

## The Hsia Origins of the Yüan Institution of Imperial Preceptor

Early in the eleventh century a multi-national state came into existence in an area north and west of the Sung-dynasty realm. It consisted of an Ordos tribal confederation led by a people with a variety of names. They were called Tang-hsiang 党項 by the Chinese, Tanguts by north Asians, and Mi-nyag by the Tibetans and the Tanguts themselves, who spoke a language related to Tibetan. The Tanguts called their state Great Hsia 大夏 in Chinese and the Great State of White and High 白高大夏國 in their own language. Western scholars generally use the term Tangut to refer to the language, people, culture, and state; Chinese scholars still refer to the state as Hsi Hsia (Western Hsia), although the Tanguts themselves never did so. I use the words Tangut/Hsia analogously to Mongol/Yüan. Moreover, Chinese was one of the official languages of the Hsia state, therefore Hsia sources or publications are written in Tangut or Chinese or both, and date to the period 1038-1227.

During the later years of the long reign of the Tangut monarch Jen-tsung 仁宗 (r. 1139-1193), the Tanguts deepened their involvement with the Tibetans and the northern steppe tribes resisting Mongolian conquest. The relationship that Jen-tsung fostered with his Buddhist prelates, with Tibetan priests in particular, gave rise to the Hsia institution of imperial preceptorship (Chin.: *ti-shih* 帝師). This office would later emerge at the Yüan court through a process largely mediated by Tanguts, Tibetans, and Mongols at Liang-chou 涼州, a major Buddhist cult center of the Hsia state.

Religious preceptorship of this type touches upon questions of Tangut sovereignty and the relationship between Buddhists and the state. Modern scholars have been studying the topic from different vantage points. Elliot Sperling has compiled Tibetan sources relating to twelfth- and thirteenth-century Hsia history, and Leonard van der Kuijp has begun to publish his

Research for this paper was supported by the Committee for Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China during 1987-88, and through the cooperation of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences Institute of Nationality Studies. I first presented the paper at the 1991 A.A.S. meeting in New Orleans and benefited from the comments of discussants Jack Dull and Elliot Sperling, as well as the written suggestions of Leonard van der Kuijp.

research on the life, work, and reputation of 'Phags-pa Blo-gros rgyal-mtshan (1235-1280), the first Yüan imperial preceptor.<sup>1</sup> In this article I examine the earlier Tangut relationship, and suggest the context of its Yüan transformation. First I comment on royal patronage and supervision of the Buddhist community in Chinese history, and specifically on the designation of Buddhist preceptors. Throughout I try to see old issues in a new perspective so as to inspire further comment and insight.

#### BUDDHISTS, PATRONAGE, AND KINGSHIP

From the beginning most, if not all, governments of the Chinese sub-continent asserted the right to regulate Buddhist communities and monastic privileges, while monks and believers tried to carve out autonomous spaces for themselves. During much of the T'ang and Sung eras, Buddhist affairs in China came under the control of lay officials in the central and local governments.<sup>2</sup> The distinctive features of the matrix of royal patronage and bureaucratic supervision that I examine here are the national and imperial preceptors (*kuo-shih* 國師, *ti-shih*). Historically, *kuo-shih* appeared before *ti-shih*; functionally *ti-shih* supplanted *kuo-shih* as the highest clerical honor, and marked a development in the relationship between throne and sangha, both as a local institution and a Pan-Asian community. The presence of national and imperial preceptors seems to have accompanied an interest in esoteric, or Tantric, Buddhism and a willingness to entertain a wide array of options in the conception and conduct of kingship. In the Hsia and Yüan states preceptors were systematically involved in the supervision of sangha affairs.

Paul Pelliot pointed out in 1911 that the appointment of *kuo-shih* goes back to the Northern Ch'i court (550-578), which bestowed it on Fa-ch'ang 法常 in 550, with the charge that he enter the palace and lecture on the *Nieh-p'an ching* 涅槃經 (*Nirvāna sūtra*).<sup>3</sup> Pelliot draws attention to, and Mochizuki Shinko 望月信孝 elaborates on, the Indian and Central Asian ante-

cedents of this highest honor a Buddhist monk could receive from a ruler.<sup>4</sup> A preliminary perusal of various compendia of data, including a computer search of the phrase in the Chinese dynastic histories from T'ang through Ch'ing, reveals eight appointments in T'ang, none in Sung, none in Chin, a few in Liao, scores in Hsia, and scores more in the Yüan and Ming.<sup>5</sup> The absence of *kuo-shih* in the Sung and their presence in Hsia testifies to a welcome toward "foreign" and Tantric associations that was greater in the Tangut capital of Chung-hsing 中興 than in Kaifeng.

As a special honor conferred directly by the ruler, appointment as national (or imperial) preceptor did not become bureaucratized or commoditized, as other clerical honors had under the Sung, although its uses changed.<sup>6</sup> Because a *kuo-shih* originally functioned as a religious tutor to the emperor and his family, and initiated them as lay Buddhists, such an appointment implied a ruler's personal interest (often need) in obtaining the services of an eminent Buddhist priest. An urgent sense of need probably dictated many of the post-756 appointments by the otherwise Taoist T'ang dynasty.<sup>7</sup> Perhaps Sung rulers satisfied their spiritual and ideological needs in Taoism and Confucianism, but the Sung case may be more complex. Past and present Confucian historiography has tended to obscure the activities of Buddhists at the Sung court. For instance, long ago Chou Yi-liang noted that although esoteric Buddhism evidently declined during the Sung, the Japanese monk Jōjin 成尋 visited Shen-tsung's 神宗 palace in 1073 and found many images of Tantric deities there.<sup>8</sup> Who was doing what with these images? To my knowledge no one has addressed this question.

As far as I can tell, the regular appointment of national preceptors by the Hsia court from about the mid-twelfth century onwards points to a particular and special relationship between the Tangut throne and the sangha

<sup>4</sup> Mochizuki Bukkyō Daijiten 望月佛教大辭典, 6th edn. (Tokyo: Sekai seikei kankō kyōkai, 1972), pp. 1142-43.

<sup>5</sup> Huang Min-chih 黃敏枝, *Sung-tai fo-chiao she-hui ching-chi shih lun-chi* 宋代佛教社會經濟史論集 (Taipei: Hsüeh-sheng shu-chü, 1989); tables covering T'ang, Wu-tai, and Sung (pp. 403-507) are not without errors. I thank Yeen-mei Wu of the U. of Washington East Asian Library for searching for the phrases *kuo-shih* and *ti-shih* in the Twenty-five Dynastic Histories database. The one Sung *kuo-shih* that Pelliot cites received his title during the Five Dynasties era and died in 972, so hardly counts as a Sung example. I have not exhausted the Liao sources or the Buddhist histories. For Hsia *kuo-shih*, see Shih Chin-po 史金波, *Hsi Hsia fo-chiao shih-lüeh* 西夏佛教史略 (Yin-ch'uan: Ning-hsia jen-min ch'u-pan she, 1988), pp. 143-44.

<sup>6</sup> Huang, *Sung-tai fo-chiao*, chap. 11. The large number of *kuo-shih* during the Ming, as revealed in the database search, suggests institutional changes.

<sup>7</sup> Stanley Weinstein, *Buddhism under the Tang* (Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1987), pp. 57-83.

<sup>8</sup> Chou Yi-liang, "Tantrism in China," *HJAS* 8.3-4 (1945), p. 246.

<sup>1</sup> Elliot Sperling, "Lama to the King of Hsia," *The Journal of the Tibet Society* 7(1987), pp. 31-50; Leonard van der Kuijp, "Apropos of the Mongol Text of the *Caghan Teike* and Lama 'Phags-pa," unpub. paper, 1991.

<sup>2</sup> Hsieh Chung-kuang 謝重光 and Pai Wen-ku 白文固, *Chung-kuo seng-kuan chih-tu shih* 中國僧官制度史 (Hsi-ning: Ch'ing-hai jen-min ch'u-pan she, 1990), chaps. 4-6.

<sup>3</sup> Chih-p'an 志磐, comp., *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi* 佛祖統紀 (1269), printed in *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經, Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡邊海旭, eds. (Tokyo: Daizō shuppan kabushiki kaisha, 1924-34; hereafter T), no. 2035, ch. 38, p. 356c; and Pelliot, "Les 國師 Kouo-che ou 'Maitres du Royaume' dans le Bouddhisme Chinois," *TP* 12(1911), pp. 671-76.

quite distinct from what prevailed at the Sung court. More than expedient patronage and bureaucratic supervision fueled this relationship. In addition was the development of Tangut conceptions of the world, their place in it, and their notion of kingship. Further, just as the national preceptor can be traced to Indian practice, so may the imperial preceptor be traced to a probable Tibetan source.

#### HSIA BUDDHISM: THE SOURCES OF HSIA HISTORY

The Tangut emperors of the Hsia state (1038–1227), successors to the Tibetan empire, vigorously promoted Buddhism. They had the entire canon of sacred scripture translated into the Tangut language and script by the close of the eleventh century, and in the twelfth century patronized several Tibetan Buddhist schools. Jen-tsung supervised the compilation of new texts, as well as the editing and revising of the Hsia canon in both Chinese and Tangut versions.<sup>9</sup>

Hsia Buddhism played a significant role in the wider context of East Asian Buddhist-state relations. Use of the Tangut script did not die out after the Mongol conquest of the Hsia state in 1227. Quite apart from the Yüan-sponsored printing of the entire Hsia canon early in the fourteenth century and the polyglot Chü-yung-kuan 居庸關 inscription of 1345, people continued to use Tangut to compose Buddhist texts up to at least the early 1500s. In 1372 a Tangut edition of the sutra *Kao wang kuan-shih-yin ching* 高王觀世音經 was printed with a dedication listing the names of the sponsors and printers.<sup>10</sup> A vow expressed hopes for the health and long life of the Ming emperor and his sons and heir-apparent, for peace and stability, for the service of loyal officials, and gratitude to the writers' parents. Moreover, it resolves to fulfill the Buddhist way. All of the names appear to be Tangut; but the place is not specified.<sup>11</sup> In 1502 a community of Tangut believers erected two Buddhist pillars engraved with *dharani* texts in Tangut inside the Hsi-shih Temple 稀什寺 of Pao-ting 保定 prefecture, Hopei province. The steles commemorated the deaths of Sha-mi-pa-ta-na-cheng 沙彌巴答

<sup>9</sup> Shih Chin-po has argued that the Tanguts prepared an edition of the canon in Chinese, as well as in Tangut: "Hsi Hsia fo-chiao hsin-cheng ssu chung 西夏佛教新証四種," *Shih-chieh tsung-chiao yen-chiu* 世界宗教研究 1 (1989), pp. 85–87.

<sup>10</sup> T no. 2898. For a description, see Ono Gemmyō 小野玄妙, *Busho kaisetsu daijiten* 佛書解說大辭典 (Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha, 1931–36), vol. 3, pp. 353–54.

