primary readers of the morality”.

of BCT, i.e., there are not any works compiled by the style of mixing ancient allusions and current maxims. What is more, although there are not any consistent subjects throughout the text, BCT shows a distinctive feature from others else in Dunhuang that it might have been made more specifically for noble children, not common people, with the purpose of expecting them to increase their historical knowledge and understand some principles in the meantime for assisting monarchs in future. This explains the fact that in BCT there mentions lots of monarchs, administrators and other outstanding persons but no moral preaches given by a senior to juniors as those in Taigong Jiajiao and Wuwang Jiajiao.

In the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, Russian Academy of Sciences, RAS, there is a plentiful collection of original Tangut maxims compiled by a Xixia official scholar (Kychanov 1974), in which we cannot find any couplets identical with those collected in BCT. If we believe that almost all of the folk maxims spread in Xixia are included there, we may estimate with some certainty that those in BCT are intrinsic in its Chinese original, but I have no idea how to explain why the folk maxims were inserted into ancient literary allusions to form a book discordant in literary style. Maybe the Chinese original was finished by two persons, the first one was the start-up author and the second one was a careless transcriber who mixed two different manuscripts together to form a miscellaneous basis for the Tangut translator to rely on.

Comparing with most authors of the primary readings in Dunhuang, the educational level of the BCT author is evidently higher. Even we may estimate him as a learned official in government of Tang or Song Dynasty than a private teacher in backcountry, whose social role determined his vision limited within elites than ordinary masses. Accordingly, the readers presupposed by the author in his compilation might have been descendants of noble families, not of common villagers, because what the latter need most is to cultivate the awareness of respecting the old and having the ability of running the household industriously and frugally, while a high post with matched salary is an elusive dream for most of the common people in their whole life. So far it has been not difficult to understand that the narrow readers of BCT determined it being given cold shoulder by civilians, and it is just this imperfection made it being not preserved until nowadays as the numerous manuscripts of primary readers in Dunhuang.
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A Document from Tangut Regarding the Lease of a Bakery

Abstract: The paper is focused on the study of Document Дх-18993 “Agreement on a Bakery Lease to Li Chungou and others, drawn as a result of a contest of tenders conducted in the 1st month of the 12th year of the Guangding reign era” kept in the Institute of Oriental manuscripts of the RAS. The writer of the paper proves that the document originates from Khara-Khoto and gives the comments on its content.

Key words: Khara-Khoto, Tangut state, rent documents, bakery lease.

Published in volume 17 of the facsimile edition of Documents from Dunhuang Kept in Russia (Ecang Dunhuang wenxian), was a unique fragment titled “Agreement on a Bakery Lease to Li Chungou and others, drawn as a result of a contest of tenders conducted in the 1st month of the 12th year of the Guangding reign era” (Guangding shi er nian deng Li Chungou pumai bing fangqi光定十二年李春狗等撲賣餅房契). 1 Although the document is kept in the Dunhuang Fund of the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the RAS catalogued as Дх-18993, it clearly does not originates from Dunhuang, coming almost definitely from Khara-Khoto. The Guangding era was proclaimed by the Xi Xia Emperor Li Zunxu (Shenzong) and the 12th year of his reign corresponds to 1222, consequently the lease document was written five years prior to the fall of the Tangut state. In the opinion of the Chinese scholars Nie Xiaohong and Chen Guocan, the above agreement was concluded in Xi Xia, which is corroborated by the following facts. First, up to now no documents written in the final years of Western Xia have ever been found among the manuscripts discovered in Dunhuang. Second, the document made use of the collocations “the person who has tabled the lease” (li wenzi ren 立文字人) and “those who have jointly tabled the lease” (tong li wenzi ren 同立文字人).
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formulas like those are only found in documentation from Western Xia and the Yuan dynasty and never in Dunhuang. Third, the formulaic phrase “need not be further discussed” (bu ci 不詞) was favoured exclusively in documents from Khara-Khoto. Fourth, no vocabulary item like “bakery” or “flatbread shop” (shao bing fang 烏無香) has ever been discovered in documents from Dunhuang either.²

Apart from this, we believe there is another important point in support of the Tangut origins of the lease paper: the present piece is not the only document from Khara-Khoto included in the publication called Documents from Dunhuang Kept in Russia. In the Дх index category, quite a few Khara-Khoto documents have figured: e.g. Дх-18992 “Document of the Chief Administration of the Yijinai District” (Yijinai lu zong guanfu wenshu 亦集乃路總管府文書), Дх-18996 "Marriage Contract of Buyanchaomu from the Yijinai District" (Yijinai lu Buyanchaomu tonghunshu 亦集乃路不顏抄木合同書), Дх-19022 “Receipt certifying payment for a purchased quantity of sulphur in year 23 of the Zhizheng reign era of the Yuan dynasty” (Yuan Zhizheng er shi san nian zhifu mai liuhuang qian shouju 元至正廿三年支付硫磺錢收據), Дх-19043 “Document dated year 24 of the Qianyou reign era in the state of Xi Xia” (Xi Xia Qianyou er shi nian weishu 西夏乾祐廿四年文書), Дх-19070 “Document on purchases of horse fodder in year 1 of the Zhiyuan reign era of the Yuan dynasty” (Yuan Zhiyuan nian xian hedi maliao wenshu 元至元年閒和糴馬料文書), Дх-19072 “Report dated year 3 of the Zhizheng reign era of the Yuan dynasty on the provision of nourishment to the aged and orphaned” (Yuan Zhizheng san nian qing zhi gu lao kouliang chengzhuang 元至正三年請支孤老口糧呈狀), Дх-19073 “Document dated year 2 of the Taiding reign era of the Yuan dynasty”(Yuan Taiding er nian wenshu 元泰定二年文書), Дх-19087 “Several documents in Xi Xia writing”(Xi Xia wen ji shu wenshu 西夏文記數文書) and so on.

Professors Nie Xiaohong and Chen Guocan mainly addressed the origins of “Agreement on a Bakery Lease to Li Chungou” hardly touching upon its content. This article will attempt to right the shortcoming.

Among the lease documents from the Sui, Tang, Song, Liao, Xia, Jin and Yuan dynasties, most related to the rent of land, while agreements on housing space were scarce and extremely fragmentary.³ The document we are publishing is the most detailed of those that have come down to us.

The following is the reproduced original text and our comments on it.

² Nie Xiaohong, CHEN Guocan 2009.
光定十二年正月廿一日立文字人李春狗、刘

番家等，今於王元受處撲到面北燒餅房舍一位，裏九五行動用等全，下項內炉鏊一富，重四十斤，無底。大小餾二口，重廿五斤。鐵匙一張，餾餾剗一張，大小槓二个，大小岸三面，升房斗二面，大小口袋二个，裏九小麥本柒石伍斗。每月行價賃雜壹石伍斗，恒月係送納。每

每月不送納，每一石倍罰一石與元受用。撲限至伍拾日，如限滿日，其五行動用，小麥七石五斗，迴与王元受。如限日不迴還之時，其五行動用、小麥本每一石倍罰一石；五行動用每一件倍罰一件与元受用。如本

人不迴與不辨之時，一面契内有名人當管填還數足，不詞。只此文契為憑。

立文字人李春狗

同立文字人李來狗

同立文字人郝老生

同立文字人王號義

同立文字人李喜狗

知見人王三寶

知見人郝黑見

Pu or pumai (撲賣) is one of the ways of business contracting in medieval China, where it came into being during the second half of the Tang dynasty’s reign and became widespread under the North Song. It was then that it gained currency not only in the economically developed south-east, but emerged on the faraway north-west outskirts of the empire. In the sixth month of fifth year of the Dazhong-xiangfu period (1012) of Emperor Zhenzong’s reign, “Cao Wei, the military chief of the Jinyuan Province, remarked that the inhabitants of frontier fortresses had just been permitted to buy shops on competitive basis and to trade in wine right on the border itself. He feared lest bad guys should be hiding there and asked for a ban on the practice. The emperor agreed with him”. In the Tiansheng years (1023–1031) the pumai license validity was extended from one to three years. The following procedure for pumai leasing had formed: half a year before announcing the contest, the authorities “posted an advertisement at the liveliest spot in the locality and for two months tried to lure prospective buyers”. Those who were interested were supposed to apply in writing and the authorities kept their tenders secret. As the deadline arrived, the bids were publicly disclosed and the contract was won by the highest bidder. If two top candidates offered the same amount, the

---

4 Li Huarui 1995, 191.
5 Song huiyao jigu, ch. 20, 5.
6 Song huiyao jigu, tr. 20, 7.
7 Xu Zizhi tongjian changbian, ch. 271 (Xining san nian shi yi yue jia wu 熹宁三年十一月甲午).
contest was won by the bidder that had applied earlier than the other one. If later anybody offered a higher price than the former participants in the competition, the contest winner was offered to outbid the new offer. If he did not want to, the contract was given to the last bidder. The contest results were properly promulgated.

In sum, the contract license was given to anyone who had offered the highest price, but if afterwards the winner did not run the business effectively or even went bankrupt, the person was forced to sell the possessions deposited as pledge. If there was nobody desirous of buying those, neighbors’ were coerced to do so. If the neighbors’ could not afford buying those possessions, the authorities searched for more distant buyers. If after the sale of personal effects the former contractor was still in debt to the authorities, the contract warrantor was ordered to pay the amount outstanding.

Besides wine shops, the pumai came to be applied to other spheres of monopoly trade. During the Song dynasty, the pumai activities were adopted by the government. The document being published herewith proves, however, that the practice existed also as a method accessible to ordinary people. Li Chungou availed himself of the right to rent the bakery because he had paid the highest price. This fact evidences considerable changes seen in the public and economic life of Xi Xia and in the whole of China in those days.

Shaobing (燒餅) and hubing (餬餅) were two favourite Tangut types of food. According to “A Timely Pearl in the Hand” (Fan han heshi zhang zhong zhu 風漢合時掌中珠) Dictionary, the Tangut dough-based cuisine included youbing (油餅), hubing (胡餅), zhengbing (蒸餅), ganbing (乾餅), shaobing (燒餅), huabing (花餅), youqiu (油球), jiaozi (餃子) and mantou (饅頭). The word shaobing is spelt with two symbols of the Tangut writing system, the first of which is pronounced as bei meaning “baked” and the other as e, meaning “flatbread”. The shaobing seems to have been like a flatbread baked in the luao oven 爐鏊. The word hubing (餬餅) also spells with two symbols, the first pronounced with two symbols, the first of which is a homophone of the Tangut word for “oven”; the second symbol is pronounced as yize, as is oven; it includes part of the character from the word denoting

---

8 Xu Zizhi tongjian changbian, ch. 220 (Xining san nian shi yi yue ding si 熹熙熙年熙年熙熙).  
9 Xu Zizhi tongjian changbian, ch. 217 (Xining san nian shi yi yue jia wu 熹熙熙年熙年熙年熙年熙年).  
10 Xu Zizhi tongjian changbian, ch. 218 (Xining san nian shi yi yue ding yichou 熹熙熙年熙年熙年熙年熙年).  
11 Lü Tao, ch. 2, 1098–1020.  
12 Cf. OUYANG XIA, 914.  
oven; the second symbol is pronounced as e and means “flatbread”. In ancient China a baked flatbread sprinkled with sesame seeds was called hubing or mabing. The Tangut hubing (胡餅) should have been essentially the same flatbread, but baked in zheng (鍾) rather than in ao (鏊) ovens.

Together with the premises of the bakery, the properties on lease included also ao and zheng ovens, a large and a small iron ladle, a trowel for hubing, a large and a small kan (欄) closet, three large and small kitchen boards, two measures of shengfangdou (升房斗), a large and a small sack, seven dan (石) and five dou (斗) of wheat.

There existed two types of ao — one looked like a flat-bottomed pot and was called bing-ao (餅鏊) or bingguo (餅鍋). In the third year of the Dazhong-xiangfu period of the Song dynasty (1010) Zhao Deming, ruler of Xiping, “built a great many palaces on the slopes of Aojishan Mount”.14 The name of the mountain indicated that its top was concave like a pot bottom. The luaо flatbread oven mentioned in the document looked like a pail without a bottom. Firewood was burnt in its lower part, while dough for flatbread was pasted and baked on the inner sides of the walls in the upper part of the oven.

The zheng character (鍾) denoted an ancient musical instrument resembling a copper gong. Here it represents a kitchen utensil — a flat-bottomed pot in which hubing is baked.

The iron ladle was evidently designed for drawing water or flour with. The hubing trowel was known as hubing chan (餬餠鏟); it was used in the baking of hubing. Kan (欄) or gui (柜) denoted wooden vessels to hold water or something else. The “Mixed Symbols” dictionary (Zi za 字雜) includes “wooden kan” (木欄).15 The Nong sang kuai xun (農桑快訙) essay states: “On the left bank of the Yangtze river grass grows; it is mown and soaked in a big kan. When the grass gets sour and yellow, it is admixed to bran. This sort of extra nourishment mixture is good for fattening livestock”.16

No mention was made in the document of a tub for water or a kneading trough, therefore what was called a large and a small kan probably referred to containers for water and dough. An (案) was a kitchen board to knead and roll dough on.

Koudai (口袋) were woolen or cotton sacks for storing flour, rice and other grain. Sheng and dou were measuring units of volume, one dou containing ten

14 Song shi, ch. 485 (Xia guo zhuan shang 夏國傳上).
16 Xu Guangqi, ch. 41 (Nong sang kuai xun 農桑快訙).
sheng. Inside the measuring tool leased, a fang container was installed; therefore the “tool” was referred to in the text as shengfangdou.

According to the text of the document, the lessee renting the bakery together with all the requisite utensils plus 7 dan 5 dou of wheat had to return monthly 1 dan 5 dou of assorted grain. The monthly interest rate amounted to 20 per cent.

In the Tangut state, grain would generally be borrowed in March-April, when the old harvest stocks were almost exhausted and the new crops were standing; debts were returned in July-August from new harvest. Interest rates ranged from 30 to 100 per cent, the latter known as “double interest” (beicheng zhi xi 倍稱之息). A number of similar examples are found in documents from Khara-Khoto. A curious case is on record when a quantity of grain was borrowed in the fourth month of year six in the Tianqing era and returned on 1 August. For each dou borrowed the amount returned was 1 dou and 7 sheng, i.e. return per 1 dou was 1 dou and 7 sheng. The interest over four months amounted to 70 per cent — 17.5 per cent a month. Another example. In May of year 12 in the Tianqing era some wheat was borrowed. It was returned on 1 August, with 4 sheng added to each dou borrowed. It came to a 40 per cent return over three months, 13.3 per cent interest repaid monthly. In January of year 12 of the Guangding period, Li Chungou and others borrowed a quantity of wheat at an interest rate of 20 per cent. The rate was high, for which there were two reasons: first, the owner lent wheat to Li Chungou, whereas the requisual was in “assorted grains”. Wheat and “assorted grains” differed in price. Secondly, the lease included not only repayment for the wheat, but also for the premises and utensils. Taking all this into account, we can observe that between the Tianqing and the Guangding periods Khara-Khoto saw relative stability in lease interest rates and commodity prices.

The document was signed by two persons, evidently by the married couple of Li Chungou 李春狗 and Liu Fanjia 劉番家. It was very rare for Western Xia documentation to have a paper signed simultaneously by the husband and wife. In ancient China, married women were not officially called by their feminine names. They were usually referred to by their husband’s names — e.g., “Liu’s wife” (Liu jia de 劉家的), Li’s wife (Li jia de 李家的) and so on. Evidently, Liu Fanjia is a feminine name. Fan reads mi in Tangut and it was the Tanguts’ national self-identity name. Perhaps the Tangut custom did not

---

17 “Assorted” or “ancillary” (za 杂) cereals — like barley, buckwheat, etc. Their market prices were much lower than those of wheat.

require a woman to bear her husband’s name. This supposition, however, needs further study.

The name Li Chungou translates as “springtime dog”. In the names of the document cosignatories, Li Laigou and Li Xigou, evidently his kinsmen, the character “dog” is also present. Names like this were not uncommon for Tanguts, especially those living in out-of-the-way places. Their babies were given lowly names like gou (“dog”), zhu (“pig”) in the belief that it would be easier to raise them that way. For example, in the document dated year 12 of the Qianing Western Xia period, asking for a lease on the pledge of a quantity of millet, the applicant’s name is He Gougou 何狗狗 and the name of the witness is Lishang Shigou 李膻使狗. In a document from the Qianyou years we come across such names as Sun Zhugou 孙猪狗, Bai Bangou 白伴狗, Li Zhuer 李猪儿, as well as the name Zhao Zhugou 赵猪狗 in the document registered as inv. № 7465v, and so on.
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Abstract: The paper discusses the 觀無量壽經 Guanwuliangshoujing (T. 365) in Old Uyghur. It is an important text of the Pure Land Buddhism known only in its original Chinese text. Several separated fragments in Old Uyghur are known. One fragment of the Turfan Collection in Berlin (U 1499) can be joined with a leaf of the Serindia Collection of the IOM (SI 1748). The result is presented here. One of its interesting differences is the list of 15 Bodhisattvas of which only Mañjuśrī is given by name in the Chinese original.
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The paper discusses the 觀無量壽經 Guanwuliangshoujing (T. 365) in Old Uyghur. It is an important text of the Pure Land Buddhism known only in its original Chinese text. The sheet U 1499 presented here was edited in 1985 by K. Kudara and P. Zieme1. At that time, however, it was not recognized that the join of two fragments of the glassed text was erroneous. Now, after knowing of SI 1748 from the IOM collection it became possible to make a correct join. The smaller fragment of U 1499 must be placed after a lacuna of two lines. SI 1748 has to be joined directly with the larger fragment of U 1499 on the left side2, while the smaller fragment of U 1499 forms the lower part of lines 8–11. This new situation does not change K. Kudara’s fundamental assessment that this sheet represents a rather free

© Peter Zieme, Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin, 2020

1 ZIEME and KUDARA 1985, 21–23.
2 Under the same number SI 1748 there is another (or two?) small fragment with remainders of 5 lines that may belong to the manuscript, but a clear localization in T. 365 is not possible.
rendering of the Chinese text by the Uighur translator. Since the Berlin fragment U 1499 bears the old signature T I α, one can assume that the leaf SI 1748 was also found at the same ruin α in Kočo (Gaochang).

The first 13 lines of the recto side which comprise the title are written in red ink. The pustaka hole interrupts lines 7 to 9, which corresponds to the usual pattern of a wide pustaka leaf. On the left margin of the verso side only the first two letters are present, but they can probably be emended to baistikă bir ptr/ “First (juan), first leaf”.

Since in most cases the first leaf of a Buddhist work is missing, it is appropriate to publish the joined leaf here separately. Apart from the composition in alliterating quatrains, only a few leaves have been found and published so far. One of them is a very early edition of a well-preserved sheet acquired by the Otani expedition and published by Z. Tachibana. Later, K. Kudara presented an improved edition. At the same time another sheet from the Berlin collection was edited. Recently, A. Mirkamal has identified a further fragment, probably from a different manuscript, in the Beijing National Library. It will be edited in a forthcoming paper together with a Berlin parallel, which could be assembled from two fragments.

Text in transcription

SI 1748 (Kr. II 8/1) + U 1499 (T I α)
(recto)
01 [na]mo but .. namo d(a)rm .. namo sañ ..
02 [tü]käl bilgä bilig-lig t(ä)ŋri t(ä)ŋri
03 [-si] burhan y(a)rlıkanım kedin yıñak
04 [art]ukrak mäni-lig uluš-ta y(a)rlı
05 [-kayur ü]lgülänč[s]iz uzun özlıg
06 [yaś -]l[ı]g y(a)rlıkanču

On the right side the Chinese equivalents are given according to the Taishō text 365.

It is not clear which word fits into the lacuna.
Although it was not possible to find a correct solution for emending this line, it is clear that here the question about the names is needed.

12 The emendation to ḡanu is unclear as only ʾy can be seen.
Translation

[Introductory Formula]
Namo buddhāya, namo dharmāya, namaḥ saṃghāya!

[Title]
The sūtra scripture preached by the perfectly wise god Buddha called “The teaching of the nine kinds of births while thinking and contemplating in thoughts of the 16 meditations on the divine Buddha Amitābha, who is in the Western Extreme Blessed Land, is of immeasurable longevity and merciful [sense]”, one book (juan).

[Time and place]
Thus I have heard. Once the the great merciful, perfectly wise god Buddha possessing the ten powers, whose name is sublime, stayed on the mountain named Grdhrakūṭa near the happy, blessed great empire named Rājagṛha.

13 It remains unclear how this line can be emended.
14 Translation of the Chinese text: “Thus have I heard. At one time the Buddha was staying on the Vulture Peak in Rājagṛha with a great assembly of twelve hundred and fifty monks. He was also accompanied by thirty-two thousand bodhisattvas led by Mañjuśrī, the Dharma Prince.” (NAGAKI 1994, 317)
15 The Old Uyghur text follows the Chinese when a transcription of the Sanskrit name is used. An Old Uyghur translation occurs in the text of the Buyan avirmak to the Altun Yaruk Sūdu: kara kuś sāńjīrīg arīg ol gytirakut tagē “on the mountain with the vulture peak, i.e. [the pronoun of has here this function] Mount Grdhrakūṭa” (Suv. 682/22–23). This occurrence not recorded in UWN II. I shows that its meaning is not only “Wald”.

