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In a series of three articles published in this journal, the Russian scholar K.B. Keping advanced a theory of verbal agreement in Tangut (Hsi Hsia).\(^1\) In her theory, she states that both transitive and intransitive verbs agree with the subject and the object of the verbal action when they are expressed by a personal pronoun. In essence, the verbal agreement takes place through the use of the personal pronoun as a verbal suffix, the suffix being named by Mrs. Keping the agreement indicator. This theory stands in sharp contrast to the theory advanced by M.V. Sofronov\(^2\); and in part too by Nishida Tatsuo\(^3\), according to whom verbal agreement does not occur in Tangut (Hsi Hsia).

Although the work of Mrs. K.B. Keping is impressive, her theory raises some disturbing questions both as to methodology and research hypothesis required for the analysis of this, after all, Central Asian language.\(^4\) Virtually all the references cited by Mrs. Keping cannot be verified as the texts are available in manuscript form only and are rather inaccessible in Leningrad. Since the publication of her articles, one text, namely Sun Tzu's Art of War,\(^5\) has been published in facsimile. However, the few examples quoted from this text can virtually not be located in this rather voluminous text (about 100 pages). This is a problem, albeit a minor one, for it is notoriously difficult
to accurately punctuate a Tangut (Hsi Hsia) text, especially when no Chinese original is available.

Thus, it is the nature of the selected texts that raise very serious methodological questions. Indeed, the texts cited by Mrs. Keping in her work appear to have been original Tangut (Hsi Hsia) compositions; there is no evidence that they were translated from another language and, even if they were, we cannot determine the original material used. It should be kept in mind that we have no native Tangut-foreign language dictionaries, except for the relatively short glossary known as the Fan Han ho shih chang chung chu. Hence, dictionaries have to be made using known translated materials. By proceeding with the study of the language using nearly exclusively native, untranslated materials, Mrs. Keping may have put the cart before the horse. As I have pointed out elsewhere, access to the language has to come through an initial study of translated materials, especially those that have been translated from Chinese. Thus a strict comparison between the Tangut text and the Chinese text of, for example, the Analects and the Mencius will yield invaluable information that will permit us a more scientific access to original native material.

It is precisely the analysis of the Chinese classics that have been translated into Tangut that raises serious doubts about the validity of the theories of Mrs. Keping. According to her theory, the characters of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd personal
pronouns are used not only to indicate the personal pronouns themselves but also, when suffixed to the verb, the verbal agreement. The characters cited by Mrs. Keping are .JFrame, MainFrame, MainFrame respectively the first person singular, the second person singular and plural. She disagrees with the interpretations given by M.V. Sofronov that the latter two characters are vocative suffixes. The evidence she advances for her position is, however, far from convincing.

An analysis of the Tangut versions of the Analects and the Mencius, however, does not confirm the statements made by Mrs. Keping with regards to the personal pronouns in Tangut. The characters MainFrame and MainFrame are not attested as personal pronouns. The investigation of the pronouns in Tangut reveals features that have not been noticed by other researchers. The results of the investigations have been tabulated hereafter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nominal</th>
<th>Oblique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>.JFrame</td>
<td>JFrame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>JFrame</td>
<td>not attested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>JFrame</td>
<td>JFrame</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The plural of all the attested forms was made by the suffixation of the character JFrame. The character JFrame was used to make the genitive case, as distinct from pure possessive pronouns, of the personal pronouns through suffixation of the oblique forms.
The analysis of the Tangut versions of the Confucian classics did not yield any instances of verbal agreement. This in spite of the fact that, according to the theory advanced by Mrs. Keping, numerous instances of verbal agreement should have occurred. The only apparent instance of verbal agreement with the personal pronoun of the first person and an omitted subject, namely  İnternet, I,10d (Kitaiskii, p. 13), cannot be explained according to these theories.

(抄 影 老 優 老)

(三子非行我不也)

(非我与夫三子也)

... the disciples were wrong, it is not me (who) did it.

a: original Tangut; b: literal Chinese translation; c: original Chinese; d: translation of the Tangut

Without the specific indication of the first person, the Tangut sentence would not be intelligible as the subject of the second clause would again have been "the disciples."

Although an analysis of two texts is not sufficient to either validate or invalidate the theories on verbal agreement advanced by Mrs. Keping, the results of this analysis raise disturbing questions about them and clearly indicate that further detailed examination of both original and translated materials is required. A preliminary investigation of the pronominal functions of the