

- Yelü Jue 耶律玞: the Epitaph of Yelü Jue 耶律玞墓誌銘 *Yelü Jue muzhiming*, dated 1071, discovery date unknown.  
 Yelü Nu 耶律奴: the Epitaph of Yelü Nu 耶律奴墓誌銘 *Yelü Nu muzhiming*, dated 1099, discovered 1999.  
 Yelü Renxian 耶律仁先: the Epitaph of Yelü Renxian 耶律仁先墓誌銘 *Yelü Renxian muzhiming*, dated 1072, discovered 1983.  
 Yelü Taishi 耶律太師: the Epitaph of Grand Preceptor (Taishi) Yelü 耶律太師墓誌銘 *Yelü Taishi muzhiming*, dated 1101, discovery date unknown, acquired 2009 (June).  
 Yelü Xiangwen 耶律詳穩: the Epitaph of Field Marshal Yelü 耶律詳穩墓誌 *Yelü Xiangwen muzhi*, dated 1091, acquired 2007 (June).  
 Yelü Zhixian 耶律智先: the Epitaph of Yelü Zhixian 耶律智先墓誌銘 *Yelü Zhixian muzhiming*, dated 1094, discovered 1998.  
 Xiao Linggong 蕭令公: the Broken Epitaph of Xiao Linggong 蕭令公墓誌殘石 *Xiao Linggong muzhi canshi*, dated 1057, discovered 1950.  
 Xiao Zhonggong 蕭仲恭: the Epitaph of Xiao Zhonggong 蕭仲恭墓誌 *Xiao Zhonggong muzhi*, dated 1150, discovered 1942.

## References

- Aisin Gioro Ulhicun 2006 — Aisin Gioro Ulhicun 愛新覺羅·烏拉熙春. *Kittanbun boshi yori mita Ryōshi* 契丹文墓誌より見た遼史 [Liao History as Seen from the Epitaphs in the Khitan Script]. Kyōto: Shōkadō shoten 京都: 松香堂書店, 2006.  
 Bao Yuzhu 2006 — Bao Yuzhu 寶玉柱. “Qidan xiaozi 𐰽𐰺 ji qi tihuanzi yanjiu” [Research on the Khitan Small Script Character 𐰽𐰺 and its Variants] 契丹小字 𐰽𐰺 及其替換字研究. In *Nei Menggu daxue xuebao* (Zhaxue shehui kexueban) [Bulletin of the Inner Mongolia University (Philosophical and Historical Series)] 內蒙古大學學報 (哲學社會科學版), 1 (2006), pp. 8–12.  
 Jishi 1996 — Jishi 即實. *Milin wenjing: qidan xiaozi jiedu xincheng* 謎林問徑: 契丹小字解讀新程 [Seeking a Path through a Forest of Riddles — A New Stage in the Decipherment of the Khitan Small Script]. Shenyang: Liaoning minzu chubanshe 瀋陽: 遼寧民族出版社, 1996.  
 Liao shi 1974 — *Liao shi* 遼史 [The History of the Liao Dynasty]. Ed. by Tuotuo 脫脫. 3 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju 北京: 中華書局, 1974.  
 Liu Fengzhu et al. 2006 — Liu Fengzhu 劉鳳翥, Cong Yanshuang 從豔雙, Yu Zhixian 於志新, Narangua/Naren Gaowa 娜仁高娃. “Qidan xiaozi ‘Yelü Cite / Wuliben muzhiming’ kaoshi” [A Study of the Epitaph of Yelü Cite / Wuliben in the Khitan Small Script] 契丹小字〈耶律慈特·兀裏本墓誌銘〉考釋. In *Yanjing xuebao* [Yenching Journal of Chinese Studies] 燕京學報 (New Series), 20 (2006), pp. 255–277.  
 Liu Fengzhu et al. 2009 — Liu Fengzhu 劉鳳翥, Tang Cailan 唐彩蘭, Chengel/Qinggele 清格勒. *Liao shangjing diqu chutu de liaodai beike huiji* [A Collection of Inscriptions on Steles Excavated from the Supreme Capital of the Liao Dynasty] 遼上京地區出土的遼代碑刻匯輯. Beijing: Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe 北京: 社會科學文獻出版社, 2009.  
 Toyoda 1998 — Toyoda Gorō 豐田五郎. “Qidan xiaozi suo baoliu xialai de zhonggu Mengguyu zhi henji — Yongfu, chunqiu, shuci” 契丹小字所保留下來的中古蒙古語之痕跡——永福、春秋、數詞 [Traces of Middle Mongolian preserved in the Khitan small script: Yongfu (tomb), spring/autumn, numerals]. In *Nitchū gōdō moji bunka kentōkai happyō ronbunshū* [Collected Papers Presented at the Japan-China Joint Writing Culture Conference] 日中合同文字文化研討會發表論文集. Kyōto: Moji bunka kenkyūsho 京都: 文字文化研究所, 1998, pp. 147–156.  
 Wang Weixiang 1999 — Wang Weixiang 王未想. “Qidan xiaozi ‘Zezhou cishi muzhi’ canshi kaoshi” [A Study of the Khitan Small Script Broken Epitaph of the Prefect of Zezhou] 契丹小字〈澤州刺史墓誌〉殘石考釋. In *Minzu yuwen* 民族語文, 2 (1999), pp. 78–81.

