

## On the Xixia Version of the Lotus Sutra<sup>1</sup>

Tatsuo Nishida

### *Xixia Studies and the Lotus Sutra*

IT is widely known that M. G. Morisse made a great contribution to Xixia language studies at the beginning of the 20th century with his study of the Xixia Lotus Sutra, *Contribution préliminaire à l'étude de l'écriture et de la langue Si-hia*, Paris, 1904. He obtained in Beijing three volumes of the Lotus Sutra, which became the object of his study. They were part of a fine manuscript of chrysography on blue paper. While modern persons first found good Xixia material in wall inscriptions at Juyong-guan 居庸關, it was in this text of the Lotus Sutra that they encountered a considerable amount of scripture. It was three years before P. K. Kozlov excavated a great wealth of Xixia documents at Khara-Khoto. Thus, Morisse's encounter with the Lotus Sutra has great significance in the history of Xixia studies. It should also be noted why studies of the Xixia Lotus Sutra have shown little progress ever since Luo Fucheng's 羅福成 study, the *Xixia yi Lianhua jing kaoshi* 《西夏譯蓮華經考釋》 (Study of the Xixia Translation of the Lotus Sutra Annotated with the Chinese Text), (Kyoto, 1914), was published. One reason is that the Xixia version of the Lotus Sutra has difficult linguistic features which must be deciphered in reference to the Chinese version. In short, compared to other sutras, the Xixia Lotus Sutra is more difficult to understand and contains many grammatical expressions that are not easily analyzed. Fortunately, however, today such difficulties are being solved and experts are able to engage in the study of this text. Incidentally, a total of eight volumes of the text including the three that were formerly owned by Morisse are now separately kept at the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin (juan 1, 3, 4, 5 and 7) and the Musée National des Arts Asiatiques Guimet in Paris (juan 2, 6 and 8).

### *The Creation of Xixia Characters and the Establishment of the Written Xixia Language*

The public authorization of Xixia characters in 1036 is recorded in the Chinese history books, including *Songshi Xiaguo chuan* 《宋史夏國傳》,

and is well-known in the academic world. While the promulgation of Xixia characters of course deserves consideration, I would like to pay more attention to the fact that the written Xixia language (language for writing) was established.

Li Yuanhao 李元昊, the first emperor of the Xixia, declared in 1036 that the nation would write the Xixia language in Xixia characters, replacing the Chinese language written in Chinese characters. It can be understood that he first authorized Xixia as the official language of the Xixia state, and then created Xixia characters to write the Xixia language replacing Chinese characters. This suggests an important change of perspective for contemporary Xixia scholars, from an emphasis on the creation of new characters to that of a new written language. In actuality, the Xixia people celebrated the birth of a new written language rather than simply that of their new characters.

Which Tangut dialect became the prototypal basis for the written Xixia language? And which dialect became the standard of the language? There are no simple answers to these questions. It can be surmised that the letter form of Xixia characters registered in the lexicons in the lineage of the *Tongyin* 《同音》 (or its prototype) was recognized as the standard. I first assumed that, as the Xixia was a multiethnic state and was inhabited by many kinds of ethnic groups, they created ideograms that describe semantic units transcending the difference of these ethnic languages, and thus they initiated their written language with their new ideograms. As the realities of the Xixia language were being clarified, I decided that my assumption was incorrect and that Xixia must have been a written language based on colloquialisms of the Mi and, in some cases, of the Minyak that were major ethnic groups composing the Xixia state. The most convincing evidence for this assumption is the fact that there are distinctions between level-tone and rising-tone characters. It can be surmised that the written Xixia language was created based on these colloquialisms owing to the fact that the contrast between the two (level and rising) tones plays a great role in determining how the character is written. I briefly explain how level-tone and rising-tone characters are distinguished according to various conditions.

𗰱 s<sup>w</sup>ɿ (level) and 𗰲 s<sup>w</sup>ɿ (rising) interrogative pronoun “who” WrT\* *su*  
 𗰳 thaɸi (level) and 𗰴 thaɸi (rising) demonstrative pronoun “it, that” WrT *de*  
 \*written Tibetan

The two level-tone characters bear the function of nominative and the other two rising-tone characters the function of oblique. This phenomenon corresponds to that of the Tibeto-Burman languages (e.g., Burmese<sup>2</sup>). I named these characters with similar forms bearing different

grammatical functions “twin characters” 雙生字. I proposed this in my paper presented at the Japan-China Joint Writing Culture Conference 日中合同文字文化研討會 in Shenyang in 1997.<sup>3</sup> Among Xixia ideograms are many twin characters that were created in consideration of close semantic and functional relationships between the twins. Even “double twin characters” (quadruple characters) were created (e.g., “to acquire” and “to hate”). Some twin characters with different tones bear the contrast between noun and verb. Examples:

