WRITTEN MONUMENTS OF THE ORIENT

VOLUME 9   No. 2 (18)
2023

IN THIS ISSUE

ON THE COVER: to the article of Pritula Anton D.
Pl. 2. Syriac collection of the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy
of Sciences. MS. Sir. 26, f. 33v

3

Nie Hongyin

Tangut Pillars of *Uṣṇīṣavijayā* in Baoding Prefecture: The Last Monuments of Xixia Descendants

Abstract: In the Park of Lotus Pond in the Baoding city of China, there is a pair of stone pillars of *Uṣṇīṣavijayā* erected in 1502, which proves to have been the latest Tangut relics existing so far. A textual investigation of their inscriptions indicates that they were built in memory of two monks of the Xingshan Temple, which was first established in the southeastern corner of the city in the 13th c. and repeatedly rebuilt later. After a reconstruction at the end of the 15th c., three Tangut monks first came and lived in the temple, two of whom died within a dozen years, and they were the buried monks for whom the pillars were erected. The pillars were originally located in a graveyard next to the Hanzhuang village outside the city, and, as mentioned in the inscription, near the village there was a considerable settlement of descendants of the Tangut warriors conscripted and transferred by the Yuan government to protect the Central Kingdom.

Key words: Baoding city; Tangut inscription; Buddhist relics; temple; *dhāraṇī*

Introduction

After the fall of the Xixia State (1038–1227), the traditional language and script of Tanguts were still used in their homeland and the environs of the Yuan-Ming capital, Beijing. The latest relics in the Tangut script preserved nowadays are a pair of stone pillars stored in the Park of Lotus Pond in Baoding City,[1] Hebei Province, China. They are valued by academic circles for their unique shape and are regarded as the last monuments of the Tangut script, for the inscription indicates the fifth reign year of Hongzhi 弘治 (1502). But when the pillars were discovered in the 1960s, the Tangut studies were just revived in China. The fact that vast amount of excavated sources had not yet been published at that time resulted in the lack of aca-

© Nie Hongyin, Institute for Advanced Study of Yan-Zhao Culture, Hebei University, China.

[1] The Lotus Pond (*lianchi* 蓮池), as one of the ten famous landscape architectures in Chinese history, was first established at the center of Baoding city in the Tang dynasty, and was renovated and extended successively during the Yuan-Ming period. It is now used as a public park and the site of the Lotus Pond College for popular education.

demic accumulation, which led the researchers to some inexact understandings of the Tangut script, and, in particular, to the mistaken identification of the temple sites and the figures recorded in the inscription. Since the end of the 20th c., significant progress has taken place in the Tangut study all over the world, and numerous new materials have been published, which gave us the basis for a re-examination of the inscriptions contents and the history of the relevant temple, in order to increase the knowledge of the activities of Tanguts in the environs of the capital during the Yuan-Ming period.

Description of the pillars and the previous studies

A pair of stone pillars were found at a ruin to the west of the Hanzhuang 韓莊 village in Lianchi Region, Baoding. The buildings there in those years may have been of some size, but in the first quarter of the 20th c. they were completely destroyed, with the exception of a single white pagoda.[2] The pillars, tipped over in a ditch outside the north wall, were unearthed by archaeologists from the Hebei Provincial Bureau of Culture and then moved to the Park of Lotus Pond in 1962, where they are now preserved in its East Yard Stele Gallery. (Pl. 1)

The two pillars are octagonal columns with mushroom-shaped caps and simple bases. The Pillar No. 1 is 2.63 and No. 2 is 2.28 m high.[3] Because the quality of the stone is too poor to preserve the inscription completely, after hundreds of years it is impossible to have clear rubbings.[4] As far as can be seen, the contents of the inscription are divided into five sections:

1. Title of the pillar in Tangut.
2. Prologue, cause of erecting the pillar in Tangut.
3. Complete version of *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī*[5] in Tangut.
4. List of more than eighty donors in Tangut.
5. Autographs by the initiator and carvers of the pillars, one in Chinese and one in Tangut.

---

[2] According to the interview by Zheng and Wang (1975), a local old man described the undamaged building he saw in his early years. He said that it was called *xisi* 西寺 (Western temple) or *dasi* 大寺 (Large temple), where Yama and the Three Women of Kindness were enshrined in the main hall.

[3] The pillars are numbered according to the date of the death.

[4] For the photos of illegible rubbings, see: *ZXW* 18: 185–188. For the transcription of the texts except *dhāraṇī*, see: SHI & BAI 1977, also SHI 1988: 329–331.

[5] *Foding Zunsheng Tuoluoni* 佛頂尊勝陀羅尼 (*Dhāraṇī* of Jubilant Buddha-Corona) was used to destroy all the hardships of all living beings.

Pl. 1. Tangut pillars in the Park of Lotus Pond

The two pillars were erected at the same time by the same person, whose Chinese title and name are recorded on the Pillar No. 2 together with the carvers from the family Bi and the date of engraving:

大明弘治十五年十月 日, 住持吒失領占建立. 鎮陽畢景昌, 畢恭鐫.
[On a certain day of the tenth month, the fifteenth reign year of Hongzhi, the Great Ming dynasty, erected by Superintendent Zhashi Lingzhan, and engraved by Bi Jingchang and Bi Gong from Zhenyang].[6]

A brief autograph may be seen on the Pillar No. 1:

鎮陽畢從刊.
[Engraved by Bi Cong from Zhenyang].

The Chinese name of the superintendent, *zhashi lingzhan* 吒失領占, is transcribed into Tangut *tśia śjir jijr dźjij*[7] 蘹纏𣢆𣢠 on the Pillar No. 1.

---

[6] Zhenyang 鎮陽, now Zhengding 正定 County in Hebei Province, is located approximately 130 km to the south of Baoding.

[7] Phonetic symbols for Tangut come from Huang-cherng Gong's reconstruction quoted by LI 1997. Most of Gong's reconstructions are adoptable, but there is no convincing evidences for the existence of the medial *-i-*, *-j-* and the final *-j*, which should be ignored in research practice.

(ZHENG & WANG 1975) correctly pointed out that his Chinese and Tangut names both were transcriptions from the Tibetan name *Bkra-shis Rin-chen* (lit. auspicious treasure). According to the tradition of the Yuan-Ming dynasty, the Tangut Buddhists used to place their surname before their religious appellations. The surname of the superintendent is absent on the Pillar No. 2, but appears on the Pillar No. 1 as *phjij-śjo* 𗋡𗏴, which was transcribed into Chinese *pingshang* 平尚 in previous studies without finding its source. Now it should be mentioned that this surname is recorded in the 20th line in the chapter of the *Tangut Names* of the Tangut primary reader *Sancai Zazi* 三才雜字,[8] and its Chinese equivalence should be *bingshang* 並尚 recorded in another Chinese reader *Zazi* 雜字 compiled in Xixia.[9] At least eight members of the Bingshang family are inscribed in the list of donors on the pillars.

Pl. 2. The top of the pillar

[8] *EHW* 10: 49.
[9] SUN 2000.

The title of the pillars, *jij bu dźjow* 䍺 祕 燚 , is carved on the top of the pillar (Pl. 2), which was literally read in Chinese *xiang sheng chuang* 相勝幢 by Shi and Bai,[10] but Zheng and Wang[11] translated it as *sheng xiang chuang* 勝相幢. Then a pointless debate took place over the title,[12] as scholars at that time were unaware that in the Khara-Khoto collection of the IOM, RAS, there are both Tangut and Chinese versions of the Tibetan work *Gtsug-tor rnam-par rgyal-ma'i gzungs phan-yon dang bcas-pa' mdo ltar bsdus-pa*,[13] in which the word *rnam-par* is translated as Tangut *jij bu* and as Chinese *sheng xiang*.[14] It can be understood unquestionably from this comparison that the real meaning of the Tangut title of the pillars, *jij bu dźjow*, is *shengxiang chuang* (pillar of jubilant appearance) in Chinese, which may also be interpreted as Tibetan *rnam-par rgyal-mtshan* and Sanskrit *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhvaja*.

