

西藏研究論文集

江兆申 著

༄༅། བོད་ལྗང་སཱེའི་བ་ཕྱིན་རྒྱུ་མ་ཡིག་བསྐྱུས་དེབ།།



第二輯

月 版
十 出
年
八 會
十 員
七 委
國 究
民 研
華 藏
中 西

西藏研究論文集

第二輯

中華民國七十八年

目 錄

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|-----|
| 1. 藏緬語的格助詞 | 龔煌城 | 1 |
| 2. 安多地區的民族及語言 | Georges de Roerich 著
孫天心 譯 | 11 |
| 3. 從大非川之役到中宗時代與吐蕃的關係 | 王吉林 | 19 |
| 4. 墀松德贊時期吐蕃與李唐關係之研究 | 林冠群 | 39 |
| 5. 清季末葉英國對藏政策之研究 | 呂秋文 | 79 |
| 6. 析論清季中英西藏交涉中的「主權」問題
——兼述十九世紀中葉以來西藏境域及藏
印邊情 | 馮明珠 | 97 |
| 7. 藏族、藏王與西藏佛教之源流 | 林崇安 | 155 |
| 8. 西藏佛教後弘時期之源流與思想 | 林崇安 | 167 |
| 9. 西藏佛教之傳入蒙古與影響 | 林崇安 | 173 |
| 10. 現觀莊嚴論明義釋及金鬘疏——序品(二) | 陳玉蛟 譯 | 179 |
| 11. 元朝時期的薩迦派略述稿——以薩班、八
思巴叔侄為主 | 陳又新 | 219 |
| 12. 藏傳佛教美術圖像的有關問題 | 葛婉章 | 253 |
| 13. 西藏流亡組織代表團赴中國大陸始末及影響 | 張駿逸 | 289 |
| 14. 近三十多年來中國大陸學者的西藏研究分析 | 林恩顯 | 305 |

出版者：西藏研究委員會

地址：台北市木柵區11623指南路二段六十四號
(國立政治大學邊政研究所內)

電話：(02)9393091-272

印刷者：永望文化事業有限公司

地址：台北市師大路一七〇號三樓之三

電話：(02)2000050 2213627

A Collection of Essays in Tibetan Studies

VOL. 2

1989

CONTENTS

1. Case Postpositions in Tibeto-Burman Languages
.....Gong Hwang-cherng 1
2. The Ethnicity and Languages of Amdo Area.....Sun Tian-shin J. 11
3. The Relationship Between T'ang Dynasty and Tibet
(670 - 710 A.D.)Wang Chi-lin 19
4. A Study on the Relationship Between T'ang and
T'u-fan During Khri Srong lDe bTsan Period.....Lin Guan-chyun 39
5. British Tibetan Policy During the Svel of
Ch'ing DynastyLu Chiu-wen 79
6. An Analysis and Discussion of the Problem of
Sovereignty in the Ch'ing Dynasty Negotition
With Britain over Tibet — Tibet and Its
Neighbours Since 1840.....Fung Ming-chu 97
7. The Origin of Tibetan Tribes, Kings and Buddhism
.....Lin Chung-an 155
8. The Origin and Thought of Tibetan Buddhism of
Late Period.....Lin Chung-an 167
9. The Spread of Tibetan Buddhism into Mongolian
and Its Influence.....Lin Chung-an 173
10. mNgon rtogs rgyan 'grel pa don gsal and legs
bshad gser gyi phreng ba — Translanton of
Introductory Survey (II).....Cheng Yu-jiao 179
11. Sa Skya Pa in Yuan Dynasty — Studies of Sa
Pan and 'Phags pa.....Cheng Yaw-shin 219
12. Some Iconographic Problems Within Tibetan
Buddhist Art.....Ge Wan-chang 253
13. The Delegacies from Dharamsala to the Main-
land China and the Influence.....Chang Jiunn-yih 289
14. An Analysis on Tibet in the Eyes of Scholars
from Mainland China for Last 3 Decades.....Lin En-shean 305

PUBLICATION: Committee on Tibetan Studies

*ADDRESS: C/O Graduate School of China Border Area
Studies National Chengchi University, Mucha
11623, Taipei, Taiwan, Republic of China*

