

The Fragments of the Tangut Translation of the *Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch* Preserved in the Fu Ssu-nien Library, Academia Sinica

K. J. Solonin*

This paper is devoted to the textual research of the fragments of the Tangut Translation of the *Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch*, discovered in the holdings of the Fu Ssu-nien Library, Academia Sinica. The translation of this text is approximately dated by 1070, thus making the *Sutra* one of the earliest Tangut texts. This paper contains reconstructions of the Tangut text, alongside available Chinese versions and a textual study of the newly identified fragments. Research into the translation techniques has proven that the main translation principles were not fixed by the time the translation was undertaken. The main conclusion of the present paper is that although the new fragments closely correlate with the textual tradition of the Dunhuang texts, the Tangut translation is not identical with the extant versions of the *Sutra* originating from Dunhuang. The conclusions of this paper are thus in line with those of Shi Jinbo, who had researched other sets of fragments of the same text stored in various libraries and museums throughout China and Japan.

Keywords: *Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch*, Tangut translation, Fahai, Dunhuang texts, Dunhuang Buddhism

* Institute of Scholastic Philosophy, Fu Jen Catholic University

Introduction

Among the Tangut texts preserved in the Fu Ssu-nien Library in Academia Sinica, several fragments have been identified recently as the parts of the Tangut translation of the famous Chinese Buddhist text—*The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch* (六祖壇經). The parts of the *Platform Sutra* were discovered among 10 Tangut fragments (*recto* and *verso* are counted separately) prepared for the International Dunhuang Project. Three of these fragments were positively identified as belonging to the manuscript copy of the Tangut translation of the *Platform Sutra*. Another smaller fragment appears to belong to a certain Buddhist text, but is too small to be researched properly. Three fragments were first identified generally as parts from the *Platform Sutra*, but no specific research has been done yet.

Due to the major role this text played in the formation of the Chan School of Buddhism in China and its spread to regions outside of the Middle Kingdom, the *Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch* is one text whose research is crucial for the understanding of Chinese Buddhism. The text of the *Platform Sutra* contains numerous discourses by the Sixth Patriarch of Chinese Chan, Huineng (慧能, 638-713) and his encounters with the disciples on various Buddhist topics as well as anecdotes from Huineng's life. The text expounds the idea of sudden enlightenment, which constitutes the core of the Chan tradition and is believed to have been first preached by Bodhidharma. In the course of succession this ultimate Dharma was transmitted to Huineng, who was later recognized as the head and founder of the so-called Southern School of Chan Buddhism, which eventually became the orthodox Chan tradition. The text was popular throughout the realm of East Asian Buddhism, but apparently was never translated into any East Asian language and was circulated in its original Chinese version alone. The Tangut version of the *Platform Sutra* is probably the only known translation of the text, and as such is valuable just due to the fact of its existence. Therefore locating even scattered fragments of the Tangut translation of the *Platform Sutra* is an important event both in the field of Tangut research and Buddhist studies in general. The present paper limits itself to a preliminary textual study of the fragments

of the Tangut translation of the *Platform Sutra* discovered in the Fu Ssu-nien library.¹

Previous Research of the Tangut Translation of the *Platform Sutra*

The origin of the texts now stored in the Fu Ssu-nien Library is not clear. The discussed fragments bear no indications of where and when original translation into Tangut took place. Therefore, the most important problem is the relationship of Fu Ssu-nien texts to the known fragments of the Tangut translations of the *Platform Sutra* elsewhere.

Some of the earliest research on the Tangut translation of the *Platform Sutra* was done by Kawakami Tenzan (川上天山) in as early as 1938. He studied all the fragments of the *Sutra* available at that time and tried to date them and determine their relationship to other versions of the text.² Most of his observations (including the dating of the text to 1070) still remain valid.³ The study by Kawakami Tenzan was based on the fragments of the Tangut texts copied and published in 1932 by Lo Fu-ch'eng (羅福成, 1884-1960, one of the pioneers of the Tangut studies in China),⁴ and thus does not cover all of the extant fragments of the Tangut text. Altogether, 12

¹ Here our thanks are due to John Kieschnick and Lin Ying-chin of Academia Sinica and the staff of the Fu Ssu-nien Library, who made it possible for the author to review the fragments ipso facto and provided excellent copies and photographs of the texts. Anonymous reviewers provided me with valuable comments both on contents and style of this paper. Remaining errors are solely my own.

² In this paper I am referring to the Chinese translation of the paper: Kawakami Tenzan 川上天山, "Xixia yuyi de Liuzu tanjing" 西夏語譯的六祖壇經, in *Fodian yanjiu xubian* 佛典研究·續編, by Yang Zengwen et al. 楊曾文等著 (Taipei臺北: Huayu chubanshe 華宇出版社, 1988), pp. 165-176.

³ Conclusions by Kawakami Tenzan were accepted by Yang Zengwen in his research of the formation of the *Platform Sutra* and its textual tradition. See: Yang Zengwen 楊曾文, *Xinban Dunhuang xinben Liuzu tanjing* 新版·敦煌新本六祖壇經 (Beijing北京: Zongjiao wenhua chubanshe 宗教文化出版社, 2001), pp. 234, 338.

⁴ The fragments published by Lo Fu-ch'eng are to be found in: Lo Fu-ch'eng 羅福成, "Xixiawen canjing shiwen" 西夏文殘經釋文, *Guoli beeping tushuguan guankan* 國立北平圖書館館刊 [Bulletin of the National Library of Peiping] 4.3 (1932), a volume on Tangut (Hsi Hsia) Studies.

fragments of the *Platform Sutra* of various lengths were known before the texts from the Fu Ssu-nien Library were discovered; all of these were collated and carefully researched by Shi Jinbo (史金波).⁵ In his research Shi indicated that all the known fragments of the Tangut translation of the *Platform Sutra* can be provisionally dated to the period of *Tianci lisheng guoqing* (天賜禮盛國慶) of the Tangut kingdom,⁶ which puts the date of the translation somewhere around 1070. This dating is based on the dates provided by the Tangut document “Notes on the Guazhou Process” 瓜州審案記 (hereafter cited as “Guazhou Process”), which is to be found on the reverse side of the text of the *Sutra*.⁷ Judging from the style of writing and the fact that almost all of the fragments researched by Shi Jinbo bear the text of “Guazhou Process” on their reverse sides, it is appropriate to suggest that all the fragments actually belong to the same one version of the text. The fragments from the Fu Ssu-nien Library appear to belong to the same manuscript. I was not able to see the original fragments, studied by Shi Jinbo, since his publication contains only one photocopy in bad resolution. However, judging from this photograph, the writing style of Shi Jinbo’s fragments and fragments from Fu Ssu-nien Library appear to be similar. Another testimony is that the biggest fragment from the Fu Ssu-nien Library also happens to contain an official document of some sort on its reverse side. This text also appears to be some kind of economic or legal document mentioning a certain area (州) in the Tangut State. Thus, we may infer that this *verso* text is part of a fragment from the “Guazhou Process.”⁸

⁵ Shi Jinbo 史金波, “Xixiawen *Liuzu tanjing* canye yishi” 西夏文六祖壇經殘頁譯釋, *Shijie zongjiao yanjiu* 世界宗教研究 [Studies in world religions] 1993.3: 90-100.