<sup>11</sup> This text is kept in the Palace Museum in Peking. See Shih, *Fo-chiao shih-t'ieh*, pp. 325–28, 387.

那征 and Pi-ch'iu-shih 比丘師.<sup>12</sup> Such artifacts are not merely isolated curiosities. The postconquest survival of the Tangut script is intimately related to the political and cultural influence of Tanguts in the Yüan empire, which in turn owed much to the Buddhist charisma of the Tangut emperors.

Tangut piety may be the principal reason for the survival down to this century of materials that allow us to study the Hsia state as Tangut history—not the sorry tale of a border nuisance during the Sung. The St. Petersburg branch of the Russian Institute of Oriental Studies houses the richest archive of secular and Buddhist Tangut materials, the Khara-khoto Collection. One of the most precious items may be the lengthy twelfth-century Tangut law code, which E. I. Kychanov has translated and annotated in a four-volume edition that includes a photographic reproduction of the text.<sup>13</sup> The code is an important source of information about the Buddhist establishment. Other vital sources are the extant colophons to Hsia sutras, many of which have been collated and published in Shih Chin-po's monograph on Hsia Buddhism; photographs of various colophons are also appended to L. N. Men'shikov's catalogue of Chinese materials in the Khara-khoto Collection.<sup>14</sup> Tibetan chronicles also contain material about later-Hsia history and Buddhism.<sup>15</sup>

#### IMPERIAL PRECEPTORS (TI-SHIH) AT THE HSIA COURT

Hsia Jen-tsung began appointing imperial preceptors perhaps midway through his reign, from the 1160s to 1193.<sup>16</sup> From a Hsia source we have

<sup>12</sup> Shih Chin-po and Pai Pin 白濱, "Ming-tai Hsi Hsia wen ching-chüan ho shih-chuang ch'u-t'an 明代西夏文經卷和石幢初探," *K'ao-ku hsüeh-pao* 考古學報 1 (1977), pp. 143–64; Cheng Shao-tzung 鄭紹宗 and Wang Ching-ju 王靜如, "Pao-ting ch'u-t'u Ming-tai Hsi Hsia wen shih-chuang 保定出土明代西夏文石幢," *ibid.*, pp. 133–41; Shih Chin-po and Pai Pin, "Ming-tai Hsi Hsia wen ching-chüan ho shih-chuang tsai t'an 明代西夏文經卷和石幢再探," in Pai Pin, ed., *Hsi Hsia shih lun-wen chi* 西夏史論文集 (Yin-ch'uan: Ning-hsia jen-min, 1984), pp. 600–22; and Shih, *Fo-chiao shih-t'ieh*, pp. 329–33. As yet there exists no standard transcription for Tangut.

<sup>13</sup> Kychanov, trans. and annot., *Izmenennyi i zanovo utverzhennyy kodeks deviza tsarstvovaniia nebesnoe protsvetanie (1149–1169) (Revised and Newly Affirmed Code of the T'ien-sheng Era)*, vol. 1, Analysis (Moscow: "Nauka," 1988; hereafter *Kodeks*); vol. 2, chaps. 1–7 (Moscow, 1987); vol. 3, chaps. 8–12 (1989); vol. 4, chaps. 13–20 (1989).

<sup>14</sup> For Shih, see n. 5 above. See Men'shikov, *Opisanie kitaiskoi chasti kolleksii iz Khara-khoto (fond P. K. Kozlova)* (Moscow: Nauka, 1984).

<sup>15</sup> I have used them with the help of Elliot Sperling and Leonard van der Kuijp. Any errors found here are mine, not theirs.

<sup>16</sup> Shih, *Fo-chiao shih-t'ieh*, pp. 137–42.

the name and titles of at least one prelate so honored,<sup>17</sup> and Tibetan chronicles report a close relationship established between Bka'-brgyud-pa sects and the Hsia throne.

Various sources in Tangut and Chinese (sutras, stele inscriptions, civil documents, graffiti at Dunhuang) and postconquest Tangut publications give us both the outline and details of an extensive Buddhist establishment that began as early as the reign of the first emperor, Wei-ming Yüan-hao 嵬名元昊 (Ching-tsung 景宗; r. 1032-1048). In the twelfth century that establishment flourished and apparently expanded under Jen-tsung and his successors. A number of government agencies supervised the affairs and property of the sangha, but it remains unclear to what degree, if at all, monks and sangha officials overlapped or were formally segregated from the regular bureaucracy. For example, the honorary ranks that prefix the names of many priest-officials are found in the same table of ranks (see below) as, and often in conjunction with, ranks denoting nobles and officials of the Secretariat (Chung-shu 中書) and Military Commission (Shu-mi 樞密). Even a cursory reading of the Tangut law code leaves the impression that monks were numerous, enjoyed high status and the same access to the inner palace as accorded "senior and junior officials."<sup>18</sup>

The designation *ti-shih* as such does not appear in the law code, which was issued early in the T'ien-sheng 天盛 era (1049-1170) of Jen-tsung's reign, but chapter 10, article 686, of the code mentions the office in a section on government organization and hierarchy:

Preceptors of the emperor and state, heir-apparent, and princes. Titles of the emperor's preceptors: supreme preceptor (*shang-shih* 尙師), state preceptor (*kuo-shih*), virtuous preceptor (*te-shih* 德師). Heir-apparent's preceptor: benevolent preceptor (*jen-shih* 任師). The princes' preceptors: loyal preceptors (*chung-shih* 忠師).<sup>19</sup>

Article 687 elaborates the equivalent ranks of the preceptors:

The emperor's designations of supreme preceptor (*shang-shih*), state preceptor (*kuo-shih*), etc., and virtuous preceptor (*te-shih*), etc., are

<sup>17</sup> E. I. Kychanov has mentioned others in "From the History of the Tangut Translation of the Buddhist Canon," in Louis Ligeti, ed, *Tibetan and Buddhist Studies Commemorating the 200th Anniversary of the Birth of Alexander Csoma de Körös* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1984) 1, pp. 377-87. Unfortunately, he does not provide integral source citations or transcriptions of the Tangut texts, so it is difficult to incorporate his data into this article.

<sup>18</sup> *Kodeks*, vol. 3, chap. 11, article 865 (p. 202, translation; p. 601, text).

<sup>19</sup> *Kodeks*, vol. 3, p. 113 (translation), pp. 417-18 (text). I have adapted Kychanov's translation.

equivalent to the first class. The benevolent preceptor (*jen-shih*) of the heir-apparent is equivalent to the second class. The loyal preceptors of the princes are equivalent to the third class.<sup>20</sup>

In the quoted passages, *shang-shih*, *kuo-shih*, *te-shih*, *jen-shih*, and *chung-shih* represent Chinese translations of the Tangut terms, themselves in some cases, like *kuo-shih*, borrowed from the Chinese Buddhist repertoire. It is possible that *shang-shih* included or preceded *ti-shih*, or simply rendered Tibetan *bla-ma*, lama, "the supreme one."<sup>21</sup>

The first class referred to in article 687 consisted of the two top organs of government: the Secretariat (Chung-shu) and the Military Commission (Shu-mi). The Tangut "Table of Ranks" lists the titles *te-shih* and *kuo-shih* (each in two ranks) under the heading of preceptors (*shih wei* 師位), which itself follows the ranked imperial concubines, imperial females (by birth), and the kings (or princes) of the Southern, Northern, Western, and Eastern courts.<sup>22</sup> This placement indicates the high status of the emperor's preceptors. So far I have found two explicit references to *ti-shih* (as opposed to *shang-shih* or supreme preceptor): one in the Chinese version of a Hsia miscellany titled "Tsa-tzu 雜字," and one in a Ming reprint of a Buddhist text published under Jen-tsung.<sup>23</sup>

A particular category of "Tsa-tzu," subtitled "Official Positions" (*kuan wei* 官位), opens with names of the emperor, empress, other imperial personages, the six hoary Chinese prestige titles (including *t'ai/shao shih* 太/少師), and other princely ranks. Then follow four Buddhist titles: *ti-shih* (imperial preceptor), *kuo-shih* (state preceptor), *fa-shih* 法師 (dharma preceptor), and

<sup>20</sup> *Kodeks*, vol. 3, pp. 113-14, 418.

<sup>21</sup> Leonard van der Kuijp's suggestion; also noted by Elliot Sperling in "The Fifth Karma-pa and Some Aspects of the Relationship Between Tibet and the Early Ming," in Michael Aris and Aung San Suu Kyi, eds., *Tibetan Studies in Honour of Hugh Richardson*, Proceedings of the International Seminar on Tibetan Studies, Oxford 1979 (Warminster, England: Aris & Phillips, Ltd., 1980), p. 283.

<sup>22</sup> Kychanov has described and published a partial transcription and translation of the table in "Tangutskie istochniki o gosudarstvenno-administrativnom apparate Si Sia," *Kratkie soobshcheniia instituta narodov Azii* 69 (1965), pp. 180-96. I have also consulted an incomplete but fuller copy of the document made by Shih Chin-po when he visited Leningrad in January of 1987. On the kings of the directional courts, see my article "Naming the Tangut Capital: Xingqing/Zhongxing and Related Matters," *Bulletin of Sung-Yuan Studies* 21 (1989), pp. 52-66, esp. 61-62. The "Table of Ranks" probably dates to the 12th or early-13th c.

<sup>23</sup> Shih, "Hsi Hsia fo-chiao hsin-cheng ssu-chung," p. 93, speculates that a notation attached to a title in Nishida Tatsuo's 西田龍雄 catalogue of Tangut sutras, *Seika mon hegonkyō* 西夏文華嚴經, The Hsi-Hsia Avatamsaka Sūtra (Kyoto: Kyoto University Faculty of Letters, 1977) 3, p. 24, item no. 076, may refer to yet another Hsia imperial preceptor. I suspect that it dates to the Yüan. The text reads: 西番中國法師禪巴集中國大乘玄密帝師傳北山大清涼寺沙門慧忠譯. Although *hsüan-mi kuo-shih* was a 12th-c. Hsia Buddhist title, in my view a Hsia official title would not include the designation Chung-kuo (China).

*ch'an-shih* 禪師 (meditation preceptor).<sup>24</sup> Shih Chin-po dates the text to a period no earlier than Jen-tsung's reign, and probably its later years.