TELEPHONE: (02) 9393091-272

藏緬語的格助詞

龔煌城

中文摘要

漢藏比較語言學上最引人注目的一個問題是：這一語系的語言雖然有共同的基本詞彙，足以證明它們的系譜關係，然而漢語與藏緬語之間却有很大的語法上的差異。最顯著的例子是：漢語的基本語序是「主動賓」(SVO)的結構，而大部分的藏緬語却是「主動賓」(SOV)的結構。在介詞方面，漢語是前置的(*Prepositional*)，而藏緬語却是後置的(*Postpositional*)。

語序與介詞的位置兩者之間有密切的關聯。格林柏(J. H. Greenberg)研究世界各種類型的語言，發現「主賓動」的語言絕大多數都是把介詞後置，認為這是「語法的通性」(*Universals of Grammar*)使然。

漢藏語的比較研究至今已有一百多年的歷史，其間大部分的研究都集中在同源詞的發見及音韻對應的確立上，很少涉及語法上的問題。漢藏語既然可以證明是同出一源，語法上的差異無疑是後來不同的演變所造成。本文探討藏緬語格助詞的來源，希望能對漢藏語法分歧的發展提供一點線索。

書面藏語的屬格詞尾有 *-kyi*, *-gyi*, *-gi*, *-i*, 及 *-yi* 等五種不同的形態，當中究竟何者為原始形態，各家看法不同。本文提出比較語言學上的證據，支持西門(W. Simon)以 **-?yi* 為原始形態的主張，並把此一詞形追溯到原始藏緬語的階段。

與格、位格詞尾 *-a* 見於古緬甸 *Myazedi* 碑文(公元 1112 年)及西夏感應塔碑文(公元 1094 年)。此字雖不見於書面藏語，然而却於現代藏語西部古方言(*Western Archaic Dialects* 例如 *Purik*、*Ladakhi*)及東北部安多方言(如 *Reb-Kong*)中可以找到，本文據此認為德蘭西(S. Delancey)所擬測的藏緬語「位格、向格、與格」(*Locative-Allative-Dative*)詞形 **-a* 是正確的。

書面藏語中表示「與格、位格、對格」的詞尾有 *-su*, *-ru*, *-du*, 及 *-tu* 等四種形態，要把這些不同的詞尾都視為由單一的詞形發展而來將會遭到很大的困難，

但就 -du 與 -tu 而言，可以斷定 -du 是原來的。米勒 (R. A. Miller) 曾指出西藏最早的文法著作《三十頌》未提到 -tu 字，而托馬斯 (F. W. Thomas) 的古藏文資料 (東北藏古代民間文學 Ancient Folk-Literature From North-Eastern Tibet) 中有很多例子顯示，依後來的書寫慣例應寫作 -tu 的地方，該文獻都寫作 -du。本文指出西夏文有同源詞 *do，認為依此一比較語言學的證據可以擬測原始藏緬語為 *-du。

把以上三種原始藏緬語的格助詞 (*-?yi, *-a, *-du) 拿來跟阿爾泰語言的格詞尾相比較，可以找到形態功能都相似的字。除這些字以外，書面藏語還有表「與格、位格、對格」的格助詞 -ru 及 -la，也可以在阿爾泰語言中找到對應的字。本文認為這些詞彙上的一致並非巧合，而是由於藏緬語受了阿爾泰語言的影響，從那裏移借過來的。漢語與藏緬語是同系的語言，後來語法上分歧的發展，外文語言的影響扮演了一個很重要的角色。(本文英文原稿曾在一九八七年八月東柏林第十四屆國際語言學會中宣讀)

✱本文作者現任國立中央研究院歷史語言研究所研究員✱

Case Postpositions in Tibeto-Burman Languages

Introduction

One of the most remarkable things in Sino-Tibetan linguistics is that in spite of the existence of shared basic vocabulary among the languages of this family, there are wide discrepancies in syntactic structures between Chinese on the one hand and Tibeto-Burman languages on the other. The differences in the word order (the order SVO in Chinese versus the order SOV in the majority of Tibeto-Burman languages) and in the position of case particles in sentences (prepositions in Chinese versus postpositions in Tibeto-Burman languages) are among the most striking of these discrepancies.

The correlation between these two syntactic features is best formulated by Greenberg (1966:79) in terms of universals of grammar as follows:

"With overwhelmingly greater than chance frequency, languages with normal SOV order are postpositional".