From this it is evident that the pillars, as they should be called in Chinese *shengxiang chuang*, were erected in 1502 by Phjij-sjo Bkra-shis Rin-chen, the superintendent of the temple, and engraved by stone carvers from Zhengding. The purpose of inscribing the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī* on the pillar was to remove the hardships from the two dead monks and deliver them from the miserable Hell.

Translations and annotations of the prologs

Before the inscriptions of *Uṣṇīṣavijayā* respectively, there are short prologs to explain the cause of erecting the pillars, which were translated into Chinese by Zheng and Wang,[15] and Shi and Bai.[16] It is now necessary to give new translations and annotations, in order to correct the oversight in the previous studies.

---

[10] SHI & BAI 1977.

[11] ZHENG & WANG 1977.

[12] Beside Zheng and Wang, and Shi and Bai. See: also LI 1979 and SHI & BAI 1984. This debate was summarized by PENG & YANG 2011.

[13] Tangut title: *tśjiw pjụ ·jij bu zji jij rjijr lọw lwər bju śjọ* 䩾 䍺 祕 祠 霼 纅 絽 賑 䆝 㵽 㪍 , Chinese title: *Shengxiang dingzun zongchi gongneng yi jing lu* 勝相頂尊總持功能依經錄 (Effect of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī* collected from the *sūtra*).

[14] DUAN 2010.

[15] ZHENG & WANG 1977.

[16] SHI & BAI 1977.

Pillar No. 1:

𗾸𗀭𗢞𗥰𗴿𗆜𗾮𗆏, 𗯨𗕟𗆷𗜁𗷬𗼨𗣼𗡞𗦼𗜢𗾧𗆜𗱥𗭜𗴿𗆜𗽷𗏵𗕟𗙿. 𗴿𗀖𗆏𗾸𗚉𗠟𗆲, 𗼗𗍩𗿚𗾙𗪼𗠍𗧣𗊷. 𗾸𗆲𗄻: 𗲶𗐬𗁷𗕟𗼽𗸸.

𗏵𗆲: 𗱅𗴒𗁦𗸅𗆷𗰿𗇋𗕟𗆜𗣼.

[In the fourteenth reign year of Hongzhi, the Great Ming dynasty, *Śrāmaṇera* Dpal-ldan Rdo-rje in the Xingshansi Temple died prematurely on the twenty-fourth day of the fourth month. I erected this pillar in the fifteenth year, and ordered the carving of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī* to be completed. Pillar erector: Phjij-śjo Bkra-shis Rin-chen.

Transcriber: transcription by Gegen-širi from the Rjur-kiẹ Shengfo Temple].

The Pillar No. 1 was erected in 1502 to remember a *śrāmaṇera* (Tang. *śia mji* 𗴿𗆜; Chin. *shami* 沙彌) who died on May 20, 1501. His Tangut name, *pja dja dow dźjij* 𗷬𗼨𗣼𗡞, was literally transcribed by Shi and Bai into Chinese *bada nazheng* 巴答那征.[17] It should be noted that the name consists of two words, the second one, *dow dźjij*, is evidently the Tangut transcription of Tibetan *rdo-rje* (diamond, Chin. *jingang* 金剛). It was repeatedly borrowed by Mongols for their appellations during the Yuan-Ming period, reading *dorji* in Mongolian and *duoerzhi* 朵爾只 in Chinese transcription. Now it was transcribed by a disyllable word, the correct Chinese transcription should be *duozhi* 朵只.[18] As for the first word, *pja dja*, it is by no means a Tangut surname, for neither of the two characters was used in Tangut appellations, but only in the transcription of the Buddhist *dhāraṇī*s for *pa* and *da*. An possible identification for this should be the Tibetan common name *dpal-ldan* (possessing glory). It is not surprising that the Tangut monks borrowed Tibetan words for their names, as this was the custom among the Buddhists of the Yuan-Ming dynasty.

The Chinese name of the temple does not appear there, but its Tangut name can be seen on both pillars as *xji śji sə tśjow* 𗯨𗕟𗆷𗜁, which was literally transcribed by Shi and Bai into Chinese *xishisi zhong* 稀什寺中, of course not being a real name of any monasteries. Zheng and Wang correctly pointed out that it ought to be identified with Xingshansi 興善寺 (Temple of promoting goodness) recorded in the *Baodingfu Zhi* 保定府志 (Chronicle of Baoding Prefecture). But they mistakenly transcribed the Tangut character

---

[17] Zheng and Wang transcribed the name as *baping nazheng* 巴平那爭. It is evident that the Tangut character *dja* 𗼨 was mistaken by them for a similar *phjij* 𗼾.

[18] This name can also be found in a vowing article of a Yuan edition (SUN 2019)

tśjow by Chinese *zhong* 眾, because in available materials at that time the scholars did not find the semantic meaning of *tśjow*, except its Chinese phonetic transcription. Now it should be pointed out that the Tangut character appears in volume 15 of the Tangut code *New Laws*, where a clause is recorded narrating the administration of the temples, in which 50 temple names are listed with an ending *tśjow*, such as *tha tśhja ŋwər bju tśjow* 𗥃𗯴𗨻𗲠𗾽 (Temple of Great Master respecting Heaven), etc.[19] Thus it can be realized beyond any question that the Tangut *tśjow* means "temple".[20] That a phonetic *sə* and a semantic *tśjow* are tied for expressing the same meaning of "temple" is a common translating technique in China, as in the Uyghur-Chinese translation *Mushitage Shan* 慕士塔格山, the word *muztagh* in Uyghur language means "ice mountain", in which *tagh* is also tied with Chinese *shan* for expressing the meaning "mountain".

The Tangut phrase *mjij dja we* 𗅲𗎁𗿷 may be translated as "become a corpse", which is an extremely unusual expression, and seems to suggest that this is not a natural death. The translation *shi gao cheng* 屍告成 (corpse telling becoming) by Zheng and Wang is complete nonsense, while the translation *yuanji* 圓寂 (nirvana) by Shi and Bai is a bit of a misnomer. According to the Buddhist convention, the word *yuanji* is used only for indicating the death of eminent monks, so it is appropriate to use "premature death" for the young *śrāmaṇera* here.

The Tangut word *zji jij* 𗰖𗿷 was mistranslated by Zheng and Wang as *xi bing* 悉禀 (all report),[21] and then corrected by Shi and Bai as *zongchi* 總持, equivalent to Sanskrit *dhāraṇī* and Tibetan *gzungs*. Here the *jij bu zji jij* 𗵒𗫡𗰖𗿷 indicates the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī*.

The Tangut word *rjar mjijr* 𗾴𗣀 (transcriber) here indicates the Chinese term *shudan* 書丹 (writing in red). Before a carver begins his work, the erector of the pillar must invite a calligrapher to write the contents of the inscription in cinnabar ink on the stele as a specimen of the characters to be engraved. The calligrapher is named *gia gia śjir jijr* 𗵘𗍊𗾴𗣀, which was transcribed as *geyan shiling* 葛嚴石領 and *henghe shiling* 恒河失領 by

---

[19] For relevant Russian translation and plates of the original. See: KYCHANOV 2013: 227–228, 465–466.

[20] The etymology of Tangut *tśjow* (temple) remains unclear to us. Considering other words with similar pronunciation, there is an earlier Tibetan word *jo* (Buddha) as in *jo-khang* (Buddha's palace) and a later Mongolian word *ǰoo* (temple) in *yihe ǰoo* (great temple, Chinese toponym: Yikezhao 伊克昭), but those words in Tibetan and Mongolian indicate the monasteries of Lamaism, while in Xixia it does not specially indicate the places of Tibetan Buddhism.