Far more interesting and informative is a recently discovered Ming reprint, dated 1447 (Cheng-t'ung 正統 12), of a bilingual Chinese-Tibetan collection of *gāthā* that had been originally produced at Jen-tsung's court. The Hsia translation was based on a Sanskrit original and done trilingually into Tangut, Chinese and Tibetan. The Ming reprint is titled *Sheng sheng hui tao pi an kung-te pao chi chi* 聖勝慧到彼岸功德寶集偈 (Tib.: 'Phags-pa shes-rab-kyi pha-rol-tu phyin-pa yon-tan rin-po-che bsdud-pa tshig-su bcad-pa); it preserves a Ming preface and an original Hsia notation in Chinese.<sup>25</sup> This work is included in the Tibetan Kanjur, the Tibetan translation of the Buddhist canon, which was compiled between the eighth and thirteenth centuries and first printed in the eighteenth. In the Chinese canon, often called the Tripitaka and first printed late in the tenth century, a comparable text, *Fo mu pao te ts'ang pan-jo p'o-lo-mi ching* 佛母寶德藏般若波囉密經, was translated in 991 by Fa-hsien 法賢, an Indian monk who contributed over sixty new works to the Tripitaka in Kaifeng under the patronage of the first three Sung emperors.<sup>26</sup> A Tangut version of *Sheng sheng hui tao pi an kung-te pao chi chi* exists in St. Petersburg (Leningrad),<sup>27</sup> but in 1952 Chinese researchers found a fragment of the Tangut text at the Buddhist caves in the T'ien-t'i Mountains 天梯山 southwest of Wu-wei 武威 (Liang-chou).<sup>28</sup> Ming-era Buddhists interested in this text presumably had no need for the Tangut version, so omitted it from their edition.

<sup>24</sup> The transcription of "Tsa-tzu" by Shih Chin-po is in his "Hsi Hsia Han-wen pen Tsa-tzu ch'u-t'an" 西夏漢文本雜字初探 in Pai Pin, Shih Chin-po et al., eds., *Chung-kuo min-tsu shih yen-chiu* 中國民族史研究 (Peking: Chung-yang min-tsu hsüeh-yüan ch'u-pan she, 1989), p. 184. The incomplete text of "Tsa-tzu" here transcribed is preserved in the St. Petersburg archives. The Tangut text of "Tsa-tzu" survives in only a brief fragment.

<sup>25</sup> See Lo Chao 羅炤, "Tsang-Han ho-pi Sheng sheng hui tao pi an kung-te pao chi chi k'ao lüeh 藏漢合璧聖勝慧到彼岸功德寶集偈考略," *Shih-chieh tsung-chiao yen-chiu* 4 (1983), pp. 4-36; and Shih, *Fo-chiao shih-tüeh*, pp. 137-45. Lo Chao, a scholar at the Institute of World Religions, found the text in 1981 with a large quantity of Tibetan sutra literature at the Yün-chü Temple 雲居寺 in Fang-shan 房山 prefecture, southwest of Peking.

<sup>26</sup> T no. 229 (see Lewis Lancaster, *The Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue* [Berkeley & Los Angeles: U. of California P., 1979], p. 403, K 1200). On Fa-hsien, see Jan Yün-hua, "Buddhism Relations between India and Sung China, Part I," *History of Religions* 6.2 (1966), pp. 34-37; and Yü Ch'ien 喻謙, *Hsin Hsü hao seng chuan ssu chi* 新續高僧傳四集 (Pei-yang yin-shua chü, 1923; rpt. Taipei: Taipei hsien Yung-ho Chen Liu-li ching-fang, 1967), ch. 1, pp. 12-26.

<sup>27</sup> Z. I. Gorbacheva and E. I. Kychanov, *Tangutskie rukopisi i ksilografy* (Moscow: Izdat. vostochnoi literatury, 1963), p. 94, no. 66. It is not clear if this is the original Hsia edition, or a later reprint.

<sup>28</sup> Ch'en Ping-ying 陳炳應, "T'ien-t'i shan shih-k'u Hsi Hsia wen fo-ching i shih 天梯山石窟西夏文佛經譯釋," *K'ao-ku yü wen-wu* 考古與文物 3 (1983), pp. 45-47.

The Hsia notation in the Ming reprint names six people (in five groups) involved in producing this text:

Expounding the dharma preceptor, [attached to] the Tangut-Chinese Three Teachings Academy<sup>29</sup> and concurrently supervisor of monks, recipient of the *fu-ch'üan* rank,<sup>30</sup> *sramana* Hsien-pei Pao-yüan<sup>31</sup> translated [into] Chinese 詮教法師番漢三學院並偏祖提點曠美則沙門鮮卑寶源漢譯;

Exoteric and esoteric dharma preceptor, deputy director of the Sangha Office, recipient of the (*woying*) rank,<sup>32</sup> *sramana* [Chou Hui-hai . . .]<sup>33</sup> 顯密法師功德司副使曠臥英沙門 [周惠海];

Interpreting the dharma preceptor, *lotsawa* [translator], recipient of the (*shang-tse*) rank,<sup>34</sup> *sramana* Anandakirti translated [into] Tibetan<sup>35</sup> 演義法師路贊訛曠賞則沙門邊啊難捺吃哩底梵譯;

Indian great *pandita*, state preceptor of the five sciences and the exoteric and esoteric [dharma], lecturer in sutra, *vinaya*, and *abhidharma*, director of the Sangha Office, recipient of the *an-i* rank,<sup>36</sup> *sramana* Jayānanda personally held the Sanskrit text to correct the meaning 天竺大鉢彌但五明顯密國師講經律論功德司正曠裏乃將沙門邊也阿難捺親執梵本証義;

Wise and realized imperial preceptor, lecturer in sutra, *vinaya*, and

<sup>29</sup> The "three teachings" refers to the three "baskets": sutra (scripture), *vinaya* (monastic discipline), and *abhidharma* (commentaries).

<sup>30</sup> *Fu-ch'üan* 覆全 is Shih Chin-po's suggested translation of the Tangut rank transliterated as *mei tzu*, found in the "Table of Ranks", fourth category, no. 12 (*Fo-chiao shih-tüeh*, p. 139).

<sup>31</sup> Hsien-pei was a common Tangut surname, possibly indicating Hsien-pei tribal elements in the Hsia population.

<sup>32</sup> *Woying*, otherwise unattested, transcribes the Tangut.

<sup>33</sup> The name Chou Hui-hai appears in another T'ien-t'i shan fragment, attached to nearly identical titles (see n. 28). To explain why Chou's name and function were omitted here, Huang Chen-hua speculates that Chou was the Tangut translator on the team, and as the Ming editors did not reprint the Tangut text, they excised his name; Huang Chen-hua 黃振華, "Ming-tai ch'ung k'an Han-Tsang ho-pi Sheng sheng hui tao pi an kung-te pao chi chi Hsi Hsia i-ching t'i-chi yen-chiu" 明代重刊漢藏合璧聖勝慧到彼岸功德寶集偈西夏譯經題記研究, in *Tsang-hsüeh yen-chiu wen-hsüan* 藏學研究文選 (Lhasa: Hsi-tsang jen-min ch'u-pan she, 1989), p. 105.

<sup>34</sup> *Shang-tse*, otherwise unattested, transcribes a Tangut rank.

<sup>35</sup> Huang Chen-hua (see n. 33) further speculates that the Hsia edition, like some others produced under Jen-tsung, came out in Tangut, Tibetan, and Chinese versions. Therefore *fan* i should not mean "translated into Sanskrit" if the text is being translated from Sanskrit, and hence Anandakirti should be understood as a Tibetan translator. In Yuan times the word *fan* could mean Tibetan as well as Sanskrit (pp. 105-6). Anandakirti is the Sanskrit name of the Tibetan cleric 'Kun-dga'-grags, Jayānanda's translator (see below).

<sup>36</sup> Shih suggests the gloss of *an-i* 安儀 for this rank found in the fourth category, no. 9 (*Fo-chiao shih-tüeh*, p. 139).

*abhidharma*, director of the Sangha Office, chief supervisor of monks, recipient of the completed precept rank,<sup>37</sup> *śramaṇa* P'olo-hsien-sheng 賢覺帝師講經律論功德司正偏袒都大提點曠臥勒沙門波囉顯勝, and the Entrusted by Heaven, Revealing the Way, Dazzling in Martiality and Proclaiming Culture, Divinely Counseled and Perspicaciously Wise, Regulating Morality and Removing Depravity, Sincere and Congenial, Admirable and Reverential Emperor<sup>38</sup> carefully rechecked [the translation] 奉天顯道耀武宣文神謀睿智制義去邪悖睦壹恣恭皇帝再詳勸.

Shih Chin-po believes that imperial preceptor P'olo-hsien-sheng was probably a Tibetan.<sup>39</sup> As the highest ranking of this particular group of ranked preceptors, P'olo-hsien-sheng shared with his imperial patron the duty of certifying the accuracy of the translation, though it might be assumed that he did the actual work while the emperor "presided" over the partnership.

Jayānanda's name appears linked with that of exoteric and esoteric dharma preceptor, deputy director of the Sangha Office, recipient of the *i-ke* rank, *śramaṇa* Chou Hui-hai, in a fragment from an unknown sutra publication found at T'ien-t'i Shan.<sup>40</sup> Given the congruence in their titles (with a difference only in the honorary rank), we can assume that Chou Hui-hai was the unnamed monk above who probably translated into Tangut.

Jayānanda himself must be the Indian *pandita* who, following a defeat in debate with the Tibetan *madhyamaka* master, Phya-pa chos-kyi seng-ge (1109-1169), departed for Wu-t'ai shan 五臺山 "to meditate on Mañjuśrī."<sup>41</sup> Leonard van der Kuijp notes that Jayānanda authored "a rather uninspiring commentary to Candrakīrti's *Madhyamakāvatārabhāṣya*,"

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., p. 139, suggests the Chinese translation *chü tsu* 具足 instead of Kychanov's *ch'üan pei* 全備 for the Tangut phrase *huai wo le*, invoking the Buddhist term, *chü tsu* *chieh* 具足節, which denotes fulfillment of the precepts for monkhood. This rank appears attached to the name of a civil court official, director of the secretariat Liang Hsing-che-nieh, in the Chinese text of the 1094 Gantong Stupa stele inscription. See Dunnell, "The 1094 Sino-Tangut Gantong Stupa Stele Inscription of Wuwei: Introduction, Translation of Chinese Text, and Source Study," in *Languages and History in East Asia: Festschrift for Tatsuo Nishida on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday* (Kyoto: Shokado, 1988), pp. 187-215, esp. 203-4. *Huai wo le* appears in the first category, no. 1 in the "Table of Ranks," opposite that of great king (*ta kuo wang*).

<sup>38</sup> Jen-tsung's honorary title is attested in, e.g., Men'shikov, *Opisanie kitaiskoi chasti kolleksiū 12 Khara-khoto*, pp. 495 (illus. 19) and 501 (illus. 25).

<sup>39</sup> Shih, *Fo-chiao shih-lüeh*, p. 141.

<sup>40</sup> Ch'en, "T'ien-t'i shan shih-k'u," pp. 45-47.