𠄎 ʔyi (level) “saying”	𠄎 ʔyi (rising) “to say”
𠄎 ɛi (level) “boots”	𠄎 ɛi (rising) “to put on boots”
𠄎 ndɬr (level) “enemy”	𠄎 ndɬr (rising) “to compete”
𠄎 žu (level) “shackles”	𠄎 žu (rising) “to shackle”

There are not a few sets of Xixia-Chinese twin characters in which one is indigenous words and the other borrowed words. Example:

𠄎 ndʷɸfi (level) “to know”	𠄎 tʃi (rising) “to know” (borrowing from Chinese)
----------------------------	---

The contrast between the tones helps distinguish the difference of meaning as in the following case:

𠄎 ndɔfi (level) “snake poison”	𠄎 ndɔfi (rising) “grass poison”
--------------------------------	---------------------------------

In the Lotus Sutra, the latter is solely used.

### *Translation of Buddhist Scriptures: Simple Style and Complex Style*

With the promulgation of Xixia characters, the written Xixia language was devised. Soon afterward, Li Yuanhao started the project of translating Buddhist scriptures. This written language would be elaborated on for the next 200 years, and to that process the translation of Buddhist scriptures and Chinese classics contributed greatly. There is great variation in the writing style of extant Xixia documents, and so judging the standard style is difficult. I tentatively classified the documents into two main groups, which I named “simple style” and “complex style.” The *Huayan jing* 《華嚴經》 (Avataṃsaka-sūtra) is a representative of the former and the Lotus Sutra the latter.

### *On the Preface of the Lotus Sutra*

Two kinds of preface of the Xixia version of the Lotus Sutra are extant. One is the *Miaofa lianhua jing hongchuan xu* 妙法蓮華經弘傳序 in the text from the Morisse collection, which is a very faithful translation of the Chinese preface to the Song version [of the Chinese text], though not a word-for-word translation. The other is the preface to the text from the

Kozlov collection, which is an original writing by a Tangut author. Besides these two, there is the preface [in Chinese] to the Hexi version of the [Xixia] Lotus Sutra 《河西本法華經》, which was not translated into Xixia.

From the preface to the Kozlov collection text we know the following:

(1) In the reign of the Emperor Fengjiaocheng 風角城皇帝 (Li Yuanhao), Xixia characters were created and a great many scriptures were translated.

(2) The Lotus Sutra was not included among the Xixia versions of the scriptures translated in the earliest period.

(3) The Lotus Sutra belongs to the next stage of the translation project.

(4) The Lotus Sutra was translated at the wish of “the present Sacred Mother and Child” 聖母子 (Empress Dowager and Emperor) who succeeded the throne and believed in Buddhism.

(5) The printing of the Lotus Sutra was soon completed and copies were distributed in the country.

“The present Sacred Mother and Child” are probably Hui Zong 惠宗 and the Empress Dowager, née Liang 皇太后梁氏, whose names accord with those of the translators at the beginning of the printed edition in the Kozlov collection (juan 1–8). Roughly speaking, this Lotus Sutra can be supposed to have been translated into Xixia in the middle of the 11th century (1068–1085),<sup>4</sup> as the Empress Dowager died in 1085. As the Xixia manuscript (juan 6) from the Kozlov collection has the description of “edited by Ren Zong” 仁宗, it must have been copied about the middle of the 12th century, a little later than the edition in the 11th century.

The extant Xixia versions of the Lotus Sutra, both from Morisse and Kozlov collections, are retranlations from the *Miaofa lianhua jing* 《妙法蓮華經》 by Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什; they are not translations from the *Tianpin Miaofa lianhua jing* 《添品妙法蓮華經》.<sup>5</sup>

#### *Collation of the Texts and the Characteristics of Morisse's Text*

Future studies of Xixia Buddhist scriptures require, first of all, the collation of the extant texts. Concerning the Lotus Sutra, we need to carry out a detailed collation of Kozlov's and Morisse's texts. Morisse's text is clearly a copy from a later period. As I have no copy of it at hand, I was unable to collate them. However, from the notes I had taken previously it is apparent that there are considerable differences in the transliteration of *dhāraṇīs*. In general, Morisse's text reflects phonetic changes of Xixia itself and tries to imitate the original Sanskrit sound (probably in

reference to Tibetan monks' readings), thus improving the transliteration. The following are examples of the texts' characteristics.