The comparative study of Sino-Tibetan (ST) languages with its history of more than a hundred years concentrated on the discovery of cognates and the study of phonological correspondences, has hardly touched on the problem of syntactic change. It is to be hoped that a study of the origins and development of postpositional case particles in Tibeto-Burman (TB) languages may eventually throw some light on the cause of syntactic change in this family.

Case particles exist widely in different branches of TB languages. Since there are wide discrepancies in their phonological forms, very few of them can be considered as inherited from Proto-Tibeto-Burman (PTB). Thus Benedict (1972:95-6) reconstructed only the genitive *-ki or *-gi for PTB, suggesting that in the parent language case postpositions were lacking. Delancey (1984) addressed himself to the problem of TB case particles and reconstructed two locatives: a *nV and a *e and/or *a for PTB.

The purpose of this paper is to review the proposed reconstructions, to suggest a few other case particles, and to try to trace their origins.

TB case postpositions

Genitive ?i

In written Tibetan (WT) genitive suffixes have five alternative forms: -kyi, -gyi, -gi, -i, and -yi. -Kyi occurs after final d, b, s; -gyi after n, m, r, l; -gi after g and ng; -i and -yi after vowels. Scholars' opinions are divided as to which of them should be regarded as primary. Simon (1942:966) suggested that the original form was *-yi (i.e., -yi preceded by the glottal stop ʔ). Benedict (1972:96) held the velar element to be archaic. Citing the modern Meithei-Anal form (-ki), he reconstructed TB *-ki or *-gi. In reference to Simon's article, DeLancey (1984:71) said, "In the absence of more convincing supporting

evidence than is provided in that article, the alternative interpretation — that *kyi* is original, and the 'i which occurs after final vowels is a result of intervocalic weakening of the velar initial — is more plausible".

In my study of the classical Tibetan *y* (Gong 1977:210-212), I presented morphological evidence in support of Simon's view. Nine examples of causeative formation were given to demonstrate that when a word with initial *y-* was prefixed with a causative morpheme *s-*, a secondary *-k-* developed (e.g., *yom-pa* < **?yom-pa*, to swing, totter, tremble, to be unsteady : *skyom-pa* < **s-?yom-pa*, to shake, agitate, stir up). These examples suggest that *kyi* occurring after *s* has developed out of the original **?yi*.

Another piece of evidence comes from a comparison with Archaic Chinese (AC) as reconstructed by Li (1971:38, 43):

eight	WT	<i>brgyad</i>	AC	* <i>priat</i>	PST	* <i>pr?iat</i>
hundred	WT	<i>brgya</i>	AC	* <i>prak</i>	PST	* <i>pr?iak</i>

The Proto-Sino-Tibetan (PST) forms proposed here show how WT *-g-* came into existence. These examples suggest that the genitive *gyi* occurring after final *-r* could have developed out of the original **-?yi*.

Modern west Tibetan dialects, which are generally regarded as retaining more archaic features, can be cited in support of reconstructing an original **?yi*. In Balti, Purik, and Ladakhi, the genitive form is all *-i*; *-kyi* and *-gyi* forms do not occur at all in these dialects.

The last piece of evidence comes from Tangut, a dead TB language of the 12th century. The Tangut form of genitive suffix is reconstructed as **?yeh* by Nishida (1966:361) and as *?in* by Sofronov (1968: II, 393). Both reconstructions differ as to the vowel and the consonant. I have argued elsewhere (Gong 1981:721-2) that the nasal *-n* reconstructed by Sofronov is unwarranted, and reconstructed (in Gong 1985:26) *-ij* for the Tangut Rime 37 (1.36-2.33), to which this Tangut genitive marker belongs. My arguments were based on Chinese transcriptions, loan words (1981) and phonological alternations (1985). According to these studies, the Tangut genitive should be reconstructed as *?ij*, instead of Nishida's *?yeh* and Sofronov's *?in*.

If we now compare Proto Tibetan *?yi*, Written Burmese (WB)

?i and Tangut ?ij, the PTB should be reconstructed as ?i, and not *ki or *gi as reconstructed by Benedict.

Dative-Locative *a

DeLancey (1984) reconstructed a locative-allative-dative *a, based solely on modern TB languages. It must be noted that the dative â is also attested in Ancient Burmese in the Myazedi inscription of 1112 A.D. (Nishida 1955: 24):

t'iw	mang	kâ	kyân	sum	-rwâh	teh
that	king	nominative-	slaves	three	villages	accusative-
		suffix				suffix
pây	mayâ	â	piy	e'		
beloved	queen	dative-	gave	sentence-		
		suffix		particle		

"The king gave slaves of three villages to the beloved queen."