**Comments on the Bodhisattva names**

The list of 15 Bodhisattvas given here is not known from other contexts. Usually Bodhisattva groups consist of 2, 3, 4, 8, 16, 25, 53 and more names. At the beginning of the *Larger Sukhāvatīvyūhasūtra* there is first the triad of the Bodhisattvas [here no. 2] Samantabhadra, [here no. 1] Mañjuśrī and [here no. 7] Maitreya. These three names are also among the Bodhisattvas listed here, but in a different order. The remaining 12 of the present list of 15 Bodhisattvas are otherwise well-known Bodhisattvas, but not known from another compilation. All these circumstances support Kudara’s suggestion that an Old Uighur Buddhist had compiled a list by himself. Possibly the Uyghur author wanted to provide a more vivid picture of the setting against the simple statement of 32000 Bodhisattvas surrounding the Buddha in the Chinese text. The position of Mañjuśrī who is the only one mentioned by name in the Chinese text as the first Bodhisattva is kept also here.

---

16 The Chinese introduction to the *Larger Sukhāvatīvyūha-sūtra* has a list of 16 Bodhisattvas, but the Uyghur version of Dunhuang (see MOTH 2 and Kudara 1995) has only 15 as here, but the names are different. Cp. KUDARA and ZIEME 1997, 78.

17 It is to be mentioned that most of the Bodhisattvas play their respective roles in the Buddhist texts, many of them are referred to in the study of KUO 1994.


19 INAGAKI 1994, 228.

20 ZIEME and KUDARA 1985, 23.
Mañjuśrī [1] who has the epithet 法王子 “the Dharma Prince”. In Old Uyghur this epithet is translated mostly by nom ögüki “Beloved of the Dharma” which is, of course, not an exact rendering of “prince”. Mañjuśrī is one of the most prominent Bodhisattvas and thus well-known in Old Uyghur.\(^{21}\)


Other famous Bodhisattvas are Ākāśagarbha [8], Vajragarbha [9] and Padmagarbha [10]. The Bodhisattva Kṣitigarbha [11] is an important figure as the guide in hells known from apocryphal texts as well as from art objects. The Bodhisattva *Sumaṅgala\(^{22}\) [12] is less prominent. The Bodhisattva Sarvanivāraṇaviśkambhin [13]\(^{23}\) is not often encountered in Old Uyghur texts. The last Bodhisattva Nityodyukta “Constantly Striving” [15] Chang jingjin is a Bodhisattva known e.g. from the Lotus Sūtra.\(^ {24}\)

The Uyghur name uzatı katıglanur = Chang jingjin occurs in the Kšanti kilguluk nom as uzatı katiglandočı.\(^ {25}\)

A special comment should be given for No. 14: uzatı yerinjūdāči bodis(a)t(a)v, the translation of the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita who holds a prominent position in Old Uyghur. The chapters Dharmodgata and Sadāpapraddita of the Prajñāpāramitā sūtra were transformed into a long poem in alliterating verses.\(^ {26}\) In the Kšanti kilguluk nom the same Bodhisattva occurs\(^ {27}\). His Chinese name 薩陀波輪菩薩 sattuobolun is a transcription of Sadāprarudita or, as J. Wilkens writes, Sadāpapradda “ever chattering, or bewailing, name of a Bodhisattva, some say who wept while searching for truth”\(^ {29}\). The Chinese translation of the name is 常啼 changti “Ever wailing”.

---

\(^{21}\) ZIEME 2020.  
\(^{22}\) Cp. the Bodhisattva name Maṅgala 吉祥菩薩 jixiang (DDB). As the name 秒吉祥菩薩 miaojixiang which could be reconstructed as *Sumaṅgala is another name of Mañjuśrī (DDB), it cannot be meant here. A similar case can be seen in the name of a Buddha Maṅgala who is known also as Sumaṅgala, cp. CIUZZA 2011, 185.  
\(^{23}\) KUO 1994, 158: 除蓋障 Chu gai zhang, DDB “Remover of Hindrances Bodhisattva”.  
\(^{24}\) DDB.  
\(^{25}\) BT 25, p. 432a.  
\(^{26}\) Recently re-edited in Nuri 2015.  
\(^{27}\) BT 25, p. 432b.  
\(^{29}\) SH 468b.
Accordingly, in both texts this name was translated into Old Uyghur as *uzatı yerıŋüdäči* 30 “ever wailing”, while in other texts, the above mentioned poem as well as in a *Bahšı Ögdisi*, the name was given in the transliterated Sanskrit form *sadapira-urudita* 31 or *sada-pira-rudite* 32. There are many studies about this Bodhisattva because he is regarded as protector of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā* and as a hero searching for the truth. The Chinese name appears also in abbreviated forms 33. One example is 波侖 bolun in the *Biography of Xuanzang* 34 transcribed in HT VIII 605 palun 35.
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A fragment of a Tocharian B text concerning
the conversion of Uruvilvā-Kāśyapa

Abstract: This article is a publication of two fragments of a Tocharian B manuscripts kept in the Petrovsky sub-collection of the Serindian Collection of the IOM RAS with a text of Buddhist content related to the conversion of Uruvilvā-Kāśyapa. The article provides transliteration and transcription of the text, as well as the provisional translation. Assumptions are made regarding the Sanskrit and Tocharian B literature parallels.
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Two Tocharian B fragments with shelf numbers SI 2089/1-2 (old number P/66) belong to the Petrovsky collection of the IOM RAS. Supposedly, they were acquired in Kuča region, but the findspot is unknown. Both fragments are written on similar paper and the ductus is similar either. Still, according to the content, one cannot be completely sure that these fragments do belong to the same manuscript. While the content of the second (small) fragment is not identified, the first one is from a text concerned with the conversion of Uruvilvā-Kāśyapa.

1. Material description

Fragment 1: size (h x w, maximal): 14.8×19.8 cm. The left part of a leaf. The lower and upper edges are visible. Six lines of text are still visible on both sides, and this must also have been the original number of lines of the...
manuscript. The string hole is preserved. The string hole space is rectangular in shape (6.5×5.7 cm) and is separated by guidelines. The left margin is present. The margin is separated by a ruler line. Pagination: 94.

Fragment 2: size (h x w, maximal): 6.0×10.0 cm. The middle part of a leaf. Two lines of text are still visible on both sides.

The paper is thick, one-layered. Laid lines are visible (5 in 1 cm). The paper was primed with white paste and ruled. Rule lines are black. Spacing between the lines is about 2.3 cm.

2. Dating

The highly calligraphic manner of the writing, ornamental layout of the leaf and several late linguistic forms suggest that the manuscript belongs to the later period of the Tocharian literature.

3. Metre

The manuscript contains a verse part inserted into the prose text indicated by the double dots and by the marked word order. The metrical segment wāsko šaišentse lyelyakormem wrocce sū: 1 suggests that the metre was 4×12 syllables, subdivision 5/7 (more exactly 5/4+3) or 4×14 syllables, subdivision 7/7 (more exactly 4+3+4+3). The name of the metre is unknown.
4. Transliteration

Fragment 1

a1 rnau tākoyā, kṣe com₃ kaśār̠₂ laikosse war₅ taktsi kall[a]u ///

a2 brāmiṇākte rano hākcyai kṣ= ankaśa pañākte ʿiṣgən • omto ///

a3 īprern[·] plusgən • yakte orotsstai □ al[le] ///

a4 ṣarne yāmormən pañākientse tārne □ ///

a5 wāsko ्śṭiṣsentse lyelavormən wrockc sū : ma ///

a6 ryaṃ śle praśpūr̠ anaisai klyaušāre • pañākent[·]e ///
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b1 ntare lyakāso • tane akalšglvi kentstse – ///

b2 śle yārke pañāktes weṣgən oroccu ्śāna mā – ///

b3 wassī palskw ersamai īlaiktsi • cau □ ///

b4 lvā kāśyape āktiṣgmane ḍarpsema □ ne w[e] ///

b5 to • ta k,ce no ṇāk ra ́sa ́śṭiṣsene ａṣanīke nesau || te we[ɲa] ///

b6 r lāntantsa kamarttanikentse kłauwa || tāw no prechaine [mā] ///

Fragment 2

a1 /// nesšle takaršşimn̦e šamssi pra[tn̦] ///

a2 /// psgt̤ ³ tā – [•] tumem cau [a] ///

b1 /// ˈš· pito w̩[s̩]sta : āst ///

b2 /// makte tsmātarc̤o yarpok  cityName ///

2 As in this manuscript virāma with Fremdzeichen consonant does not include a dot, this dot should be regarded as a punctuation mark. However, syntactically a punctuation mark is not expected here. The end of the sentence should be after tākoyā. Still there any marking is absent (may be in order not to add one more dot after the two-dots virāma needed after a non-Fremdzeichen consonant).

3 As here a virāma with Fremdzeichen is used, one would expect no dots above the akṣara. However, a ligature consists of a non-Fremdzeichen consonant ‘s” and a Fremdzeichen “t̤”. So, maybe it was “s” which effected the two-dots virāma.

4 A vowel, supposedly the Fremdvokal, is inserted for metrical reasons.
5. Assumed parallels:

The text is supposed to contain a passage of a story about the conversion of the ascetic Uruvilvā-Kāśyapa with his brothers and disciples, who were followers of fire-worship, to Buddhism. Buddha had to make a great number of miracles to convince them. The story is known from two sources in Indian languages: the Mahāvagga I, 15–23 and the Mahāvastu III, 428–430. The stories vary considerably. Though they match on substantive items, the miracles mentioned in the Mahāvastu Uruvilvā/Kāśyapa/Nadi/Kāśyapa/Gayā Kāśyapa-jātaka do not coincide (except three) with those in the corresponding Mahāvagga episode.

The principal structure of both variants is similar. Buddha shows a miracle, and Uruvilvā-Kāśyapa is appalled at the evidence of his miraculous powers. However, he thinks that his magic and status are greater. There is a refrain that recurs each time this situation is replicated. In the Sanskrit version it is marked by the phrase: yam ahaṃ punar mahāṛddhikataro, vayaṃ punar mahāṛddhikatarā: “Nevertheless it’s me [who is the possessor] of the greatest magical powers”, in the Pāli version by the phrase: na tu eva ca kho arahā yathā aham ti: “But, however, indeed not surely [he is an] arhat like me”. Thus, one can observe that while in the Sanskrit story Uruvilvā-Kāśyapa underlines the fact that his magic powers are more powerful, in the Pāli story he focuses on his arhatship, meaning that his stage of emancipation is higher.

For reasons that will become clear later, three of those miracles from the Mahāvagga, which are absent in the Mahāvastu, are list here. The first miracle: Buddha triumphs over a Nāga king conquering the fire of the Nāga

---

5 As it is quite unlikely that the primary source for a Tocharian text could be a text in a non-Indian language, the other (Tibetan, Chinese etc.) versions are not mentioned.

6 Mahāvagga is the first volume of Khandhaka, the second book of the Theravadin Vinaya Pitaka. The first chapter is called the great chapter — Mahākhandhaka.

7 Pāli text edition according to BIBLIOTHECA POLYGLOTTA.

8 Mahāvastu, a text of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravāda school of Early Buddhism, which is regarded as a collection of the avadāna genre related to the Vinaya. For details see TOURNIER 2012.

9 Sanskrit text edition according to MARCINIAK 2019.

10 About differences see WINDSCH 1909, 497–499.


12 MARCINIAK 2019, 552.

13 For the description of all the miracles from the Mahāvagga see TALIM 2002–2203, 249–263.
king with his own fire. The second miracle: four Mahārāja deities, in the shape of pillars of fire, come to hear the Buddha’s sermon. The sixth miracle needs to be quoted almost entirely. “At that time, the Blessed One had rags taken from a dust heap (of which he was going to make himself a dress).

Now the Blessed One thought: ‘Where shall I wash these rags?’ Then Sakka the king of the devas, understanding in his mind the thought which had arisen in the mind of the Blessed One, dug a tank with his own hand, and said to the Blessed One: ‘Lord, might the Blessed One wash the rags here.’ And the Blessed One thought: ‘What shall I rub the rags upon?’ Then Sakka the king of the devas, understanding in his mind the thought which had arisen in the mind of the Blessed One, put there a great stone and said: ‘Lord, might the Blessed One rob the rags upon this stone.’ And the Blessed One thought: ‘What shall I take hold of when going up (from the tank)?’ Then a deity that resided in a Kakudha tree, understanding in his mind the thought which had arisen in the mind of the Blessed One, bent down a branch and said: ‘Lord, might the Blessed One take hold of this branch when going up (from the tank).’ And the Blessed One thought: ‘What shall I lay the rags upon (in order to dry them)?’ Then Sakka the king of the devas, understanding in his mind the thought which had arisen in the mind of the Blessed One, put there a great stone and said: ‘Lord, might the Blessed One lay the rags upon this stone.’ And when that night had elapsed, the Gatila Uruvelâ Kassapa went to the place where the Blessed One was; having approached him, he said to the Blessed One: ‘It is time, great Samana, the meal is ready. What is this, great Samana? Formerly there was here no tank, and now here is this tank. Formerly no stone was put here; by whom has this stone been put here? Formerly this Kakudha tree did not bend down its branch, and now this branch is bent down.’ ‘I had rags, Kassapa, taken from a dust heap; and I thought, Kassapa: “Where shall I wash these rags?” Then, Kassapa, Sakka the king of the devas, understanding in his mind the thought which had arisen in my mind, dug a tank with his hand and said to me: “Lord, might the Blessed One wash the rags here.” Thus, this tank has been dug by the hand of a non-human being. ‘And I thought, Kassapa: “What shall I rub the rags upon?” Then, Kassapa, Sakka, ...’ [4] Thus this stone has been put here by a non-human being. ‘And I thought, Kassapa: “What shall I take hold of when going up (from the tank)?” Then, Kassapa, a deity... . Thus, this Kakudha tree has served me as a hold for my hand.

\[1\] Translation according to PĀLI VINAYA 1965.
'And I thought, Kassapa: "Where shall I lay the rags upon (in order to dry them)?" Then, Kassapa, Sakka,... [5] Thus this stone has been put here by a non-human being.' Then the Gatila Uruvelâ Kassapa thought: 'Truly the great Samana possesses high magical powers and great faculties since Sakka the king of the devas does service to him. He is not, however, holy like me.'"

In SI 2089/1 b5 one can see the phrase ta k, ce no ŋšak ra tsa śaiṣṣene aṣanīke nesau “anyway, even though, (he is not) the worthy [one] amongst people15 just like I am”, which is close in meaning with the Pāli phrase na tu eva ca kho arahā yathā aham “but, however, indeed not surely (he is an) arhat like me”. The Tocharian word aṣanīke “the worthy [one] is a standard equivalent of the Sanskrit term arhat or Pāli arahant (nom. sg. arahā). Though except for this example the Tocharian and Pāli texts do not correspond phrase by phrase, it is clear that the Tocharian version tells the same story as the Pāli one. Note SI 2089/1 a1 k,śe com kaśār laikōsse war takti “that robe, [in] gain to wash (lit. to touch the water for washing)”, SI 2089/1 b3 wassi palskw ersamai laikatsi “I got the thought to wash clothes”. The Tocharian text is elaborated and expanded by additional details, which could be added by a Tocharian author or could be translated from a Sanskrit original whose text has not been preserved.

6. Transcription

Fragment 1

a1 (pe)rnau tākoy k,śe com kaśār laikōsse war takti kaallau ///
a2 bramnākte rano ŋākciyai k,ś= ankaisa pañākte ipšām • om no ///
a3 īprern(e) puṣām • yakte orotstsai alle(k) ///
a4 (aṅcali) śarne yāmormem pañāktentse tarne ///
a5 wāsko śaiṣṣentse lyelakormem wrocce sī : ma ///
a6 (plo)ram śle praśpīr anaśai klyausāre • pañāktent(s)e ///
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b1 (wä)ntare lyakāso • tane akalśālyi kenantsse - ///
b2 śle yärke pañākties weśšām oroccu samāna mā - ///
b3 wassī palskw ersamai laikatsi • cau ///
b4 (uruvi)vā kāśyape āktikāmne šārpsemene we(ssem) ///
b5 to • ta k, ce no ŋšak ra tsa śaiṣṣene aṣanīke nesau || te weñā ///
b6 r lāntatsa kamartnerikentsse klauwa || tāw no preśyaine mā ///

15 Or “in the world”.
Fragment 2

a1  /// eneśle takarṣkāṃñe ṣaṃssi prat- ///
b1  /// (t)s(e) pito w(ā)sāsta : āst t- ///
b2  /// makte tsmātārc yarpo makā – ///

7. Comments

Fragment 1

a1  pernau — possibly a later form of perne: adjective, nom. sg. masc., “worthy, glorious”. It could be either the subject or the predicate of the verb tāko. “A Glorious (one) would be” or “would be glorious”.  
a1  tāko — 3sg. active optative from nes- a verb of existence or a copula.  
a1  korse — nom. sg. masc., of the relative pronoun “who, whoever, which”.  
a1  com — obl. sg. masc., of the demonstrative pronoun sam(p) “that (one)”.  
a1  kasha — noun, obl. sg., “robes”, saffron-colored monk’s garb.  
a1  laikošše — adjective, nom./obl. sg. masc., should be a derivative of the word laiko “bath, washing”.  
a1  war — noun, nom./obl. sg., “water”; here probably a direct object of a verb tak- “to touch” in the form of the infinitive taktsi.  
a1  kalla — noun, nom./obl. sg. masc., “gain, profit”; it is possible that there was a locative casal ending: kallaune.  
a2  bramnākte — noun, nom./obl. sg. masc., “(the god) Brahma”.  
a2  rano — conj., with adjectives “however”.  
a2  ṇākcīyai — adjective, obl. sg. fem., “divine”; maybe for a word maīyya obl. sg. fem., “power”.

---

16 ADAMS 2013, 426.  
17 ADAMS 2013, 365-366.  
18 Used with all genders and both numbers according to ADAMS 2013, 200.  
19 ADAMS 2013, 739.  
21 ADAMS 2013, 610.  
22 ADAMS 2013, 627.  
23 ADAMS 2013, 305.  
24 ADAMS 2013, 156.  
25 ADAMS 2013, 466.  
26 ADAMS 2013, 571.  
27 ADAMS 2013, 508.
a2 ankaisa — adverb, “reverse”; one would expect the spelling ankai{n}sa.
a2 ipṣām — 3sg. caus. active present from yāp- “let enter”; one would expect the spelling yapāṣām “lets enter”.
a2 om no — “there then”.
a3 īprene — noun, loc. sg. masc., of īpre “sky, air”; one would expect the spelling īpre{r}ne.
a3 pluṣāṃ — 3sg. active present from plu- “fly”.
a3 yakte — adjective, nom./obl. sg./pl. masc./fem. “small, little”.
a3 orostsai — adjective, obl. sg. masc., “great, big” or noun “adult”.
a3 allek — adjective, nom. sg. masc. “other, another”.
a4 (aṇcalī) śarne yāmormeṃ — absolutive in -ormeṃ from aṇcalī śarne yāṃ- “to fold hands”, as in THT 92, a5: aṇcalī śarne yāmu araṇemi weṣṣāṃ “with folded hands Araṇemi speaks”.
a4 tarne — noun, nom./obl. sg., “crown of the head”.
a5 wāsko — nom./obl. sg. masc., a nominal derivative from wāsk- “to move”.
a5 lyelyakormeṃ — absolutive in -ormeṃ from lāṅk- “to see, look”.
a5 wroce — adjective, obl. sg. masc. “great”.
a5 sā — nom. sg. masc., of the demonstrative pronoun su, the usual anaforic pronoun of Toch B.
a6 (plo)ryaṃ — noun, acc. pl. “a musical instrument”.
a6 šle — “(together) with”.
a6 praśpīr — according to the context, it should be a musical instrument. Compare IOL Toch 66 a3 praśpīr klyau-e.
a6 anaiśai — adverb, “carefully, clearly”\textsuperscript{44}.

a6 klyausāre — 3pl. active preterite from klyaus- “to hear, listen to”.

a6 pañāktentse — noun, gen. sg., “buddha”\textsuperscript{45}.

b1 wāntare — noun, nom./obl. sg., “thing, affair, matter”\textsuperscript{46}.

b1 lyakāso — 2pl. active preterite from lāk- “to see, look”\textsuperscript{47}.

b1 tane — adverb, “here, there”\textsuperscript{48}.

b1 akalṣālyi — noun, nom. pl., “pupil, scholar”\textsuperscript{49}. It also could be a voc. pl. form, however, here the sentence starting with tane akalṣālyi is likely to be the beginning of the text following the direct speech of the previous sentence and therefore the case is nominative.

b1 kenantse — noun, gen. sg., “earth, ground; base, place”\textsuperscript{50}.

b2 yārke — noun, obl. sg., “deference, honour”\textsuperscript{51}. One would expect yarke, however, as it is a part of a compound with śle, stressed /ā/, spelled as <a> becomes unstressed, being spelled as <ā>.

b2 paṇākteś — noun, dat. sg., “buddha”\textsuperscript{52}.

b2 oroccu — adjective, voc. sg. masc., “great”\textsuperscript{53}.

b2 ʂamāna — noun, voc. sg., “monk”\textsuperscript{54}. Possibly, a first registered occurrence of the singular vocative of this word.

b3 wassi — noun, nom./obl. sg., “clothing, garment”\textsuperscript{55}.

b3 palskw ersamai — a sandhi of palsko, noun, nom./obl. sg. “thought”\textsuperscript{56}, and ersamai, 1sg. middle, preterit from er- “evoke, produce”\textsuperscript{57}.

b3 laikatsi — infinitive from lik- “wash”\textsuperscript{58}.

b3 cau — obl. sg. masc., of the demonstrative pronoun su, the usual anaphoric pronoun of Toch B\textsuperscript{59}.

