Galambos Imre

Consistency in Tangut Translations of Chinese Military Texts[1]

Translations of Chinese works on military strategy are an important part of the Tangut texts available to us today. As texts for which we have parallel Chinese versions, they are invaluable for enriching our knowledge of the Tangut language, including its syntax, morphology, and lexicon. When aligned side by side, however, Chinese and Tangut versions often exhibit differences, ranging from minor discrepancies in wording to omissions or additions of complete sentences and sections. The question arises whether these differences are due to the fact that the translators worked from Chinese editions that are no longer extant or they took liberties with the texts for a variety of reasons. Perhaps they localized them to fit their cultural and linguistic environment and made them more accessible for Tangut readers, at times leaving out details they deemed inconsequential, or integrating commentary-type explanations for passages that otherwise would have been obscure for the Xi-Xia readership.

In this paper, I look at examples of discrepancies between multiple Tangut versions of the same Chinese phrase or text segment, to assess the consistency of their translation. In order to secure a relatively stable environment where variation cannot be attributed to the diversity of the material, I limit my analysis to translations of Chinese military works. My aim is to show that even within such a closely defined genre, at times we encounter inconsistencies. This not only implies that many of the texts were translated by different people but also that even the key works lacked textual authority, and none of them functioned as a model for new transla-

---

1

tions. Similarly, the differences in the transliteration of the names of some important historical figures from China's past show that the Tangut did not have a constant way of writing them but transcribed them phonetically each time they occurred.

1. Tangut translations of Chinese military texts

Among the non-Buddhist material translated from Chinese into Tangut, works on military strategy represent one of the principal categories. Beside the cultural implications of this pronounced interest in military lore,[2] the corpus is also significant in size, containing both printed and handwritten material. The currently identified texts are as follows:

A) *Sunzi bingfa* with three commentaries 孫子兵法三家注 (hereafter: *Sunzi*)

The three commentaries referred to in the title are those by Cao Cao 曹操 (155–220), Li Quan 李筌 (fl. 740) and Du Mu 杜牧 (803–852). A version of the *Sunzi* with three commentaries is unknown in the Chinese tradition, where we only find editions with ten or eleven.[3] These, however, include the three commentaries we see in the Tangut edition.[4]

There are two copies of this text, held at the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts (IOM), Russian Academy of Sciences, in St. Petersburg. The first copy is a printed edition in a 'butterfly' format (Танг 6/2-3), followed by an incomplete biography of Sunzi (*Sunzi zhuan* – see below).[5] Two pages of the *Sunzi* with commentaries from probably the same printed edition were also identified in the Stein collection at the British Library.[6] The other copy in St. Petersburg is a manuscript scroll with the very end of the *Sunzi* (17 rows in total) followed by a complete biography of Sunzi.[7] A Russian translation of the printed Tangut edition and its commentaries,

---

[2] The Tangut were certainly not the only non-Chinese people who valued Chinese military works. One of the earliest Chinese books translated into Manchu, for example, was the *Sanguo yanyi* 三國演義, which is essentially a literary representation of the military lore. The list of other early translations of works on strategy into Manchu is very similar to the ones found at Khara-Khoto, including the *Huang Shigong sanlüe* 黃石公三略 and the *Liutao* 六韜. See Durrant 1979, pp. 654-655.

[3] The difference between the ten and eleven commentaries of Chinese Song editions lies in whether the commentary of Du You 杜佑 (735–812) is included among them. For a short overview of the textual history of the *Sunzi* in the Chinese tradition, see Gawlikowski and Lowe 1993.

[4] Kepping showed that bits and pieces of the Chinese text commentaries are absent from the Tangut translation. The translation, however, at times also contains parts that do not appear in extant Chinese editions. Accordingly, Kepping concluded that the editions serving as a basis for the translation differed from the ones surviving today (Kepping 1979, pp. 16–17).

[5] Gorbachova and Kychanov 1963, p. 36. On the bookbinding formats used for Tangut books, see Drège 2006.

[6] These two pages were identified by Eric Grinstead who also published a photograph of one of the pages (Grinstead 1961, p. 85).

