

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

Uighur Scribble Attached to a Tangut Buddhist Fragment from Dunhuang*

The relationship between the Tangut (Xi-Xia) and the Uighurs has been a target of the academic studies related to the history, cultures, Buddhism and other religions, linguistics, and other fields of the Central Asian studies. Our esteemed jubilee Prof. Dr. Evgeny Kychanov has contributed to the issue with his numerous articles and monographs.¹ In this short paper I deal with a Uighur scribble attached to a fragment of a Buddhist Tangut blockprint, whereby I would like to honour Prof. Kychanov on the occasion of his 80th birthday.

The Tangut fragment in question is now preserved under the shelf number Peald 6f in the East Asian Library and the Gest Collection of Princeton University. The size of the paper is 15.6 × 18.8 cm. The contents of the Buddhist Tangut text can be identified with the Chinese version of 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論 *A-pi-da-mo da-pi-po-sha-lun* (Skt. *Abhidharma-mahāvibhāṣāśāstra*). Five of other Tangut fragments of the Princeton Collection (Peald 6c, Peald 6d, Peald 6e, Peald 6h and Peald 6i) and one (Txd 39-08b) in the Tenri Library, Nara, Japan also belong to the same print as Peald 6f, and all of these fragments must have been brought from the Northern Caves of Dunhuang Mogaoku.²

The 1st line of the Tangut text of Peald 6f shows the ideograms corresponding to the Chinese chapter heading as 雜蘊第一中愛敬納息第四[之一] *za-yun di-yi zhong ai-jing na-xi di-si [zhi yi]* “[Section 1] of (Chapter) 4 of *Ai-jing na-xi* in (Part) 1 of *Za-yun*” of *Abhidharma-mahāvibhāṣāśāstra*.³ In fact, the line ends with the Tangut ideogram for Chin. 四 *si* “4, four” before the bottom marginal line, and

* I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Shintarō Arakawa, Prof. Peter Zieme and Dr. Simone-Christiane Raschmann for their kind and important suggestions.

¹ E.g. Kychanov 2004.

² Arakawa 2011, p. 148; Arakawa 2012, pp. 6–7. Cf. Matsui 2011, pp. 32, 42; Matsui, forthcoming, for the Uighur almanac divination texts on the reverse side.

³ Taishō Tripitaka, vol. 27, No. 1545, p. 150c12.



Peald 6f recto

The East Asian Library and the Gest Collection, Princeton University
http://idp.bl.uk/database/oo_scroll_h.a4d?uid=159286112011;recnum=79512;index=1

the ideograms for Chin. 之一 *zhi yi* “one of” should have been at the top of line 2, which is now lost but there is blank space left beneath. Accordingly the current second line was originally line 3, and it comprises the Tangut text corresponding to the following Chinese text [云何愛], 云何敬, 如是等章 [*yun he ai*], *yun he jing*, *ru shi deng zhang* “The section concerning (the questions about) [what is love], what is respect, and so on.”⁴

The reverse side of our fragment Peald 6f was reused for a Uighur text of almanac divination, which apparently belongs to the Mongol-Yuan times (13th–14th cc.) and has nothing to do with the Tangut text on the recto side. However, we find another Uighur note scribbled in the blank beneath the original line 2 of the Tangut text on the recto side. It is also written in the cursive script of the Mongol

⁴ Arakawa 2012, pp. 8, 13.

times, but the clumsiest handwriting hardly allows us to decipher all of the words in full.

For two upper lines, I would propose a tentative transliteration and transcription as shown below:

<i>Transliteration</i>	<i>Transcription</i>
1. PYRD' 𐰽	birdä 𐰽
2. TWRT	tört

${}_2TWRT = tort \sim tört$ seems to be a mistake for $TWYRT = tört$ “four”. Then *birdä tört* should be literally interpreted as “four of one.”⁵ Still we find an ideograph below ${}_1birdä$ (rendered as 𐰽 in the text above), which seems to be written by the same hand as the Uighur inscription. Prof. Shintarō Arakawa proposed to regard it as a rough sketch of the Tangut script “one”, appearing as the third ideogram in the first line (𐰽).⁶

The Uighur writings beneath are most difficult to decipher. Judging from the vertical positioning, they seem to run from upper-right to bottom-left, in the order reverse to the normal Uighur writing.

<i>Transliteration</i>	<i>Transcription</i>
3. ČWDK'Y TWYD 夫	čodk'i töđ 夫
4. Č'W PYRD'	Č'W birdä

For ${}_3ČWDK'Y$, which looks like $ČWDYRW$ at a glance, I would place *čodk'i* as a mistake for $ČWD'KY = čodaki \sim čodake$ “questioner, asker, objector, pupil” (< Skt. *codaka*).⁷ The following ${}_3TWYD = töđ$ may be modified into $tö(r)đ \sim tört$ “four”. The meaning of a sign or symbol like a Chinese character 夫 *fu* beneath ${}_3töđ$ is totally ungraspable for me. If we may modify ${}_4Č'W$ into $Č'W$, it might be regarded as *čo[daki]* repeated but interrupted. Reading ${}_4PYRD' = birdä$ “in one” needs some explanations: Its initial strokes *P*- and *-Y*- are written intermittently, and the oval stroke of *-D*- is so small that it is nearly indistinguishable from the tail of *-Y*-.