<sup>41</sup> Leonard van der Kuijp, *Contributions to the Development of Tibetan Buddhist Epistemology: From the Eleventh to the Thirteenth Centuries* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1983), chap. 2, esp. pp. 60, 69, and nn. 260-62.

and that his retreat to Wu-t'ai shan conveyed his need for Mañjuśrī's help.<sup>42</sup> The colophon to Jayānanda's commentary reveals that he composed it in Mi-nyag ("near the Huang-ho and the Wu T'ai-shan"), and translated it into Tibetan with the help of Kun-dga'-grags (our Ānandakīrti).<sup>43</sup> At the end of the text the author himself notes that he had been (to quote Van der Kuijp's paraphrase),

honored as a preceptor "by the dharma-lord, ruler of Mi-nyag" (*mi nyag yul gyi mnga' bdag chos rjes*), that he was active in a/the great monastery/temple adorned by 100,000 Buddha[images], and that, having been petitioned to do so, he, the scholar who had come from Kashmir, Rgyal-ba kin-dga' (= Jayānanda) had composed the text.<sup>44</sup>

Van der Kuijp's English rendering of the translator's colophon bears citing:

The *Dbu ma la 'jug 'grel bshad don gsal* was translated by the great Kashmirian scholar, the author himself, and the Tibetan translator, the venerable Kun-dga'-grags, in the great temple called Khyad par mkhar sku [lit. "special/extraordinary bronze statue"], the abode of the emperor's palace together with [his] host of troops [in] Mi-nyag land, similar to the land of the gods, resplendent with wealth, [and] of an unbroken family line of religious emperors, [on] the shore of the Yellow River and [in] the vicinity of the Five-Peaked Mountain [Wu-t'ai Shan].<sup>45</sup>

Thus far, we have learned that:

1. Jayānanda composed his commentary in a royal Tangut monastery upon imperial request;
2. The Tibetan cleric Ānandakīrti (Tib.: Kun-dga'-grags) translated it from the Sanskrit into Tibetan in a great temple attached to an imperial palace presumably in or near the Tangut capital of Chung-hsing and perhaps the same temple in which the Kashmirian composed it;
3. The Hsia empire, "similar to the land of the gods," was ruled by a

<sup>42</sup> Van der Kuijp, *Contributions*, p. 69 and n. 261.

<sup>43</sup> David Seyfort Ruegg, *The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of Philosophy in India* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1981), pp. 113-14.

<sup>44</sup> Van der Kuijp, "Jayānanda: A Twelfth Century *Guoshi* from Kashmir Among the Tangut," unpubl. paper (October 1991), p. 3.

<sup>45</sup> Van der Kuijp "Jayānanda," p. 4, taken from *Madhyamakāvatāravṛtti*; Peking print in D. T. Suzuki, ed., *The Tibetan Tripitaka* (Kyoto and Tokyo: Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute, 1957), vol. 99 (= YA), no. 5271, p. 443a, and the Sde-dge print in *The Nyingma Edition of the Sde-dge bKa'-gyur and bsTan-gyur* (Emeryville: Dharma Press, 1981), vol. 71 (= RA), no. 3870, p. 365a.

family of "religious emperors" on the banks of the Yellow River in the vicinity of Wu-t'ai shan.

Although this Wu-t'ai shan could refer to the renowned sacred site in Shansi, under Jurchen Chin rule at the time, it may instead indicate the replica Wu-t'ai shan temple-complex built by the Tanguts themselves in the Alashan mountains outside of Chung-hsing.<sup>46</sup> Thus, Jayānanda traveled from Kashmir to Tibet, and after an unsatisfactory visit there went on to the Tangut court. Van der Kuijp's evidence suggests that Jayānanda appeared in Tangut circles late in the 1160s or at the beginning of the 1170s.<sup>47</sup> Given the prestigious position he secured there, his Tangut hosts evidently were unaware of, or unconcerned with, his humiliation in Tibet.

There are other clues for dating the tenure of imperial preceptor P'olo-hsien-sheng. Mention of Hsien-pei Pao-yüan and Jayānanda also appears in conjunction with the translation and publication of two other compositions ordered by Jen-tsung.<sup>48</sup> In his colophon to that publication, Jen-tsung expressed his belief in the efficacy of sacred mantras and consequently his decision to have the texts in question produced in wood-block editions of 15,000 each in Tangut and Chinese, for distribution among officials and the people. He further convoked a large Buddhist service and feast in the palace to carry out the dharma and to assure salvation for his ancestors and prosperity for his descendants. Alas, the text of the colophon breaks off before a date is given, but given Jayānanda's involvement, it must have been after about 1167.<sup>49</sup> The evidence for Jen-tsung's lavish Buddhist activities mostly dates to the latter period of his reign; in 1184, his cyclical birth year, and in 1189, on the fiftieth anniversary of his ascension to the throne, Jen-tsung sponsored a number of large-scale Buddhist publications and celebrations.<sup>50</sup>

As far as the position of imperial preceptor is concerned, the Tibetan material also points to the late 1100s.<sup>51</sup> According to Karma-pa sources, the

Tangut king summoned to Hsia the Karma-pa founder Dus-gsum mkhyen-pa (1110-1193) from his monastery at Mtshur-phu (northwest of Lhasa). Dus-gsum mkhyen-pa declined and instead dispatched his disciple, Gtsang-po-pa Dkon-mchog seng-ge (?-1218), instructing him to "meditate in the mountains of Ho-lan-shan 賀蘭山" (Alashan); the latter served the Hsia king and became known as Gtsang-pa ti-shri (*ti-shih*). Gtsang-po-pa evidently also earned handsome material rewards and official leave to go home, for this source notes that he made a series of rich gifts to the Mtshur-phu monastery.<sup>52</sup> Clearly the early Karma-pa activists looked upon the Tangut emperor as a great patron.<sup>53</sup>

In the earth-male-tiger year (1218-19) Gtsang-po-pa died in Liang-chou (Byang-ngos), that is, well after the death of his Tibetan master in 1193. The sources do not say how long he spent in Hsia territory, but presumably Jen-tsung enjoyed his services before he too died in 1193. Jen-tsung's son and successor, Ch'un-yu 純祐 (Huan-tsung 桓宗; r. 1193-1206), lost his throne in a coup to his cousin An-ch'üan 安全 (Hsiang-tsung 襄宗; r. 1206-1211), who in turn fell victim to another prince, Tsun-hsiang 遵頊 (Shen-tsung 神宗; 1211-1223). Thus Gtsang-po-pa witnessed some turbulent years at the Tangut court, as well as the first three or four Mongolian incursions. Gtsang-po-pa's student in Hsia, Ti-shri ras-pa (also known as Ti-shri Sangs-rgyas ras-chen, or Shes-rab seng-ge), attended Gtsang-po-pa's funeral and looked after his chapel and reliquary.<sup>54</sup>

Ti-shri ras-pa studied under the founders of both the 'Ba'-rom-pa and Tshal-pa subsects of the Bka'-brgyud-pa. He received ordination at age thirty-one, and about a year later he traveled to Hsia where he served as chaplain (*bla-mchod*) to the Tangut emperor and courtiers. Tibetan sources claim that he "set everyone on the path of the dharma. He founded four

<sup>46</sup> Si-tu pan-chen Chos-kyi 'byung-gnas and 'Be-lo Tshe-dbang Kun-khyab, *Sgrub-brgyud Karma Kan-tshang brgyud-pa rin-po-che'i nam-par thar-pa rab-'byams nor-bu zla-ba chu-shel-gyi phreng-ba* (New Delhi, 1972) 1, p. 26v. Van der Kuijp observes that sources earlier than Si-tu pan-chen (1699-1774) do not style Gtsang-po-pa a *ti-shih*. I have quoted from a translation of the passage in Sperling, "Lama to the King of Hsia," p. 33.

<sup>47</sup> Elliot Sperling comments on the Tangut Karma-pa relationship in his "The Szechwan-Tibet Frontier in the Fifteenth Century," *Ming Studies* 26 (Fall 1988), pp. 40-41.

<sup>48</sup> The possibility of confusion resulting from two Jayānandas is admitted by Ruegg, *Literature of the Madhyamaka School*, p. 113, n. 362. His dating to 100 years earlier, in the mid-11th c., must be wrong.

<sup>49</sup> See Men'shikov, *Opisaniie kitaiskoi chasti kollektzii iz Khara-khoto*, no. 177, pp. 223-25, p. 491 (illus. 15); Shih, *Fo-chiao shih-lieh*, 270-71. Shih's transcription of the original preface is fuller than the fragment reproduced in Men'shikov's volume and allows us to correct Men'shikov's reading of it.

<sup>50</sup> Shih, *Fo-chiao shih-lieh*, pp. 270-71, rejects Men'shikov's dating of the colophon to 1141, as do I. There is no specific reference to Jen-tsung's deceased father, Ch'ung-tung (r. 1086-1139), or to a third-year anniversary of his death.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 36-43.

<sup>52</sup> See R. A. Stein, "Nouveaux documents tibétains sur le Mi-nag/Si-Hia," in *Mélanges de Sinologie offerts à Monsieur Paul Demiéville* (Paris: P. U. de France, 1966) 1, p. 286.

<sup>53</sup> Si-tu pan-chen (see n. 52); and Sperling, "Lama to the King of Hsia," p. 33. For Ti-shri Ras-pa, see Khetsun Sangpo, *Biographical Dictionary of Tibet and Tibetan Buddhism* (Dharamsala, 1981), vol. 8; *Bab-rom bka'-brgyud-kyi chos-skor thar-bu sna-tshogs* (New Delhi, 1982) 2, pp. 101-9 (47v-51v); *Ritual Texts of the 'Ba'-rom Bka'-brgyud-pa Tradition* (New Delhi, 1985), pp. 276-81 (35v-38r); and Skyo-grwa Sku-rgyal, *Bka'-brgyud che-bzhi-las dpal 'ba'-rom-pa Chen-po'i brgyud-pa gser-gyi phreng-ba'i nam-thar thos-grol nyan-byed 'od-stong phyogs-las nam-rgyal-ba* (Tashi Jong, 1985), pp. 29, 34, as cited in Sperling, "Lama to the King of Hsia," p. 42, n. 15. Sperling does not give authors for the second and third titles listed above; the last is a modern work.

great monasteries, and an unimaginably [extensive] monastic community spread.<sup>55</sup> After thirty years (the "thirty-three" of the sources is a conceit) at age sixty-two (sixty-three?) he returned to Tibet in the 1226, on the eve of the Mongol destruction of the Hsia state. Like Gtsang-po-pa, Ti-shri Ras-pa also made trips back to his home monastery of Tshal.<sup>56</sup> Evidently he resided for some time at Liang-chou, where Gtsang-po-pa died. After the latter's passing, Ti-shri Ras-pa probably succeeded to the position of imperial preceptor, as reflected in his name (Ti-shri = *ti-shih*).

The imperial preceptor P'olo-hsien-sheng predated the Tibetan Gtsang-po-pa.<sup>57</sup> We know nothing about his predecessors, if he had any. What we do know indicates that he was a very high-ranking official in the Tangut government, the supreme head of the large monastic establishment (*p'ien t'an tu ta li tien*). He shared at least in title the directorship of the sangha office with his colleague Jayānanda, and held the highest honorary rank, completed precept (Tangut: *wo-le*), in the "Table of Ranks," which made him equivalent to an imperial prince of the rank of great king (*ta kuo wang* 大國王).