⁶ Shi’s study is based on fragments from the Museum of Chinese History 國立歷史博物館, Library of Beijing University 北京大學圖書館, the National Library in Beijing 國家圖書館 and the Tenri 天理 Library in Japan together with the fragments studied and translated by Lo Fu-ch’eng in 1932.

⁷ For a preliminary study of the “Guazhou Process,” see Chen Bingying 陳炳應, *Xixia wenwu yanjiu* 西夏文物研究 (Yinchuan 銀川: Ningxia renmin chubanshe 寧夏人民出版社, 1985), pp. 291-293. The civil process described in the text apparently took about five months and involved quite a number of people of different nationalities and social status as well as large amounts of property. Nothing is known about the conclusion of the process and of its consequences.

⁸ This can be ascertained only after extensive research of the document has been carried out. I haven’t seen any other fragment of the “Guazhou Process,” so I would hesitate to make any final

The Tangut Translation and the Dunhuang Texts of the *Platform Sutra*

The *Platform Sutra* is known now in a number of versions, partly fragmented, which can be divided into four basic traditions. The first is the Dunhuang tradition (represented by Stein 5475, the text from Dunhuang Museum holdings # 077 and the text from Beijing Library). Other textual traditions are represented by the versions of Huixin (惠昕 active during the end of the 10th century, text dated to 967), Qisong (契嵩, 1007-1072, text dated to 1056) and Zongbao (宗寶, late 13th-14th centuries, text dated to 1291).⁹ These texts were the basis for a number of collated editions of the text of the *Sutra*, which have appeared recently.¹⁰

In his paper “Translation of the Tangut text of ‘The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch’,” Shi Jinbo arranged 12 known fragments in logical order according to the original structure of the *Platform Sutra* in Fahai’s Dunhuang version, i.e., the one known as: “南宗頓教最上大乘摩訶般若波羅蜜經六祖慧能大師於韶州大梵寺施法壇經.”¹¹ The fragments identified by Shi mostly belong to one section of the *Sutra*,

conclusions about the nature of the Fu Ssu-nien document, but one might still suggest that the text from the Fu Ssu-nien Library belongs to the same original text as other fragments of the *Platform Sutra* located elsewhere.

⁹ Yang, *Xinban Dunhuang xinben Liuzu tanjing*, p. 314.

¹⁰ Several published collated versions of the text exist, for example, Li Zhonghua 李中華注譯, *Xinyi Liuzu tanjing* 新譯六祖壇經 (Taipei臺北: San Min Book Co., Ltd. 三民書局, 2004); Guo Peng 郭朋, *Tanjing duikan* 壇經對勘 (Jinan濟南: Qilu shushe 齊魯書社, 1981); idem, *Tanjing xiaoshi* 壇經校釋 (Beijing北京: Zhonghua shuju 中華書局, 1983). For initial publication of the Dunhuang text of the *Sutra*, see D. T. Suzuki and Kuda Rentaro 鈴木貞太郎・公田連太郎, *Tonko shutsudo Rokusho Dankyo* 敦煌出土六祖壇經 (Tokyo東京: Morie shoten 森江書店, 1934). This text introduces the division of the original text into 57 sections. This type of division was further employed by Philip Yampolsky in his study of the *Platform Sutra*; Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山, *Rokusho Dankyo shohon shusei* 六祖壇經諸本集成 (Kyoto京都: Chinesebook Co. 中文出版社, 1976). This volume reproduces the research paper by Kawakami Tenzan.

¹¹ *Nanzong dunjiao zuishang dacheng mohe banruo poluomi jing Liuzu Huineng dashi yu Shaozhou Dafansi shifa tanjing* (hereafter cited as *Nanzong dunjiao*), in *Dazheng Xinxiu Dazangjing* 大正新修大藏經, vol. 48, no. 2007 (Taipei臺北: Xin Wenfeng chuban gongsi 新文豐出版公司, 1984).

dealing primarily with the famous *gatha* debate between Huineng and Shenxiu (神秀, 605-706), and the whole matter of Huineng's succession to the Fifth Patriarch Hongren (弘仁, 601-674). One of the three identified fragments from Fu Ssu-nien Library also deals with the same matter, therefore this tiny fragment (188119_a06) has to be positioned after Number 1 (belonging to the History Museum) and 2 (trans. by Lo Fu-ch'eng) as Number 3 according to Shi Jinbo's initial numbering.¹² The other two fragments (188119_b03 and 188119_a04) belong to the concluding part of the text and should be positioned as numbers 13 and 14 and thus continue Shi Jinbo's numbering. Altogether this makes 15 fragments of the *Platform Sutra* in Tangut translation. The new numeration thus should run as follows: 1 (History Museum), 2 (Lo Fu-ch'eng 1), 3 (Fu Ssu-nien 188119_a06), 4 (Beijing Library 1), 5 (Lo Fu-ch'eng 2), 6 (Beijing University 1), 7 (Beijing University 2), 8 (Lo Fu-ch'eng 3), 9 (Lo Fu-ch'eng 4), 10 (Lo Fu-ch'eng 5), 11 (Tenri, Japan), 12 (Beijing Library 2), 13 (Beijing Library 3), 14 (Fu Ssu-nien 188119_b03), 15 (Fu Ssu-nien 188119_a04). Among these, fragment 14 (Fu Ssu-nien, 188119_b03) is directly connected with Beijing Library 3, which is the beginning of the discourse on "precepts, concentration and wisdom" (戒定慧) between disciple Zhicheng (志誠) and master Huineng. During the conversation recorded in the Beijing fragment of the *Sutra* Zhicheng advocates the views of his former master Shenxiu (神秀; Beijing Library 3), but is later converted by the supreme doctrine of Huineng and becomes his devoted follower in the Fu Ssu-nien fragment (Fu Ssu-nien 188119_b03). The last fragment (Fu Ssu-nien 188119_a04) completes the discussion.

