

# TEXTS AND MANUSCRIPTS: DESCRIPTION AND RESEARCH

Hiroshi Kumamoto

## SINO-HVATANICA PETERSBURGENSIA (PART I)

The manuscript fragments we deal here with are the following: Dx 18926 + SI P 93.22 + Dx 18928; Dx 18916; Dx 18927; Dx 18930; Dx 18931; Dx 1461. They all belong to the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies (Russian Academy of Sciences), but no transcription or interpretation of them was given in *Saka Documents VII: the St. Petersburg Collections* (1993) by R. E. EMMERICK and M. I. VOROB'EVA-DES'ATOVS'KAYA and *Saka Documents Text Volume III: the St. Petersburg Collections* (1995) by the same authors. The reason these manuscripts first escaped the close attention of the editors of the above-mentioned volumes seems to be that all fragments contain Chinese text, with few portions of Khotanese added. In fact, they are more Chinese than Khotanese documents. For this reason, the fragments were put aside to be included in a future publication of Chinese documents from Central Asia. Although the manuscripts bear call numbers with signature Dx to indicate their Dunhuang origin, and are classified among Chinese Dunhuang documents, the Chinese texts, as well as the Khotanese ones, clearly show that the manuscripts come from the Gaysāta area (in the Domoko oasis north-east of Khotan); they can be dated to the second half of the eighth century.

Of these manuscripts with Chinese and Khotanese texts, however, only Dx 18926 + SI P 93.22 + Dx 18928 (and probably a small fragment Dx 18930) can be called a bilingual document in the sense that the Khotanese text appears to be an interlinear translation of the Chinese. We find the same method of interlinear translation, with a Chinese text representing an original official document and the Khotanese a gloss to it for the benefit of the non-Chinese local population in Hedin 24 [1]. This text is unfortunately more fragmentary than ours. There is also a series of bilingual voucher entries (Hedin 15, 16, Dumaqu C, D), in which the Chinese text appears to be primary, too.

As for our texts, part of Dx 18927 shows that the Khotanese text relates to the preceding Chinese text, whereas in all others (Dx 18916, Dx 18931, Dx 1461 and the remaining part of Dx 18927) the Chinese and Khotanese texts are independent.

We note here that in the present article, the Chinese texts are dealt with only if they have some relation to the Khotanese texts. We leave the proper interpretation of the Chinese texts to specialists in the field.

### Camel sale contract (Dx 18926 + SI P 93.22 + Dx 18928)

It is immediately clear that the larger two pieces (Dx 18926 and Dx 18928) form the greater part of a single document (see *fig. 1*). Dr. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya has kindly confirmed for me that the small piece of SI P 93.22, published earlier in *Saka Documents VII*, plate 67e and *Saka Documents Text Volume III*, p. 94, No. 112, neatly fits the upper left corner of the right-hand piece (Dx 18926). On the other hand, the left-hand edge of combined Dx 18926 + SI P 93.22 and the right-hand edge of Dx 18928 do not make a perfect fit. In order to determine what portion of the Chinese text with the accompanying Khotanese translation is lost in the gap it is first necessary to examine the external evidence. *Fig. 2* shows bits of Chinese characters on the right margin of Dx 18928. The upper stroke going downward to the left could be the lower left end of the character *qian* 錢 (cf. the same character in the middle of line 3 and near the bottom of line 4 in

Dx 18926) making up a whole character together with the remaining traces at the top of line 4 of Dx 18926. Likewise, two small bits in the lower part of *fig. 2* might be the top part of the character *yi* 壹 in line 4 of Dx 18926 (the top of the vertical stroke of 士 and the beginning of 冫 respectively) [2]. In support of the assumption that only a few characters at the bottom, not the whole line (or lines) in the Chinese text are lost in the gap between the two larger fragments, identical passages from other sale contracts may be adduced. In our document, line 4 of Dx 18926 has 其錢及(駝) "That money (as agreed upon) and the camel" with a few characters missing at the broken bottom, while the first line of Dx 18928 has 交]相分付了 "have changed hands" with the first character lost at the broken top. This can readily be compared with S 5820+5826 [3] (a cow sale contract from Dunhuang under Tibetan rule, the year 803), lines 4–5 其牛及麥即日交相分付了 "That cow and