The Tangut code preserves a hierarchy of government agencies classified in five ranks; in the first rank we find only the Secretariat and Military Commission. Among seventeen agencies of the second class, three carry the designation of Kung-te ssu 功德司 (Office of Merit and Virtue): Ho-shang kung-te ssu 和尚, Ch'u-chia kung-te ssu 出家, Hu-fa kung-te ssu 護法.<sup>58</sup> The first two, ranked fifth and sixth in this class, dealt with Buddhist affairs and constituted the Sangha Office; the third, appearing eleventh in the class, dealt with Taoist affairs and was not part of the sangha, as previously assumed. Thus the code leaves no doubt as to the importance of Buddhist affairs in the Hsia government, and it offers one possible explanation for the dual staffing of the position of director of the Sangha Office.<sup>59</sup>

<sup>55</sup> *Bab-rom*, and *Ritual Texts* (previous n.); I cite Sperling's translation of a portion of *Ritual Texts* from "Lama to the King of Hsia," p. 34.

<sup>56</sup> Van der Kuip has uncovered references to Ti-shri Ras-pa's activities at Tshal in the 1210s, in Tshal-pa Kun-dga' rdo-rje, *Deb-ther dmar-po* (later 1300s) (Peking, 1981), p. 131. Article 634 of the Tangut code (*Kodeks*, vol. 3, pp. 94, 381-82) prescribes procedures for sangha officials to obtain leave from duty.

<sup>57</sup> Note that the name P'olo-hsien-sheng consists of a transcription (*p'o-lo*) of possibly the Sanskrit syllables *para* or *pra*, and a translation (*hsien-sheng*) of a possibly Tibetan name or epithet. Perhaps Gsal-rgyal (Prasenajit's name in Tibetan) is a possible source of *hsien-sheng*; Sarat Chandra Das, *Tibetan-English Dictionary* (1902; rpt. Kyoto: Rinsen, 1983), p. 1305; see under *hsien* in *Han-Tsang tui chao tz'u hui* 漢藏對照詞匯 (Peking: Min-tsu ch'u-pan she, 1976), pp. 1052-53.

<sup>58</sup> *Kodeks*, vol. 3, article 675, pp. 109, 410-11; Shih, *Fo-chiao shih-lüeh*, p. 150.

<sup>59</sup> The Tanguts regularly practiced multiple staffing of governmental agencies, including sharing of the title of director (*cheng*). See, for example, Dunnell, "1094 Sino-Tangut Inscription," pp. 204-5, line 23 of the Chinese text, in which three persons appear with the title of

In regard to staffing, article 690 of the code prescribes the following personnel:<sup>60</sup>

For the Office of Merit and Virtue for Taoist Affairs (Hu-fa kung-te ssu): one director (*cheng* 正), one deputy, one administrative assistant (*p'an* 判), two recipients of edicts (*ch'eng-chih* 承). For the two Offices of Merit and Virtue [for Sangha Affairs] (Kung-te ssu) each: six state preceptors (*kuo-shih*), two deacons (*wei-kuan* 維官);<sup>61</sup> in addition, for the Chu-chia [sic?] kung-te ssu 住家, four deputies, six administrative assistants, and six recipients of edicts, and for the Ch'u-chia kung-te ssu, six (*yen kuo ch'u* 言過處),<sup>62</sup> and six recipients of edicts.

From this passage we learn that the combined Sangha Office had a much larger staff than the Office of Taoist Affairs, but that no directors (*cheng*) per se were prescribed for the Sangha Offices, evidence to the contrary notwithstanding. Evidently the six state preceptors occupied the equivalent position, or perhaps the code has omitted something. Apart from the state preceptors, Buddhist clerics may have occupied many other positions as well, suggesting that sangha affairs were administered mainly by Buddhist, not lay officials.

Curiously, instead of the expected Ho-shang kung-te ssu, listed in article 675, here we have a Chu-chia kung-te ssu (Office of Merit and Virtue for Those Who Remain in the Household?), which is perplexing — a slip of the brush. Does it refer to lay Buddhist communities? Its staff, moreover, is larger than that for the Office of Merit and Virtue for Those Who Leave the Household (Ch'u-chia kung-te ssu), referring presumably to monastic communities.

In addition to the responsibilities and prerogatives incumbent upon the head of the Sangha Office, the imperial preceptor, like his colleagues the state preceptors, dharma preceptors, and meditation preceptors, also engaged in teaching and composing, translating, and editing texts for

director of the Auxiliary Palace Fiscal Commission (*hsing kung san ssu cheng*). Article 690 (chapter 10) of the code authorizes four directors for this office (*Kodeks*, vol. 3, pp. 116, 426.)

<sup>60</sup> *Kodeks*, vol. 3, pp. 115, 421-22. Shih, *Fo-chiao shih-lüeh*, p. 151, lacking access to this volume of the code, relied on an earlier publication of Kychanov, so gives an incomplete and faulty rendering of the passage.

<sup>61</sup> *Kodeks*, p. 214, n. 30) speculates that the transliteration *wei-kuan* represents the ancient Buddhist office of *weina* (Sanskrit: *karmadāna*), the deacon, "assigner of duties" and second most senior officer of a monastery; Charles O. Hucker, *A Dictionary of Official Titles in Imperial China* (Stanford: Stanford U.P., 1985), p. 565, and he here translates it as discipline officer.

<sup>62</sup> Kychanov translates the Tangut term rendered *yen kuo ch'u* in Chinese as "consultant." This remains a provisional translation; the term occurs widely throughout the law code.



publication. Most importantly, the *ti-shih* served as the emperor's chaplain or personal teacher, and conducted ceremonies of consecration (*kuan-ting* 灌頂). One of Ti-shri Ras-pa's biographies defines *ti-shih* as a "lama who initiates the crown of the emperor's head."<sup>63</sup> Before the position of *ti-shih* was inaugurated, *kuo-shih* acted in such a capacity for the emperor, his family, and other aristocrats, and continued to serve the Hsia elite to the end of the dynasty.<sup>64</sup> Further, the title *kuan-ting kuo-shih* is attested for the T'ang, Yüan, and Ming, but not, to my knowledge, the Hsia.<sup>65</sup>

Tibetan sources suggest that initiation of the lama-patron relationship came primarily from the Tangut side, and even hint at an element of coercion, not unlike the manner in which Sa-skya-pa fortunes later became linked to the Yüan imperial house. For instance, the biography of 'Gar Dam-pa (1180-?1240, also called Dam-pa 'Gar, Chos-sdings-pa, or Sa-kyadpal) records that this lama received a message from the Tangut emperor directing him to come act as the emperor's chaplain, for which he would be honored as *gug-shi* (*kuo-shih*) or *de'u-shi* (*ti-shih* ?); grave consequences, however, would follow any refusal.<sup>66</sup> 'Gar Dam-pa did visit the Tangut court and met there the *bla-ma de'u-shi*, presumably Ti-shri Ras-pa. If true, the incident makes most sense in the context of a beleaguered and divided Tangut court early in the 1220s, or before Ti-shri Ras-pa resigned his office to escape the approaching Mongolian onslaught.

Other Tshal-pa sect members and contemporaries of Ti-shri Ras-pa cultivated ties with the Hsia court, including *gu-shri* Rtogs-pa yongs-su gsal-

<sup>63</sup> Khetsun Sangpo, *Biographical Dictionary of Tibet and Tibetan Buddhism* 8, p. 121, not, admittedly, a contemporary source.

<sup>64</sup> Recall the famous testimony of P'eng Ta-ya's 彭大雅 *Hei-ta shih-t'ieh* 黑鞑事略, in Wang Kuo-wei 王國維, *Meng-ku shih-liao ssu-chung* 蒙古史料四種 (Taipei, 1962), pp. 518-19 [27b-28a]: "It is a custom in the Hsi Hsia state that, from their ruler on down, all reverently pay homage to the state preceptor. Everyone who has a daughter will always first offer [her] to the state preceptor and only afterward dare to match [her] with someone. When Chinggis conquered their country, [the Mongols] first cut down the state preceptors. The state preceptors are *bhikshu* monks."

<sup>65</sup> In the 8th c. the two Tantric masters Vajrabodhi and Amoghavajra both held this title (Vajrabodhi posthumously); it appeared again towards the end of Yüan (Sung Lien 宋濂, ed., *Yüan-shih* 元史 [Po-na edn.; rpt. Peking, 1976] 39, pp. 837, 843) and then proliferated in the Ming. For some examples, see *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi* 40, p. 374c; Nien Ch'ang 念常 (Yüan), *Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai* 佛祖歷代通載, T no. 2036, ch. 13, p. 593a; ch. 14, p. 602b; and Huan Lun 幻輪 (Ming), *Shih chien chi-ku lüeh hsü chi* 釋鑑稽古略續集, T no. 2038, ch. 2, p. 926a.

<sup>66</sup> Translated by van der Kuijp from *Rje-btsun chen-po chos-lding-pa'i nam-thar* in *Bka'-brgyud yid-bzhin nor-bu-yi 'phreng-ba* (Leh, 1972), pp. 502-9. Van der Kuijp identifies *de'u-shi* as possibly reflecting a Tangut approximation of *ti-shih*; this assumes that the Tanguts preferred the Chinese designation, for the Tangut words do not phonetically resemble the Chinese. The question then would be: why do all the Tibetan titles reflect Chinese, rather than Tangut, spellings? Did 14th-c. and later chronicles "convert" them, following Yüan usage? Did the Tangut court originally bestow the titles in multiple spellings? Or in Chinese?

ba, who probably received the title of *gu-shri* (*kuo-shih*, state preceptor) from the Tangut court.<sup>67</sup> More interesting was Ti-shri Ras-pa's native Tangut student and successor in the 'Ba'-rom-pa lineage, Gsang-ba ras-pa dkar-po (also called Shes-rab byang-chub, 1198-1262).<sup>68</sup> A native of Gsang (not yet identified), this lama, like the better-known Karma Pakshi (1206-1283, the second Karma-pa hierarchy), enjoyed the patronage of Prince Qubilai.<sup>69</sup> Further, the founder of the 'Bri-gung Bka'-brgyud-pa subsect, 'Jig-rten mgon-po, reportedly sent the thirteenth-century Tangut court an image of Mañjughosa (Mañjuśrī) around the time of the 1207 Mongolian attack. The Tangut ruler bestowed silk and gold upon 'Jig-rten mgon-po in exchange for a favorable (and inaccurate!) reading of the auspices.<sup>70</sup>

All the above Tibetans were members of related lineages of the Bka'-brgyud-pa and its subsects, the best known being the Karma-pa, to which Tibetans attribute the first reincarnations of lamas. The Karma-pa were also the first to establish, during Jen-tsung's reign, a formal and enduring priest-patron relationship with the Tangut court. According to his autobiographical writings, Karma Pakshi, in whom Qubilai was initially so interested, felt a strong karmic tie propelling him to the Tangut lands, where dwelled "the one who was known throughout the Tangut land by dint of his honest and upright speech, the one who had excellently venerated [me] in a previous [life] and been born as the king."<sup>71</sup> Elliot Sperling understands this as a reference to "Köden, an incarnation of a Tangut emperor, and Dugsum mkhyen-pa, Karma Pakshi's previous incarnation who had himself been the object of veneration by the Tangut court."<sup>72</sup> Thus, according to another Karma-pa source, as Karma Pakshi traveled from Köden's court to Mönge's,

<sup>67</sup> *Deb-ther dmar-po* (see n. 56), p. 128.