[7] For a detailed description of the scroll and a Russian translation of the surviving 17 rows of the *Sunzi*, see Kepping 1977. She points out that although a title at the end of the *Sunzi* claims that this an edition with three commentaries, there are no commentaries in the few surviving lines of the text (Kepping 1977, p. 162).

with photographic reproductions, was published by Ksenia Kepping in 1979.[8] Subsequently, Lin Ying-chin 林英津 also published the entire text with detailed textual and linguistic analyses.[9]

B) *Sunzi zhuan* 孫子傳

This is a biography of Sunzi which is appended to the end of the Tangut translation of the *Sunzi*. The text essentially matches the "Biography of Sunzi" 孫子列傳 in the *Shiji* 史記. Considering that there is not a single copy of a dynastic history among the relatively large number of Tangut translations of Chinese texts and that historical works in general are rare among the surviving material, it is reasonable to assume that the Tangut translator did not extract the *Sunzi zhuan* from the *Shiji* but that he was working with the Chinese editions that had already joined the *Sunzi* and the *Sunzi zhuan* together.[10] The overlapping portions between the printed and handwritten copies of both the *Sunzi* and the *Sunzi zhuan* confirm that despite the number of smaller discrepancies we are essentially dealing with the same translation.[11]

There are two copies of this text, both kept at the IOM in St. Petersburg. One is an incomplete copy on a woodblock print (Танг 6/3), the other a complete one as part of a manuscript scroll (Танг 7). In both cases the text is appended to the translation of the *Sunzi* (see above). There are some differences between the printed and handwritten versions but the printed edition seems to be an improved version of the manuscript, and it is possible that the manuscript served as the proofs for the woodblock edition.[12] The printed has been published by Kepping along with her study of the *Sunzi*, and later by Lin Ying-chin.[13]

C) *Liutao* 六韜

This is a printed edition at the IOM in St. Petersburg (Танг 8/1-4), bound using the 'butterfly' format. Among the surviving pages, there are also duplicate fragments of the same edition. One of the interesting features of the Tangut translation is that it includes two chapters (*pian* 篇) which cannot be found in the Chinese text. These two chapters have been located as quotes from the *Liutao* in the Tang dynasty encyclopedias such as the *Taiping yulan* 太平御覽 and Du You's 杜佑 *Tongdian* 通典.[14] In addition to the material at the IOM, recently a small fragment from the Stein collection at the British Library has been identified as belonging to the *Liutao*, although it is probably a different edition from that in St. Petersburg.[15]

---

[8] Kepping 1979. Photographic images of all Tangut military texts in the IOM collection have been published in *Ecang Heishuicheng wenxian,* vol. 11.

[9] Lin Ying-chin 1994.

[10] This argument is put forward in Nie Hongyin 1991, p 267.

[11] For the list of discrepancies between the printed and manuscript copies of the *Sunzi zhuan*, see Kepping 1977, pp. 163–165.

[12] Kepping 1977, p. 165.

[13] Kepping 1979; Lin Ying-chin 1994.

[14] Nie Hongyin reconstructed the Tangut chapters missing from the Chinese text (Nie Hongyin 1996) and his reconstruction later served as the basis for locating the missing parts in Tang encyclopedias (Song Lulu 2004).

[15] This is item Or.12380/0516, identified by Shi Jinbo (2010, p. 7).

D) *Huang Shigong sanlüe* 黃石公三略 (hereafter: *Sanlüe*)

A printed edition at the IOM in St. Petersburg (Танг 9/1-4), bound using the 'butterfly' format. All surviving pages belong to the same edition. Beside the main text, there is also a commentary by an unidentified commentator, which did not survive in the Chinese tradition.[16]

E) *Jiangyuan* 將苑

This is a military treatise attributed to Zhuge Liang, the renowned strategist of the 3rd c. The text, also known in Chinese as *Xinshu* 心書, has long been recognized as a medieval forgery and since it is mentioned the first time in Song catalogues, it is reasonable to assume that it was compiled around the Northern Song. Peculiarly, the Tangut translation is the earliest known edition of this text, and the oldest Chinese editions date to the Ming.[17] The Tangut manuscript is a scroll in the collection of the British Library (Or.12380/1840). It represents about two-third of the Chinese text, including the title at the end. The lower part of the scroll is torn off and because of this all lines a few characters from their lower part. There are no commentaries to the main text.

2. Translation consistency as a corpus builder

By the Song period, military texts have evolved into a distinct genre with specific terminology and imagery. In 1080, under the orders of the Song emperor Shenzong 神宗 (r. 1068–1085), seven works were officially gathered into a canon by the name of *Wujing qishu* 武經七書, a Song edition of which survives to this day.[18] This compilation had a strong standardizing effect on the texts and almost complete eradicated the other editions of smaller titles such as the *Liutao* and *Sanlüe*. Of the five military texts that survive in Tangut, the *Sunzi*, the *Liutao*, and the *Sanlüe* were also part of the *Wujing qishu* canon, whereas the *Sunzi zhuan* and the *Jiangyuan* were not.[19] A comparison of the *Wujing qishu* edition with the corresponding Tangut translations shows that the Tangut translators relied on other editions that are no longer extant.[20] In this way, the Tangut translations are important

---

[16] The bibliographic catalogue of the *Suishu* 隋書 lists a *Huang Shigong sanlüe* with a commentary by a Mr. Cheng 成氏, which was popular during the Tang, and perhaps this was the one translated into Tangut (Zhong Han 2007, p. 90).