# ТАНГУТЫ в Центральной Азии

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

P. Zieme

## Some Notes on the Ethnic Name *Taḡut* (*Tanguṭ*) in Turkic Sources

The name of the powerful Kingdom of 西夏 Xi-Xia (982–1227) in the indigenous sources was treated several times by the jubilee himself. In his book of 2008 the jubilee gives a survey on the history and culture of the Xi-Xia (*Taḡut*), i.e. on the sources that mention the name *Taḡut* in non-*Taḡut* languages.<sup>1</sup> In my contribution in honour of the highly esteemed scholar I would like to present some Old Uighur texts as well as to make some remarks on the name *taḡut* used in the Turkic sources.<sup>2</sup> Although many scholars regard the etymology of the term *taḡut* as settled insofar as the first component of the Chinese designation 党項 *Dang Xiang* is explained as its etymon,<sup>3</sup> others do not.<sup>4</sup> R. Dunnell discusses in great detail the historical sources where the name *taḡut* is attested.<sup>5</sup> Chinese sources mention the tribe of the *Taḡut* for earlier periods, e.g. in the 7<sup>th</sup> c.<sup>6</sup>

### The name *Taḡut* in the Old Turkic inscriptions

It is common knowledge that the earliest record of the tribal name *taḡut* is found in the Old Turkic inscriptions of the first half of the 8<sup>th</sup> c. Thanks to H. Şirin User's new dictionary it has become easy to refer to the data of the inscriptions. In the section of ethnic names (Kavim ve Boy Adları) her dictionary has the following entry from the Bilgä Kagan inscription:<sup>7</sup> *y(e)ti y(e)g(i)rmi : y(a)ṣ(i)ma : t(a)ḡut : t(a)pa :*

<sup>1</sup> Kychanov 2008, pp. 650–658.

<sup>2</sup> Golden 1992, pp. 166–167.

<sup>3</sup> Erdal 2004, p. 158 fn. 272: “The *Taḡut* people (this name first mentioned twice in the Orkhon inscriptions) were in Tang China called *Dang Xiang*. I would propose that +*Ut* was added to this first syllable. If this was done by Turks, the vowel would be fixed as /U/. If the language was Mongolic (the plural suffix +*Ud* being fully productive there), Mongolic /U/ would correspond to Turkic /X/.”

<sup>4</sup> Kwanten 1982, p. 55.

<sup>5</sup> Dunnell 1984. On p. 79 she refers to Bailey 1940, but in fact Bailey interpreted Khotanese *Tāḡutta* as “Tibetan,” not as “*Taḡut*.”

<sup>6</sup> Atwood 2010.

<sup>7</sup> User 2009, p. 163, (text of the Bilgä Kagan inscription: p. 458).



*sül(ä)dim : y(e)ti y(e)g(i)rmi : y(a)ṣ(i)ma : t(a)ṇut ; bod(u)n(u)g : bozd(u)m* “At my age of seventeen I waged war against the Taṇut; at my age of seventeen I destroyed the people of the Taṇut.”