\textsuperscript{44} ADAMS 2013, 14.
\textsuperscript{45} ADAMS 2013, 375.
\textsuperscript{46} ADAMS 2013, 643.
\textsuperscript{47} ADAMS 2013, 596.
\textsuperscript{48} ADAMS 2013, 295.
\textsuperscript{49} ADAMS 2013, 2.
\textsuperscript{50} ADAMS 2013, 205.
\textsuperscript{51} ADAMS 2013, 521.
\textsuperscript{52} ADAMS 2013, 375.
\textsuperscript{53} ADAMS 2013, 127.
\textsuperscript{54} ADAMS 2013, 711.
\textsuperscript{55} ADAMS 2013, 635.
\textsuperscript{56} ADAMS 2013, 385.
\textsuperscript{57} ADAMS 2013, 98.
\textsuperscript{58} ADAMS 2013, 600.
\textsuperscript{59} ADAMS 2013, 758.
b4  urbīlvā kāśyape — [urbi]lvā is reconstructed according to the THT 1575. g., line b660.
b4  āktikāṃñe — noun, nom./obl. sg., “wonder, miracle”61.
b4  sārpsemane — m-participle from sārp- “explain to, indicate”62.
b4  weṣsēṃ — 3sg. active present from we- “speak, say”63.
b5  ta — particle, “this, here, now”64.
b5  kuce — conj., “because, (so) that, since”65.
b5  īāktikāṃñe — noun, nom./obl. sg., “wonder, miracle”66.
b5  sārpsemane — m-participle from sārp- “explain to, indicate”67.
b5  weṣṣeṃ — 3sg. active present from we- “speak, say”68.
b5  ta — particle, “this, here, now”69.
b5  kuce — conj., “because, (so) that, since”70.
b5  īāktikāṃñe — noun, nom./obl. sg., “wonder, miracle”71.
b5  sārpsemane — m-participle from sārp- “explain to, indicate”72.
b5  weṣṣeṃ — 3sg. active present from we- “speak, say”73.
b5  ta — particle, “this, here, now”74.
b5  kuce — conj., “because, (so) that, since”75.
b5  īāktikāṃñe — noun, nom./obl. sg., “wonder, miracle”76.
b5  sārpsemane — m-participle from sārp- “explain to, indicate”77.
b5  weṣṣeṃ — 3sg. active present from we- “speak, say”78.
b5  ta — particle, “this, here, now”79.
b5  kuce — conj., “because, (so) that, since”80.
b5  īāktikāṃñe — noun, nom./obl. sg., “wonder, miracle”81.
b5  sārpsemane — m-participle from sārp- “explain to, indicate”82.
b5  weṣṣeṃ — 3sg. active present from we- “speak, say”83.
b5  ta — particle, “this, here, now”84.
b5  kuce — conj., “because, (so) that, since”85.
b5  īāktikāṃñe — noun, nom./obl. sg., “wonder, miracle”86.
b5  sārpsemane — m-participle from sārp- “explain to, indicate”87.
b5  weṣṣeṃ — 3sg. active present from we- “speak, say”88.
b5  ta — particle, “this, here, now”89.
b5  kuce — conj., “because, (so) that, since”90.
b5  īāktikāṃñe — noun, nom./obl. sg., “wonder, miracle”91.
b5  sārpsemane — m-participle from sārp- “explain to, indicate”92.
b5  weṣṣeṃ — 3sg. active present from we- “speak, say”93.
b5  ta — particle, “this, here, now”94.

Possibly, a first registered occurrence of the form.

60 Transliteration by CEToM: b6 /// – meṃ u rbi lvā ///
61 ADAMS 2013, 718.
62 ADAMS 2013, 58.
63 ADAMS 2013, 349.
64 ADAMS 2013, 283.
65 ADAMS 2013, 143.
66 ADAMS 2013, 179–180.
67 ADAMS 2013, 369.
68 ADAMS 2013, 569.
69 ADAMS 2013, 365-366.
70 ADAMS 2013, 763.
71 ADAMS 2013, 658.
b6 tāw — obl. sg. fem. of the demonstrative pronoun su\textsuperscript{77}, the usual anaforic pronoun of Toch B\textsuperscript{78}.

b6 preśyaine — noun, loc. sg. fem., “time”\textsuperscript{79}.

Fragment 2

a1 enešle — postposition, “like”\textsuperscript{80}.

a1 taka — adverb, “then, certainly”\textsuperscript{81}.

a1 rṣkāṃñe — adj., nom./obl. sg. masc., “pertaining to a ṛṣi”; one would expect rṣākāññe\textsuperscript{82}.

a1 šaṁssi — infinitive from šaṁs- “to count (as)”\textsuperscript{83}.

a2 pāst — particle, “away, back”\textsuperscript{84}.

a2 tāka — 3sg, active preterit from nes- a verb of existence or a copula\textsuperscript{85}.

a2 tumṃ — adverb, “then, thereupon”\textsuperscript{86}.

b1 -tse pito — noun, nom./obl. sg., “price” \textsuperscript{87} with a genitive form of a noun.

b1 w(ā)sāsta — 2sg, active preterit from wās- “to give”\textsuperscript{88}.

b1 āst t· — from āyo “bone”, nom. obl. pl or any casal form from the obl. plural.

b2 makte — pronoun, nom. sg., “-self”\textsuperscript{89}.

b2 tsmātār-c — 3sg, middle subjunctive from tsām- “grow [in size or number]”\textsuperscript{90} with a pronoun suffix (2sg.).

b2 yarpo — noun, nom./obl. sg., “merit”\textsuperscript{91}.

b2 makā — adjective, “many, much”; as a part of a compound, for example makā-ykne “in manifold ways”\textsuperscript{92}.

\textsuperscript{77} ADAMS 2013, 758.
\textsuperscript{78} ADAMS 2013, 758.
\textsuperscript{79} ADAMS 2013, 454.
\textsuperscript{80} ADAMS 2013, 90.
\textsuperscript{81} ADAMS 2013, 292.
\textsuperscript{82} ADAMS 2013, 589.
\textsuperscript{83} ADAMS 2013, 715.
\textsuperscript{84} ADAMS 2013, 408.
\textsuperscript{85} ADAMS 2013, 365-366.
\textsuperscript{86} ADAMS 2013, 319.
\textsuperscript{87} ADAMS 2013, 412.
\textsuperscript{88} ADAMS 2013, 649.
\textsuperscript{89} ADAMS 2013, 469.
\textsuperscript{90} ADAMS 2013, 804.
\textsuperscript{91} ADAMS 2013, 522.
\textsuperscript{92} ADAMS 2013, 479.
8. Tentative translation

Fragment 1

a1 a Glorious (one) would be*. Who [...] that robe [in] gain to wash (lit. to touch the water for washing) ... *
a2 god Brahma, too, [exerted] divine [power?], which let the Buddha enter back (from the tank? **); there then ...
a3 flies in the sky. Another [one] (nom.) big and small (acc.) ... 
a4 having [his] hands folded, (he honoured?) the top of the head of Buddha ...
a5 having seen the great stir [among] people, he ...
a6 they clearly heard flutes and praśpir; ... of the Buddha ...

94

b1 the matter you (pl.) have seen. Here the disciples ... of the earth ...
b2 with deference [he] says to the Buddha: “Oh great monk, ...
b3 I got the idea to wash clothes. That ...
b4 Uruvilvā Kāśyapa, indicating the miracle, says: ...
b5 anyway, it is precisely me [who is] the worthy [one] in the world. He said this to ...
b6 they (f.) were brought by the ruler over the kings. However, at that time ...

---

* Or “would be glorious”.
** This text is exceedingly difficult for understanding and translation not only due to the the punctuation confusion mentioned above but also because the phrase is broken off in the mid-sentence. One can think of several translational possibilities. For example, Michaël Peyrot, giving me a kind consultation concerning this tricky fragment, suggested a few samples such as

1) “What (is) the profit to touch that garment [and] the bathing water?” (meaning “wash the garment with bathing water”).
2) “Who (has ... placed here??) ... for the profit (+ loc.) of touching that garment and the bathing water”.
3) “If I get to touch that garment and the bathing water...” (with k₄r in the sense of “if”?? and kallau as 1sg.sbj. of kalpa-).
4) The sentence contains a translated Sanskrit compound “that-garment-washing-water-touch-...” or something like that.

Anyway, as there is not enough material to translate this part of the text with a high degree of certainty I’ve decided to base the translation on the supposed Sanskrit parallel referring to the situation when Buddha came to the tank to wash his robe made of rags.

** Supposing from the context.
9. Notes:

There is one more Tocharian manuscript which appears to contain the description of the first or maybe of the second miracle. This is IOL Toch 86\(^96\). SI 2089/1 b5 ta ke no ṇsak ra tsaiṣṣene asanīke nesau || te weṇhâ /// corresponds to IOL Toch 86 b5 -ṣanīke nesau || te we(we)ho(rmen) ///, being the same refrain indicating the story. Here also such words as ṣintse, gen.sg. of “night”, pwārntse gen.sg. of “fire” and swañcaiṣṣai “radiant” are mentioned, which could refer either to the first or to the second miracle, or to both of them consequently\(^97\). Possible. but then you have to mention that you cannot treat this fragment in more detail here.

\(^96\) Published in PEYROT 2007.
\(^97\) Translation according to PALI VINAYA 1965.

"Then the Blessed One entered the room where the fire was kept, made himself a couch of grass, and sat down cross-legged, keeping the body erect and surrounding himself with watchfulness of mind. And the Nāga saw that the Blessed One had entered; when he saw that, he became annoyed, and irritated, and sent forth a cloud of smoke. Then the Blessed One thought: 'What if I were to leave intact the skin, and hide, and flesh, and ligaments, and bones, and marrow of this Nāga; but were to conquer the fire, which he will send forth, by my fire.' And the Blessed One effected the appropriate exercise of miraculous power and sent forth a cloud of smoke. Then the Nāga, who could not master his rage, sent forth flames. And the Blessed One, converting his body into fire, sent forth flames. When they both shone forth with their flames, the fire room looked as if it were burning and blazing, as if it were all in flames. And the Gatilas, surrounding the fire room, said: 'Truly, the countenance of the great Samana is beautiful, but the Nāga will do harm to him.' That night having elapsed, the Blessed One, leaving intact the skin and hide and flesh and ligaments and bones and marrow of that Nāga, and conquering the Nāga's fire by his fire, threw him into his alms-bowl, and showed him to the Gatila Uruvelā Kassapa (saying), 'Here you see the Nāga, Kassapa; his fire has been conquered by my fire.' Then the Gatila Uruvelā Kassapa thought: 'Truly the great Samana possesses high magical powers and great faculties, in that he is able to conquer by his fire the fire of that savage Nāga king, who is possessed of magical power, that dreadfully venomous serpent. He is not, however, holy (arahā) as I am.' …End of the first Wonder. And the Blessed One resided in a certain grove near the hermitage of the Gatila Uruvelā Kassapa. And on a beautiful night the four Mahārājas, filling the whole grove with light by the brilliancy of their complexion, went to the place where the Blessed One was; having approached him and respectfully saluted the Blessed One, they stood in the four directions like great firebrands. And when that night had elapsed, the Gatila Uruvelā
Though the refrain clearly indicates the story as the *Uruvilvā-Kāśyapa jātaka* contained in the Pāli *Mahāvagga*, here is however some uncertainty concerning the SI 2089/1 fragment because the text is too fragmentary. Then, it is possible that the complete manuscript contained the successive telling of several jātakas in very abridged form (a type of text which is known otherwise). And among them, it contained the jātaka of *Uruvilvā-Kāśyapa*. Another possibility is that a miracle from the *Uruvilvā-Kāśyapa* story (or the whole story itself) was mentioned for illustrative purposes in a text of unknown content.
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Kassapa went to the place where the Blessed One was; having approached him, he said to the Blessed One: 'It is time, great Samana, the meal is ready. Who were they, great Samana, who came, this beautiful night, filling the whole grove with light by the brilliancy of their complexion, to the place where you were, and having approached you and respectfully saluted you, stood in the four directions like great firebrands?' 'They were the four Mahārājas, Kassapa, who came to me in order to hear my preaching.' Then the Gatila Uruvelā Kassapa thought: 'Truly the great Samana possesses high magical powers and great faculties, since even the four Mahārājas come to hear his preaching. He is not, however, holy like me.'
Gu Songjie

An Analysis of Manhan huangyu shanhe diming kao
滿漢皇輿山河地名考 — A Bilingual Manchu and Chinese Study of Mountain and River Toponyms of the Imperial Territories

Abstract: Manhan huangyu shanhe diming kao 滿漢皇輿山河地名考 “A Study of Mountain and River Toponyms of the Imperial Territories” is a Manchu and Chinese bilingual manuscript on geography in the collection of the National Library of China. It is a collection of toponyms covering the northeastern territory of the Qing and includes a brief description of the military achievements before the Manchu conquest of the central plains. In this paper I argue that this text is closely related to the Shengjing Jilin Heilongjiang deng chu biaozhu zhanji yutu 盛京吉林黑龍江等處標注戰跡輿圖 “Map of Military Deeds in Shengjing, Jilin, Heilongjiang,” and that its dating on the title page to the Qianlong gengchen nian 乾隆庚辰年 “White Dragon year of Qianlong (1760)” is not actually the date of this manuscript’s composition. The phrase of huangyu (the imperial territories) refers in the context of this work to the territory of the Qing before 1644.

Key words: Man-Han huangyu shanhe diming kao, Shengjing Jilin Heilongjiang deng chu biaozhu zhanji yutu, Qianlong gengchen nian, Dachun

Introduction

The Manhan huangyu shanhe diming kao 滿漢皇輿山河地名考, hereafter abbreviated as the Toponym Study, is a manuscript from the geography section of Manchu and Chinese collection at the National Library of China. The Toponym Study is composed of five thread bound volumes, each meas-

© GU Songjie, The Academy for research on Chinese ethnic minority languages, Minzu University of China, 2020
uring 29.6×18.3 centimeters, without a case/tao to hold the volumes together. The main text on each half-page is in four parallel rows of Manchu and Chinese text. On the middle of the first, title page or kolophone, of the first volume is the title and to the upper right of this title is written Qianlong geng-chen nian 乾隆庚辰年 “the White Dragon year of Qianlong (1760),” while on the bottom left is written Dachun shanxie 達椿繕寫 “compiled by Dachun.” The Toponym Study is very well preserved, and in the August of 2017 Fujian People’s Publishing issued a photographic reproduction of the work. Until now scholars have neither studied nor cited the Toponym Study, and among the published catalogues of Manchu books it is mentioned four times. However, there are great discrepancies in these catalogs. The “wuchen 戊辰 year” dating in Li Deqi’s volume, which is the thirteenth year of the Qianlong period (1748). The volumes edited by Fu Li and Huang Runhua, Qu Liusheng date the manuscript to “the fifteenth year of the Qianlong period” and indicate the year incorrectly as “1760” in parenthesis, since the fifteenth year of the Qianlong period was 1748. If the authors of these catalogs have relied on the title page of the Toponym Study in their dating of this text, they have all dated the work incorrectly except the Beijing diqu man-wen tushu zongmu 北京地區滿文圖書總目 (A General Catalogue of Manchu Books in Beijing) with the manuscript dated from “the 25th year of the Qianlong period (1760)”.

The Toponym Study is a compilation of the names of locations in the northern three provinces. Some of the place names include annotations relating to the history of the military conquest of each of the places by Nurhaci and Hongtaiji—and this suggests that this work is related to the 1778 Sheng-jing Jilin Heilongjiang deng chu biaozhu zhanji yutu 盛京吉林黑龍江等處標注戰跡輿圖 “Map of Military Deeds in Shengjing, Jilin, Heilongjiang”, hereafter abbreviated as the Map of Military Deeds. In this paper I will follow this clue to reveal the relationship between the Toponym Study and the Map of Military Deeds by a comparison between them, and I will then provide a preliminary analysis of the composition and authorship of the Toponym Study.

---

1 LI 1933, 51.
1. The relationship between the *Toponym Study* and the *Map of Military Deeds*

A comparison between the *Toponym Study* and the *Map of Military Deeds* shows that these texts are mostly the same as to the recorded place names, the military achievement annotations contained within, as well as of the order of the entries. The main differences between the two occur in repeated or omitted entries in the *Toponym Study*, as well as in a very small number of different Chinese characters used in the transliteration of Manchu. Common errors between the two works also appear. I argue that the *Toponym Study* and the *Map of Military Deeds* share a common origin, and below I will add an organized comparison of the two in three categories.

1.1 Place Names

The *Toponym Study* is composed of five volumes, and by omitting the text of the first page or first two pages of each volume, there is a total of 2175 place names in the *Toponym Study* and a total of 2195 place names in the *Map of Military Deeds*. Imanishi Shunju composed an index of place names for the *Map of Military Deeds* with a total of 2176 entries; clearly there were omissions. By comparing all the entries in the *Toponym Study* and the *Map of Military Deeds*, we can find the repeated and omitted entries in the *Toponym Study* as well as the entries which appeared in both texts with slight variations. Let’s summarize these in the following 3 tables:

**Table 1: The repeated place names in the *Toponym Study***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>In Toponym Study</th>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>In Map of Military Deeds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>siowai lii giyamu/xue li zhan 雪・站 (Snow Place Relay Station)</td>
<td>1-6b</td>
<td>siowei lii jan giyamun 雪里站</td>
<td>Second in the first row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siowei lii jan giyamun 雪里站</td>
<td>1-7a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barda hoton/ba’erda cheng 巴尔达城 (Fort Barda)</td>
<td>2-13b</td>
<td>barda hoton 巴尔达城</td>
<td>Forth in the second row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barda hoton 巴尔达城</td>
<td>2-16a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 IMANISHI 1959, 222–268.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>In the Map of Military Deeds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>liyang šui ho bira/liangshui he 凉水河 (Cold Water River)</td>
<td>First in the first row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da yang ho bira/dayang he 大洋河 (Da Yang River)</td>
<td>Second in the first row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niyamniyakū/niyamuniyaku he 尼雅木尼雅库河 (River of No Mounted Archery)</td>
<td>Second in the second row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niowanggiyaha hoton/qinghe cheng 清河水 (Fort Green Water)</td>
<td>Fourth in the second row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fakū giyamun/faku zhan 法库站 (Fa Ku Relay Station)</td>
<td>Fourth in the second row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sung šan pu/song shan bao 松山堡 (Fort Pine Mountain)</td>
<td>Fourth in the second row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tomhui bira/tuomohui he 托摩辉河 (Tomhui River)</td>
<td>Fourth in the second row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moshi ioi gašan/moshi yu tun 磨石峪屯 (Millstone Valley Village)</td>
<td>Fourth in the second row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neihe hecen /kai cheng 开城 (Fort Open Gate)</td>
<td>Fourth in the second row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liyooha bira/liao he 河 (Liao River)</td>
<td>Fourth in the second row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caïha/cai he 蔡河 (Cai River)</td>
<td>Fourth in the second row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horhai pu/he' erhai bao 和尔海堡 (Fort Horhai)</td>
<td>Fourth in the second row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tumet beile i harangga ba/tumote beile suoshu dijie 土默特貝勒所属地界 (Frontier of the Tumet Prince)</td>
<td>Fifth in the second row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karacin beile i harangga ba/kalaqin beile suoshu dijie 喀喇沁貝勒所属地界 (Frontier of the Harqin Prince)</td>
<td>Fifth in the second row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karacin wang ni harangga ba/kalaqin wang suoshu dijie 喀喇沁王所属地界 (Frontier of the Harqin Wang)</td>
<td>Fifth in the second row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchu location name</td>
<td>Chinese location name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ilta şan</td>
<td>yila ta 伊拉塔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ciyan tun wei</td>
<td>qian tun wei 前屯卫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gas holo</td>
<td>kasi yu 喀斯峪</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imsun bira</td>
<td>yimuxun he 伊穆逊河</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jakūmu bira</td>
<td>孔库穆河</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>san ca ho</td>
<td>三岔河</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Names and locations which differ between the *Toponym Study* and the *Map of Military Deeds*

The Manchu and Chinese writing in the original map do not conform with each other.
The ten instances in the *Toponym Study* and the *Map of Military Deeds* where place names are recorded differently occur in the following circumstances:

(1) When the Manchu names are the same, but the Chinese names are different. For example, *iltə šan* in the *Toponym Study* is recorded in Chinese as *yila ta* 伊拉塔 without the *šan* which corresponds to the Chinese *shan* 山; the *Map of Military Deeds* records this completely. *jakūmu bira* is recorded the same in both, but the *Map of Military Deeds* lacks the Chinese word *he* 河 (river) which corresponds to the Manchu *bira* (river).