[17] The text has been first identified by Eric Grinstead (1962); a more detailed study was done by Ksenia Kepping (Kepping and Gong Hwang-cherng 2003). See also my own papers on this manuscript (Galambos 2011a and 2011b).

[18] Gawlikowski and Lowe 1993, p. 450.

[19] This can be explained with the fact that the *Sunzi zhuan* is not a military text *per se* but a biography that was originally part of a historiographical composition. In contrast, the *Jiangyuan* would have qualified as a military treatise but it might have not have existed before1080, or was viewed as a recent forgery and thus unworthy of being canonized.

[20] This is naturally true for the Tangut *Sunzi* which includes only three commentaries, whereas the one in the *Wujing qishu*, ten. But there is also the case of the *Sanlüe* where the Tangut version in many cases matches the *Changduanjing* 長短經 edition, as opposed to the *Wujing qishu*. See Zhong Han 2005, p. 89 and Zhong Han 2006.

witnesses to the diversity of the editions in Song times, implying that alongside large-scale normative textual projects, such as the compilation of the *Wujing qishu*, there were also other versions that gradually lost their significance. In most cases the Tangut translations stem from this earlier tradition and predate Song standardizations.

Military texts are a clearly identifiable category in classical Chinese literature, with a highly developed and systematic technical vocabulary. Terms are used consistently and the vocabulary is fairly standardized. Within this system, from the early medieval period onward, the *Sunzi* has been regarded as the most authoritative text and was commonly cited in all other works. In the Chinese context, phrases or passages from the *Sunzi* would have been adopted into later texts and integrated as quotes. A Tangut translator, on the other hand, had two choices. First, he could have translated the quote along with the rest of the text, disregarding the fact that it came from somewhere else. In this case the quote technically would have ceased to be a quote, as it would have stopped referred to another text in the new language. The second solution was to look up an existing translation for the quote, if its source text (e.g. the *Sunzi*) had already been translated. This would have simplified the task of the translator since he would have only had to locate the part in question in an available translation. More importantly, the connection between the two texts, established by virtue of the quote, would have also been preserved in Tangut.

The Tangut translations of most military texts are believed to have been made during the second half of the 12th c.[21] Based on the fact that even within such a limited corpus some texts survive in more than one edition, we can make a couple observations. First, that works on military strategy were extremely popular in Tangut society. This is indirectly corroborated by the rarity, or complete absence, of some of the other genres that were popular in China (e.g. dynastic histories). Based on the material we have today, we have to assume that military works were one of the most popular writings in the Xi-Xia kingdom.[22] Second, the existence of different editions means that the same treatise could have been translated more than once and that an earlier translation could be improved in a follow-up edition. This also indicates that such texts would not have been translated as part of a centralized project as it was the case with Buddhist scriptures.

With the availability of Tangut translations of several Chinese military works we have a sizeable collection of texts that belong to the same literary genre and share the same basic vocabulary and rhetorical style. The analysis of such a corpus is a much more efficient way of understanding the process of translation activity

---

[21] As an exception from this, Kepping proposed that the *Jiangyuan* might have been translated "not earlier than the second half of the 12th c., but seemingly much later" because she believed that the Northern Di 北狄 barbarians, described in the last section of the text, referred to the Mongols (Kepping and Gong Hwang-cherng 2003, p. 22). Thus she seems to suggest an early 13th c. dating, which is unlikely as the content the passage in question comes from Chinese sources and certainly predates the Mongol threat. Accordingly, the appearance of Mongol forces on the Xi-Xia border has no bearing on the date of the translation. See Galambos 2011b, pp. 103–104.

[22] Other prominent categories beside military literature were various types of dictionaries and popular Confucian works.

than examining single works. Unlike translations of Buddhist scriptures, where fidelity and consistency had a religious significance and thus translators had to approximate the Chinese text as much as possible, sometimes down to the level of characters, for military works intelligibility and clarity of meaning was valued higher than a word for word correspondence. Naturally, in an effort to increase readability, the translator may have chosen to handle the same term differently based on the context. For example, Nishida Tatsuo 西田龍雄 points out that the Tangut *Liutao* uses different words in place of the Chinese character 守 (*shou* 'to protect; guard') when that appears in different contexts: *liu shou* 六守 ('the six kinds of *shou*'), *shou tu* 守土 ('defense of national territory') and *shou guo* 守國 ('maintenance of the state').[23] Nishida comments that although the Tangut characters used as equivalents for the Chinese character 守 are noticeably related to each other, 'it is difficult to concretely determine the differences among them.'[24] Yet translating words according to their meaning in the context do not always present a problem especially if these words are not technical terms. But within a closely defined domain of technical treatises, such as the corpus of Chinese military texts, a consistent handling of key terminology is certainly desirable.