*The name Taṇut in the Compendium of the Turkic Languages (1072)*

Maḥmūd al-Kāšgarī has a list of names of peoples in which the Taṇut occupy a position between the Uighur and the Xitay: Čigil, Tuxsi, Yagma, Oğraq, Čaruq, Čömül, Uyğur, Taṇut, Xitay, Čin, Tawgač.<sup>8</sup> He also recorded many scattered stanzas about the battle of Taṇut and Uyğur that can be reconstructed as a verse cycle.<sup>9</sup>

*The chapter on the Taṇut by Rašīd ad-Dīn*

In his chapter on the Taṇut (Taṇqūt) Rašīd ad-Dīn describes their territory and mentions some rulers and their bellicose army during the time of Čiñiz Xān and how they were finally subdued. Here I only refer to the excellent English translation of W.M. Thackston.<sup>10</sup>

*A Christian manuscript*

In an Old Uighur manuscript of the Church of the East the borders of the Realm of the Old Uighurs are described as stretching from the lands of the Taṇut in the East to Fars in the West (ll. 65-66): *d(a)ṇut ellärtin . p(a)rs [...] ellärtin* “From the Taṇut countries, from countries of Pars (= Fārs) [...]”<sup>11</sup> Unfortunately there is no way for precisely dating this manuscript.

*A colophon attached to a Buddhist text*

In a colophon text written in strophic alliteration we find the following list of realms or peoples.<sup>12</sup> [*tavgač*] *taṇut töpöt sart el-[läri]* “the realms of the [Chinese], the Taṇut, the Tibetans, the Sart.”<sup>13</sup> In the course of history under Sart different peoples were understood. As this manuscript seems to originate from the Mongol period, it is not clear which realm or state the realm *Sart eli* can refer to. But in the light of the Mongol sources a shift from “merchants” to “Muslims” can be taken as sure.<sup>14</sup>

*A miscellaneous text from Turfan region mentioning the Taṇut*

The text discussed in the following was written on the verso side of a Chinese scroll containing the Buddhist text *Shi shan ye dao jing* 十善業道經 (T. 660).

<sup>8</sup> Dankoff, Kelly 1982 (Vol. I), p. 82.

<sup>9</sup> Dankoff 1980.

<sup>10</sup> In English translation: Thackston 1998, pp. 72–74.

<sup>11</sup> U 330 + U 334 (Turfan Collection of Berlin. Cf. Digital Turfan Archive on the website of the Berlin Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities).

<sup>12</sup> Dilara 2011, line 25.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Zieme 2005.

Unfortunately although several pieces are preserved,<sup>15</sup> one cannot decide whether the paper of the Chinese scroll was cut into two halves or used in its complete height. Judging from the fact that the Uighur text starts at the utmost upper margin which is the upper margin of the Chinese side, one is inclined to consider that only half of the height was used for writing the Uighur text. There is a single fragment, Ch/U 7542, on which the margin is preserved. All other pieces have no traces of margins, they all are middle pieces. If the complete height of the original Chinese sheets were used, the missing text between the lines is more than half of a line. If only half of it was used, the lacunae are of course less, but still not exactly discernible. Therefore the interpretation of the text is hanging around. The Uighur script is astonishingly small, the letters are nevertheless clear. Some Sanskrit phrases or expressions in Brāhmī characters are inserted, but it is not totally clear whether they were translated or not. The mentioned difficulties make a reasonable understanding of the fragments nearly impossible. Therefore I abstain from a full translation.

