Multilingualism in Tun-huang

TAKATA Tokio

PREAMBLE:

TUN-HUANG AS A COLONIAL TOWN OF THE HAN-CHINESE

Today’s Tun-huang 敦煌 known as Sha-chou 沙州 during the T’ang 唐 dynasty, is situated at the western extremity of the long Ho-hsi 河西 Corridor, along which a line of oases Kua-chou 瓜州 (An-hsi 安西), Su-chou 肃州 (Chiu-ch’uan 濮泉), Kan-chou 甘州 (Chang-yeh 张掖), and Liang-chou 凉州 (Wu-wei 武威) provided a route of communication with central China. This was the gateway to China for the east-west Silk Road linking China and the “Western Regions,” and it can be readily imagined that different peoples from the west, speaking a variety of Indo-Iranian languages, would have been passing through this region from early times. Tun-huang is mentioned already in Ptolemaios’ Guide to Geography under the name Θροανα and it is also referred to as δρw”n [Th”rwan] in the Sogdian “Ancient Letters” thought to have been written in the fourth century A.D.¹ and discovered in a watchtower in western Tun-huang by Sir Aurel Stein during his second expedition. It is not immediately clear from which language this place-name derives, but there is a strong possibility that the Chinese form ‘Tun-huang’ is a transcription of some local place-name in a language other than Chinese.

Originally this area had been the home of the Yüeh-chih 月氏 (Tokharians), but during the reign of the Han 漢 emperor Wen-ti 文帝 (r. 179-157 B.C.) they were subjected to attacks by the Hsiung-nu 匈奴 and forced to migrate westwards. Near the end of the second century B.C. the Han emperor Wu-ti 武帝 launched an offensive against the Hsiung-nu and not only ousted them from the Ho-hsi Corridor, but also set about actively establishing colonies in the oases of Ho-hsi, and it is recorded that during this colonizing process a commandery (chün 郡) was established at Tun-huang too. It was probably around this time that the Chinese form of the name ‘Tun-huang’ was also established. Since then this locality has indisputably remained a colonial town of the Han-Chinese, notwithstanding certain historical vicissitudes, and when the control of the central Chinese dynasty waned, it frequently became the centre of independent Han-Chinese regional administrations. Therefore, there can be no doubt that Tun-huang’s most important language was the language of the Chinese, who held a predominant position both politically and socially. In this sense the linguistic environment of Tun-huang presents a patent contrast with that of the other oasis towns of Central Asia. We will have opportunity later to consider the nature of the Chinese language spoken in Tun-huang and how it changed over the centuries.

the Ho-hsi Corridor also connected it with the oases along the Etsin Gol. These routes represented north-south branches of the main east-west route of the Silk Road, and the northern regions with which they communicated were inhabited by Altaic nomads speaking Turkic and Mongolic languages. These peoples frequently moved south along these routes, and in some instances they took up farming and settled in Ho-hsi. In addition, Tun-huang was connected with the upper reaches of the Yellow River (Huang-ho) in today’s Ch’ing-hai province, and the people of T’u-yü-hun 吐谷浑, who had built up a powerful base in this region, also had important connections with Tun-huang.

The aim of this essay is to provide an outline on the basis of the Tun-huang manuscripts of the linguistic situation that prevailed in Tun-huang, occupying as it did the geographical position described above. Because of the chronological bias of the Tun-huang manuscripts, our considerations will perforce be subject to certain limitations, and it should be pointed out at the outset that I will be focussing on the period from the T’ang dynasty onwards, including the period of rule by T’u-po 吐蕃 and the Kuei-i-Chün 歸義軍 (lit. Return-to-Allegiance Army), while the period from the second half of the eleventh century onwards, when Tun-huang came under the domination of Hsi-hsia 西夏, will be excluded altogether. Furthermore, because we are dependent on manuscript materials, there is regrettably no way of gaining an adequate grasp of the situation concerning languages other than written languages.

I. LANGUAGES FOUND IN TUN-HUANG

I-1. Sogdian

The so-called “Ancient Letters” alluded to earlier were letters written by Sogdians who had come east, and they were addressed to their masters and relatives in their hometown of Samarkand. It would thus appear that Sogdians had at an early stage established a base in Ho-hsi and were trading with China proper. According to Ikeda On, a township (hsiang) called Ts’ung-hua 從化 appears in a register of selective impositions (ch’ai-k’o) from the year T’ien-pao 天寶 10 (751), and the majority of its inhabitants were Sogdians. They seem to have been living in a walled settlement to the east of the district headquarters of Tun-huang. The origins of this settlement go back to the early T’ang, but eventually its inhabitants were engulfed by Han-Chinese society, and they are said to have all but disappeared by the second half of the eighth century, when T’u-po took control of Tun-huang. The Tun-huang manuscripts include more than fifty Sogdian manuscripts, the majority of which are Buddhist texts, and they were presumably used chiefly by Sogdian Buddhists living in the above settlement. But even though it may have lost its speakers, the Sogdian language itself did not die out completely, and it was still being used during the ninth and tenth centuries under the Return-to-Allegiance Army. This was so-called Turco-Sogdian, and it is thought to have been probably used by Uighurized Sogdians or by Uighurs whose language had been strongly influenced by Sogdian. Texts written in this language, which had undergone

---

2 Ikeda On 池田溫 "Hasseki chiyō ni okera Tonkō no Sogudōjin shuraku" 8 世紀中葉における敦煌のソグド人策落 (The Sogdian settlement in Tun-huang in the mid-8th century), in Yaraslia bunka kenkyu ユーラシア文化研究 (Studies in Eurasian culture; Sapporo, 1965), pp.49-92.

