

РОССИЙСКАЯ АКАДЕМИЯ НАУК  
Институт восточных рукописей

# ТАНГУТЫ в Центральной Азии

*Сборник статей  
в честь 80-летия  
профессора Е.И.Кычанова*



МОСКВА  
Издательская фирма  
«Восточная литература»  
2012

УДК 94(5)  
ББК 63.3(5)  
Т18

*Издание выполнено при поддержке  
Фонда Цзян Цзин-го  
(Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation for  
International Scholarly Exchange), Тайвань*

Составитель и ответственный редактор  
*И.Ф. Попова*

**Тангуты** в Центральной Азии : сб. ст. в честь 80-летия проф. Е.И. Кычанова / сост. и отв. ред. И.Ф. Попова ; Ин-т восточных рукописей РАН. — М. : Вост. лит., 2012. — 501 с. : ил. — ISBN 978-5-02-036505-6 (в пер.)

Сборник, в который вошли статьи отечественных и зарубежных ученых, посвящен 80-летию известного российского востоковеда, доктора исторических наук, профессора Е.И. Кычанова. Проблематика сборника задана основными доминантами многолетнего исследовательского творчества юбиляра, который, являясь в первую очередь тангутоведом и опираясь на широчайшую источниковедческую базу, блестяще разработал многие актуальные проблемы истории государственности, права, этногенеза, письменного наследия народов Китая и Центральной Азии. Большинство авторов статей постарались показать, как вопросы, поставленные в свое время в работах Е.И. Кычанова, получили дальнейшее развитие в науке.

ISBN 978-5-02-036505-6

© Институт восточных рукописей РАН, 2012  
© Редакционно-издательское оформление.  
Издательская фирма  
«Восточная литература», 2012

Lin Ying-chin

## The Principles of Tangut Text Interpretation: Taking 𗵑 zju<sup>2</sup> as an Example\*

**B**ased on the author's own experience in the Tangut language, this article illustrates basic principles of Tangut text interpretation with linguistic concerns. Two main points are stated as follows.

The first main point of the article focuses on the Tangut character 𗵑 zju<sup>2</sup>, seeking an appropriate interpretation of it based on several Chinese-Tangut translation materials. According to these texts, 𗵑 zju<sup>2</sup> can either serve as a phonetic transcription of Chinese proper nouns such as *rǔ* 汝, *rú* 孺, *rú* 如 and *rú* 儒 or a semantic translation of several Chinese lexemes. Based on existing sources, the semantic concept of 𗵑 zju<sup>2</sup> is associated with 'the distinction of the shapes between two or more objects after deliberate measurement.'

It is also clear that 𗵑 zju<sup>2</sup> has a salient verbal property. As we can observe, 𗵑 zju<sup>2</sup> can go after the prefix 𗵑 djij<sup>2</sup>. Also, it can appear before the sentence-final particle 𗵑 lj+<sup>1</sup>, the nominalized character 𗵑 ·jjj<sup>1</sup> indicating the property of its argument, and the character 𗵑 ku<sup>1</sup> which serves as a conjunction to connect two sentences. Similar interpretation of 𗵑 zju<sup>2</sup> can also be adopted in the contexts where 𗵑 zju<sup>2</sup> serves as an attribute of nouns or goes after the interrogative pronoun 𗵑 ljø<sup>2</sup>.

\* This article is originally my personal memorandum of Tangut text interpretation. In August 19<sup>th</sup>, 2011, this article was used as a handout for my oral presentation at the Second International Conference on the Tangut Studies in Wuwei, Gansu Province. At that time the article was simply based on Sentences (5) and (6), with respect to interpreting the common meaning of 𗵑 zju<sup>2</sup> shared between Sentences (5)–(8) recorded in *Nv-II*, p. 484, along with further analysis of three related Tangut sentences from *Jiangyuan, Beidi*. In the new version, materials from the Tangut law *Tiansheng lüling* are added, together with some more specific discussions. Based on Professor Kychanov's twenty-year devotion to the *Tiansheng lüling* that lightens the path of Tangut literary studies, I am able today to engage in further analysis of the character 𗵑 zju<sup>2</sup> from *Tiansheng lüling*. I sincerely wish to dedicate this article to Professor Kychanov in celebration of his birthday, as a salute to his brilliant contribution to the Tangut language studies. Finally, I am deeply grateful to Victoria Chen, now of the University of Hawaii, who generously helped me revise the writing of English.

Second, I illustrate several principles of Tangut text interpretation from a linguistic perspective. The basic idea is the discipline of four-line glossing, along with an emphasis on a clear and thorough understanding of the syntactic property of Tangut with respect to giving coherent interpretations. The discipline of four-line glossing guarantees objective translations, avoiding vague interpretations as well as providing a better way for readers to make their own judgments about the texts. On the other hand, despite the fact that these texts cannot be properly interpreted without taking into account the original goals of Chinese or Tibetan literature, the syntactic property of the Tangut language itself should always be prioritized and carefully considered.

## § 1. Some examples with reference to 𐞑 zju<sup>2</sup>

### § 1.1. 𐞑 zju<sup>2</sup> serving as phonetic transcription of Chinese

𐞑 zju<sup>2</sup> is basically a rarely used character.<sup>1</sup> According to Nevsky (1960, vol. II, p. 484; hereinafter Nv-II) and Li Fanwen (1997, No. 5708), this character is a loanword from Chinese (the source is the character *rú* 如). In fact, in the Tangut *Leilin*, this character often serves as the phonetic transcription of Chinese characters such as *rǔ* 汝, *rú* 孺, *rú* 如 and *rú* 儒, as shown in the following materials.

1. 𐞑 𐞑 𐞑 𐞑 𐞑 𐞑 𐞑 𐞑 𐞑 𐞑 𐞑  
 zju<sup>2</sup> na<sup>1</sup> ljɿ<sup>2</sup> ·io<sup>1</sup> tsjow<sup>1</sup> ·jwā<sup>1</sup> pie<sup>1</sup> rjir<sup>2</sup> wji<sup>1</sup> dǰjwɿ<sup>1</sup> rjɿ<sup>2</sup> wji<sup>1</sup>  
 [汝南] 地 方 [張 元 伯] 與 友 友 △ 爲。  
 Rǔnán place Zhāng Yuánbó with friends PRE. do/be<sup>2</sup>  
 與汝南張元伯爲友。  
 ‘be friends with Zhāng Yuánbó from Rǔnán.’ (l. 156-1)<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The tentative claim that 𐞑 zju<sup>2</sup> is a rare word is based on the fact that it is seldom used, for which reason scholars are still unable to give a clear explanation of its meaning. However, it is not because of its rareness that I choose it as an example for this article. In the spring of 2011, I had the pleasure of reading Dr. Galambos’s manuscript, ‘The northern neighbors of the Tangut.’ In the Tangut text *Jiangyuan, Beidi* which this manuscripts dealt with, 𐞑 zju<sup>2</sup> appears three times: 𐞑 ( / 樞 / 毅 ) 𐞑 𐞑 𐞑 lew<sup>1</sup> ( / njɿ<sup>1</sup> / sɿ<sup>1</sup> ) tsew<sup>2</sup> zju<sup>2</sup> sjij<sup>1</sup> ηwu<sup>2</sup>, which corresponds to the Chinese sentence *yī* (èr/sān) yě — (二 / 三) 也. In this example, there is no appropriate Chinese character to serve as a translation of 𐞑 zju<sup>2</sup>, as discussed in § 2.

<sup>2</sup> Abbreviations used in this paper are as follows: CONJ: conjunctive; NEG: negative; PART: particle; PL: plural; POST: postposition; PRE: prefix; SUF: suffix; TOP: topic.