In his research on the Tangut *Platform Sutra* Shi has made several observations, which can be summarized as follows: the Tangut text is close to the Dunhuang version of Fahai (法海). The proximity between the texts does not mean that they are identical, and Fahai's version was the source text for the Tangut translation.¹³ There are some differences in sentence structure and use of words, indicated by Shi Jinbo, which allow us to suppose that the Tangut translation of the text was based on the original text, different from any known Dunhuang text of the *Platform Sutra*. Furthermore, Shi Jinbo

¹² Shi, "Xixiawen *Liuzu tanjing* canye yishi," pp. 92-100.

¹³ Ibid., p. 91.

suggests that since the Tangut text bears a lot of editorial markings and corrections, it was probably a working copy of the translator or editor of the text. These conclusions are fully supported by the Tangut fragments from Fu Ssu-nien Library. Still, there are certain additional notes to be made.

1. Two bigger fragments of the Tangut translation of the *Sutra* from the Fu Ssu-nien Library (188119_b03; 188119_a04) contain the discussion between Huineng and the monk Zhicheng on the nature of basic Buddhist practices of “precepts, concentration, and wisdom.” During the encounter with Zhicheng, Huineng mentions that in his teaching ‘*precepts, concentration, and wisdom are not established*’ (不立戒定慧). This paragraph, with minor deviations, is present in all versions of the text. However, the Tangut translation introduces a different view on the subject: According to the Tangut text, “precepts, concentration, and wisdom” actually are established, and “sudden and gradual” (頓漸) are understood as “practices of perfection.” (I will return to this in more detail below in the “Textual Study” section of the present paper.) The Tangut text also omits several characters and place-names (such as Caoxi, 曹溪) from the discourse present in Fahai’s version, and often mixes up terms like “heshang” (和尚) and “monk” (僧). Sometimes whole sentences present in Fahai’s version or in other Dunhuang texts are also omitted. A more detailed study of the doctrinal deviations between the Tangut texts and Fahai’s texts should be undertaken within the general project of publishing all the present fragments of the text under the same cover. Here, however, I only wish to point out these divergences and bring attention to the fact that the doctrinal differences mentioned above might be more than just usual aberrations, which occur in the course of translation. The divergences in this part might actually demonstrate certain doctrinal discrepancies between the Tangut translation and the known Dunhuang texts. This conclusion cannot be properly verified, since presently our command of the Tangut language does not allow us to determine whether the differences between the Tangut translation and the Dunhuang texts were caused by the use of a Chinese source, different from the existing versions of the *Platform Sutra*, or whether they are just minor aberrations, which emerge in the course of any translation. This argument, of course does not undermine the general conclusion about the proximity between the Tangut version of the *Sutra* and the Dunhuang texts.

2. In the Fu Ssu-nien fragments we meet two persons: Zhicheng and Fada, both of which were disciples of Huineng. Tangut for Zhicheng (志誠)¹⁴ is 𗵑 𗵑, which if translated semantically back into Chinese will give 知成, thus being different from the original name. Neither one of the characters seems adequate for the rendering of the name, since Chinese monastic names were, as a rule, translated into Tangut semantically rather than phonetically and sometimes even rearranged according to the rules of the Tangut grammar.¹⁵ In our case, however, the transcribing of name is done according to the Chinese pattern. A phonetic equivalent for the Tangut 𗵑 is *tʃji*, while for 𗵑 it is *ʃ j+j*. In his “Tangutskaya filologia” N. A. Nevskij renders the first character through Chinese 知, or *ci*, and the second one with Chinese character 成.¹⁶ Thus, the name of Zhicheng 𗵑 𗵑 is rendered phonetically, which is in violation of the Tangut custom to actually translate the monastic names, but resembles the frequent use of homophones in the Dunhuang version of the *Platform Sutra*.¹⁷ Certain semantic correlation of the actual name and its Tangut form appears irrelevant here. The case with Fada (originally 法達) is even clearer: the name 𗵑 𗵑 is a phonetic reproduction, and if transcribed back into Chinese will give something like 梵道 (Fandao) and not 法達. This complication could be resolved through three possible explanations: the translator was not qualified in translations of Buddhist texts, or the text he had as the original was not Chinese, but the one which rendered original

¹⁴ The writing of Zhicheng differs greatly in various texts. In his research of the *Platform Sutra*, Philip Yampolsky accepts the form 志誠, which I also accept. See *The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch*, the text of the TUN-HUANG manuscript, translated, with notes, by Philip B. Yampolsky (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967), pp. 19-20, et passim of the reconstructed Chinese text.

¹⁵ For example, the name of a famous Khitan Chan master Tongli (通理) is rendered into Tangut as 𗵑 𗵑, or 理通 if translated back into Chinese. The phonetic rendering was used when a monastic name contained a place name as its element.

¹⁶ N. A. Nevskij, *Tangutskaya Filologia* [Tangut Philology] (Moscow: Vostochnaya Literatura, 1960), 2:44, 207.

¹⁷ The list of homophones, writing errors, and other mistakes in the *Platform Sutra* is provided by Yang, *Xinben Dunhuang xinben Liuzu tanjing*, pp. 228-230. Yampolsky in his publication of the Dunhuang text actually reproduces all the homophones and character variations.

Chinese names phonetically, i.e., Uighur or Tibetan.¹⁸ This suggestion is not really likely. The third and most relevant explanation is that the principles of translations had not been clearly set at the time when the translation of the *Platform Sutra* was carried out. One can assume that the Chinese original which was used for the Tangut translation also contained a variety of different spellings for the same names and terms. Thus, the translator chose to render the names phonetically rather than semantically to avoid misunderstanding and confusion, since Chinese homophones would not be identical with the Tangut ones.