- (1) Skt. dhāraṇī 陀羅尼 Kozlov's text 𑖑𑖦𑖫𑖱𑖦𑖱𑖦𑖱  
Morisse's text 𑖑𑖦𑖫𑖱𑖦𑖱𑖦𑖱 *long* ramifi

While the translated form of the word in Kozlov's text is a fixed term appearing in many scriptures, the form in Morisse's text has an indication of long vowel.

- (2) Skt. dharma 達磨 Kozlov's text 𑖑𑖦𑖫𑖱𑖦𑖱𑖦𑖱  
Morisse's text 𑖑𑖦𑖫𑖱𑖦𑖱𑖦𑖱 *nda*hirirmafi

While the translated form of the word in Kozlov's text is a fixed term like in Zen/Chan scriptures, in Morisse's text a portion of character indicating by *-r-* is inserted.

(3) In Morisse's text, each of the final consonants of Sanskrit words, -ŋ -n -k, is described with a Xixia character. Every syllable of the Xixia language at the time ends with a vowel and final consonants disappear or are assimilated with the precedent vowel by nasalization. In Morisse's text, the final consonant is indicated by one particular character.

	Kozlov's text	Morisse's text
羶 shan	𑖑𑖦𑖫𑖱𑖦𑖱𑖦𑖱	𑖑𑖦𑖫𑖱𑖦𑖱𑖦𑖱
僧 saṃ (gha)	𑖑𑖦𑖫𑖱𑖦𑖱𑖦𑖱	𑖑𑖦𑖫𑖱𑖦𑖱𑖦𑖱
目 muk	𑖑𑖦𑖫𑖱𑖦𑖱𑖦𑖱	𑖑𑖦𑖫𑖱𑖦𑖱𑖦𑖱

(4) As the double consonant *kṣ-* in Sanskrit is transliterated into Chinese as one character beginning with the consonant *tsh-* or *kh-*, Kozlov's text follows the same method. On the other hand, in Morisse's text two characters are applied to describe the sound of the original.

	Kozlov's text	Morisse's text
kṣa 叉	𑖑𑖦𑖫𑖱𑖦𑖱𑖦𑖱	𑖑𑖦𑖫𑖱𑖦𑖱𑖦𑖱
kṣi 耆	𑖑𑖦𑖫𑖱𑖦𑖱𑖦𑖱	𑖑𑖦𑖫𑖱𑖦𑖱𑖦𑖱

In the same manner, Morisse's text uses 𑖑𑖦𑖫𑖱𑖦𑖱𑖦𑖱 *tirar* for *ṭr-* in Sanskrit. The method of transliteration in Morisse's text almost accords with that in the *Jingguangming zuishengwang jing* 《金光明最勝王經》 (*suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra*) and Yuan-period wall inscriptions at Juyong-guan. This indicates that an innovation was undertaken to transliterate Sanskrit sounds more precisely in the process of Xixia translation.

Incidentally, while Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什, the translator of the Lotus Sutra in Chinese, is transliterated as 𑖑𑖦𑖫𑖱𑖦𑖱𑖦𑖱 *kīəwmɔfɩɔfɩšir* in both Kozlov's and Morisse's texts, in the preface to Morisse's text, namely the "Miaofa lianhua jing hongchuan xu" 妙法蓮華經弘傳序 (by Tang Zhongnanshan Shi Daoxuan, 唐終南山釋道宣述), it was rendered as 𑖑𑖦𑖫𑖱𑖦𑖱𑖦𑖱 *kīafɩmafɩlīasīlīa*.

*On the Xixia Version of the Lotus Sutra*

Though the Xixia version of the Lotus Sutra is a faithful translation of the Chinese version, it has been rendered nonliterally, in a way appropriate to an understanding of the content. On close observation, one finds many differences between the Chinese and the Xixia versions. For example, the Chinese version of “The Life Span of the Thus Come One” chapter 如來壽量品 (16) of juan 6 has the passage of four characters “導利衆生” ([I have] led and benefited living beings), but it is rendered with 12 characters in the Xixia version.

## B

禿輶躄徧禿穉穉穉穉穉穉

[living beings] [have led, taught] [benefit and gain] [have made] [I]

(I have led [and] taught living beings [and] made [their] benefit and gain.)