In the Tangut language the locative a is attested in the inscription on the Kan-ying Tower of 1094 A.D. (Nishida 1964: 163):

𐰇𐰏𐰤	𐰇𐰏𐰤	𐰇𐰏𐰤	𐰇𐰏𐰤	
Nîeñ pâ	ɾaŋ	khî	ɾoŋ	"enter into Nirvana"
Nirvana	locative-	verbal-	enter	
	suffix	prefix		

In the Tangut-Chinese glossary Fan-han ho-shih chang-chung chu (The Timely Pearl in the Palm) of 1190 A.D. The locative a appears in the following expression (Nishida 1964:218):

𐰇𐰏𐰤	𐰇𐰏𐰤	𐰇𐰏𐰤	𐰇𐰏𐰤	
nî	ɟhaŋ	ɾaŋ	ɾoŋ	"the blame lies in me"
blame	me	locative-	lie	
		suffix		

The Tangut dative-locative suffix reconstructed as ɾaŋ by Nishida (as cited above) is reconstructed as ?a by Sofronov (1968: II, 317 No. 1763). The difference between the glottal stop and the velar fricative (?a and ɾa) is non-phonemic.

In WT we do not find any cognate of the dative-locative -a, but in archaic west Tibetan dialects we do find a dative-accusative -a in Purik (Bailey 1915:13), and a dative -a in La-

dakhi (Francke 1901: 10,13). In Reb-kong, an Amdo dialect, we also find a dative-locative suffix -a (Roerich 1958:32). These are the facts not mentioned by DeLancey and I am just referring to them in support of his reconstruction.

Locative *du

In WT there are terminative suffixes -su, -ru, -du, and -tu: -ru occurs after vowels; -tu after final g and b; -su after s; -du after n, r, l and the other final consonants (Jaschke 1929:22). The attempt to reduce them to a single underlying form meets with serious difficulties, for in any case we have to set up phonological rules which seem to be quite ad hoc. In reference to the early Tibetan Grammatical Treatise Luñ-ston-pa rtsa-ba sum-cu-pa, Miller (1963:496) said, "it makes no mention of tu, while Thomas' materials abound in examples where du, the only form that the SCP knows is used for what the later orthographic practice would have as tu". In Tangut of the 12th century only the form 𐽳 do is attested. This suffix is reconstructed as ndo by Sofronov (1968: II, 324 No. 2114). I have argued (Gong 1981) that Tangut voiced stops were not prenasalized and reconstructed do instead of ndo.

The Origins of Tibeto-Burman Case Postpositions

Considering the case suffixes reconstructed for PTB, one can not but be impressed by their striking similarities with the case suffixes in the Altaic languages.

PTB Genitive *-ŋi

In the Manchu-Tungus group of the Altaic family, genitive suffixes take the following forms:

Jurchen -i, -ni; Manchu -i, -ni; Evenki -ngi;

Lamut -ngi ; Ude -ngi (Menges 1968, Sinor 1968)

Sibo -i, -j (Li Shu-lan et al 1986:42)

Jurchen is an extinct language that was spoken in the 12th century. The reconstruction is based on the material called Hua-

i i-yü compiled in the 16th century. This is the oldest written language of this group. Manchu is the literary language of the 17th century. The others (Evenki, Lamut and Ude) are all modern dialects (Poppe 1965:28). In Manchu -ni occurs only after -ng of the Chinese loanwords, so that in most cases -i is used (Menges 1975:114).

Genitive -i occurs also in the languages of the Mongolian group. Aside from modern dialects such as Mogol and Dagur, where we have genitive-accusative -ii (Yü 1983:58), in Altan Tobci of the 17th century and Mukaddimat al-Adab of the 13-14th century, -i is used not only as accusative suffix, but also as genitive suffix (Doerfer 1964:37). The situation here is exactly the same as in Tangut of the TB alnguages, where -?i is used not only as genitive, but also as accusative marker.

e.g.	nga mbju	.in(=?ij)	tšiwa	"the faults of the general"
	general'	s	fault	

li ₁ on xi	li ₁ wu ko	.in (=?ij)	☒	kâi
personal name	personal name	accusative marker	resist	want

"Li₁on-xi wanted to resist Li₁wu-ko" (Keping 1979:260)

The case particle *-i is reconstructed for Proto-Altaic (Lee 1983:32) not as genitive, but as accusative suffix.