<sup>68</sup> See *'Bab-rom bka'-brgyud-kyi chos-skar thor-bu sna-tshogs* 2, pp. 167-69, and *Ritual Texts*, pp. 319-20.

<sup>69</sup> Luciano Petech, "Tibetan Relations with Sung China and with the Mongols," in Morris Rossabi, ed., *China among Equals* (Berkeley: U. of California P., 1983), pp. 182-84. Qubilai reportedly bestowed on Shes-rab byang-chub "myriarchy subjects" in Khams. See *Ritual Texts*, p. 81v, and *Bka'-brgyud che-bzhi-las dpal nam-rgyal-ba*, p. 35; Sperling's translation ("Lama to the King of Hsia," pp. 33-34) emended by van der Kuijp.

<sup>70</sup> Sperling found this in Gene Smith, "Introduction," *Mnyam-med 'Bri-gung-pa chen-po skyob-pa 'Jig-rten mgon-po'i bka'-bum* (New Delhi, 1969) 1, p. 2, citing the biography of 'Jig-rten mgon-po by Shes-rab 'byung-gnas, pp. 79r and 83r, in the same volume ("Lama to the King of Hsia," p. 39, nn. 3-4).

<sup>71</sup> Cited and translated by Sperling (personal communication April 4, 1991) from Karma Pakshi's *Grub-chen Karma Pakshi'i bka'-bum-las nyid-kyi nam-thar dus-3 dus-med gzig-tu rig-shing-tshal chen-po rdsogs-pa'i gling-gzhi* [The Autobiographical Writings of the Second Karma-pa Karma Pakshi and Sgyi Lan Rin Mo] (Gangtok, 1978), pp. 99-100 (222-22b).

<sup>72</sup> Sperling, letter of May 4, 1991.

along the route by which he went the harm that had broken out along the Mongol-Tangut border had caused an eclipse of the sun, and thus, with the look of *vajrarākṣasa* [*rdo-rje srin-po*] he wiped it [the harm] out in an instant. As he blessed the land and even all of the sand there, it is reputed that even now if there were to appear the harm of insects and flies it could be coped with.<sup>73</sup>

After this comes a disdainful dismissal of 'Phags-pa, so that we should read Karma Pakshi's Tangut sympathies in terms of a frustrated Karma-pa claim to the patron-priest relationship reconstituted by 'Phags-pa and Qubilai.

The Tibetan relationship with the Tangut emperor evolved out of the infusion of older patterns of interaction with the new tide of Tibetan religious renaissance and missionary activity in Hsia. Despite the element of coercion, as suggested above, the newly emerging Tibetan sects needed patrons and the Hsia emperor valued their intellectual and spiritual powers. An anecdote from the Karma-pa founder Dus-gsum mkhyen-pa's hagiography expresses what seems to have become a widely held view of the relationship. When asked to name some of the previous incarnations among his closest followers, Dus-gsum mkhyen-pa's reply included "the lama of the Tangut *dharmarāja* (dharma king) called Rgya Be-bum ring-mo and also called Rgya Byang-chub sems-dpa."<sup>74</sup> Whoever this lama might have been, the anecdote affirms the image of the Tangut emperor as a *dharmarāja* in the eyes of his Tibetan clients.

Late in the twelfth century Tibetans enjoyed great prestige and influence at the Tangut court as valuable allies and propagandists for the emperor. Surviving Hsia literature bespeaks a Tibetan presence at the Tangut court and an affirmation of the cultural affinities between Tanguts and Tibetans. The evidence available thus far dates the establishment of the imperial preceptor to the 1170s (after publication of the code), when new Tibetan teachings and theories found a receptive audience and perhaps fulfilled an urgent imperial need.

In 1170 Jen-tsung had just weathered the most serious challenge to his

<sup>73</sup> Cited and translated by Sperling from Si-tu, *Sgrub-bryud Karma Kan-tshang*, pp. 54a-54b. The *vajrarākṣasa* are a class of fierce "ging" deities associated with the Rnying-ma-pa and Bka'-bryud-pa sects. See René Nebesky-Wojkowitz, *Oracles and Demons of Tibet: The Cult and Iconography of the Tibetan Protective Deities* (1956; rpt. Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck, 1975), 279.

<sup>74</sup> Si-tu, *Sgrub-bryud* 1, p. 19a; Sperling's translation from "Lama to the King of Hsia," p. 38. I disagree, however, with his conclusion that the presence of the element *rgya* necessarily denotes a Chinese name or person. *Rgya* can also denote India or an Indian, not at all impossible here. Moreover, the lama referred to here may not have been a *ti-shih*, rather a *kuo-shih*, which widens considerably the field of possible candidates.

rule and to the Wei-ming dynasty. A surrendered Chinese military man named Jen Te-ching 任得敬 had, over several decades, risen to the post of chief minister, taken over the government, and built a power base southeast of the capital. Jen tried to obtain Chin Shih-tsung's blessing to a plan, apparently ratified by the Tangut emperor, to create his own state of Ch'u 楚.<sup>75</sup> The Chin emperor threatened to intervene to suppress the "rebellious" minister, but in 1170 forces loyal to the dynasty liquidated Jen Te-ching, his family, and followers. What little we know of the crisis suggests that its resolution required the intervention of imperial clan members to restore Wei-ming control over the army, which the emperor had left in Jen Te-ching's hands for many years. The emperor was not a military man.

From the early part of Jen-tsung's reign up to 1170 and beyond, Sung and Chin records sketch the various Confucian-inspired reforms enacted by the emperor to strengthen the "civil" bureaucracy, but breathe not a word of his Buddhist activities, to which the mass of internal sources testifies eloquently. These activities cannot be dismissed, in David Farquhar's felicitous phrase, "as casual imperial puffery."<sup>76</sup>

I have interpreted the publication of the law code in about 1170 (the end of the T'ien-sheng reign period, 1149-1169/70) as one response by Wei-ming loyalists to the lawlessness and arbitrary infringement of imperial prerogatives that characterized Jen Te-ching's tenure.<sup>77</sup> Establishment of the office of imperial preceptor may have been another, more personal, response aimed at enhancing the throne's spiritual authority and divine powers of protection.

Institutionally, this innovation raises a number of questions. Did appointment of the imperial preceptor replace the state preceptors or result in a devaluation of the latter's position? Was it a purely honorary appointment with no impact on court politics and government? Did the naming of an imperial preceptor represent an institutional shift away from a collegial directorship of the Buddhist sangha towards something more personal or centralized? Appointments of this type seem to have run counter to the spirit of the law code, but may reflect Jen-tsung's effort to polish his tarnished image and recoup personal authority and legitimacy in the eyes of the ruling clan.

<sup>75</sup> Dunnell, "Tanguts and the Tangut State of Da Hsia," (unpub. Ph.D., Princeton, 1983), pp. 157-91.

<sup>76</sup> David M. Farquhar, "Emperor as Bodhisattva in the Governance of the Ch'ing Empire," *HJAS* 38.1 (1978), pp. 5-34, 15.

<sup>77</sup> Dunnell, "Tanguts," pp. 190-91. The code may, in fact, have been published before 1170.

How Jen-tsung viewed his own position and that of the imperial preceptor can be gauged from both others' remarks and his own activities. In the extant vows and prefaces to sutras that he authored Jen-tsung portrays himself as a pious, filial, conscientious sovereign. He is seen as a sincere Buddhist practitioner and adept, a generous patron and powerful protector of the dharma and the people (Tibetans, Tanguts, and Chinese). He is also the supreme head of an extensive Buddhist establishment under the direct authority of his imperial preceptor.<sup>78</sup> In his 1247 preface to the "Golden Light Sūtra," Tangut *śramaṇa* Hui-chüeh 慧覺 credits Jen-tsung with restoring and boosting the fortunes of the dharma in the Tangut lands, confirming other allusions to a period of Buddhist decline and decadence (if not persecution) in Hsia prior to Jen-tsung's reign.<sup>79</sup> We have already seen that Jen-tsung was a *dharmarāja* in Tibetan eyes.

An important contemporary evidence of Buddhist and other elements in a mature Hsia imperial ideology is a collection of odes composed at the Tangut court in about 1185.<sup>80</sup> The late N. A. Nevskii remarked in reference to these odes: "The emperor himself, at least during the time of emperor Jen-hsiao (1139-1194) (sic) was, evidently, a semidivine ruler, for the court odes exalt their emperor as 'humane emperor-bodhisattva' and even 'Buddha son-of-heaven.'<sup>81</sup> Nevskii also translated parts of other odes that extol the emperor in Confucian language, citing the inspiring examples of Yao and Shun, and pointing out that:

Under august heaven all have submitted to him, on earth he is the sole ruler; he, ruler of the eight directions, does not arouse anger, and with the people of the four seas together guards the world.<sup>82</sup>

Without doubt this collection of court odes holds valuable information regarding the complex image and conception of sovereignty in Hsia in the late-1100s. Publication of all these texts is a scholarly imperative.<sup>83</sup>

<sup>78</sup> See esp. Shih, *Fo-chiao shih-tüeh*, pp. 259, 262-65, 267-72.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 285, 311.

<sup>80</sup> The odes are in the St. Petersburg archives; Gorbacheva and Kychanov, *Tangutskie rukopisi i islografiya*, pp. 53-54, no. 25. Nishida Tatsuo has published studies of several of these odes in "Seika go Yüeh yüeh le shih no kenkyū" 西夏語月月樂詩の研究, *Kyōto daigaku bungakubu kenkyū kiji* 京都大學文學部研究紀要 25 (1987); and Nich Hung-yin 聶鴻音, in "Hsi Hsia wen Hsin hsiu t'ai-hsüeh ke k'ao-shih" 西夏文新修太學歌考釋, *Ning-hsia she-hui k'o-hsüeh* 寧夏社會科學 3 (1990), pp. 8-12.

<sup>81</sup> Nevskii, *Tangutskaja filologija* (Moscow: Izdat. vostochnoi literatury, 1960) 1, p. 82.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.* 1, pp. 90-91.

<sup>83</sup> I should add that I have looked for signs that Jen-tsung or other Hsia emperors appropriated the symbols or image of the *cakravartin* in cultivating an imperial persona, as did earlier and later emperors, Chinese and non-Chinese. See Farquhar, "Emperor as Bodhi-

The Tangut emperor, like his Mongolian and Manchu successors, had to balance several different constituencies. Compared to the Yüan and Ch'ing rulers, Jen-tsung's Chinese constituency, though influential, was considerably smaller in relation to the population of non-Chinese. Nor does the evidence indicate that Hsia Chinese were any less devoted to Buddhism than their Tangut, Tibetan, or other compatriots. Given the strength of Buddhism throughout all segments of the population, and the pervasiveness of Buddhist, especially Tantric, imagery and language in extant materials, I believe that the role of Buddhist elements in Tangut imperial ideology was decisive. Alternatively, we are dealing with a unique blend of Buddhist and Confucian elements in the matrix of a native Tangut worldview.