(2) When both the Manchu and Chinese names are different. For example, in the *Toponym Study* a place name is recorded as *ciyan tun wei* in Manchu and *qian tun wei* 前屯衛 in Chinese. In the *Map of Military Deeds*, the Manchu and Chinese both use the word “walled city” with the Manchu *hoton* and the Chinese *cheng* 城.

(3) When the Manchu transliteration of Chinese is different. For example, the *Toponym Study* transcribes the Manchu *gas holo* with the Chinese *kasi yu* 喀斯峪 while in the *Map of Military Deeps* the same Manchu is transcribed into Chinese as *gasi yu* 噶斯峪. Here the Chinese character used to transcribe the g/k sound is different. In another example, the Manchu *imsun bira* is in both the *Toponym Study* and the *Map of Military Deeds*, but here the m sound is transcribed differently. The Manchu for *karcin wang ni harangga ba* is identical in both, but the r sound is transcribed differently into Chinese. The Manchu for *mukturi alin* is recorded identically in both, but the Chinese character used to transcribe the m sound differs.

(4) When there is an error in the recording. For example, the *Toponym Study* has duplicate entries for *san ca ho*/*san cha he* 三岔河 (Three Branches
River), and the duplicate entry is a mistake for the san ho pu/san he bao 三河堡 of the Map of Military Deeds. This place name has a small “□” sign below what is an annotation for military history.

(5) When the two texts have mistakes. Both texts record the Manchu inu alin the same way, and even though the Manchu alin means “mountain,” from the graphical depiction in the Map of Military Deeds what should have been yinu shan 伊努山 (Yinu Mountain) is recorded as yinu he 伊努河 (Yinu River). The Toponym Study also records the Chinese name here as yinu he 伊努河 (Yinu River), which I suspect is incorrect. There is also the ookiya gašan which is recorded similarly in both texts (gašan means village and corresponds to the Chinese tun屯), the Toponym Study records this as ao qia tun 奥恰屯, while the Map of Military Deeds records this as ao qia he 奥恰河. I suspect, the recording of this place name in the Map of Military Deeds is incorrect.

1.2 Annotation of Military Deeds

The Toponym Study records a total of 142 military deeds, while the Map of Military Deeds records a total of 144. Those not found in the Toponym Study are:

(1) Niowanggiyaha hoton/qinghe cheng 清河城 (Green River City): Nurhaci attacked and brought the Korean army to submission at this place in the Yellow Sheep year. Here in the year of Yellow Sheep the emperor Taizu (Nurhaci) attacked and submitted the Korean army

\[ \text{taidzu dergi hûwangdi sohon i honin aniya solgo i cooha be ubade afame dahabuha} \]

太祖高皇帝己未年攻降朝鮮兵於此

(2) Gin cang pu/jin chang bao 錦昌堡 (Fort Jinchang): Nurhaci waged a military campaign against the Ming dynasty and took the Fort Jinchang in their surrender in the Black Dog year. In the year of Black Dog the emperor Taizu (Nurhaci) waged military campaign against Ming and took the fort Jinchang

\[ \text{taidzu dergi hûwangdi sahaliyan indahvn aniya ming gurun be dailame gin cang pu be bargiyame dahabuha} \]

太祖高皇帝壬戌年征明收降錦昌堡

Except for these two examples, all the other records of military deeds are identical.
1.3 The annotations in the five volumes of the *Toponym Study* all follow the pattern where they end in *xi yuandi* 系原底 (is the original).

The comparison of this kind of place name items to the corresponding entries in the *Map of Military Deeds* is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place name and annotation</th>
<th>Map of Military Deeds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yenggišen alin 英吉伸仙 “仙字照元底”</td>
<td>yenggišen alin 英吉伸仙</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niman gašan 尼滿河 “河字系元底”</td>
<td>niman gašan 尼滿河</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miyangkeda oforo 密陽喀達鄂佛囉 “喀 ke 系原底”</td>
<td>miyangkeda oforo 密陽喀達鄂佛囉</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alha gašan 阿勒哈河 “河系原底”</td>
<td>alha gašan 阿勒哈河</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lalicin ba 拉里拉地 “cin 系原底”</td>
<td>lalicin ba 拉里拉地</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kabun bira 喀木河 “bun 木系原底”</td>
<td>kabun bira 喀木河</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuretu noor omo 庫哷圖諾爾鄂博 “系原底”</td>
<td>kuretu noor omo 庫哷圖諾爾鄂博</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hülajin omo 呼拉津鄂諾 “系原底”</td>
<td>hülajin omo 呼拉津鄂諾</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the place names listed here in Manchu and Chinese are identical to those in the *Toponym Study* and the *Map of Military Deeds*. That the author of the *Toponym Study*, Dachun, uses the term *yuandi* 原底 “original source” in his annotations assures us that the *Toponym Study* was a copy of another document. Moreover, Dachun discovered that some of the place names were written in his original source incorrectly. For example, Dachun saw that the *yenggišen* in *yenggišen alin* 英吉伸仙 is correct and without error—but the word *alin* in Manchu means mountain and corresponds to the Chinese character *shan* 山, and not the character *xian* 仙 (immortal). Other examples are the same, *niman gašan* (Mountain Goat Village) should be transliterated into Chinese as *niman tun* 尼滿屯 as the Chinese word *he* 河 (river) corresponds to the Manchu *bira* (river). Another error can be found in the sound “ke” of the Chinese transliteration given for *miyangkeda oforo* 密陽喀達鄂佛囉. The sound “ke” should be represented by the Chinese character *ke* 克, while the character *ka* 喀 represents the sound “ka.” *alha gašan/A’leha he* 阿勒哈河 should be transcribed to Chinese as *A’leha tun* 阿勒哈屯. In the *lalicin* part of *lalicin ba/lali ladi* 拉里拉地, the *lalicin* should be transliterated in Chinese as *laliqin* 拉裡沁 according to the *Transliteration Guide*. The *kabun* in *kabun bira/kamun he* 喀木河 should be transliterated as *kaben* 喀畚, the character *mu* 木 is used to transliterate the Manchu *mu*. The *omo* in *kuretu noor omo/ kuletu nu’er e’bo* 庫哷圖諾爾鄂博 should correspond to the Chinese *e’mo* 鄂誤, the *e’bo*
used here transliterates the Manchu obo; and in the same way the omo in hilajin omo/hulajin e’nuo 呼拉津鄂諾 should also be transliterated into Chinese as e’mo 鄂謨 and not e’nuo 鄂諾. Here we can see that the place names recorded in the Map of Military Deeds are not without error. Still, I have no explanation as to why these place name errors went undiscovered as the Map of Military Deeds was completed and published.

In summary of the above, I have shown through a detailed analysis of the place names, the annotations of military accomplishments, as well as Dachun’s annotations mentioning a “source text”, that the Toponym Study and the Map of Military Deeds contain much of the same content on the place names of the northeast three provinces before the Manchu conquest of China proper and related military annotations — from all of this it is clear that the two texts share a common source.

2. On the Date of the Text’s Completion

On the colophone of the Toponym Study is written: Qianlong gengchen nian 乾隆庚辰年 “the White Dragon year of Qianlong,” which was the 25th year of the Qianlong reign, or 1760. If this is the date of the text’s composition, this would mean that its date of publication would be separated by eighteen years from the Map of Military Deeds discussed above. With the nearly identical contents of the two texts, how should we understand the relationship between these two texts? Was this volume of place names collected and compiled in 1760 and later published as the Map of Military Deeds only after Qianlong’s 1775 imperial edict? As the Toponym Study contains no preface, and there are no related materials which we can consult, it is impossible for us to know the compilation process of the Toponym Study. There are, however, several Manchu and Chinese archival documents which shed light on the details regarding the composition of the Map of Military Deeds. Moreover, I have been able to ascertain in detail that the place names and annotations of military history on the Map of Military Deeds are related to the Toponym Study — they arise from the same source. From this I have concluded that the general date of composition assumed for the Toponym Study is incorrect.

In 1775, when Qianlong read through the old Manchu archives, he found that the archives mentioned many place names in Manchuria, but there was no map to check them with. As it should not be that the homeland of his ancestors were without a map, he ordered the Grand Councillors to check the
old Manchu archives, the Gazetteer of Shengjing and the Venerable Records in detail and write out a list of place names and mailed to the garrison generals of such places as Shengjing, Jilin, and Heilongjiang. Each examined in detail mainly their provincial capitals, but also some other places which were quite a distance from the provincial capitals, and they checked the existence of famous mountains, great waterways, and the places with vestiges of historical persons by their current and former names so as to jointly compile a single map of the three provinces to submit for his perusal. The Manchu version of this edict included in the Hunchun fudutong yamen dang (Yamen Achieves of the Garrison Lieutenant General of Hunchun).

The Map of Military Deeds was drafted by using the ten-row version of Huangyu quantu as its basis. On May 20, 1776, the Shengjing governor-general Hong Shang, following the orders given to him, sent a memorial back to the emperor which included a folded map of the three provinces of Shengjing, Jilin, and Heilongjiang with red labels affixed to the places affiliated with Shengjing, pink labels affixed to the places affiliated with Jilin, and white labels affixed to the places affiliated with Heilongjiang. The officials, living in the capitals of each of the provinces, have traversed the areas of the mountains and rivers and completed the detailed investigation and in the areas of the lieutenant banner commanders, provincial commanders, military commandants, brigade commanders, and so on, the place names of the mountains and rivers was sent with invariable meticulousness and repeatedly checked over and over again. Through this large-scale investigation, more than seven hundred place names were found which were not in Huangyu quantu. The Qianlong emperor decreed:

"Take the draft of the maps to develop a comprehensive map and enumerate the main points of the various items of achievement in Manchu and Chinese annotations on the map in preparation for introspection with respect the achievement of our ancestors and pass through the ages."
The leaders of this map’s composition, the ministers Šuhede (舒赫德), Agūi (阿桂), and Ingliyan (英廉), sent their suggested format of the annotations of military deeds and their suggestions to enlarge the dimensions of the map—they sent the following memorial in June, 1776.

We your ministers have humbly checked the total ten rows of the Huan-gyu quantu and found that the places of Shengjing and so on stop after a bit over two rows. Its square space is limited and besides listing place names it is impossible to have any annotations. For the places such as Shengjing which are contained inside, we will separately draft a complete map to annotate all historical achievements in detail. Yet, we have found through our respectful investigation of the Veritable Records that the various achievements of the past were numerous. Nevertheless, that which we take to annotate the main points of must also not be oversimplified. If for every single place name, we are to annotate one historical achievement, the lines of Manchu and Chinese texts would be too numerous, and it would be difficult to expand the size of the map. Now, we your ministers have thought carefully on this matter, all the records of achievement of the place names in the map will be narrated with their year and month and their main points indicated under the place names. For example, there is a place called Mt. Sarhū with the annotation ‘On the third month of the fourth year of the Tianming reign four-hundred and seventy thousand soldiers of the Ming came to attack. The Taizu emperor led sixty-thousand soldiers to this place.’ All the place names with historical achievements in the map imitate this style in their annotations in using Manchu and Chinese characters. …Again, besides the formerly accepted decree which was handed over to the generals of such places as Shengjing and has been supplemented with the discovery of a total of seven-hundred place names to be added to the new map, the old map will also be handed over to Department of Cartography for their detailed addition of the ten rows included within the print. This combination will be declared to you in a respectful memorial.\textsuperscript{11}

Only at this time did the format for the inclusion of military deeds appear, and over 700 place names were newly added to the map. Thus, in the span of two years the map project was finally wrapped up. On May 20, 1778, the Department of Cartography in the Workshop of the Imperial Household submitted a memorial requesting compensation for their work.\textsuperscript{12} By that time

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{11} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{12} Memorial 05-08-030-000007-0033.
\end{footnotesize}
Șuhede had already passed away in 1777, so Agūi was the head minister in charge of the project. Agūi led Fulong’an, Ingliyan, and Heshen to memorialize respectfully:

Concerning the matter of our respectful presentation of a territorial map, we, your ministers, have respectfully received the imperial edict to handle the matter of the territorial mapping of Shengjing, Jilin, and Heilongjiang. We have sent drafts of the map in succession, and checked the place names in the Veritable Records and the Old Manchu Achieves about historical achievements related to the beginning of the great enterprise to be compiled into annotations. We respectfully received the benefits of your majesty’s instructions and followed your instructions to handle this matter to expand the map into five rows and unite the two-thousand three-hundred and thirteen places on the map with a hundred and forty-four annotations which we respectfully recorded in both Manchu and Chinese. The original edict from your majesty was placed at the beginning of the map. Now we have finished the drafting and respectfully submitting the territorial map for your inspection. We humbly wait for your orders. We will hand over the map to the Department of Cartography so that it may be engraved for woodblock print and decorated. We respectfully send it to be kept in the inner place and in Shengjing, so that it may be passed down through the ages. Thus, we have issued with respect a single copy of the map to the generals and lieutenant-generals in such places as Shengjing as well as to the various yamen for storage. With this we respectfully submit our memorial. Submitted in memorial on the 26th day of the 6th month of the 43rd year of the Qianlong.\textsuperscript{13}

In this way the map was finally handed over to the \textit{Wuying dian} 武英殿 (Hall of Military Excellence) for a woodblock print engraving to be made in the second lunar month of 1779.\textsuperscript{14} In 1782 the Qing court bestowed a reward on the nobility and officials who participated in the drafting of this map. Unfortunately, by that time Șuhede, the leader, and the garrison general Hong Shang had already passed away and were unable to receive their rewards.\textsuperscript{15}

In light of the aforementioned details of the compilation process of the \textit{Map of Military Deeds}, we can know that the 2000 additionally recorded place name entries in the \textit{Toponym Study} were collected after Qianlong’s imperial edict of 1776, and 700 of these entries were not included in any

\textsuperscript{13} Imperial Household Department memorial (micro-film archives).
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{15} Memorial 03-0178-098.
previous territorial maps and were only added with the progress of the *Map of Military Deeds*. Except for the two entries of *Qinghe cheng* 清河城 and *Jinchang bao* 錦昌堡 which are not included in the *Map of Military Deeds*, all the entries in the *Toponym Study* also appear in the *Map of Military Deeds*. Only in 1777 did the ministers of the Grand Council who led this project determine the format of the annotations. The *Map of Military Deeds* was completed in summer of 1778 and was printed in spring of 1779. If the *Toponym Study* was written in 1760, the Qianlong emperor would not have 15-years later ordered again for a place name study of the northeast, and then spent another two or three years of effort and money to produce the *Map of Military Deeds*. Thus, the *Toponym Study* could not possibly have been written in 1760 as is indicated on its title page. This book, perhaps, is a volume of place names used during the 1776-1779 period of the compilation of the *Map of Military Deeds*, or it is also possible that it was composed after 1779 as a handwritten copy of the *Map of Military Deeds*.

3. Concerning Authorship

On the colophone page of the *Toponym Study* to the left of the title is indicated, “written by Dachun”, so there should be no doubt that Dachun was the author of this volume. Moreover, we can find four figures with a name pronounced as and written with the characters “Dachun 達椿,” and two of the figures were successful candidates in the highest imperial examinations who held positions in the imperial court. The other two figures were local government officials—one was the military commandant of Taiyuan, later promoted to be the garrison lieutenant general of Shengjing, then transferred to be the garrison lieutenant general of Jingzhou. The other held the position of garrison lieutenant general of Guangzhou.

Biographical information about the Dachun who became a *jinshi* (presented scholar) in 1760 appears in the *Draft History of the Qing*:

Dachun’s courtesy name was Xiangpu and his lineage name was Wusu. He was a Manchu of the Bordered White Banner. He became a *jinshi*, successful candidate in the highest imperial examination in the 25th year of the Qianlong period, and was selected to the Hanlin Academy. Upon his release from the Hanlin Academy he was accepted to the Ministry of Revenue, where he took an untitled position. He had once been an imperial tutor, academician, performed the libations at the imperial academy, deputy intendent to the House of the Crown Prince, and presided over the Court of Judicial
Review while being in the Hanlin Academy. In the 29th year of the Qianlong period he entered into service for the emperor in the school for the emperor’s sons where they read fully in the Complete Library of the Four Branches (by the 37th year of the Qianlong period). For his hard work he was promoted to be assistant minister of the Ministry of Rites, while concurrently a banner vice-commander. In the 44th year of the Qianlong period, he committed a crime by braking the roof of the Institute of Interpreters and Translators (which was the hotel for envoys from tributary countries), when an envoy from Korea was killed. He was deprived of his title, but remained in office. In the 54th year of the Qianlong period he was demoted to be an academician of the Grand Secretariat. Dachun entered the imperial court. He did not get along with Heshen, and several times pointed out his shortcomings. He was dismissed from his office due to neglect. Yet, he remained to devote his efforts at the School of the emperor’s sons. He was sought out and conferred the title of academician at the Hanlin Academy, yet again due to his performance in the great internal examination, he was demoted and criticised. The Jiaqing emperor was aware that, he had been treated unfairly, so in the 4th year of his reign he issued an edict to confer upon Dachun a position of an academician in the Grand Secretariat and a concurrent position of a lieutenant banner commander. He had experience as an assistant minister in the Ministry of Rites and the Ministry of Personnel while also being a chancellor of the Hanlin Academy. He was promoted to be the premier president of the metropolitan Court of Censors and a provincial military governor before being transferred to become a high official of the Ministry of Rites. In the 6th year of the Jiaqing period, he administered the metropolitan examination. He passed away in the 7th year of the Jiaqing period.\footnote{Zhao 1977, Vol.37, 11279-11280.}

Compared with the other three figures, I believe that the Dachun mentioned above is the author of the Toponym Study. The basis of my inference is:

1. in 1775 he presided at the Court of Judicial Review, and along with Heshen and others he held office in the same imperial court, as all of the officials such as Heshen, who had undertaken the drafting of the Map of Military Deeds, and he had the opportunity to see the Map of Military Deeds;

2. he had once read through the entire Siku quanshu (Complete Library of the Four Branches) of which the revised edition later included the Map of Military Deeds, so Dachun would have had the opportunity to see all kinds of documents including the Map of Military Deeds;
3. in 1764 he entered the school of the emperor’s sons where he instructed for many years. In 1802, he wrote a memorial to the Jiaqing emperor at the time when he became critically ill, “I have worked part time in the esteemed study for twenty-eight years, and every day when I waited upon you, I received your imperial favor.” In this way, this particular Dachun had a greater opportunity than the other three Dachun to consult the Map of Military Deeds and have his colleagues show him territorial maps.

In short, this Dachun had a greater opportunity than the other three Dachun to directly consult the Map of Military Deeds and to create the Toponym Study. Also, my best guess is that the date indicated on the Toponym Study’s title page the “Qianlong gengchen nian 乾隆庚辰年” (1760) refers to the year when this Dachun became a jinshi (presented scholar). As there are no resources which can be further consulted to prove this, this remains only my conjecture.

Conclusion

This paper has through a comparison of Man-Han huangyu shanhe diming kao (Imperial Territory Mountain and River Toponym Study in Manchu and Chinese) to the Shengjing Jilin Heilongjiang deng chu biaozhu zhanji yutu (Territorial Map of Military Deeds in Places Such as Shengjing, Jilin, and Heilongjiang), inferred that these two works arise from the same source. It is very unlikely that this work was composed in the “Qianlong gengchen nian 乾隆庚辰年” (1760). During the Qing period, Manchus were referred to only by their given names without their family names, and there were many Manchus who had the same name. I hypothesize that the author of it was the Dachun who had become a jinshi in 1760.

Additionally, the first page or the first two pages of the main text in each volume of the Toponym Study are without a common name, and the vocabulary like this adds up to altogether 70 entries. Of these entries, 24 have annotations which explain that the terms correspond to either Manchu or Mongolian vocabulary—for example, the entry for “janggiya” is “zhangjia 张家 in Mongolian a knot (jiezi 结子) is called zhangjia 章家.” The inclusion of these entries which do not have a common noun is the unique characteristic which differs this work from the Map of Military Deeds, and it could be

17 Grand Council copied Chinese archives 03-1464-047.
said that this is the “study” (kao 考) part of this work. As to why the author had chosen to list seventy of the terms independently among the numerous toponyms and only make annotations for a third of the entries—we cannot know.