[21] *Bing* 禀 should be *bing* 秉 (to hold). This mistake came from the 27th folio of *Fanhan Heshi Zhangzhongzhu* 番漢合時掌中珠 (KWANTEN 1982: 215).

Zheng and Wang, and Shi and Bai respectively. Indeed, Tangut *gia gia* may be used for Sanskrit *Gaṅgā*,[22] but it is not recorded in the chapter of *Tangut Names* in *Sancai Zazi*, and was never used as anybody's surname. It maybe suspected here that these two words might have been the transcription of Mongolian *gegen širi*, in which the first word has its Chinese meaning *ming* 明 (bright),[23] and the second word seems to come from the Sanskrit word *śri* (auspicious). Tanguts may take Mongolian names in the Yuan-Ming dynasty, for it can be seen that there are more than twenty donors listed in the Tangut vowing text attached to the Ming edition *Gaowang Guanshiyin Jing* 高王觀世音經 (*Mahārājāvalokiteśvara sūtra*),[24] where all of the donors take Mongolian words as their last names, but their surnames suggest that they are Tangut descendants.[25]

The calligrapher, *Gegen širi*,[26] was invited from the *rjur kię śjɨj tha tśjow* 𗣀𘜶𗣼𗗚𘓀, which must have been the appellation of a specific temple, but the temple with corresponding name does not appear in any historical materials available. Indeed, adopting these words as an appellation for a temple is extremely curious.[27] Purely as a supposition, there is a homophone of *rjur kiej* 𗣀𗾈 (capital, Chin. *jingshi* 京師) with *rjur kię* 𗣀𘜶 (Chin. *zhujin* 諸金).[28] If this is the case, *rjur kiej śjɨj tha tśjow* will make sense of the "Temple of Saint Buddha in the capital", and one can even suppose

---

[22] NEVSKY 1960: II, 195.

[23] KURIBAYASHI 2009: 173.

[24] A xylograph preserved in the Palace Museum, dated 1430 (*ZXW* 12: 402–408).

[25] Some typical example: [Zji-o] *jir-r kja tha-i* [𗣀 �]𘃢𘟩𗱕𗗦𘓀 (Mong. *irgetei*; Chin. *Yiergetai* 亦兒格台), [Phjij-śjo] *khia rar dźia-ŋ* [𘃋 𗤁]𗣀𗲆𘜶𗤁 (Mong. *qaraĵang*; Chin. *Halazhang* 哈喇章), [ja xwa] *bu ɣa tja-i* [𗾈 �]𘃞𘟩𘓀𗴺 (Mong. *buqadai*; Chin. *Buhedai* 不合歹), [phjij-ŋ] *bu ɣa tjij-m rjɨr* [𘜶 𗤁]𘃞𘟩𗟲𘟩𗣀 (Mong. *buqa temür*; Chin. *Buhe tiemuer* 不合帖木兒). See: NIE 2022 for detail.

[26] According to the inscription on Pillar No. 2, his status in the temple was a *bhikṣu* (Chin. *bichu* 苾芻, qualified monk).

[27] The *rjur kię śjɨj tha tśjow* may be literally translated into Chinese *Zhujin Shengfo Si* 諸金聖佛寺, in which the *zhujin* (each gold) is not a word. If the appellation is *Jinfo Si* 金佛寺 (Temple of Golden Buddha) or *Jinsheng Si* 金聖寺 (Temple of Golden Saint) or *Shengfo Si* 聖佛寺 (Temple of Saint Buddha), they are common appellations for monasteries, but according to the chronicle of the Ming dynasty, those temples were too far from Baoding to send somebody to transcribe the inscription, and what is more, it seems that there were no calligraphers who knew Tangut.

[28] The most common meaning of *rjur kiej* is "the world", but occasionally it may be used for "the capital", as in Chen Huigao's vowing article of the *Suvarṇaprabhāsa sūtra* there is a phrase *tha kiej lhjij rjur kiej dźiej·ji* 𘀗𗾈𘞶𗣀𗾈𘝝𗯴, which should be translated as "believers in the capital of the Great Dynasty". SHI 1988: 315 translated as "believers in the world of the Great Dynasty", which does not make sense.

further that it might have been the Nengren 能仁 Temple in Beijing. The Nengren Temple, located to the west of the Southern Xisi Street in Beijing, was a Tibetan Buddhist temple founded in 1319 by *Tripiṭaka* Viratnaśrī (Vinayaśrī, ?–1332), a Dharma master in the Yuan dynasty.[29] The temple enjoyed a high reputation during the Yuan-Ming period, but declined in the mid — 20th c., and was completely demolished in 2001. The above-mentioned *Gaowang Guanshiyin Jing* was printed there in 1000 copies in 1430, so it may be estimated that there must have been someone skilled in the Tangut language and calligraphy in the temple run by monks from the Gansu Corridor. The title of the temple, Nengren, is one of the Chinese nomenclatures of Śākyamuni,[30] which could be connected with the temple name *śjɨj tha* (Saint Buddha) in the inscription of Baoding, because "Saint Buddha" also indicates Śākyamuni.

Pillar No. 2:

𗗟𗴺𗏵𗴴𗿒𗟲𗟨𗧺𗒀, 𗡞𗘿𗥃𗧺𗤺𗵑, 𗁶𗫨𗖍𗸫𗣮𗦲𗤑𗖫𗵘, 𗌭𗖆𗆈𗧂𗵵𗤑𗵘�E, 𗥀𗮙𗆈𗟨𗢣𗫨𗟲𗾉𗵹𗦲。𗲀𗹙𗆈𗟨𗟢𗤑𗸦𗖍𗸫, 《𗱢𗼻𗇪𗢧》𗜏𗫡𗱛𗧃。𗢣𗴺𗈛: 𗘲𗑣𗵹𗘿𗢣𗵘𗽈。

𗜏𗈛: 𗴲𗃴𗑾𗼇𗤺𗲀𗮙…

[Now, in the fifteenth reign year of Hongzhi, the Great Ming dynasty, in the Xingshansi Temple, Master Śi͟ow-khjiw died on the sixth day of the second month, and was buried in the tomb of the *stūpa* courtyard four *li*[31] to the north of the city. I erected this pillar on the twentieth day of the ninth month, and ordered the carving of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī* to be completed. Pillar erector: Phjij-śjo Bkra-shis Rin-chen.

Transcriber: transcription by *Bhikṣu*…[32] from the Rjur-kiẹ Shengfo Temple].

Tangut *du·io la* 轪 肬 㑄 was correctly translated by Shi and Bai as *tayuan mu* 塔院墓 (tomb of the *stūpa* courtyard). Zheng and Wang translated as *tasi*

---

[29] In the fifth volume of his *Rixia Jiuwen Kao* 日下舊聞考, Zhu Yizun 朱彝尊 (1629–1709) transcribed Hu Ying's 胡濙 *Danengrensi Jilue* 大能仁寺記略, reading: 京都城內有寺曰能仁, 實延祐六年 (1319) 開府儀同三司崇祥院使普覺圓明廣照三藏法師建造. 逮洪熙元年 (1424), 仁宗昭皇帝增廣故宇而一新之, 加賜大能仁寺之額. Here the full official title *Kaifu Yitongsansi Chongxiangyuanshi Pujue Yuanming Guangzhao Sanzang Fashi* indicates Viratnaśrī.

[30] The lower volume of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* translated by Zhiqian: 有佛名釋迦文, 漢言能仁 (*Taishō Tripiṭaka* T14, p0532b).

[31] *Li* 里 is a Chinese length unit. ≈ 560 m in the Ming dynasty.