<sup>3</sup> In l. 278-3 and 280-5, there are also two sentences that adopt 𐞑 zju<sup>2</sup> na<sup>1</sup> as the phonetic transcription of the Chinese proper noun *rǔnán* 汝南. Also, in 275-4, the sentence 𐞑 𐞑 𐞑 𐞑 zju<sup>2</sup> na<sup>1</sup> zjɿ<sup>2</sup> rjij<sup>1</sup> dǰjwo<sup>2</sup> ηwu<sup>1</sup> can be interpreted as *rǔnán nánfāng rén* 汝南南方人 ‘a southerner in Rǔnán’. Despite the fact that it is rather different from the sentence *hénán yǐngchūān rén* 河南潁川人 in the Chinese text *Leilin zashuo* ‘a person from hénán Yǐngchūān,’ the use of 𐞑 zju<sup>2</sup> na<sup>1</sup> as a phonetic transcription of *rǔnán* 汝南 is appropriate.

2. 穉 娘 旼 窳 務 精 劬  
 sju<sup>2</sup> tsjjj<sup>2</sup> nioow<sup>1</sup> mjijj<sup>2</sup> źju<sup>2</sup> tsə<sup>1</sup> ·jɿ<sup>2</sup>  
 [徐 稚] 又 名 [孺 子] 謂。  
 XúZhì literati.name Rúzǐ say  
 徐稚字孺子。(l. 282-1)  
 ‘XúZhì has a literati name called RúZǐ.’

3. 葑 嬭 務 苑 羸 豨 胤 務 斂 覈 覈 纒 務  
 śju<sup>1</sup> lhjjj<sup>2</sup> tsjow<sup>1</sup> nji<sup>2</sup> mjij<sup>1</sup> sə<sup>1</sup> bja<sup>2</sup> sjo<sup>2</sup> źju<sup>2</sup> do<sup>2</sup> kjɿ<sup>1</sup> dew<sup>2</sup> wji<sup>1</sup>  
 [蜀] 國 [卓] -▽ 女 [司 馬 相 如] 處 △ 奔 爲。  
 Shǔ state Zúo -PL. woman Sīmǎ Xiàngǔ place PRE. run do/be  
 蜀卓氏女奔司馬相如。(l. 293-4)<sup>4</sup>  
 ‘A woman of the Zúo family in Shǔ state ran away in order to get married to Sīmǎ Xiàngǔ.’

4. 務 頑 孺 編 籍 務 羸 斂 斂 斂 斂 斂 斂 斂  
 sjwǐ<sup>1</sup> ljwǐ<sup>1</sup> ·jjj<sup>1</sup> ljo<sup>2</sup> tsəj<sup>1</sup> źju<sup>2</sup> lja<sup>1</sup> rjjjr<sup>2</sup> twu<sup>1</sup> mja<sup>1</sup> do<sup>2</sup> kjwɿ<sup>1</sup> tsja<sup>1</sup> śji<sup>2</sup>  
 [荀 倫] 之 弟 [儒] 北 方 邊 母 處 跪 拜 往。  
 Xúnlún GEN. brother Rú northern.frontier mother place kneel.bow, go  
 (荀) 倫弟儒北方省舅氏。(l. 415-7)<sup>5</sup>  
 ‘Xúnlún’s younger brother Rú goes to the north to visit his wife’s parents.’

§ 1.2. 務 zju<sup>2</sup> serving as semantic translation of Chinese

Despite the fact that 務 zju<sup>2</sup> is often used as phonetic transcription of Chinese characters, examples such as Sentence (5) from *Leilin* and others indicate that 務 zju<sup>2</sup> does have actual semantic meanings. Furthermore, based on the syntactic property of Tangut we have sufficient evidence to claim that 務 źju<sup>2</sup> is the main predicate of the sentence, since there is a sentence-final particle 斂 ljɿ<sup>1</sup> that goes after 務 źju<sup>2</sup> indicating the end of the sentence.

<sup>4</sup> As for the character 孺 nji<sup>2</sup> in this sentence, I agree with Kepping’s opinion (1981) that 孺 nji<sup>2</sup> is a plural marker, indicating that the preceding 務 tsjow<sup>1</sup> is a family name (hence it bears a plural connotation).

<sup>5</sup> The ninth character of this sentence is clearly 斂 lha<sup>-</sup>, instead of 斂 twu<sup>1</sup>. However, since 斂 lha<sup>-</sup> has an actual semantic meaning, it is impossible for it to appear in this context here. In my opinion, 斂 lha<sup>-</sup> might actually be an incorrectly written 斂 twu<sup>1</sup>. Since 斂 twu<sup>1</sup> is a locative noun that bears a similar meaning with 斂 tjǐ<sup>2</sup>, it is appropriate to appear before the character 斂 do<sup>2</sup> (see also Sentence 3), a postposition that nominalizes its antecedent into a locative noun.

5. 𦉑 𦉑 𦉑 𦉑 𦉑 𦉑 𦉑 𦉑  
 sjij<sup>2</sup> tshju<sup>1</sup> sjij<sup>2</sup> mjij<sup>1</sup> so<sup>1</sup> ʧa<sup>2</sup> bjuu<sup>2</sup> zju<sup>2</sup> ljɿ<sup>1</sup>  
 智 有，智 無，三十里 也。  
 wisdom have, wisdom lack, thirty.miles PART.  
 有智無智，校三十里。(l. 280-5)  
 ‘The difference between the two men’s intelligence is distinguished through a thirty-mile way.’

Obviously, in this sentence 𦉑 zju<sup>2</sup> corresponds to Chinese *jiào* 校, having the meaning ‘to measure, to evaluate.’ The complete meaning of the sentence spoken by Cao Cao 曹操 is ‘after pitting ourselves against each other, our intelligence is distinguished through the thirty-mile way.’<sup>6</sup> Such an interpretation agrees with the evidence from the Tangut *Sunzi*, as shown in the following sentences.

6. 𦉑 𦉑 𦉑 𦉑 𦉑 𦉑  
 wjjij<sup>2</sup> zjɿ<sup>1</sup> su<sup>1</sup> ʧa<sup>2</sup> bjijij<sup>1</sup> zju<sup>2</sup> ku<sup>1</sup>  
 敵 如，十 倍 則；  
 enemy as ten.times then  
 十倍相懸（，然後…）(s. 30a-5b)  
 ‘While the enemy is ten times as much as us, then...’

At first sight, it seems that the Tangut translation is rather different from the original Chinese sentence. However, in my opinion, 𦉑 zju<sup>2</sup> corresponds well to Chinese *xíngxuán* 相懸. In Chinese, *xuán* 懸 has the meaning ‘distant; highly different.’ In this sentence, *shíbèi xíngxuán* 十倍相懸 ‘ten times different from the other’ is used to describe the extreme differences in quality (e.g., military strategies, quality of soldiers, conditions of terrain, etc.) between the two armies. From such a perspective, both the semantic and syntactic property of 𦉑 zju<sup>2</sup> are clear and compatible with our previous interpretations of Example 5.

### § 1.3. The materials from Nv-II, p. 491

For the reasons stated above, I agree with Li Fanwen’s opinion and interpretation (1997, No. 5708). In his dictionary, Li cites Nv-II, p. 491, for reference. However, the shape of the character in Nv-II, p. 491 looks very different from the shape of 𦉑 zju<sup>2</sup>. Without any phonological illustration, Nv-II, p. 491 simply states two sentences,<sup>7</sup> as shown below:

<sup>6</sup> According to *Leilin yanjiu* (Shi Jinbo et al. 1993, p. 99), the Chinese character corresponding to the Tangut 𦉑 zju<sup>2</sup> is *néng* 能.