The Chinese *dao* 導 and *li* 利 are respectively translated into two-syllable Xixia words, corresponding to the Chinese equivalents *daojiao* 導教 and *liyi* 利益. The main verb “make” has a B-stem form and this passage is an agent’s view sentence with a first-person pronominal affix. (To be discussed in detail later. See pp. 117–118.) Because such sentences are frequently used, the text is classified as “complex style.” Two prefixes precede verb stems. One of them may be a superfluous letter.<sup>6</sup>

Another example is a passage from “Simile and Parable” chapter 譬喻品 (3) of juan 2:

生受楚毒 死被瓦石

(in life undergoing torment and hardship, in death buried beneath tiles and stones)

穉穉穉穉 穉穉穉穉

[during life time] [undergoing torment] [on the corpse others do harm]

(during life time undergoing torment, on the corpse others do harm)

Though each version is a four-character two-phrase verse, the Xixia version is described in a different manner from the Chinese and is easier to understand than the other. In the same [chapter and] juan, the Chinese phrase 或時致死 (sometimes to the point of death) is translated as 穉穉穉穉 (or reaching [the point of] death), which is a case of literal translation. Besides this, there is another rendering of 穉穉穉穉 (or reaching [the point of] life), which is a well-considered rendering.

*Xixia Translation of Buddhist Terms*

The study of Buddhist terms in Xixia has not been undertaken satisfactorily. It is still very much in its infancy. Lexicons equivalent to the *Fanyi mingyi ji* 《翻譯名義集》 (*Mahāvīyutpatti*) have not been edited.

Regarding Xixia Buddhist vocabularies, words of literal and nonliteral translation from Chinese are dominant, supplemented by those of literal and nonliteral translation from Tibetan. Though the national authority in charge of translation was established, it is surmised that it did not attempt to standardize translated terms. Therefore, for 世尊 (*shizun*) is used as a translation from the Chinese version, and 壤有渡 (*bcom-ldan-'das*) is used from the Tibetan. For 比丘 (*biqu*), 毘芻 (*phifkhāw*) and 善起 (*niew-šoh*) (*dge-slong*) are used respectively. If one sees the translated word, it is apparent whether the original text was Chinese or Tibetan.

However, even if a certain text is a translation from Chinese, the Buddhist terms included are not necessarily standardized. Regarding the term *biqu* 比丘, in the *Fo benxing ji jing* 《佛本行集經》 and other scriptures 毘芻 *phifhtš'ü* is used, reflecting a variant pronunciation in Chinese. The word *yecha* 夜叉 (Skt. *yakṣa*) is transliterated as 𑖦𑖪𑖫𑖬 in the Lotus Sutra; and 𑖦𑖪𑖫𑖬 *'atsha* in the *Huayan jing* 《華嚴經》. (In the *Fo benxing ji jing*, 𑖦𑖪𑖫𑖬 *'akhafi* is used. Regarding *luocha* 羅刹 (Skt. *rākṣasa*), in the *Fo benxing ji jing* it is transliterated as 𑖦𑖪𑖫𑖬 *rarkhafi*, and in the Lotus Sutra as 𑖦𑖪𑖫𑖬 *lōhtšha*.) On the other hand, as is the case of the word *rulai* 如来 鋒巖, literally translated words from Tibetan are adopted as fixed terms and commonly used in texts translated from Chinese. This word is transliterated from *yang-dag gsheg-pa*, a term that appears in the old Tibetan translations.<sup>7</sup> Though further study is required, the translation vocabulary in the Lotus Sutra may be regarded as one of the standardized terminologies.

### *Distinction between Common and Buddhist Terms*

It can be said that, despite the difficulty of the teachings, expressions in Buddhist scriptures were translated so as to be understandable to the common people, and thus the Xixia version of the Lotus Sutra has some colloquial forms. The problem is how to distinguish colloquial forms from others. I would like to assume that the vocabulary registered in the *Fanhan heshi zhangzhong zhu* 《番漢合時掌中珠》, a collection of Xixia-Chinese words and phrase examples, is basically colloquial. And it may be thought that word forms in the *Tongyin* 《同音》 lexicon were generally used. I assume that concordance with the vocabularies in these two books is a criterion for colloquialism. For example, let me take an example of the word *xiedai* 懈怠 (Skt. *kausīdya*). The Lotus Sutra's juan 4 (chapter 8) has an example in the passage “雖小欲懈怠” (limited in aspiration, lazy and indolent though [the multitudes are]), which is translated in Xixia as “𑖦𑖪𑖫𑖬 𑖦𑖪𑖫𑖬” (slightly lazy and indolent though