*Transcription of the text fragments*

Ch/U 6691+ Ch/U 6687

01 01 [	äd]gü adl(i)g tügünü[	]
02 02 [	ng-niṇ yin-kä [	]
03 03 [	g t(a)vgač bodunı [	]
04 04 [	lämiš b(ä)k bağlar [	]
05 05 [	m]iṣ täg tal taglıg (?) [	]
06 06 [	] tiš kızıglıg in[	]
07 07 [	ug-lar al[	]
08 08 [	g[ ]ulmiš ar[	]
09 09 [	] ägrülü ulun-lag [	]
10 10 [	qa yal(a)ṇuk-lar-lıg [	]
11 11 [	] ärmäz käyik-lär u[	]

*lacuna of approximately 32 Chinese lines*

Ch/U 7542

12 01 [	ın kavırlmadın kamag ta [	]
13 02 [	] kadir katıg-lanmakıñız [	]
14 03 [	] di ärsär anunup kälmiš taṇut-l[a]r [	]
15 04 urtı amti-katägi amıl-in enčin a[	siz]	
16 05 -ıñ al-lıg inčgä biligiñiz ağır ulug [	]	
17 06 t[o]bač türk bodunın kalkan say-ta kamçı [	]	
18 07 -qa basgan oğlu tatar bodunın bars-qa böğ[ü	]	
19 08 xanı täg korkınčsız alp arslan ıduk t(ä)ñri[	]	
20 09 aṣnu azag-laštukuñuz üçün agzanmıš y(a)rlıg [	]	
21 10 bodunın açını ağır-ın tapıg-ın tapını y(a)rlık[a	]	

<sup>15</sup> The fragments: Ch/U 6691+ Ch/U 6687; lacuna of approximately 32 Chinese lines; Ch/U 7542; lacuna of approximately 2 lines (according to the Chinese Recto side); Ch/U 7750 + Ch/ 7540; Ch/U 7547; a not localised fragment: Ch/U 6684. Photographs are available in the Digital Turfan Archive on the website of the Berlin Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities.

22 11 baxşı birlä iduq şazını tıtag-inta ilk[i] ]  
*lacuna of approximately 2 lines (according to the Chinese Recto side)*

Ch/U 7750 + Ch/ 7540

23 01 [ o]lar [ ]  
 24 02 [ ] näčä [ ]  
 25 03 [ ] amıl k[ön]gl[ün]üz ]  
 26 04 [ ] sizin köñ[ül] ]  
 27 05 [ ] bodun-ug . [ ] [ ]  
 28 06 [ ]-up . yalrı [ ]  
 29 07 [ ]n ükliyü [ ]  
 30 08 [ ]bolu y(a)rıkla [ ]  
 31 09 [ yar]lıkadıñız . [ ]  
 32 10 [ ]kañ siz [ ]  
 33 11 [ t]amtulur ö [ ]  
 34 12 [ x]an eligimiz ö [ ]  
 35 13 [ ] ulug bädük tn [ ]  
 36 14 [ äd]gü-lüg ulug tö[rlüg] ]  
 37 15 [ tın]l(i)g-larka umug [ınag] ]  
 38 16 [ ] **gu nā ti ša yai-r**<sup>16</sup> [ ]  
 39 17 [ ] ädgü-lüg [ ]  
 40 18 [ ] burxan kutıña [ ]  
 41 19 [ ]-lar üzä ükliyü asılı [ ]  
 42 20 [ ]lğ kök kalık yüzintä y [ ]  
 43 21 [ y]u y(a)rıkla siz . **du kham su kham** [ ]  
 44 22 [ ] bodun-nuñ bokun-nuñ **sta vā** [ ]i [ ]  
 45 23 [ ]z ärür ançulayu ok ärk üz[ä] ]  
 46 24 [ ] anın siz arka bodunug küzädgä[y] ]  
 47 25 [e]l-tä taşdıñk-lar-qa bı bıç[gu] ]  
 48 26 [a] **še ša jñā tvāj jñā ta ko**<sup>17</sup> [ ]  
 49 27 [ ]mamak [ ]  
 50 28 [ ]mak-ta [ ]  
 51 29 [ ]s[u] pu ji tā [ ]  
 52 30 [ ] ögrünč-lüg [ ]  
 53 31 [ ]iç [ ]

Ch/U 7547

54 01 [ ]maz-a : boguk [ ]  
 55 02 [ ]sur ärki . ud [ ]  
 56 03 [ ]duki ok täg [ ]  
 57 04 [ ] körk . tirilür [ ]

<sup>16</sup> Explanation by D. Maue: “gu nā ti ša yai-r, Sandhi (-r) of Instr. Pl. m./n. of *guñātišaya*-, here either Tatpuruṣa ‘abundance of good qualities’ or Bahuvrīhi ‘having abundance of good qualities’ (cf. *ädgölüg* in line 39).”