<sup>7</sup> In Nv-II, p. 484, 𦉑 zju<sup>2</sup> is noted as a phonetic transcription. Other characters that serve as transcriptions provided on the same page are 𦉑 rowr<sup>1</sup>, 𦉑 njij<sup>2</sup>, 𦉑 sioow<sup>1</sup>, 𦉑 ʧa<sup>1</sup>, 𦉑 sioow<sup>1</sup>, 𦉑 ·iejr<sup>2</sup>, and 𦉑 kjur<sup>2</sup>. From Sofronov’s perspective, all the left-part components of these characters are identical. On the other hand, however, in Nv-II, p. 491, 𦉑 zju<sup>2</sup> is placed between the characters 𦉑 daa<sup>2</sup> and 𦉑 baj<sup>1</sup>, in which combination these three characters do not share a common component. Also, we cannot find a character corresponding to it in Sofronov 1968.

7. 𗵑 𗵒 𗵓 𗵔 𗵕 𗵖  
 tha<sup>2</sup> tsəj<sup>1</sup> tshji<sup>2</sup> zju<sup>2</sup> ·jij<sup>1</sup> dzju<sup>1</sup>  
 大 小 根 \_\_, 於 明  
 big small root \_\_ POSP. distinguish

‘The difference of the (shape of) the big and the small roots is clear and distinct.’

In this sentence, Nevsky explains the phrase *dàxiǎo jīfēn zhī béi* 大小機分之別 as ‘The distinction of the big and the small genius’ [*lián, xù*]. ‘Preface of *Lotus*.’ This sentence may be derived from the Chinese sentence *jīfēn xiǎodà zhī béi* 機分小大之別 ‘the difference between the sizes of the roots’ in the *Hongchuan* preface of *Miaofa lianhuajing* by Daoxuan. Here 𗵑 zju<sup>2</sup> corresponds to Chinese *béi* 別, indicating the ‘difference’ between 𗵑 tsəj<sup>1</sup> tshji<sup>2</sup>: ‘the big and the small roots.’<sup>8</sup>

Another sentence goes as follows:

8. 𗵗 𗵘 𗵙 𗵚 𗵛 𗵜 𗵝 𗵞 𗵟 𗵠  
 dzjwo<sup>2</sup> we<sup>2</sup> tjtj<sup>2</sup> mj+<sup>1</sup> sjij<sup>2</sup> ljw+<sup>1</sup> dzjwow<sup>1</sup> rjir<sup>1</sup> ljo<sup>2</sup> zju<sup>2</sup>  
 人 爲, 禮 不 識, 禽 獸 \_\_ 與 豈 \_\_。  
 human be etiquette not.understand birds.and.beasts with how \_\_

‘Without etiquette, there is no difference between men and beasts.’

In Example 8, Nevsky compares the Tangut sentence to *jīn rén ér wú lǐ (suēi néng yán) bú yì qínshòu zhī xīn hū* 今人而無禮 (雖能言) 不亦禽獸之心乎 ‘Without etiquette, there is no difference between men and beasts, even though men are able to speak languages,’ and notes that it is cited from *Liji* (I, 6–7).<sup>9</sup> Here it is applicable to adopt our previous interpretation (Examples 5–7) of 𗵑 zju<sup>2</sup> to this sentence, since the character 𗵟 ljo<sup>2</sup> has an interrogative meaning, the phrase 𗵟 𗵑 ljo<sup>2</sup> zju<sup>2</sup> is similar to Chinese *zěnmó fēnbéi* 怎麼分別 ‘how to distinguish it?’ or *yǒu shénmó bùtóng* 有什麼不同 ‘what is the difference?’

<sup>8</sup> According to Nv-II, p. 491, cited by Li Fanwen (1997), the sentence goes as *dàxiǎo gēnfēn zhī béi* 大小根分之別 ‘the distinction between the big and the small roots’ (*liánxù* 蓮序). The ‘Preface of *Lotus*’ mentioned by Nevsky is actually the *Hongchuan* preface of *Miaofa lianhuajing* by Daoxuan. The explanation of Nv-II, p. 491, seems to correspond to 𗵑 zju<sup>2</sup> to Chinese (*jī* 機) *fēn* 分 ‘the distinction’; also, Li interprets this character as *fēn* 分 ‘difference.’ However, the sentence preceding it is *suōyì xiānyuàn gàoichéng, jīfēn xiǎodà zhī béi, jūnhé gùmǐng, dàoshū bànmǎn zhī kē* 所以仙苑告成, 機分小大之別。金河顧命, 道殊半滿之科。In such parallel prose, the sentence *jīfēn xiǎodà* 機分小大 must correspond to *dàoshū bànmǎn* 道殊半滿 in form. Thus I suggest that *jīfēn* 機分 conveys here the meaning ‘genius’ or ‘intelligence.’

<sup>9</sup> The original material seems to be preserved in St. Petersburg and numbered “Танг 5,” that is, the Tangut *Jingshi zachao* named by Nie Hongyin (2002). According to Huang Yanjun 2009, this material is the Tangut translation based on the Chinese *Xinji wenci jiujiingchao* which was discovered in Dunhuang. The original Tangut material (p. 15) includes sentences from the article of the Chinese classic *Liji, Quli: yīnwǔ néng yán, bù lí fēiniǎo; xīngxīng néng yán, bù lí qínshòu. jīn rén ér wú lǐ, suēi néng yán, bú yì qínshòu zhī xīn hū* 鸚鵡能言, 不離飛鳥; 猩猩能言, 不離禽獸。今人而無禮, 雖能言, 不亦禽獸之心乎。Parrots can speak (language), but they are still birds; orangutans can speak [language], but they are still beasts. Without etiquette, there is no difference between men and beasts.’

On the basis of the four sentences above, we are able to reach a general conclusion as to the meaning of the Tangut 𑖇𑖉𑖂𑖄.

(1) 𑖇𑖉𑖂𑖄 refers to an abstract semantic concept, having the meaning ‘the difference or distinction between two objects after deliberate measurement.’

(2) With respect to the constituents that appear before 𑖇𑖉𑖂𑖄 in these sentences, we can observe that in Examples 5 and 6 it is 𑖇𑖉𑖂𑖄’s complement that goes before it, indicating the quantity of the ‘differences’; while in Example 7 it is the nouns 𑖇𑖉𑖂𑖄 *tha<sup>2</sup> tsəj<sup>1</sup> tshji<sup>2</sup>* ‘the big and the small roots’ which are subjected to measurement that appear before 𑖇𑖉𑖂𑖄. In Example 8, 𑖇𑖉𑖂𑖄 *rjir<sup>1</sup>* marks the object 𑖇𑖉𑖂𑖄 *ljw<sup>1</sup> dzjw<sup>1</sup>* ‘birds and beasts’ which is under comparison with the subject 𑖇𑖉𑖂𑖄 *dzjwo<sup>2</sup> we<sup>2</sup>* ‘being a man.’ Hence, in this sentence 𑖇𑖉𑖂𑖄 *dzjwo<sup>2</sup> we<sup>2</sup>* ‘being a man’ is also an object that is under comparison. This phrase is an antecedent of the interrogative pronoun 𑖇𑖉𑖂𑖄 *lj<sup>2</sup>* which appears before 𑖇𑖉𑖂𑖄. Based on these materials, we can conclude that 𑖇𑖉𑖂𑖄 serves as the head of the sentence, that is, the verb of the predicate.