3. Analysis of examples

Below I look at three examples to evaluate the consistency of translation in Tangut versions of Chinese military works. The first example is a quote from the *Sunzi* that appears in two other texts; the second, a parallel section in the *Sanlüe* and the *Jiangyuan*; finally the third, the name of Zhuge Liang in the commentaries of the *Sunzi* and the *Sunzi zhuan*.

In my analysis, I use the numbering in Lin Ying-chin's book (1994) to refer to specific parts of the *Sunzi* and the *Sunzi zhuan* (e.g. Lin Ying-chin 1994, pp. 3–44). For the other texts, I adopt the section numbers of their extant editions (e.g. *Jiangyuan* 28). In the tables used for comparison, the first row is the name of the source text; the second row ("T") contains the Tangut characters; the third ("TC"), the Chinese word-for-word glosses of the Tangut text; and the fourth ("C"), the Chinese original in the corresponding place. For the Chinese *Jiangyuan*, I use the 1960 Zhonghua shuju edition called *Zhuge Liang ji* 諸葛亮集; for the *Sanlüe*, the *Wujing qishu* edition. The pronunciation of Tangut words, whenever relevant, is based on Sofronov's reconstruction, in the form they are presented in Kychanov's dictionary.

Example 1.
The phrase 'there are cases when the ruler's orders are not obeyed' 君命有所不受 appears in the *Sunzi*, the *Sunzi zhuan* and the *Jiangyuan*. Although in the Warring States period this probably circulated as a proverb-like popular axiom, in the two texts in question it is unmistakably a quote from the *Sunzi*. Yet as shown in

---

[23] Nishida 2000, pp. 228–229.
[24] Nishida 2000, p. 229.

Table 1, the Tangut translation is different in each case. In the Tangut version of the *Sunzi*[25], it appears as 𗼃𗫐𗦲𗆟𗤒 (君命不聽有); in the *Sunzi zhuan* as 𗈪𗼃𗗟𗫜𗆷𗦲𗆟𗆷 𗴮𗤒𗿟 (軍君之敕言不聽可亦有謂); and in the *Jiangyuan*, in an incomplete form, as 𗼑𗫐𗼨𗆷𗴺... (王命令言中...). In addition, the phrase 'the general receives his orders from the ruler' 將受命於君, which appears in the *Sunzi*[26] and is similar to the one examined in Table 1, is translated as 𗫜𗼃𗫐𗢳𗦲 (將君命△受). This latter seems to be the closest in structure to the original Chinese.

Table 1. The phrase 'there are cases when the ruler's orders are no obeyed'
君命有所不受 in different military texts

	Sunzi [Lin 3–50]	*Sunzi zhuan* [Lin 3–186]	*Jiangyuan* 28
T	𗼃𗫐𗦲𗆟𗤒	𗈪𗼃𗗟𗫜𗆷𗦲𗆟𗆷 𗴮𗤒𗿟	𗈪𗫜𗼕𗴻𗼑𗫐𗼨𗆷𗴺...
TC	君命不聽有	軍君之敕言不聽可亦有謂	將軍出時王命令言中...
C	君命有所不受	將在軍, 君命有所不受。	將之出, 君命有所不受。

In the first two cases, the concept of 'obeying orders' 受命 is expressed using the verb 𗦲 (*ni* 'to listen to') which in this context is equivalent to the meaning of the verb "to accept, obey." Yet, as Table 2 demonstrates, the phrase 'the ruler's orders' shows a great deal of variation between different versions. It is expressed as 𗼃𗫐 (君命) both times in the *Sunzi*, yet the *Sunzi zhuan* uses a more roundabout form of 𗼃𗗟𗫜𗆷 (君之敕言). In the *Jiangyuan*, on the other hand, we see the more specific word 'king' (*nın* 𗼑) instead of the generic 'ruler' (*ndzwı* 𗼃). In addition, the word 'orders' is expressed using the three-syllable, and thus presumably semantically more precise, noun phrase 𗫐𗼨𗆷 (命令言). We must assume that the translator used this translation for the sake of clarity, instead of trying to approximate the concise language of classical Chinese by finding an equivalent monosyllabic word for each Chinese character.