One might conclude that the Chinese source text for the Tangut translation of the *Platform Sutra* was not Fahai's version in its present form, but another version of the text, now unknown. One also cannot totally rule out the possibility that the original text was written not in Chinese, but in some other languages. For example, there is the remote possibility of locating the source-text among Uighur or Tibetan findings. The area of Guazhou, from which the Tangut text originates, was a multi-ethnic compound, captured by the Tangut from the Uighurs around 1068, which puts the suggested date of the translation of the *Platform Sutra* at a one or two-year distance from the actual Tangut conquest of the area. Buddhism in Guazhou was probably close to that of Dunhuang, so that the *Platform Sutra* could have been found there easily, but not necessarily in Fahai's version, which itself was a variant of an unknown "text of the Patriarch."¹⁹

¹⁸ Chan Buddhist text in Tibetan (the so called Pelliot 116) actually transcribes the names of Chinese Chan masters. See J. Broughton, "Early Chan Schools in Tibet," in *Studies in Chan and Huayan*, ed. R. M. Gimello and Peter N. Gregory. Studies in East Asian Buddhism, no. 1 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1983); G. Mala, *Un Traite Tibetaine de Dhyana Chinois. Ms. De Dunhuang Pelliot Tibetan 116, folios 119-170* (Tokyo: Maison Franco-Japanoise, 1988). However, nothing is known about the Tibetan translation of the *Platform Sutra*. As of now, little can be said concerning Uighur Chan literature. A preliminary list of Turfan texts from the holdings of the German State Library in Berlin mentions a text entitled *Chanmen shier shi* 禪門十二時, Ch. 1421v. See Rong Xin-jiang 榮新江, "Deguo tulufan shoujipin zhong de hanwen dianji yu wenshu" 德國吐魯番收集品中的漢文典籍與文書, *Hua xue* 華學3 (1998): 309-325. Again, nothing is known about the Uighur version of the *Platform Sutra* either. However, further research into the matter will probably bring more definite results in this respect.

¹⁹ Yang, *Xinban Dunhuang xinben Liuzu tanjing*, pp. 269-279, 314 (the table).

The Tangut translation of the *Platform Sutra* occupies an important position within the textual tradition of the *Platform Sutra*: Yang Zengwen places the Tangut text among the direct successors to the “original Dunhuang text,” putting it as the third in the line of textual transmission, very close to the alleged original “text of the Patriarch.”²⁰ Unfortunately, the known fragments of the Tangut text are rather scattered, which does not allow the comparison of its structure with the structure of the original text as it had been reconstructed by Yang Zengwen. Therefore, the actual relationship of the Tangut text with the “text of the Patriarch” cannot be properly clarified.

The Tangut version of the *Sutra* shared the fate of other Dunhuang and Tangut texts—it was long forgotten, emerging again only in the 20th century. The *Platform Sutra*, as it appears now, was not exactly a popular text in the Tangut State: As of now, only one manuscript copy of the text has been located. Lack of a printed copy of the Tangut text of the *Platform Sutra* suggests that the Tangut translation of the *Sutra* was a matter of private initiative, rather than part of a state sponsored project of Buddhist translations, as was the case with other Buddhist scriptures. That is probably why the text of the *Sutra* had never been properly published or distributed in any substantial quantities. This, however, does not diminish the importance of research on the text. Below, I present a preliminary textual study of the fragments of the Tangut translation of the *Platform Sutra* from the Fu Ssu-nien Library.

The Tangut Fragments of the *Platform Sutra*: A Textual Study

Notes to the text: The Tangut text below is the reconstruction of the three fragments of the *Platform Sutra*, which were positively identified. The fragments are located in logical order, following the structure of Fahai’s version of the *Platform*

²⁰ Yang Zengwen believes that there was a basic source text for all the further textual traditions of the *Platform Sutra*. He calls this alleged source the “text of the Patriarch” 壇經祖本 and dates it at 713-732. For a discussion of the contents and structure of the “patriarchal text” and its relationship to other textual traditions, see Yang, *Xinban Dunhuang xinben Liuzu tanjing*, pp. 269-279, 314 (the table).

Sutra. The original writing is not exactly cursive, but still I was not able to reconstruct a number of characters, which are marked with empty spaces, or question marks, where the identifications were tentative. Below the Tangut text I provide the rendering of the original Tangut text in Chinese characters line by line, and the relevant paragraphs from Fahai's version of the *Platform Sutra*. For the identification of fragments the electronic version of Tripitaka Taisho by CBETA was used alongside the traditional version of the text: 南宗頓教最上大乘摩訶般若波羅蜜經六祖慧能大師於韶州大梵寺施法壇經.²¹ For reference purposes I have referred to the texts reconstructed by Philip Yampolsky (Dunhuang version, S 5475) and collated and corrected versions by Yang Zengwen, based on the version from the Dunhuang Museum (#077) as well as Li Zhonghua and Ding Min's collated edition.²²

Reconstruction of the Tangut Text

188119_a06:

Line 1:

𐰇𐰺	𐰇𐰺	𐰇𐰺	𐰇𐰺	𐰇𐰺	𐰇𐰺	𐰇𐰺	𐰇𐰺	𐰇𐰺	𐰇𐰺	𐰇𐰺	𐰇𐰺
dzjiij ²	gji ²	·jij ¹	twu ¹	lew ¹	ljaa ¹	wji ¹	ŋa ²	do ²	zar ¹	lja ¹	tha ² phji ¹
弟	子	各	自	唯	偈	-爲。	我	處	經	送。	大 意

Line 2:

𐰇𐰺	𐰇𐰺	𐰇𐰺	𐰇𐰺	𐰇𐰺	𐰇𐰺	𐰇𐰺	𐰇𐰺	𐰇𐰺	𐰇𐰺
sjij ²	tsjiij ²	tshjwo ¹	lhwu ¹	tsjiir ¹	khjiij ¹	ŋa ²	tshjiw ¹	tsew ²	ljij ² /tha ²
識	悟，	故	衣	法	授	-我。	六	第	大

²¹ *Nanzong dunjiao*, pp. 337-345.

²² Yang, *Xinben Dunhuang xinben Liuzu tanjing*, pp. 7-80; Li, *Xinyi Liuzu tanjing*, pp. 252-324.

version	
Fahai Dunhuang	各作一偈呈吾。吾看汝偈。若吾大意者。付汝衣法。稟為六代。 ²³
Yampolsky Dunhuang	令門人等各作一偈，來呈看，悟大意即付衣法稟為六代祖。 ²⁴
Yang Zengwen	this part is similar to Fahai.

