

# DĪPAṂKARA IN THE TANGUT CONTEXT: AN INQUIRY INTO THE SYSTEMATIC NATURE OF TIBETAN BUDDHISM IN XIXIA

## (PART 1)

KIRILL SOLONIN

Renmin University of China, Institute of Chinese Classics  
Beijing, Haidian, Zhongguan cun dajie, 59, 100872, China  
e-mail: kirill\_solonin@mail.ru

This paper discusses the Tangut textual heritage relating to the subject matter of Tibetan Buddhism in Xixia in order to uncover the “systematic nature” of the Tibetan dimension of Tangut Buddhism. That is, in what follows I will try to recover rudiments of the systematic approach which the Tangut Buddhists probably used in dealing with a variety of Tibetan traditions which became available to them during the 12th century.

*Key words:* Tangut Buddhism, Tibetan Buddhism, Bka’ brgyud, Bka’ gdams, Atiśa, doctrinal Buddhism.

Tibetan Buddhism in Xixia emerged as a combination of a variety of yogic lineages together with a broad repertoire of the doctrinal compositions, revolving around the famous *Entry into the Two Truths* by Atiśa. The first part of the paper explores, in a brief introduction, the general context of Tibetan Buddhism in the Tangut Empire. The second part of the paper investigates the available Tangut texts pertaining to the subject matter of the “Two Truths”, including the Tangut translations of the *Satyadvāyāvatāra* and commentaries pertaining thereto. The conclusion of the paper is that Tibetan Buddhism in the Tangut state emerged not as a collection of random esoteric transmissions and practices, but, rather, took shape as a result of conscious effort by the Tangut Buddhists to reproduce a coherent system of doctrinal learning and esoteric practice modelled after the contemporaneous Tibetan Buddhism.

To demonstrate the role of Atiśa in the formation of Tangut Buddhism, apart from the text directly associated with Atiśa and his circle, one needs to survey the existing repertoire of the Tangut texts pertaining to the Tibetan subject matter. Another step is to examine a Tangut text known as #2885 from Khara-Khoto collection, which can serve as the basic source for the history of esoteric Buddhism in Xixia.

## Facets of Tibetan Buddhism in the Tangut State

### Introduction<sup>1</sup>

Despite the diversity of the repertoire of the Tangut texts pertaining to the realm of Tibetan Buddhism, many of these texts are traceable to one major source of textual production, which can provisionally be identified as the *Bka' brgyud*.

The existence of a substantial layer of Tibetan “doctrinal” writings (i.e. texts devoted to the doctrinal and philosophical aspects of Buddhism) was identified by Nishida Tatsuo (西田龍雄) as early as in 1975.<sup>2</sup> Nishida’s identifications were fully

#### <sup>1</sup> Notes on translations and transcriptions

In the paper the term “Tibetan text” indicates “the texts of Tibetan subject matter translated into Tangut”. In the discussion below I provide titles of Tangut works in the original (accompanied with the transcription, in the footnotes transcriptions are omitted as well as the tone marks) and in English translation. I only make corrections to Kychanov’s readings where I can see obvious mistakes or typos in the original text of his *Catalogue of the Tangut Buddhist Texts* from the collection of the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts (Kychanov 1999). Reconstructions of the Tibetan titles and reverse translations from Tangut into Tibetan are all done by myself, if not otherwise specified. Reconstructions and tentative readings are marked with \*. In the phonetic reconstructions I am generally following Hwang-cherng Gong system; in some specific cases Sun Bojun (2010) is helpful.

Major translation tool used here is Nevskij (1960) and abridged version of his dictionary by Hwang-cherng Gong. In general, the texts discussed in this paper do not have Chinese versions, and are either translated from Tibetan or composed in Xixia; thus Chinese characters roughly corresponding to the Tangut graphs are provided for reference purposes only. If title in Chinese is provided, it is a literal substitution of Tangut graphs with the Chinese ones, similar to the method used in Kychanov (1999; hereafter referred to as *Catalogue*). Although this mode of translation is generally incorrect, it allows the reader to locate the discussed texts in the *Catalogue*. No Chinese “reconstructions” of original texts are provided; these are only helpful for the texts with the Sinitic subject matter. Some of the texts discussed in the paper, especially the works of Atiśa, are quite straightforward and linguistically transparent; thus they do not pose much difficulty for translation. Others, such as #2825, tend to reproduce Tibetan syntax in a manner which is not obvious at a first glance, making translations of such texts more complicated. Cases of uncertain translation are marked as “tentative”. Monastic names are given in transcriptions of their Chinese versions.

Many of the texts used in this research have already been studied with varying degree of diligence, especially Sun Bojun (2014, pp. 71–109) studies more texts than mentioned in this paper, partially overlapping with its content. Although I consulted these translations (or paraphrases), all translations are my own; when accepting other’s readings, it is specified. This paper owes a lot to my colleagues who guided and helped me throughout its course; I thank the anonymous reviewers of this paper, and especially Dan Martin and Sam van Schaik for their most valuable suggestions. All the mistakes in the paper are solely my responsibility and originate from my general lack of scholarship.

I am aware that the terms which I use throughout this study, such as “*Bka' brgyud*” tradition or “conglomerate”, “Mahāsiddha tradition” etc., are pure conventions and serve to denominate certain textual and teaching vectors for which I failed to arrive to a more precise definition.

References to the Chinese Buddhist texts are according to the CBETA edition (2014), punctuation all mine; Tibetan works are mentioned under the numbers from *The Catalogue of the Tibetan Tripitaka. Peking Edition kept in the Library of the Otani University*, edited by Daisetz T. Suzuki, Tokyo–Kyoto, TTRI, 1961 (hereafter *Peking Catalogue*).

<sup>2</sup> Nishida’s identifications of Tibetan texts are to be found in the 3rd volume of his fundamental study of the Tangut version of the *Avatamsaka sūtra* (Nishida 1975–1977, vol. 3, pp. 13–59).

reproduced by E. Kychanov in his *Catalogue of the Tangut Buddhist Texts in the Collection of the Institute of Oriental Studies*. However, neither Nishida nor Kychanov ever followed up on their observations about the nature of the Tibetan Buddhism in Xixia, so that this substantial stratum of Buddhist literature remained somewhat neglected, and the general understanding of the Tibetan Buddhism in Xixia as a collection of esoteric instructions continues in modern scholarship. Despite the overall legitimacy of this point of view,<sup>3</sup> the research of the available Tangut materials requests certain modifications of such an approach.

This means that the cache of Tibetan Buddhist texts available from P. K. Kozlov's collection and other repositories should be understood as a reflection of a systematic effort to reproduce the entirety of Tibetan Buddhism as it was available to the Tanguts in the mid-12th century. This version of Buddhism included the elements of doctrinal authority revolving around the teaching of Atiśa (982–1052, Dīpaṁkara) combined with the ritual manuals and meditation guides of various origin. Study of this cache of texts might be revealing in clarifying the process of Tangut appropriation of Buddhism and locate Tangut Buddhism within a more general framework of Buddhist history of East and Central Asia.

## Texts of Tibetan Subject Matter in Xixia

### 1. Chronological Considerations

The imaginary division of the Tangut Buddhist history into its Sinitic and Tibetan stages is not as evident as general scholarship would have us to believe. On the contrary, available textual data suggests that the inflow of Sinitic “doctrinal” texts (i.e. various Huayan and Chan Buddhist compilations, which date back to the second half of the 12th century)<sup>4</sup> into Xixia is simultaneous with the increase of Tibetan Buddhist presence in Xixia. Growth of Tibetan Buddhism in Xixia should be dated to the early and middle 12th century, when the area known in Tangut as *tsow-ka* 𐰇𐰆𐰪𐰸, i.e. *Tsongkha* (\**zongka* 宗喀, to the east from Qinghai lake) was incorporated into the Tangut Empire by the Emperor Qianshun (乾順, Chongzong 崇宗) around 1130s.<sup>5</sup> If this timeline is correct, the successful career of the Tangut Buddhist scholar Rtsa mi lotsāwa Sangs rgyas grags pa (fl. early 12th century) in India and Tibet – generally seen as the symbol of the efflorescence of the Tibetan Buddhism in Xixia – is an exception rather

<sup>3</sup> The research into this particular topic was promoted by Shen Weirong in a number of publications, e.g. Shen Weirong (2006, pp. 23–34).

<sup>4</sup> For details see Solonin (2013b).

<sup>5</sup> Another Tangut denomination for the Tsongkha area in Tangut was “*mji wəə phə*” (𐰇𐰆𐰪𐰸 𐰇𐰆𐰪𐰸 *\*mi you Bo* 彌有蕃/*\*mi shu Bo* 彌屬蕃, possible translation ‘*Bod* belonging to the *Mi* [*nyang*] people’); this term was probably used to distinguish between Tibet proper *Xibo Zhongguo* 西蕃中國 (*lji phə gu lji* 𐰇𐰆𐰪𐰸 𐰇𐰆𐰪𐰸, “Western *Mādhyadeśa* of the Bod people”, *\*Bod yul dbus*) and parts of Tibet belonging to the Tangut realm.