The huangyu (imperial territories) in the title the Huangyu shanhe diming kao (A Study of Mountain and River Toponyms of the Imperial Territories) refers to the imperial domain. This huangyu, is however, not the same as the Huangyu quantu (Complete Map of the Imperial Territory). It is widely known that the Huangyu quantu is a map of the national territory of the Qianlong period. Yet, the content of this only refers to the Three Eastern Provinces (Heilongjiang, Jilin, and Liaoning). This area is the birthplace of the Manchu people, and the goal of the Qianlong drafted Map of Military Deeds was to allow for his descendants to commemorate their ancestors and inscribe the deeds of the conquest of the northeast before the Manchu’s had established Beijing as the capital of the Qing. At the same time, Qianlong wanted to investigate the mountains and rivers of all sizes in the northeast. Thus, the huangyu in the title of this book refers to the state territory of the Qing before it had conquered China proper.
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Abstract: the paper presents eleven fragments of Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā identified during analysis of the Tibetan texts from Khara-khoto kept in the IOM, RAS. In 2019 as an intermediate result of a project ‘Compilation of the Catalogue of the Tibetan texts from Khara-Khoto preserved at the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, RAS’ being done by researchers of the Institute thirty-three fragments that had been added to Khara-khoto collection by mistake, were transferred to a separate collection of Tibetan texts from Dunhuang. Although the edited fragments of Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā cannot be considered to be unique they are worth studying in terms of codicology.
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Being a part of the manuscript holdings of the Institute of Oriental manuscripts, RAS, Tibetan texts from Dunhuang are kept as a separate collection under call numbers Дх.Тиб. (abbreviation for ‘Dunhuang Tibetan’). The majority of the texts included in this collection are well-known thanks to the catalogue edited by L.S. Savitskiī and several publications made by M.I. Vorobiova-Desiatovskia, A.V. Zorin and K. Iwao. Meanwhile, a new research project carried out by A. Zorin, A. Sizova and A. Turanskaya has revealed that
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some Tibetan texts preserved in the Khara-khoto collection are of Dunhuang origin.\(^6\)

This consumption is rather plausible concerning the fact that Tibetan texts found in the Big Mound hoard in the Tangut (Tib. Mi nyag, Chinese Xi xia 西夏) fortified town of Khara-khoto and kept in St. Petersburg have not been properly sorted and arranged until recently.\(^7\) It is known that the Tibetan books were transferred to the Asiatich Museum (now the IOM, RAS) on May 3 (April 20, according to the Gregorian Calendar), 1911. Dunhuang and other Central Asian collections were partly mixed up during the Soviet time, and in the late 1960s it was not an easy task to identify Tibetan texts from Khara-khoto when the separate collection was first formed. By 1970, 70 book fragments acquired code XT (abbreviation for “Хара-хото, Тибетский” (Khara-khoto, Tibetan). Later the collection of Tibetan texts was enlarged and, by 2018, included 194 call numbers.\(^8\) As a result of collection preliminary study in the framework of the above mentioned project, it became clear that thirty-three items from Dunhuang had been transferred to Khara-Khoto collection of Tibetan texts by mistake. In 2019 they were returned to the collection of Tibetan texts from Dunhuang and obtained new call numbers:\(^9\)

\[\begin{align*}
\text{XT 2} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.222} & \text{XT 31} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.233} & \text{XT 70} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.244} \\
\text{XT 4} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.223} & \text{XT 32} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.234} & \text{XT 77} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.245} \\
\text{XT 11} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.224} & \text{XT 33} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.235} & \text{XT 80} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.246} \\
\text{XT 12} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.225} & \text{XT 34} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.236} & \text{XT 81} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.247} \\
\text{XT 13} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.226} & \text{XT 35} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.237} & \text{XT 82} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.248} \\
\text{XT 14} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.227} & \text{XT 39} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.238} & \text{XT 83} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.249} \\
\text{XT 15} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.228} & \text{XT 46} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.239} & \text{XT 84} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.250} \\
\text{XT 17} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.229} & \text{XT 50} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.240} & \text{XT 85} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.251} \\
\text{XT 24} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.230} & \text{XT 52} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.241} & \text{XT 86} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.252} \\
\text{XT 29} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.231} & \text{XT 56} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.242} & \text{XT 92} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.253} \\
\text{XT 30} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.232} & \text{XT 57} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.243} & \text{XT 97} & \rightarrow \text{Дх. Тиб.254}
\end{align*}\]

\(^6\) Hypothetically speaking, these book fragments could be found in Khara-khoto as it is well-known that manuscripts produced in Dunhuang were distributed to other places (IWAO 2012, 104). However, as Dunhuang manuscript fragments are not found in the Stein’s collection of Tibetan books from Khara-khoto preserved in the British library, this speculation is rather unlikely.

\(^7\) This fact was indicated in Vorobiova-Desiatovskaja 1995, 46; Takeuchi 2016, 323; Zorin, Sizova 2019.

\(^8\) History of the collection is provided in Zorin, Sizova 2019.

\(^9\) More details in Zorin, Sizova 2019.
These items are variegated in terms of writing style and contents and include:

- several fragments of documents (Đх. Tiブ.223; Đх. Tiブ.228; Đх. Tiブ.245; Đх. Tiブ.246) and glegs tshas covers (Đх. Tiブ.234; Đх. Tiブ.240; Đх. Tiブ.242).


It is well known that the established scriptorium in Tibetan-ruled Dunhuang (786–848) was engaged in the ambiguous project of copying various Buddhist texts in both Tibetan and Chinese languages on behalf of the Tibetan emperor. Aparimitāyurjñāna Sūtra and Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra in Tibetan were copied to such a great extent that they comprised a larger part of the Tibetan Dunhuang manuscripts. According to numerous previous studies, Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā was vastly copied during the reign of the Tibetan king Khri gtsug lde btsan (815–841). According to S. van Schaik, about 14,000 sheets of Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra in pothī format are preserved nowadays in world manuscript holdings.

The roll-type copies are not rare either. Thus, the above-mentioned fragments of Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra do not seem much promising for the researchers of Tibetan history and culture. However, their edition and further study can be useful in codicological and paleographical aspects.

---

10 The edition of the fragment is presented in Takeuchi 1995.
11 The fragment is mentioned in Takeuchi 2013, 103.
12 Iwao 2013, 111.
14 This term is used to indicate a variation of a scroll, oriented horizontally Iwao 2013; Dotson, Helman-Wazny 2016, 36.
The fragments are parts of nine different rolls. Full dimensions and completeness of the latter remain unknown as fragments are too small to speculate. However, the textual collation gives enough evidence to suppose that the text columns and, thus, paper panels which were attached together with adhesive, differed in length.\textsuperscript{15}

The writing style of these Tibetan fragments is \textit{dbu can} that contains several features of Old Tibetan writing such as reverse gi gu, da drag, ma ya btags, medial ‘a (e.g. bka’s), ‘a rten (e.g. pa’), which are common for Dunhuang manuscripts. Particles ‘i and ‘o (with the letter ‘a chung) are quite often separated from the preceding syllables with the tsheg sign (e.g. bcu ‘i, bya ‘o, etc.). A special ligature for the combination sp- (as in spyod or spong, etc.) is used, it is similar to the one used in dbu med script.

The ductus of all fragments is alike (except for \textit{Dh. Tib.227, Dh. Tib.239}) and renders so-called ‘sutra style’\textsuperscript{16} with minor specific features that allows to suppose that the manuscripts were produced in the same scriptorium.\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Dh. Tib.227, Dh. Tib.239} are more likely to be written in ‘square style’.\textsuperscript{18} Paleographical features clearly indicate that the Tibetan manuscripts were carefully prepared and written. The handwritings are neat and legible while corrections and corrector’s interpolations into the main text are minor. They are inserted into the texts by ‘+’ sign.

The codicological description and edition of the fragments are presented below. The fragments are identified with relevant places in the later canonical Derge edition (D), thanks to the search tool available at the web site of the Buddhist Digital Research Center (BDRC). The Derge edition was also used to fill the lacunae found in the fragments although the original texts must have had certain differences.

\textsuperscript{15} Each paper panel has two or three columns, in which Tibetan text is written horizontally. The roll-type \textit{Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā} sutras from Dunhuang are produced on panels which are ca. 27.5 cm high and have 15 to 19 lines per column (\textit{Dotsen, Helman-Wazny 2016, 63}).

\textsuperscript{16} This style is rather typical for Dunhuang documents and was used by scribes to write Buddhist texts at some speed while retaining legibility. A more detailed description is found in \textit{Van Schaijik 2013, 122–123; Van Schaijik 2014, 309–312}.

\textsuperscript{17} For the ductus of the five fragments a reduction of strokes and pen-lifts is typical. The head of \textit{ga} and \textit{kha} is triangle in shape; \textit{ba} is triangle with flat head stroke; ‘a in the majority of cases is written without ‘tail-stroke’ on the bottom right.

\textsuperscript{18} The square style appears in several documents from the library cave at Dunhuang and is often dated back to the late eighth and mid-ninth centuries (\textit{Van Schaijik 2014, 309}). The preserved text of the fragment includes all specifications typical for this style: \textit{ta} shows similarity with Brāhmī \textit{ṭa}; diagonal line extends across the whole letter \textit{pha}, from right top tip to bottom left corner; \textit{ba} in square shape; \textit{la} has long flat “head” on right vertical.
The edition uses a system developed by A. Zorin for the project. Texts of the fragments are given in bold type, the lacunae being put in the angle brackets and marked with italics. Crossed syllables are put in quotation marks "". Interpolations that could be considered scribe’s or corrector’s corrections are given in curly brackets. Special Tibetan letters and signs used for rendering of Sanskrit words and syllables are transliterated with use of diacritics — ā, ī, ō, ṃ, ḥ, etc. The ‘ ‘ and : signs render tsheg and double tsheg signs correspondingly. Intervals between words and shad ( ) signs are rendered with underscores. Marked margins are indicated by sign ¦.

1. Дх. Тиб.222 (XT 2)

Fragment. 17.2×16.8 cm.
‘Woven’, one-layered, medium thick paper of light brownish colour. Verso is blank. Guidelines by drypoint (1.5 cm).
Tears, creases, holes, surface grim.
D: ‘bum, nga, 335a/3–335a/6.

<thog ma>|‘dang' ma' myed|pa’ stong|pa’ nyid|‘dhen’ zhes|‘bya’ ba’ dang’| [1]

<bya’ bar’> na’ s’par’ myi’ ba’ o|<dmyigs pa’ l’ tshul’ gyis|thog’ ma’ dang’|tha<ma>

<myed’> pa’ stong|pa’ nyid’ stong’ zhes’ bya’ ba’ dang’|myi’ stong’ zhes’ bya’
bar’ gna’<par>

<myi’> bya’ o2<|<dmyigs pa’ l’ tshul’ gyis|thog’ ma’ dang’|tha’ ma’ myed’|
<pa’ stong’ pa’> |

<nyid ma’> tshan’<m’|‘yod’|‘ces’|‘bya’|‘ba’|‘dang’|mtshan’ ma’ myed’|‘ces’|‘bya’
bar’ gnah<par’ myi’>

<bya’ o|<dmyigs pa’ l’ tshul’ gyis|thog’ ma’ dang’|tha’ ma’ myed’|pa’ stong’|
pa’ nyi’<d>

19 It will be used for the edition of the catalogue of the Tibetan texts from Khara-Khoto preserved at the IOM, RAS. Its aim is to render all textual aspects of the fragments, including orthographical peculiarities, gaps, various auxiliary signs, etc.

20 The double tsheg is a rare form found only in early inscriptions, some legal, administrative, ritual documents, and sutras (Dotson, Helman-Wazny 2016, 83).

21 The fragment was edited by A. Sizova.

22 Interpolation res (?) between lines 4 and 5.

23 Cross sign between lines 5 and 6.
<smon>d·pa·yod·ces·bya·ba·dang</smon> [7]
smond·pa·myed·ces·bya·bar·gna<s par·myi>

<bya>o_o|_dmyigs·pa·tshul·gyis·dor·ba·myed·pa·stong·pa·nyi</bya> [8]
<ges ces bya ba>

<dang>myi·rtag·ces·bya·bar·gna·s·par·myl·bya·o|_dmyigs</dang> [9]

<lor>ba·myed·pa·stong·pa·nyid·bde·zhes</lor> [10]
<bya>

<bar gnas par myi bya o|_dmyigs pa·i·tshul·gyis|_lor·ba·myed·pa·stong·pa·nyid...> [11]

2. Дх. Туё.224 (XT 11), Дх. Туё.236 (XT 34)
Joint fragments.25 23.8×25.9, 15.9×25.3 cm.
‘Woven’, one-layered, thin, even paper of light brown-yellowish colour.
Verso is blank. Guidelines in ink (line spacing 1.5 cm). Margins are marked out in ink.
Cut paper edges.
D: ’bum, nya, 281b/1–282b/2

[1] _shes·rab·kyI·pha·rol·du·phyin·pa·tshad·myed·do·sha·ra·dwa·tI’i·bu·len·pa·tshad·myed·pa·l’phyir·shes·rab·kyi·pha·rol·du·phyin·pa<_
[2] _myed·do·sha·ra·dwa·te’I·bu·srid·pa·tshad·myed·pa’l’phyir·shes·rab·kyI·pha·rol·du·phyIn·pa·tshad·myed·do·_[sha·ra·dwa·te’I·bu·skye·ba’tshad·med:]`
[3] _pa’l’phyir|shes·rab·kyI·pha·rol·du·phyin·pa·tshad·myed·do·sha·ra·dwa·tI’i·bu·rga·shI·tshad·myed·pa’l’phyir|shes·rab·kyi·pha·rol·du·phyin·pa·tshad·myed·do·`
[4] _pa’l’phyir|shes·rab·kyI·pha·rol·du·phyin·pa·tshad·myed·do·sha·ra·dwa·tI’i·bu·sbyin·ba’i·pha·rol·du·phyin·pa·tshad·myed·do·`
[5] _shes·rab·kyi·pha·rol·du·phyin·pa·tshad·myed·do·sha·ra·dwa·tI’i·bu·shes·rab·kyI·pha·rol·du·phyin·pa·tshad·myed·do·`
[6] _shes·rab·kyi·pha·rol·du·phyin·pa·tshad·myed·do·sha·ra·dwa·tI’i·bu·shes·rab·kyI·pha·rol·du·phyin·pa·tshad·myed·do·`

24 Paper perforation between nya and da.
25 The fragments will probably be pasted together after conservation procedures. Text of Дх.Тиб. 236 is marked by dash line in transliteration.
3. Дх. Тиб.225 (XT 12)
Fragment. 10.1×10.1 cm.
Laid (4 laid lines/cm), double-layered, medium thick paper of light brown-yellowish colour. Verso is blank. Guidelines in ink (line spacing 1.5 cm).
Cut paper edges.
D: 'bum, nya, 65a/1–65a/3

27 The precise lines separation is impossible.
4. *Дх. Тиб.226* (XT 13)
Fragment. 12.9×14.3 cm.
Laid (4 laid lines/cm), double-layered, medium thick paper of light brown-yellowish colour. Verso is blank. Guidelines in drypoint (line spacing 1.5 cm).
Cut paper edges.

\[D: \text{’bum, nga, 326b/1–326b/4}\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&<\text{myi·sto}>\text{ng·zhes·bya·bar·g}<\text{nas·par·myi·bya’o|dmyigs·pa’i·tshul·gyis|}> \quad [1] \\
&\text{mye’i·kham·mtshan·ma·yod·ces·bya·ba’adang·mtshan·}<\text{ma·myed·ces·bya·bar·gnas}> \quad [2] \\
&\text{par·myil·bya’o|dmyigs·pa’i·tshul·gyis|mye’i·kham<s>|smon·pa} \quad [3] \\
&\text{pa·myed·ces·bya·bar·gna’as·par·myil·bya’o|dmyi<gs·pa’i·tshul·gyis|} \quad [4] \\
&\text{rlung} \quad > \\
&\text{gi·kham·rtag·ces·bya·ba’adang·myi·rtag·ces·bya·bar<gnas·par·myi·bya’o}> \quad [5] \\
&\text{dmyigs·pa’i·tshul·gyis·rlung·gi·kham·bde·zhes}<\text{bya·ba·dang·sdug·bsang·zhes}> \quad [6] \\
&\text{bya·bar·gna’s·par·myil·bya’o|dmyigs·pa’i·tshul<gyis|rlung·gi·kham·bdag·ces|} \quad [7] \\
&\text{bya·ba’adang·bdag·myed·ces·bya·bar·gna’s·par·myil<bya’o|dmyigs·pa’i·tshul>} \quad [8] \\
&\text{gyis·rlung·gi·kham·sdug·ces·bya·ba’adang·myi·sdug<ces·bya·bar·gnas·par·myi·bya’o}> \quad [9]
\end{align*}
\]

5. *Дх. Тиб.227* (XT 14)
Fragment. 7.0×9.5 cm.
‘Woven’, one-layered, thin, even paper of light yellowish colour. Verso is blank. Guidelines in drypoint (line spacing 1.3–1.5 cm)
Cut paper edges, tears.

\[D: \text{’bum, kha, 59a/6–59b/2}\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&<\text{becom·ldan’·das·gal·te·byang·chub·sens·dpa’·sens·dpa}>>\text{chen·po’·sh<es·rak kyi·pha·rol·tu·phyin·pa’·la·spyod·pa’i}>. \quad [1] \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[28\text{The precise lines separation is impossible.}\]
Two fragments of the same manuscript of the same size. 8.7×8.6 cm.
Laid (4/cm), multi-layered, medium thick, even paper of light yellowish colour. Verso is blank. Guidelines in drypoint (line spacing 1.5 cm)
Cut paper edges, creases.

Fragment no. 1
D: 'bum, nya, 326b/4–327a/4

6. Дх. Тиб.239 (XT 46)
chos phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|chos 'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_|myig gi rna>mpar'shes pa
<sngon gyi mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|myig gi rnam par shes pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|myig gi rnam par shes pa 'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_|rna ba'i rnam par shes pa sngon gyi mthar myi dmnyigs so|_
\[4\]
\[5\]
\[1\]
\[2\]
\[3\]
\[4\]
\[5\]
\[1\]
\[2\]
\[3\]
\[4\]

Fragment no. 2
D: 'bum, nya, 369a/1–369b/1

<mying dang gzugs 'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_|sna'i rnam par shes pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sna'i rnam par shes pa 'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_|len pa sngon gyi mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|len pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|len pa 'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab gyi phar rol du phyis|<|pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_|len pa 'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|len pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sred pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sred pa 'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|sred pa sngon gyi mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sred pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sred pa 'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_|len pa sngon gyi mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|len pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab gyi phar rol du phyis|<|pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_|len pa 'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|len pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_|len pa 'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|len pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab gyi phar rol du phyis|<|pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_|sna'i rnam par shes pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sna'i rnam par shes pa 'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_|sna'i rnam par shes pa sngon gyi mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sna'i rnam par shes pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sna'i rnam par shes pa 'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_|sna'i rnam par shes pa sngon gyi mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sna'i rnam par shes pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sna'i rnam par shes pa 'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_|sna'i rnam par shes pa sngon gyi mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sna'i rnam par shes pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sna'i rnam par shes pa 'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_|len pa sngon gyi mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|len pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab gyi phar rol du phyis|<|pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_|len pa 'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|len pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sred pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sred pa 'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|sred pa sngon gyi mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sred pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sred pa 'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_|len pa sngon gyi mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|len pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab gyi phar rol du phyis|<|pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_|len pa 'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|len pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sred pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sred pa 'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|sred pa sngon gyi mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sred pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sred pa 'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_|len pa sngon gyi mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|len pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab gyi phar rol du phyis|<|pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_|len pa 'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|len pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sred pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sred pa 'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|sred pa sngon gyi mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sred pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sred pa 'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_|len pa sngon gyi mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|len pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab gyi phar rol du phyis|<|pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_|len pa 'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|len pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sred pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sred pa 'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|sred pa sngon gyi mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sred pa phyi ma'i mthar myi dmnyigs so|_|sred pa 'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_|len pa sngon gyi mthar myi dmnyigs so|_

\[4\]

rga·shi·sngon·gyi·mthar·myi·dmnyig·so|_|rga·shi·phyi·ma'i·mthar·myi·dmnyig·so|_|rga·shi·'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_

\[4\]

rga·shi·sngon·gyi·mthar·myi·dmnyig·so|_|rga·shi·phyi·ma'i·mthar·myi·dmnyig·so|_|rga·shi·'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_

\[4\]

rga·shi·sngon·gyi·mthar·myi·dmnyig·so|_|rga·shi·phyi·ma'i·mthar·myi·dmnyig·so|_|rga·shi·'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_

\[4\]

rga·shi·sngon·gyi·mthar·myi·dmnyig·so|_|rga·shi·phyi·ma'i·mthar·myi·dmnyig·so|_|rga·shi·'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_

\[4\]

rga·shi·sngon·gyi·mthar·myi·dmnyig·so|_|rga·shi·phyi·ma'i·mthar·myi·dmnyig·so|_|rga·shi·'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_

\[4\]

rga·shi·sngon·gyi·mthar·myi·dmnyig·so|_|rga·shi·phyi·ma'i·mthar·myi·dmnyig·so|_|rga·shi·'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_

\[4\]

rga·shi·sngon·gyi·mthar·myi·dmnyig·so|_|rga·shi·phyi·ma'i·mthar·myi·dmnyig·so|_|rga·shi·'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_

\[4\]

rga·shi·sngon·gyi·mthar·myi·dmnyig·so|_|rga·shi·phyi·ma'i·mthar·myi·dmnyig·so|_|rga·shi·'dbus su myi dmnyigs so|_|shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la 'spyod pa'i tshe|_

\[4\]
7. Дх. Тиб.248 (XT 82)
Fragment. 26.5×17 cm.
‘Woven’, one-layered, medium thick, uneven paper of brown-yellowish colour. Verso is blank. Guidelines in drypoint (line spacing 1.5 cm)
Cut paper edges, tears, holes. Traces of adhesive on the left side of the paper panel.
D: ’bum, ja, 177b/5–178a/4

