

西域歷史語言研究集刊

第三輯

中國人民大學國學院西域歷史語言研究所

沈衛榮 主編

科學出版社

北京

內 容 簡 介

《西域歷史語言研究集刊》是由中國人民大學國學院西域歷史語言研究所主辦的學術刊物。以介紹國內外學者關於中國西北邊疆地區少數民族歷史、語言、考古、地理、宗教等方面的最新研究成果為主要宗旨。發表具有原創性的學術研究論文、書評和研究綜述等，以期推動國內學界在西域歷史語言研究方面的進步。

本書適合於從事中國西北邊疆地區民族語言、歷史、考古、地理以及宗教研究的國內外學者，和相關專業的大專院校師生參考閱讀。

圖書在版編目(CIP)數據

西域歷史語言研究集刊. 第3輯 / 沈衛榮主編; 中國人民大學國學院西域歷史語言研究所編. —北京: 科學出版社, 2010.5

ISBN 978-7-03-027125-9

I. 西… II. ①沈…②中… III. 西域-語言學史-文集 IV. H172.2-09

中國版本圖書館 CIP 數據核字 (2010) 第 056682 號

責任編輯: 孫 莉 郝莎莎 / 責任校對: 張 琪

責任印製: 趙德靜 / 封面設計: 王 浩

科學出版社出版

北京東黃城根北街16號
郵政編碼: 100717

<http://www.sciencep.com>

中國科學院印刷廠印刷

科學出版社發行 各地新華書店經銷

* *

2010年5月第一版 開本: 787×1092 1/16

2010年5月第一次印刷 印張: 25 3/4 插頁: 1

印數: 1—1 600 字數: 610 000

定價: 80.00 圓

(如有印裝質量問題, 我社負責調換)

Historical and Philological Studies of China's Western Regions

No. 3

Institute for Historical and Philological Studies of China's
Western Regions, Renmin University of China

Shen Weirong Editor-in-Chief

Science Press

Beijing

Tib. Ma rdum pa—A Phantom Name

Ernst Steinkellner

That I dare to contribute the following short note to this volume in honour of Professor Wang Yao is only due to being certain that the celebrate will know that an even more important contribution could not sufficiently reflect my admiration and respect for his lifelong scholarly achievements as well as my great affection for the friend of many years.

The name in question occurs in two forms, *Ma rdum pa* and *Ma rdum*, in the translation of Dignāga's *Pramāṇasamuccayavṛtti* by Vasudhararakṣita and Señ rgyal,^① and represents the name of the famous Sāṅkhya teacher Mādharma. Hattori considers this Tibetan representation to be "a wrong transliteration of Mādharma"^②. The Tibetan form of the name is certainly a transliteration, for as a translation it doesn't make any sense. However, I believe that it was not originally an incorrect transliteration, but rather that it was the result of a development in the transmission which started with a correct transliteration of the name.^③

A clue to the possible process of this development can be found in the Tibetan translation of Jinendrabuddhi's *Pramāṇasamuccayaṭīkā*.^④ Here we find the correct transliteration *mā dha ba* (P75a3,6; D66b4, pa in 6), as well as *ma dha ba* (P77a8; *mā dha ba* D68b4), but one also finds *ma dhu ba* (P74b4) and *ma dhu pa* (D66a6).

Taking this as a clue, I feel confident in proposing the following hypothesis for the changes that took place in the transmission of this name's originally correct transliteration. Unattested stages of this assumed development are in brackets.

1. *mā dha ba*

2. (*ma dhā ba*): by shifting the subscript *a chuñ* from the first to the second syllable.

① *Ma rdum pa* D23b2, C23b1; *Ma rdum* P23b3, N 24a (after Masaaki Hattori, *Dignāga, On Perception, being the Pratyakṣapariccheda of Dignāga's Pramāṇasamuccaya from the Sanskrit fragments and the Tibetan versions*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 1968, p. 218, 14). The name does not appear in the translation by Kanakavarman and Dad pa'i Śes rab.

② Hattori, *loc. cit.*, note 5. 40.

③ If I had easy access to all the Tanjur editions and manuscripts available, I would have tried to find examples for this development. But given the reasonably certain hypothesis for such a development presented below, I hope my colleagues in the field will pardon this deliberate negligence.

④ P (Tokyo-Kyoto, 1955-1961, Nr. 5766), D (Tokyo 1977ff, Nr. 4268).

- 3. *ma dhu ba*:by misreading the subscript *a chuñ* for subscript *u*.
- 4. (*ma rdu ba*):by misreading *dhu* for *rdu*.
- 5. (*ma rdum*):by misreading *b* for *m* and attaching the latter to the second syllable.
- 6. *ma rdum pa*:by restoring a name form in *pa*.