Dative-Locative *-a

The TB *-a/-e can be compared with the dative-suffix *-a/-e of the Proto-Altaic. This suffix appears in Turkic and Mongolian as dative and locative (Lee 1977:21; 1983:32; Poppe 1955:198). The forms and functions are exactly the same in both language families.

Dative-Locative *-du

TB locative *-du can be compared with Proto-Altaic *-du/-

*dũ. Jurchen has dative-locative -do/-du (Menges 1975:114), which looks exactly like Tangut -do and Tibetan -du.

Other Comparisons Between TB and Altaic Families

Tibetan has a dative-locative suffix -ru (also called terminative) which has been regarded as a variant of -du. But the similarities in form and function of this suffix with the reconstructed Altaic directional suffix *-ru/-rũ cannot be overlooked. No satisfactory explanation has been offered for alternation between -du and -ru. Most probably they had different origins. Tibetan has also a dative-locative suffix -la, which can be compared with Jurchen allativ-locative -la/-le (Menges 1968:252), Lamut locative -la (op. cit. p.103), Ude locative -la (op. cit. p.141) and Nanaj locative-allative -la.

Concluding Remarks

We have made a comparison of case particles across two linguistic families. The similarities of their forms and functions cannot be simply dismissed as coincidence. Since case postpositions are only found in TB languages and not in Archaic Chinese, it must be either that AC has lost them or that TB languages have innovated them. Judging from the time span of the documents (Chinese documents go back to 1000 B.C. while the oldest documents of Tibetan are not earlier than the 8th century A.D.), the chance is that TB languages have innovated and borrowed them from the Altaic family.

REFERENCES

- Bailey, G. 1915. *Linguistic Studies from the Himalayas*. The Royal Asiatic Society. London.
- Benedict, Paul, K. 1972. *Sino-Tibetan: A Conspectus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DeLancey, Scott. 1984. "Etymological Notes on Tibeto-Burman Case Particles," *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area*, Vol. 8.1.
- Doerfer, Gerhard. 1964. "Klassifikation und Verbreitung der

- Mongolischen Sprachen," in Handbuch der Orientalistik I. ABT., V. BAND, 2. Abschnitt.
- Francke, A. H. 1901. Sketch of Ladakhi Grammar. Calcutta.
- Gong, Hwang-cherng. 1977. "The Classical Tibetan Y and its Related Problems," BIHP 48:2.
- 1981. "Chinese Loanwords in the Tangut Language," BIHP 52:4.
- 1981. "Voiced Obstruents in the Tangut Language," BIHP 52:1, pp.1-16.
- Greenberg, J. H. 1966. "Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements," in Greenberg (ed.), Universals of Language, Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press.
- Jäschke. 1929. Tibetan Grammar. Addenda by A. H. Francke, assisted by W. Simon. Berlin & Leipzig.
- Keping, Ksenia B. 1979. Sun' Czy v Tangutskom Perevode [Sun tzu in Tangut Translation]. Moskva.
- Lee, Ki-Moon 1977. Geschichte der Koreanischen Sprache. Deutsche Übersetzung herausgegeben von Bruno Lewin, Wiesbaden.
- 1983. Kankokugo no Keisei [Formation of Korean]. Tokyo: Seiko Shobo.
- Li, Fang Kuei. 1971. "Shangku Yin Yenchiu" [Studies on Archaic Chinese Phonology]. The Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies, New Series IX, Numbers 1 and 2, PP.1-61.
- Li, Shu-lan & Qian Zhong. 1986. Xi-bo-yu Jian-zhi [Brief Description of the Sibo Language]. Peking: Minzu Chubanshe.
- Menges, Karl. H. 1968. "Die Tungusischen Sprachen." in Handbuch der Orientalistik, herausgegeben von B. Spuler. I. ABT., V. Band, 3. Abschnitt. Leiden/Köln.
- 1975. Japanisch und Altajisch. Altaiische Studien, II, Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, XLI, 3, Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner.
- Miller, R. A. 1963. "Thon-mi Sambhota and his Grammatical Treatises," JAOS Vol. 83, No. 4, pp.485-502.
- Nishida, Tatsuo. 1955-1956. "Myazedi hibun ni okeru chuko birumago no kenkyu," Kodaigaku (Palaeologia) 4: 17-32 and 5: 22-40.
- 1964; 1966. Sei-ka-go no kenkyu [A Study of the Hsi-hsia Language]. Vol. 1 (1964); Vol. 2 (1966). Tokyo: Za-u-ho

kanko-kai.