If I am right in my transcriptions and interpretations of the Uighur scribble shown above, ${}_1birdä$ ${}_2tört$ “four of one” can be interpreted as “(Section) 4 of (Part) 1”, and it should be the translation for the Tangut text corresponding to Chin. 雜蘊第一中愛敬納息第四 “Chapter 4 (of *Ai-jing na-xi*) in Part 1 (of *Za-yun*)”. Also ${}_3čodk'i töđ$ ${}_4Č'W birdä > čodaki töđ čo[daki] birdä$ “In [Questioner] 1 (of) Questioner 4” may correspond to the following Tangut text for Chin. [愛敬納息]第四[之一, 云何愛]云何敬, 如是等章 “[Section 1] of (Chapter) 4 of *ai-jing na-xi*, i.e., the section concerning (the questions about) [what is love], what

⁵ However, reading in reverse as *tört birdä* “in four-one; in one (of) four” would be possible if it had been written from right to left similar to lines 3-4.

⁶ Arakawa 2011, p. 148; Arakawa 2012.

⁷ See Shōgaito 2008, p. 542. I am grateful to Prof. Peter Zieme for suggesting this reconstruction.

is respect, and so on”. In the Uighur *Abhidharma*-texts, *čodaki* ~ *čodake* “questioner, asker, objector, pupil” is frequently used in the phrases as *čodake sözlär* “the questioner says (= questions) [as following]” or *čodake sezik ayıdu* “the questioner asks a question (as following)” to begin a catechism.⁸

As the result, we may now consider that the scribe of our Uighur scribble was able to read and understand the chapter heading of the Tangut Buddhist text and even translate it into Uighur language. The quite clumsy handwriting of the scribble might suggest that the scribe was not a native Uighur. On the other hand, the sketch  for the Tangut ideogram  “one” is too rough to be regarded as written by a native Tangut: The letters for numbers are most fundamental. Moreover, it would not have been necessary for the Tangut scribe to translate only the chapter heading in his/her native language into Uighur. Accordingly, for the time being I would assume that the scribe was of Uighur origin, or of any other ethnic origin but familiar with the Uighur language.⁹

Here we may mention also that several Uighur *Abhidharma*-texts have been brought from the Dunhuang Mogaoku. So far as hitherto is known, all of them are based on Chinese originals.¹⁰ Of course we need more materials to prove that the scribe of our scribble knew the Tangut script as well as the Buddhist doctrine of *Abhidharma-mahāvibhāṣāsāstra* from the Tangut blockprint, but our fragment might be a first attestation of the Tangut texts as sources of the Uighur Buddhist texts in the Gansu region.

Even though some Chinese historical records inform us about the contribution of Uighur Buddhist monks to the translation of the Chinese Buddhist canons into the Tangut language during the Tangut-Xi-Xia Kingdom, contradictorily we have thus far no Tangut Buddhist text to declare that it was translated from the Uighur original or by the Uighur monk(s), or to show linguistic influence by Uighur.¹¹ It has been debatable how close or how remote was the Buddhist relationship between the Tanguts and the Uighurs during the 10th–14th centuries.¹²

Our fragment may well demonstrate the real existence of the Tangut-Uighur bilingual Buddhist in the Mongol times, and it can throw a light on the practical aspects of the cultural interaction between the Tanguts and the Uighurs.

⁸ See Shōgaito 2008, lines 79, 2596, 2658, 2827, 3559.

⁹ For this assumption I owe many to the discussion with Prof. Shintarō Arakawa. Also see Arakawa 2012, p. 9.

¹⁰ Kudara 1982, pp. 1–5; Kudara 1984, p. 65. Especially, see Kudara 1986, pp. 155–153, for the Uighur *Abhidharma*-text in the Tenri Library that corresponds to *Abhidharma-mahāvibhāṣāsāstra* (or its variant Chin. 阿毘曇毘婆沙論 *A-pi-tan-pi-po-sha-lun*) and even comprises modifications and additions to the Chinese original. For the up-to-date information on extant Uighur *Abhidharma*-texts, see Shōgaito 2008, pp. 1–2.

¹¹ But we may note the Sino-Uighur inscription for the memory of the Tangut officials’ family, who governed the circuit of Suzhou through the Mongol period. See Geng Shimin 1986; cf. Moriyasu 1982, pp. 14–15.

¹² E.g., Kychanov 1968, pp. 286, 287–278; Kychanov 1978, p. 208; Kychanov 2004, p. 156; Nishida 1975, pp. 5–6; Moriyasu 1985, pp. 74, 88 & n. 27.