Table 2. Translations of the phrase 'the ruler's orders' 君命

	Sunzi [Lin 3–44]	*Sunzi* [Lin 3–50]	*Sunzi zhuan* [Lin 3–186]	*Jiangyuan* 28
T	𗼃𗫐	𗼃𗫐	𗼃𗗟𗫜𗆷	𗼑𗫐𗼨𗆷
TC	君命	君命	君之敕言	王命令言
C	君命	君命	君命	君命

Example 2.
The *Sanlüe* and the *Jiangyuan* have a parallel section that appears in their received versions the following way:

[25] Lin Ying-chin 1994, pp. 3–50.
[26] Lin Ying-chin 1994, pp. 3–44.

Sanlüe — 'Shang lüe' 上略

軍讖曰：
軍井未達, 將不言渴;
軍幕未辦, 將不言倦;
軍竈未炊, 將不言飢;
冬不服裘, 夏不操扇, 雨不張蓋。

There is an old military wisdom which says that before his troops reach the well, the general does not speak of being thirsty; before his troops are set up, the general does not speak of being tired. In the winter he does not wear a fur coat, in the summer he is not cooled with a fan, in the rain he is not sheltered under a canopy.

Jiangyuan 45

夫為將之道,
軍井未汲, 將不言渴;
軍食未熟, 將不言飢;
軍火未然, 將不言寒;
軍幕未施, 將不言困;
夏不操扇, 雨不張蓋,
與眾同也。

Now the way of the general is such that before his troops draw water from the well, the general does not speak of being thirsty; before the food of his troops is cooked, the general does not speak of being hungry; before the fire of his troops is lit, the general does not speak of being cold; before the tents of his troops are set, the general does not speak of being sleepy. In the summer he is not cooled with a fan, in the rain he is not sheltered under a canopy — he is the same as everyone else.

The *Sanlüe* is itself a text with complex textual history and there are considerable differences between different editions. Its earliest surviving copy is a manuscript from Dunhuang, currently held at the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts in St. Petersburg (shelfmark: Дх-17449), probably predating the Sui-Tang period.[27] In the corresponding part, however, we find less than half of what appears in the *Wujing qishu* edition. Other editions have additional discrepancies, thus it is clear that the assessment of the most important textual witnesses would be a prerequisite of any serious comparison. Similarly, the *Jiangyuan* also has a complicated history, with the earliest extant editions going back to the Ming.[28] What matters for our purposes here, however, is how the corresponding parts in the Tangut translations of

---

[27] Fujii 2011, p. 115.
[28] For an overview of the textual history of the Chinese *Jiangyuan*, see Galambos 2011b, pp. 80–82.

the *Sanlüe* and the *Jiangyuan* compare with each other, and to some extent this is independent of the history of the Chinese editions. We are looking for phrases that can be positively identified as being translations of the same Chinese phrase. The relevant sections in Tangut are shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Parallel sections in the Tangut translations of the *Sanlüe* and the *Jiangyuan*

	Sanlüe — 'Shang lüe' 上略	*Jiangyuan* 45 (36)[29]
T	𗿢𗿢𗿢𗿢, 𗿢𗿢𗿢𗿢。 𗿢𗿢𗿢𗿢, 𗿢𗿢𗿢𗿢。 [𗿢]𗿢𗿢𗿢, 𗿢𗿢𗿢𗿢, 𗿢𗿢𗿢𗿢。	𗿢𗿢𗿢𗿢, 𗿢𗿢𗿢𗿢; 𗿢□[𗿢]□, [𗿢]□[𗿢]□; 𗿢𗿢𗿢𗿢, 𗿢𗿢𗿢𗿢; 𗿢𗿢𗿢𗿢, 𗿢□[𗿢]□...
TC	井掘不俱, 將渴不言; 軍營未定, 將倦不言; [冬] 裘不服, 夏扇不操, 雨蓋不張。	軍水未飲, 自渴不思; 軍□[未]□, [自]□[不]□; 軍火未燃, 自寒不言; 軍未涼至此, 自□[不]□...
C	軍井未達, 將不言渴; 軍幕未辦, 將不言倦; 冬不服裘, 夏不操扇, 雨不張蓋	軍井未汲, 將不言渴; 軍食未熟, 將不言飢; 軍火未燃, 將不言寒; 夏不操扇, 雨不張蓋

Without considering the arrangement of the entire section, we can see that the two translations are quite similar. Although because of the fragmentary nature of the *Jiangyuan* manuscript, only Line #1 can qualify as a definite match between the two versions, the pattern of the segments' structure is clear. One of the most apparent differences is the way the second half-segment is rendered into Tangut. In the *Sanlüe*, it closely follows the Chinese: e.g. 𗿢𗿢𗿢𗿢 (將渴不言 < 將不言渴). In the *Jiangyuan*, however, we see a different grammatical structure, as here the subject "general" (𗿢/將) is substituted with the reflexive pronoun "himself" (𗿢/自). Because the surviving editions show that the Chinese must have been the same in both cases (i.e. 將不言渴 'the general does not speak of being thirsty'), we can be certain that the discrepancy is produced by the act of translation. Naturally, in both translations the meaning of the text remains the same.