[32] According to the Pillar No. 1, the lost words here may be *gia gi͟a śji rjijr* 兽佰粃胅.

mu 塔寺墓 (tomb of the *stūpa* temple) in order to go along with the "Palace of Yama" or the "Large Temple" in local legend they heard, but actually, the Tangut *io* 𗼃 never had the meaning "palace" or "temple". The location suggested for erecting the pillar, i.e., the tomb in the *stūpa* courtyard four *li* to the north of Baoding city, is precisely the Hanzhuang village where the pillars were unearthed. According to the ancient custom, the *stūpa* courtyard where the dead monks were buried should have been situated at some distance from the temple, and in a large courtyard there might have been a simple building for sacrifice. Materials available have led to the affirmation that the site was but a graveyard of monks, rather than the Xingshan Temple which was held by previous scholars. Such a fact is attested in the local historical chronicles that there had never been any monasteries in the vicinity of Hanzhuang. As shown in the *Map of the Baoding Prefecture* in the *Baodingfu Zhi* 保定府志 (vol. 35, f. 2) compiled in the reign year of Guangxu (1871–1908), the Xingshan Temple was located in the southeast corner inside the old city, beside which there was a vegetable garden. It is self-evident that large graveyards could not be built in areas within the city walls, and that two temples in the same area could not share the same appellation, so it is believable that the temple in the southeast corner inside the city drawn in the *Map of the Baoding Prefecture* must have been the very site of the Xingshan Temple, and that the ruin near Hanzhuang was only the *stūpa* courtyard for burying monks. What ought to be noticed is that the "tomb of the *stūpa* courtyard", the place of burying, is emphasized specifically in the inscription. This is unnecessary in terms of habit, because monk tombs must be in the *stūpa* courtyards, only mentioning the village name is enough without repeating the "*stūpa* courtyard".[33] There may, of course, be another explanation, namely, that the pillars were carved at temples within the city and then transported to Hanzhuang after they were completed. Moreover, one can think of Zheng and Wang's interview concerning that Yama and the Three Women of Kindness being enshrined there, which may not be the case, as there are no temples in China dedicated specially to Yama, the Lord of Hell. It is unclear whether these buildings were created at some other time after the 16th c., and were not directly related to the former *stūpa* courtyard.

The first character of *śiǫw khjiw dzjij* 𗾭𗼨𗏵, the name of the tomb owner, was misjudged by Shi and Bai as *phji* 𗿢 with similar form, and the

---

[33] If the burying place of somebody was mentioned in Chinese history, only a relevant village or "ancestors' graves" were recorded at most, and never used the word as "*stūpa* courtyard".

whole appellation was mistranslated as *biqiu shi* 比丘師 (*bhikṣu* master). In fact, the *śio̯w khjiw* is a normative Tangut surname,[34] which was recorded on the 35th line of the primary reader *Sancai Zazi*,[35] merely its Chinese transcription cannot be found in history. The correct understanding of the appellation should be "Master Śio̯w-khjiw". Just as above mentioned Phjij-śjo, the surname of Bkra-shis Rin-chen, is omitted in the Chinese autograph of the pillar, the last name of Śio̯w-khjiw is omitted here, but hereinafter it will be shown that he is the preceptor of Dpal-dan Rdo-rje, the tomb owner of the Pillar No. 1, and his real name is Shes-rab Rgyal-mtshan.

Dhāraṇī and the donors

Zheng and Wang first investigated the entire inscription on the pillars in 1977. Comparing the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī* on the pillars with the cognominal one on the gateway of the Juyongguan Pass in Beijing in the Yuan dynasty, they realized that many differences existed between the transcribing characters on both inscriptions.[36] After that, Li Yang[37] restored the entire *dhāraṇī* on the pillars, finding that there were few divergences between the pillars and the versions in Xixia period kept in the IOM, RAS. It is even possible to believe that the *dhāraṇī* on the pillars were engraved based on the cognate version in Xixia, and that the inscription at Juyongguan appears to be a retranslation directly from its Sanskrit or Tibetan original.[38] In other words, the intrinsic Buddhist tradition of the Xixia period was maintained at the Xingshan Temple.

The Xixia edition of the *Shengxiang Dingzun Zongchi Gongneng Yijinglu* 勝相頂尊總持功能依經錄, in which there are the entire *Uṣṇīṣavijayā*

---

[34] Another *Śio̯w khjiw dzjij kja* 㲋𗷛𗾧𗾪 as a donor appears in the list on the Pillar No. 2.

[35] *EHW* 10: 49.

[36] The reason for this misjudgment is that they did not refer to the rubbing of the inscriptions at the Juyongguan Pass, but only collated the *dhāraṇī* on the pillars with the inaccurate handwritten copy of the Juyongguan inscriptions by LUO 1930.

[37] LI 2010.

[38] The inscription at Juyongguan was completed in 1345, more than a century after the fall of Xixia, when the compilation and printing of the *Tangut Tripiṭaka* had just been completed by some monks who acquainted with the Tangut language and script. On the contrary, the pillars in Baoding were erected nearly three centuries after the fall of Xixia, when it was impossible for people to write even a few simple sentences in Tangut, so that it is hard to imagine that there were monks who could translate *sūtras* in Tangut.

dhāraṇī and its effect of chanting, was transmitted by an official monk named Jayānanda and was translated into Chinese and Tangut respectively under the instruction of Empire Renzong (1124–1193). Both versions were printed and donated for a *dharma* assembly held in 1149. Renzong said in his vowing article attached to the Chinese text:

> 朕覩茲勝因，倍激誠懇，遂命工鏤板，雕印番漢一萬五千卷，普施國內。臣民志心看轉，虔誠頂受，朕亦躬親而□服，每當竭意而誦持。
>
> [Seeing these wonderful effects inspires my double purity of heart, and I ordered the craftsmen to engrave and print fifteen thousand copies of the Tangut and Chinese editions for donating to the domestic people. The subjects should read it wholeheartedly and receive it with devotion, and I myself shall also carry and chant it with devotion from time to time].

The print run of fifteen thousand copies was tolerably enough, but it was still not sufficient for the demand, so various manuscripts and xylographs emerged in succession, such as what was read in the postscript attached to the reprinting of Kwo Śja-tśjĩ 𗨁𗾘𘀄 (Chin. Guo Shanzhen 郭善真):

> 𗼃𘕰𗤢𗒅𗡝，�-𗸐𘉞𗪚𘃘�",𗆐�𗬠𘉁𗨷，𘉱𗥩𗼞𘓄�->𘍐，𗨁𗾘𘀄�-𘉞�旗𘕴𗴮𗄠，𘟑�绿𘈩𘜶.[39]
>
> [As the book shows such effects, it was successively engraved and printed for numerous retainers and chanters, which has resulted in the blocks being damaged within a short time. Accordingly, I, Guo Shanzhen, ordered a new edition to be engraved for the convenience of receiving and keeping].

The form of the books is rather small for the convenience of those who carry with them for their own protection. In addition to the vigorous promotion by the Emperor, it became one of the most popular *sūtras* in Xixia, and one of the *sūtras* most copiously preserved in the world.[40] It is conceivable that one or more copies of the *sūtra* were brought to the capital and its environs by the adherents of the Tangut in their eastward migration, and were subsequently put into the temple collection.

---

[39] Nɪᴇ 2016: 47–48.

[40] Dozens of fragments of this *sūtra* are preserved in Russia, China and Britain, of which the collection at the IOM, RAS is the most abundant. Except numerous fragments, the relatively complete Chinese pieces were catalogued by Mᴇɴ'ꜱʜɪᴋᴏᴠ 1984: 223–226, the relatively complete Tangut pieces were catalogued by Kʏᴄʜᴀɴᴏᴠ 1999: 580–581.