## § 2. 𑖇𑖉𑖂𑖄 in the Tangut text *Jiangyuan, Beidi*

The character 𑖇𑖉𑖂𑖄 also appears in the Tangut text *Jiangyuan, Beidi*. However, its semantic context is rather different from that in the Tangut *Leilin* and *Sunzi*, as shown in the following sentences:<sup>10</sup>

- (20) 𑖇𑖉𑖂𑖄 𑖇𑖉𑖂𑖄 𑖇𑖉𑖂𑖄 𑖇𑖉𑖂𑖄 𑖇𑖉𑖂𑖄 𑖇𑖉𑖂𑖄 𑖇𑖉𑖂𑖄 𑖇𑖉𑖂𑖄 𑖇𑖉𑖂𑖄 ……  
 thja<sup>1</sup> rjir<sup>1</sup> ɣwej<sup>1</sup> lew<sup>2</sup> njaa<sup>2</sup> sjij<sup>1</sup> tja<sup>1</sup> so<sup>1</sup> mə<sup>2</sup>  
 之 與 戰， 可， 非。 勢 者 三 種  
 they with fight, should.not situation TOP. three.types  
 ‘(The Han) should not fight with them. The situation (of the war) can be divided into three subtypes …….’<sup>11</sup>

<sup>10</sup> The Tangut *Jiangyuan* is one of the texts discovered by M.A. Stein in Khara-Khoto. The material is preserved at the National British Library, numbered Or.12380/1840. According to the *Yingcang Heishuicheng wenxian*, vol. 2, pp. 217–219, this is a 113-line manuscript damaged at several places in the lower part of some pages. Galambos suggests that there are twenty Tangut characters per line. The Tangut sentences in this article are mainly based on Galambos (2011, pp. 97–99). In discussing these sentences, I replace the ‘□’ marker with ‘……’. Readers can check the original manuscript by the line and page number noted in this article. In addition, I dismiss five characters in l. 20, and the character 𑖇𑖉𑖂𑖄 *lew<sup>1</sup>* in l. 26, for they are irrelevant to our discussion here.

<sup>11</sup> Because of the damage of the original manuscript, the corresponding Chinese translation is incomplete. Hence, the translation here is simply based on the meaning of the Tangut characters. Sentences from the original Chinese classic corresponding to these Tangut sentences (Galambos 2011, pp. 84–85) are cited below.



- (21) 蕤 聃 聃 輶 尾 嚳 殺 後 後 鹿 麤 麤……虱<sup>12</sup>  
 ywej<sup>1</sup> tɿ<sup>2</sup> ·jar<sup>2</sup> lɿ<sup>1</sup> rɿjɿr<sup>2</sup> la<sup>2</sup> zɿj<sup>1</sup> ·o<sup>1</sup> njjɿr<sup>1</sup> khia<sup>1</sup> njwɿ<sup>1</sup> lhjɿ<sup>2</sup> lew<sup>1</sup>  
 戰，疲，勞 苦 多。廣 主 射 獵，敏 捷 一  
 fight exhausted toil many wide.ruler shoot.hunting agile one  
 ‘(They) fight, (they) must toil and suffer from fatigue. The ruler of the northern tribes is very good at hunting …… the first’
- (22) 礫 務 穢 敵 殺 殺 結 鹿 概 刻 窺  
 tsew<sup>2</sup> zju<sup>2</sup> ʃjɿj<sup>1</sup> ŋwu<sup>2</sup> zar<sup>1</sup> gja<sup>1</sup> lɿ<sup>1</sup> ɿ<sup>2</sup> ŋwu<sup>2</sup> khwa<sup>1</sup> tɿ<sup>1</sup> njɿ<sup>1</sup> njɿ<sup>1</sup><sup>2</sup>  
 第 分 勢 也。漢 軍 地 程 遠，一 日  
 SUF. sub- situation PART. Han.soldier marching far, one.day  
 窺 効 殺……  
 ·jɿr<sup>2</sup> bjuu<sup>2</sup> dʒjɿ-  
 百 里 步  
 hundred.miles on.foot.  
 ‘It is the (first) subtype situation. The Han soldiers are good at marching on foot. They are able to march a hundred Chinese miles within a day. ……’
- (23) 務 馳 務 殺 殺 後 鹿 燧 疏 叢 鎗 鋤 麤……  
 ·ja<sup>1</sup> bjɿjɿj<sup>1</sup> gjɿj<sup>1</sup> zar<sup>1</sup> zɿjɿj<sup>1</sup> ·o<sup>1</sup> nioow<sup>1</sup> dʒjɿw<sup>1</sup> dzjɿ<sup>2</sup> dʒjɿw<sup>2</sup> dzju<sup>2</sup> njjɿj<sup>2</sup> wjɿr<sup>2</sup>  
 一 倍 過。漢 廣 主 後 追，食 糧 甲 負  
 one.time exceed Han wide.uler after chase provision weapon carry  
 ‘doubled as much. While the Han are in pursuit of the ruler of the northern tribes, (they must) carry the provisions and weapons (on their own) ……’
- (24) 鹿 燧 飛 飛 獮 虬 飛 殺 飛  
 nioow<sup>1</sup> dʒjɿw<sup>1</sup> dzeej<sup>1</sup> tʃhjaa<sup>1</sup> tʃhjɿ<sup>2</sup> rjar<sup>2</sup> lhjɿ- dʒjɿ- dzeej<sup>1</sup>  
 後 追，騎 上 疾 及。步，騎  
 after chase ride above speedy reach on.foot ride  
 識 殺 殺 梟 礫 務 穢 敵……殺 殺<sup>13</sup>  
 bji<sup>2</sup> mjɿ<sup>1</sup> ka<sup>1</sup> njɿ<sup>1</sup> tsew<sup>2</sup> zju<sup>2</sup> ʃjɿj<sup>1</sup> ŋwu<sup>2</sup> zar<sup>1</sup> dʒjɿ-  
 步 不 等。第 二 分 勢 是。漢 步  
 pace unequal second sub- situation PART. Han on.foot  
 ‘(While the northern tribes) chase after (an enemy), they ride on horseback and move fast. The speed of infantry and cavalry is different. This is the second subtype situation. …… the Han have (numerous) infantry

<sup>12</sup> Galambos considers the last character of this line to be 虱 lew<sup>1</sup>. I agree with his view.

<sup>13</sup> There are five characters lost at the end of this line. Galambos fills in four characters. I basically agree with his opinion.

- (25) 徧 駁 駁 駁 駁 駁 駁<sup>14</sup> 馥 馥 馥 駁  
 rejr<sup>2</sup> zjij<sup>1</sup> ·o<sup>1</sup> dzeej<sup>1</sup> dzeej<sup>2</sup> la<sup>2</sup> ljɿ<sup>1</sup> sjij<sup>1</sup> dəə<sup>1</sup> dəə<sup>1</sup> zjij<sup>1</sup> dzeej<sup>1</sup>  
 多，廣主 騎 多。風勢 爭，時，騎  
 many wide.ruler cavalry many wind situation compete when ride

駁……

dzjɿ<sup>1</sup>

疾

rapid

‘many (infantry), the ruler of the northern tribes has many cavalry. When competing for the situation of the wind force, the cavalry is fast as regards speed……’

- (26) 鏞 滌 茲 茲 茲 鏞 鏞 駁 鏞 懲  
 khwej<sup>2</sup> thja<sup>1</sup> rjir<sup>1</sup> ɣwej<sup>1</sup> tji<sup>2</sup> mjij<sup>1</sup> thjɿ<sup>2</sup> tja<sup>1</sup> so<sup>1</sup> tsew<sup>2</sup> zju<sup>2</sup>  
 魁。之與戰，處無。此者第三分  
 huge they with fight place have.no this TOP. third sub-

鏞 敵……

sjij<sup>1</sup> ŋwu<sup>2</sup>

勢也。

situation PART.