<sup>17</sup> Explanation by D. Maue: “*ašešajñātvāj jñāta*ko ‘famous because of his omniscience’, Sandhi -j < -t in front of j; Sandhi -o < -as in front of voiced consonants plus a-.”

58 05 [ ]d[.]l-äšiqiz tuta kälğ [ ]  
 59 06 [ ]ögdir ančo açığ a [ ]  
 60 07 [ ] agladı takı bo tuz [ ]  
 61 08 [ ]n kuvratduru kut [ ]  
 62 09 [ ]inip . kurč-ta a [ ]  
 63 10 [ ]m bo **dha rma rā ja** id[uk] ]

*A fragment not localizable*

Ch/U 6684

64 01 [ ] beş ya [ ]  
 65 02 [ ] asıg bolu[r] ]  
 66 03 [ ]uzta ädgü yol-l [ ]  
 67 04 [ ]-ka knt-tin ädgü [ ]

### Translation

It is nearly impossible to present a continuous translation. Here I would like to mention some points. In line 03 “the people of China” (or: “the Chinese people”), followed by 04 “the lords (*bäglär*). The “creatures” (or: “human beings”) in line 10 may be a part of a metaphorical expression in connection with the following “wild animals” of line (11). A large lacuna disjoints the text from the following passage:

12 [...] without being pressed (?), all [...] 13 [...] your strong striving [...] 14 [...] if it was [...], the *Taγuts* who have prepared and came, [...] 15 threw (established?). Up to now, in piece and rest [...] 16 through your fine knowledge of means [you have ...] 17 the people of the T[o]bač Türk in Kalkan Say [with (?)] whip [...] 18 to [...], *Basgan oğlu* the people of the Tatar to Bars [...] 19 [...] the fearless Alp Arslan like the *Xan* of the wise [...], the holy *Tängri*[kän ...] 20 because of your former failing the command you expressed [was not followed ...] 21 protecting the people of [...] with great respect serving [...] 22 with the *Baxşı* because of the holy discipline the primordial ...

This passage gives the impression as if a historical event is reported on, but in the following we find references to clear religious expressions like (Sanskrit) “I want to confess” (line 38), “to the Buddhahood” (line 40), or (Sanskrit) “Well-honoured One” (line 51). Also (Sanskrit) *dharmarāja* (in line 63) belongs to the religious sphere. Therefore it is possible to explain the text as a kind of a long colophon discussing the “outer” (= worldly) and “inner” (= religious) matters. Similar examples are known from the *Avadāna* colophons edited by M. Shōgaito.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>18</sup> Shōgaito 1988.



Notes<sup>19</sup>

Lines 17 to 19 contain some interesting details on a certain Alp Arslan ("Brave Lion") who is compared to the famous Böğ[ü Xan]. But this is already an emendation without any certainty. In line 17 a local place is mentioned: Kalkan Say. In the region of today's Xinjiang *say* means inter alia "salty steppe"<sup>20</sup> and is used in many place-names as also the word *kalkan*, originally "shield."<sup>21</sup> The same place name is known from the fragment Ch/U 6885v32 *kalkan say-taki sakıg-ča* "like a Fata Morgana in Qalqan Say."

Very enigmatic remains in line 17 the word before *türk* here read as *t[o]bač*. Presumably this is an epithet to the designation *türk*. At first sight I thought to read [*čo*]bač for [*čo*]vač recorded by Maḥmūd al-Kāšgarī as "the royal parasol was set up there; this is a parasol made of silk for the kings of the Turks under which they seek shade in the summer heat and take shelter from rain and snow."<sup>22</sup> Could this word be the etymon of the name of the Čuvaš? While J. Benzing regarded the name of the Čuvaš as not yet explained,<sup>23</sup> J. Németh proposed a derivation from Tatar *yıvaš*.<sup>24</sup> But if the word in question is spelled *t[?]bač*, it represents, at any case, another ethnic name.