Apart from the Kashmiri monks of great renown, such as Jayānanda (mid-12th century, *Dzja ja a nja djaa* 𑖣𑖦𑖭𑖮𑖱𑖳; 拶也阿難捺) and his Tibetan associate Ānandakīrti (Kun dga' grags) who emerge in the Tangut colophons with the dates around mid-12th century, and translator Sumatikīrti (fl. mid-late 11th century, *Sju mja tji kji rji tji* 𑖰𑖪𑖫𑖬𑖭𑖮𑖯𑖰𑖱𑖲𑖳, once one of the masters and collaborators of Rngog lotsāwa Blo ldan shes rab, 1059–1109), another dated encounter between the Tangut translator Dehui and the Tibetan master Brtson 'grus occurred in 1152 at the earliest, and took place in an unidentified location in the Tsongkha area.<sup>7</sup> Such historical works

The date 1152 for the initial reception of Mahāmudrā teachings in Xixia is established on the basis of the record of the encounter between Tangut translator Dehui and Tibetan master \*Brtsol 'grus in Tsong-kha. The date is *renshen* 壬申 year, which can be either 1152 or 1212; on the basis of other information on Dehui, the earlier date is more probable (see Suoluoning 2013a, pp. 264–267). The date 1152 is established on the basis of the following Tangut paragraph discovered in the commentary to the Tangut text “The Ultimate Collection of Mahāmudrā” (Tang 345, #7163 and Tang 345, #2858) composed by Dehui, which reads as follows:

Acta Orient. Hung. 68, 2015

as *Mdo smad chos 'byung* and the *Blue Annals* indicate that close affiliation once existed between the *Bka' brgyud* monks and Tangut rulers during the middle of the 12th century.<sup>8</sup> This again corroborates the date around the 1130s as the terminus *post quem* for the expansion of Tibetan Buddhism in Xixia.

## 2. Variety of Textual Material

Despite salient “practical” or “applicable” tenor of the Tibetan textual repertoire in Xixia, current scholarship has identified a number of “doctrinal” compilations of Tibetan origin in Tangut translation. Most of these texts are connected with Atiśa and the early *Bka' gdams* circle. Numerous compositions on “valid cognition” discovered in the Tangut translations probably also relate to this circle. In the following I try to analyse the nomenclature of some of these texts and delineate their position within generally esoteric background of the Tangut version of Buddhism.<sup>9</sup>

Kychanov's *Catalogue* (which is incomplete, but representative of the textual repertoire of the available Buddhist texts in Tangut) lists 768 items (i.e. texts under separate call numbers), covering the mass of 374 independent texts (that is, there are several entries for the different parts or versions of the same text). Out of these, about seventy (the figure may vary)<sup>10</sup> texts are Mahāyāna sūtras and translations of Sinitic doctrinal literature: Mahāyāna sūtras, Āgamas, Vinaya, Mahāyāna Abhidharma and Vijñānavāda treatises, Avatamsaka and Chan school texts, Sinitic and Tibetan compositions on the Pure Land etc. About ten texts are various “hymns”, “laudations” of Prajñāpāramitā; another group of texts (about five pieces) belongs to “valid cognition” subject matter.

---

“Renshen” year mentioned here is either 1212 or 1152, on the basis of other available information I am inclined to accept the earlier date (see Suoluoning 2014). The place name Tsongkha emerges earlier in the text. The meaning of the paragraph is generally clear, but requires further elaboration. Sumatikīrti (late 11th century) is responsible for a variety of Tangut texts, and probably has travelled to Xixia (Wei Wen 2013, pp. 316–326).

<sup>8</sup> I am referring to the Chinese translation of the text: Zhiguanba Gongjieshu danba raoji (1989). In the outline of the early period of Buddhism in Amdo, the text contains information on the encounters between the Tangut rulers and Tibetan masters. According to the calculations in the text, the first Tangut ruler mentioned as Sihegeju (司赫格居, Tib. Sa hu'i ga'i ju) is probably the first Tangut Emperor Yuanhao; then the fifth Emperor known in Tibetan as Thehu (Chin. 太和) who contacted Du gsum mkhyen pa should be Renxiao (仁孝 reign 1139–1193, Renzong 仁宗). However, if the Tibetan historians followed traditional Tangut chronology, known from the Tangut “Ode to Ancestors of the Lhwi people” (蘇刻禪齋集) the first Emperor would be Li Jiqian (李繼遷, 963–1004). Thus the fifth Emperor Taihu will be not Renxiao but Bingchang (秉常, 1068–1086, Huizong 惠宗). However, the *Amduo Zhengjiao shi* (Zhiguanba Gongjieshu danba raoji 1989, pp. 25–26) gives an account of the Tangut territory which is contemporaneous with the later period of Renxiao. Here and throughout I refer to the Russian edition of the *Blue Annals* (2001).

<sup>9</sup> Very little of what follows would have been possible without the thoughtful guidance of senior colleagues, especially of Dan Martin, who directed my attention to several important matters which constitute the core of this research.

<sup>10</sup> Shi Jinbo gives figure 300, meaning all the available Tangut translations of sūtras (see Shi Jinbo 1988, pp. 65–71). Kychanov concurs with Shi on this figure.

Apart from these, a group of texts revolves around the teaching of the “two truths” (or “two realities”) as exposed by Atiśa. This group currently lists about six texts directly dealing with the “two truths” subject matter. Still another major category includes the works on “generating bodhicitta”; this category is rather uniform and lists five independent compositions, one of them represented by a number of copies attesting to its substantial circulation.

This leaves about two hundred texts, which can be provisionally defined as “Tibetan”, but not necessarily “esoteric” or “tantric”; the majority of these texts are of *Bka' brgyud* subject matter: the texts are distributed between *Mahāmudrā*, *Vajravārāhī*, *Six Dharmas of Nāropa*, *Lam 'bras*, *Cakrasaṃvara* and a few other systems generally originating from Maitrīpa (1007–1085), Tilopa (988–1069) and Nāropa (1016–1100).

The number of the texts in each of the above categories can be established only with a degree of approximation: currently about *thirty* titles are affiliated with the *Vajravārāhī* system; about *ten* titles relate to the *Six Dharmas of Nāropa* and affiliated traditions;<sup>11</sup> together with *bardo* texts this totals up to fifteen or even twenty

<sup>11</sup> As of now, one can provisionally discriminate one major line of the Six Yogas transmission: i.e. the one which was transmitted by Yarlungs pa otherwise known as *Tsjiir katsjij* 藏藏路 (\*Fa Shizi, 法獅子, \**Chos kyi seng ge*). Currently we have several systematic expositions of the Six Dharmas. The first one is a collection of Six Yoga texts transmitted by *Tsjiir katsjij* 藏藏路 (\**Chos kyi seng ge* who also emerges under the title of *dwewr swew lhjij dzjiij* 鐵弱漢斯, \*Jueming guoshi 覺明國師) from “The Temple of the Great Deliverance of the People”. The collection consists of six texts, each one devoted to one of Nāropa’s dharmas: the first is “Upadeśa on attainment of samādhi of Inner heat in the yogic practice of attaining enlightenment” 勝寂藏藏藏龍龍慢發藏, exposition of the *gtum mo* practice. The transmission lineage of this text includes: Nāropa (*nja rjo pja* 藏藏峰 1016–1100), who received prophecy on a cemetery and met Tilopa (988–1069; Trilopa in Tangut; *tji rjiir lo pja* 劉錫鹿峰), Kamalaśīla (Kjamja sjilja 藏藏藏, i.e. Dampa Sangs rgyas). The second text in the collection “Upadeśa on Attaining samādhi of illusory body in the practice of enlightenment in a dream” 勝寂藏藏藏龍龍弱慢發藏 (*sgyu lus*, ‘illusory body’), contains no lineage as well as the third text “Upadeśa on attainment of the samādhi of light in the practice of enlightenment in awakening” 寂藏藏藏藏藏藏弱慢發藏 (*'od gsal*). The fourth text in the collection: 慨勝藏藏藏藏藏藏藏慢發藏 (*grong 'jug*) attributes the teaching to “*mja rjiir pja lho pji rja kji pja*” 藏藏藏藏藏藏藏藏藏, which is the Tangut transcription of Marpa Lho brag pa (i.e. Marpa Chos kyi blo gros, the famous translator, 1012–1097) and Nāropa. The fifth is the text on the *bardo* practice “Upadeśa on the Intermediate body” 勝寂藏藏藏藏藏 in which I failed to identify a lineage. The collection closes with a text “Upadeśa on Entry into the realm of other” 藏藏藏藏藏藏藏 (i.e. *'pho ba*). From a Tibetological perspective such a repertoire and titles are rather obvious for the collection of the texts on the Six Dharmas of Nāropa; in terms of Tangut Buddhist studies this is an example of systematic exposition of Nāropa’s teaching (Tang 209, #2545 *Catalogue* #564, pp. 547–548).

Yarlungs pa’s *Vajravārāhī* texts include 龍勝藏藏藏藏藏藏藏勝寂勝寂勝寂, which can be translated as “Ritual of Laudation according to the [sādhana] of *Vajravārāhī* using the Pure Vase” (Tang 260, #2557, *Catalogue* #541, p. 539); a *bardo* text as well as few others. Another systematic exposition of the Six Yogas is “Upadeśa commanding attainment of union between desire and joy” *Kiej rejir 'iolwu šjij tshji jwuui* 鐵弱龍勝藏藏藏藏藏藏藏 (Tang 325, #5116, *Catalogue* #593, p. 558; in fact the title adopted by Kychanov only represents the first treatise in the collection). The text under this title is a collection of short treatises on the Six Yogas, generally originating from Tilopa, Nāropa, Milarepa, transmitted by Yarlungs pa and translated by Huizhao, a translator monk from the Temple

items; three texts belong to *lam 'bras* (*Bka' brgyud* version) tradition but in a variety of copies, which attests to its substantial circulation.<sup>12</sup> Mahāmudrā system of Maitrīpa (1007–1085) is represented by six texts accompanied by several Mahāmudrā compositions identified in Yuan–Ming period compilation *Dasheng Yaodao miji* 大乘要道密集,<sup>13</sup> texts of the Cakrasamvara system introduced by Sumatikīrti are probably the most numerous totalling approximately 20 items.<sup>14</sup>

The real number of independent works is higher: many of the titles mentioned in the *Catalogue* are anthologies, including several compositions rather than one specific text. The study of colophons, prefaces and votive laudations attached to the texts demonstrates that in some cases Vajravārāhī system and Six Yogas were transmitted by a similar group of people or are traceable to one master, e.g. Yarlungs pa (*ja ljow sji pja* 殺攝設麟), who emerges in the Tangut texts under a variety of names. In many cases the same group of translators and “transmitters” were as well responsible for the texts belonging to the cult of “Thirty Five Buddhas”, “Pure Land”, etc.<sup>15</sup>

Below I have specified several groups of texts according to their uniform transmission lineages or common subject matter. The exposition is not fully exhaustive

---

of the Manifestation of Five Wisdoms (see below). Identification between Yarlungs pa, Jueming guoshi and Fa Shizi is discussed by Sun Bojun (2013, forthcoming).