Unfortunately, the differences between the texts are evident immediately after the end of this portion: The Fahai version features 火急急, while the Yampolsky version omits this part, and the New Dunhuang text by Yang Zengwen features 火急作.²⁵ According to the Tangut translation, Hongren intended to make the author of the best gatha “the sixth great master.” As of now, I cannot ascertain if this is an aberration due to translation or whether this reflects the influence of the source text: The Tangut Buddhists were actually familiar with the concept of “patriarch” and had a special character for that.²⁶ At the same time, in another Tangut text Huineng and Shenhui are often called “The Sixth Founding Teacher” and “The Seventh Founding Teacher” respectively.²⁷ The Tangut *Platform Sutra* seems to follow neither of these patterns.

²³ *Nanzong dunjiao*, p. 337zhong, lines 12-13.

²⁴ *The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch*, p. 4, 8 from the end.

²⁵ Yang, *Xinban Dunhuang xinben Liuzu tanjing*, p. 9.

²⁶ This term, for example, is applied to Mazu Daoyi in the Tangut text known as “The Essence of the Hongzhou Doctrine.” See K. J. Solonin, “Hongzhou Buddhism in Xixia and the Heritage of Zongmi (780-841): A Tangut Source,” *Asia Major*, 3rd ser., 16.2 (2003): 97.

²⁷ See for example 第六宗師, 第七宗師, Tangut: 緇 璽 禪 影; 贊 璽 禪 影。

188119_b03:

Line 1:

慢 戢 鑑 數 難 龍 鋤 霸 數 龍 徧 矩 紆
djij² ljij² tja¹ dzjir¹ lwe² dju¹ tsji¹ sjij¹ tha² dzjiiij² .jij¹ .jir¹ da²
定 見 者 遲 疾 有。 [志 誠] 大 師 於 問 言，

Line 2:

徧 慢 龍 鑑 紆 難 鋤 數 龍 紆 鑑 紆
kie¹ djij² zjir² rjir² tshjiiij¹ wji¹ na² tha² dzjiiij² da² na² tshjiiij¹
戒 定 慧 Δ- 說 -爲 -我。 大 師 言， 我 說，

Line 3:

發 鑑 貳 絆 結 紆 緝 齋 睨 徧 戢 絆
kji¹ nji² nja² njiiij¹ lji² dzji² mjij¹ .jij¹ tsjiir² kie¹ ŋwu² njiiij¹
Δ- 聽 -你。 心 地 罪 無， 自 性 戒 是。 心

Line 4:

結 屏 緝 齋 睨 龍 戢 絆 結 龍 緝 齋 睨
lji² lo mjij¹ .jij¹ tsjiir² zjir² ŋwu² njiiij¹ lji² ŋewr¹ mjij¹ .jij¹ tsjiir²
地 愚 無， 自 性 慧 是。 心 地 亂 無， 自 性

Line 5:

慢 戢 龍 龍 紆 徧 慢 龍 紆 鑑 戢 戢
djij² ŋwu² nji² dzjiiij² tshjiiij¹ kie¹ djij² zjir² tshjiiij¹ tja¹ zjiir¹ sjij²
定 是。 汝 師 說， 戒 定 慧 說 者， 小 智

Line 6:

戢 龍 戢 鑑 徧 慢 龍 紆 鑑 數 戢 戢
dzjow² sjwo¹ ŋwu² na² kie¹ djij² zjir² tshjiiij¹ tja¹ tha² sjij² dzjow²
人 生 是。 我 戒 定 慧 說 者， 大 智 人

Line 7:

(龍) 戢 龍 齋 睨 鑑 難 徧 徧 慢 龍 睨
sjwo¹ ŋwu² tjij¹ .jij¹ tsjiir² tsjiij² rjir¹ ku¹ kie¹ djij² zjir² mji¹
是。 若 自 性 悟 得 則， 戒 定 慧 不

Line 8:

𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏
gu¹ śjwo¹ tsji¹ śji¹ da² thji² sjo² mji¹ gu¹ śjwo¹ tha² dzjiij²
安 立。 [志 誠] 言， 云 何 不 安 立。 大 師

Line 9:

𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏
da² .ji¹ tsjiir² dzji² mji¹ lə mji¹ ŋewr¹ mji¹ lə lə pa² zja²
言， 自 性 罪 無、 愚 無、 亂 無， 念 念 [般] [若]

Line 10:

𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏
bioo¹ swew¹ .ji¹ tsjiir¹ ka² .ji¹ tsjiir² dəə¹ tsjiir¹ mji¹ tsji² ku¹
觀 照， 相 法 離， 自 性 頓 法 不 悟 則，

Line 11:

𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏
tśhwo¹ kie¹ djij² zji² mji¹ gu¹ śjwo¹ tjij¹ .ji¹ tsjiir² dəə¹ tsjiir¹
故 戒 定 慧 不 安 立。 若 自 性 頓 法

188119_a04:

Line 1:

𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏
tsji² ku¹ kie¹ djij² zji² gu¹ śjwo¹ dəə¹ mjiij² djo² dzji¹ lji¹
悟 則， 戒 定 慧 安 立。 頓 漸 修 行 也。

Line 2:

𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏
tsji¹ śji¹ tsja¹ tshwew¹ dzjiij² gji² dja² we² tha² dzjiij² zji¹ tsier¹
[志 誠] 禮 拜， 弟 子 Δ- 作。 大 師 左 右

Line 3:

𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏 𢆏
mji¹ ka² lew¹ ŋwej² .ji¹ dju¹ mjiij² tja¹ xiwā¹ tha² .ju²
不 離。 一 和 尙 有， 名 者 [梵 道] 常