\[\begin{align*}
\text{\dngos\po\myed\pa'} &\text{\l'ngo\bo\nyid\stong\pa'nyid\yongs\su'dag\pa\_dgos}\ [1] \\
\text{\yongs\su'dag\pa\_byed\pa'po\yongs\su'dag\pa\ste'} &\text{\de\ltar\na'byed\pa'} [2] \\
\text{\po\myed\pa'i\ngo\bo\nyid\stong\pa'nyid\yongs\su'dag\pa'\dI'la'gnyis\su'myd\de\g\nyis\su'byar\myed\so\so} [3] \\
\text{\ma\yin'tha\myi\dad\do\_\byed\pa'po\yongs\su'dag\pa\_\dran'pa'nyc\bar\gzhag\pa} [4] \\
\text{\dran'ba'nyc\bar\gzhag\pa'"???s"\yongs\su'dag\pa\_byed\pa'po\yongs\su'dag\pa\ste'} [5] \\
\text{\yongs\su'dag\pa\_\dran'ba'nyc\bar\gzhag\pa'yongs\su'dag\pa'\dI'la'gnyis\su'myd\de\g\nyis} [6] \\
\text{\su'byar\myed\so\so\ma\yin'tha\myi\<\dad\do\>_\byed\pa'po\yongs\su'dag\pa\ya\ng\dag\pa\_spong\pa'} [7] \\
\text{\yongs\su'dag\pa\_\drang\dag\pa\_\spong\ba'yongs\su'dag\pa\_\byed\pa'po\yongs\su'dag\pa\ste} [8] \\
\text{\na\_\byed\pa'po\yongs\su'dag\pa'\dang\|\yang\dag\pa\_\spong\ba'yongs\su'dag\pa'} [9] \\
\text{\myed\de\gnyis\su'byar\myed\so\so\ma\yin'tha\myi\dad\do\_\byed\pa'po\yongs\su'dag\pa\_\rdzu\phrul'} [10] \\
\text{\gs\\yir\kang\pa'\yongs\su'dag\pa\_\byed\pa'po\yongs\su'dag\pa\ste}\<\plul'gyi\rkang\pa'yongs\su'dag\pa\ste\<\dI'la'gnyis\su'myd\de\gnyis} [11] \\
\text{\yir\kang\pa'yongs\su'dag\pa\ste}\<\plul'gyi\rkang\pa'yongs\su'dag\pa\ste\<\dI'la'gnyis\su'myd\de\gnyis\su'byar\myed\so\so\ma\yin'tha\myi\dad\do\_\byed\pa'po\yongs\su'dag\pa\_\spong\pa'} [12] \\
\text{\dI'la'gnyis\su'myd\de\gnyis\su'byar\myed\so\so\ma're\so'ma\yin'tha\myi\dad\do\_\byed\pa'po\yongs\su'dag\pa\_\spong\pa'} [13] \\
\text{\dI'la'gnyis\su'myd\de\gnyis\su'byar\myed\so\so\ma're\so'ma\yin'tha\myi\dad\do\_\byed\pa'po\yongs\su'dag\pa\_\spong\pa'} [14] \\
\text{\dI'la'gnyis\su'myd\de\gnyis\su'byar\myed\so\so\ma're\so'ma\yin'tha\myi\dad\do\_\byed\pa'po\yongs\su'dag\pa\_\spong\pa'} [15] \\
\text{\dI'la'gnyis\su'myd\de\gnyis\su'byar\myed\so\so\ma're\so'ma\yin'tha\myi\dad\do\_\byed\pa'po\yongs\su'dag\pa\_\spong\pa'} [16]
\end{align*}\]
8. Дх. Тиб.251 (XT 85)
Fragment. 10.7×9.2 cm.
‘Woven’, one-layered, thin, even paper of light yellowish colour. Verso is blank. Guidelines in drypoint (line spacing 1.5–2 cm)
Cut paper edges, surface abrasion.
D: ‘bum, ja, 260a/7–260b/4

<ice ‘i ‘dus te reg pa’i rkyen kyiis tshor ba rnam par dag pa dang| rnam pa\thams cad mkh>y<en pa nyid rnam par’[1]
<dag pa’di la gnyis su myed de gnyis su ‘byar myed so so mar yin th\a myi-
dar d’do myi dmyigs pa stong pa nyid>[2]
<rnam par dag pa| lus kyi ‘dus te reg pa rnam par dag| lus ky\i ‘dus-
teq reg pa’rnam par dag;[3]
<par dag pa| lus kyi ‘dus te reg pa rnam par dag| lus| rnam pa>\thams cad mkh\y<en pa nyid rnam pa|\[4]
<rnam par dag pa’di la gnyis su myed de gnyis su ‘byar myed so so mar yin>\tha myi da\r pa\d’do myi dmyigs pa stong[5]

9. Дх. Тиб.252 (XT 86)\[29
Fragment. 16.2×13.3 cm.
Laid (4/cm), multi-layered, medium thick, even paper of brown-yellowish colour. Verso is blank. Guidelines in drypoint (line spacing 1.5–1.7 cm)
Severely damaged: cut paper edges, tears, creases, surface abrasion.
D: ‘bum, nga, 107a/7–107b/3

<n\yd nyon mongs>pa myed<pa ste|gang dang yang bral bas\ma yin no|]s he dang>[1]
<ldan pa sha ra dwat\’i bu|>dran ba ye bar g\zhag pa rnam nyon mongs pa myed>[2]
<pa ste|gang\da>ng yang bral bas ma yin no|\yang\da pa<r spon g ba rnam nyon>[3]
<mongs>pa myed pa ste|g\ang dangyang>bral bas ma\yno|\rdzu 'phrul ‘kyi ’rkang>[4]

\[29] This call number includes two additional fragments of the same manuscript. The text\ does not corresopond to Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā and it probably part of the colophon (F.1: <...>su’ bul ba las ichad pa<...>; F.2: <...>’i chad yig dkar ca<...>).
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In 2017 one of the coauthors of this paper edited eleven fragments of Tibetan Buddhist texts found at the Dunhuang Collection preserved in the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, RAS (IOM, RAS) (ZORIN 2017). They belonged to the list of 51 items with Tibetan inscriptions identified by him in this collection. He classified these items into four groups: Group 1, canonical
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1 The main Dunhuang collection is meant here. There is also a separate collection of Tibetan texts from Dunhuang that initially consisted of the copies of Ārya-aparimitāyunyāna-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra and Hridaya-sūtra (SAVITSKY 1991) along with two other items that had to be transferred to other IOM collections since they had been added to this collection mistakenly. On the contrary, two other scrolls, three pothi books and two concertina books were added to it (ZORIN 2018). Since the 1990s, it had been clear that the IOM collection of Tibetan texts from Khara-Khoto also had some Dunhuang texts. Thus, T. Takeuchi discussed XT-4 as an example of a loan contract from this site (TAKEUCHI 1995: 204–207). In 2018, A. Zorin, A. Sizova and A. Turanskaya, participants of a special project aimed at cataloguing
Buddhist texts; Group 2, fragments of documents; Group 3, tiny fragments; and Group 4, separate letters, mantras, scribbles, etc. While the 2017 text cataloged Group 1 items, the current paper addresses twelve of the thirteen items in Group 2.

All of the fragments in Group 2 are secular texts, such as contracts, letters, and name lists. Many Tibetan texts in this group, all of which are apparently from the Dunhuang cave, are written on the back of Chinese Buddhist texts, which means that these Tibetan texts were written on reused paper in Dunhuang.

The presentation of each fragment consists of following aspects: call number, physical features, identification (if possible), digital copy and transliteration. Most of the fragments seem to have belonged to letters and economic documents. One item apparently contains the results of the divination with dice and one is a part of *Old Tibetan Annals*. We hope that our publication can help researchers find some jointing parts of these fragments in other repositories that will make it possible to analyze them with more preciseness.

In this paper, the transliteration of Tibetan texts is based on Wylie system, with the following changes and additions.

the Tibetan texts from Khara-Khoto, thoroughly checked the collection and identified 34 fragments from Dunhuang within it. These items, as well as other 10 found among unprocessed materials, were added to the collection Tibetan texts from Dunhuang, see (ZORIN, SIZOVA 2019). These items have been studied by the above-mentioned group; A. Turanskaya has edited eleven fragments of *Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (TURANSKAYA 2020). There are some secular items as well, one of them is going to be specially studied and published by K. Iwao who found a jointing part of it in the Paris collection.

Дх-12851 was edited and analyzed in Iwao 2011. It is a part of *Old Tibetan Annals*, which is the different version of the *Annals* preserved in the British Library and Bibliothèque Nationale de France (for example, see BACOT ET AL. 1940 and DOTSON 2007). This fragment only bears the report of 703 and 704.

We would like to add only that the smaller fragment of the item is currently kept in a separate envelope that also contains a tiny piece of paper that bears the ending of some phrase: ng·|. Judging by paper and style of writing it clearly used to belong to a different manuscript.

Original Russian letters are used: Ф (=F) that relates to K. K. Flug’s inventory and Дх (=Dh, or Dx) that relates to the remaining part of the Dunhuang collection. We would also like to note that A. S. Zhukovskaya has been processing the entire Dunhuang collection anew and providing new call numbers to the items (they start with the letters ДХH), her aim being to unite scattered fragments of the same manuscripts. We provide these alternative call numbers for those items that have already been given them. Needless to say, the old numbers can be always used by researchers.
The Chinese scroll, *Yiqie Jing Yinyi* 一切經音義. On the Verso side of the scroll, there are several small patching papers, three of which bear a Tibetan text. Apparently, this patching is a reused paper of Tibetan text. The sizes of the three patching papers are, respectively, (1) 3.8×2.7 cm, (2) 9×5.3 cm, and (3) 8×3.8 cm. Patching paper 2 is directly connected to 3. Judging by the handwriting and the repeated word ^an ta, all three fragments belonged to the same manuscript.

**Patching paper (1)**

Paper 1 is a tiny paper with three Tibetan lines. Left, top and right sides of the fragment are torn off, and the beginning and end of the text are missing. The bottom side seems to be even enough to be the original edge of the manuscript. Although the first syllable misses its left part the word ^an ta is certainly written here, cf. the same word in line 3 of Patching paper (2).

---

4 This Tibetan letter is usually transliterated as *a*. However, in respect of secular texts written by Chinese inhabitants of Dunhuang it seems necessary to add some sign before *a* to show that they could use this letter as the phonetic rendering of Chinese pronunciation ʔ. Such a necessity is most clearly seen in the case of the syllable ʔim (see text No. 7 of this paper, Дж-6721) which could be used for 陰 ʔim.
Patching paper (2) and (3)

On paper 2, the bottom and left sides are torn off, the right side is directly jointed with the left side of paper 3 where the bottom side is torn off. The top side of both papers and the right side of paper 3 seem to be even enough to be original edges of the manuscript.

The text is too short to identify the content, but it seems to be either a legal document or letter draft.

The left part of the text is Patching 2, while the right is Patching 3.

2. Дх-5179 (ДХН 4406)

A fragment (13.2/7 × 8.7 cm). All sides are torn off. On the Recto side, Tibetan lines are found. Verso is blank.

Recto

Seven lines in Tibetan with standard lines. The beginning and end of the text is missing. Judging from the term such as chibs-bseb, it is probably a text concerning on a horse. See BLONDEAU 1972.
3. Дх-5500 (ДХН 5040)

Fragment of scroll (25.4×40.5 cm). The Chinese text on the Recto side and Tibetan on the Verso side.

**Recto**

Chinese Daoist text. A part of 8th volume of *Taishang Dongyuan Shenzhou Jing* 太上洞淵咒經.

**Verso**

Four lines in Tibetan. It is an unfinished text of the letter draft. For the format of Old Tibetan letter, see TAKEUCHI 1990.

---

5 TAI 2019: 405 states “the fragment with Uighur texts,” but it is apparently Tibetan.
1. $|nang·rjeˆpoˆbla(!)nˆnzang·dang·_ blonˆlhaˆbzherˆdang·_ bl\[
2. blonˆllong·bzharˆdang·_ blon·sta<b>gˆbzang·la+stsogsˆpa’’zhaˆsnga r|
3. gnyan kang·dang·_ mdoˆbzherˆdang·dgeˆbzang·dang·|
   <snya>_snyaˆla+stsogsˆpa
4. ’rtsaˆchadˆgsolˆbaˆlhaˆdpalˆbnyul - bnyu(?)|ˆda-ng(da-d?)

4. Дх-6396 (ДХ Н 5878)
A left side of an oblong sheet (12.1/10.7×5.6 cm). The Tibetan text is written on the both sides of Chinese scroll.

Recto
Three lines in Tibetan. The end of the text is missing. Account of the death
toll of soldiers belonged to the thousand-district named Gzong-sde⁶.

Verso
Four lines in Chinese Buddhist text, most probably Miaofa Lianhua Jing
妙法蓮華經.

⁶ According to Classical Tibetan sources such as Lde’u chos ‘byang and Mchas pa’i pga’ ston, Gzong sde belonged to the right ru (g.yas ru) in Central Tibet. Cf. IWAO 2000, 598.
5. Дх-6554

Upper right corner of a sheet (12.1/1×9.2 cm). Reusing paper of a Chinese Buddhist scroll.

Recto
Four lines in Tibetan. The beginning and the end of the text are missing. A part of letter type (1)?

1. [...]mkhan’gar’gyi’dgar’stsal’pa’lda’cog
2. [...]dka’stsald’pal|_|gro’khal
3. [...]gy[i]’dka’stsal’pa’gro’khal’dang’ gnyis’pa’khar’bu
4. [...]dang’gta’po|__|khar’ba’l rin|so’b[-]i [...]

Verso
Five lines in Chinese. *Da Banruo Boluomiduo Jing* 大般若波羅蜜多經.

6. Дх-6606 and Дх-6562

Originally one single sheet of the Chinese scroll *Jingang Banruo Jing* 金剛般若經, which is divided into three fragments, Дх-6606 (26×26 cm), Дх-6562 (36×26.2 cm), Dx6563 (7×12.3 cm).

Recto
Chinese Buddhist text. *Jingang Banruo Jing* 金剛般若經.

Verso
Two lines in Tibetan. The text is an unfinished draft of contract.

---

7 We do not provide its picture since it contains no Tibetan text.
1. | |glang·gi·lo·'|...|kyil·'|sl[|o?]|g·pa·gchig·mja·pa·i·b(?i·rdza·ma?
2. |[-]|l·phyed·<b>shong·d?|...|]'bre____________________

7. Дх-6721

Fragment (15.8 × 15.5 cm). Chinese text is found on the Verso side, while Tibetan text is found on both Recto and Verso sides. The Tibetan text of both sides bears the same content, a list of Chinese with the pattern of individual clan name (rus), courtesy name (mkhan), and given name (mying).

**Recto**

Five lines in Tibetan between two Chinese lines, which is a part of *Jingang Banruo Jing* 金剛般若經. The end of each line is missing.

所・說皆大歡喜信受・奉行

1. $||rus·ni·cang·|mkhan·nI·dgra·dog[...]
2. ______rus·nI·li·|mkhan·nI·lyag·skang [...]
3. rusˆnI·mgra·|mkhan·nI·thar·pa·|myIng·nI·thar 
4. rus·nI·zong·|mkhan·nI·dgra·dog·dpa[...]}
5. cang·|mkhan·nI·sog·rtan|myIng·nI·^a[...]
Verso
Five lines in Tibetan. The end of the text is missing.

1. [...]sgring\[bzang\]
2. [...]sgra\[my\]<\ng\[ng\[n\]
3. [...]dog\[my\]<\ng\[n\]
4. [...]n\[song\]<\chang\[\&\&\&\]/yIm
5. [...]n\[\]cung

8. Дх-3111 (ДХ 2524)
A fragment (10.9/6.3×6.2/4.4 cm) of Chinese text. On the Verso side, seven Tibetan lines are found.

Recto
Fragment of Chinese text Taigong Jiajiao 太公家教.

Verso
Seven lines in Tibetan. The end of the text is missing. The list includes Chinese inhabitants most probably in Dunhuang with their levying based on rkya, a tax unit of Tibetan Empire. On the term rkya, see IWAO 2009.

---

8 See the footnote 2 of the paper.
1. [@]|cang ya?’bu’d[o] rkyas phul [ba]>
2. [@]|shig sha’ tse rkyas phul ba |
3. [@]|yang shun zd i rkyas phul ba |
4. [@]|’cang lang lang rkyas phul ba |
5. [@]|wa ng khir tig rkyas phul ba |
6. [@]|wang bur ’do rkyas phul |
   ba [---] yug phyed ye[-] [---]
7. [...] [---] [---]

9. Дх-7759

A fragment (15/7×9.4/2.5 cm) with two tiny fragments (see the left middle part). All sides are torn off.

**Recto**

Six lines in Chinese. The text is unidentified.

**Verso**

Eight lines in Tibetan with several twofold circles. The beginning and the end of the text are missing. The text is apparently the results of the divination with dice\(^9\). Ai Nishida mentions this fragment in her dissertation (NISHIDA 2012, 205)\(^10\), with SI O 145 kept at IOM RAS.

\(^9\) For the divination with dice in Old Tibetan texts, see NISHIDA 2008.

\(^10\) However, she makes a mistake when calling it SI 56a, hence her entire analysis of this item as a piece from N. F. Petrovsky’s collection is based on a misunderstanding. She did not work with the manuscript in St. Petersburg but used its picture taken by Ts. Takeuchi. This
1. [...]  
2. [...]  
3. [...]\text{is•thang•gis•zhal•nas[•]myi•khyod•na•gis[•]}
4. [...]\text{gduk\•lag\•du•'o•ngo •phyug\•nor•kyang\•bs[•]}
5. [...]\text{btab•kyai\•ng\•bza•ngo _[\quad[\quad[\quad[\quad[\quad[}}
6. [...]\text{[\quad[]\quad[\quad[\quad[\quad[\quad[}}
7. [...]\text{dr\•re•myi\•cig\•gis•mthong•pa\•'i•mchids?}[\ldots]
8. [...]\text{r?[-][-]g\•swa\•la\•myi\•(m)yi\•bya•'la\•ngan•'u[[-[-[}}

10. Дл-9533

An oblong fragment of a sheet (16×9.7/9 cm). The right and bottom sides are torn off. On the Recto side, there are two lines in Tibetan and a line in Chinese. Both are apparently written by pen with the same hand. These are most probably the review of the missing volumes of \textit{Da Banruo Jing}. The results are strangely different between Chinese and Tibetan.

picture is included in the text of her dissertation (NISHIDA 2012: 281) and the true call number (Дл 7759) is clearly seen there since it is written with pencil right on the manuscript. Ai Nishida did not provide the transliteration of the text. Moreover, the arrangement of the main part of the fragment with one of the two small fragments that are torn off is not correct on the picture used by her. For the digital copy published in our paper all the fragments were assembled in a correct way. Therefore, our edition can be considered the first proper publication of this item.

We would like to thank Alla Sizova (IOM) for her explanation of Nishida’s mistake: it turned out that Дл 7759 was put, in a provisional way, inside a sort of an envelope on which the call number SI 56a was written. It refers to a completely different item in N. F. Petrovsky’s collection.
11. *Ux-10385*

A rectangular fragment (10.7×7.5). Recto: a four-line letter draft in Tibetan. For the format of the Old Tibetan letter, see TAKEUCHI 1990. Verso is blank.

Recto

Four lines in Tibetan. The beginning and end of the text is missing. The left and right sides are torn off.

1. [...]ch?[btag?]mch?[\-||]_bdag_ngan pa\'snga [...]  
2. [...][ts? ]myI\'ni\dva\nste||skab\'bab[...]
3. [...]__da\'slan\chad\kyang\rtag\du\thugs [...]  
4. [...][-]ubs\'gyl\thugs\las\dgos\pa\[-]\[...\]

---

Recto

1. $\mid$pha$\mid$ {bcu baṃ}bzhi·bcu·rtsa·bzhi·l?I{nang·na}·baṃ·po·brgyad·pa·ma·m[chis][...]
2. bcu·pa·ma·mchas·|bcu baṃ\<bzha>nyi·shu\'drug\gi\'nang·na\baṃ[...]

大般若經第廿六禪缺第十卷四十四禪缺[...]
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12. [Dx-11758]

A fragment (8×6.6 cm) of Chinese Buddhist scroll on which Tibetan is written on both Recto and Verso. The Tibetan text is unidentified.

Recto

A Tibetan line between Chinese Buddhist text Jingang Banruo Jing 金刚般若经.

![Fragment of a Chinese Buddhist scroll with Tibetan text on both sides.](image)

1. kun’gr(?)u’myes’bo\(^{11}\)

Verso

1. $||khag’\text{\`{m}}\text{\`{g}}\text{\`{a}}\text{\`{m}}\text{\`{y}}\text{\`{e}}[s\ldots]$  
2. de’gnang’slang’ma’yang ||[-][...]  
3. legs|da-ng’tsong’bgyi’ba’ya[...]
4. myi’nyond’na’re’shiq’al[-][...]
5. m[-]d’gn?o[- - -]_ts?ong’pa[-]I[...]
6. [...]I[...]