After the *dhāraṇī*, more than eighty appellations of donors are inscribed separately on the two pillars.[41] The list begins on Pillar No. 1 with the monks who lived in the temple:

𗋐𗟲𗣼𗾟𗷒𗥓 𗓽𗹦𗊢
[Living in the Xingshansi Temple on Baoding Prefecture]

Most of the appellations of the monks are Tangut phonetic transcriptions of common Tibetan names. Borrowing Tibetan words for their own names proves to be a common practice among the Tangut monks of the Yuan-Ming dynasty,[42] but it is interesting to see that some of the monks in the Xingshan Temple directly shared the names of prominent monks of the Sa-skya Sect of Tibetan Buddhism. Some of the words I could make out were as follows:

So no zjɨ bo 𗰖𗤶𗴾𗾟 < Tib. *bsod-nams rce-mo*
Pja dja dow tśju 𗼨𗵆𗄈𗗙 < Tib. *dpal-ldan don-grub*
So no kja tshja 𗰖𗤶𗼻𗴺 < Tib. *bsod-nams rgyal-mtshan*
So no sjɨ gjɨ 𗰖𗤶𗦻𗧘 < Tib. *bsod-nams seng-ge*[43]

As shown above, Bsod-nams Rce-mo (1142–1182), the second son of the founder of the Sa-skya Sect, Sa-chen Kun-dga' Snying-po (1092–1158), was respected as the second patriarch of the Sect. Dpal-ldan Don-grub (1182–1251), the primitive name of Sa-skya Paṇḍita Kun-dga' Rgyal-mtshan, was the fourth patriarch of the Sect. Bsod-nams Rgyal-mtshan (1184–1239), the grandson of Kun-dga' Snying-po, was the father of 'Phags-pa Bro-gros Rgyal-mtshan (1235–1280), the fifth patriarch of the Sect. Bsod-nams Seng-ge (1429–1489) was a representative figure of the Sa-skya Sect in the Ming dynasty. This fact confirms that the Xingshan Temple of the Yuan-Ming dynasty inherited the tradition of the Tangut-Tibetan Tantrism spread in

---

[41] Most of the names recorded there need not be deciphered, because all of them written in Tangut script are formed in "surname with Tangut pronunciation + last name with Chinese meaning", which can only be translated according to their literal pronunciation and meaning without historical evidence.

[42] Besides, in the inscription on the Pillar No. 1, there are donors named in Sanskrit, such as *pja mja śji rjijr* 𗼨𗸯𗾚𗾟 comes from Sanskrit *Padmaśrī*, and *dja rjɨr mja śji rjijr* 𗵆𗡦𗸯𗾚𗾟 comes from Sanskrit *Dharmaśrī*, which were common appellations for Serindia monks from the Yuan dynasty, as the Uyghur transcriber of the inscription in Juyongguan Pass was also called *Darmašïrī* (MURATA 1957: 278).

[43] The Tibetan word *seng-ge* (lion) was pronounced *sing-ki* in the Yuan-Ming period, and was transcribed as *xingji* 星吉/惺機 in Chinese.

Xixia from the middle of the 12th c.,[44] and, as Sperling pointed out,[45] the Sa-skya-pa was just the most valued Tantric sect during the late period of Xixia.

Story about the Xingshan Temple

In the year 1977, Zheng and Wang noticed an article titled *Chongxiu Xingshansi Jilue* 重修興善寺記略 (A brief narration on reconstructing the Xingshan Temple) recorded in the *Chronicle of Baoding Prefecture* compiled in the reign years of Guangxu (1875–1908).[46] It is parallel to the illustration of the *Map of the Baoding City* and tells definitely that the temple was located in the southeastern corner within the city. They did not conclude that it was the site of the Xingshan Temple, but only mentioned it in a footnote to their article, because they considered the incongruity of the temple with the ruins where the pillars were unearthed.

"A brief narration on reconstructing the Xingshan Temple", written by Guo Fen 郭棻 (1622–1690) in the tenth reign year of the Qing Emperor Kangxi (1671), is the only remaining record concerning the Xingshan Temple (Pl. 3). The beginning of the article (line 1–3) reads:

The Xingshan Temple is located in the southeastern corner of the prefecture, but its date of creation remains unknown. Its reconstruction is recorded in the Ming inscriptions of the Yongle and Xuande reigns, while the Yuan stele is too deteriorated to read. It has been going on now for three hundred years.

It is accordingly known that the Xingshan Temple was built no later than the Yuan dynasty, and was repeatedly rebuilt afterwards, but again fell into dilapidation in the early Qing period. Guo Fen describes the wretched appearance he saw in the temple (line 3–7):

---

[44] There are four words for "temple" in Tangut language, in which *tshə* 皽 is the phonetic transcription of Chinese *si* 寺, *mjijr·jɨj* 繍牅 is the semantic translation of Chinese *jingshe* 精舍 (Skr. *vihara*). Besides, *tśjow* 彼 roughly indicates native Xixia temples and *·jimji* 繖胹 roughly indicates Tibetan Tantric monasteries. Here the name of Xingshansi uses *tśjow* rather than *ji mji*, showing that Tibetan Buddhism had been integrated into the native Buddhism in the late period of Xixia.

[45] SPERLING 1987.

[46] See: Vol. 77, f. 3.

保定府志卷七十七

Wind and rain damaged it; birds and rats hurt it. Mosses filled the sacrificial altars; cobwebs hid the seats of the Buddhas. Bricks and beams were mutilated and crumbling, and the men in black[47] were afraid to go forward when they saw it. In the temple, there were a few date-trees which were distinguished from the rest. When the dates were ripe each fall, children picked and ate them. When someone passed by, he could only see the holes of foxes and rabbits. Alas! Buddhism had long flourished in China, and to what harsh extremes had this temple alone fallen! Who was at fault for this, the circumstances, the people, or the time?

Guo Fen then praises the incorruption of Nadu, a local officer who initiated the rebuilding of the temple, in contrast to the corruption of the local soldiers (line 7–11):

In the tenth year after our Emperor ascended the throne, garrisons were established in the prefecture, where officers and men performed their duties. Nadu,[48] a Boshiku,[49] is a Mongol with an intelligent and kind-hearted nature, humble in manner and amiable to others. Everywhere at the time, most of the soldiers in the garrison were civilians who had been plundered and captured in large numbers, enduring hardships one by one without daring to say a word. Only Nadu preserves his purity and keep his subordinates under strict control, so that people thank him for his morality.

Nadu's contribution to the rebuilding of the temple is recorded after the preceding paragraph (line 11–17):

The place where he was stationed is the adjoining neighborhood of the Xingshan Temple, and Nadu used to sigh there when he visited it, and he accordingly contributed money to recruit laborers, and personally led them in their operations. He used to carry the wood and stones himself in the dust under the burning sun, and the project was completed on schedule. He then invited Monk Qingru to be the superintendent, and purchased a garden of five *mu* and five *fen* and five *li*[50] to supply the *bhikṣus*. The reconstruction included a principal hall of three-*ying*,[51] two side halls of six-*ying*, two

---

[47] "The men in black" (Chin. *ziyizheliu* 淄衣者流) indicates officials or gentlemen who, as stated, must wear black clothes in formal occasions.

[48] *Nadu* 哪杜 seems to be an Uyghur name, but I cannot trace the etymology of it.

[49] *Boshiku* 撥什庫 is the Chinese transcription of Manchurian *bošokū* (Chinese translation: *lingcui* 領催), a junior officer in charge of documents and provisions.

[50] According to the area measurement in the Qing dynasty, 1 *mu* 亩 = 10 *fen* 分 = 100 *li* 厘 ≈ 667 square meters.

[51] *Ying* 楹 indicates the stand column in traditional architecture. The distance between two columns (≈ 6 m) was used to measure the width of a building.

towers for a bell and a drum, and six rooms for meditation. Moreover, the gate was heightened to represent its solemnity, and a flagstaff was erected to show its prosperity. All the red, white, golden, and green coatings were painted there without a single omission. Alas! The achievements of the world require a combination of circumstance, people, or time. Only on one occasion in hundreds of years has such a project come into action.