3 Pelliot sogdien 8 ends with a prayer for the transference of merit by a Sogdian with the family name K’ang 康 (X’n), thus indicating that this manuscript had not been brought to Tun-huang from Sogdiana, but was written by a Sogdian living in a Chinese milieu. In addition the Sogdian manuscripts from Tun-huang often have the corresponding Chinese title written on the back or at the end, and this too hints at the background against which these manuscripts were produced. An annotated list of the Sogdian manuscripts from Tun-huang may be found in Yoshida Yutaka 吉田隆, “Sogudogo bunken” ソグド語文獻 (Sogdian literature), in Köza Tonkō 6: Tonkō logo bunken 漢語語文獻 (Lectures on Tun-huang 6: Non-Chinese literature of Tun-huang; Tokyo, 1985), pp.187-204. As a brief, albeit slightly dated introduction to Sogdian studies in general, David A. Utz, A Survey of Buddhist Sogdian Studies (= Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica, Series Minor III; Tokyo, 1978) is useful.
Uighuric changes, include accounts, letters and jottings. It may seem strange that the Khotanese envoy Cā Kimā-śaṇi (Chang Chin-shan 張金山), who visited Tun-huang in the tenth century, should have signed his name in the Sogdian script on a Khotanese manuscript which he himself used, but this illustrates the fact that even at this time Sogdian was still being used to a certain extent.

I-2. Khotanese

Well over one hundred Khotanese manuscripts were discovered in the Library Cave at Tun-huang. These are all written in Late Khotanese, and apart from Buddhist texts they also include a considerable number of secular documents, such as diplomatic documents and reports. Khotan was a state made up chiefly of people of Iranian stock who had settled in the oases along the southern margin of the Tarim basin, and there must have been some special circumstances for the language of this distant country to have been used with such frequency in Tun-huang. The presence of Khotanese in Tun-huang can be best explained by the fact that the regime of the Return-to-Allegiance Army under the Ts’ao family, which ruled Tun-huang in the tenth century, was related by marriage to the royal house of Khotan and the two parties maintained close relations with each other. Furthermore, during the reign of the T’ang emperor Kao-tsong (r. 649-83) a governor generalship (tu-tu-fu 都督府) had been created in Khotan, with the jurisdiction name of P’i-sha 比沙 as a result of which Khotan was in effect placed under Chinese rule, and until the end of the eighth century, when it came under the sway of T’u-po, there operated over the native society an administrative system virtually identical to that of China proper. Consequently, there would have been no small number of people with Chinese blood, and the cultural traditions of China would have taken a deep hold, another circumstance that would have underpinned the links between Tun-huang and Khotan. Any embassy sent to the Chinese court by Khotan would of necessity have had to pass through Tun-huang, and during the period of rule by the Return-to-Allegiance Army under the Ts’ao not only would there have been regular embassies passing through Tun-huang, but it would have been hardly surprising had there also been a group of Khotanese, centred on a diplomatic corps, permanently stationed in Tun-huang. They would have understood Chinese to varying degrees, and the famous Chinese Buddhist text copied in Khotanese script must have been produced by people such as these. Khotanese-Chinese bilingual texts consisting of conversational phrases, thought to have been compiled for the benefit of Khotanese travelling to and from Tun-huang, have also been discovered.
I-3. Sanskrit

It is unlikely that there would have existed in Tun-huang any Sanskrit-speaking social group. However, Buddhist monks from India often stayed not only in Tun-huang but also in the oases of Ho-hsi. Especially in the early Sung 宋, when the crisis facing Buddhism on account of the inroads made by Islamic forces in northwest India coincided with the zealous encouragement of Buddhism by the Sung emperors Ta’i-tsu 太祖 and T’ai-tsung 太宗 the number of Indian monks visiting China increased still more. China was also the site of the holy mountain Wu-t’ai-shan 五臺山 sacred to the bodhisattva Mañjuśrī, and this was presumably another reason that they were drawn to China. Already in 1924 Joseph Hackin published a Sanskrit-Tibetan formulary from the Pelliot Collection, dictated in the late tenth century at Su-chou by the Indian monk Devaputra, who had in fact made a pilgrimage to Wu-t’ai-shan. These Indian monks would naturally have used Sanskrit, and it is to be supposed that there would also have been opportunities for monks at the Buddhist monasteries in Tun-huang to study Sanskrit under the tutelage of Indian monks.

In addition, it is to be surmised that sometime earlier, during the period of rule by T’u-po, the practice of studying the original Sanskrit texts of Buddhist scriptures would have been introduced to Tun-huang by Tibetan monks. Corroborative evidence of this is possibly provided by the fact that not long after its compilation in Tibet the Mahāvyutpatti seems to have reached Tun-huang, for a small fragment has been preserved on the verso side of a manuscript dating from the T’u-po period (Text 1).

With the rise in the number of Indian monks visiting China in the second half of the tenth century, it was only natural that there should have been increasing opportunities for conversing with them, and it may be assumed that in Khotan, which lay en route to China, there were many people who acted as intermediaries for them. It is for this reason that we have a Sanskrit-Khotanese bilingual text, described by Kumamoto Hiroshi as “an exercise book for Sanskrit-Khotanese conversation for the use of Central Asian travellers”. This manual appears to have been compiled in consultation with an Indian monk