Poppe, Nicholas. 1955. Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

---- 1965. Introduction to Altaic Linguistics. Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.

Roerich, Georges de. 1958. Le Parler de l'Amdo, (Etude d'un dialecte archaïque du Tibet). Roma.

Simon, W. 1942. "Tibetan dañ, ciñ, kyin, yin and ham," BSOAS Vol. X, pp.954-975.

Sinor, Denis. 1968. "La Langue Mandjoue". in Handbuch der orientalistik, herausgegeben von B. Spuler. I. ABT.,V.Band, 3. Abschnitt. Leiden/Köln.

Sofronov, Michail Viktorovic. 1968. Grammatika Tangutskogo Jazyka [Grammar of the Tangut Language], 2 Vols. Moskva: Nauka.

Yü, Shih-chang. 1983. Lun Mong-ku yü ti Hsing-cheng he Fa-chan [On the Formation and Development of the Mongolian Languages]. Min-tsu chu-pan-she. Peking.

安多地區的民族及語言 ①

Georges de Roerich 著

孫天心 譯註

安多，係指西藏高原東北部，夾於北方祁連山與南方巴顏喀喇山之間的一片廣闊地區。習慣上，本區可分為黃河以北，青海湖與平番河②之間的「下安多」及黃河以南的「上安多」兩部分；不過，西藏的文獻資料並沒有明確地劃清兩地的界線。根據第五世達賴（一六一七～一六八二）的著作《gSung bum③（十萬言）》第十六卷三〇五頁的說法，安多地區包括以下五個由土官（Nang so）治理的省分：（一）濟那省（Zi na nang so），青海塔爾寺一帶尚有濟那營址；（二）營斯穹省（Zhing sKyong nang so）；（三）多巴省（mDo pa nang so），包括今青海雷卜貢（Re skong）一帶；（四）阿爾架省（A rgya nang so），包括今青海巴燕（Ba yin）一帶；（五）木雅省（Mu nyag nang so）但是依據其他文獻資料，安多地區還應含青海湖牧區一帶。

安多地區曾經數度成為歐洲科學考察隊探險的目標。俄國探險隊方面值得一提的有（中亞研究的創始人）N.M. Prževalski（1872～73，1880，1884），Grum-Gržemalio 兄弟（1889～90），G.N. Potanin（1893～94），Ro-borovski（1893～95），V. A. Obroutchev（1893～99）和P. K. Kozlov（1900～01，1907～09）。其他國家的學者曾到安多考察的有W. Rockhill（1892），Littledale（1893），Tafel（1906），W. Filcher（1905，1927），以及d'Ollone 子爵（1906～09），這些科學研究在西藏東北地理及自然景觀等領域上是有豐碩成果的，但是對於當地民族的調查則忽略了。直到今天，我們對於安多地區的民族及其語言情況所知仍不多。

本區民族成分複雜，在藏族部落（如：安多瓦 Amdowa，瓦那克 Banag，果洛 Golok 等）周圍，還有操保守蒙古支語言的部族④，屬突厥支裔的撒拉族，東干族⑤，漢族，以及甘州一帶的西喇裕固族（在下安多也有裕固族，部分已改用藏語安多方言）。

目前還不可能將本區及附近甘肅省一帶蒙古支裔的各部落、各部族的名稱詳盡列舉出來。這種工作必須實地深入調查之後才能完成，而且目前也是刻不容緩的，因為這一帶的蒙古人在文化上及風俗上正迅速地向漢族及唐古特族⑦同化。一九一二年之前，所有此地的部族都擁有部分自治權，由各部落之首領（漢語叫「土司」）管理。然而現在這些部落漢化程度已經很深，蒙古人居住之地區已併入漢人縣下，歸漢族官員治理。至於說這些蒙古部族到底是不是真正的蒙古人這個問題，目前還未解決。從民族成分來看，他們當中部分族群應該不是純粹蒙裔，而有可能是蒙化了的突厥人。另一方面，今天甘肅境內大多數的蒙古族均已定居營生，由牧轉農的生活方式只有更加快了漢化的腳步。