At the end of his article, Guo Fen quoted a statement from the Ming inscriptions available at the temple, and emphatically mentioned the names of three monks who first came to the temple for Buddhist practice (line 17–22):

> The record on the stele of the Ming dynasty reads: In those days it was Dpal-dan Don-grub who came and revived the temple, and it was Shes-rab Rgyal-mtshan and his apprentice Dpal-dan Rdo-rje who practised with burning incense, and the donor was Daguan Chaiwu,[52] all of whom were native Serindians. Now Master Nadu, also a native Serindian, rebuilt it after three hundred years. This fact struck me deeply. Was it not a consequence of the coming of time? Was it caused by the supernatural of the circumstance or the supernatural of Buddhas? I could not refrain myself from being deeply affected by it.
> In the third month of the tenth reign year of Kangxi.

The appellations of three monks in the temple mentioned above came from Tibetan, i.e., Dpal-ldan Don-grub (*bandan duanzhu* 班丹端竹, virtuous achievement), Shes-rab Rgyal-mtshan (*shilai jiancan* 失嚙堅參, wisdom pillar) and Dpal-dan Rdo-rje (*bandan duoerzhi* 班丹朵爾只, virtuous diamond), which led Zheng and Wang to decide that the temple was run by Lamaists in the Ming dynasty. It is recorded on the stele that the monks in the temple and the donor were regarded as Serindians (*xituren* 西土人), which was only a geographic concept, actually including Tibetans, Uyghurs, and certainly including Tanguts. It must be reminded that the Serindian Lamaism believers at that time did not limit to Tibetans, but also to Tanguts who, like Mongolian Lamas, used to borrow Tibetan names for themselves. That is to say, the Tibetan names did not prevent the understanding that the temple was run by Tanguts. It should be noted that Zheng and Wang overlooked an important fact that the three monks recorded in the inscription

---

[52] This donor (Skr. *dānapati*, Chin. *tanyue* 檀越) seems to be a Mongol, whose name is formed by a Turkic borrowing *tarqan* (officer) and a Mongolian *ča'ur* (go to campaign), which was transcribed as *dalahan chawuer* 達剌罕察兀兒 in the tradition of the Yuan dynasty. The first word is repeatedly found in the *Yuan shi* 元史, the second word appears in the 11th volume of the *Secret History of the Mongols*, § 254, 255 (KURIBAYASHI 2009: 106).

appear just right on the pillars of Baoding. As one of the donors to erect the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā* pillars, the name of Dpal-ldan Don-grub (pja dja dow tśju 犐 嫬 祔 韼) may be found in the second line of the eighth side of the Pillar No. 2. Dpal-dan Rdo-rje (pja dja dow dźjij 犐 嫬 祔 䕫) is just the tomb owner of the Pillar No. 1. If the identification of the two names is correct, one can further presume that the tomb owner of the Pillar No. 2 is the preceptor of Dpal-dan Rdo-rje, Shes-rab Rgyal-mtshan, whose surname is recorded on the pillar without his last name, while his last name is recorded by Guo Fen without his surname.[53] Shes-rab Rgyal-mtshan came to Baoding with Dpal-dan Rdo-rje sometime in the Ming period and practiced at the Xingshan Temple revived by Dpal-ldan Don-grub, but both died within a dozen years after their arrival. The exact date of their arrival is suggested by the age of *Śrāmaṇera* Dpal-dan Rdo-rje, who was a juvenile apprentice in the learning stage. According to the Buddhist institutions, a child may become a *śrāmaṇera* not earlier than the age of seven, and may change his identity to *bhikṣu* at least at the age of twenty. Assuming that he arrived at the temple early at the age of seven and died at nineteen, he would have remained there for at most twelve years. Thus, it may be inferred that the Xingshan Temple was rebuilt no earlier than 1489, most likely in the 1490s, when the three monks came to practice there.

After the death of Dpal-dan Rdo-rje and Shes-rab Rgyal-mtshan, no *stūpas* were built for them, but two simple and crude pillars were put there. This may have been a reflection of the hierarchy within the temple. According to the ancient tradition, only eminent monks were eligible to enjoy *stūpa* tombs, and the number of *stūpa* layers reflected their position in the temple. The reason why Dpal-dan Rdo-rje and Shes-rab Rgyal-mtshan did not enjoy *stūpa* tombs was that they were in lower positions in the temple. As the preceptor of Dpal-dan Rdo-rje, Shes-rab Rgyal-mtshan may have been an ordinary *bhikṣu*, for, except in special cases, the preceptor of a *śrāmaṇera* need not be held personally by a senior monk. Moreover, the fact that the pillars were completed at the same time, one year and a half after the death and half a year after another death, may be due to the limited financial resources of the

---

[53] The above assumption needs to meet such a condition that the stele entitled "A brief narration on reconstructing the Xingshan Temple" recorded by Guo Fen was not a relic in the reign years of Yongle and Xuande, but erected in almost half a century later, the reign years of Hongzhi, otherwise we shall not explain why Dpal-dan Rdo-rje lived always as a young *śrāmaṇera* at least from 1435 to 1501. It is a pity that Guo Fen did not give the exact date of the erection of that stele, and that all of the steles in the Xingshan Temple have been long lost, so that the relevant history cannot be examined further.

temple, otherwise it would not have been necessary to mobilize more than eighty men and women for donation to erect the pillars of such coarse stone.[54]

Tangut settlements in Hebei Province

It is common sense to assume, there must have been a settlement of Xixia descendants near the temple of Tangut tradition.[55] As shown by the surnames of donors to the pillars, the inhabitants there were the descendants of Tangut warriors of local garrison in the Yuan dynasty, belonging to several families as *ŋwe mji* 緻㣖 (*weiming* 嵬名) of the Imperial clan, *ljow* 胯 (*liang* 梁) of the Queen's clan, and *sjɨ pji* 赦聶 (*xianbei* 鮮卑) clan,[56] etc. A similar case appears in another temple in Dingzhou, Hebei Province, where several wooden plates for printing a Tangut *sūtra* were found, but it is a pity that the site of the temple has already had no ways for investigation, and the original plates also have been missing, only four photos of paper printing left at the beginning of the *Bulletin of the National Library of Peiping*. Wang estimated in the introduction to the *Bulletin* that those were printed from the old plates engraved long ago, on which the leaf surfaces were fragmentary and illegible because of the abrasion plate.[57] Zhang revealed that this xylograph was a Tangut version of the *Sūtra of the Ten Kings* (*Shiwang jing* 十王經) never seen before,[58] which shows considerable difference from the version of Xixia in the collection of the IOM, RAS. From this an assumption will be thought of that if this edition was a new translation and a new xylograph in the Yuan dynasty, it will prove that near the temple in Dingzhou during the Yuan era, there might have been a settlement of a Tangut garrison, in which there were intellectuals who knew the Tangut language.

A different fact is a stele unearthed in 2013 in Chenzhuang village of Daming County, Hebei Province. According to the related historical accounts, the village near the tomb site was not a garrison, but a single noble family of the Yuan dynasty. On the stele there are two lines of Tangut inscriptions (Pl. 4):

---

[54] Assuming that all the monks adopted Tibetan and Sanskrit names as their own, and that all of them participated in the donation, the number of monks in the temple would not exceed a dozen. This suggests that the Xingshansi was a small-scale temple with limited funds.

[55] The Hanzhuang village is now out of public view, as it was completely demolished during recent urban construction.

[56] The surname *xianbei* suggests that they were descended from the Northern Dynasties (439–581), but incorporated into Tanguts after the founding of Xixia.

[57] WANG 1930.

[58] ZHANG 2019.