‘huge. There is no space to fight with them. This is the third subtype situation.……’

Obviously, these Tangut sentences are originally from the following Chinese text:<sup>15</sup>

漢不與戰，其略有三。漢卒且耕且戰，故疲而怯；虜但牧獵，故逸而勇。以疲敵逸，以怯敵勇，不相當也。此不可戰一也。漢長於步，日馳百里；虜長於騎，日乃倍之。漢逐虜，則齎糧負甲而隨之；虜逐漢，則驅疾騎而運之。運負之勢已殊，走逐之形不等。此不可戰二也。漢戰多步，虜戰多騎；爭地形之勢，則騎疾於步。遲疾勢懸，此不可戰三也。

The reason why the Han do not fight them is based on three strategies. The Han soldiers have to engage in farming as well as fighting, thus they are fatigued and timid. The barbarians, on the other hand, live on hunting, thus they are well rested and courageous. Using the fatigued against the well-rested, the timid against the courageous, the Han are unable to be equal to the barbarians. This is the first

<sup>14</sup> The literal translation of 駁 鏞 ljɿ<sup>1</sup> sjij<sup>1</sup> is *fēngshì* 風勢 ‘the force of the wind.’ However, this seems to be very different from the original Chinese sentence *dìxíng zhī shì* 地形之勢 ‘the terrain.’

<sup>15</sup> See also fn. 10, 11. I slightly modify the punctuation of the Chinese sentence, and refer to Galambos 2011, pp. 85–86 in translating this paragraph into English, only with several little modifications.

reason why the Han should not fight with the barbarians. The Han are good at marching on foot and can cover a hundred Chinese miles a day. The barbarians are good at riding on horseback and thus can cover twice as much in a day. When the Han are in pursuit of the barbarians, they have to haul their provisions and carry their armor during the chase. When the barbarians are in pursuit of the Han, however, they move at great speed and transport things on horseback. The efficiency of transporting things on horseback as opposed to carrying those on foot being so different, the means of pursuit are unequal. This is the second reason why the Han should not fight with the barbarians. In battle, the Han soldiers are mostly infantry, while the barbarians are mostly cavalry. When competing for advantageous terrain, riding is faster than walking. The difference between the efficiency of slowness and speed should be very salient. Thus this is the third reason why the Han should not fight with the barbarians.

However, the Tangut version is not a direct translation of the original text. Instead, it should be viewed as a combination of the original content and the Tangut interpreter's own understanding of the Chinese text. There are also some modifications to the wording. An obvious example comes from the change of *lǔ* 虜 to *guǎngzhǔ* 廣主 𐰇𐰺𐰽 *zji*<sup>1</sup> ·o<sup>1</sup> (ll. 21, 23, 25),<sup>16</sup> in which the former conveys the meaning 'barbarian' while the latter simply means 'the ruler of tribes.' Also, the original text is not fully translated. Instead, the Tangut version merely starts with the eighth character of line 4 in 𐰇𐰺𐰽 𐰇𐰺𐰽 𐰇𐰺𐰽 𐰇𐰺𐰽 *pju*<sup>1</sup> *wer*<sup>1</sup> *so*<sup>1</sup> *ʧa*<sup>2</sup> *ʃja*<sup>1</sup> *tsew*<sup>2</sup> *wēiyi* *dī sānshiqī* 威儀第三十七 'the thirty-seventh: demeanor', i.e., the upper part of the manuscript, l. 17 on p. 219).<sup>17</sup>

According to our understanding of the Tangut syntax, 𐰇𐰺𐰽 (/ 𐰇𐰺𐰽 / 𐰇𐰺𐰽) 𐰇𐰺𐰽 𐰇𐰺𐰽 *lew*<sup>1</sup> (/ *nj*<sup>++1</sup> / *so*<sup>1</sup>) *tsew*<sup>2</sup> *ʒju*<sup>2</sup> *ʃji*<sup>1</sup> *ŋwu*<sup>2</sup> is a typical declarative sentence. 𐰇𐰺𐰽 *ŋwu*<sup>2</sup> is a frequently used Tangut copula that was normally a translation of Chinese sentence-final particle *yě* 也. Hence, the constituent 𐰇𐰺𐰽 *ʒju*<sup>2</sup> *ʃji*<sup>1</sup> here should be a nominal predicate. These characters also form a complex ordinal noun phrase, based on the evidence that 𐰇𐰺𐰽 *tsew*<sup>2</sup> is placed after the quantifiers 𐰇𐰺𐰽 (/ 𐰇𐰺𐰽 / 𐰇𐰺𐰽) *lew*<sup>1</sup> (/ *nj*<sup>++1</sup> / *so*<sup>1</sup>). However, 𐰇𐰺𐰽 *ʒju*<sup>2</sup> should be treated as the attribute of the noun phrase (in which the stative verb serves as the head of the noun phrase). Semantically, 'dis-

<sup>16</sup> The correspondence of 𐰇𐰺𐰽 *zji*<sup>1</sup> ·o<sup>1</sup> to *guǎngzhǔ* 廣主 is based on Kepping 2003, where these two characters have the meaning of Chinese *guǎng* 廣 and *zhǔ* 主. Galambos gives a long discussion of this phrase in his article. See Galambos 2011, pp. 99–101.

<sup>17</sup> The Tangut 𐰇𐰺𐰽 *pju*<sup>1</sup> *wer*<sup>1</sup> can be matched with the topic of the original Chinese text *wēiling* 威令 'governing.' 𐰇𐰺𐰽 *ʒju*<sup>2</sup> appears in line 16, as shown above.

12. 𐰇𐰺𐰽 𐰇𐰺𐰽 𐰇𐰺𐰽 𐰇𐰺𐰽 𐰇𐰺𐰽 𐰇𐰺𐰽 𐰇𐰺𐰽  
*khja*<sup>2</sup> *tʃhjiw*<sup>2</sup> *nj*<sup>++1</sup> *nji*<sup>2</sup> *rji*<sup>2</sup> *tha*<sup>2</sup> *mji*<sup>1</sup> *ʒju*<sup>2</sup> *lji*<sup>1</sup>  
 [桀] [紂] 二 王 與 大, 不 \_\_\_\_ 也。  
*Jie* *Zhou* two.rulers POSP. big NEG. \_\_\_\_ PART.  
 'The two rulers, *Jie* and *Zhou* .....'

Despite the fact that we cannot interpret the whole paragraph due to the lack of context, it is still clear that 𐰇𐰺𐰽 *ʒju*<sup>2</sup> appears after the negative adverb 𐰇𐰺𐰽 *mji*<sup>1</sup> and before the sentence-final particle 𐰇𐰺𐰽 *lji*<sup>1</sup>. Such an order is exactly the same with the sentences mentioned in § 1.2, which supports our previous interpretation.

inction' or 'difference' may prompt one to carry out further subgrouping, hence it would be reasonable to claim that 務  $zju^2$  is the attribute of 齋  $sjj^1$ . For the same reason, I suggest that 務  $zju^2$  must correspond to the Chinese character *fēn* 分, meaning 'to separate into parts, subdivide.'

### § 3. 務 $zju^2$ in the Tangut Code *Tiansheng lüling*

The following sentences are from the *Tiansheng lüling*, vol. II, section 6, article 4.<sup>18</sup>

(1) 殺 殺 殺 殺 殺 殺 齋 齋 鞞  
 $lj^1 dzj^2 lhjw^1 lj^1 sq^1 m\alpha^2 \cdot jij^1 sjj^1 nj^2$   
 -- 備 取 及 三 種 已 世 等，  
 M. have.obtained CONJ. three type self.generation etc.

處 處 苑 鞞 鞞 鞞 鞞 鞞  
 $rjur^1 rjar^1 nji^2 phja^1 dzj^2 mjij^2 \cdot o^1 mji^1$   
 諸 司 -▽ 斷 判； 名 有， 不<sup>19</sup>  
 these.court-PL. judge trial name have NEG.