<sup>12</sup> The best account of the Tibetan esoteric texts in Chinese, available from Khara-Khoto, see in Shen Weirong (2013, pp. 58–61; 68–70). The most influential *lam 'bras* text in Xixia seems to be *Potijij kjirsijij xiewlew tsja lji mja rjir jašijij džjušja ljizjur* 蘇數賴曉繼續藏敵迭發務繼續藏敵續, *Precious Torch Elucidating the Bodhisattva Study of Fruit as the Way as One-Practice* available in 27 copies. The Tibetan title of this work can be provisionally reconstructed as \**Byang chub sems dpa' lam 'bras bslab bya'i don gsal 'grel gyi sgron ma*, and its author *Lji katšijij* 數執錄 (Chinese: \*Bao shizi, 寶獅子, \**Dkon mchog seng ge*) in all probability can be identified as Gtsang po pa Dkon mchog seng ge (?–1219), Dus gsum mkhyen pa's disciple, as discussed in Dunnell (2009, pp. 57–58). The Tangut text of *Tsja mjaaj ŋwuusjoo xji njij gjiwi jij phie sji la* 藏終祚嗣藏席結循發統蘇, which, as Sun Bojun observed, is independent form the composition with similar title from *Dasheng Yaodao miji* 大乘要道密集. The researches of the Tangut *lam 'bras* texts is currently underway, so I omit discussion here. One major observation to be made here is that although the texts of *lam 'bras* found in Tangut have similar titles with the compositions identified in *Dasheng Yaodao miji*, the actual reading into these texts demonstrates substantial deviations between the Chinese and Tangut versions.

<sup>13</sup> Maitrīpa's understanding of Mahāmudrā is discussed in Mathes (2009, pp. 5–32) and Tatz (1987, pp. 695–711). Mahāmudrā texts from Khara-Khoto and the ones found in *Dasheng Yaodao miji* are partially identical; only Tangut repertoire is much broader (see Suoluoning 2013a, pp. 238–243).

<sup>14</sup> For Cakrasamvara system's spread in Xixia we have some actual information from both Tangut and Tibetan texts: Wei Wen (2013, pp. 301–331).

<sup>15</sup> Even a brief scan of Kychanov's *Catalogue* returns the texts of *Sanshiwu Fosui lichen yaoyu* 三十五佛隨禮懺要語 (*Catalogue* #103 殺設饒絳賴緡緡殺蘇, more correct translation will be: 依三十五佛懺罪要語). The text probably is a work of Sino-Tibetan Buddhism: according to the colophon, the text was composed by the famous Dehui (德慧, 德慧), major proponent of Tibetan Buddhism in Xixia probably on the basis of Bukong's original text; another Tangut text pertaining to the “repentance of thirty five Buddhas” is: 絳絳緡緡緡緡緡殺設饒絳賴緡緡殺蘇 (*Catalogue* #513; Chinese: 佛說如來一切總持三十五佛懺罪法事), probably another version of Bukong's *Foshuo sanshiwu fo lichen wen* (佛說三十五佛禮懺文, Taishō 326, Tangut text “edited” during Renxiao's reign).

This repertoire only describes part of the Tibetan Buddhist heritage in Xixia; below I will briefly deal with the texts on Mahāmudrā, Vajravārāhī, bodhicitta, as well as with some of the doctrinal compositions and the texts on valid cognition. The final part of the paper will cover the available Tangut texts pertaining to the realm of Atiśa's teachings.

One important source for reconstructing the basic *Bka' brgyud* context in Xixia is a fragment known as #2885, with a tentative title “Master Tilopa’s Exposition of the nature of mind” (\**Tjī rjiir lo pja dzjiij njijsjir tshjiij* 刻錫龐麟髻絳毗惹, \**鳴吟羅巴師心性說*). Generally, the text is a first person narrative concerning the attainment of various tantric teachings by a certain master whose name is unidentified.

1. Nāgārjuna (wephu 飛聳髑), \*Matanga (*mja tā-khwa* 燐髑髑), Tilopa (Trilopa in Tangut; *tjī rjijr lo pja* 刻錫靡髑).

Lineage for the *yoginī tantras* is also twofold:

<sup>17</sup> As suggested by Kychanov, this temple was probably located in the Khara-Khoto area.

Xixia.



3. Sumatibhadra (\*Sumati the Wise *šju mja tji nji mee* 微憐統織敎; \*Samantabhadra; the name can also be reconstructed as Sumatikīrti), Caryāpa (*šjiw lo pja* 蕤靡憐, \*Sjarapa), \*Tharpa (*thā lo pja* 蕤靡憐, probably Thar pa Lam ston, i.e. Jñānagarbha/Kukkuripa), Kanaripa (*kjaa nja rjir pja* 訖訖訖憐), Tilopa.

4. The last lineage consists of Brahman Saraha (*pho lo mē pja sja rjar xa* 攸靡肅憐), Lūipa (*lju ji pja* 蕤靡憐), Dengipa (*djiij kji pja* 蕤蕤憐), Tilopa.<sup>19</sup>

The lineage in #2885 sets a framework for the transmission of the Six Dharmas and respective tantras in the Tangut Empire. Earlier in the text *Dīpaṁkara* is mentioned as the source of upadeśas, which puts the Indian master within the general context of the esoteric transmission in the Tangut State (see below). Other available lineages are presented below.

### 1. Mahāmudrā

The contents of the Mahāmudrā texts discovered in Khara-Khoto or identified in the *Dasheng Yaodao Miji* 大乘要道密集 are not specifically tantric and concentrate on the attainment of the “indiscriminative insight” (*amanasikāra*, *lā mijj* 懶憐; i.e. Chinese *wunian* 無念); this again implies their origination from the early *Bka' brgyud*.

One important text from the *Dasheng Yaodao Miji*, “Da shouyin yinglou deng sizhong yaomen” (“The Golden Garland of Mahāmudrā and other four Upadeśas” 大手印金瓔珞等四種要門; further “The Golden Garland”) has become the focus of scholarly attention (e.g. Sun Bojun 2014). This anthology contains four smaller treatises with Vajravārāhī and Mahāmudrā lineages almost completely congruent with the ones known from the excavated Kara-Khoto texts. Corroborative data are available from the “Praise for Eighty Five Mahāsiddhas” (“Chengjiu bashiwu shi dao Zhu” 成就八十五師禱祝) composed by Jinggang zuo (金剛座, probably Rtsa mi Lotsāwa; further “Praise”)<sup>20</sup> and “Laudation for the Manifestation of Virtues of Stimulus and Response of the Lama Wusheng” (“Wusheng shangshi chuxian ganxying gongde song” 無生上師出現感應功德頌; further “Laudation”), also preserved in the *Dasheng Yao-*

<sup>19</sup> The persons within the above-mentioned name list are easily identifiable in the traditional Mahāsiddha lineages (e.g. Abhayadatta (1979); however, in the Tibetan sources they do not necessarily emerge in the order presented in the Tangut text (see Chökyi Nima 2009, pp. 117–118). Less known personalities include Matanga (Matangi) who is one of Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva's disciples (Tāranātha 2004, pp. 128–129; Seyfort Ruegg 2010, p. 329); Taropa (correct Tangut reconstruction is probably \*Tarpa) is probably a Tangut reading of Thal pa, i.e. Jñānagarbha/Kukkuripa; Caryāpa is the second name for Kṛṣṇacārya (Chökyi Nima 2009, p. 435, n. 413; Tāranātha in *Seven Instruction Lineages* seems to discriminate between the two, see Tāranātha (1983, pp. 22–23); however cf. Tāranātha (2004, p. 259); Tachikawa (1987, pp. 47–48). Identification of Sumati the Wise with Samantabhadra is based on the meaning of the Tangut 織敎 (Chinese *Puxian* 普賢). The above paragraph was originally studied by Nishida Tatsuo and Sun Bojun (Sun Bojun 2014, pp. 104–105); however, their translations are in need of substantial corrections and identifications.

<sup>20</sup> Most of the personages in the aforementioned tantric lineages occur in the “Praise”: Zhongbi xiluge 鐘必兮魯葛 for Dombi heruka; Luxiba 魯兮巴 for Lūipa; Binasha 必捺莎 for Bhinasavajra; Lawaba 辣幹巴 for Lawapa; Zariyapa 拶哩牙 三合巴 for Caryāpa; Dingjiba 丁吉巴 for Dengipa, etc.