Looking at the larger context of this section in the Chinese versions of the two texts, we can see that the reason why the reflexive pronoun "himself" (𗿢/自) can be used in the *Jiangyuan* is that the subject is introduced at the very beginning of the section with the words "Now the way of the general..." 夫為將之道. Thus later on it is possible to refer back to this subject. In a way, the Tangut translator is eliminating the redundancy that is part of the Chinese original by omitting the word

---

[29] The section numbers in Tangut and Chinese do not match. Section 45 of the received Chinese text is marked in the Tangut manuscript as Section 36.

'general' from each line. In the *Sanlüe*, however, the section is introduced with the words "There is an old military wisdom which says..." 軍讖曰, without any reference to the subject of the following segments. Accordingly, the discrepancies between the two Tangut translations are to some extent triggered by the way these sections are introduced in their Chinese original.

Example 3.

Another interesting aspect of translation consistency is how Chinese names are transliterated in Tangut. Zhuge Liang, the famous statesman and general of the 3rd c., is one of the most prominent figures in military literature. In the Tangut material, his name occurs in the commentaries of the *Sunzi* and the *Sunzi zhuan*. At least once, he is referred to as Zhuge-wuhou 諸葛武侯 (Lord Martial Zhuge), which is rendered into Tangut as a purely phonetic transcription, even though the second half of it is an epithet. Finally, there is also a mention of Zhuge Kan 諸葛侃 who shares the same surname, and thus can be included in the comparison as a reference. Table 4 shows these names side by side.

Table 4. Tangut transliterations of Zhuge Liang's name

	Sunzi [Lin 3–8]	*Sunzi* [Lin 3–26]	*Sunzi* [Lin 3–67]	*Sunzi zhuan* [Lin 3–120]	*Sunzi zhuan* [Lin 3–112]
T	𗴾𘁥𗋽	𗴾𗾧𗰖	𗴾𗦻𗉯𗥃	𗴾𘁥𗰖	𗴾𗦻𗽈
TC	tśịu ka lịon	tśịu kịa lịon	tśịu ka u xeɯ	tśịu ka lịon	tśịu ka khan
C	諸葛亮	諸葛亮	諸葛武侯	諸葛亮	諸葛侃

We can see that Zhuge Liang's name is never written in exactly the same way. In the second instance,[30] there is divergence even in the pronunciation. This is surprising in view of his general popularity during the Song.[31] We would expect the name of such a well-known historical figure to be written consistently in military works, especially since he was a hero of this very tradition. In other words, we would expect that there was a more or less standard Tangut way of writing his name. The lack of consistency is an indication that he was not as well-known in Xi-Xia and when a translator had to write his name, he could not simply write it the 'usual way', because such a way did not exist, but had to invent his own transliteration. As the first two instances show,[32] variation existed even within the same text.

At the same time, other names that occur multiple times in the corpus, such as Sun Bin 孫臏 and Huang Shigong 黃石公, are written consistently. The reason for this must have been their prominence in military lore, although Zhuge Liang's case

---

[30] Lin Ying-chin 1994, pp. 3–26.

[31] Zhuge Liang's heroic popularity seems to date no earlier than the Song, when his figure indeed acquired a supernatural dimension. On the evolution of his image and his rise to prominence in the popular lore, see Henry 1992; Tillman 2002.

[32] Lin Ying-chin 1994, pp. 3–8 and 3–26.

seems to be a counter-example to this argument. Similarly, the names of the three commentators in the Tangut *Sunzi* (e.g. Cao Cao 曹操, Li Quan 李筌 and Du Mu 杜牧) are also written consistently, which can be explained by the fact that their name occurred in the text so often that it inevitably led to a stable orthography. But of the five military texts available to us, their names only occur in the *Sunzi* and it is reasonable to assume that elsewhere they would have been written differently.

4. Conclusion

In this paper I attempted to assess translation consistency in Tangut versions of Chinese military works. Military texts were chosen because they represent a set of technical writings belonging to the same genre and sharing a common vocabulary and rhetorical devices. As part of the same tradition, the texts are interconnected by means of quotes and allusions. In addition, there are several surviving translations of military texts, which provide sufficient material for such an analysis. I chose three examples of text segments (phrases or names) that occur in this corpus more than once, with the aim to compare the way they are translated into Tangut.