#### AFTER THE CONQUEST: TANGUTS, TIBETANS, AND MONGOLS IN HO-HSI

Twenty years after the conquest of Hsia, in 1247, a Buddhist community residing in Ho-hsi published a new Tangut edition of *Chin kuang ming tsui sheng wang ching* 金光明最勝王經 (*Suvarṇaprabhāsottamarājasūtra*), or "Golden Light Sūtra," with a lengthy preface compiled by the Lan-shan 蘭山 (Alashan) *śramaṇa* Hui-chüeh and a shorter dedication at the end of chapter ten by the sponsors' leader, Ch'en Hui-kao 陳慧高.<sup>84</sup> Ch'en refers to himself as sponsor of a Buddhist community at the court of the Great Border Country (the Tangut term for the Mongolian empire).<sup>85</sup> He says that because the old printing blocks were lost when the Tangut state was

sattva," and Herbert Franke, *From Tribal Chieftain to Universal Emperor and God: The Legitimation of the Yüan Dynasty* (München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1978), pp. 61-69. In the Tangut case, the presence of Tantric Buddhism does not preclude pursuit of the *cakravartin* ideal. Still a useful discussion is David Snellgrove, "The Notion of Divine Kingship in Tantric Buddhism," in *The Sacred Kingship*, Contributions to the Central Theme of the VIIIth International Congress for the History of Religions, Rome 1955 (Leiden, 1959), pp. 204-18. Examination of the precise Buddhological components of Jen-tsung's imperial persona should be part of a larger effort to reassess the religious lives of Chinese and non-Chinese emperors.

<sup>84</sup> T no. 665. For a description of the sutra, see Ono, *Busho kaisetsu daijiten* 3, pp. 428-34; Shih, *Fo-chiao shih-tüeh*, pp. 199-200, 303-15. Judging by surnames, which is always risky, the community included both Han-Chinese and Tanguts.

<sup>85</sup> Possible Chinese translations of the three Tangut graphs include *ta chieh kuo* 大界國 (Great Border Country), *ta tu kuo* 大都國 (Great Capital Country), *ta ch'ao kuo* 大朝國 (Great Court Country), etc. Likewise, the two graphs following the name of the Mongol empire, commonly rendered *shih chieh* 世界 (world), may also be translated as *ching shih* 京世, referring to the capital. See Shih Chin-po's discussion in his article "Lei-lin Hsi Hsia wen i-pen ho Hsi Hsia yü yen-chiu 類林西夏文譯本和西夏語研究," *Min-tsu yü-wen* 民族語文 6 (1989), pp. 6-7, example 34. Here *ching shih* must refer to Qara Qorum, the grand qan's capital, and/or Liang-chou, the center of Köden's administration over Ho-hsi.

destroyed, new ones were ordered to be carved on the fifteenth day of the eighth lunar month of the *issu* year 乙巳 (1245) and were completed in the middle of the *ting wei* 丁未 year (1247).<sup>86</sup> The sutra was printed on clean paper and distributed (the number of copies is not stated). Thus the dharma was revived and Buddhist affairs renewed.

The "Golden Light Sūtra" is addressed to rulers. Of its nineteen chapters, by far the longest is the sixth — the centerpiece of the work, titled "Chapter on the Four Great Kings." It lays out the duties and rewards awaiting "any king of men" who upholds this sutra, and the consequences for those who do not. Chapter twelve, "Chapter on Instruction Concerning Divine Kings," develops the theme of "Regal Science" more explicitly.<sup>87</sup> One imagines that the sponsors of this sutra's republication intended to extol its virtues among their Mongolian overlords.

Hui-chüeh was a prominent monk at the Tz'u-en Temple 慈恩寺, one of many Tangut temple complexes in the Alashan foothills west of the former Hsia capital of Chung-hsing. His involvement suggests a close relationship, both spiritually and geographically (possibly one of kinship), with Ch'en Hui-kao and his group. Hui-chüeh's preface recounts the entire history of the sutra's translation in China up to its first rendering into Tangut in the eleventh century, its retranslation in the twelfth century, and its disappearance after the Great Border Country arose and the Hsia state, "like winter leaves, dissolved into a puddle." Now that the time of the third concealment of the law and the four destructions had come,<sup>88</sup> Hui-chüeh wrote, this sutra should be spread abroad as medicine to heal and restore the faith. Before the *gāthā* that ends the preface, as in the 1372 vow cited above, Hui-chüeh prays that "the present emperor (or *qan*) [enjoy] abundant virtue and augmented fortune, that the heir and imperial princes [enjoy] long life and absence of illness."

In 1247 this prayer presumably referred to Güyüg Qan, who had just come to the throne the previous year, following the divisive regency of his mother Törgene and his return from campaigning in the west. Güyüg's

<sup>86</sup> The dating 1245 and 1247 rests first of all on the argument that use of the 60-year cycle occurred before the Mongols instituted era-names in 1260. Further, the context seems to militate against the dates 1305 and 1307, in the Ta-te reign period. Later Tangut publications use the Yüan reign dates, so if this were an early 14th-c. edition we would expect to find reference to Ta-te. Ch'en Hui-kao's comments make more sense in a period closer to the conquest, while other references exist to Hui-chüeh's activities early in Qubilai's reign.

<sup>87</sup> R. E. Emmerick, *The Sūtra of Golden Light: Being a Translation of the Suvarṇabhāsottama-sūtra* (London: The Pali Text Society, 1979), esp. pp. 23–43, 57–62.

<sup>88</sup> The Tangut phrase evidently refers to the *mo-fa* 末法, or third age of the dharma marked by its disappearance and the resulting destruction and chaos in human society.

brother Köden, Ögödei's second son, ruled Ho-hsi (the former Tangut territories) as his fief. A prayer for the health of the imperial princes was especially apt here, since Köden suffered from a chronic malady.

The date of the preface is noteworthy in another connection. Köden had made his headquarters near Liang-chou in 1239. The Mongols' military goals in Szechwan and Shensi prompted Köden to send a reconnaissance force into Tibet under the command of Doorda Darqan, who was most likely a Ho-hsi Tangut.<sup>89</sup> According to Turrell Wylie, Doorda's task was to find someone who could surrender Tibet to the Mongols and then rule it for them. Although the death of Ögödei in 1241 interrupted Doorda's mission, his efforts led to Köden's 1244 summons of the Sa-skya *paṇḍita* Kun-dga'-rgyal-mtshan (1182–1251). Sa-skya *paṇḍita* set out in 1245 with his two young nephews 'Phags-pa (1235–1280) and Phyag-na-rdo-rje as hostages, and reached Liang-chou in 1246 while Köden was away attending the *quriltai* at which Güyüg was elected qan.<sup>90</sup> In the first lunar month of 1247 Köden returned and received his Tibetan visitors. The Sa-skya chronicles claim that because the *paṇḍita* effectively treated Köden's illness, the latter began to favor Buddhism and accommodated the Tibetans in a new temple, the *Sprul pa'i sde* (Huan-hua ssu 幻化寺).<sup>91</sup>

Although the Mongolian throne soon passed to the Toluid branch of the ruling clan, headed first by Möngke (r. 1251–1259) and then Qubilai (r. 1260–1294), Köden's support for his cousin Möngke meant that Ho-hsi remained in the hands of Köden's sons after his death.<sup>92</sup> The elder *paṇḍita*

<sup>89</sup> See Turrell V. Wylie, "The First Mongol Conquest of Tibet Reinterpreted," *HJAS* 37.1 (1977), pp. 109–11. Samuel M. Grupper has assembled persuasive evidence for the Tangut affiliation of the unknown Doorda Darqan in an unpublished paper, "On the Identity of Doorda Darqan, Commander of the 1240 Invasion of Tibet," August 1985. On these and related events see also the recent study by Luciano Petech, *Central Tibet and the Mongols: The Yuan-Sa-Skya Period of Tibetan History* (Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1990), chap. 2.

<sup>90</sup> See Ch'en Ch'ing-ying's 陳慶英 reconstruction of 'Phags-pa's chronology from Tibetan sources in "Yüan ti-shih Pa-ssu-pa nien-p'u 元帝師八思巴年譜," *Shih-chieh tsung-chiao yen-chiu* 4 (1985), pp. 105–123, esp. 107.

<sup>91</sup> Ch'en, "Yüan ti-shih," p. 107, apparently reconstructs Huan-hua ssu from the Tibetan (which roughly translates as "transformation monastery"). I have not found corroborating evidence for a Huan-hua ssu in Liang-chou. A pamphlet on Wu-wei history published by the Wu-wei Municipal Museum and obtained there in 1988 devotes an entire paragraph to Köden's meeting with Sa-skya *paṇḍita*. It does not mention the Huan-hua ssu, but notes that the *paṇḍita* died at Liang-chou and was buried at the Ta-ho hsiang Pai-t'a ssu 大河鄉百塔寺. The pamphlet's text claims that Sa-skya *paṇḍita*'s meeting with the Mongolian chief initiated Tibet's subordination to the Mongols, hence to the Yüan and to China. Interestingly, a lengthier pamphlet on Wu-wei history written by the director of the Wu-wei District Museum, Liang Hsin-min 梁新民, makes no mention at all of the Tibetans' visit to Liang-chou.

<sup>92</sup> See Rashid Al-Din, *The Successors of Genghis Khan*, trans. J. A. Boyle (New York: Columbia U.P., 1971), pp. 20–21, 170, 176–86; and Petech, "Tibetan Relations," pp. 180–81.

died in 1251 at Liang-chou; Köden may also have died in 1251, or several years later.<sup>93</sup> In 1253, after extensive Mongolian operations in Tibet, 'Phags-pa departed Liang-chou and joined Qubilai.<sup>94</sup>

According to the standard interpretation, after some time the young 'Phags-pa became Qubilai's esteemed instrument in the supposed subordination of Tibet to Mongolian domination and administration.<sup>95</sup> In 1270, upon devising a new script for the dynasty, 'Phags-pa received from Qubilai the title of imperial preceptor (*ti-shih*), a dignity thereafter reserved for Sa-skyapa lamas at the Yüan court. As the spiritual teacher of his Mongolian patron, *ti-shih* and emperor ideally stood in a complementary relationship of equals according to the later Tibetan theory of the "Two Systems" (Tib.: *lugs gnis*; Mong.: *qoyar-yosun*), in which the lama presided over religious affairs and the king over secular affairs in their dual rule. Rooted in early Buddhist notions of the "two wheels" (royal and monastic) of the law, this theory found elaboration in a Mongolian text, *Chaghan teüke* (*The White History*), often, and erroneously, dated to the late-thirteenth century and attributed to 'Phags-pa himself.<sup>96</sup> Certainly the relationship between 'Phags-pa and Qubilai, which I will not pursue here, set important precedents that Mongolian and Tibetan writers of the late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries systematically propagated to establish institutional continuity and legitimacy for the innovations of their own era.<sup>97</sup>

Sa-skyapa chronicles show that in 1270, when Qubilai received a second initiation from 'Phags-pa and granted him the title of imperial preceptor, he also handed over to the lama a six-cornered restored jade seal of the Mi-

nyag (Hsia) king.<sup>98</sup> Whatever the origin of this seal, it symbolized a new relationship between Qubilai and 'Phags-pa and lent authority to Sa-skyapa jurisdiction over Tibetan and Buddhist affairs. Even if a pious fiction by later historians, its bestowal suggests the magnitude of the Tangut monarch's prestige and pretensions and ritually signaled the act of transference of the emperor-priest relationship from one court to another.