*dao Miji*. So far, one can infer the existence of two related Mahāmudrā lineages in Xixia.

a. In a generalised form, the Tangut Mahāmudrā lineage as represented by both the texts from *Dasheng Yaodao miji* and excavated Tangut texts, appears as follows: originating from the Buddha himself (*Mingman* 明滿 in the *Dasheng Yaodao Miji*, i.e. translation of Tib. *Sangs rgyas*), the transmission follows on to Saraha (薩囉曷, 𐰇𐰺𐰍𐰏), Saropa (薩囉巴, 𐰇𐰺𐰍𐰏), Avadhūtipa (啞幹諾帝, 𐰇𐰺𐰍𐰏), Lama Marpa (辣麻馬巴, 𐰇𐰺𐰍𐰏), Milaraspa (銘移辣囉悉巴, 𐰇𐰺𐰍𐰏), Lama Lhazhe (辣麻辣征, 𐰇𐰺𐰍𐰏), provisionally identified with Sgam po pa Bsod nams rin chen, as suggested by Shen Weirong), Imperial Preceptor Xuanmi (玄密帝師, otherwise known in Tangut as *Dwer mijj* 𐰇𐰺𐰍𐰏), emerges in *Dasheng Yaodao Miji* as Wubi 無比, ‘Incomparable’), Lama Dabao (大寶), State Preceptor Xuanzhao (玄照國師).<sup>21</sup> The transcription techniques utilised both in the texts from *Dasheng Yaodao miji* and in Tangut materials demonstrate similarities; whereas the Tibetan version of “The Golden Garland” reveals deviations in both transcription and subject matter.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>21</sup> The concluding part of the lineage is missing from Tangut text; thus no actual Tangut names can be reconstructed for these persons. Apart from this, a Tangut Mahāmudrā compilation Tangut #7216 from Kozlov’s collection is a Tangut version of another text from *Dasheng Yaodao miji*: “Da shoyin yin yinding yaomen”, of which Tibetan text has not survived, but which clearly overlaps with the aforementioned Mahāmudrā texts (see Suoluoning 2013a, pp. 240–241). “The Golden Garland” is available only in Chinese and Tibetan, the Tangut names are provided on the basis of the aforementioned Tangut texts (see also Sun Bojun 2014, pp. 84–91).

<sup>22</sup> The transcriptions of personal names as found in *Dasheng Yaodao miji* Mahāmudrā texts demonstrate linguistic proximity with the ones discovered in the excavated texts, whereas “The Golden Garland of Mahāmudrā” sometimes employs different translation techniques as compared to other texts; thus it probably stems from a different source tradition.

The Mahāmudrā texts from the *Dasheng Yaodao miji* can be divided into two groups: one is a collection of small texts whose repertoire fully reproduces the contents of the Tangut collection of Mahāmudrā texts known as Tang 348, #2841; detailed account in Suoluoning (2013a, pp. 237–239). Another Tangut text is one Tang 342, #7216, known as 𐰇𐰺𐰍𐰏 (i.e. *Da shoyin yinding* 大手印引定 which includes materials from “Da shoyin gatuozhi yaomen” 大手印伽陀支要門 and “Da shoyin yinding yaomen” (Suoluoning 2013a, pp. 240–243). The Tangut text appears to be more detailed and contains a commentary unavailable in the Chinese version. Tang 342, #7216 includes quotations from several masters which warrant consideration: Chinese text of *Dayin yinding* introduces “Dangjingwa” (\*Dēngipa) 當精幹, for him Tangut is *tow tsjij wa* 𐰇𐰺𐰍𐰏; Tilopa, 𐰇𐰺𐰍𐰏 for him Tangut is *tji rjij lo pja* 𐰇𐰺𐰍𐰏, i.e. Trilopa. The above ones are transcriptions, whereas 𐰇𐰺𐰍𐰏 (\*語交槍持); 𐰇𐰺𐰍𐰏 (\*浦有堅); 𐰇𐰺𐰍𐰏 (\*精持劍) and 𐰇𐰺𐰍𐰏 (\*妙好) are translations.

The Tibetan text of “The Golden Garland” edited by Lü Cheng identifies “Dangjingwa” (Dēngipa) as Tog tse pa, for which both Chinese 當精幹 and Tangut 𐰇𐰺𐰍𐰏 (*tow tsjij wa*, \*當精哂) are correct representations. “The Praise” mentions in this stead “Duojieba 朵節巴”, which is an alternative reading. “The Golden Garland” further mentions 𐰇𐰺𐰍𐰏, representative not of the standard pronunciation of “Tilopa”, but of Trilopa, Tangut version represents similar pronunciation. “The Praise” refers to the master as “\*Deluba” 的盧巴, which is the transcription of the standard name form. Tangut *phu zjir lheew* 𐰇𐰺𐰍𐰏 from #7126 can be translated as ‘Phu endowed with armor’. The relevant slot in “The Golden Garland” has Phyogs kyi glang po; the Chinese version of “The Golden Garland” has “Yada Jianjia” 啞達堅甲 (‘Yada with strong armor’) and Chinese

**b.** A specifically Tsongkha version of Mahāmudrā lineage is recorded in *Tha tjiŋ nji džjwa tshjisjoo* 散轍鐵發發 (‘Ultimate Upadeśa of the Great Seal’) which was obtained by the famous Tangut translator Dehui (*tshja źjir* 紇菟; \*Dehui 德慧) from the Master \*Brtson ’grus. The lineage includes the following personages: Śākyamuni (*šjikja* 薩轍; 釋迦), Vimalakīrti (*wjimo* 禪貳, Weimo 維摩, Tangut based on the Chinese transcription), Saraha (*sja rjar xa* 孫若霞), Nāgārjuna (*wephu* 飛聳, Longshu 龍樹, based on the Chinese translation), Śavarīpa (*ŋarla* 桑梭; *shanmu* 山墓, Mountain Cemetery, probably Tib. *ri khrod*), Maitrīpa (Benevolent Master *njiŋ dzjiŋ* 尼經, *cishi* 慈師, based on the translation of the name in Chinese manner), Master Prajñākīrti (*sjij džwoow* 殺續, 智稱, plausible identifications: Tilopa, Kor Nirūpa, 1061–1062, Prajñāsriṇānakīrti); ‘Lord of Speech’ (*ŋwuu dzjuu* 訶尊, *Ngag gyi dbang phyug*, 語自在; the Tangut version clearly represents Tib. *ngag dbang*). The details of this master’s biography as preserved in the Tangut text allow his identification as Balpo Asu, i.e. Balpo Skye med (a Nepalese Mahāmudrā master) (Suoluoning 2013a, pp. 260–261).<sup>23</sup> His successor was a Tibetan master \*Brtson ’grus, who finally transmitted the teaching to the famous Tangut translator Dehui in the ‘Tangut Tibet’. The text contains a doctrinal taxonomy with noticeable Rnying ma overtones which warrants further study.

## 2. Vajravārāhī Lineages

**a.** The Vajravārāhī lineages known from the Tangut sources are more diverse than those of Mahāmudrā. One version of Tangut Vajravārāhī lineage in ‘Shicheng deng chu feng jilun yi’ (師承等處奉集論儀 one text from ‘The Golden Garland’) includes Śāvarīpa 薩幹哩巴, Maitrīpa 銘得哩幹, Vajrapāṇi 金剛手, Balpo Skye med (巴波無

---

version of *Dayin yinding* features *Fangjia* 方甲, which omits Tangut verb *lheew*, ‘to have’ used to render Tibetan ‘can’. Apparently, Tangut and Chinese from *Dayin yinding* render Tibetan in similar manner: both Tangut *Phu* and Chinese *Fang* transcribe the Tibetan *phyong*, whereas the rest represents Tibetan *glang po*, both versions being close to Tibetan, but somewhat further apart from the Chinese of the ‘The Golden Garland’. Furthermore, Tangut *ŋwuu tja be jiŋ* 訶尊持鐵 is translated as 語交槍持 which is similar to *jueyu chi qiang* 絕語持槍 as featured in the Chinese *Dayin yinding*. The Tibetan text of ‘The Golden Garland’ mentions here *Mdung can lkugs*, which is correctly rendered by the Chinese ‘Golden Garland’ phonetically as Nuozhe Gangba 諾遮崗巴, i.e. the original name is modified with *-pa*. Both Tangut and Chinese from *Dayin yinding* seem to have translated the Tibetan name as ‘Mute with a spear’, which is correct. Tangut 𐰇𐰆𐰏𐰤 *’jirjiŋra* 殺敵鐵 and Wubai chijian 無敗持劍 translates Tibetan *Mi pham ral pa can*, for which the Chinese ‘Golden Garland’ has *Sheng shi qi zhang* 勝勢器仗, where both *chi* and *qi* transcribe Tibetan ‘can’, whereas both *wubai* and *shengshi* are translations of *mi pham* (‘the unconquered’). ‘Sword’ and ‘Stuff’ in the Tangut and Chinese versions seem to have no Tibetan counterparts. Here again, one may notice the proximity between the Tangut and Chinese text of *Dayin yinding*, whereas ‘The Golden Garland’ appears to represent a different version of the Tibetan text.

<sup>23</sup> Alternative view in Sun Penghao 孫鵬浩 (2012, pp. 93–96). In the ‘Praise’ this person might be identified either with *Liaojie yin* 了解音 (‘the knower of sounds’) or Balasu (巴辣素) which is the transcription of Balpo Asu. According to Lū Cheng, the gatha about Balasu is found only in the Derge edition of ‘The Praise’. Its addition actually made its author to deviate from the traditional number 84 and make 85 entries. Lū Cheng, however, doubted its authenticity and indicated that according to the Tibetan text this name represents Sarasuka.

The Mahāmudrā lineage from “The Golden Garland” (preserved only in the Chinese version, but not in the Tibetan one) is identical with the above: Śavaripa, Maitrīpa, Vajrapāṇi, Balpo Skye med (i.e. Balpo Asu), Vajraguru, Imperial Preceptor Xuanmi, Zhi Jingang and State Preceptor Xuanzhao. All the above lineages seem to revolve around the figure of Asu (Skye med), who probably had special importance for Tangut Buddhism.

Acta Orient. Hung. 68, 2015

he set off on the journey, but could not reach [the place of destination]: while he was going to the place of Lama Be (*lja mja pjij* 綾嬌咄), one night he heard upadeśas in a dream and manifested the signs of mental joy from the yogic practice (脩習隨安樂, \**rnal 'byor gyi yid bde*) and the state of non-discrimination arose. Because the joy was so great, his body trembled in sleep, and when he woke up from the sleep, [he] did not lose what [he] realised before (i.e. during his sleep; here Tangut 𐼀 ‘to wake up’) is probably a mistake for 𐼀 ‘to know, wisdom’). His body trembled, and those nearby were asking each other; when [the trembling] stopped, [they] said: “Go ask the master.” Then, when the master came nearby, [Yarlungs pa] pronounced the upadeśa in the same way [as he has received them] in the dream; and his contemplation and wisdom arose in the same way as in the dream; the master said: “Remarkable.” You truly attained the seal. [...]