Persons called Alp Arslan are known from the colophon fragment U 709<sup>25</sup> in which a layman is mentioned who ordered a copy of the *Altun Yaruk Sudur*<sup>26</sup> or from a colophon of the *Säkiz yükmäk Yaruk sudur*.<sup>27</sup> But here it should be a high-ranking person, probably the ruling king.

## Suzhou inscription of 1361

In the 1361 inscription from Suzhou<sup>28</sup> studied and edited by Geng Shimin<sup>29</sup> in line 03 we encounter the term Great Taḡut: *ulug<sup>30</sup> taḡut yerindäki Sügču* "(the city of) 肃州 Suzhou in the country of the Great Taḡut."

The term *ulug taḡut* either reflects their own dynastic name of 大夏 *Da Xia* "Great Xia" or is simply an addition by the Uighur writer of the inscription.

<sup>19</sup> Here I want to express my thanks to J. U. Hartmann and D. Maue for their help in reading the Brāhmī characters. D. Maue also gave explanations of two compounds (fn. 16 and 17).

<sup>20</sup> Jarring 1997, p. 398: "hard, sterile soil with a thin sprinkling of gravelly débris on the surface," "gravel desert" etc. On pp. 398–400 69 different place-names are listed in detail.

<sup>21</sup> Jarring 1997, p. 342: "main beams in the horizontal edges of the ceiling," "an arrangement in the walls of a fortress in the form of pointed corners for the protection of the fortress," "a shelter against the sun or the wind."

<sup>22</sup> Clauson 1972, p. 395a.

<sup>23</sup> Benzing 1968, p. 62.

<sup>24</sup> Rejected by Golden 1992, p. 396: "but this is, by no means, conclusively demonstrated."

<sup>25</sup> Raschmann 2005, No. 669.

<sup>26</sup> For further details cf. Zieme 1981, p. 90 with reference to Alp Arslan as a part of a king's name.

<sup>27</sup> Oda 2010, Text volume, p. 201.

<sup>28</sup> Franke 2002, p. 262, n. 124; Franke 2003, pp. 143–156.

<sup>29</sup> Geng 1986.

<sup>30</sup> Not read by Geng Shimin (Geng 1986). I have to admit that this reading is not absolutely clear, but the most probable one.

In line 07 the attack against and the killing of the Taḡut by Genghis (Čingis) Khan and his troops is recorded: *taḡut öldürüp alkıp yokadurup*<sup>31</sup> "killing, extinguishing<sup>32</sup> and quashing of the Taḡut."

## Taḡut čölgä

D. Matsui mentions the term *Taḡut čölgä* "the circuit of the Taḡut" in an inscription of the Mogao caves still unedited.<sup>33</sup> He supplied also a useful map showing some places of Buddhist pilgrimage in Mongol times.<sup>34</sup>

## Conclusion

The data show us convincingly that the name of the Taḡut is known from various sources throughout the history. The Xi-Xia state existed only two centuries, but the tribe(s) of the Taḡut were known as neighbours and/or enemies across several centuries in the indigenous sources of the Türks and Uighur even before and after the flourishing time of the Taḡut. S.-Ch. Raschmann documents in her contribution many persons in different types of text who were simply called "Taḡut."<sup>35</sup>