11 Pelliot sanscrit 1 is a xylographic version of a Sanskrit dhārānt bearing the date “28th day, 10th month, K’ai-pao 4 (= 971)” in Chinese (開寶四年十月二十八日). Following the dhārānt there is a colophon in Sanskrit, which reads to the effect that it “was written by the instructor Guo Gila of Satyana College” (Wu Chi-yu, Quatre manuscrits sanscrits de Touen-houang”, in Contributions aux études de Touen-houang, Vol. III [Paris, 1984], p.69). According to Kao Ming-shih 高明士, “T’ang-tai Tun-huang ti chiao-yü (Education in T’ang-dynasty Tun-huang; Han-hsueh Y en-chiu 習教育研究, 4-2 [1986]), p.270, this Sanskrit colophon was written at a monastery school in Tun-huang during the period of rule by the Ts’ao-family Return-to-Allegiance Army, in which case it would offer concrete proof of the fact that Indian monks were engaged in teaching Buddhism in Tun-huang. But Kao’s interpretation is open to question, and this colophon should probably be considered to have been originally appended to the dhārānt that served as the base text of the xylograph and to have no direct connection with Tun-huang.
12 According to Giuseppe Tucci, the compilation of the Mahāvyutpatti began in 814 (The Tombs of the Tibetan Kings, = Serie Orientale Roma 1; Roma, 1950), p.18). Yamaguchi Zuiho 山口瑞雄, “Toban おくoku Būkyōshō nenai kō 吐蕃王子佛教年代考 (Notes on the chronology of the history of Buddhism in the T’u-po kingdom; Nartitasan Bukkyō Kenkyū Kiyō 成田佛山佛教研究所紀要 3 [1978]), p.17, similarly gives the date of its compilation as 814, but in id., “Nikanbon yakugo shaku kenkyū 二巻本譯語 释研究 (A study of the sGrub phyor bAMP 68 ins: 4; Nantasan Bukkyō Kenkyū Kiyō 4 [1979]), p.12, he states that it would have been “slightly earlier” than 814.
13 P. 1261 Verso. The recto of this manuscript is a Sino-Tibetan glossary of Buddhist terminology, and the Chinese terms have been taken from Hsian-tsang’s 玄奘 translation of the Yogācāra-bhāmī (Taisho No. 1579), fascs. 13-20, 31-34. But the Tibetan equivalents mostly differ from those appearing in the corresponding passages in today’s bTan-’gyur. The verso bears lists of monks and nuns given offerings at the time of special retreats, and the fragment of the Mahāvyutpatti is written in between these lists; cf. Li Fang-kuí, “A Sino-Tibetan Glossary from Tun-huang”, Ts’oung Pao 49 (1962), pp.233-356. Judging from its handwriting, the glossary on the recto represented notes belonging to the eminent monk Fa-ch’êng Fa-ch’êng seems to have himself also studied Sanskrit, and he translated a manual on Sanskrit grammar, which he used in his lectures; see Ueyama Daishun, ibid., pp.152-154, 180-182.
14 P. 5538. The recto is an official letter sent by the Khotanese king Viṣa’surà (r. 967-78) to Ts’ao Yuan-chung 曹元忠, the grand prince (ta-wang 太王) of Sha-chou (r. 944-74), and it was written in the fourth year of the Khotanese king’s reign.
actually on his way to China, and it is intriguing to note that he was headed for Wu-t’ai-shan.

I-4. Uighur

In order to secure the conditions conducive to the founding of a state based on trade, the administration of the Return-to-Allegiance Army under the Ts’ao family in the tenth century entered more than once into marital relations with the Uighurs of Kan-chou, as they had done with Khotan, and endeavoured to maintain friendly relations with the Kan-chou Uighurs. Partly because of this relationship, there were probably quite a number of Uighurs residing in Tun-huang. Furthermore, as pressure exerted by Hsi-hsia began to extend westwards in the eleventh century, a considerable number of Kan-chou Uighurs would no doubt have moved to the area around Tun-huang in the west. At the same time, the presence of migrants from the territories of the West Uighurs would also have grown to such an extent that they too could no longer be ignored. At any rate, the influence of this rapid influx of Uighurs gradually transformed the Ts’ao regime of Tun-huang into no more than a puppet government, and the Uighurs seized real control of Tun-huang. As is indicated by the fact that Ts’ai Hsien-shun 蔡賢順 who sent an embassy to the Liao 遼 in 1014, was called a “Sha-chou Uighur”, Tun-huang was now out of Chinese hands and coming under Uighur hegemony. When these historical circumstances are taken into account 16, it would seem natural to assume that the use of Uighur in Tun-huang would have increased markedly from the second half of the tenth century onwards. Its influence would have rivalled that of Chinese, and eventually it may even have surpassed that of Chinese. But although roughly fifty Uighur manuscripts were retrieved from the Library Cave, including Buddhist texts, divinatory works, aphorisms and letters 17, they are by no means numerous, and therefore it could perhaps be said that the use of the written word was still not wide-spread in Uighur society at this time. However, the manuscripts preserved in the Library Cave show a bias towards particular languages, and it is possible that the actual state of affairs was quite different. This is, therefore, a matter that is still open to conjecture, and it reflects the limitations of any attempt to reconstruct linguistic history solely on the basis of literary materials. The Tun-huang manuscripts also include a considerable number of Uighur documents from the Mongol and Yuan 元 periods discovered at a cave other than the Library Cave 18, but these I have left out of consideration here.

II. THE COEXISTENCE OF TIBETAN AND CHINESE

II-1. The Influence of the Period of Tibetan Rule

In the above we have briefly considered the use of several languages employed in Tun-huang. But if we exclude Uighur, the degree of whose influence cannot be accurately measured from extant literary remains, it is Tibetan that had a fundamental and lasting effect on the Chinese-speaking world of Tun-