Tanguts recruited into Köden's Ho-hsi administration, like Doorda Darqan, played an intermediary role in Tibeto-Mongol relations and took advantage of the presence of Sa-skyapa *pandita* and 'Phags-pa in Liang-chou to renew or expand religious contacts with Tibet. Several Tibetan sources mention a certain Shes-rab ye-shes of Mi-nyag, who was a disciple of the Sa-skyapa *pandita* and a priest (or abbot) of Liang-chou.<sup>99</sup> According to this account, the Tangut Shes-rab asserted that Köden was a reincarnation of the Hsia monarch Mi-nyag rGyal-rgod, who had been killed by an upstart minister, and that when Köden came to Liang-chou, he erected a temple on the spot where the Tangut king had met his end and further exterminated the family of the murderer.<sup>100</sup> As we have seen, Karma Pakshi also shared the view that Köden was a reincarnation of the Tangut emperor. Such a view had manifold political implications.

The identities of Mi-nyag rGyal-rgod and his murderer are not certain.<sup>101</sup> The identification of Köden as a reincarnation of a previous Hsia emperor suggests an effort to incorporate the Mongolian conquerors into the sacred political history of the Tanguts and Tibetans. Wylie has argued that "the concept of reincarnation originated only in the lifetime of Rang-byung

<sup>93</sup> Petech, *Central Tibet and the Mongols*, pp. 10-11, rejects the date of 1251, producing evidence to show that Köden was still alive in 1253.

<sup>94</sup> Ch'en, "Yüan ti-shih," p. 108, says they first met in 1251; a later article co-authored with Chou Sheng-wen 周生文, "Ta Yüan ti-shih Pa-szu-pa tsai Yü-shu ti huo-tung 大元帝師八思巴在玉樹的活動," *Hsi-tsang yen-chiu* 西藏研究 1 (1990), pp. 36-44, p. 36, asserts that the meeting occurred in 1252. Wylie, "First Mongol Conquest of Tibet," p. 117, maintains that Qubilai and 'Phags-pa first met in 1253, as does van der Kuip, unpub. paper, in "Apropos of the Mongol Text of the *Chaghan Teüke* and Lama 'Phags-pa".

<sup>95</sup> Van der Kuip challenges this interpretation in his work on 'Phags-pa, questioning both the closeness of 'Phags-pa's relationship with Qubilai, and the degree of Mongolian control over "ethnic Tibet." See idem, "Apropos," introduction.

<sup>96</sup> Klaus Sagaster, *Die Weisse Geschichte. Eine mongolische Quelle zur Lehre von den Beiden Ordnungen Religion und Staat in Tibet und der Mongolei* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1976), and the review of this work by Sam Grupper in *Mongolian Studies* 7 (1981-82), pp. 127-33. Van der Kuip does not accept Sagaster's conclusions about the date and composition of the text (see "Apropos").

<sup>97</sup> An important discussion is that of Samuel M. Grupper, "The Manchu Imperial Cult of the Early Ch'ing Dynasty: Texts and Studies of the Tantric Sanctuary of Mahākāla at Mukden" (unpub. Ph.D., Indiana University, 1980), esp. chap. 2, pp. 61-63.

<sup>98</sup> Ch'en, "Yüan ti-shih," p. 117, citing p. 128 of "Sa-skyapa Historical Chronicle." Van der Kuip has supplied me with the translation and passage from 'Jam-mgon A-myes-zhabs Ngag-dbang kun-dga' bsod-nams, *Sa-skyapa'i gdung-rabs ngo-mthshar bang-mdzod* (based on a Sde-dge print) (Peking, 1986), p. 212. See n. 103 to "Apropos." Compare Sperling's translation of the same passage in "Lama to the King of Hsia," p. 37. Van der Kuip prefers the translation "six-cornered" to "six continents" for *gting-drug* (see Sperling, p. 46, n. 31).

<sup>99</sup> Stein, "Nouveaux documents tibétains," pp. 284-85, citing the chronicle by Dpa'-bo Gtsug-lag rin-chen phreng-ba, *Chos-'byung mkas-pa'i dga'-ston* (ca. 1545-65) (New Delhi, 1980; Peking, 1986). Stein used an earlier edition edited by Lokesh Chandra and published in Delhi in 1959, and cited Ma (a chap. designation), pp. 15b, 5b. Reference to Shes-rab ye-shes also occurs in Tshal-pa Kun-dga' rdo-rje's *Deb-ther dmar-po* (*Red Annals*, mid-14th c.?) (rpt. Peking, 1981). Stein (p. 285, n. 1) speculates that Shes-rab was still active during the reign of Yüan Jen-tung (Buyantu, 1312-20). This would make him at least 70.

<sup>100</sup> Stein, "Nouveaux documents tibétains," p. 285; see previous n.

<sup>101</sup> Stein claims that rGyal-rgod is used interchangeably with Mi-nyag. See his "Mi-nyag et Si-Hia: Géographie historique et légendes ancestrales," *BEFEO* 44.1 (1947-1950; Paris-Hanoi, 1951), pp. 234-35. Sperling believes that Stein has misinterpreted the text (personal communication, March 4, 1992).

rdo-tje [1284–1338], the third Karma-pa hierarch,<sup>102</sup> but it was probably a much older idea.<sup>103</sup>

If Shes-rab ye-shes was indeed still active early in the fourteenth century, as Stein suggests,<sup>104</sup> then he may have contributed to the formulation of this theocracy. Tibetan and Tangut Buddhists at Liang-chou thus incorporated their new rulers into a sacred hierarchy; if Köden was the reincarnation of the Tangut ruler, then implicitly Chinggis and later Qubilai would become reincarnations of more powerful personages, *qua* Buddhist deities. Qubilai later was identified as the bodhisattva Mañjuśrī in the Mongolian text of the Chü-yung-kuan stele inscriptions, erected under the last Yüan emperor.<sup>105</sup> Herbert Franke has observed that both inscriptions are evidences of late-Yüan Buddhist sacralization of Mongol rule.<sup>106</sup> In fact, the process began much earlier, in the thirteenth century. A proper understanding of this development requires first of all to sort out the kinds of rivalry between adherents of the Sa-skyapa and Karma-pa (or other Bka'brgyud-pa) sects that I discussed above.

Even if the Tangut monarch Jen-tung and his successors never explicitly identified themselves as incarnated (or reincarnated) bodhisattvas, it seems probable that the Tibetan and Tangut Buddhists at Liang-chou in the postconquest period did make such a connection. Thus, around the turn of the fourteenth century reincarnation emerged as a new solution to the perennial problem of dynastic legitimation. The Mongols made good use of the solution, which thereafter played a decisive role in Chinese political history.<sup>107</sup>

In this context, the Lan-shan temple community's republication of the *Chin kuang ming* sutra between 1245 and 1247 acquires new meaning. Although nowhere referred to, it seems unlikely that the community would have had no knowledge of Köden's summons of the Sa-skyapa *pandita* to a renowned Tangut Buddhist cult center not far away, where strong ties had long been established between the Tanguts and various Bka-brgyud-pa lineages. Whether or not that knowledge inspired their publishing work, both

events in 1247 signaled a revival of regional Buddhist fortunes that was felt in the far corners of the Yüan empire. From about 1230 to 1260, a new center of pan-Asian Buddhist civilization was forming at the hub of Mongolian power. A fuller context for assessing the Tangut Buddhist legacy will reconstruct the network of spiritual and political activities of north Chinese, Jurchen, Khitan, Uighur, Kashmiri, Tangut, and other Buddhists drawn to the courts of the powerful new rulers of Asia.<sup>108</sup>

Śramaṇa Hui-chüeh, author of the preface to the "Golden Light Sūtra" published in 1247, went on to become a Yüan state preceptor (*kuo-shih*) and was actively promoting efforts to republish the Tangut Tripitaka in 1270, the year that 'Phags-pa became Qubilai's imperial preceptor.<sup>109</sup> Thus, far from ending Tangut Buddhist activities, the Mongol conquest gave them scope for unimagined growth in the enlarged setting of a powerful empire embracing all of China, whose Mongolian rulers found personal and political reasons for patronizing Buddhism. This development had consequences for the subsequent history of imperial China.

<sup>108</sup> Sam Grupper is working on a book-length project addressing this subject, titled "An Ecclesiastical History of the Buddhist Establishment of the Mongol World Empire and the Establishment of Il-Qanid Buddhism." My intellectual debt to his thinking and writing on these matters is great.

<sup>109</sup> See the Tangut preface (and its Chinese translation) to the Yüan edition of *Kuo chü chuang-yen ch'ieh ch'ien fo ming ching* 過去莊嚴劫千佛名經 (T no. 446), dated 1312, in Shih, *Fo-chiao shih-lieh*, pp. 321–24. Hui-chüeh is referred to by the title *i-hsing kuo-shih* 一行國師, not by name. I-hsing is the sobriquet he carries in the 1247 preface and all later references.

#### LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>Kodeks</i>	Kychanov, <i>Izmenennyi i zonovo utverzhennyyi kodeks</i>
<i>T</i>	<i>Taishō shinshū daizōkyō</i> 大正新修大藏經

<sup>102</sup> "Reincarnation: A Political Innovation in Tibetan Buddhism," in Louis Ligeti, ed., *Proceedings of the Csoma de Körös Memorial Symposium* (Budapest: Akademiai Kiadó, 1978), pp. 580–81. Wylie distinguishes incarnation, an early Buddhist concept, from reincarnation.

<sup>103</sup> Sperling suggests that Wylie was referring to the "institutionalization of reincarnation in sectarian lineage structures" (personal communication, March 4, 1992).

<sup>104</sup> "Nouveaux documents tibétains," p. 281, p. 285 n. 1.

<sup>105</sup> Farquhar, "Emperor as Bodhisattva," pp. 11–12. <sup>106</sup> *From Tribal Chief*, p. 68.

<sup>107</sup> Jack Dull made this observation at the A.A.S. meeting in 1991, noting that the establishment of the Sung dynasty was the last time that abdication played a meaningful role in a dynastic founding.