## References

- Atwood 2010 — Atwood C. "The Notion of Tribe in Medieval China. Ouyang Xiu and the Shatuo Dynastic Myth." In *Miscellanea Asiatica: Mélanges en l'honneur de / Festschrift in Honour of Françoise Aubin*. Ed. by D. Aigle et alii. Nettetal: Steyler Verlag, 2010, pp. 593–621.
- Bailey 1940 — Bailey H. W. "Ttāgutta." In *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 10 (1940), pp. 599–605.
- Benzing 1968 — Benzing J. "Das Tschuwaschische." In *Handbuch der Orientalistik*. I Abt., 5. Bd. Turkologie. Leiden–Köln: Brill Publishers, 1968.
- Clauson 1972 — Clauson G. *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- Dankoff 1980 — Dankoff R. "Three Turkic Cycles Relating to Inner Asian Warfare." In *Eucharisterion. Essays Presented to Omeljan Pritsak on His Sixtieth Birthday by His Colleagues and Students*. Ed. by I. Ševčenko & F. E. Sysyn. Vol. III–IV. Pt. 1. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Ukrainian Research Institute, 1979–1980, pp. 151–165.
- Dankoff, Kelly 1982 — Dankoff R. and Kelly J. *Compendium of the Turkic Dialects (Dīwān Luyāt at-Turk)*. I–III. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Printing Office, 1982–1985.
- Dunnell 1984 — Dunnell R. W. "Who are the Tanguts? Remarks on Tangut Ethnogenesis and the Ethnonym Tangut." In *Journal of Asian History*, 18 (1984), pp. 78–89.
- Erdal 2004 — Erdal M. *A Grammar of Old Turkic*. Leiden: Brill Publishers, 2004.
- Franke 2002 — Franke H. "Seitenwechsel zum Feind. Tanguten im Dienst der mongolischen Eroberer." In *Saeculum*, 53 (2002), pp. 226–268.
- Franke 2003 — Franke H. "Zur chinesisch-uygurischen Inschrift von 1361." In *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 153 (2003), pp. 143–156.

<sup>31</sup> Different reading in Geng 1986.

<sup>32</sup> This example, although important for the meaning of the word in this tripartite conjunction, is not recorded in the new edition of the "Uigurisches Wörterbuch" (Röhrborn 2010, p. 48 sub *alk-*).

<sup>33</sup> The word *čölgä* < Mong. *čölge* "circuit," cf. Matsui 2008, p. 27.

<sup>34</sup> Matsui 2008, p. 28.

<sup>35</sup> See: Raschmann S.-Ch. "The Personal Name Taḡut as Seen from the Old Uighur Texts" in this volume.