[the multitudes are]). The two last Xixia characters 𪛗𪛘 *lon-tɛ* are equivalent to the Chinese *xiedai* 懈怠. The same character form appears in other parts of the Lotus Sutra, such as chapter 1 (Introduction) and in the *Qifo bapusa tuoluoni jing* 《七佛八菩薩陀羅尼經》. However, in the *Da Baoji jing* 《大寶積經》 a different form, 𪛗𪛙 *lon-l<sup>w</sup>i*, is used, which is a variant translation of *xiedai* 懈怠. If one consults with the *Fanhan heshi zhangzhong zhu* 《番漢合時掌中珠》 and the *Tongyin* 《同音》 lexicon, the entry is 𪛗𪛙 *lon-l<sup>w</sup>i*, so *lon-l<sup>w</sup>i* may have been regarded as a common term and colloquial. Thus, *lon-tɛ* is assumed to have been a Buddhist term. (Cf., WrT: *snyom-las, le-lo*)

When one see names of things like musical instruments, Xixia equivalents for the Chinese *jinse* 琴瑟, *konghou* 箏篋 and *xiaodi* 蕭笛 appearing in the Lotus Sutra are different from those in the *Fanhan heshi zhangzhong zhu*. In a nutshell, this case shows that these examples in the Lotus Sutra do not accord with colloquial forms.

	琴瑟	箏篋	蕭	笛
Lotus Sutra	𪛗𪛗	𪛗𪛗𪛗	𪛗𪛗	𪛗𪛗
<i>Zhangzhong zhu</i>	(琴) 𪛗𪛗	𪛗𪛗 (鶴琴)	𪛗𪛗 (管)	𪛗𪛗

The word *konghou* 箏篋 in the Lotus Sutra is translated as the Xixia equivalent of the Chinese word *liuxian* 六絃 in the *Fanhan heshi zhangzhong zhu*. This suggests that the translator might have employed the name of the then-fashionable musical instrument. The Xixia equivalent of the Chinese *xiao* 蕭 in the Lotus Sutra can be literally translated as “long flute”; and that of *di* 笛 as “transverse flute.” However, Xixia words for *konghou* 箏篋 and *xiaodi* 蕭笛 in the Lotus Sutra, juan 6 (chapter 17), are phonetic copies from the Chinese:

蕭笛 ( <i>xiaodi</i> )	𪛗𪛗	<i>səwθhif</i>
箏篋 ( <i>konghou</i> )	𪛗𪛗	<i>khonxəw</i>

Incidentally, in the *Fanhan heshi zhangzhong zhu*, *xiao* 蕭 is interpreted as 𪛗𪛗 (parallel flute).

With regard to the seven treasures, the Lotus Sutra and the *Fanhan heshi zhangzhong zhu* have same Xixia translations for *jin* 金 (gold), *yin* 銀 (silver), *liuli* 瑠璃 (lapis lazuli), *shanhu* 珊瑚 (coral) and *hupo* 琥珀 (amber), but they are different for *manao* 瑪瑙 (agate):

Lotus Sutra	𪛗𪛗
<i>Zhangzhong zhu</i>	𪛗𪛗

The Lotus Sutra’s *n<sup>w</sup>ik<sup>w</sup>i* (speckled gem) is a nonliteral translation



while the *Zhangzhong zhu*'s  $\eta\text{gefn}\text{ɔf}$  is a combination of Xixia,  $\eta\text{gefn}$  (horse's), and a phonetic representation of the Chinese equivalent,  $\text{ɔf}$  (瑙 *nao*).

*Agent's View Sentence and Patient-beneficiary's View Sentence*

I would like to explain the two sentence patterns I propose: the agent's view sentence and the patient-beneficiary's view sentence. I had long referred to this idea, and I formally named these sentence patterns in 1998.<sup>8</sup> I think that this is not only to a problem concerning sentence patterns of the Lotus Sutra but also an important issue for the progress of Xixia studies as a whole.

Earlier, I gave an example of the agent's view sentence (see p. 114), and will present some examples of the patient-beneficiary's view sentence:

A  
□ 鞞 鞞 鞞 鞞 鞞 鞞 鞞

[whatever wants] [to me] [give] [saying] (Saying, "Give me whatever wants.")

(Affix pronoun's corresponding case "to me" is not specified.)

A  
鞞 鞞 鞞 鞞 鞞 鞞 鞞 鞞

[me] [from the great fear] [make liberate] [me] (Make liberate from the great fear, [make] me [liberate].)

(Affix pronoun's corresponding case "me" is specified.)