16 Moriyasu Takao 森安孝夫, “Uiguru to Tonkō” ウイグルと敦煌, in Kōza Tonkō 2: Tonkō no rekishi 讲座敦煌 2 敦煌の歴史 (Lectures on Tun-huang 2: The history of Tun-huang; Tokyo, 1980), pp. 299-338.
17 The most important of these manuscripts may be found in James Hamilton, Manuscrits ouïgours du IXe-Xe siècle de Touen-houang, 2 vols. (Paris, 1986). See also Moriyasu Takao, “Uigurugo bunken” ウイグル語文獻 (Uighurica from Tun-huang), in Kōza Tonkō 6: Tonkō kogo bunken (see n. 2), pp.1-98, esp. Sect.2 “Tonko zōkyōdō shutsudo no kodai Torukogo (Uigurugo) monjo” 敦煌藏経洞出土の古代トルコ語 (ウイグル語) 文書 (Ancient Turkish [Uighur] documents unearthed from the Library Cave at Tun-huang) (pp.15-36). There is also the following work based on Hamilton’s and Moriyasu’s research: Yang Fu-hsüeh 杨福祿, Niu Ju-chi 牛汝棣, Sha-chou Hui-hu chi ch’i wen-hsien 沙州回鹘文獻 (The Sha-chou Uighurs and their literature; Lan-chou 蘭州, 1995).
18 On the Tun-huang Uighur manuscripts apart from those found in the Library Cave, see Moriyasu, “Uigurugo bunken” (see n.16), pp.3-13, 37-98.
huang. Because Tun-huang was under Tibetan military rule from 786 to 848, during this period the inhabitants of Tun-huang came unavoidably into contact with Tibetan in many different spheres of life. It can be readily imagined that, since the rulers’ language was Tibetan, there would have been many instances in which Tibetan would have had to be used at various levels of government. Interpreters would naturally have been necessary to liaise between Tibetan officials and the Chinese, and it is only natural to suppose that a rudimentary knowledge of Tibetan would gradually have spread among the Han-Chinese population of Tun-huang. It may be assumed that some knowledge of Tibetan, especially written Tibetan for drawing up administrative documents, would have been required of the Chinese employed at the Tibetan government offices. This conjecture is supported by the fact that many of the exemplars of writing practice found among the Tun-huang manuscripts from the T’u-po period correspond to the opening sections of such administrative documents. Contracts too were sometimes drawn up in Tibetan even if the signatories were Chinese, while Chinese documents were often signed and sealed in the Tibetan script.

Furthermore, as is only to be expected, Tibetan terms appear in Chinese documents from the T’u-po period. These are not limited just to words difficult to translate, such as the names of official positions, including ch’i-li-pen 乞利本 (khri dpon: ‘district official in charge of 10,000 households’) and chieh-erh 節兒 (rtse rje: ‘chief lord’), and the names of villages like Hsi-tung-sa 悉童薩 (sTong-sar) and Ho-ku-sa 葛骨薩 (rGod-sar), but also include words such as lo-i 洛易, corresponding to the Tibetan lag yig (‘finger-seal’) 21. Conversely, there also appear many — in fact, far more — Chinese terms in Tibetan documents 22. Fragments of several Tibeto-Chinese glossaries have been discovered among the Tun-huang manuscripts, and works such as these would naturally have been necessary tools for mediating between the two languages. S.2736 and S.1000, written completely in Tibetan script, and Pt.1263 (= P.ch.2762), written in Tibetan and Chinese, are already well-known 23, and so in the supplementary materials appended to this article I have included a small fragment that has hitherto received scant attention (Text 2) and a Tibeto-Chinese bilingual list of the “twelve branches” (Text 3), which would have been necessary on a daily basis for the purpose of indicating dates.

Even after Ho-hsi and Central Asia had broken free of Tibetan rule, the status of the Tibetan language in this region remained high during the ninth and tenth centuries, and it was often used as the language of diplomacy 24. Among the Khotanese-Chinese bilingual texts mentioned earlier, there is one that includes Tibetan and Chinese phrases in the same manuscript and contains Khotanese words in examples of Tibetan phrases, clear indications that this text was used by a Khotanese 25, in which case this text too could be said to demonstrate the international standing of Tibetan in the tenth century.

---

19 A detailed study of Tibetan contracts may be found in T. Takeuchi, Old Tibetan Contracts from Central Asia (Tokyo, 1995).
20 In some manuscripts the first character of 葛骨薩 is given as 个 or 佫, but in either case a character with a final in -t (< -t) has been selected (佫 was in this case an “entering-tone” [ju-sheng 入声] syllable ending in -t).
22 E.g., deb tse (果子), “an pan (模本), etc. For further examples, see F.W. Thomas, Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents concerning Chinese Turkestan, Part II (London, 1951), in which one often encounters unidentified Chinese terms.
23 On S.2736 and S.1000, see Takata, op. cit., p.195ff. Pt.1263 (= P.ch.2762V) is discussed in P. Pelliot, Histoire du Tibet (= Œuvres posthumes de Paul Pelliot, V, Paris, 1961), pp.143-144. These may all be considered to date from the period of Tibetan rule. The recto of Pt.1263 bears a text entitled “Chang Huai-shen hsiu kung-te chi” 長懷深休功德記 from the Return-to-Allegiance Army period, but the vocabulary items on the verso were written first and may be assumed to date from the period of Tibetan rule.
25 S.5212 Verso; see Takata, op.cit., p.196.
II-2. The Copying of Buddhist Scriptures

During the reign of the Tibetan ruler (btsan po) Khṛi-gtsug-lde-brtsan (r. 815-41)\(^{26}\), the copying of Buddhist scriptures was initiated on a grand scale throughout Tibet at the king’s behest, and Tun-huang, then under Tibetan rule, would have been no exception. More than one thousand civilians are thought to have been made to take part in this undertaking. The main texts copied were the Tibetan Tṣhe dpag tu med pa žhes bya ba theg pa chen po ‘i mdo (corresponding to the Sanskrit Aparimitāyur-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra), its Chinese translation (Wu-liang-shou tsung-yao ching 無量壽宗要經), the Tibetan Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa stong phrag brgya pa (Tōhoku No.8; Skt. Śatasāhasrikā-prajñā-pāramitā), and the corresponding Chinese Ta pan-po-lo-mi-to ching 大般若波羅蜜多經 (Taishō No.220) translated by Hsüan-tsang?\(^{\text{27}}\). The names of the scribe(s) and reviser(s) were usually added to the scriptures copied in this manner, and although it is only natural that the Chinese texts should have been copied by Chinese, it is notable that, judging from their names, the majority of those responsible for copying the Tibetan texts were also Chinese\(^{27}\). In view of Tun-huang’s population ratio, this was probably inevitable, but a precondition for this would have been sufficient knowledge of the Tibetan script on the part of the Chinese to be able to copy Tibetan Buddhist scriptures. Conversely speaking, many Chinese would no doubt have mastered the Tibetan script by copying these scriptures. In any case, because the Tibetan government used coercive measures to carry out this undertaking\(^{28}\), the Tibetan script would have penetrated Tun-huang’s Han-Chinese society regardless of the wishes of the Chinese themselves. When copying the Tibetan translation of the Śatasāhasrikā-prajñā-pāramitā, the scribes were able to receive an extra sheet of paper for their own use and of the same size as the paper used for copying the text. Called glegs tshas, it is not known whether this was meant to serve as an underlay or as protection from soiling or what its original purpose was, but it can be identified as such because the owner would often write, for example, “[This] is the glegs tshas of Bung Tse-weng” (bung tse-weng gi glegs tshas lagso) (Pt.1155). These glegs tshas are often inscribed with phrases from the scriptures, the opening lines of letters, loan bills, and the like, all in Tibetan, thus suggesting that the scribes used their spare time while copying to practise their writing. This indicates that they were not simply copying Tibetan graphs mechanically, but had considerable knowledge of the Tibetan language as well.