- Geng 1986 — Geng Shimin 耿世民. “Huihuwen ‘Dayuan Suzhou lu yeke daluhuachi Shixi zhi bei’ yanjiu” [Studies on the Uighur Inscription of ‘Da Yuan Suzhou lu yeke daluhuachi Shixi zhi bei’] 回鹘文〈大元肅州路可達魯花赤世襲之碑〉研究. In *Xiang Da xiansheng jinian lunwenji* [Essays in Memory of Professor Xiang Da] 向達先生紀念論文集. Ed. by Yan Wenru 閻文儒 and Chen Yulong 陳玉龍. Urumqi: Xinjiang renmin chubanshe 新疆人民出版社, 1986, pp. 440–454.
- Golden 1992 — Golden P. B. *Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1992.
- Jarring 1997 — Jarring G. *Central Asian Turkic Place-Names, Lop Nor and Tarim Area: An Attempt at Classification and Explanation Based on Sven Hedin's Diaries and Published Works*. Stockholm: The Sven Hedin Foundation, 1997.
- Israpil 2011 — Israpil D. 迪拉娜·伊斯拉非尔. “国家图书馆藏‘畏吾儿写经残卷’跋文研究” [Study on a Colophon of an Uighur Miscellany in the National Library of China]. In *Minzu yuwen* 民族語文, 3 (2011), pp. 56–62.
- Kwanten 1982 — Kwanten L. “The Lexicography of the Hsi Hsia (Tangut) Language.” In *Cahiers de linguistique — Asie centrale*, 11 (2) (1982), pp. 55–67.
- Kychanov 2008 — Кычанов Е.И. *История тангутского государства*. СПб.: Факультет филологии и искусств СПбГУ, 2008.
- Matsui 2008 — Matsui Dai. “Revising the Uigur Inscriptions of the Yulin Caves.” In *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages*, 23 (2008), pp. 17–33.
- Oda 2010 — Oda Joten. *A Study on the Buddhist Sūtra Named ‘Säkiz yükmäk yaruq’ or ‘Säkiz törlügin yarumış yaltrımış’ in Old Turkic*. In 2 vols. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2010.
- Raschmann 2005 — *Altürkische Handschriften. Teil 7: Berliner Fragmente des Goldglanz-Sūtras. Teil 3: Sechstes bis zehntes Buch, Kolophone, Kommentare und Versifizierungen, Gesamtkonkordanzen*. Beschrieben von S.-Ch. Raschmann. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2005 (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland. 13,15).
- Röhrborn 2010 — Röhrborn K. *Uigurisches Wörterbuch. Sprachmaterial der vorislamischen türkischen Texte aus Zentralasien*. Neubearbeitung. I. Verben Bd. 1: ab- – äzüglä-. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2010.
- Rybatzki 2006 — Rybatzki V. *Die Personennamen und Titel der mittelmongolischen Dokumente. Eine lexikalische Untersuchung*. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino Oy, 2006.
- Shi Jinbo, Bai Bin 1982 — Shi Jinbo 史金波, Bai Bin 白濱. “Mogaoku Yulinku xixiawen tiji yanjiu” [Study on the Xi-Xia Inscriptions in the Mogao and Yulin Caves] 莫高窟榆林窟西夏文題記研究. In *Kaogu xuebao* 考古學報, 3 (1982), pp. 367–386.
- Shōgaito 1988 — Shōgaito M. “Drei zum Avalokiteśvara-sūtra passende Avadānas.” In *Der türkische Buddhismus in der japanischen Forschung*. Ed. by J.P. Laut, K. Röhrborn. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1988, pp. 56–99, 13 plates.
- Thackston 1998 — Rashiduddin Fazlullah. *Jami’u’t-Tawarikh: Compendium of Chronicles. A History of the Mongols*. Transl. and annotated by W.M. Thackston. Pt. 1. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Dept. of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, 1998.
- User 2009 — User Ş. H. *Köktürk ve Ötüken Uyğur Kağanlığı Yazıtları (Söz Varlığı İncelemesi)*. Konya: Kömen Yayınları, 2009.
- Zieme 1994 — Zieme P. “Review of K. Röhrborn, Die altürkische Xuanzang-Biographie VII.” In *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 144 (1994), pp. 422–424.
- Zieme 1981 — Zieme P. “Materialien zum uigurischen Onomasticon II.” In *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belleten 1978–1979*. Ankara, 1981, pp. 81–94.
- Zieme 2005 — Zieme P. “Notizen zur Geschichte des Namens sart.” In *Turks and Non-Turks: Studies on the History of Linguistic and Cultural Contacts*. Ed. by E. Siemienieć-Golaś & M. Pomorska. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2005, pp. 531–539 (Studia Turcologica Cracovensia 10).

Shi Jinbo

## The Pillar of Tangutology: E.I. Kychanov's Contribution and Influence on Tangut Studies

Professor Evgenij Ivanovich Kychanov is well-known among the international academic community as an outstanding specialist who contributed greatly to the Tangut studies, triggering significantly the development and progress of research.

E.I. Kychanov has devoted himself to Tangut studies for more than half a century since 1959, when he set up with research of Tangut manuscripts collected in the Leningrad (St. Petersburg) Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences (IOS RAS). He has made good use of a number of Tangut documents kept in his Institute and having started with the inventory work and paleography achieved great results and gained respect from his colleagues Tangutologists worldwide.

In 2012 we are celebrating Professor Kychanov's 80<sup>th</sup> anniversary and the whole international Tangutological community extend their sincere congratulations on this occasion.

My postgraduate career majoring in Tangut studies began in 1950s and since then I have known about Russian scholars' works in Tangut studies, including Professor Kychanov's monographs. I didn't meet him at that time, but had an imaginary contact with him. After the opening-up of China since the late 1970s, there was a recovery in academic exchange between China and Russia, and in Tangutology this process was faster than in any other field. In 1987, I was into luck to be one of the first Chinese Tangutologists visiting IOS RAS and met Professor Kychanov and other Russian scholars. From then on, I have known E.I. Kychanov for 25 years mostly through our research communication and cooperation. And we became good friends. He is 8 years older than me, therefore, I consider him as my Mentor. I have learnt a lot from him and his works and he is a great example to me. Hereupon I would like to speak about Professor Kychanov's great contribution and deep influence on the Tangut studies and it will be based on my own knowledge about him.

© Shi Jinbo, 2012