In Example 1, we saw that a quote from the *Sunzi* was slightly different in each text, showing that no 'standard' translation existed to which translators could refer to. Thus translators had to re-translate the quote each time they came across it. This was the same in the case of the name of Zhuge Liang (Example 3), which was written differently every time it occurred, revealing that no definite way of writing this name existed in the Tangut language. This also meant that, unlike in the Chinese tradition where by Song times Zhuge Liang had evolved in the popular imagination into one of top strategists of all times, he was relatively unknown in the Xi-Xia kingdom. In contrast with this, some other names (e.g. Sun Bin, Huang Shigong) are translated consistently, which suggests that these figures were either better known or their names occurred in the available material more often. Finally, Example 2 demonstrated that the discrepancies between the parallel segments in the *Sanlüe* and the *Jiangyuan* could at least partially be explained by differences between the textual contexts of their Chinese originals.

The inconsistencies introduced in the above examples did little in way of changing the meaning of the text, the parallel renditions remained synonymous and functioned as alternate translations of the same original. Nevertheless, the lack of consistency implies that Chinese military texts were not translated as a canon. They were done by different people, at different times, presumably each of them undertaking the task for his own reasons. Therefore the treatises appear in Tangut as separate text, missing much of the interconnectedness that characterizes the Chinese tradition.

In contrast with this, in Chinese military literature the connections established by quotes and other intertextual devices form a complex network of textual interdependencies. When the quotes are translated in a consistent manner, these relations to some extent can be preserved in the target language. But when they are inconsistent, as we have seen in the examples analyzed in this paper, they lose their trans-

parency and stop functioning as links between texts. The corpus falls apart. Accordingly, in the Tangut context we can only speak of individual texts, not a unified tradition or corpus. A large-scale centrally controlled translation project would have solved most of these problems but, as the above examples intended to show, there is no evidence for this in the case of secular texts.

References

Drège 2006 — Drège J.-P. "Le livre imprimé sino-tangut." In *Journal asiatique*, 294 (2006), pp. 343–371.

Durrant 1979 — Durrant S. "Sino-Manchu Translations at the Mukden Court." In *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 99/4 (1979), pp. 653–661.

Ecang Heishuicheng wenxian 2001 — *Ecang Heishuicheng wenxian* [Khara-Khoto Manuscripts Collected in Russia] 俄藏黑水城文献. Vol. 11. *Xi-Xia wen shisu bufen* [Tangut Secular Manuscripts] 西夏文世俗部分. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe 上海：上海古籍出版社, 2001.

Fujii 2011 — Fujii Noriyuki 藤井律之 2011. "Dx17449 *Kyōchūbon kō sekikō sanryaku* shōkō Дх17449" 「夾注本黃石公三略」小考. In *Tonkō shahon kenkyū nenpō* [Annual Journal of Dunhuang Manuscripts Studies] 敦煌寫本研究年報, 5 (2011), pp. 115–127.

Galambos 2011a — Galambos I. "The Tangut Translation of the *General's Garden* by Zhuge Liang." In *Письменные памятники Востока*, 1(14) (2011), pp. 131–142.

Galambos 2011b — Galambos I. "The northern neighbors of the Tangut." In *Cahiers de Linguistique – Asie Orientale*, 40 (2011), pp. 69–104.

Gawlikowski and Lowe 1993 — Gawlikowski K., Lowe M. "Sun tzu ping fa 孫子兵法." In *Early Chinese Texts: A Bibliographical Guide*. Ed. by M. Lowe. Berkeley: SSEC and IEAS, UC Berkeley, 1993, pp. 446–455 (Early China Special Monograph Series 2).

Gorbachova and Kychanov 1963 — *Тангутские рукописи и ксилографы. Список отождествленных и определенных тангутских рукописей и ксилографов коллекции Института народов Азии АН СССР*. Сост. З.И. Горбачева и Е.И. Кычанов. М.: Издательство восточной литературы, 1963.

Grinstead 1961 — Grinstead E. "Tangut Fragments in the British Museum." In *The British Museum Quarterly*, 24 (3/4) (1961), pp. 82–87.

Grinstead 1962 — Grinstead E. "The General's Garden, a Twelfth-Century Military Work." In *The British Museum Quarterly*, 26 (1/2) (1962), pp. 35–37.

Henry 1992 — Henry E. "Chu-ko Liang in the Eyes of his Contemporaries." In *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 52 (2) (1992), pp. 589–612.