<sup>26</sup> Alternative version would be that Lavapa was Indrabhūti's teacher.

散絲拆麤塵，散帛枝姑襖捕獮絳綸緜緜。絲繡緜苴貳醫腓，律徇姦姦嚴飛戔鏡敕，敵珍  
鐵瓊夜戔罔扼匙敕，鉅彝椎菸霰蜂形駁銅炭戔“慘觀厭蕪”，戎格駁峰種銑路旋後戔。

If I determine the sequence of pages correctly, the text of “Four Consecrations” was transmitted by Ya lia sipa (Yarlungs pa) on the basis of the text and according to the rules established by the master Śja sing juu rjarkəpja 郭麻雅紐若格撥, which can be provisionally reconstructed as \*Śang

c. Still another Vajravārāhī lineage is found in the *Gju mja njudeej la* 瓏瓏鹿殺蘇 (\**Haimu erzhuan ji* 亥母耳傳記, *Oral Transmission of Vajravārāhī sādhanā*, \**Rdo rje phag mo'i snyan rgyud*). Its Chinese version survived among the Khara-Khoto findings under the title *Sizi kongxingmu jiwen* 四字空行母記文. This text was composed by Supa (\*Sumpa) Sangs rgyas (\*孫巴明滿, 鑣鋒衍甌 probably identical with Sumpa lotsāwa of the *Blue Annals*). The lineage of this particular sādhanā is traced as originating from Dampa Sangs rgyas (d. 1117) and culminating in Wusheng (*Mjijwee*, 莽翁, 無生 Skye med).<sup>28</sup> Judging from the imaginary timeline of the trans-

Yu ragpa, i.e. possibly Zhang G.yu-brag-pa, i.e. Lama Zhang (Sun Bojun's reading). Still another text in the collection is based on the text which was originally written by Kṛṣṇapada and expounded by the master 'jij rjir pja wa 徹瓏鑣瓏, i.e. \*Yerpawa, once associated with Lama Zhang whom he instructed in Nāropa's teachings (*Blue Annals* 2001, p. 376). The name of the first person in the above lineage reads as *jwar lo* 瓏鹿, which can be tentatively reconstructed as \*Yelo. Considering the honorific 徹瓏鑣, 大吉祥, *dpal chen po*, *heruka* attached to the name, I tend to reconstruct the name as Dpal Chen Rgwa lo (11th century, the *Blue Annals* chapter devoted to lama Zhang, see *Blue Annals* 2001, pp. 375–376). I am not sure of the relation between Dpal Rgwa lo and Yerpawa mentioned above: Lama Zhang, apparently composed two biographies: one for Rgwa lo “Dpal-chen Rgwa Lo'i Rnam-thar Byang-chub-sems 'Byongs-ma”; and another one for Yerpawa: “Mal Yer-pa-ba'i Rnam-thar Bskal-pa Dpag-med-ma” (Martin 2012, p. 219). Thus the lineage in the Tangut text is: Dpal Rgwa lo, Lama Zhang, Yarlungs pa.

<sup>28</sup> Considering the lack of reliable records, I am inclined to identify the author of the text “Sumpa Sangs rgyas” with the mysterious Sumpa lotsāwa (see Tubten Jinpa 2006, pp. 214–216, note 338). The text is listed in Kychanov, *Catalogue* #652, p. 579–580; number Tang 406, #823. “Distant” lineage: Śakyamuni, through Mañjuśrī, Āryadeva, Virūpa, Śukhamahāsiddhi, Mitripa, yoginī Klu las gyur pa, Kṛṣṇapada Senior, Kṛṣṇapada Junior (瓏瓏瓏鑣, 黑色小足, Kamalaśīla, which in this context represents Dampa Sangs rgyas, –1117), through lama \*Sumpa (*ljamja Supja* 瓏瓏 鑣鋒, \*松巴 who is probably identical with the author of the text) and several other personalities to lama Wusheng. In the “close” lineage Wusheng is a direct predecessor of the current holder of the lineage, “Head translator *Lü*” 瓏瓏鑣瓏. There is some confusion about the identity between Lama Sumpa of the text and the author of *Oral Transmission*: 鑣鋒衍甌 (i.e. Sumpa Sangs rgyas), i.e. Lama Sungpa 松巴. The part of the text discussed below is located on pp. 4–6 of the original Tangut text. The Chinese version of the text preserved in Khara-Khoto allows a more profound insight into the nature of transmission lineages in Xixia (see Sun Penghao 孫鵬浩 2012). The original of the text TK-329 is reproduced in *Ecang Heishui cheng wenxian* 俄藏黑水城文獻, vol. 5, pp. 116–120. According to the Tangut text, Kṛṣṇapada small/junior (黑色大小) received Vajravārāhī lineage from Mañjuśrī and dākinī who gave him the name of Kamalaśīla. The combined transmission lineage is as follows: Buddha (瓏瓏瓏瓏瓏瓏, 真實明滿, Sangs rgyas), Mañjuśrīsimha (*ma sjuu ne tschjii ka tsjij* “瓏瓏瓏瓏瓏瓏, 文殊演說師利), Āryadeva (*a jar tjij wa* “瓏瓏瓏瓏), Virūpa (*bjii jar wa* “瓏瓏瓏瓏), dākinī (mkha' 'gro ma, 空行母), Śukhamahāsiddhi (*su kjaa mja xa sji tji* 瓏瓏瓏瓏瓏瓏瓏瓏瓏瓏瓏瓏). Thus one should differentiate between Virūpa of the Khara-Khoto text and traditionally known Virūpa (see Davidson 2008, pp. 53–54) and Maitrīpa (*mjij tji rjir wa* 瓏瓏瓏瓏). These transcriptions are similar to the ones in “Sizi kongxing mu jiwen”.

The next is dākinī Luki (*lju kjii* 瓏瓏瓏瓏瓏瓏). The Chinese text mentions in her stead “dākinī Xima cang 悉麻倉” (Tib: \**Sems can*, there is a notation attached to her name in the Chinese text, but it is illegible on the available photograph). The Tangut version of the name can be translated as ‘transforming the body’, whereas the Chinese version is a transcription. Based on the Tangut version of the name, she can be identified as a yoginī Klu las gyur pa (‘Transformed from a nāga’, see Chökyi Nima 2009, p. 118, note 410). Finally from her the teaching reached Kṛṣṇapada (*tsɔ njaa rew r khwej* 瓏瓏瓏瓏瓏瓏, 黑色大足). According to the Tangut text, Kṛṣṇapāda (Nag po chen po) transmitted the doctrine further, to Kṛṣṇapada Junior (瓏瓏瓏瓏瓏瓏, 黑色小足, 征捺波攝斯, i.e.

mission, one is reluctant to identify this Skye med with Balpo Asu; a plausible identification is one between this master and famous Tangut translator Dehui. Other Tangut documents allow further identification between Dehui and the Imperial Preceptor Xuanmi (*Xuami dishi*, 玄密帝師).<sup>29</sup>

Rje nagpo zhabs [chung ba], reconstruction by Sun Bojun). Kṛṣṇapada's name is transcribed into Chinese as Nagchong 捺乙鐘 (according to the Tangut rules of transcription 乙 indicates final nasalised consonant -ng; see Hwang-chenng Gong 2005, p. 503). This person should be Nag chung, that is, historical Pha Dampa Sangs rgyas (*Dam pa rgya gar nag chung* 'Supreme Black One from India'; see www.tbrc.org/#!rid=P1243) and not Kṛṣṇapada-Kaṇha. However, both texts are certain in translating the name as 'Kṛṣṇapada Small', thus creating certain confusion: that is, Dampa Sangs rgyas would have transmitted to himself the teaching he already had as Kamalaśīla.

The teaching then went to *Ljamja tsjiw džji* 𐰇𐰢𐰏𐰤𐰏𐰤, \*Lama Chudi who corresponds to lama 辣麻周乙, \*Lama Zhong in the Chinese text. From him the teaching went to *Tsji sji tow tsjow xjir* 𐰇𐰢𐰏𐰤𐰏𐰤𐰏𐰤𐰏𐰤, who corresponds to Xiexi dangzhangchi 斜悉當章吃 of the Chinese text. "Oral Transmission" translates this name as Puzong 普宗. Finally, the transmission reached to lama Sumpa (whose name probably has to be modified with an -ng, due to the character *xing* 性 attached as a notation, reflecting Tangut rules of transcription). This probably is the author of the text, whose name in Chinese is given as Sanlijie zhangguang 散哩結章光 and translated as Zhengjue baochang 正覺寶昌. Sun Bojun connects 散哩結 with 正覺 (sangs rgyas, 'complete enlightenment'), and reads *xing* 性 literally, and thus arrives at a conclusion that the text implies "master Sangs rgyas from the Sumpa clan", as Chen Qingying once suggested (see Chen Qingying 2000).

I believe that this conclusion better applies to another character in the "close" lineage: "swe pja" 𐰇𐰢𐰏𐰤, direct predecessor of Skye med, especially as long as the Tangut text does not add anything to the name of Songpa. The first Tangut graph in "swe pja" 𐰇𐰢𐰏𐰤 renders Chinese "sun"; this makes him "Su[m]pa", i.e. 'from the Sumpa clan'. As far as Zhengjue baochang is concerned, I cannot suggest plausible identification. Through the mediation of this person the teaching came to Skye med, Xijianming 悉兼名 of the Chinese text, which is Xixia Chinese transcription of "Skye med". Sun Bojun has prepared a study of both Chinese and Tangut texts (see Sun Bojun 2014), where she goes into some detail concerning identification of the personages above; see also Sun Penghao (2012); above are my previous considerations which are close to Sun Bojun's, but deviate from her in some details, especially considering that her study is overly dependent on the Chinese text, rather than on the Tangut one.