References

- Arakawa 2011 — Arakawa Shintarō 荒川慎太郎. “Purinsuton Daigaku shozō Seika-bun *Kegonkyō* maki 77 yakuchū” [An Annotated Japanese Translation of the Tangut Version of *Avataṃsaka sūtra* Vol. 77 in Princeton University Collection] プリンストン大学所蔵西夏文華嚴經卷七十七譯注. In *Ajia Afurika gengo bunka kenkyū* [Journal of Asian and African Studies] アジア・アフリカ言語文化研究, 81 (2011), pp. 147–305.
- Arakawa 2012 — Arakawa Shintarō 荒川慎太郎. “Purinsuton Daigaku shozō Seika-bun butten danpen (Peald) ni tsuite” [On the Tangut Buddhist Fragments in Princeton University Collection Peald] プリンストン大学所蔵西夏文佛典断片 (Peald) について. In *Ajia Afurika gengo bunka kenkyū* [Journal of Asian and African Studies] アジア・アフリカ言語文化研究, 83 (2012), pp. 5–36.
- Geng 1986 — Geng Shimin 耿世民. “Huigu wen ‘Dayuan Suzhou lu yeke daluhuachi shixi zhi bei’ yishi” [Study of the Uighur inscription of Suzhou Prefecture in Yuan dynasty] 回鹘文『大元肅州路也可達魯花赤世襲之碑』譯釋. In *Xiang Da xiansheng jinian lunwen ji* 向達先生紀念論文集. Ed. by Yan Wenru 閻文儒 and Chen Yulong 陳玉龍. Urumqi, 1986, pp. 440–454.
- Kudara 1982 — Kudara Kōgi 百濟康義. “Uiguru-yaku ‘Abidatsuma-junshō-ron’ shōhon” [An Abridgement of Uighur *Abhidharmayāyānusāra-sāstra*] ウイグル譯『阿毘達磨順正理論』抄本. In *Bukkyogaku kenkyū* [Studies in Buddhism] 佛教學研究, 38 (1982), pp. 1–27.
- Kudara 1984 — Kudara Kōgi 百濟康義. “Uiguru-yaku ‘Abidatsuma-kusharon’ shotan” [Preliminary study on Uighur *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*] ウイグル譯『阿毘達磨俱舍論』初探. In *Ryūkoku daigaku ronshū* [Journal of Ryukoku University] 龍谷大學論集, 425 (1984), pp. 65–90.
- Kudara 1986 — Kudara Kōgi 百濟康義. “Tenri-toshokan-zō Uiguru-go bunken” [Uighur texts in the Tenri Library] 天理圖書館藏ウイグル語文獻. In *Biblia* ビブリア, 86 (1986), pp. 180–127 + 4 pls.
- Kychanov 1968 — Кычанов Е.И. *Очерк истории тангутского государства*. М.: Наука, ГРБЛ, 1968.
- Kychanov 1978 — Kychanov E.J. “Tibetans and Tibetan culture in the Tangut state Hsi-Hsia (982–1227).” In *Proceedings of the Csoma de Kőrös Memorial Symposium*. Ed. by L. Ligeti. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1978, pp. 205–211 (Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica; Vol. XXIII).
- Kychanov 2004 — Kyčanov E.I. “Turfan und Xixia”. In *Turfan Revisited — The First Century of Research into the Arts and Cultures of the Silk Road*. Ed. by D. Durkin-Meisterernst et al. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 2004, pp. 155–158 (Monographien zur Indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie; Bd. 17).
- Matsui 2011 — Matsui Dai 松井太. “Tonkō shutsudo no Uiguru-go rekisen monjo” [Uighur almanac divination fragments from Dunhuang] 敦煌出土のウイグル語曆占文書. In *Jinbun shakai ronsō* [Studies in Humanities] 人文社會論叢, 26 (2011), pp. 25–48 (Faculty of Humanities Hirosaki University).
- Matsui (forthcoming) — Matsui Dai 松井太. “Uighur Almanac Divination Fragments from Dunhuang”. In *Proceedings of Dunhuang Studies: Prospects and Problems for the Coming Second Century of Research, St. Petersburg, 3–5 September 2009*. St. Petersburg, (forthcoming).
- Moriyasu 1982 — Moriyasu Takao 森安孝夫. “An Uigur Buddhist’s Letter of the Yüan Dynasty from Tun-huang”. In *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Tōyō Bunko*, 40 (1982), pp. 1–18.

- Moriyasu 1985 — Moriyasu Takao 森安孝夫. “Uiguru-go bunken” [Uighurica from Dunhuang] ウイグル語文獻. In *Kōza Tonkō 6, Tonkō kogo bunken* [Lecture Series on Tun-huang, Vol. 6, Literature in Central Asian Languages from Tun-huang] 講座敦煌 6・敦煌胡語文獻. Ed. by Z. Yamaguchi. Tokyo, 1985, pp. 1–98.
- Nishida 1975 — Nishida Tatsuo 西田龍雄. *Seika-bun Kegoṅkyō* [The Hsi-Hsia *Avataṃsaka Sūtra*] 西夏文華嚴經. Vol. I. Kyoto, 1975.
- Shōgaito 2008 — Shōgaito Masahiro 庄垣内正弘. *Uiguru-bun Abidaruma ronsho no bunken-gaku-teki kenkyū* [Uighur Abhidharma Texts: A Philological Study] ウイグル文アビダルマ論書の文献學的研究. Kyoto, 2008.