Kepping 1977 — Кепинг К.Б. "Рукописный фрагмент военного трактата Сунь-цзы в тангутском переводе." In *Письменные памятники Востока. Историко-филологические исследования*. Ежегодник 1972. М.: Наука, ГРВЛ, 1977, pp. 161–166.

Kepping 1979 — *Сунь-цзы в тангутском переводе*. Факсимиле ксилографа, изд. текста, пер., введ., коммент., граммат. очерк, словарь и прил. К.Б. Кепинг. М.: Наука, ГРВЛ, 1979 (Памятники письменности Востока, XLIX).

Kepping and Gong Hwang-cherng 2003 — Kepping K., Gong Hwang-cherng. "Zhuge Liang's 'The General's Garden' in the Mi-nia Translation." In Кепинг К.Б. *Последние статьи и документы* [English subtitle: Last Works and Documents]. Под ред. Б.Г. Александрова. СПб.: Омега, 2003, pp. 12–23.

Lin Ying-jin 1994 — Lin Ying-jin 林英津. *Xiayi 'Sunzi bingfa' yanjiu* [English title: Research on Sun-tzy Ping-fa in Tangut] 夏譯《孫子兵法》研究. 2 vols. Taipei: Institute of History and

Philology, Academia Sinica 臺北：中研院史語所, 1994 (Monograph Series of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica 國立中央研究院歷史語言研究所單刊之 28).

Nie Hongyin 1991 — Nie Hongyin 聶鴻音. "Xi-Xia yi *Sunzi zhuan* kaoshi" 西夏譯《孫子傳》考釋. In *Zhongguo minzu guwenzi yanjiu* [Studies on Ancient Scripts of National Minorities of China] 中國民族古文字研究, 3 (1991), pp. 267–278.

Nie Hongyin 1996 — Nie Hongyin 聶鴻音. "*Liutao* de Xi-Xia wen yiben" 《六韜》的西夏文譯本. In *Chuantong wenhua yu xiandaihua* [Traditional Culture and Modernization] 傳統文化與現代化, 5 (1996), pp. 57–60.

Nishida 2000 — Nishida Tatsuo 西田龍雄. "Xixia Language Studies and the Lotus Sutra II." In *The Journal of Oriental Studies* (Tokyo), 20 (2000), pp. 222–251.

Shi Jinbo 2010 — Shi Jinbo 史金波. "*Yingcang Heishuicheng wenxian* dingming chuyi ji buzheng" 《英藏黑水城文獻》定名芻議及不正. In *Xi-Xia xue* [Tangut Studies] 西夏學, 5 (2010), pp. 1–16.

Song Lulu 2004 — Song Lulu 宋璐璐. "Xi-Xia yiben zhong de liang pian *Liutao* yiwen" 西夏譯本中的兩篇《六韜》佚文. In *Ningxia shehui kexue* [Social Sciences in Ningxia] 寧夏社會科學, 1 (122) (2004), pp. 79–80.

Sun Yingxin 2010 — Sun Yingxin 孫穎新. "Xixia yiben *Sunzi zhuan* kaobu" 西夏譯本《孫子傳》考補. In *Xi-Xia xue* [Tangut Studies] 西夏學, 6 (2010), pp. 70–74.

Tillman 2002 — Tillman H.C. "Reassessing Du Fu's line on Zhuge Liang." In *Monumenta Serica*, 50 (2002), pp. 295–313.

Zhong Han 2005 — Zhong Han 鍾焓. "*Huang Shigong sanlüe* Xixia ben zhengwen de wenxian tezheng" 《黃石公三略》西夏譯本正文的文獻特徵. In *Minzu yanjiu* [Research on Ethnic Nationalities] 民族研究, 6 (2005), pp. 85–91.

Zhong Han 2006 — Zhong Han 鐘焓. "*Huang Shigong sanlüe* Xixia ben zhushi yu *Changduanjing* ben zhushi de bijiao yanjiu" 《黃石公三略》西夏本注釋與《長短經》本注釋的比較研究. In *Ningxia shehui kexue* [Social Sciences in Ningxia] 寧夏社會科學, 1 (2006), pp. 100–102, 108.

Zhong Han 2007 — Zhong Han 鐘焓. "*Huang Shigong sanlüe* Xixia yiben zhushi laiyuan chutan: Yi yu *Qunshu zhiyao* ben zhushi de bijiao wei zhongxin" 《黃石公三略》西夏譯本注釋來源初探——以與《群書治要》本注釋的比較为中心. In *Ningxia shehui kexue* [Social Sciences in Ningxia] 寧夏社會科學, 5 (2007), pp. 90–93.

Zhuge Liang ji — *Zhuge Liang ji* [Collected Works of Zhuge Liang] 諸葛亮集. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju 北京：中華書局, 1960.