In my understanding, the Tangut text is not very straightforward: that is, the graphs 𐰇𐰢 (*su*) and 𐰇𐰢 (*swe*) are phonetically distinct, but the chart in the text mentions these two persons directly after one another, which might be interpreted as an indication of their identity. Generally, Sun Bojun's identification of the *dākinī* Luki (especially a notation that "貿身" which Sun Bojun believes to be similar in meaning with the "*dākinī* Xima cang 悉麻倉"?) as well as several others should be corrected on the basis of the above.

<sup>29</sup> My identification is based on the interpretation of the verses contained in the "Laudation" (p. 330), which I understand as coinciding with some of Dehui's activities known otherwise; partially I follow Chen Qingying's observations in "Xixia Dasheng Xuanmi Dishu de shengping". The verses (also quoted in Sun Bojun 2014, pp. 71–109) in question include the following:

辭王化利夏國大臣民;  
僧俗求請奉金曼捺辣;  
受與耳傳四字亥母法;  
甚深無生師處我讚禮





This identification puts the author of both Tangut texts within the Rngog lineage of commentaries. This lineage in turn stemmed from Nāropa and Marpa, alternative to the Virūpa system. If this is the case, the origins of the Hevajra cycle in Xixia are also traceable to the *Bka' brgyud* rather than to the *Sakya* tradition, which is implied by the history of the Hevajra transmission in India. The tentative timeline for the transmission for this tradition could be established during the late 11th and mid-12th century (Sobisch 2008, pp. 46–48).

This does not mean that the clearly defined “*Bka' brgyud* school” ever existed in the Tangut Empire: in the texts known to me, the word *Karma pa* (*kja rja mja pjia* 𐰇𐰏𐰤𐰚𐰏𐰤) can be tentatively reconstructed only once in a fragment of a commentary to one of the “bodhicitta texts” (see below),<sup>32</sup> which does not allow us to establish its privileged position in Tangut Buddhism against other schools and lineages.

#### 4. Bodhicitta Texts

(The texts which probably relate to the “Awakening of Faith” category of the *Tian-sheng Law Code*)

1. “Bodhicaryāvatāra” (*Potjij kjirsij jij džji kha šjij dzjwa* 𐰇𐰏𐰤𐰚𐰏𐰤 𐰇𐰏𐰤𐰚𐰏𐰤 𐰇𐰏𐰤𐰚𐰏𐰤) by Śāntideva (fl. 8th century, *Šja tja thew wa* 𐰇𐰏𐰤𐰚𐰏𐰤 𐰇𐰏𐰤𐰚𐰏𐰤); another work by Śāntideva identified among Khara-Khoto findings is the *Śikṣāsamuccaya. Bodhicaryāvatāra* survived in two Tangut translations. One belongs to Huizhao (*Žjirswew* 𐰇𐰏𐰤𐰚𐰏𐰤; 慧照) from the “Saṃgharāma of the Great Deliverance of the People”; another translation was produced by the monk-official Zhengyuan (正源, *tšja xjow* 𐰇𐰏𐰤𐰚𐰏𐰤) by the imperial order. Huizhao’s version of *Bodhicaryāvatāra* is available in three fragments; two of these belong to woodblock edition, whereas one is a manuscript (*Cata-*

beyond my reach, whereas 8324 is a small fragment; the colophon reads: “Collected by Tripiṭaka kalyanamitra of Western Tibetan Madhyadeśa “*rjar-mji-lju-ko-ṇa-wa*”; 𐰇𐰏𐰤𐰚𐰏𐰤 𐰇𐰏𐰤𐰚𐰏𐰤 𐰇𐰏𐰤𐰚𐰏𐰤. Usage of character *šjoo* 𐰇𐰏𐰤 implies that the text was actually composed in Xixia by a Tibetan master whose name might be reconstructed as \*Ramlukongwa. Dan Martin suggested identification with Rams Klu-gong-ba, i.e. member of Rams clan from Klu-gong valley. This person is probably identifiable with Rams Btsan can, who was a holder of the Hevajra lineage of Rngog Chos rdor, one of the Marpa disciples (*Blue Annals* 2001, p. 228).

The text was translated by 𐰇𐰏𐰤𐰚𐰏𐰤 (番譯主, ‘head of Tangut translations’), *dge slong* (𐰇𐰏𐰤𐰚𐰏𐰤, 善起) Huizun 𐰇𐰏𐰤𐰚𐰏𐰤. Another text is #2877 (Tang 327, 2877, *Catalogue* #682, p. 589), which is a lengthy work with a title: 𐰇𐰏𐰤𐰚𐰏𐰤 𐰇𐰏𐰤𐰚𐰏𐰤 𐰇𐰏𐰤𐰚𐰏𐰤 𐰇𐰏𐰤𐰚𐰏𐰤 (tentative Tibetan title might be \**Kye'i rdo rje dang de bzhin gshegs dgu'i dkyil 'khor la bdag bskur rim pa*), which might be translated as ‘Ritual of consecration on the Hevajra maṇḍala of the Nine Buddhas’. This is a lengthy text of 73 pages devoted to the description and practice of Hevajra maṇḍala, mantras, root syllables, appearances of deities, etc. The author of this work is also Rams Klu-gong-ba.

<sup>32</sup> The text in question (#4691) is a commentary to *Byang chub kyi sems byed pa dang yidam blang pa'i choga* (see following discussion). This is a fragmented text written in cursive script; I suspect that the names *Bka' gdams* and *Sakya* are written next to the word *Karma pa*, but the issue is currently unresolved. The three Tangut characters can also read as the Tangut transcription of the Sanskrit “krama”.



The number of the texts on “bodhicitta” allows specifying them as an independent dimension of Tibetan Buddhism in Xixia. Monk translator Huizhao, who is responsible for the Tangut versions of many of these compositions, was also one of the main translators of Six Yogas texts and some of Vajravārāhī texts, which again suggests combined circulation of these traditions in the Tangut state.

So far, several paragraphs from the Tangut texts allow an insight into the nature of the doctrinal transmission in the Tangut Empire. A crucial paragraph dealing with the transmission of the doctrinal teachings in Xixia is found in the transmission records from the aforementioned *Ultimate Upadeśa of the Great Seal*.

[illegible]

This seventh root teacher, was from Balpo (Nepal), his secular name was Baro; he pursued the wisdom of “six syllables”; removed the cataract from the eye of “five wisdoms”; maintained “three groups of precepts” and drank the water of the “ten pure contemplations”. The *ḍākīnīs* from twenty-four places assembled together on his *bodhimanda*; the *maṇḍala* of the sixty-two Buddhas appeared before him and he received consecration; he attained “the four lords” and reached the stage of “warmth, head knot and patience”.<sup>39</sup> He explained “five characteristics” and made

<sup>37</sup> The difference in titles is one character 祿 in the title of the second text.

<sup>38</sup> In fact this composition is a better candidate for identification with *Bodhicittotpādasamādānavidhi* (*Byang chub kyi sems byed pa dang yidam blang pa'i choga*): Tangut 𐽖𐾀𐽕𐿅𐺄𐸔𐹍 is correct translation of Tibetan Byang chub kyi sems byed pa, using Tangut 𐽓𐻬 as nominaliser in the capacity of the Tibetan *byed pa*. The issue will be resolved after the versions are compared.

<sup>39</sup> The references in the paragraph can be reconstructed as follows: “ten contemplations (sa-mādhi, the term is based on the Chinese 定)” can be interpreted in a number ways; “dākīṇīs of the twenty-four places” indicate the goddesses of the twenty-four sacred locations in India; “sixty-two Buddhas” refer to Cakrasamvara mandala; “four lords” (based on the Tangut wording, Chinese 主受)



Among the compositions dealing with the overall exposition of the Buddhist doctrine, one should mention:

$$\left[ \begin{array}{c} \vdots \end{array} \right]$$
[illegible]
$$\left[ \begin{array}{c} \vdots \end{array} \right]$$

Acta Orient. Hung. 68, 2015

To say the main about the Lesser Vehicle; there are discriminations and ...;  
 There are many divisions in the evil teachings; generally there are five groups;  
 These are “harmonious speech”, “victorious discussion”, “without clothes”  
 and “valid cognition”;  
 If these five groups are collectively examined, two tenets of permanence and  
 nihilism...;  
 Out of these “harmonious speech” adheres to nihilism; other four are tīrthika  
 teachings of permanence;  
 Those who teach about adhering to the true substance are refuted through  
 explaining the basic mind...

Apart from the above, among the category of the doctrinal writings translated from Tibetan one should provisionally specify the following texts:

**b.** *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (*yiewlew zji sjoo jij lja lji* 綴續龍韶衍說藏). In Chinese the title would appear as 集所學之頌論, i.e. “Śastra [expounding] the verses from the Collection of what has to be learned”, i.e. \**Bslab pa kun las btus pa'i tshig le'i bstan bcos*, i.e. *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. This identification is on the basis of the title only, so the actual reading might prove this conclusion irrelevant. Yet another text titled 綴續龍韶衍 (yiewlew zji sjoo la) also qualifies for the Tangut version of *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (*Catalogue* #439, p. 507; Tang 494, #6464; *Catalogue* #636, p. 574, Tang 445, #4852).