version	
Fahai Dunhuang	<p>見有遲疾。志誠請和尚說所見戒定惠。大師言。如汝聽悟說，看悟所見處。心地無疑非自性戒。心地無亂是自性定。心地無癡自性是惠。能大師言。汝戒定惠勸小根諸人。吾戒定惠勸上人。得吾自亦不立戒定惠。志城（誠）言。請大師說不立如何。大師言。自性無非無亂無癡。念念般若觀照。當離法相。有何可立。自性頓修。立有漸此契以不立。志誠禮拜。便不離漕溪山。即為門人。不離大師左右。又有一僧。名法達。常誦法華經七年。²⁸</p>
Yampolsky	<p>〔惠能〕大曰：見有遲疾。志誠請和尚說所見戒定惠。大師言。如汝聽悟（吾）說，看悟（吾）所見處。心地無疑非自性戒。心地無亂是自性定。心地無癡自性是惠。汝戒定惠勸小根諸人。吾戒定惠勸上人。得吾（悟）自〔性〕亦不立戒定惠。志城（誠）言。請大師說不立如何。大師言。自性無非無亂無癡。念念般若觀照。當（常）離法相。有何可立。自性（性）頓修。立有漸，此契以不立。志誠禮拜。便不離漕溪山。即為門人。不離大師左右。²⁹</p>
Yang Zengwen	<p>〔慧能〕答曰，見有遲疾，志誠請和尚說所見戒定慧。汝聽悟（吾）說，看吾所見處。心地無是自性戒。心地無亂是自性定。心地無癡是自性慧。汝戒定慧勸小根諸人，吾戒定慧勸上人，得吾（悟）自〔性〕亦不立戒定慧。志誠言，請大師說，不立如何。大師言。自性無非無亂無癡。念念般若觀照，常離法相，有何可立？自性頓修，亦無漸次，所以不立。志誠禮拜。便不離漕溪山。即為門人。不離大師左右。³⁰</p>

²⁸ Nanzong dunjiao, p. 342 zhong, lines 24-29; p. 342 xia, lines 1-3.

²⁹ Yampolsky, *The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch*, p. 20, sec. 41 from the end.

³⁰ Yang, *Xinban Dunhuang xinben Liuzu tanjing*, pp. 53-54.

The Tangut version demonstrates a number of deviations when compared to Chinese versions of the text. First, let us examine the 10th character in line 10 of the Tangut text of 188119_b03 (In the Chinese version, the character 不 was discarded by the Tangut editor as erroneous, and thus should be omitted from discussion.) The discourse between Zhicheng and Huineng is one of the most important parts in the *Platform Sutra*. Here I would like to point out an interesting matter: In the Tangut translation, Zhicheng's questions are rendered through direct speech, and Huineng is addressed as "The Great Master" (大師) instead of "heshang" (和尚), while Fada is addressed to as "heshang" instead of "monk" (僧).

The Tangut version omits the following sentences present in all Chinese versions: 看悟 (吾) 所見處 (must have been at 188119_b03, line 3); 便不離漕溪山 (must have been at 188119_a04, line 2); 有何可立 (must have been at 188119_b03, line 10). In the Tangut translation of the expression 常 (當) 離法相, the first character is missing. However, general discussion of the relationship between precepts, concentration, and wisdom (戒定慧) in the Tangut translation of the *Sutra* is slightly different from Chinese versions, which feature almost similar discourses on that matter. If one tries to tentatively reconstruct the Chinese original from which the Tangut translation was made, the portion on "setting up precepts, concentration, and wisdom" (立戒定慧) would probably read as follows: "自性無罪無愚無亂, 念念般若觀照, 離法相, [not must be disregarded, see above] 悟自性頓法, 則便戒定慧不安立。若悟自性頓法, 則安立戒定慧, 頓漸修行也" (188119_b03, lines 8-11; 188119_a04, line 1). Here, the Tangut sentence appears to be different from Chinese: the "non-establishment of the precepts, concentration and wisdom" is the result of "self-nature being without error, disturbance, and ignorance. Every thought puts forth the radiance of prajña wisdom, and when one is always separated from the form of things, what is there that can be set up? Sudden practice of self-awakening—there is nothing gradual in it, so that nothing at all can be set up."³¹ The English translation of the Tangut paragraph is similar to this one except that it reads: "Every thought puts forth the radiance of prajña wisdom, and when one is separated from the form of things, the sudden Dharma of

³¹ Yampolsky, *The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch*, pp. 164-165.

self-nature is realized; thus the precepts, concentration and wisdom are not set up. *If the sudden Dharma of self-nature [is attained], the precepts, concentration and wisdom are set up. [Then] sudden and gradual are [the ways] of practice.*” Here one might see that the teaching expounded in this paragraph is quite different from the one put forth in the collated versions of the Dunhuang text of the *Sutra*. I believe that the line 11 of Tangut 188119_b03 and line 1 of 188119_a04 are an attempt to translate the line: 立有漸 from Fahai’s version, which is believed to be unreliable³² and is omitted in critical translations.

One might suggest that the Tangut version of the *Platform Sutra* is actually not a reproduction of any known Chinese text, but is a translation from an original, close but not identical to Fahai’s version of the text. It might be close to the proto-version, whose existence was suggested by Yang Zengwen,³³ but further research is necessary to determine this.

Conclusion

As mentioned above, the *Platform Sutra* does not appear to have been a popular text in the Tangut State. The low popularity of the *Sutra* in Xixia is testified by the lack of a printed version of the text, which is not found anywhere, while the Chan writings of Zongmi (宗密, 780-841) and the Huayan Chan tradition in general are represented in great variety.³⁴ As the present state of research indicates, the dominant tradition in the

³² Yampolsky, *The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch*, p. 165; Yang, *Xinban Dunhuang xinben Liuzu tanjing*, pp. 53-54.

³³ Yang, *Xinban Dunhuang xinben Liuzu tanjing*, pp. 269-279.

³⁴ So far, Zongmi appears to be the only Chan writer of the Tangut State known today. See K. J. Solonin, “Guifeng Zongmi and Tangut Chan Buddhism,” *Zhonghua foxue xuebao* 中華佛學學報 [Chung-Hwa buddhist journal] 11 (1998): 365-424; idem, “The Tang Heritage of the Tangut Buddhism. Teachings Classification in the Tangut Text ‘The Mirror’,” *Manuscripta Orientalia* 6.3 (2000): 39-49; idem, “‘The Essence of the Doctrine of the Masters of the Hongzhou lineage’ as the Source for the Research of Tangut Buddhism,” in *Studies on Sino-Tibetan languages: Papers in Honor of Professor Hwang-cherng Gong on His Seventieth Birthday* 漢藏語研究：龔煌城先生七秩壽慶論文集, ed. Lin Ying-chin et al. 林英津等編輯 (Taipei 臺北: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica 中央研究院語言學研究所, 2004), pp. 549-562.