<sup>18</sup> (1) This Tangut paragraph is cited from Kychanov 1987, vol. 2, p. 348. The line numbers listed in the article are based on the original text. From the line 2 to the last line, all of the lines in the original text are written by two characters lower than the first line. As we can see, article 4 has 13 lines. Besides the sentence discussed here, there are still 11 characters in the sixth line. Along with the following ll. 7 to 14 (proviso), they are irrelevant to our discussion, therefore I omit those sentences. (2) It is obvious that the format of the *Tiansheng lüling* imitated the Chinese classic *Tanglü shuyi*, and some articles were adaptations of the *Tanglü shuyi*. However, the *Tiansheng lüling* is not a Tangut translation of the *Tanglü shuyi*; hence the fourth line does not exist here. (3) Most parts of the *lüling* have been translated into Russian by Kychanov (1987). Li Zhongsan (1988) translated the second volume of the Russian version into Chinese. Shi Jinbo et al. (1994) translated the Tangut manuscripts (published by Kychanov) into Chinese. Then they (1999) modified the previous work (1994) based on the *Ecang Heishuicheng wenxian*, vol. 8 and 9, which had not been interpreted by Kychanov, and engaged in Chinese translation of Tangut *Minglüe* (two volumes). In addition, Shimada (2003) translated part of the Chinese version into Japanese (based on Shi Jinbo et al. 1999). (4) For the reader's reference, I provide the corresponding sentences from Shi Jinbo et al. 1999 and Li Zhongsan 1988 below.

Shi Jinbo et al. 1999, p. 151:

一無期徒刑及三種長期徒刑等，諸司人判決有名以外，而後判決各不有名者，應奏不奏，擅自判斷時，不應贖及應贖未使贖等，已承贖杖者，一律當算，當依人數多寡，罪狀高低，有一人徒三年，二人徒五年，三年以上一律徒六年。體例 格式。

Li Zhongsan 1988, pp. 40–41 (Kychanov 1987, vol. 2, pp. 54–55):

任何衙門在斷議十三年苦役滿後即于配處落戶或三期苦役[終身苦役不得回自窩]案時，議斷既不宣明案情，又不申奏(儘管有可能申奏)，而擅自裁斷，或被判有罪者不能贖罪，但亦未宣明可否贖罪，或對罪犯施烙印並用刑杖者，應算錯獄，依斷錯人數[斷錯主司]應獲罪：[斷錯]一人者，處三年苦役；二人者，處五年苦役；三人以上者，處六年苦役。

<sup>19</sup> (1) See also fn. 4. 苑  $nji^2$  in this line is also a plural marker. I suggest that 苑  $nji^2$  indicates that the preceding phrase 處  $rjur^1 rjar^1$  should be a plural noun. There is also 苑  $nji^2$  in the second line that indicates the preceding 齋  $\cdot jij^1$  is a plural pronoun. (2) As for the phrase 鞞  $phja^1 dzj^2$ , Shi Jinbo et al. (1999) interpreted it as 'to adjudge.' Li Zhongsan (1988) interpreted it as 'to decide somebody is guilty or not' (see also the note given above). I consider these both views acceptable.

- (2) 翻 辨 慨 徽 祗 窳 慨 辨 殺 徽  
 wjij<sup>1</sup> tshj<sup>1</sup> nioow<sup>1</sup> phja<sup>1</sup> dzj<sup>2</sup> mjij<sup>2</sup> mji<sup>1</sup> ·o<sup>1</sup> ηewr<sup>2</sup> khjij<sup>2</sup>  
 有。爾 後 斷 判，名 不 有。數 告，  
 have after.that judge trial name NEG. have several inform  
 祿 慨 徽 翦 苑 胤  
 wo<sup>2</sup> mji<sup>1</sup> khjij<sup>2</sup> ·jij<sup>1</sup> nji<sup>2</sup> phji<sup>1</sup>  
 應，不 告；己 -▽ 意  
 should NEG. inform self-PL. opinion

- (3) 諱 祗 覈 覈 慨 祿 敵 覈 祿  
 dzjw<sup>2</sup> dzj<sup>2</sup> zjij<sup>1</sup> zjor<sup>1</sup> mji<sup>1</sup> wo<sup>2</sup> lj<sup>1</sup> zjor<sup>1</sup> wo<sup>2</sup>  
 決 斷，時；贖，不 應，及 贖 應，  
 decide while redeem NEG. should CONJ. should.redeem  
 覈 覈 祗 鞞 胤 茲 徽  
 mjij<sup>2</sup> zjor<sup>1</sup> phji<sup>1</sup> nj<sup>2</sup> dzji<sup>2</sup> bo<sup>2</sup> wj<sup>2</sup>  
 未 贖，令，等，黥 碎 △<sup>20</sup>  
 not.yet redeem cause etc. tattoo smash PRE.

- (4) 緘 緘 榜 慨 殺 擗 殺 殺 徧 敵  
 lhjj- tja<sup>1</sup> ·ja<sup>1</sup> tj<sup>2</sup> wjij<sup>2</sup> sej<sup>1</sup> dzjwo<sup>2</sup> ηewr<sup>2</sup> rej<sup>2</sup> zj<sup>1</sup>  
 受 者，△ 法，△ 算；人 數 多少，  
 suffer TOP. PRE. mode PRE. count person several how.many

<sup>20</sup> (1) See also fn. 19. According to the phonetic reconstruction, I consider 諱 祗 dzjw<sup>2</sup> dzj<sup>2</sup> to be an integrated phrase. The evidence of it being corresponding to Chinese *juéduàn* 決斷 'to decide somebody is guilty or not' is based on Sutra translations, in which 諱 祗 胤 緘 dzjw<sup>2</sup> dzj<sup>2</sup> phji<sup>1</sup> tha<sup>1</sup> is the translation of *juéduàn yì fó* 決斷意佛 (from *Guoqu qianfo mingjing*. See Wang Jingru 1932, p. 144). However, in the same text, 胤 緘 緘 緘 yie<sup>2</sup> tsjiir<sup>1</sup> gjij<sup>1</sup> tha<sup>1</sup> is used to translate *juéduàn yīn fó* 決斷音佛 (Wang Jingru 1932, p. 162). In this sentence the Tangut phrase used to render Chinese *juéduàn* 決斷 is 緘 緘 tsjiir<sup>1</sup> gjij<sup>1</sup> instead of 諱 祗 dzjw<sup>2</sup> dzj<sup>2</sup>. On the other hand, *Zhangzhongzhu* 281 correlates 諱 緘 dzjw<sup>2</sup> dzjw<sup>2</sup> with an officer's name *yùshǐ* 御史. This provides some clues for 諱 祗 dzjw<sup>2</sup> dzj<sup>2</sup>'s correspondence to *tǒnglǐ* 統理 (from *Qifo*. Cited from Nv-1, p. 292) and *zhípíng* 治擗 (from *Jingguang mingjing*. See Wang Jingru 1933, p. 214). (2) The last second character in this line is clearly 茲 swej<sup>1</sup>. This character usually serves as the phonetic transcription of Chinese *sù* 碎. The sentence 胤 茲 緘 緘 dzji<sup>2</sup> swej<sup>1</sup> wj<sup>2</sup> lhjj- can be roughly interpreted as 'to be sentenced to tattooing,' i.e. being tattooed on the body or face. However, I cannot give a clear interpretation if 胤 dzji<sup>2</sup> and 茲 swej<sup>1</sup> is a compound word or not. The only clue is the sentences from the seventh part of this volume: 胤 慨 殺 dzji<sup>2</sup> tj<sup>2</sup> ya<sup>1</sup> 'the rule of tattoo.' In this part, there is a statement 胤 胤 胤 dzji<sup>2</sup> dji<sup>2</sup> tj<sup>2</sup> 'the form of tattoo,' in which the first point mentions the sentence 胤 緘 緘 dzji<sup>2</sup> bo<sup>2</sup> lhjj- wo<sup>2</sup> (Kychanov 1987, vol. 2, p. 351). It is very likely that the character 茲 swej<sup>1</sup> here is a mistaken 緘 bo<sup>2</sup> because of their similarity in shape. The Tangut 緘 bo<sup>2</sup> means 'stick,' for which reason Shi Jinpo et al. translate 胤 緘 緘 dzji<sup>2</sup> bo<sup>2</sup> lhjj- bo<sup>2</sup> as *yīng shòu qíng, zhàng* 應受黥、杖 'should be tattooed, struck' (Shi Jinpo et al. 1999, p. 152); and Kychanov translates this sentence as *shī làoìn hé zhàngxíng* 施烙印和杖刑 'to be tattooed and struck by a stick' (see Li Zhongsan 1988, p. 42).