\(^{11}\)The syllable bo is the final one on the recto while what is seen after it is nothing but a fragment of the text on the verso that appears visible.
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Hartmut Walravens

Letters by J.P.A. Rémusat to Schilling von Canstadt (1817–1829)\(^1\)
in the Orientalists Archives of the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, Russian Academy of Sciences

Abstract: The paper documents the relationship between the inventor, printer and collector of Oriental books P.L. Schilling von Canstadt and the Orientalist J.P. Abel Rémusat by means of their extant correspondence. The bibliophile with a splendid Oriental library was a welcome partner and correspondent as he could and often would help colleagues with his rarities not to be found anywhere else in Europe. His expertise in printing Oriental scripts was attractive, too, as Orientalists were in need of adding Oriental scripts to their publications. Rémusat, on the other hand, wrote evaluations for the Petersburg dictionary project and publicized Schilling’s Chinese publications as models of perfect printing art. There is also a memo from Fr. Gass to Schilling, which gives some details about their printing experiments.

Key words: Schilling von Canstadt, Paul Ludwig (1786–1837); Rémusat, Jean Pierre Abel (1788–1832); history of printing Oriental scripts; history of Oriental Studies; Gass, Friedrich Wilhelm (1769–1854)

Introduction

Chinese studies in the modern sense — a serious critical branch of science — started only at the beginning of the 19th century. The founders were Jean Pierre Abel Rémusat (Paris Sept. 5, 1788–June 2, 1832 Paris) and Julius Klaproth\(^2\) (Berlin Oct. 11, 1783–Aug. 20, 1835 Paris). Both were self-taught in Chinese and other languages (Klaproth never took an exam), both

\(^1\) I would like to express my gratitude to my colleague Dr. Claudius Müller for kindly checking my transcription of the letters. — The transcription used for Russian is the bibliographic system widely applied in Central Europe. The new ISO 9 standard is based on it.

were appointed professors of Chinese (or, Asiatic languages respectively), and both exercised a tremendous influence on the new discipline. Rémusat was appointed professor of Chinese at the University of Paris by ministerial decree of Nov. 26, 1814, and thus became the first chairholder of sinology in the world; Klaproth was also appointed professor, of Asiatic languages, at the newly established university at Bonn, in 1816. But he preferred research to teaching and Paris to the sleepy country town of Bonn, and arranged with the Prussian ministry to let him work in Paris with his friend Rémusat, a group of other Orientalists and the splendid government printing-shop. Both scholars, together with the historian and Armeniologist Antoine Jean Saint-Martin (Paris Jan. 17, 1791–July 17, 1832 Paris), formed a troika which dominated the Société asiatique founded in 1822 and also the society’s journal, the Journal asiatique.

Rémusat’s father was a physician from Grasse while his mother’s family originated in the Franche-Comté. During his childhood Rémusat fell from the terrace of the Tuileries down onto the pavement of the quai; consequently he had to be very careful with his health and had to stay at home; he survived but lost one eye. As his father died in 1805 he felt he had to support his mother and therefore decided to follow her wish and study medicine. He did this successfully but his interests led him into another direction. He had seen a Chinese herbal at the Abbey aux-Bois where the abbe de Tersan maintained a collection of curiosities and rarities. He was smitten with the idea of learning this language to understand all the plates. He was encouraged by the abbe who let him borrow Chinese books, and during the following years he learned all by himself Chinese, with the help of the publications of the Jesuit missionaries in China and Fourmont’s grammar. In 1811 he published his Essai sur la langue et la littérature chinoises (Remusat 1811) which created a stir in scholarly circles. When in 1814 the ministry established a chair of Chinese at the Collège de France Rémusat was appointed on the proposal of Silvestre de Sacy who also supported him in the following years — thus he saw to it that Rémusat became a member of the Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres and a collaborator of the Journal des savants. Rémusat belonged to the founders of the Société asiatique in 1822, and in 1824 he became the successor of Louis Mathieu Langlès as curator of Oriental manuscripts at the Bibliothèque

3 Cf. WALRAVENS 2020.
4 RENAUD 1838.
5 Cf. RÉMUSAT 1824.
royale. He had many students both from France and abroad, and his numerous publications supported his reputation. He published a Chinese grammar, on the basis of an earlier work by Father Joseph de Prémare S.J., which received much praise. He translated the second of the Confucian Four Books, the Zhongyong 中庸, with a Manchu version, a description of the kingdom of Cambodia, and wrote an influential book Recherches sur les langues tartares (Rémusat 1820). A Mémoire sur la vie et les opinions de Lao-tseu (Rémusat 1823) introduced the audience to the teachings of Laozi while Fuguaji 佛國記, a description of the travels of the Buddhist pilgrim Faxian was published posthumously. He is also known for a partial translation of the pentaglot dictionary of Buddhist terms, Fan Xifan Man Meng Han jiyao and a groundbreaking paper on the relations of the kings of France with the Moghul emperors which he based on an edition and translation of the (Mongolian) letters of the Moghul rulers. A full list of Rémusat’s publications is given in Walravens (1999).

Rémusat died during the cholera epidemic in 1832, like his friend Antoine Léonard Chézy, the Sanskritist. He was succeeded by a very able scholar, his disciple Stanislas Julien.

The recipient of the letters given below, Paul Ludwig (Pavel Lvovič) Schilling von Canstadt (Reval April 5/16 1786–June 25/Aug. 6 1837 St. Petersburg), gifted inventor, Orientalist and bibliophile as well as diplomat in Russian service, was already introduced in the previous paper on Klaproth’s letters. We owe him the discovery of the insulation of electric wires and the invention of the electro-magnetic telegraph; but he was also interested in printing and introduced lithography into Russia, a technique which he had learnt from Alois Senefelder in Munich. Schilling was appointed head of the first lithographic printing-shop in Russia in 1818. But

---

6 Prémare 1831.  
7 Rémusat 1817.  
8 Rémusat 1819.  
9 Rémusat 1836.  
10 Rémusat 1814.  
11 Rémusat 1822–1824.  
12 Neuilly-sur-Seine Jan. 15, 1773–Aug. 31, 1832 Paris. He was appointed to the chair of Indology newly established in Paris in 1814.  
14 Walravens 2020.  
15 Prag Nov. 6, 1771–Febr. 26, 1834 München, inventor of lithography.
already before this date he had experimented with Oriental scripts and had
designed Manchu and Mongol fonts. He had assembled a splendid Oriental
library which comprised rare Chinese, Manchu, Mongol and Tibetan books;
it was sold to the Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg later on. It was
Schilling’s reputation as a bibliophile which caused Rémusat to contact him.
He was known to own quite a number of East Asian books which could not
be found anywhere else in Europe. Schilling’s Chinese editions were models
of excellent printing, definitely up to Peking palace quality. The first letter
shows that Schilling as a printing and script expert was called upon when the
large pentaglot dictionary (with additional Latin and Russian translation) by
Pavel Kamenskij was to be printed. He cooperated with the printer and
publisher Nikolai Gretsch\textsuperscript{16} to design the layout and was partly responsible
for the typography, or lithography, respectively. The project came, however,
to a standstill and was eventually given up as Kamenskij was sent to Peking
and nobody in St. Petersburg felt competent enough to handle the complex
task of seeing the dictionary through the press.

The fourth letter gives an evaluation of Schilling’s first master printing,
the \textit{Sanzijing}, and as Schilling wanted an unbiased reply, he circulated
the booklet accompanied by a pseudonymous letter.

Letter 5 deals with the shipment of a Manchu-Chinese dictionary for
the Société asiatique; the two following ones ask for the communication of
a number of poetic passages from the Manchu translation of the novel \textit{Ioi
giyo li} which Rémusat had just translated from the Chinese but he was
insecure about the meaning of these poetic parts; so he wanted to check them
by means of the Manchu translation which he did not have access to.

The last letter mentions a valuable present, a Mongolian manuscript
(a copy made by the interpreter Vasilij Novoselov in Peking in 1806) for
which Rémusat expresses his gratitude. It is a translation of the \textit{Enduringge
tačihiyan be neileme badarambuha bithe}, or \textit{Shengyu guangxun} (the Holy Admonitions of the Kangxi emperor). Rémusat was impressed and
wanted to publish at least a part of it, a plan to be realized only after his

---
\textsuperscript{16} Nikolaj Ivanovič Greč (St. Petersburg Aug. 3, 1787–Jan. 12, 1867 St. Petersburg),
author, linguist, literary critic, translator, printer and publisher. He became well known by his
Russian grammar and his History of Russian literature and as co-editor of the journal
\textit{Severnaja pěšča}. He was also the printer of I.J. Schmidt’s translation of the Bible into
Mongolian. An early biography was edited by Maximilian Heine (brother of the poet Heinrich
St. Petersburg: Karl Kray 1838.
There is also the idea to publish the hexaglot dictionary *Qinding Xiyu tongwenzhi* 欽定西域同文志 with Russian and French translation; this plan was taken up again years later by Jules Thonnelle who printed only the fascicle, however.\(^{17}\)

### Letters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>n. d. [1817(^{18})]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9 Sept. 1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wednesday n. d. [1818]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8 Jan. 1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7 June 1821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14 Febr. 1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>18 April 1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9 Oct. 1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3 Nov. 1823, from Friedrich Wilhelm Gass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 [3a]\(^{19}\)

Monsieur,

J’ai examiné avec attention les fragments du Dictionnaire triple, mandchou, chinois et Mongol\(^{20}\) que vous avez bien voulu me remettre et je vais vous faire part des observations auxquelles ces fragments m’ont paru donner lieu; elles ne seront en grande partie que la répétition de celles que j’ai déjà présentées à Monsieur Pozzo di Borgo, qui m’avait fait, il ya quelques mois, l’honneur de me consulter sur le projet de l’impression de ce Dictionnaire.

---

\(^{17}\) THONNELIER 1869.

\(^{18}\) This may be dated 1817. At the same time the Royal Asiatic Society received the printed sample of the dictionary for evaluation. For the context see WALRAEVENS 2015.

\(^{19}\) The brackets give the page numbers in the original file.

\(^{20}\) The samples are from the large polyglot dictionary which archimandrite Petr (Pavel Ivanović Kamenskij, June 15, 1765–May 17, 1845), member of the VIII and head of the X Russian Ecclesiastical Mission in Peking had prepared on the basis of the dictionaries of the mission. One sample is reproduced by Skal’kov (1977), 125; it may be doubted, however, that this is the first printed version of it. Among the papers of Schilling even prints of 1835 are reported (32 sheets) if that is not a scribal error. At any rate, the sample in the possession of Warsaw University (see WALRAEVENS 2015) is an earlier version than Skal’kov’s which already shows a few changes suggested by Rémuat.
Quant au fonds de l’ouvrage, il est près, comme je l’avais imaginé dans le grand Dictionnaire chinois-mandchou21 que l’Empereur Khanghi a fait traduire en Mongol.22 Ce bel ouvrage dont nous possédons ici plusieurs exemplaires, et dont j’ai traduit à peu près la moitié en français23, est plutôt une encyclopédie qu’un Dictionnaire, au moins suivant l’idée que nous attachons à ce mot. Tous les termes des langues chinoise et mandchoue y sont arrangés par ordre de matières, distribués en classes et en sections, et répétés plusieurs fois, quand ils ont des acceptions variées. On n’y saurait chercher un mot, si l’on n’a pas d’avance la connaissance de ce qu’il signifie, c’est-à-dire qu’on ne peut guère s’en servir, que dans le cas où on n’en a pas besoin.

[3b] Les deux fragmens que je viens d’examiner sont pris dans deux Sections de ce grand ouvrage, avec cette différence que dans la feuille imprimée on s’est borné à mettre aux mots chinois et tartares, les mots qui leur correspondent en russe et en latin, et que dans le cahier manuscrit, on a traduit tout au long les explications et les définitions, parmi lesquelles se trouvent quelques exemples et phrases complexes. Je ne sais auquelle de ces deux systèmes l’auteur est résolu de s’attacher dans la suite de son travail: le dernier conviendrait mieux si l’on conservait à l’ouvrage sa forme encyclopédique; le premier serait bien préférable si on lui donnait la forme d’un vocabulaire alphabétique, ce qui serait, à mon avis, une importante amélioration.

Si l’on ne craignait pas d’augmenter l’étendue de l’ouvrage à publier, on poussait réunir les avantages des deux systèmes, en plaçant d’abord le vocabulaire triple par ordre de matières, avec les définitions, telles qu’on les trouve dans le cahier manuscrit, et en rédigeant deux tables alphabétiques, l’une pour le mongol et l’autre pour le mandchou. J’insisterais pour qu’on ne fit pas usage de celles qui se trouvent dans le Dictionnaire original, parce qu’elles ne sont ni complettes ni régulières. Je voudrais aussi qu’on ne se bornât pas à mettre des renvois en chiffres au corps de l’ouvrage, mais qu’on eut soin de placer après chaque expression tartare, son équivalent en russe et

---

21 This statement is somewhat ambiguous. The large bilingual dictionary is Nonggime toktobuha Manju gisun-i buleku bithe of 1772; it was translated and published by order of the Qianlong emperor. The Kangxi emperor had the Manju gisun-i buleku bithe of 1708 (in Manchu only) translated into Mongol.

22 Han-i araha Manju gisun-i buleku bithe — Qayan-u bičīgṣen Manju ügen-ü toli bičig — [Man Meng hebi Qingwenjian]. 20 fascicles. 1717. — The trilingual edition was published only in 1775 (date of the preface).

23 REMUSAT 1838.
en latin. La première méthode est très incommode; l’autre donnerait un double dictionnaire fort utile. Il serait inutile de faire une table pour le chinois, parce que ce n’est, dans l’original, qu’une partie accessoire, subordonnée à l’ordre mandchou, et où l’on a mis

[4a] souvent des définitions ou les phrases à la place du mot propre.

Pour le Dictionnaire, l’arrangement typographique dont la feuille imprimée offre un échantillon, ne me paraît pas favorable à la rapidité des recherches. Il faudrait autant que possible que le commencement de tous les mots d’une page fut placé sur une même ligne, dont un seul coup d’œil peut embrasser l’ensemble. Cette observation pourrait sembler minutieuse, si l’on ne savait que dans ces sortes de livres, on doit tout sacrifier à la commodité de ceux qui doivent en faire un usage journalier. Dans l’intérêt de ces mêmes personnes, je remarquerai que la direction perpendiculaire donnée aux mots tartares coupe la page en parties inégales et irrégulières, qu’elle fait un contraste choquant avec celle des mots européens, qu’on peut la remplacer sans inconveniens par la direction horizontale, et que les mots tartares couchés de droite à gauche seront plus facile à retrouver sans être plus difficiles à lire. Les transcriptions en lettres russes et latines me paraissent une double additions un peu superflue, surtout dans le plus grand nombre des cas, où la prononciation répond très exactement à l’orthographe, et il suffirait, à mon avis, de les admettre quand il y a quelque irrégularité à cet egard.

L’écriture chinoise et tartare du cahier manuscrit est fort belle, et montre une main habile et exercée; mais la feuille imprimée est sous ce rapport, très inférieure au modèle, malgré son élégance apparente. Nos caractères tartares, quoique plus petits, sont beaucoup plus beaux, et très complets. Le chinois seul pouvait causer quelque embarras,

[4b] parce que nos types sont trop gros. Mais on trouverait ici des graveurs habiles, et l’on poussait completer le petit corps qui a été commencé pour l’impression de mon Tchoung young\textsuperscript{24}. Le nombre de ceux qui manquent soit être assez borné\textsuperscript{25}, et la dépense pour les graver ne parait pas être une considération qui puisse arrêter dans une entreprise si utile.

Voilà, Monsieur, les remarques que Vous m’avez demandées. Je leur avais donné plus d’étendue dans le Mémoire que j’ai remis sur cet objet.

\textsuperscript{24} Rémusat published the Zhongyong in Chinese and Manchu: \textit{L’Invariable Milieu}, cf. RÉMUSAT 1817.

\textsuperscript{25} The request for an evaluation apparently comprised the query whether it would be possible to print the dictionary in Paris.
1st (?) sample of the printing of Kamen's dictionary.
Kept in the library of the Mongolian and Tibetan Studies
of the Faculty of Oriental Studies of the University of Warsaw.
2nd (?) printing of a sample of Pavel Kamenskij’s dictionary
à Monsieur Pozzo di Borgo, en lui témoignant le désir de voir mes idées soumises au jugement de l’Académie Impériale de Petersbourg et de M. Ouvravoff. Puisque vous voulez bien vous charger de lui faire connaître le jugement que je crois devoir porter sur les essais soumis à notre examen. Ayez, je vous prie la bonté, en renouvelant à S.E. l’expression de mon respect, de lui rappeler la promesse qu’elle me fit en cette circonstance, de m’informer du sort qu’auraient mes observations, et de parti qu’on prendrait définitivement par rapport à un travail auquel personne ne peut prendre un plus vif intérêt que moi.

Agréz l’assurance du respectueux dévouement avec lequel je suis,
Monsieur,
Votre très humble et très obeissant serviteur,
J. P. Abel-Rémusat

[Société Asiatique
Paris le 9 7bre 18]

Le Secrétaire de la Société, Membre de l’Institut Royal de France


吉萬祥百 J. P. Abel-Rémusat

---

26 Carlo Andrea Pozzo di Borgo (Alata 8 March 1764–15 Febr. 1842 Paris), French politician and diplomat. He belonged to a family from Corsica, but was at odds with Napoleon and therefore went to England and Russia. From 1814 to 1835 he served as influential Russian ambassador in Paris.

27 Sergej Semenovič Uvarov (Moscow 5 Sept. 1786–16 Sept. 1855 Moscow), politician and literary historian. Having studied at Göttingen University, he became rector of St. Petersburg University and served also as president of the Petersburg Academy of Sciences. Cf. CHAMBERLAIN 2019.

28 Good luck and good fortune!
Page 12 of Rémusat’s *Invariable Milieu* (1817), which shows that the Chinese fount is not particularly elegant but the Manchu script is easy to read horizontally.
3 [12] Bibliothèque du Roi

Paria [!], le mercredi [1818?]

J’ai l’honneur de faire remettre chez Monsieur le Baron Schilling le 錄華 東 30 dont j’ai pris la notice, & pour lequel je le prie de recevoir mes remercimens.

En donnant hier a Monsieur de Schilling & a M. Klaproth rendez-vous a la Bibliothèque pour jeudi, j’ignorois que ce jour fût celui qu’on designe pour la cérémonie.

Si cette annonce se confirme, il-faudra bien, malgré mon regret que nous choisissions un autre jour. Je serai à la disposition de ces Messieurs.

賀稱謝致 30 P.J. Abel-Rémusat

4

龍不隱鱗
鳳不藏羽 31

Monsieur,

A l’interêt que ne pouvoit manquer de m’inspirer Votre entreprise, Vous avez voulu ajouter celui de la curiosité, et je ne puis nier que Vous y ayez réussi. Toutefois je pense que Vous avez pris des soins superflus. Le resultat auquel Vous êtes parvenu est par lui-même un objet digne de l’attention de tous les amateurs de la littérature orientale, et s’il faut Vous dire toute ma pensée, les études qu’il Vous a fallu faire pour atteindre ce degré de perfection, doivent Vous laisser peu d’incertitude sur les succès de Vos efforts.

Comme par un effet des précautions que Vous avez prises, je ne sais à qui je m’adresse, 32 et comme je n’ai pas non plus une notion suffisante des moyens qui ont été à Votre disposition, Vous me permettiez, Monsieur, d’exprimer avec quelques restrictions, sous une forme un peu conditionnelle, le jugement que Vous voulez bien me demander. Si Votre édition du San tseu king 33 offre

29 Donghuadu, a chronicle by Jiang Liangqi (1723–1789); it is based on the shilu (records of imperial activities) and covers the period from 1644 to the Yongzheng era. Later editions bring the coverage up to the Guangxu era.
30 zhixie chenghe, many thanks and greetings!
31 «The dragon does not hide his scales, the phenix does not conceal his feathers». The phrase occurs in Hou-Hanshu, liezhuan 57.
32 Schilling had indicated his name by initials only.
33 Sanzijing 三字經, the Three Character Classic, a didactic poem for children, by Wang Yinglin 王應麟, 1223–1296. It comprises 1200 characters which are arranged in verses of three characters each.
la représentation exacte d’un original chinois en Votre possession, il faut que Vos soins aient été secondés par un graveur bien habile, et bien exercé à ce genre de gravures qu’on nomme fac-simile. Ainsi que Vous le pensez, Monsieur, je dois savoir ce qu’il en coute de peines, pour diriger un artiste, dans la gravure de caractères dont les formes et le genre d’elegance ne lui sont pas connues, et qu’il est toujours tenté [1b] d’embellir. Je ne saurais assez regretter de n’avoir pas eu un pareil graveur pour les caractères de mon et M. Deguignes devrait Vous l’envier encore davantage, lui qui par la faute de son pinceau ou par celle de l’artiste qu’il a employé, a ajouté de si mauvais caractères à ceux que Fourmont avoit dessinés.

Si à ce mérite déjà si remarquable, Votre procédé joint l’avantage d’être expeditif et peu couteux, Vous pouvez Vous flatter d’avoir rendu aux personnes qui s’occupent de littérature chinoise, le service le plus signalé. La multiplication des textes est maintenant le seul secours qui leur manque, et en les choisissant bien, on pourra faire pour ces personnes une chrestomathie qui leur sera de la plus grande utilité.