Xixia verbs have inflection. A-form (basic stem) and B-form (inflecting stem) verbal stems determine the case, namely the corresponding case, of the affix pronoun that follows at the end of the sentence. Though there is no other Tibeto-Burman language today that has exactly the same pattern of corresponding relation as this, an example of one very proximal has been recently reported. It is the Yelong dialect of the Tibetan language. The following are examples:

①  $\eta\text{ə}^{55} \text{ji}^{55} \text{ai}^{55} \text{-ti}^{33} \text{ydo-}\eta^{55}$  [I] [him] [strike] [I] (I strike him, I)

②  $\text{ni}^{55} \text{ji}^{55} \eta\text{o}^{55} \text{ydo-}\eta^{33}$  [you] [me] [strike] [me] (Affix pronoun's corresponding case "me" is specified.)

① is a agent's view sentence while ② is a patient-beneficiary's view sentence. ① and ② are distinguished regarding the following two points: that in ① the object has  $\text{-ti}^{33}$  attached and in ② the object has nothing

attached; and that in ① the tone of the affix pronoun is type 55 and in ② type 33. Though the verbal stems of ① and ② are now the same form  $\gamma$ do- (a word derived from the same origin with WrT *rdung-pa* “to strike”), I am inclined to think that the Yelong verb might have inflected as the Xixia.<sup>9</sup>

The Yelong dialect is exactly a form of Tibetan that lost the distinction between A- and B-forms of verbal stems. Therefore, it can be said that Xixia represents a stage of development of the Tibeto-Burman languages, as it records the distinction between the two forms of verbal stems.

### *Forms of Xixia Verbs*

Before the 11th century, Xixia verbs had the same inflection system as Tibetan (three tenses and one mood). Toward the beginning of the 11th century, verbal stem forms had disappeared (the estimated percentage is approximately 20 percent) except for verbs holding A- and B-forms. But I think it is possible to restore verbal forms of the earlier stages. For example, it may be surmised that each of the following sets was member of the respective verbs' inflections:<sup>10</sup>

𣎵 žu and 𣎵 žu “to wash”; 𣎵 k<sup>w</sup>ir and 𣎵 kiər “to steal”; 𣎵 phi and 𣎵 phiŋ “to throw away”; and 𣎵 si and 𣎵 siŋ “to die”

### *Secrets of the Xixia Language behind Xixia Characters*

Due to its description in Xixia characters, the morphology of the Xixia language had long been hidden behind the ideographic enigma. As its phonetic system has been restored, gradually it has become apparent that this is a language of many variations. But its real aspects still remain difficult to grasp. For example, 𣎵 ndi<sup>o</sup>yar “to be tired from” and 𣎵 ndu<sup>o</sup>yar “to feel weary of” are used in the Lotus Sutra. Either of the first syllabic main verbs must be a variant.

Also, 𣎵 dzefi- “another country” (余国) and 𣎵 tsefi- “other country” (他国) are examples indicating that the difference between voiced and voiceless initial consonants bears particular meanings. Thus, when detailed examination of the Lotus Sutra text is carried out, one will find that the text addresses many of the problems in Xixia studies and should be considered extensively.

### Notes

<sup>1</sup> This paper is a revised edition of the draft I delivered at the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences, on September 18,

2001. I would like to express my deepest appreciation to Prof. E. I. Kychanov, [then] director of the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, Prof. Y. A. Petrosyan, Dr. E. A. Rezvan, Dr. M. I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya and Dr. Yoichi Kawada, director of the Institute of Oriental Philosophy, Mr. Yoshinori Miyagawa and Ms. Yuko Sato.

<sup>2</sup> See Tatsuo Nishida, “Seika moji shinkō” 「西夏文字新考」 (A New Study of the Xixia Writing System), *Tōhō Gakkai sōritsu gojussūnen kinen Tōhōgaku ronshū* 『東方学会創立五十周年記念 東方学論集』 (Eastern Studies: Fiftieth Anniversary Volume), The Tōhō Gakkai, 1997.

<sup>3</sup> Nishida, “Seika moji no tokusei—sono moji soshiki no kenkyū” 「西夏文字の特性—その文字組織の研究」 (Characteristics of Xixia Scripts—A Study of the Xixia Writing System), 『日中合同文字文化研討會發表論文集』 (Collected Papers Presented at the Japan-China Joint Writing Culture Conference), Moji Bunka Kenkyusho 文字文化研究所 and Liaoning Museum 遼寧博物館, 1998.