整個安多地區，蒙古語都受到藏語（安多方言）深遠的影響，部分蒙古人已改用藏語⑧，服裝、習俗上也有仿藏風者。如居住在青海湖與毛伯勝鎮之間的阿力克（Arig）人⑨，在語言上幾已完全採用安多藏語，不過仍保存了蒙語的數詞。黃河以北的巴燕區（Ba yin zhung）⑩，也有藏化之蒙古人與藏族混居。在官亭以北，沿黃河有所謂「三川」（San tch'ouan）蒙古人（W. Rockhill 在其著作 Diary of a Journey Through Mongolia and Tibet in 1891 and 1892.，Washington, 1894, P.377 ~ 379 上，列出了三川蒙語的一個詞彙表，可參閱）。在大通河與西寧河⑪之間，有一支人數不少的蒙古人，自稱「蒙兀爾」，漢人稱其為「土人」⑫。他們的語言，已有 A. Mostaert 及 A. de Smedt 等人之著述描寫，如今已知之甚詳（參閱：A. Mostaert 與 A. de Smedt “Le dialecte monghor parl'e par les Mongols du Kan-son Occidental.”, Anthropos, XXV, 1930；A. de Smedt 與 A. Mostaert: Dictionnaire Monghor-français.，Peking, 1933；A. Mostaert: The Mongols of Kansu and their Language.，Bull. n.8 of the Catholic Univ. of Peking, 1931 年 10 月號，P.75 ~ 89）。上述蒙古族群也有「達拉特」（Dalāt）或「多洛特」（Dolōt），（比較藏語名稱 dol rdo，以及 N. M. Prževalsk 所謂的 Dald 或 Dold）⑬等他稱。達拉特人在安多地區別處也有分布，例如雷卜貢中部 Seng ge gzhung 等地都有重要的達拉特人聚落；達拉特人過去曾信回教，但部分目前已改信佛教。他們在整個安多地區以精繪佛像聞名，在這一帶許多寺院集中地都有以此業謀生的達拉特人。

黃河以南，河州（現在之洮河縣）⑭有「桑塔」（Santa）蒙古人（東鄉回回）⑮，已信回教，使用阿拉伯文字母。在甘州、肅州、沙州、及敦煌⑯裕固人中，

也有蒙古血統的族群。上安多還有衛拉特蒙古人，在拉卜楞^{①⑦}一帶游牧爲生；目前他們在服裝及語言上也迅速藏化。安多地區以西的青海省，藏族與迪德蒙古人相鄰。迪德人（Dēd）又稱和碩特人（Hošut）、鄂洛特人（Ölöt），或托爾古特人（Torgut），在柴達木盆地及其北部山區游牧營生。本地區到處可見漢族及回族，特別是在黃河、大通河、西寧河、平番河、洮河等河谷地帶。循化及巴燕^{①⑧}兩縣境內之黃河沿岸，有撒拉爾突厥人（Salar）^{①⑨}定居，仍保留其本族之語言，但河左岸的撒拉爾人已經藏化，撒拉爾人地區附近有轉信回教之安多瓦藏族，青海省政府軍中之最精良者部分即自其中徵募來的。安多地區以西藏族巴那克人（Banag）以牧爲生，所操安多藏語方言近似安多瓦藏語。再向西南，在拉加寺一帶，安多瓦人與下果洛（Smad kyi mgo log）各部落比鄰而居，果洛藏族語言也接近巴那克藏語。青海南疆、安多瓦藏族與康巴族及霍爾人爲鄰；又Robert B. Ekvall 在 Cultural Relations of the Kansu-Tibetan Border. , Chicago, 1939, P.12 ff. 一書中提到在臨洮縣東南之山區有一種特殊之土著部族，所操語言系屬不明。