**c.** *The Explication of the True Nature of the Middle Way* (*gu tsja yiej tsjii tshji šja* 髣藏蔭曉瓶藏). Currently a lengthy fragment of the first *juan* of the text was identified (Tang 169, ##889, 5035; *Catalogue* ##487, 488, p. 520).<sup>43</sup> The title of the composition can be analysed as follows: Tangut 髣藏 is reproduction of the Tibetan *dbu ma'i lam* or *dbu ma* (cf. Chinese *zhongdao* 中道); whereas 蔭曉 normally translates Sinitic *zhenxing* 真性. In case of translating Tibetan works (e.g. *Satyadvayāvatāra*) it renders *chos nyid* (*dharmatā*, cf. 法性) or *de kho na nyid* (*tattva* or *tathatā*). Tangut 瓶 (根) can be interpreted as ‘treatise’. Tangut 藏 normally translates a variety of terms meaning ‘explanation’ (e.g. *snang*, [*don*] ‘*grel*, etc.), used as generic term for commentarial literature. The text is arranged in a traditional commentarial scheme: major topics directly quoted from a yet unidentified source accompanied with a lengthy explanation section. The subject matter of the texts includes the relationship between “non-abiding” and “producing illusion” aspects of the “two truths”; identity and difference in “substance” (*kwər* 爾, *dnegos*) between *dharmatā* (*tsjiir tsjiir* 瓶曉, *chos nyid*) and *dharmin* (*tsjiir jij* 綴續, *chos can*); relevance, reliability and consequences of using “valid cognition” for the analysis of “conventions” (*mjiij da* 窺說, lit. ‘things and names’, i.e. *tha snyad*, *vyavahāra*) and other topics.<sup>44</sup> This allows locating the

<sup>43</sup> There is a possibility that the beginning of the scroll will be discovered among the unidentified fragments in St. Petersburg.

<sup>44</sup> The relationship between the Tangut and Tibetan terms in this paragraph is established on the basis of correspondences in the Tangut translation of *Satyadvayāvatāra*. The semantic field of Tangut terms is different from their Tibetan originals: e.g. Tib. *dnegos* (‘explicit’) is translated through

text within the circle of *svātantrika/prāsaṅgika* debates; however, any positive identification of the text has to be postponed until a full translation is completed.<sup>45</sup>

### Valid Cognition

By far, only one of the seven treatises by Dharmakīrti had been identified in the Khara-Khoto collection. However, the texts pertaining to the realm of valid cognition occupy substantial position in the Tangut Buddhist corpus.

**a.** The translation of the *Nyāyabinduprakarāṇa* (*Rigs pa'i thigs pa shes bya ba'i rab tu byed pa*) by Dharmakīrti. The Tangut title reveals that the translation was done from the Tibetan text: *Tshja wo gjiwr rjargjijjir* 𐰇𐰺𐰽𐰚𐰚𐰚𐰚 (i.e. 正理滴特殊造): although *Tshja wo gjiwr* 𐰇𐰺𐰽𐰚 is probably based on the Sinitic *zhengli di* 正理滴 ('drops of valid reasoning'), Tangut *rjar gjij jir* 𐰇𐰺𐰽𐰚 ('specially prepared') derives from the Tibetan *rab tu byed pa*.<sup>46</sup>

**b.** The title of the second text in this category reads *Tshja wo gjiwr jij gjwi wo dzju šja* 𐰇𐰺𐰽𐰚𐰚𐰚𐰚𐰚𐰚𐰚𐰚, which translates as "Elucidation of the Meanings of the Phrases of from *Nyāyabindu*" (Tang 231, ##861, 862, 863, and 5022).<sup>47</sup> Tangut colophon mentions *Žjirywie* 𐰇𐰺𐰽𐰚 (慧勢, 'Power of Wisdom'), "the Great Master from Tibetan Mādhyadeśa" as the "compiler" of the text, indicative that the above work is probably a native Tibetan text. Parts of the examined contents of the text allow it to be associated with the Candrakīrti's system.<sup>48</sup>

---

Tangut *kwər* 𐰇𐰺 which is based on the Sinitic *ti* 體 (meaning 'substance'), which in turn implies not "explicit" but "implicit" true reality concealed by the appearances. *Tha snyad* is translated into Tangut as *mjiid da* 𐰇𐰺𐰽𐰚, meaning 'names and things'.

<sup>45</sup> My provisional identification of *De kho na nyid snang ba zhes bya ba'i rab tu byed pa* by Kamalaśīla (*Peking Catalogue* 5288) has to be reconsidered.

<sup>46</sup> Text is available in two copies: Tang 233, #5609 is the final part of the third chapter of the text: "Gshan gyi don rjes su dpag" (Tangut: 𐰇𐰺𐰽𐰚𐰚𐰚𐰚; *Peking Catalogue* 5711); Tang 232, #4363 contains full text of the third chapter and part of the second chapter of Dharmakīrti's work: "Bdag gi don gyi rjes su dpag" (Tangut: 𐰇𐰺𐰽𐰚𐰚𐰚𐰚).

<sup>47</sup> Nishida's original identification was with *Peking Catalogue* 5732, i.e. *Rigs pa'i thigs pa'i don bsdus pa* (*Nyāya bindu piṇḍartha*) by Jinamitra, Śurendrabodhi and Yeshe sde. This identification is highly probable, since the name of the compiler in Tangut might be reconstructed as Yeshe sde. However, the Tangut 𐰇𐰺𐰽𐰚 (義顯) translates back into Tibetan as "don gsal" rather than "don bsdus (ārhasaṅgraha)". Tangut 𐰇𐰺 is a grammatical particle with nominalising meaning. Thus, additional research is needed for positive identification. Tangut 𐰇𐰺𐰽𐰚 translates Tib. *tshig* or *tshing le.u*, "sentence" or "chapter". That is, the identification has to be confirmed.

<sup>48</sup> The name of the compiler can be retranslated into Tibetan in a number of ways which impedes direct identification. The text actually includes phrases from a text which is reproduced in an abridged manner, and its subject matter is really concerned with the exposition of terms found in *Nyāyabindu prakaraṇa*. At least one paragraph containing criticism of Kamalaśīla was found in the text. For the moment any direct identification of this work is tentative.

*d.* A topical explanation of the *Nyāyabinduṣaṅkṣa* attached to the Tangut translation of the *Satyadvayāvātāra* (Tang 296), probably composed by Blo ldan shes rab.

(To be continued)

Abhayadatta (1979): *Buddha's Lions: The Lives of the Eighty Four Siddhas*. Transl. by J. Robinson. Berkeley, Dharma Publishing.

Arakawa, Shintaro 荒川慎太 (2014): *Seika bun Konggo kyō no kenkyū* 西夏文《金剛經》の研究. Tokyo, Shoukadoh.

*Blue Annals* (2001): 'Gos lo tsa ba gZhon nu dpal [Гой лотцава Шоннупэл]: *Голубые анналы* [The blue annals]. St. Petersburg, Eurasia Press.

Chen, Qingying 陳慶英 (2000): Xixia Dasheng Xuanmi Dishi de shengping 西夏大乘玄密帝師的生平. *Xizang Daxue Xuebao* 西藏大學學報 No. 3, pp. 6–14.

Chökyi Nima, Thukten Losang (2009): *The Crystal Mirror of Philosophical Systems: A Tibetan Study of Asian Religious Thought*. Somerville, Wisdom Publications.

*Dasheng Yaodao Miji* 大乘要道密集 (1983): Taibei, Micheng chubanshe.

Davidson, R. (2008): *Tibetan Renaissance: Tantric Buddhism in the Rebirth of Tibetan Culture*. Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass.

Dudjom Rinpoche (2008): *The Nyingma School of Tibetan Buddhism*, translated by Gyurmey Dorje and Matthew Kapstein. London, Wisdom Publications.

Acta Orient. Hung. 68, 2015



- Duff, Tony (2014): *The Illuminator: Tibetan English Encyclopedic Dictionary*. Padma Karpo Translation Committee.
- Dunnell, R. (2009): Translating History from Tangut Buddhist Texts. *Asia Major* Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 4–78.
- Dunzhu Fawang (H.H. Dudjom Rinpoche) 敦珠法王 (1997): Xu Xien 許錫恩, transl., *Jiucheng cidi lun ji* 九乘次第論集. Hong Kong, Vajrayāna Buddhism Association.
- Dunzhu Fawang (H.H. Dudjom Rinpoche)–Tan Xiyong 談錫–Shen Weirong 沈衛榮 (2012): *Ningma pai sibu zongyi shi* 寧瑪派四部宗義釋. Beijing, Zhongguo Zangxue.
- Hwang-cherng Gong 龔煌城 (2005): *Xixia yuwen wenzi yanjiu lunji* 西夏語文文字研究論集. Beijing, Minzu chubanshe.
- Iuchi Maho (2006): Bka' gdams pa Manuscripts Discovered at Khara-khoto in the Stein Collection. In: Dotson, B.–Schetter-Schaub, C. A.–Takeuchi, T. (eds): *Old and Classical Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the 11th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Konigswinter, 2006*. Halle, International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies.
- Iuchi Maho (2012): A Note on the Relationship between the Bka' gdams pa School and Mi nyag/Xixia. *Zangxue xuekan* 藏學學刊 No. 8, pp. 58–62.
- Iuchi Maho 井内真帆 (separate copy): Kara-Khoto shutsudo no Kadamu ha kankei shahon カラホト出土のカダム派關係寫本.
- Kano Kazuo (2008): Rngog Blo Ldan Shes rab's Topical Outline of *Ratnogotravibhāga* Discovered at Khara-Khoto. In: Almogi, Orna (ed.): *Contributions to Tibetan Buddhist Literature*. PIATS 2006. Halle/Salle, IITBS.
- Kapstein, M. (2000): *Tibetan Assimilation of Buddhism*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Kychanov, E. I. (1999): Кычанов, Е. И.: *Каталог тангутских буддийских памятников Института Востоковедения РАН* [Catalogue of Tangut Buddhist texts from the collection of the Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences]. Kyoto, University of Kyoto Press.
- Lü Cheng 呂澂 (n.y.): *Hanzang Fojiao guanxi yanjiu shiliao* 漢藏佛教關係研究史料. Sanche Publisher.
- Martin, D. (n.d.): TIBSKRIT – *TIBSKRIT PHILOLOGY*, compiled by Dan Martin, ed. by A. Cherniak. Separate copy.
- Martin, D. (2012): *The Works of Zhang Rinpoche*: Tables of Contents to the Collected Works (Bka'-'bum), Partial Works, (Bka' 'Thor-bu), and the Sealed Teachings (Bka'-rgya-ma) of Zhang G.yu-brag-pa Brtson-'grus-grags-pa (1123–1193). Jerusalem, separate copy.
- Masaaki Chikusa 竺沙雅章 (2000): *Sō Gen Bukkyō bunkashi kenkyū* 宋元佛教文化史研究. Tokyo, Kyūkosho.
- Mathes, K. D. (2006): Blending Sūtras with the Tantras: The Influence of Maitrīpa and his Circle on the Formation of Sūtra Mahāmudrā in Kagyu School. In: Davidson, R. M.–Wedemeyer, Ch. K. (eds): *Tibetan Literature and Praxis: Studies in its Formative Period, 900–1400 (Proceedings of the Tenth Seminar of the IATS, Oxford 2003, vol. 10/4)*. Leiden, Brill, pp. 201–227.
- Mathes, K. D. (2009): Maitrīpa's *Amanasikāradhāra* (A Justification of Becoming Mentally Disengaged). *Journal of Nepal Research Center* No. 13, pp. 5–32.
- Mimaki, Kazumi (1982): *Blo gsal grub mtha': Chapitres XI–XII*. Kyoto, Zinbun Kagaku kenkyūsyō.
- Nevskij, N. A. (1960): Невский, Н. А.: *Тангутская филология*. Moscow, GRVL.
- Nie Hongyin 聶鴻音 (2012): *Xixia wenxian lungao* 西夏文獻論稿. Shanghai, Shanghai guji.
- Nishida Tatsuo 西田龍雄 (1966): *Seika go no kenkyū* 西夏語の研究. Tokyo, The Zauho Press.