<sup>4</sup> Prof. Shi Jinbo, a Xixia scholar in China, presumes that this Lotus Sutra text was completed in 1049–1069, the reign of Yi Zong 毅宗, the second Xixia emperor. (*Xixia Fojiao shilüe* 《西夏佛教史略》 [A Brief History of Xixia Buddhism], 1988). However, regarding the specified name in the printed Xixia edition (juan 2–6) of Daming Huangdi 大明皇帝 as Hui Zong 惠宗, I would presume that this Xixia Lotus Sutra text was completed in the reign of Hui Zong, the third Xixia emperor, and his mother, the Empress Dowager, née Liang 皇太后梁氏, which roughly falls upon 1068–1085.

<sup>5</sup> Regarding Xixia Buddhist scriptures, see Nishida, “Seikago Butten mokuroku hensan jō no shomondai” 「西夏語仏典目録編纂上の諸問題」 (Problems of Compiling Catalogues of Xixia Buddhist Scriptures), Introduction, E. I. Kychanov, *Katalog Tanguskikh Buddyiskikh Pamyatnikov*, Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Letters, Kyoto University, 1999.

<sup>6</sup> Afterward, as I found it occurs not a few times, I came to think of this not as a superfluous letter but a newly revived prefix that indicates direction. See Nishida, “Seikago kenkyū no shin ryōiki” 「西夏語研究の新領域」 (New Developments in the Study of Xixia Language), *Tōhōgaku* 『東方学』 (*Eastern Studies*), no. 104, 2002.

<sup>7</sup> See Nishida’s paper referred to in note 5.

<sup>8</sup> Nishida, “Seikago kenkyū zakkō” 「西夏語研究雜考」 (A Miscellaneous Study of the Xixia Language), *Seikago kenkyū shinron* 『西夏語研究新論』 (New Studies of the Xixia Language), ed., Koki Kinen-kai 古稀記念会 (Society for the Commemoration of the 70th Birthday of Prof T. Nishida), 1998.

<sup>9</sup> This language is now spoken by 450 persons in Zhoushan qu, Abazhou Jinchuan xian, Sichuan sheng 四川省阿壩州金川縣周山區, and has been authorized as a dialect of Tibetan. My reference to the forms of the Yelong dialect is from Yin Weibin 尹蔚彬, “Yelong yu gaikuang” 業隆語概況 (Outline of the Yelong Language), *Minzu yuwen* 《民族語文》 (Minority Languages of China), 6 qi, 2000.

<sup>10</sup> Though many examples of this kind can be found, sufficient consideration is required in the future because it is surmised that the regular sound correspondence of them may reflect the contrast among tribal languages. (It may lead to the possibility that the minute sound distinction referred to as “level 97 rhymes—rising 86 rhymes” 平声97韻—上声86韻 in *Wenhai* 《文海》 and *Wenhai zalei* 《文海雜類》 may include the contrast among tribal languages.)

### Additional Notes

1. In this paper, I referred to the writing style of the *Huayan jing* 《華嚴經》 “simple style.” Its writing style is not only pseudo-Chinese but also a representative of literal translations close to the early word-to-word rendering style. On the other hand, the “complex style” of the Lotus Sutra is much more elaborate, written in an age of development approaching its height. I assume that the style contains ample agent’s view sentences, fully reflecting colloquialism. The written Xixia language had developed remarkably some 30 years after the promulgation of Xixia characters in 1036.

2. Recently, I decided to refer to all tribal colloquialisms before the establishment of the Xixia language as Tangut (党項羌語 [Dangxiang Qiang yu], 西番語 [Xifan yu] (?)), and I came to think that Xixia characters were devised to impartially describe the characteristics of each tribe’s language. (See Nishida, *Ajia kodai moji no kaidoku* 『アジア古代文字の解説』 (Deciphering Asia’s Ancient Scripts), Chūkō Bunko 中公文庫, B7–20, 2002, fuki 付記 (postscript).)

\*The Chinese text of Kumārajīva’s translation of the Lotus Sutra herein referred to is from Yukio Sakamoto and Yutaka Iwamoto, translated and annotated, *Hokekyō* 『法華經』 vols. 1–3, Iwanami Bunko 岩波文庫 and its English translation from Burton Watson, *The Lotus Sutra*, Columbia University Press, 1993.

†Xixia characters herein used are the fonts created by the Mojikyo Institute.

### Additional Remarks

I recently heard that the Xixia text of the Lotus Sutra once kept at the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin had now been lost. If that is the case, it is very regrettable. Fortunately, however, as I have photographs of the beginning portion of each juan of the text formerly owned by Morisse, I would like to introduce the outline of each (i.e., chapter 1, juan 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8).