𪛗 𪛗 𪛗 𪛗 𪛗 𪛗  
 sjij<sup>1</sup> bju<sup>1</sup> dʒji<sup>2</sup> tsewr<sup>1</sup> bji<sup>2</sup> bjij<sup>2</sup>  
 法 依； 罪 節 低 高  
 law accord crime scale low high

(5) 𪛗 𪛗 𪛗 𪛗 𪛗 𪛗 𪛗 𪛗 𪛗 𪛗  
 djij<sup>2</sup> zju<sup>2</sup> lew<sup>1</sup> ·jij<sup>1</sup> so<sup>1</sup> kjiw<sup>1</sup> njt+<sup>1</sup> ·jij<sup>1</sup> ηwə<sup>1</sup> kjiw<sup>1</sup> so<sup>1</sup>  
 △ \_\_\_；一 於 三 年， 二 於 五 年， 三  
 PRE. \_\_\_ one POSP. three year two POSP. five year three

𪛗 𪛗 𪛗 𪛗 𪛗  
 sjwo<sup>1</sup> bj+<sup>1</sup> bjij<sup>2</sup> ·ja<sup>1</sup> tj+<sup>2</sup>  
 起， 上 上 △ 法，  
 exceed upward PRE. mode

(6) 𪛗 𪛗 𪛗 𪛗 𪛗  
 tshjiw<sup>1</sup> kjiw<sup>1</sup> nj+<sup>2</sup> kjij<sup>1</sup> lhju<sup>2</sup>  
 六 年 等； △ 獲。<sup>21</sup>  
 six year etc. PRE. be.found

Despite the fact that the Tangut code is an adaptation of the Chinese classic *Tanglü shuyi*, the exact content of the *Tiansheng lüling* is not a Tangut-Chinese translation of the *Tanglü shuyi*. As Professor Kychanov has said,<sup>22</sup> we are still unable to interpret the whole paragraph accurately, even if every Tangut character is individually interpretable.

However, there are still clues helpful to our analysis. As we can observe, there is a prefix 𪛗 djij<sup>2</sup> preceding 𪛗 zju<sup>2</sup> in l. 5, which indicates that our previous analysis of 𪛗 zju<sup>2</sup>'s syntactic property is also compatible with this example. Our previous interpretation of 𪛗 zju<sup>2</sup> is suitable in this context, either. Furthermore, the Tangut sentences from 𪛗 𪛗 to 𪛗 𪛗 should mean 'to distinguish the degree of penalty by the number of persons misjudged by a judge.' Presumably, I would still suggest that 𪛗 zju<sup>2</sup> corresponds to the Chinese character *fēn* 分, meaning 'to separate into parts, to be subdivided,' so that the interpretation we get here is exactly the same as that I suggested in section 2.

<sup>21</sup> Here I agree with Kychanov's interpretation, in which the phrase 𪛗 𪛗 𪛗 rjur<sup>1</sup> rjar<sup>1</sup> nji<sup>2</sup> serves as the subject of 𪛗 𪛗 kjij<sup>1</sup> lhju<sup>2</sup>. Hence the core meaning of the law is *zhūsī huòzuì* 諸司獲罪 'all the judges who commit misjudgment(s) are pronounced guilty.' The sentences between the two phrases state the conditions of various types of misjudgments, along with the criteria of penalty for the miscarriage of justice. From the seventh character of l. 4 to the third character of l. 6, the meaning might be 'based on the instances of misjudgment, the judge of the court will be punished accordingly. Judges who misjudged one person would be sentenced to a three-year penalty; a five-year penalty is for those who misjudged two persons; and a six-year penalty for those who misjudged three or more persons.'

<sup>22</sup> See the Russian translation (Kychanov 1987) of the *Tiansheng lüling* and the preface of the publication.

#### § 4. Conclusion

It is about twenty years since I began to think about the Tangut character 𐞗 zju<sup>2</sup>. At the beginning, I dealt with two sentences (i.e. Examples 5 and 6) when I had been interpreting the Tangut *Sunzi bingfa*. Although it is clear that 𐞗 zju<sup>2</sup> in those two examples shows identical syntactic and semantic behavior, it is difficult to reach further conclusion based on just two sentences. Later on, while I engaged in the study of the Tangut *Tiansheng liling*, the phrase 𐞗 𐞗 djij<sup>2</sup> zju<sup>2</sup> (see § 3) drew my attention. Due to the lack of corresponding sentences from the original Chinese text (see fn. 18–22), however, the clues for interpreting this character were still insufficient.

In 1997, Li Fanwen published his *Tangut-Chinese Dictionary*, having combined Nv-II, pp. 484 and 491 together and put them under No. 5708. At that time, I was still reserved about his interpretation of 𐞗 zju<sup>2</sup> from Examples 7 and 8, for the source of the sentences was still unknown. It was not until Galambos (2011) achieved a word-by-word interpretation of the Tangut *Jiangyuan, Beidi* that I began to adopt an optimistic attitude toward the interpretation of this character. I collected those sentences from different texts in pursuit of a rigorous analysis, attempting to reach a definite conclusion regarding the character 𐞗 zju<sup>2</sup>. And now, in accordance with the examination of the three sections above, I am able to reach a general conclusion as regards the meaning of the Tangut 𐞗 zju<sup>2</sup>.

(1) 𐞗 zju<sup>2</sup> refers to an abstract semantic concept having the meaning ‘the difference or distinction between two objects after deliberate measurement.’

(2) It is also clear that 𐞗 zju<sup>2</sup> has a salient verbal property. As we can observe, 𐞗 zju<sup>2</sup> can go after the prefix 𐞗 djij<sup>2</sup>. Also, it can appear before the sentence-final particle 𐞗 lja<sup>1</sup>, the nominalized character 𐞗 jji<sup>1</sup> indicating the property of its argument, and the character 𐞗 ku<sup>1</sup> which serves as a conjunction to connect two sentences. Similar interpretation of 𐞗 zju<sup>2</sup> can also be adopted in the contexts in which 𐞗 zju<sup>2</sup> serves as an attribute of nouns or goes after the interrogative pronoun 𐞗 ljo<sup>2</sup>.