Northern Chinese borderland was the Huayan Chan teaching of Zongmi.³⁵ Thus, although we cannot confirm the degree of popularity of the *Platform Sutra* in Xixia, we can still suggest that it was definitely much less popular than other Chan texts.³⁶ Furthermore, one is inclined to believe that the low circulation of the *Platform Sutra* was in fact characteristic of Northern Buddhism,³⁷ while in the South the text enjoyed a greater degree of recognition.³⁸

The Chan doctrine was not unknown in Xixia and its popularity in the Tangut State spread much earlier than is usually believed—at least as early the 9th century.³⁹ The

³⁵ See K. J. Solonin, “Hongzhou Buddhism in Xixia and the Heritage of Zongmi (780-841),” pp. 57-103, esp. 58-60. Of course, divisions between the traditions of Tangut Chan remains hypothetical until more research into the Tangut Buddhism is done. Apparently Hongzhou Buddhism was not unknown in Xixia, but attempts were made to reconcile it with Zongmi’s tradition.

³⁶ It is generally believed that printed texts are by definition more popular than the manuscripts, therefore the presence of a printed version or lack thereof is taken as a criterion to decide upon the popularity of a certain text.

³⁷ At least, the survey of Tangut Buddhism suggests that Chan Buddhism in the North was represented by the tradition of Zongmi and some sort of Bodhidharma Chan. Bodhidharma’s *Treatise on the Two Entrances and Four Practices* 二入四行觀 appears to have been quite popular in Xixia. Another Tangut associated with Bodhidharma Chan in Tangut translation is “The Treatise on Cutting off Examining” (達摩大師絕觀論) by Bodhidharma. See Nishida Tatsuo 西田龍雄, *Seikabun no Kego kyo* 西夏文華嚴經 [The Hsi-hsia Avatamsaka Sutra] (Kyoto 京都: Graduate School of Letters, Kyoto University 京都大學文學部, 1975-1977), 3:47, # 232; K. J. Solonin, “Po povodu tangutskikh chan-buddhijskikh tekstov iz sobraniya SPbF IV RAN” [Concerning the Tangut Chan Buddhist texts from the Collection of St. Petersburg Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences], *Peterburgskoe vostokovedenie* 7 (1995): 390-412.

³⁸ As a matter of fact, both Qisong and Zongbao appear to be Southerners—the first being the native of Tengzhou (modern Tengxian 藤縣 in Guangxi), the second being the abbot of Guangxiao Temple 光孝寺 in Guangzhou.

³⁹ This observation is confirmed indirectly by Tibetan historical data, especially the “BLUE ANNALS,” which contain information on the wrong doctrine of sudden enlightenment in the region of Xunhua, near the Dantig Mountain, adjacent to the Tangut lands. This account is connected with the activities of one of the personalities of early Tibetan Buddhism—Bla-chen-pa (891-975) and accounts of his travels throughout North-Western China. See George N. Roerich ed. and trans., *The Blue Annals. Deb-ther sñon-po* by ’Gos lo-tsā-ba gZhon-nu-dpal (1392-1481) (Calcutta: Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1949-1953). I refer to the Russian translation of

principle of “sudden teaching” definitely had some relationship to certain early Chan traditions, and according to the Tibetan sources, it was popular in the Minyag lands. However, the precise nature of “sudden teaching” remains unclear. One of the earliest Chan figures ever to appear in the Tangut parts was Baotang Wuzhu (保唐無著, 720-794), but his relationship to the Tangut Chan Buddhism has yet to be clarified.⁴⁰ What is more important however is the fact that the Tangut version of the *Platform Sutra* created in the 11th century belonged to the “Dunhuang circle” of Buddhist texts. Therefore, one might assume that Tangut Buddhism as a whole remained isolated from the mainstream developments of Chinese Buddhism⁴¹ and had to develop its own tradition and orthodoxy. The analysis of the alleged “Tangut Orthodoxy” could probably explain the domination of Zongmi’s writings in the Tangut collections of Buddhist texts. This observation can be further elaborated to draw more general conclusions about the proximity between Tangut and Dunhuang Buddhism, and thus might be of methodological value for further research on the Tangut Buddhist texts.

(Accepted for publication 20 April 2006)

Roerich’s work: Ibid. (St. Petersburg: Eurasia Press, 2004), pp. 57-58; concerning the possible origins of Tangut Buddhism, see K. J. Solonin, “Guifeng Zongmi and Tangut Chan Buddhism”; Shi Jinbo 史金波, *Xixia fojiao shilue* 西夏佛教史略 (Yinchuan 银川: Ningxia renmin chubanshe 宁夏人民出版社, 1988).

⁴⁰ According to *Record of the Dharma Treasure through Generations* 歷代法寶記, Wuzhu spent a long period of time (751-758) in the Helan mountains (a future Tangut stronghold) and enjoyed a certain degree of popularity there: at least the local worthies did not want him to leave when he finally decided to go to Sichuan to become a disciple of Reverend Kim (無相, 金和尚). See Broughton, “Early Chan Schools in Tibet,” pp. 4-9. The text of *Record of the Dharma Treasure through Generations* actually demonstrates that Buddhism was quite popular in the Helan area. See *Lidai fabao ji* 歷代法寶記, in *Dazheng Xinxu Dazangjing* 大正新修大藏經, vol. 51, no. 2075, pp. 186-187, 192-194.

⁴¹ The observation concerning the growing isolation of Dunhuang Buddhism from the Southern Chinese Buddhist mainstream in the 10th century was made by J. Broughton. See J. Broughton, *The Bodhidharma Anthology: The Earliest Records of Zen* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), p. 104.