མ་རྩུམ་པ་ → མ་རྩུམ་པ་ → མ་རྩུམ་པ་ → མ་རྩུམ་པ་ → མ་རྩུམ་པ་ → མ་རྩུམ་པ་

མ་རྩུམ་པ་ → མ་རྩུམ་པ་ → མ་རྩུམ་པ་ → མ་རྩུམ་པ་ → མ་རྩུམ་པ་

མ་རྩུམ་པ་ → མ་རྩུམ་པ་ → མ་རྩུམ་པ་ → མ་རྩུམ་པ་ → མ་རྩུམ་པ་ → མ་རྩུམ་པ་

When reproduced in the scripts of the beautifully designed fonts now available,^⑤ these steps of gradual change may not appear so evident, and it is, of course, difficult to decide whether all of them or which ones individually occurred in the process of copying manuscripts or prints, or both. With a view to the date “late eleventh or early twelfth century”^⑥ for the translation by Vasudhararakṣita and Señ ge rgyal po, long before the printed Tanjur editions that we are used to, we have to think of manuscripts and copies in *dbu med* script primarily, as well as of a sequence of scribal mistakes and corrections.^⑦In any case, it seems sufficiently clear that the name *Ma rdum pa* is not a candidate for a future Tibetan onomasticon.

⑤ I used the fonts CTRC-Uchen, CTRC-Betsu and CTRC-Tsumachu, and would like to thank the China Tibetology Research Center for kindly making these fonts available to me.

⑥ Hattori, *loc. cit.*, p. 13.

⑦ For pertinent observations on comparable mistakes in the Tanjur transmission cf. Helmut Eimer, “Überlegungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des tibetischen Buddhacarita,” in: *Essays and Studies on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature Dedicated to Claus Vogel by Colleagues, Students and Friends*. Ed. Dragomir Dimitrov, Michael Hahn, and Roland Steiner, Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag 2008, pp. 65-77, as well as Kurtis R. Schaeffer, *Dreaming the Great Brahmin*. New York: Oxford University Press 2005, pp. 107-108.

吐谷渾的藏文拼寫、藏文名稱及其阿爾泰語源

卓鴻澤

一、Tho gon

今藏英國印度事務部圖書館 (India Office Library)、舊屬印度事務部圖書館 (India Office Library 藏品之古藏文寫卷) ITJ 1368 為吐谷渾史事紀年, 中有 [th]o gon kha gan, ma ga tho gon kha gan 等專名^①, 似相當於“吐渾可汗”、“莫何吐渾可汗”。《舊唐書·高宗本紀》上元二年 (675):

[正月] 辛未, 吐蕃遣其大臣論吐渾彌來請和, 不許。

《新唐書·吐蕃傳上》:

上元二年, 遣大臣論吐渾彌來請和, 且求與吐谷渾脩好, 帝不聽。

按: 吐渾彌當為涼州界吐渾部落中党項羌人, 降於吐蕃, 封官為“論” (藏文 blon), 為吐蕃辦理吐谷渾事務, “彌”似為党項羌語 *mī 或 *mer^②。“吐渾”即東晉時鮮卑 (*Šerpi, *Šerβi) 語“吐谷渾”在唐代的新譯。但後世的古典藏文著述有時據漢文“吐谷渾”譯寫為 Thu lu hun, 法國伯希和 (Paul Pelliot) 以其晚出, 未加珍視, 而將“吐谷渾”的原型擬為 *Tu’uγ-γun (Tuyuγ-γun) ~ *Tu’uγun (Tuyuγun)^③。

誠然, 儘管中土傳讀並非一致無訛, 但具有西域背景的慧琳 (737—820) 在《一切經音義》中亦注“谷”字“音欲”^④, 有此權威音注執為成見, 鮮不以藏文 lu 為 yu 之形訛。所以晚近辭書與研究論著, 凡涉及藏文 Thu lu hun 之處, 大抵訂為 Thu yu hun。此一字之異, 似於唐代羌、渾歷史無關宏旨, 可置勿論, 而實與金、元之際河西地區史學之傳播不無關係, 請試論之。

① Frederick William Thomas, *Tibetan literary texts and documents from Chinese Turkestan*, London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1951, Vol. 2, pp. 8-16. Lucie no Petech, “Nugae Tibeticae”, *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 31, (1956), pp. 291-294. Géza Uray, “The annals of the ‘A-za Principality: the problems of chronology and genre of the Stein document, Tunhuang, vol. 69, fol. 84”, in Louis Ligeti ed., *Proceedings of the Csoma de Körös Memorial Symposium held at Mátrafüred, Hungary, 24-30 September 1976*, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1978, pp. 541-578.

② 參看《舊唐書·党項羌傳》: “有羌酋拓拔赤辭者, 初臣屬吐谷渾, 甚為渾主伏所暱, 與之結婚。及貞觀初, 諸羌歸附, 而赤辭不至。李靖之擊吐谷渾, 赤辭屯狼道坡以抗官軍。”《舊唐書·杜佑傳》載佑上疏有“党項與西戎 (按: 謂吐蕃) 潛通, 屢有降人指陳事跡”之語。又突厥頡利可汗母家有臣名吐渾邪, 參注 21。

③ Paul Pelliot, “Notes sur les Tou-yu-houen et les Sou-pi”, *T’oung pao* 20 (1921): 323-31. 卜弼德 (Peter A. Boodberg) 頗曾注意 Thu lu hun 的讀法, 但他將“吐谷渾”追溯至詞根 *To’ol (舉蒙古語 toyol- “pass through”), 謂吐谷渾從遼東跋涉山川、度隴而至青海, 因此得名, 則純屬無根之談, 所擬形式亦違反蒙古語的演變規律, 見 Boodberg, “The Language of the T’o-pa Wei”, *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 1/2 (1936), p. 182.

④ 《大正藏》第 54 冊, 編號 2128, 卷 77, 808c 頁。