②⑩

由於安多地區人口普查資料缺乏，本區安多藏族所佔人口比例無法得知。根據 P. K. Kozlov: Mongolia : Amdo i mertvij gorod khara-khoto. （蒙古、安多、及死城黑城）莫斯科，1923, P.413，本區人口總數約在五十萬上下。安多人民有業農者，也有游牧者，而以前者佔多數。這些定居之安多人分布於海拔二五〇〇至二七五〇公尺之高地河谷，谷地土壤宜於墾植，作物有兩個品種的大麥、小麥、粟米、豌豆、嬰粟、以及少量玉米，除了務農之外，他們也兼營畜牧。本區西部、南部都是游牧部落，如平番河與大通河間的花利^{②①}，黃河與西寧河之間的巴燕^{②②}，塔爾寺以西，貴德以北的果米（Go mi），黃河邊上之貴德、以及雷卜貢（Reb kong）^{②③}、錯爾那（Tshor na）、甘架（Gan ja）、巴容（Ba zhung）、節容（Tse zhung）、陸桑（Lu sang）、桑科（San khog）、阿木去乎（A mchog）、博拉（'Bo ra）、卒（gTsos）、紮葉（Tsa ye）、迭部（The bo）、桑木搭（Zam tsha）、恰爾給（Khya dge）及下若兒蓋（mDzo dge smad ma）等。更南的四川邊界，也有安多藏族部落，如松潘縣附近之阿壩（rNga ba）或阿科（lNga khog）（又稱那迭 lNga dge 部落。^{②④}洮州^{②⑤}附近卓尼的藏族地位較偏離中心，他們說的藏語極特別。安多本區以外，也有安多藏族的踪跡，如藏北那曲河（Nag chu）以西南木惹（Gnam ru）一帶的錯那湖（mTsho nag）沿岸。

安多藏語方言迄今還是一個完全陌生的語言，僅有W. Rockhill 在 “ The Land of the Lamas ”（倫敦 1891 年出版，P.362 ~ 367）一書中引了幾個巴納克話及安多瓦話的例子。此外Matthias Hermanns 也發表了一篇安多藏語的論文，登在 *Anthropos* 期刊（第 47 卷，P.193 ~ 202，1952 年）上，叫做 “ *Tibetische Dialecte Von Amdo* ”。安多瓦、巴納克、以及果洛等地的藏語共同屬於一個東北藏語方言群，可稱之為「唐古特」方言群，因為蒙古語叫安多藏人就叫「唐古特」人，俄文地理學文獻，也已沿用了這個名稱。這些方言彼此很接近，主要差別在語音方面。這三種藏話都保存詞頭及濁輔音聲母的發音，也保存了一些古老的語詞。這些保守而古老的東北方言是極富研究價值的。這種研究對於了解新疆東部發現的古藏文稿本的語言肯定會有重大啟發，因為這些稿本經常是依據當時（八至十世紀）當地的口語寫定的。在解決西夏語的問題方面，研究安多藏語更是重要；今天安多地區大部分屬於當時西夏國的範圍，西夏遺民的後裔，也雜處於安多藏族之中，例如布木塔爾（'Bum thar）部落中的木雅宗族即是，他們以牧為業，生息於青海湖以南山脈的西南方（參閱G. C. Cibikov：Buddist Palomnik u Svyatin Tibeta.（西藏朝聖記），彼得堡，1919 年，P.60）。

研究藏語方言，首先必須了解的事實是，各地藏族並沒有一種統一的民族口語。基於各地藏族分布極為廣濶分散以及連串的歷史因素，藏語世界迅速分裂成兩個基本的層面，一方面是各地的方音土語，另一方面是普及於全境的共同書面語。書面藏語以為翻譯佛學經典所創制的書面語為基礎，在時間的長河中逐漸獨立發展而成今日的面貌。有人認為書面藏語代表保留七至十世紀古代藏語特點的古語，而方言土語僅是書面語言後來「簡化」後的產物，這是不對的。事實上，藏語方言，尤其是東北部的安多方言里，也保存有許多古代藏語的成分。不過，今天中部^{②⑥}方言對外圍地帶的方言土語上的影響正與日俱增。中部方言的推廣，是經由各地寺院系統及西藏自治政府分支機構而進行的；安多方言也同樣無法避免承受這方面的影響。每年此地都有一些年輕僧侶遠赴西藏首府三大寺院之一研習佛學，在當地待了幾年後，很快地學會使用中部藏語，返鄉之後，便成為安多地方寺院里推動中部藏語擴張的新力量。正因為如此，整個安多地區誦讀經典及祈禱詞時，都用拉薩音，^{②⑦}這種讀書音的習慣，對口語不可能沒有任何影響。所以，要研究純粹的安多方言，必須以凡俗人（農民、牧民）的口語為對象。安多方言內部不完全一致，可以再分成一系列的土話，各地土話都有語音上的特點，可以歸為北安多（含花利 Dpal