Although bearing no comparison with the scripture-copying activities conducted under government direction, the copying of scriptures also seems to have been carried out on a smaller scale at monasteries. For instance, there have survived several dozen manuscripts of the Chinese Chin-yu t’o-lo-ni ching 金有陀羅尼經 in identical format, to all of which have been appended the name of the scribe in Tibetan script. Several of these names, such as Bam Kwang (Fan Kuang), Cang Si-ka (Chang Ssu-chia 張寺吉)\(^{29}\) and Deng "Eng-tse (Teng Ying-tzu 乗英子), are also found among the scribes of either the

\(^{26}\)There are several views on the dates of his reign, and I have followed Yamaguchi, “Tobanōkoku Bukkyōshi nendai kō (see n.11), p.18ff.

\(^{27}\)On the names of the scribes, see Nishioka Soshū 西岡祖秀, "Perio shishū Chibetobun Muryōju shōyō kyō no shakyo sei, kōkansha ichiran” ベリオ蒐集チベット文『無量壽宗要經』の寫經生・校勘者一覧 list of the scribes and revisers of the Tibetan version of the Wu-liang-shou tsung-yao ching in the Pelliot Collection), Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū日本佛教敎學研究 33, No.1 (1984), pp.320-314; id., “Sashō ni okeru shakyo jigyō 沙州における寫經事業 (Scripture-copying activities in Sha-chou), in Köka Tonkō 6: Tonkō kogo bunken (see n.2), pp.379-393; Ueyama Daishun, “Toban no shakyo jigyō to Tonkō” 吐蕃の寫經事業と敦煌 (T’u-po’s scripture-copying activities and Tun-huang), in Chāgoku toshi ni rekishiteki kenkyū日本都市の歴史的研究 (Historical studies of Chinese cities [= Todaishi Kenkyūkai Hōkoku近代史研究會報告 (Reports of the Society for the Study of T’ang History)] 6); Tokyo, 1988), pp.190-198; id., Tonkō Bukkyō no kenkyu (see n.12), p.440ff.

\(^{28}\)There has survived a document relating to the organization of scripture-copying and penalties for tardiness (Ch.73, XV.5; Vol.69, fols.53-56); see Nishioka, “Sashō ni okeru shakyo jigyō” (see n.26). There also exist several quota lists.

\(^{29}\)This name is also written as 張似嘉 or 張寺嘉 and it appears frequently in Chinese documents; see Cheng Ping-lin 鄭炳琳, “K’ang Hsiu-hua hsieh-ching shih-ju shu yù Hsüan ho-shang huo-mai hu-fen li yen-chiu” 『康秀華寫經施入疏』與『朽和尚貨
Chinese or the Tibetan version of the *Aparimitāya-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra*. Moreover, five manuscripts of this scripture bear the name Sam-ke (San-chieh 三界), indicating that the copying of scriptures was also being conducted at the monastery San-chieh-ssu 三界寺 at about the same time as the government-sponsored undertaking. It is worth noting, at any rate, that in this case too the scribes signed their names in Tibetan script even when copying Chinese texts.

II-3. Monasteries

As regards Buddhism, which dominated the contemporary spiritual world, Tibetan control of the Ho-hsi region brought Tibetan Buddhism and Chinese Buddhism into direct contact with each other, and this would have been of considerable significance. In view of the social status and influence of Buddhism, one cannot ignore the influence that the study of Tibetan Buddhism and use of Tibetan in monasteries would have had on general trends. The leading scholar of Tibetan Buddhism at this time was Fa-ch’eng 法成 (Chos-grub), a Chinese whose secular surname was Wu 與. Born in Tun-huang during the T’u-po period, he was proficient in both Chinese and Tibetan and wrote many works in both languages, as well as carrying out translations into both languages. He stood at the pinnacle of Buddhist circles in Tun-huang and was granted the title of Tripitaka Master (san-tsang fa-shih 三藏法師). It is known that at least some of his disciples were familiar with Tibetan 産, and his influence also appears to have extended to the laity as well. Pt.336 is a Tibetan version of the *Cintāmani-mantra*, and according to the colophon it was “written by Chang 張 (cang) gTsug-legs (cang gtsug legs gyis bris), but in addition the Chinese characters Sung 宋 on the verso indicate that it belonged to a Chinese administrative assistant by the name of Sung.

II-4. The Formation of Bilingual Tibeto-Chinese Communities

The influence of Tibetan rule culminated in the creation of bilingual Tibeto-Chinese communities. Among the Han-Chinese of Tun-huang, there seem to have been some who were fluent not only in their native Chinese, but also in speaking, reading and writing Tibetan, and there is evidence that these “Tibetanized” Chinese formed associations or communities (she 社), although it is not clear whether the use of Tibetan motivated the formation of these associations or whether it merely happened to be convenient for the majority of their members to use Tibetan. Either way, the fact that Tibetan had penetrated to the level of the she 社, which constituted the basis of Han-Chinese local society, merits special attention.