Pl. 4. Rubbing of the stele of Xiaoli Qianbu

𘀗 𘚍 𗊨 𗕿 𗼓 𘀎
𘊼 𗗜 𗏳 𘜶 𗩈 [59]
[Madam Tian, the mother
Xiaoli Qianbu, the father]

The Tangut word *gia bju* 𗼓 𘜶 means "commander of an army" (Chin. *tongjun* 統軍). Xiaoli Qianbu 小李鈐部, also called Xili Qianbu 昔里鈐部 in the volume 122 of *Yuan shi* 元史, was the *daruqači* (chief executive) of the Daming Road.[60] His eldest son and eldest grandson also held the office as heredities, and his elder brother, Julisha, was the *daruqači* of the Suzhou (now Jiuquan city) Road.[61] Previously, a Chinese inscription on the tomb stele of his son Li Ailu was unearthed near the tomb of Xiaoli Qianbu.[62] Documents and unearthed records prove that it was a prominent family. To meet the demands of their office-holding, some members of their

---

[59] According to the writing regulation of Chinese tomb stele (male left female right), the positions for men and women should be transposed with each other. The present sequence is read from left to right, which may have been influenced by Mongolian writing form.

[60] His life and family are recorded in Chinese on the back of the stele. (ZHU 2014) carefully studied the inscription by the combination of the materials in the collection of the Yuan dynasty and the chorography of the Ming dynasty.

[61] BAI & SHI 1979.

[62] ZHU & LIU 2012.

forefathers remained in their native country in the Gansu Corridor, and others, with some attendants, emigrated to Daming, and took the shape of a small settlement in their new abode.

The re-engraved tomb stele dedicated to Laosuo in 1360 is preserved in the Park of Lotus Pond, and the Chinese inscriptions on the stele were transcribed and studied in detail by Liang.[63] According to the inscriptions, Laosuo came from the Tangwushi 唐兀氏 (Family of Tangut's) in the Gansu Corridor, who followed Genghis Khan in his invasion of the Middle East and followed Ögötai to march southward and destroy the Jin dynasty. He died in 1260 at his official post of *daruqačǐ* of the Shuntian Road. He was buried in Taijing village in Qingyuan County, where the present-day Xiezhuang village is located in Baoding, seven kilometers from Hanzhuang village where the pillars were found.[64] Because subordinates had to try to be in tune with the Mongol potentates, the consciousness of traditional Tangut culture was downplayed in the family of Laosuo, whose descendants left no vestiges of Tangut character and even whose names were changed to Mongolian type. For example, his son was named Manggu 忙古 (Mong. *mangqut*), and his grandson was named Hudu Buhua 忽都不花 (Mong. *quduq buqa*). Similar case may be seen in the family of Xiaoli Qianbu, whose descendants took the Chinese surname Li 李. His Tangut appellation is recorded only on his tomb stele, suggesting that the ability of his descendants to use the Tangut language was insufficient to support them in writing a complete inscription. It is clear that such a custom differed from that of the Tangut donors recorded on the pillars of Baoding, who wrote their names in Tangut or Tibetan until the middle of the Ming dynasty.

When the Xixia state was destroyed by the Mongols, the Tanguts who had submitted to the Mongol-Yuan dynasty enjoyed a higher social status than Chinese, though lower than Mongols. As education was relatively more developed in Xixia and Tangut officeholders had a higher level of culture, many Tanguts were included into the ruling clique of the Yuan government,[65]

---

[63] LIANG 2007.

[64] The materials of Laosuo's family are not recorded in histories, except the information incidentally mentioned in the *Lingchuan Ji* 陵川集 (vol. 35) by Hao Jing 郝經 (1223–1275) in the Yuan dynasty, the *Heyang Dunshi Goujun Muming* 河陽遯士苟君墓銘 (Stele Inscription of Hermit Gou in Heyang), in which Gou Shizhong 苟士忠 (1199–1258), the tomb owner, came to Hebei for escaping from the chaos of war. The Imperial Envoy, Laosuo, came to Shuntian Prefecture, and, knowing Gou's intelligence, intended to invite him to become a senator; but he stoutly declined and did not arrive. (苟士忠… 居燕趙之間. 宣使老索來蒞順天, 知其材, 欲引為參佐. 力辭不就).

[65] For the official careers of Tanguts in the Yuan government. See: BAI 1989: 48, 52.

and their families and subordinates migrated with them to the environs of the capital. Around that time, the Yuan government successfully conscripted a large number of Tanguts from the Gansu Corridor to be stationed everywhere, including the Tangut Garrison (*Tangwuwei* 唐兀衛) near the Central Kingdom. On the previous suggestion of the inscriptions at the Juyongguan Pass, it has been assumed that the Tangut were chiefly quartered to the north of the capital, and the pillars at Baoding prove that they were also quartered in the south.

During the Mongol-Yuan period, two ethnic groups immigrated on a large scale to the area around the capital. The Tanguts entered the interior in two ways, through the migration of noble families led by official needs, and through the migration of the families of common soldiers led by conscription. As a rule, the nobles, in order to be dependent on the new governors, deliberately and actively pandered to the culture of the ruling people, while ordinary soldiers living in relatively confined environments expect to retain their native language, script and lifestyle forever, and to avoid the infiltration and influence of non-native cultures. Therefore, the reason why the Tangut culture in Chenzhuang and Xiezhuang did not survive as long as in Hanzhuang is that the inhabitants in Chenzhuang and Xiezhuang belonged to the upper aristocracy, while those in Hanzhuang belonged to the lower class. In addition, religious beliefs favored the continued use of the Tangut language and thus delayed the demise of Tangut culture. However, less than ten years after the erection of the pillars, the Ming government issued the *Ming Huidian* 明會典 (Assembled code of the Ming dynasty), in which the volume 141 stipulates the marriage of Mongols and Semus, admitting the marriage between a Mongol or a Semu with a Chinese, but they must be mutually willing; marriages within the same race are not allowed; offenders will be punished with 80 stick-lashes, and they, male and female, will be made slaves to be confiscated by the government.[66] It was just this restriction on marriage that led to the eventual demise of the Tangut people and led to the Tangut pillars of *Uṣṇīṣavijayā* in Baoding Prefecture being regarded as the last monuments of Xixia descendants.

Abbreviations

EHW: Ecang Heishuicheng Wenxian 俄藏黑水城文獻 [Heishuicheng Manuscripts Collected in Russia], vol. 4, compiled by the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of the Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, the Institute of Nationality Studies of the

---

[66] Chinese original: 凡蒙古色目人, 聽與中國人為婚姻, 務要兩相情願. 不許本類自相嫁娶, 違者杖八十, 男女入官為奴.

Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, the Shanghai Chinese Classics Publishing House, Shanghai: Shanghai Chinese Classics Publishing House, 1997.

ZXW: Zhongguo cang Xixia Wenxian 中國藏西夏文獻 [Tangut Manuscripts Collected in China], vol. 18, compiled by the Center for Xixia Studies of Ningxia University, the China National Library, the Compilation and Translation Center for Chinese Classics and Archives Collation of Gansu Province, Lanzhou: Gansu People's Publishing House, Dunhuang Literature and Arts Publishing House, 2005.

References

BAI Bin 白濱 & SHI Jinbo 史金波 1979: *Dayuan Suzhoulu Yeke Daluhuachi Shixi zhi Bei kaoshi — Lun yuandai dangxiangren zai Hexi de huodong* 《大元肅州路也可達魯花赤世襲之碑》考釋 — 論元代党項人在河西的活動 [A textual research on the *Stele of the Hereditary Yehe Daruqači in the Suzhou Road of the Great Yuan*: On the activities of Tanguts in the Gansu Corridor during the Yuan period]. *Minzu Yanjiu* 民族研究 1: 68–80.