En fin si, comme Vous me le donnez à entendre, Vous n’avez eu qu’un original chinois très imparfait, si Vous êtes en état d’ecrire Vous-même d’après des modèles médiocres, et de faire imprimer des caractères dont s’honoreroit le plus habile calligraphe de Peking, si Vous pouvez à volonté les tracer sur différents modules, et toujours les mettre bien d’aplomb, les espacer convenablement, et faire, en observant toutes les délicatesses du goût chinois, des pages de différents formats, Vous êtes possesseur d’un Secret admirable, que Vous ne sauriez trop tôt dévoiler, dans l’intérêt d’un genre de littérature auquel Vous avez du consacrer bien du temps, pour y avoir fait de tels progrès.

Je ne puis m’empêcher de souhaiter qu’une personne qui s’annonce comme un digne rival de Klaproth et de Morrison, se trouve être un de mes

---


36 Robert Morrison (Bullers Green 5 Jan. 1782–1 Aug. 1834 Guangzhou), Presbyterian missionary to China, (co)translator of the Bible into Chinese, author of a Chinese grammar and a comprehensive Chinese-English dictionary. Morrison’s Chinese library was bequeathed
compatriotes. Mais dans tous les cas, si, comme je prends la liberté de Vous y inviter, Vous vous décidez promptement à Vous faire connaître, Vous pouvez compter sur mon empressement à proclamer dans le Journal des Savans ou ailleurs, le mérite de votre procédé, et de l'édition chinoise qui en est le premier échantillon. Mes [2a] auditeurs pour qui ce ne sera pas un secours indifférent qu'un livre élémentaire bien imprimé et aussi élegant que Votre San tseu king, n'attendent pas avec moins d'impatience que moi que Vous leur fournirez les moyens de se procurer des exemplaires de ce livre. Je tiendrai jusqu'à leur disposition celui que Vous m'avez envoyé pour le Collège Royal, et je remettrai, conformément à Vos intentions, le troisième exemplaire à la Bibliothèque du Roi.

Je vois sur une carte que par mégarde sans doute, Vous avez laissé se glisse dans l’enveloppe du paquet, des fumés des caractères tartares qui m'annoncent que Vous vous êtes pareillement occupé de cette partie de la typographie orientale, et quelque peu considérable que soit cet autre échantillon, je juge qu'en poussant plus loin la décomposition des lettres Vous n'obtiendrez pas moins de succès en tartare qu’en Chinois. C'est pour moi une nouvelle raison de Vous engager à Vous découvrir, et un motif de plus de Vous assurer que je suis très disposé à être, avec toute la considération possible

Monsieur,
Votre très humble et très obéissant serviteur
J. P. Abel-Rémusat
Membre de l’Institut

8 Janvier 1820

À Monsieur P. B. S. d. C-t
Editeur du San Tzeu King,
chez M. Firmin Didot

[2b]

[reverse:] 多謝

37 fumé, i.e. sample print.
38 xie duo — Many thanks!

to University College London and is today part of the collections of the School of Oriental and African Studies, The University of London. Cf. West 1998.
Société Asiatique
Paris le 7 juin, 1821
Le Secrétaire de la Société, Membre de l’Institut Royal de France, à Monsieur le Baron Schilling de Canstadt, à Petersbourg

Monsieur le Baron,

J’ai reçu, il y a trois semaines, le Dictionnaire Mandchou-Chinois que Vous avez bien voulu m’envoyer pour l’usage de la Société. Je me suis conformé à Votre intention en le remettant au Conseil dans sa séance du 4 juin dernier, & le Conseil l’a confié à M. Klaproth, suivant l’autorisation expresse que Vous nous en avez donnée de vive voix & par écrit. Nous ne doutons nullement du zèle & de l’empressement que M. Klaproth mettra à profiter de ce secours dont il est redevable à Votre obligeance, afin d’être en état de Vous restituer, le plus promptement possible, cet estimable ouvrage, après en avoir tiré tous les mots & tous les éclaircissements qui sont nécessaires pour compléter son propre travail. Ce sera une nouvelle obligation que Vous aura une Compagnie à laquelle Vous avez déjà rendu d’autres services avec un dévouement & une générosité qui Vous ont déjà valu sa reconnaissance, & c’est une occasion pour moi de Vous adresser de sa part de nouveaux remerciments. Permettez-moi d’y joindre l’expression de la considération distinguée avec laquelle je suis,

Votre très humble & très obéissant Serviteur

J. P. Abel-Rémusat

Société Asiatique
Paris, le 14 Février 1826
Le Secrétaire de la Société, Membre de l’Institut Royal de France

Monsieur,

Quoique je ne aye pas encore reçu de réponse à la dernière lettre que j’ai eu l’honneur de Vous écrire, et que j’ignore même si le paquet qui l’accompagnait Vous est parvenu, permettez que je vienne de nouveau Vous interrompre, et même Vous adresse encore une sollicitation. Si ma demande est indiscrète, Vous voudrez bien n’y avoir aucun egard, et dans cet confiance, je procède immédiatement à Vous l’exposer: M. Klaproth m’assure que la
Bibliothèque de l’Académie Impériale possède un exemplaire de la traduction mandchou du Roman intitulé 玉嬌梨 vraisemblablement en tartare [in Manchu script: Ioi giyoo li]; or Vous savez que j’ai traduit ce Roman et je suis sur le point de publier ma traduction; mais en moment de commencer l’impression, il me vient des scrupules sur plusieurs points du texte, et notamment sur les passages en Vers, dont il est à peu près impossible d’assurer le Sens, à moins d’avoir un commentaire poétique, ou une Version tartare.

[9b] Seroit il possible, au moyen de Votre puissante intercession, d’obtenir pour un mois ou deux la communication de cette version, en donnant, comme cela est juste, toutes les garanties qui seroient jugées nécessaires? Je n’ai pas besoin de Vous dire que l’ouvrage seroit traité avec soins et fidèlement réintégré. J’ai, comme Vous savez, par ma position, l’occasion de savoir le qu’imposent de pareils services. Mais dans le cas, trop probable, où Vous refuseroit de laisser voyager ainsi un volume de l’Académie, Vous auriez peut-être la bonté de me faire transcrire les Vers qui sont au commencement, au milieu et à la fin de chaque chapitre, et c’est à cela que je me réduis, en Vous priant, si cela est possible, de faire pour mois cette petite dépense, que j’aurai soin de Vous rembourser. Et s’il n’étoit pas possible d’avoir tout ceux que je désirerois le plus sont ceux que je Vous indique dans la page suivante. Mille pardons, Monsieur, de la liberté que je prends. Votre complaisance m’est si connue, que je ne crains pas d’en abuser. Ce seroit avec bien du plaisir que je Vous rendrois la pareille à la Bibliothèque du Roi, ou ailleurs. La Séance générale de la Société Asiatique approche, et si Vous aviez quelque renseignement à me faire pour le Rapport que j’y dois faire, je Vous serois fort obligé.

[10a] de me les faire passer le plutôt possible. Traduction, publication, graverar [!] de caractères, ou tout autre chose relative aux idiômes de l’Asie, Vous savez que tout nous est bon et a droit à nous interesser. Nous parlons souvent de Vous au Jardin du Roi, et l’on voudroit bien Vous y revoir. Procurez-nous ce plaisir, auquel je serois plus sensible que tout autre. Et veuillez bien, en agréant mes excuses, croire aux sentimens de haute estime et de consideration très distinguée avec lesquels je suis,

Monsieur le Baron,
Votre très humble & très obéissant Serviteur
J. P. Abel-Réamusat

P.S. Vous possédez, je crois, une petite édition du ōu kiao li qui correspond page pour page avec la mienne. Je me sers de celle-ci pour indiquer les passages dont la version mandchou m’est la plus indispensable.

[10b]

Ch. I.  
–  p. 1. 8 vers
–  p. 11. 4 v.
–  p. 12v. 8 v.
–  p. 14v. 4 v.
–  p. 30. 8 v.
–  p. 34v. 4 v.
–  p. 41. 4 v.
–  p.45. 8 v.
–  p. 46. 16 v.
–  p. 47v. 8 v.

Ch. II.  
–  p. 7v. 4
–  p. 15. 8
–  p. 19. 8
–  p. 21. 8
–  p. 21v. 8
–  p. 22v. 8
–  p. 25. 4
–  p. 26. 8
–  p. 47v. 4
–  p. 48. longue chanson
–  p. 52v. les deux derniers vers
–  p. 57v. 4

Ch. III.  
–  p. 3v. 8
–  p. 4. 8
–  p. 8. 4
–  p. 12. 8
–  p. 13. 4
–  p. 38. 8
–  p. 44. 4 strophes

Ch. IV.  
–  p. 12. 16
–  p. 13v. 16
–  p. 19. 8
J’ai, Monsieur, bien des remerciments à Vous faire et des excuses à Vous adresser. Je vous ai, par mon indiscrétion, causé plus d’embarras que je ne croyois, et l’inexactitude des renseignemens qu’en m’avoit donnés a contribué à les augmenter encore. Je ne voudrais pas recommencer à Vous être importun; mais M. Klaproth, qui m’avoit d’abord donné l’espoir que le iu-kiao-li mandchou se trouverait à la Bibliothèque de l’Académie, soutient à présent que c’est Vous, Vous, Monsieur le Baron, qui devez l’avoir dans Votre riche collection, que c’est un manuscrit très informe, très inélégant, tout précieux que je le trouve, en plusieurs volumes, qui faisoit partie du reste de la collection que Vous avez acheté à Vladykin\(^40\), qu’il y avoit là plusieurs Romans traduits au nombre desquels il est, dit il, très certain d’avoir vu le iu kiao li. Si donc il ne devoit Vous en couter d’autre fatigue que de parcourir les tablettes de Votre bibliothèque, et si à cette nouvelle bonté Vous voudriez joindre celle de

\[7\text{[7a]}\] Société Asiatique
Paris le 18 avril 1826

[7b] me confier pour deux ou trois mois ce brouillon à peine lisible, dit-on, mais pour mon objet d’un prix inestimable, j’as[s]ervis avec plus de liberté de Votre complaisance sans pareille, sentant bien toutefois que ma seule manière de m’acquitter envers Vous sera de Vous adresser un exemplaire un

peu moins fautif des Deux Couines, lors de leur apparition dans le monde. Je desirerais qu'on fut un peu plus exact à Vous transmettre les hommages que je suis empressé de Vous adresser. Je vois par Votre lettre que Vous n’avez pas reçu encore le paquet contenant le T. 1er de mes Mélanges pour Vous, un petit-in-4° de Géographie aussi pour Vous, et en même tems pour M. Schmidt & M. Fraehn. J’ai maintenant le T. 2 de Mélanges pour Vous; mais avant de le mettre en route, je voudrois être sur que la voye que j’ai prise, celle de l’Ambassade, est ouverte pour ces envois. Vous m’aviez annoncé, Monsieur, que Vous me donneriez une lettre pour une des personnes de l’Ambassade ou que Vous la préviendriez Vous même de recevoir et surtout de Vous faire parvenir surement les paquets à Votre adresse. Je n’y connois absolument que M. Pozzo di Borgo, qui à ce que je vois, ne peut entrer dans tous ces détails.

[8a] Je viens d’éprouver une indisposition de quelques semaines, ce qui m’a tenu éloigné du monde et m’a empêché de faire Votre commission près de Mlle. Clémentine. Je suis bien sur que Votre promesse la ravira. pour Votre Souvenir, elle en eût bien assurée d’avance. Vous ne l’êtes pas moins de ceux que Vous avez laissé ici, et du désir que nous aurions tous que Vous vinssez la renouveler. En mon particulier, je voudrois bien qu’il Vous fut possible de passer quelques mois avec nous. Je ne serois pas des derniers à profiter de Votre Séjour, ni à Vous prouver de nouveau quel prix j’attache aux relations que j’ai eu le bonheur d’avoir avec Vous. Agréez la nouvelle assurance [de mes] Sentimens de haute estime et de considération bien distinguée

J.P. Abel-Rémusat

41 This intention was not realised as Rémusat passed away during the cholera epidemic in 1832. A revised translation was published only by Stanislas Julien (Orléans Sept. 21, 1797–Febr. 14, 1873 Paris), Rémusats successor on the Paris chair: Yu-kiao-li, Les deux cousines; cf. Julien (1864),

42 Mélanges asiatiques ou choix de morceau critiques et de memoires relatifs aux religions, aux sciences, aux coutumes, à l’histoire et à la géographie des nations orientales. Cf. Rémusat (1825–1826).

43 Mémoires sur plusieurs questions relatives à la géographie de l’Asie centrale. Cf. Rémusat (1825).


45 Christian Martin Joachim Fraehn (June 4, 1782–Aug. 28, 1851), Orientalist, Professor of Oriental Studies at the university of Kazan; in 1818 he was appointed director of the newly established Asiatic Museum in St. Petersbourg. Cf. Klenz (1904).

46 not identified.
À Monsieur
Monsieur le Baron Schilling de Canstadt
Au Ministère des affaires étrangères, etc.
à Petersbourg

8 [5a] Société Asiatique
Paris le 9 Octobre 1829

Le Secrétaire de la Société, Membre de l’Institut Royal de France,

Monsieur le Baron,

Le Conseil de la Société ayant fait graver quelques lettres mandchou et mongoles qui manquaient au Corps dont Vous lui avez si généreusement procuré une fonte, s’est fait un devoir de faire frapper doubles les matrices de ces lettres afin de pouvoir Vous en offrir un exemplaire. Il m’a chargé, en Vous les faisant passer, de Vous prier de voir dans cette foible offrande un souvenir de sa part, et une marque de sa gratitude pour les procédés nobles et désintéressés que Vous avez eus envers la Société Asiatique.

Après m’être acquitté de cette commission officielle, j’aurais, pour mon propre compte, beaucoup de choses à Vous dire. Votre dernière lettre et le beau présent que Vous y avez joint doivent d’abord obtenir mes vifs remerciements. Rien ne pouvoit m’être plus agréable et

[5b] plus avantageux que d’avoir un texte mongol de cette étendue, sur un sujet connu, et à l’aide duquel il est très facile de prendre une notion juste de la Grammaire de cet idiole pour lequel Vous savez que j’ai depuis longtemps une passion malheureuse. Je regrette seulement que Vous ayez voulu Vous priver en ma faveur d’un manuscrit si précieux. Peut-être serais-je tenté d’en publier quelque chose; mais comme j’ignore si le copiste Wasilij Novosieloff est encore vivant je crus devoir à cet égard solliciter Votre agrément. M. Schmidt nous donnera-t-il enfin son bel ouvrage sur les Mongols? On regrette que ses disputes avec M. Klaproth nuisent peut-être à une entreprise si intéressante. Il a bien fait de s’exercer sur le texte des

48 Geschichte der Ostmongolen und ihres Fürstenhauses; Erdeni-yin toböi, cf. Sayang Sečen (1829).
lettres Mongoles⁴⁹, et Vous savez que c’est à cette intention que je lui en avois d’avance envoyé des épreuves. Il a usé rigoureusement du droit commun en publant cette espèce de critique sans m’en faire part⁵⁰; mais je ne lui en sais aucun mauvais gré, et je profiterai de quelques unes de ses observations, en en laissant d’autres que je crois mal fondées. Je regrette que la difficulté des communications nuise à l’exactitude du commerce que j’aurais voulu entretenir avec lui. Soyez assez bon, si Vous le voyez, pour lui faire agréer mes excuses, et pour lui remettre le second exemplaire des Mélanges Asiatiques

[6a] que Vous trouverez dans le paquet qui Vous est adressé. Je n’ai pas besoin de Vous dire que le premier Vous est offert, et que Vous êtes prié de l’agréer avec Votre indulgence accoutumée. Il ya une autre persone de Votre Ville avec laquelle je suis certain de n’avoir pas de torts, mais qui m’en suppose peut-être, s’il n’a pas reçu les remerciements que je lui ais adressés pour son ouvrage: c’est M. Tinkoffski⁵¹, dont le voyage va bientôt paroitre à la française. Servez-moi près de lui si Vous en trouvez l’occasion. Je lui avois [envoyé] une lettre à laquelle je supposais qu’il auroit répon----⁵² Peut-être ne l’a-t-il pas recue. Je ne dis ici que a----⁵³ qui me parlent de Vous et qui Vous regrettent. On Vous désireroit surtout au Jardin des Plantes. MM. de Turgenieff⁵⁴, Lomonosoff⁵⁵, Olénine⁵⁶ et plusieurs autres font

⁵¹ Egor Fedorovič Timkovskij (April 23, 1790–Febr. 9, 1875 St. Petersburg), diplomat and later archivist of the Russian Foreign Ministry, became known through his 3volume travelogue; cf. TIMKOVSKIJ 1824.
⁵² Text missing (original is damaged).
⁵³ Text missing (original is damaged)
⁵⁴ Probably Aleksandr Ivanovič Turgenev (April 7, 1784–Dec. 15, 1845 Moscow), official and historian. After his study he entered the civil servant career but befriended writers and artists (he was, e.g. a close friend of Pushkin) and soon found himself in opposition to the régime of tzar Alexander I. who dismissed him from his position. After 1825 he mainly lived abroad. Tzar Nicolas I. ordered him to collect material on Russian history in foreign collections. Cf. BROKGAUZ/EFRON 34.1901, 96.
⁵⁵ Sergej Grigorjevič Lomonosov (1799–Oct. 13, 1857 San Daniello near Florence), diplomat; he was sent to Spain in 1821, then transferred to Paris where he occupied the position of the secretary of the embassy. Cf. POPOV 1914.
⁵⁶ Aleksej Nikolaevič Olenin (Moscow Dec. 9, 1763–April 29, 1843 St. Petersburg), archaeologist, director of the Imperial Library (1811–1843), president of the Academy of the Arts. Cf. KUBASOV 1902.
chorus avec nous sur tous les sujets qui Vous concernent. Nous voudrions bien apprendre que Vous avez mis sous presse les premières feuilles du grand Dictionnaire Mandchou-Mongol-tibétain-chinois-tétou-boukhare russe et français. Pour vous stimuler, Nous Vous donnerons sous peu des nouvelles qui Vous font plaisir. Mais nous aimerions mieux Vous les dire à Vous même ainsi qu’on nous ait fait espérer que cela pouvait être. En attendant que ce Vous se réalise, recevez, Monsieur & cher confrère, avec de nouveaux remerciments, l’assurance de mes sentiments les plus sincères et les plus distingués.

J.P. Abel-Rémusat

[6b]

A Monsieur
Monsieur le Baron Schilling de Canstadt
&c. &c. &c.
à Petersbourg

A Note by F. Gass to Baron Schilling von Canstadt

The Schilling Collection in the IOM contains also the following note (f. 56, op. 2, Nr 64=51!) by F. Gass, which gives a few details about Schilling’s printing experiments. Friedrich Wilhelm Gass (St. Petersburg Febr. 1769–Nov. 3/15 1854 St. Petersburg) was apparently Schilling’s assistant. He had learned his profession as medailler from his father at the Imperial Mint in 1794–1797. His father was Johann Balthasar Gass (Oct. 1730–Oct. 22, 1813) who became master of the guild of foreign goldsmiths in 1760 and entered the permanent staff of the Mint in 1771. F.W. Gass rose later to the rank of aulic councillor (Hofrat).

It is interesting to read that Schilling tried the lottery to support his budget. His experiments and his book collecting were certainly not inexpensive.

57 Probably the hexaglot dictionary of the Western regions Qinding Xiyu tongwen zhi 欽定 地域同文志, with added Russian and French translation. Schilling owned two copies of this work. It was quite a rare item in those days. Klaproth borrowed part of it and failed to return it in time, which probably caused irritations on Schilling’s side. — The Manchu title of the work is Hesei tokotoba Wargi aiman-i hergen be enu obahe ejetun bithe. It comprises 24 juan and was edited under the supervision of the statesman Fuheng 傅恒. It was presented to the throne in 1763.

Besides Gass Rachonin (Рахонин) worked as an assistant. The enclosed sample (Bibliothèque nationale de France) shows that he was a capable worker. It also proves that there were connections between Schilling and Isaak Jakob Schmidt as already stipulated in Walravens (2015).

The note also reports on current experiments, namely to print a chessboard in colour, and combine it with movable type printing — something Schilling had apparently suggested for Kamenskij’s dictionary.

Another assistant, by name of Kakuškin, did not stay; apparently the technical procedure was too smelly for him. Gass therefore used a shed for the smelly part of the work.

St. Petersb. d. 3t. Nov. 1823

Wertgeschätzter Herr Baron


59 Jakov Matveevič Rachonin, engraver, received a certificate (attestat) of the 2nd degree in 1817 (as an artist).


Mit dem Wunsche daß Sie immer gesund bleiben möchten, empfehle ich mich Ihrer ferneren Liebe und Gewogenheit
Ihr Dienstwilliger und Gehorsamer
F. Gaß

Seiner Hochgebohren
dem Herrn Baron
Schilling von Canstadt
durch Einschluß

---

Title-page of the sample print:

---

61 The word is not given in full.
62 Loanword from Turkish: barn, shed.
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