To date two texts thought to record the codes of regulations of such associations in Tibetan have been found. One of these (Ch.73.xiii.18) lists ten members (zha myi 産), starting with their leader (zha co 社長) Dze’i-shi (Ch’i-shih 齊施?), and they would all seem to have been Chinese. Unfortunately the main part of the text is missing, and so the regulations are not clear in their entirety, but they include provisions for punishment for infringements of the rules, similar to those found in codes of regulations written in Chinese. The second such text (Pt.1103) also includes two or three names that would seem to be Chinese.


30Opinion is divided as to whether Fa-ch’eng was Chinese or Tibetan, but here I have deemed it appropriate to follow Ueyama Daishun’s convincing arguments; see Ueyama, *Tonkō Bukkyō no kenkyū* (see n.12), p.92ff.

31Notes taken by Fa-ching 法親, who attended Fa-ch’eng’s lectures, are said to contain numerous interpolations in Tibetan; see Ueyama, *ibid*., p.181.

32An amalgam of Ch. she 社 and Tib. myi ‘person’.
There also exists an association notice in Chinese, on the back of which there is a list in Tibetan of goods pooled by the members (na-tseng-li 納贈勜 (Pt.1102). This too provides supplementary evidence of the use of Tibetan in these associations.33

These Tibetan documents relating to community associations date from the period of Tibetan rule, but the bilingual Tibeto-Chinese communities created during this period appear to have continued to exist under the Return-to-Allegiance Army. This is suggested by the existence of a Tibetan manuscript pertaining to a form of onomancy known as wu-hsing 五姓 (‘five surnames’), in which surnames are classified in accordance with the five notes of the pentatonic scale, and the manuscript in question is thought to date from the tenth century (Myi’i rus pa dgu ’yim gang la gtogs pa’i mdo) 35. This form of divination based on the ‘five surnames’ would have been of no use to non-Chinese or at least people who had not undergone a considerable degree of sinicization, and it was probably used by Chinese who had come under the strong influence of the Tibetan language 36. Material such as this serves to shed light on one aspect of bilingual Tibeto-Chinese communities, and it is possible to ascertain the use of at least the Tibetan script up until the second half of the tenth century.

II-5. Tibeto-Chinese Bilingual Texts

With the increasing penetration of the Tibetan script and language in the Han-Chinese society of Tun-huang during the period of Tibetan rule, there gradually developed the practice among some Chinese of using the Tibetan script, rather than Chinese characters, to write Chinese, and this has resulted in the survival of various kinds of Chinese texts transcribed in Tibetan. Broadly speaking, these consist of the following types:


- **Songs and poems:** “Tui Ming-chu” 崔明之 on the tune of Cheng Lang-tzu tz’u 鄭郎子辭, “Yu chiang lo” 餘杭樂 on the tune of Fan lung-chou 泛龍舟, “Han-shih p’ian” 韓食篇.

- **Catechisms, etc.:** *P’u-ti T a-mo ch’an-shih kuan-men* 普提達磨禪師觀門, *Ta-ch’eng chung-tsung chien-chieh* 大乘中宗見解, “Long Scroll” (“Ch’ang-chüan” 長卷).

- **Buddhist eulogies:** *Tao-an fa-shih nien-fo tsan* 道安法師念佛撰 and eulogies contained in

---


34I was previously of the view that, because of their phonological features, the regulations in Ch.73.xiii.18 could date from the 10th century; see “Bouddhisme chinois en écriture tibétaine: Le Long Rouleau chinois et la communauté sino-tibétaine de Dunhuang”, in Bouddhisme et cultures locales, quelques cas de réciproques adaptations (Paris, 1994), p.144. However, it is in certain respects inappropriate to form such a judgement purely on the basis of phonological features, and I now believe that these regulations should after all be considered to date from the period of Tibetan rule. Accordingly I hereby wish to withdraw the view put forward in the above article.


“Long Scroll” such as Nan-tsung tsan 南宗譜 and Tz’u tao-ch’ang tsang 辭道場譜.

Primers: Multiplication table, Ts-a-ch’ao 雜抄, Ch’ien-tzu wen 千字文.

Firstly, chronologically speaking, it is worth noting that these texts were written not only during the T’u-po period, but up until the period of the Return-to-Allegiance Army under the Ts’ai in the tenth century. Among the Buddhist scriptures, there are clear differences in phonological features between those dating from the T’u-po period and those from the Return-to-Allegiance Army period, and these allow one to draw quite interesting inferences, which will be touched on in the following section. Songs and poems are written chiefly on glegs tshas from the scripture-copying centres of the T’u-po period, and they were presumably written by scribes as they sang to themselves to relieve the boredom of copying out the scriptures. They are a type of random jotting and would probably not have been committed to writing in any other circumstances (see Texts 4 and 5). The introductions to Buddhism and eulogies would have been used on a daily basis in monasteries by the monks. The London “Long Scroll”, the longest of the Tibeto-Chinese transcriptional texts, consists mainly of cat echisms and eulogies and, judging from its content and phonological features, was most certainly used in a tenth-century monastery. For some unknown reason Buddhist texts from the T’u-po texts such as these, reflecting monastic life, have been discovered. Among the primers, the Tsa-ch’ao37, like the songs and poems, is found on glegs tshas dating from the T’u-po period. Likewise, the Ch’ien-tzu wen (Ch.86.II Verso; differs from the Ch’ien-tzu wen with phonetic glosses [P. 1046]) also dates from the T’u-po period. The multiplication table, on the other hand, has on its verso a Tibetan document containing the name of a Khotanese envoy Liu Ssu-k’ung 劉司空 and it clearly dates from the time of the Return-to-Allegiance Army.

What is important here is the fact that the tradition of writing Chinese with the Tibetan script, established during the period of Tibetan rule, was still being maintained in the tenth century under the Return-to-Allegiance Army of the Ts’ai. After the expulsion of Tibetan forces from Tun-huang, all political pressure to use the Tibetan language and script would of course have disappeared. But once a particular custom has been established, it does not vanish all that easily, and one must also take into account the possibility that this tradition was preserved by a social stratum that had been alienated from the study of Chinese writing. However, at present there does not exist any material able to provide evidence in this regard.