This article is dedicated to Professor Kychanov in celebration of his birthday. Along with my salute to his contribution, I would like to promote the discipline of the four-line glossing methodology for Tangut text interpretation. This is not an innovation of mine, but it has been adopted by many scholars. Professor K.J. Solonin, Arakawa Shintarō, Ikeda Takumi and Duan Yuquan accept this type of glossing. With respect to establishing a universal and readily understandable glossing system, it is advantageous to scholars to share a common method of sentence glossing. On the other hand, the form of four-line glossing has the advantage of avoiding vague translations; via the form, interpreters maintain strict discipline in interpretations. For the convenience of readers, the four-line glossing is also favorable in terms of the literal clearness of the sentences illustrated, hence readers are able to make their own judgments about the text. Furthermore, the four-line glossing system provides a good basis for establishing a thorough database of the Tangut language—as we all know, a well-established database is nowadays the only way for scholars to perform accurate analysis of the Tangut materials.

## References

- Huang Yanjun 2009 — Huang Yanjun 黃延軍. “Xi-Xia wen *Jingshi zachao* kaoyuan” [On the Origin of the Tangut Script of *Jingshi zachao*] 西夏文《經史雜抄》考源. In *Minzu yanjiu* [Ethno-National Studies] 民族研究, 2 (2009), pp. 97–103.
- Galambos 2011 — Galambos I. “The Northern Neighbors of the Tangut.” In *Cahiers de Linguistique – Asie Orientale*, 40 (2011), pp. 69–104.
- Керпинг 1979 — *Сунь цзы в тангутском переводе*. Факсимиле ксилографа. Изд. текста, перевод, введение, коммент., грамматич. очерк, словарь и прил. К.Б. Кепинг. М.: Наука, ГРВЛ, 1979 (Памятники письменности Востока XLIX).
- Керпинг 1983 — *Лес категорий. Утраченная китайская лэйшу в тангутском переводе*. Факсимиле ксилографа. Изд. текста, вступ. статья, перевод, коммент. и указатели К.Б. Кепинг. М.: Наука, ГРВЛ, 1983 (Памятники письменности Востока XXXVIII).
- Керпинг 1985 — Кепинг К.Б. *Тангутский язык. Морфология*. М.: Наука, ГРВЛ, 1985.
- Kuchanov 1987 — *Измененный и заново утвержденный кодекс девиза царствования Невесное процветание (1149–1169)*. В 4-х кн. Кн. 2. Факсимиле, перевод и примечания (главы 1–7). Изд. текста, пер. с тангутского, исслед. и примеч. Е. И. Кычанова. М.: Наука, ГРВЛ, 1987 (Памятники письменности Востока LXXXI, 2).
- Li Fanwen 1986 — Li Fanwen 李范文. *Tongyin yanjiu* [The Study of *Tongyin*] 同音研究. Yinchuan: Ningxia renmin chubanshe 銀川：寧夏人民出版社, 1986.
- Li Fanwen 1997 — Li Fanwen 李范文. *Xia-han zidian* [Tangut-Chinese Dictionary] 夏漢字典. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe 北京：中國社會科學出版社, 1997.
- Li Zhongsan 1988 — *Xi-Xia fadian — Tiansheng gaijiu dingxin lüling (di 1–7 zhang)* [Amended and Re-approved Code of the Tiansheng Reign (Chapters 1–7)] 西夏法典——天盛爭改舊定新律令. [Trans. into Russian by E.I. Kuchanov] 克恰諾夫俄譯. [Trans. into Chinese by Li Zhongsan] 李仲三漢譯, [ed. by Luo Maokun] 羅矛昆校訂. Yinchuan: Ningxia renmin chubanshe 銀川：寧夏人民出版社, 1988.
- Lin Ying-chin 1994 — Lin Ying-chin 林英津. *Xiayi ‘Sunzi bingfa’ yanjiu* [Research on *Sun-tzy Ping-fa* in Tangut] 夏譯《孫子兵法》研究. 2 vols. Taipei: Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica 臺北：中央研究院歷史語言研究所 (Monograph Series of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica 中央研究院歷史語言研究所單刊之 28).
- Lin Ying-chin 2010a — Lin Ying-chin 林英津. “Touguo fanyi han (yi) wen ben foxue wenxian, xi-xia ren jian-gou ben minzu foxue sixiang tixi de changshi: yi *Xi-Xia wen ben Huizhong ‘Xinjing’ zhu wei li*” [Attempt to Establish the Xi-Xia National Buddhist Ideology Reflected in the Interpretation of Chinese Version of Buddhist Works: An Example of the Tangut Version of *Prajnaparamita-hrdaya Sutra* with Huizhong’s Commentaries] 透過翻譯漢(譯)文本佛學文獻，西夏人建構本民族佛學思想體系的嘗試：以「西夏文本慧忠《心經》注」為例. In *Xi-Xia xue* [Tangut studies] 西夏學, 6 (2010), pp. 19–56.
- Lin Ying-chin 2010b — Lin Ying-chin 林英津. “San du *Fan-han heshi zhangzhongzhu xu*” [The Third Reading of the Preface for *Fan-han heshi zhangzhong zhu*] 三讀《番漢合時掌中珠·序》. Paper for 2010 Conference of Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica, Taipei, 09/20/2010.
- Ma Zhongjin 1987 — Ma Zhongjin 馬忠建. *Xi-Xia yu yufa ruogan wenti zh itaolun* [The Consideration of Some Questions on Tangut Grammar] 西夏語語法若干問題之討論. Academic diss. Chinese Academy of Social Science Graduate School, 1987.
- Nevsky (= Nv-I / Nv-II) — Невский Н.А. *Тангутская филология. Исследования и словарь*. В 2-х кн. М.: Издательство восточной литературы, 1960.
- Nie Hongyin 2002 — Nie Hongyin 聶鴻音. “Xi-Xia ben *Jingshi zachao* chutan” [The Preliminary Study of the Tangut Text of *Jingshi zachao*] 西夏本《經史雜抄》初探. In *Ningxia shehui kexue* [Ningxia Social Sciences] 寧夏社會科學, 3 (2002), pp. 84–86.



- Shi Jinbo et al. 1993 — Shi Jinbo 史金波, Nie Hongyin 聶鴻音, Bai Bin 白濱. *Leilin yanjiu* [Study of *Leilin*] 類林研究. Yinchuan: Ningxia renmin chubanshe 銀川：寧夏人民出版社, 1993.
- Shi Jinbo et al. 1994 — *Xi-Xia Tiansheng lüling* [Tangut Code of Laws of Tiansheng Reign] 西夏天盛律令. Trans. and commented by Shi Jinbo 史金波, Nie Hongyin 聶鴻音, Bai Bin 白濱. Beijing: Kexue chubanshe 北京：科學出版社, 1994.
- Shi Jinbo et al. 1999 — *Tiansheng gaijiu xinding lüling* [Amended and Re-approved Code of Tiansheng Reign] 天盛改舊新定律令. Trans. and commented by Shi Jinbo 史金波, Nie Hongyin 聶鴻音, Bai Bin 白濱. Beijing: Falü chubanshe 法律出版社.
- Shimada 2003 — Shimada Masao 島田正郎. *Seika hōten shotan* [Preliminary Study on the Tangut Code] 西夏法典初探. Tōkyō: Sōbunsha 創文社, 2003 (Tōyō hōshi ronshū 東洋法史論集 8).
- Sofronov 1968 — Софронов М.В. *Грамматика тангутского языка*. В 2 кн. М.: Издательство восточной литературы, 1968.
- Wang Jingru 1932–1933 — Wang Jingru 王靜如. *Xi-Xia yanjiu* [The Study of Xi-Xia] 西夏研究. 3 輯 [3 issues]. Beijing: Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica 北平：國立中央研究院歷史語言研究所, 1932–1933 (Monograph Series of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica 國立中央研究院歷史語言研究所單刊甲種之 8, 11, 13).
- Yingcang Heishuicheng wenxian — *Yingcang Heishuicheng wenxian* [Documents from Khara-Khoto in the British Library] 英藏黑水城文獻. 5 vols. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe 上海古籍出版社, 2005–2010.