- Nishida Tatsuo 西田龍雄 (1975–1977): *Seika bun no Kego kyō* 西夏文華嚴經. Kyoto, University of Kyoto Press.
- Nishida Tatsuo 西田龍雄 (1999): *Seika go Buden mokuroku hensan jo no shomondai* 西夏語佛典目錄編纂上の諸問. In: Kychanov (1999), pp. xxxix–xl.
- Obermiller, E. (1933): *The Analysis of Abhisamayālaṃkāra*. London, Luzac & Co.
- Peking Catalogue*: Suzuki, Daisetz T. (ed.) (1961): *The Tibetan Tripitaka. Peking Edition kept in the Library of the Otani University, Kyoto*. Tokyo–Kyoto, Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute.
- Seyfort Ruegg, D. (2010): *The Buddhist Philosophy of the Middle*. Boston, Wisdom Publications.
- Shen Weirong 沈衛榮 (2006): Chonggou 11–14 shiji de Xiyu Fojiao shi – jiyu Ecang Heishuicheng Hanwen Fojiao wenshu de tantao 重構 11–14 世紀的西域佛教史 – 基於俄藏黑水城漢文佛教文書的探討. *Lishi yanjiu* 歷史研究 No. 5, pp. 23–24.
- Shen Weirong 沈衛榮 (ed.) (2012): *Hanzang Foxue yanjiu: wenben, renwu tuxiang he lishi* 漢藏佛學研究: 文本, 人物, 圖像和歷史. Beijing, Zangxue chubanshe.
- Shen Weirong 沈衛榮 (2013): Wenben duikan yu lishi jiangou: Zangchuan Fojiao yu xiyu he zhongyuan chuanbo lishi yanjiu daolun 文本對勘與歷史建構: 藏傳佛教與於西域和中原傳播歷史研究導論. *Wenshi* 文史 No. 4, pp. 43–93.
- Shi Jinbo 史金波 (1988): *Xixia Fojiao shi lue* 西夏佛教史略. Yinchuan, Ningxia renmin.
- Sobisch, Jan Ulrich (2008): *Hevajra and Lam 'bras Literature of India and Tibet as Seen through the Eyes of A-mes-zhabs*. Wiesbaden, Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Solonin, K. (2009): Mahāmudrā Texts in the Tangut Buddhism and the Doctrine of No-thought. *Xiyu Lishi yuyan xue yanjiu jikan* 西域歷史語言研究集刊, No. 2.
- Solonin, K. (2012): The Teaching of Daoshen in Tangut Translation: The Mirror of Mind. In: Gimello, R. – Girard, Fr. – Hamar, I. (eds): *Avatamsaka Buddhism in East Asia: Huayan, Kego, Flower Ornament Buddhism. Origins and Adaptation of a Visual Culture*. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, pp. 137–187.
- Solonin, K. (2013a): Buddhist Connections between the Liao and Xixia: Preliminary Considerations. *Journal of Song-Yuan Studies* No. 43, pp. 171–219.
- Solonin, K. (2013b): The “Prefect Teaching” and Liao Sources of Tangut Chan Buddhism: A Study of *Jiexing Zhaoxin tu*. *Asia Major* Vol. 26, No. 1, pp. 79–125.
- Solonin, K. (2014): Chan Contemplation in the Tangut Buddhism. *Fudan Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences* Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 203–245.
- Sperling, E. (1994): Rtsa-mi lo-tsā-ba Sangs-rgyas grags-pa and the Tangut Background to Early Tibetan–Mongol Relations. In: Kvaerne, P. (ed.): *Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the 6th Seminar of the IATS*. Oslo, The Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture, vol. 2, pp. 801–821.
- Sperling, E. (2005): Further Remarks apropos of the ‘Ba’ rom pa and Tanguts. *AOH* Vol. 57, No. 1, pp. 1–26.
- Sun Bojun 孫伯君 (2010): *Xixia xinyi fojing tuoluoni de duiyin yanjiu* 西夏新譯佛經陀羅尼的對音研究. Beijing, Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe.
- Sun Bojun 孫伯君 (2014): *Xixia yicun wenxian suojian Zangchuan Fojiao de chuancheng tixi* 西夏遺存文獻所見藏傳佛教的傳承體系. *Zhonghua Wenshi xincong* No. 3, pp. 72–109.
- Sun Bojun 孫伯君 (unpublished): *Xixia wen Haimu erzhan ji kaoshi* 西夏文《亥母耳傳記》考釋 (separate copy).
- Sun Bojun 孫伯君 (forthcoming): *Fa shizi Guoshi kao* 西夏國師法獅子考. Forthcoming in *Zhongguo Zangxue* 中國藏學.

- Sun Penghao 孫鵬浩 (2012): Dampa Sangs rgyas de Xixia Hanwen mijiao si pian 帕當巴桑杰的西夏漢文密教四篇. In: Shen Weirong (ed.): *Wenben yu Lishi* 文本中的歷史. Beijing, Zhongguo Zangxue chubanshe.
- Suoluoning 索羅寧 (2012): Yixing Huijue jiqi *Dafangguang Fo Huayan jing haiyin daochang shizhong xingyuan changpian lichan yi* 一行慧覺及其《大方廣佛華嚴經海印道場十重行願常徧禮懺儀》 *Taida Foxue yanjiu* 台大佛學研究 No. 23, pp. 1–78.
- Suoluoning 索羅寧 (2013a): Xixia wen Da shouyin wenxian zakao 西夏文大手印文獻雜考. In: Shen Weirong (2013), pp. 235–267.
- Suoluoning 索羅寧 (2013b): Xixia Fojiao zhi xitong xing chutan 西夏佛教之系統性初探. *Shijie Zongjiao yanjiu* 世界宗教研究 No. 1, pp. 22–39.
- Tachikawa, Musashi 立川武藏 (1987): *Sezo Bukkyō shūgi kenkyū*. Vol. 5: Thu.u bkwan grub mtha' bka' brgyud pa'i skabs 西藏佛教宗義研究. Tokyo, Toyo Bunko.
- Tāranātha (1983): *Seven Instruction Lineages*. Transl. by D. Templeman. Dharamsala, Library of Tibetan Works and Archives.
- Tāranātha (2004): *History of Buddhism in India*. Transl. by Lama Chimpa and Alaka Chattopadhyaya. Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass.
- Tatz, M. (1987): The Life of the Siddha Philosopher Maitrīgupta. *JAOS* Vol. 107, No. 4, pp. 695–701.
- Tatz, M. (1988): Maitrīpa and Atiśa. *Tibetan Studies* Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 477–478.
- Tubten Jinpa (tr.) (2006): *Mind Training: The Great Collection*. Trans. by Tubten Jinpa. Somerville, Wisdom Publications.
- Tuguan Losang jieji nima 土觀羅桑羅桑卻吉尼 (1999): Thu.u bkwan Lobsang Chos kyi Nyima, Liu Liqian 劉立千 (transl.) *Tuguan zongpai yuanliu* 土觀宗派源流 Grub mtha' shel gyi melong. Xizang, Xizang minzu chubanshe. – Chinese translation of Chökyi Nima (2009).
- van der Kuip, L. (1993): Jayānanda. A Twelfth Century Guoshi from Kashmir among the Tangut. *CAJ* Vol. 37, pp. 188–197.
- Vose, K. (2010): *Resurrecting Candrakīrti: Disputes in the Tibetan Creation of Prāsaṅgika*. Boston, Wisdom Publications.
- Walter, M. (2009): *Buddhism and Empire: Politics and Religious Culture in Early Tibet*. Leiden, Brill.
- Wang Song 王頌 (2008): *Songdai Huayan sixiang yanjiu* 宋代華嚴思想研究. Beijing, Zongjiao wenhua chubanshe.
- Wei Wen 魏文 (2013): *Zuishang le ji benxu xianshi ji yichuan yualiu kao* 最上樂集本續顯釋記譯傳源流考. In: Shen Weirong 沈衛榮 (2012).
- Zhiguanba Gongjieshu danba raoji 智觀巴貢劫乎丹巴繞吉 (1989): *Anduo Zhengjiao shi* 安多政教史. Transl. by Wu Jun 吳均 – Mao Xuzu 毛續祖 – Ma Shilin 馬世林. Lanzhou, Gansu renmin chubanshe.