III. THE CHINESE LANGUAGE IN TUN-HUANG

As was pointed out at the beginning, Tun-huang was a colonial town of Han-Chinese with long-standing traditions going back to Han times, and it would be by no means surprising should a distinctive dialect have developed during its long history. This would have been all the more likely in view of the fact that Tun-huang was often cut off politically from the central government. But since many of the colonists would have come from the neighbouring regions of Kan-su 甘肅 and Shan-hsi 陝西 it can also be readily imagined that the patois spoken in Tun-huang would have belonged in a broad sense to the Northwestern dialect. In point of fact, it was noted at an early stage on the basis of an analysis of the phonetic forms

found in the above-mentioned Chinese texts transcribed in Tibetan that the Chinese language used in Sha-chou during the T’ang dynasty possessed the characteristics of the Northwestern dialect. But during the T’ang dynasty, prior to Tibetan rule, Tun-huang would have been strongly imbued with the customs and institutions of central China, as were all parts of China at this time. The bureaucrats dispatched from the central government would have spoken the normative language of the capital Ch’ang-an and the texts used at schools would also have had to be read in the normative pronunciation of Ch’ang-an. Because, geographically speaking, Ch’ang-an itself also belonged to the area where the Northwestern dialect was spoken, the situation becomes a little complicated, but it must be assumed that the standard language, representing the refined speech of the T’ang dynasty (and best exemplified, as in the case of Mandarin in later times, by the language of the bureaucracy), would have been differentiated from the local dialect of Ch’ang-an. If there were differences even in Ch’ang-an, then it may be supposed that the differences between standard speech and the local dialect in Tun-huang would have been still more noticeable and more strongly felt. Moreover, although the dialect of Tun-huang (Ho-hsi dialect) would have been the native tongue of the majority of local inhabitants, its status would have remained unrecognized on official occasions. But after the restoration of Chinese hegemony in 848 by Chang I-ch’ao, Tun-huang became in effect an independent state and its links with central China slowly diminished, while at the same time the position of the Tun-huang dialect rose proportionately and it began to appear on the public stage. Especially in the tenth century, under the Return-to-Allegiance Army of the Ts’ao, the Tun-huang dialect may be assumed to have become the standard language of the independent state of Tun-huang. Whereas the Chinese texts transcribed in Tibetan during the period of Tibetan rule and the early stages of rule by the Return-to-Allegiance Army reflect the standard pronunciation of Ch’ang-an or a pronunciation that is very close to this, texts from the later period of rule by the Return-to-Allegiance Army clearly exhibit the characteristics of the Ho-hsi dialect. It may thus be assumed that whereas standard pronunciation was used for reciting Buddhist scriptures at monasteries during the T’ang dynasty and the period of Tibetan rule, under the Return-to-Allegiance Army local pronunciation began to be used. This is a vivid manifestation of the changes that occurred in the norms of Chinese spoken in Tun-huang. But it should be noted that the local Tun-huang dialect would have existed throughout this entire period, and it would naturally have been used on a daily basis by the people of Tun-huang under T’ang and Tibetan rule too. It is only because of its low degree of recognition at this time that it has been scarcely reflected at all in extant materials. The phonetic equivalents of the names recorded in the association regulations alluded to earlier in Section 2-4 display the phonetic forms of the Tun-huang dialect, and on this account these texts were initially wrongly dated. But because they are neither Buddhist scriptures nor songs or poems, there would have been no need to use the reading pronunciation, and it is for this reason that the everyday pronunciation is thought to have appeared in these names. In this sense these materials are all the more valuable.

IV. CONCLUDING REMARKS

As was explained at the beginning, since Han times Tun-huang had generally belonged to the world of Chinese-speaking Han-Chinese. It is also true that, because of its position as a crossroads on the
Silk Road, many different peoples passed through Tun-huang, thereby leading to the development of a multilingual world. But this did not alter the fact that Chinese was the prevailing language. However, the period of Tibetan rule from 786 to the mid-ninth century had a profound influence on this Chinese-speaking world. Later, Chinese culture revived under the rule of the Return-to-Allegiance Army, and the Ho-hsi dialect of Chinese emerged as the chief language of Tun-huang. But this was no more than a fleeting phenomenon, and although it is difficult to corroborate on the basis of extant materials, it would appear that after the gradual spread of Uighur influence in the late tenth century the use of Chinese slowly declined, to be eventually superseded by Uighur and other languages. However, following the vicissitudes of the Hsi-hsia, Yuan and Ming 漢 periods, Tun-huang has today once again reverted to an almost completely Sinophonic society. This state of affairs was brought about by renewed colonization during the reigns of the Ch'ing 清 emperors Yung-cheng 正 and Ch'ien-lung 正 and it offers an apposite illustration of how the survival of languages in frontier regions is influenced by changes in the political situation. There is very little material that enables us to speculate on the linguistic situation in Tun-huang in the centuries immediately preceding the Ch'ing dynasty. By way of contrast, because of the existence of the many manuscripts discovered in the Library Cave at Tun-huang, it is possible to gain a rough picture of the linguistic situation prior to the eleventh century. It is of this that this essay has attempted to present a preliminary overview, but it has regrettably not been possible to examine in detail the background of the various source materials.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

The following texts are reproduced here with the aim of supplementing my previous publications. They are all fragments, and although their value as source materials cannot be said to be all that great, it is to be hoped that they will nonetheless serve to some extent as supplementary material.