Bibliography

- Lidai fabao ji*歷代法寶記. In *Dazheng Xinxiu Dazangjing*大正新修大藏經, vol. 51, no. 2075. Taipei臺北: Xin Wenfeng chuban gongsi新文豐出版公司, 1984.
- Nanzong dunjiao zuishang dacheng mohe banruo poluomi jing Liuzu Huineng dashi yu Shaozhou Dafansi shifa tanjing*南宗頓教最上大乘摩訶般若波羅蜜經六祖慧能大師於韶州大梵寺施法壇經. In *Dazheng Xinxiu Dazangjing*大正新修大藏經, vol. 48, no. 2007.
- Broughton, J.
- 1983 “Early Chan Schools in Tibet,” in *Studies in Chan and Huayen*, edited by R. M. Gimello and Peter N. Gregory. Studies in East Asian Buddhism, no. 1. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- 1999 *The Bodhidharma Anthology: The Earliest Records of Zen*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Chen, Bingying陳炳應
- 1985 *Xixia wenwu yanjiu*西夏文物研究. Yinchuan銀川: Ningxia renmin chubanshe寧夏人民出版社.
- Guo, Peng郭朋
- 1981 *Tanjing duikan*壇經對勘. Jinan濟南: Qilu shushe齊魯書社.
- 1983 *Tanjing xiaoshi*壇經校釋. Beijing北京: Zhonghua shuju中華書局.
- Kawakami, Tenzan川上天山
- 1988 “Xixia yuyi de Liuzu tanjing”西夏語譯的六祖壇經, in *Fodian yanjiu xubian*佛典研究・續編, by Yang Zengwen et al.楊曾文等著. Taipei臺北: Huayu chubanshe華宇出版社, pp. 165-176.
- Li, Shen, trans.李申譯
- 2005 *Liuzu tanjing*六祖壇經. Kaohsiung高雄: Foguang Publisher佛光出版社.
- Li, Zhonghua, n.李中華注譯
- 2004 *Xinyi Liuzu tanjing*新譯六祖壇經. Taipei臺北: San Min Book Co., Ltd.三民書局.
- Lo, Fu-ch'eng羅福成
- 1932 “Xixiawen canjing shiwen”西夏文殘經釋文, *Guoli beeping tushuguan guankan*國立北平圖書館館刊[Bulletin of the National Library of Peiping] 4.3, a volume on Tangut (Hsi Hsia) Studies西夏文專號.

Mala, G.

- 1988 *Un Traite Tibetaine de Dhyana Chinois. Ms. De Dunhuang Pelliot Tibetan 116, folios 119-170.* Tokyo: Maison Franco-Japanoise.

Nevskij, N. A. 聶歷山

- 1960 *Tangutskaya Filologia*[Tangut Philology]. 2 vols. Moscow: Vostochnaya Literatura.

Nishida, Tatsuo 西田龍雄

- 1975-1977 *Seikabun no Keron kyo* 西夏文華嚴經[The Hsi-hsia Avatamsaka Sutra]. 3 vols. Kyoto 京都: Graduate School of Letters, Kyoto University 京都大學文學部.

Roerich, George N., ed. and trans.

- 1949-1953 *The Blue Annals. Deb-ther sñon-po* by 'Gos lo-tsā-ba gZhon-nu-dpal (1392-1481). Calcutta: Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal.
- 2004 *The Blue Annals. Deb-ther sñon-po* by 'Gos lo-tsā-ba gZhon-nu-dpal (1392-1481). St. Petersburg: Eurasia Press.

Rong, Xin-jiang 榮新江

- 1998 “Deguo tulufan shoujipin zhong de hanwen dianji yu wenshu” 德國吐魯番收集品中的漢文典籍與文書, *Hua xue* 華學 3: 309-325.

Shi, Jinbo 史金波

- 1988 *Xixia fojiao shilue* 西夏佛教史略. Yinchuan 銀川: Ningxia renmin chubanshe 寧夏人民出版社.
- 1993 “Xixiawen Liuzu tanjing canye yishi” 西夏文六祖壇經殘頁譯釋, *Shijie zongjiao yanjiu* 世界宗教研究[Studies in world religions] 1993.3: 90-100.

Solonin, K. J.

- 1995 “Po povodu tangutskikh chan-buddhijskikh tekstov iz sobraniya SPbF IV RAN” [Concerning the Tangut Chan Buddhist texts from the Collection of St. Petersburg Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences], *Peterburgskoe vostokovedenie* 7: 390-412.
- 1998 “Guifeng Zongmi and Tangut Chan Buddhism,” *Zhonghua foxue xuebao* 中華佛學學報[Chung-Hwa buddhist journal] 11: 365-424.
- 2000 “The Tang Heritage of the Tangut Buddhism. Teachings Classification in the Tangut Text ‘The Mirror’,” *Manuscripta Orientalia* 6.3: 39-49.
- 2003 “Hongzhou Buddhism in Xixia and the Heritage of Zongmi (780-841): A Tangut Source,” *Asia Major*, 3rd ser., 16.2: 57-103.

K. J. Solonin

- 2004 “‘The Essence of the Doctrine of the Masters of the Hongzhou lineage’ as the Source for the Research of Tangut Buddhism,” in *Studies on Sino-Tibetan languages: Papers in Honor of Professor Hwang-cherng Gong on His Seventieth Birthday* 漢藏語研究：龔煌城先生七秩壽慶論文集, edited by Lin Ying-chin et al. 林英津等編輯. Taipei臺北: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica 中央研究院語言學研究所, pp. 549-562.
- Suzuki, D. T. and Kuda Rentaro 鈴木貞太郎、公田連太郎
- 1934 *Tonko shutsudo Rokusho Dankyo* 敦煌出土六祖壇經. Tokyo東京: Morie shoten 森江書店.
- Yampolsky, Philip B.
- 1967 *The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch*. The text of the TUN-HUANG manuscript, translated, with notes, by Philip B. Yampolsky. New York: Columbia University Press. Chinese title: 南宗頓教最上大乘摩訶般若波羅蜜經六祖惠能大師於韶州大梵寺施法壇經一卷。
- Yanagida, Seizan, ed. 柳田聖山主編
- 1976 *Rokusho Dankyo shohon shusei* 六祖壇經諸本集成. Kyoto京都: Chinesebook Co. 中文出版社.
- Yang, Zengwen 楊曾文
- 2001 *Xinban Dunhuang xinben Liuzu tanjing* 新版・敦煌新本六祖壇經. Beijing北京: Zongjiao wenhua chubanshe 宗教文化出版社.

傅斯年圖書館所藏的西夏文《六祖壇經》殘頁初探

K · J · 索羅寧

輔仁大學士林哲學研究中心

本論文的目的，在於向學術界介紹中央研究院歷史語言研究所傅斯年圖書館（簡稱傅圖）收藏的西夏文本《六祖壇經》的殘頁。《六祖壇經》為中國傳統佛教禪宗的基本資料，極少其他語言的翻譯本。本論文比對傅圖的收藏與散在中國、日本的西夏文本《六祖壇經》的殘頁，發現傅圖的收藏可與其他殘頁銜接，並且屬於同一個原本；可見，傅圖收藏的資料學術價值甚高。透過本文的初步分析，西夏文本《六祖壇經》雖然接近法海的敦煌漢文本，卻不完全一致，可能另有翻譯底本。

本文除了翻譯底本的初步分析之外，還提供西夏文的重建（reconstruction）、中文譯解，並與法海的漢文本互相對照。

關鍵詞：六祖壇經 西夏文 法海 敦煌