Before the title of chapter 1 is a four-fold illustration of Buddha’s sermon, on the extreme right of which is written the general title, “Illustrations of the Lotus Sutra of the Wonderful Law” (妙法蓮華經變相), in outline-style Xixia characters. (This form isn’t used in other documents except for *chiran mapai* 勅燃馬牌, the copper-passes of horse-rider messengers.)

In the illustration of Buddha’s sermon, the center is occupied by Śākyamuni Buddha, and symmetrically arrayed on either side are the Buddhas of the ten directions, the Four Heavenly Kings and the Eight Dragon Kings. In addition, on the right are Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī, Bodhisattva Gadgadasvara and kimnaras, and on the left are Bodhisattva Samantabhadra, Brahmadevapura and garuḍas. At the top on the extreme left stands the Many Treasured Stupa. Attached to each is a label in Xixia characters outlined by a border. Juan 2 and the following juan are each preceded by two-fold drawings, the first fold of which is identical. At the top right of the second folio in juan 2 is a caption that reads, “the second illustration” (第二變相); other juan are labeled “the third illustration” (第三變相) to “the eighth illustration” (第八變相), respectively; each caption is positioned at the top right of the first fold and outlined by a border (those in juan 4, 7 and 8 have double-line borders).

In chapter 1, after the title, “Introduction to the Lotus Sutra of the Wonderful Law” (妙法蓮華經序) is written the following [translated literally from Xixia into Chinese by the present writer]:

樞密西攝大恒曆院正賜藝弘武孝恭敬

東南姓官上國柱 王長信 造\*

Shumi (primary [government] council [minister]), Xishe, Daheng li yuan (department), Zhengci Yiguang Wuxiao gongjing

dongnan xingguan shangguozhu (status), Wang Changxin (name) made

The title of each juan is followed by two lines of Xixia characters [translated literally from Xixia into Chinese by the present writer]:

姚秦三藏法師 鳩摩羅什 漢譯

今上皇帝 奉詔 再校正

Yao Qin Tripiṭaka Dharma Master Kumārajīva translated into Chinese,

His Majesty the Present Emperor issued an imperial edict to proofread again

Each juan has an identical format, but there are no clues as to which emperor the “Present Emperor” (Jinshang Huangdi, 今上皇帝) indicates. The date of the production seems to be during a late period.

\*The translation into Chinese follows Shi Jinbo 史金波 except for several points which I revised. Xishe (西攝) is one of Xixia’s six Shumi (樞密; primary [government] council ministers). The fifth, sixth and seventh characters can be literally translated as “Liben si” (礼本司) or “Ligen si” (礼根司), but the *Fanhan heshi zhangzhong zhu* 《番漢合時掌中珠》 gives the translation of “Daheng li yuan” (大恒曆院), which I have adopted. The Daheng li yuan is listed as one of the four Zhongdeng si (中等司, middle-class departments) in the *Tiansheng jiugai xinding liling* 《天盛舊改新定律令》 juan 10, but the details about what kind of office this was are unclear. Shi Jinbo translates this as “Dianli si” (典礼司, ceremony department), which I do not adopt as it is uncertain. (《西夏佛教史》 p. 236). It corresponds to the rank described as “(Wen) Wugong dongnan xingguan shangguozhu” ((文)武恭東南姓官上國柱) in the *Guanje fenghao biao* (官階封號表, official rank list) of the Xixia state. (See 史金波 “西夏文《官階封號表》考釋” p. 262; 《中國民族古文字研究》(第三輯), 天津古籍出版社, 1991).

Though Shi Jinbo reads the name appearing at the end as “Wang Puxin” (旺普信), I revise it as “Wang Changxin made” (王長信 造). The second character is not 𐰇 pīufu (上声三韻) but 𐰇 rzir (上声七十二韻). Incidentally, according to the *Tiansheng jiugai xinding liling* 《天盛舊改新定律令》, there were five classifications of official rank in the Xixia state during the Tiansheng era (天盛年間): Shangdeng (上等, first class), Cideng (次等, second class), Zhongdeng (中等, middle class), Xiadeng (下等, low class) and Modeng (末等, lowest class); and Shumi (樞密) belonged to the first-class departments and Daheng li yuan (大恒曆院) to the middle-class departments. (史金波、聶鴻音、白浜譯注《中華傳世法典〈天盛改舊新定律令〉》北京·法律出版社, 2000).