Text 1: Pelliot tib.1261 Verso

(1) /g/ gcig / bcu / brgya’ / stong / khrig / "e ka (eka) / da sha (daśa) / sha ta (sata) / sa ha sra (sahasra) / "a yu ta (ayuta)

(2) /l/ 'bum / sa ya / bye ba3 / dung phyur / lag ksha (lakṣa) / ni ya ta (niyuta) / ko’ti’ (koti) / nyar bu da2 (nyarbuda) /

(3) /t/ ther’bum / shu [rd]og3 / mchog ŋal / skyang ’pyes / pad ma (padma) / knar ba (kharva) / ni khar ba (nikharva) /

(4) /b/ bye ma nab nab / thig ’bum mam mtsho yas / lhab / phyor / dži / sha ta ku /

The above corresponds to “names of worldly numerals” (’jig rten pa’i grangs kyi ming) in the Bre brag tu rtogs par bya pa, sDe-dge ed. (Tōhoku No.4346), Co 113a (= Mahāvyutpatti [Sakaki ed.], nos. 8050-68). The original manuscript gives only the Tibetan and the Sanskrit equivalents transcribed in Tibetan script; the Sanskrit forms in parentheses and the Chinese equivalents have been added from the Sakaki edition. Whereas the bsTan-’gyur text gives first the Sanskrit term and then the Tibetan equivalent, in the Tun-huang equivalent, the order has been reversed. Moreover, the bsTan-’gyur text gives the neuter case ending of each Sanskrit term (with anusvāra), but the Tun-huang manuscript gives only the stem form. In addition, whereas the bsTan-’gyur text regularly indicates Sanskrit cerebrals by means of the inverted form of the corresponding Tibetan graph, the Tun-huang manuscript is inconsistent in this regard. Further differences between the bsTan-’gyur text and Tun-huang manuscript are as follows:
1. In the bsTan-'gyur text this is followed by the entry "arbu dam = bye ba.
2. bsTan-'gyur text gives nya rbu dam.
3. bsTan-'gyur text gives shu rdogs.

Text 2: Pelliot tib.1260 (fragment of Tibeto-Chinese glossary)

(1) ... is 'a ma(?)/ zo ca /... (2) gzar son bu / / zhuan bu / 大人前泡院/tshar phe / 大...
(3) pho bu 大院 / pi cag chan pho / 大刀子 / klu he(?)... (4) gri 刀子 / dri ri 在刀 / cag zang 鐵過 / zangs sang / 熟銅過...

In view of the many orthographical errors, the following comments may be helpful:
(1) zo ca = pitcher? The Chinese equivalent cannot be made out.
(2) gzar is a rug placed under a saddle to protect the horse’s back, but the Chinese equivalent is missing; zhan bu = zhal bu 'small cup'? — the final character of Ӄ is perhaps ་; if tshar phe is a variant of tshar spe, then it signifies a heap of harvested grain.
(3) If pho bu is equivalent to phor bu 'small cup', then Ch. ་ should perhaps also be read ་, although ta 'big' rather than 'small'; pi cag is a loanword corresponding to Turkish biç / biç 'cut' (cf. Sir Gerald Clauson, An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish [Oxford, 1972], p. 293), while chan po is a variant form of chen po 'big', and thus the entire phrase tallies with Ch. 大刀子; klur he: meaning unclear. (4) gri 'knife' tallies with Ch. ་; dra ri = dra gri 'knife used for sewing'? is presumably meant for ་; cag zang = lcags zangs 'iron kettle', with Ch. ་ similarly emended to ་.

Text 3: Ch.73.viii, frag.3 (Poussin, Cat.724)

// byi ba la // glang la // stag la // yos bu la // 'brug la // sbrul la // rta la // lug la // sphre'u la //
ty ши la che'u ān 'yin 辰 zi / gu 午 bri / gzhin よ /
bya la // khri la // phag la //
ye'u 酉 gshur 郑 /

Text 4: Pelliot tib.1259, “Yu chiang lo” 遊江樂 on the tune of Fan lung-chou 泛龍舟

(1) chun phung se yu cam "i shib / ha shi kho khwar "ig yang chun /
春風細雨宫衣溫 何時愜自憶揚州
nam ci li sheng sen (2) dze'u khe'u / pub ci lan ling to yig la'u /
南至柳城先造 云北至蘭陵孤騷樓
ye'u bo'u tung se si hu shu / hud cag jong kang wan la le'u /
南望東西二湖水 何至長江萬里流
beg la shong puyi char keng hag / ba shu kang "e'u shu shang ye'u /
白鷺雙飛出棱璧無數江橋水上遊
(3) yi'u kang lag bam long ci'u /
遊江樂泛龍舟

The Chinese text appears together with Text 5 in P.3271 and S.6537. In the original Chinese, the two characters at the start of L.6 are 復見, but they do not tally with Tib. hud cag; further deliberation is required. The Chinese text may be found in Jao Tsong-yi and Paul Demiéville, Airs de Touen-houang (Paris, 1971), pp.265-266, and in Jen Pan-t’ang 任端, textitTun-huang ko-tz'u tsung-pien 敦煌歌辭總編 (collection of songs and poems from Tun-huang), Vol.1 (Shang-hai, 1987), pp.379, 400.

Text 5: Pelliot tib.1235 Verso, “Tui Ming-chu” 題明主 on the tune of Cheng Lang-tzu tz'u 鄭郎子詩

tseng si hya’n [ ] beg 'gog / k’un shang k’a’g ci [ ] / go ’im tswag /
清絲絃揮白玉宮 官商角徵羽五音足
ha shi tig dwa’i meng cu da’n / "yi hda’n / da’n kha g then ha khwag //
何時得對明主彈一絃 羽彈而天下曲

The Chinese text appears together with Text 4 in P.3271 and S.6537. The syllables corresponding to Ch. 握 and 羽 are missing in the Tibetan manuscript.
Text 1: Pelliot tib. 1261 Verso, Part of Mahāvyutpatti.

Text 2: Pelliot tib. 1260, fragment of Tibeto-Chinese glossary.
Text 3: Ch.73 viii frag. 3 (Poussin Cat. 724), Tibeto-Chinese bilingual list of the “twelve branches”.


Text 5: Pelliot tib. 1235, “Tui ming-chu”.