BAI Bin 白濱 1989: *Dangxiangshi Yanjiu* 党項史研究 [A Study on the History of Tangut]. Changchun: Jinlin Education Publishing House.

DUAN Yuquan 段玉泉 2010: "Xixia Zangchuan *Zunsheng Jing* de Xia Han Zang duikan yanjiu" 西夏藏傳《尊勝經》的夏漢藏對勘研究 [A collative research on the Xixia edition of Tibetan *Uṣṇīṣavijayā Sūtra* in Tangut, Chinese and Tibetan]. In Du Jianlu ed. *Xixiaxue* 西夏學 5: 29–37. Shanghai: Shanghai Chinese Classics Publishing House.

KURIBAYASHI Hitoshi 栗林均 2009: "*Gencho Hishi*" *Mongorugo Kanji Onyaku·boyaku Kango Taisho Goi* 『元朝秘史』モンゴル語漢字音訳·傍訳漢語対照語彙 [Word-Index to the *Secret History of the Mongols* with Chinese Transcriptions and Glosses]. Sendai: Center of Northeast Asia Studies of Northeast University.

KWANTEN, Luc 1982: *The Timely Pearl: A 12th Century Tangut-Chinese Glossary*. Bloomington: Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies, Indiana University.

KYCHANOV, Evgeny I. 1999: *Katalog tangutskikh buddiiskikh pamiatnikov* [Catalog of the Tangut Buddhist Monuments]. Kyoto: Kyoto University.

KYCHANOV, Evgenyi I. 2013: "*Novye zakony*" *tangutskogo gosudarstva* ["New Laws" of the Tangut State]. Moscow: Nauka.

LI Fanwen 李範文 1979: "Guanyu Mingdai Xixiawen jingjuan de niandai he shichuang de mingcheng wenti" 關於明代西夏文經卷的年代和石幢的名稱問題 [On the date of the Tangut *sūtra* and the appellation of the stone pillars in the Ming period]. *Kaogu* 考古 5: 72–473.

LI Fanwen 李範文 1997: *Xiahan Zidian* 夏漢字典 [A Tangut-Chinese Dictionary]. Beijing: China Social Sciences Press.

LI Yang 李楊 2010: "Baoding Xixiawen jingchuang *Zunsheng Tuoluoni* de fuyuan yu yanjiu" 保定西夏文經幢《尊勝陀羅尼》的復原與研究 [Restoration and research of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā Dhāraṇī* on the Tangut stele in Baoding]. *Ningxia Shehui Kexue* 寧夏社會科學 3: 115–120.

LIANG Songtao 梁松濤 2007: "Hexi Laosuo Shendao Beiming kaoshi" 《河西老索神道碑銘》考釋 [A textual research and comments on the *Inscription on the Tomb Stele of Laosuo from the Gansu Corridor*]. *Minzu Yanjiu* 民族研究 2: 80–84.

LUO Fucheng 羅福成 1930: "Juyongguan Shike" 居庸關石刻 [The inscriptions at Juyongguan]. *Guoli Beiping Tushuguan Guankan* 國立北平圖書館館刊 4.3: 105–150.

MEN'SHIKOV, Lev N. 1984: *Opisanie kitaiskoi chasti kollektsii iz Khara-Khoto* [Description of the Chinese Part from the Khara-khoto Collection]. Moscow: Nauka.

MURATA Jiro 村田治郎 (ed.) 1957: *Chü-Yung-Kuan, The Buddhist Arch of the Fourteenth Century A.D. at the Pass of the Great Wall Northwest of Peking*. Kyoto: Faculty of Engineering, Kyoto University.

NEVSKIJ, Nikolaj A. 1960: *Tangutskaia filologiia* [Tangut philology]. Moscow: Nauka.

NIE Hongyin 聶鴻音 2016: *Xixia Fojing Xuba Yizhu* 西夏佛經序跋譯注 [Translation and Annotation of the Prefaces and Postscripts in Tangut Buddhist Scriptures]. Shanghai: Shanghai Chinese Classics Publishing House.

NIE Hongyin 聶鴻音 2022: "Mingdai Dangxiangren de dangxiang xing he Menggu ming" 明代党項人的党項姓和蒙古名 [The Tangut surnames and Mongol last names of the Tanguts in the Ming period]. *Xixia Yanjiu* 西夏研究 1: 27–32.

PENG Xiangqian 彭向前 & Yang Huan 楊浣 2011: "Baoding chutu Mingdai Xixiawen shichuang mingcheng kao" 保定出土明代西夏文石幢名稱考 [A textual research on the appellation of the Tangut stone pillars unearthed in Baoding]. *Ningxia Shehui Kexue* 寧夏社會科學 4: 98–102.

SHI Jinbo 史金波 & BAI Bin 白濱 1977: "Mingdai Xixiawen jingjuan he shichuang chutan" 明代西夏文經卷和石幢初探 [A preliminary exploration of the Tangut *sūtra* and stone pillars in the Ming period]. *Kaogu Xuebao* 考古學報 1: 143–164.

SHI Jinbo 史金波 & BAI Bin 白濱 1984: "Mingdai Xixiawen jingjuan he shichuang zaitan" 明代西夏文經卷和石幢再探 [A further exploration of the Tangut *sūtra* and stone pillars in the Ming period] in Bai Bin ed. In: *Xixiashi Lunwenji*: 600–622. Yinchuan: Ningxia People's Publishing House.

SHI Jinbo 史金波 1988: *Xixia Fojiao Shilue* 西夏佛教史略 [A brief history of the Buddhism in Xixia]. Yinchuan: Ningxia People's Publishing House.

SPERLING, Elliot 1987: "Lama to the King of Hsia". *The Journal of the Tibet Society* 7: 31–50.

SUN Bojun 孫伯君 2000: "Xixia fanxing yizheng" 西夏番姓譯正 [Collative translation of the Tangut surnames in Xixia]. *Minzu Yanjiu* 民族研究 5: 83–90.

SUN Bojun 孫伯君 2019: "Yuandai *Hexizang*" 元代《河西藏》編刊資料補正 [Supplements and corrections of compiling and printing the *Tangut Tripiṭaka*]. *Zhonghua Wenhua Luntan* 中華文化論壇 6: 55–80, 155.

WANG Jingru 王静如 1930: "Yinlun" 引論 [Introduction]. *Guoli Beiping Tushuguan Guankan* 國立北平圖書館館刊 4.3: 1–39.

ZHANG Jiuling 張九玲 2019: "Dingzhou foxiang fuzhong suochu Xixiawen *Shiwang Jing* canpian kao" 定州佛像腹中所出西夏文《十王經》殘片考 [A Textual research on the Tangut fragmentary *Sūtra of the Ten Kings* found in the belly of a statue of Buddha in Dingzhou], in Du Jianlu ed. *Xixiaxue* 西夏學 19: 317–325. Lanzhou: Gansu Culture Publishing House.

ZHENG Shaozong 鄭紹宗 & WANG Jingru 王靜如 1977: "Baoding chutu Xixiawen Shichuang in the Ming period" 保定出土明代西夏文石幢 [Tangut stone pillars in the Yuan period unearthed in Baoding]. *Kaogu Xuebao* 考古學報 1: 133–141.

ZHU Jianlu 朱建路 & LIU Jia 劉佳 2012: 元代唐兀人李愛魯墓誌考釋 [A textual research and comments on the tomb inscription of Li Ailu, a Tangut in the Yuan dynasty]. *Minzu Yanjiu* 民族研究 3: 76–80, 109–110.

ZHU Jianlu 朱建路 2014: "元代《宣差大名路達魯花赤小李鈐部公墓志》考釋" [A textual research and comments on the *Tomb inscription of the Imperial Envoy, Daruqači of the Daming Road, Master Xiaoli Qianbu* in the Yuan dynasty]. *Minzu Yanjiu* 民族研究 6: 94–100.