6 Translation vs. adaptation

The Tangut collection of the British Library includes an incomplete manuscript of a Tangut version of the General’s Garden, a Chinese military strategy text ostensibly written by the great strategist Zhuge Liang 諸葛亮 (181–234).623 Scholars since the Qing dynasty have repeatedly called into question the authenticity of the Chinese text, and since none of its known editions precede the late Ming dynasty, it has generally been treated as a forgery. As a result, the work has been largely neglected in the philological tradition. The discovery of a Tangut translation, however, made it clear that the text existed as far back as the 12th century and was considered important enough to be included among the works translated by the Tanguts. This chapter examines this manuscript in an attempt to shed light on the relationship of the translation with the Chinese original. My main concern is how closely the translator followed the Chinese text and whether he took any liberties in adapting it for a Tangut readership. In this connection I am also interested whether the discrepancies between the translation and the Chinese text are due to the translator having used a different edition from those that are available today or he knowingly introduced some changes that reflect his specific point of view, in which case I would like to reconstruct that point of view.

The manuscript in question is part of the Stein collection of the British Library, known under the pressmark Or.12380/1840. It was first studied in 1962 by Eric Grinstead, Assistant Keeper in charge of the Chinese collections at the British Museum, where the Tangut collection was kept at that time. He published a short notice in the British Museum Quarterly, pointing out that this was the first non-Buddhist manuscript identified in the collection.624 The timing of Grinstead’s work on this text is of interest itself, as his notice came out shortly after the 1960 publication of Nevsky’s posthumous works which marked the beginning of a new stage of Tangut studies not only in Russia but also in China and Japan. Nevsky’s works also generated an interest among scholars in Britain, most notably Gerard Clauson and Grinstead. Nevsky’s dictionary was admittedly one of the key tools
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623 As far as I can tell, the English title General’s Garden is Eric Grinstead’s translation. A more accurate rendition of Jiangyuan would be General’s Grove, which is also corroborated by the Tangut title. Yet because the text has been known under this title in English scholarship, I will continue to use it to refer to the Tangut version as a way to differentiate it from the Chinese versions. 624 Grinstead 1962, 35. In a publication a year earlier Grinstead (1961) had already identified several non-Buddhist texts, including pages of a printed edition of the Tangut Sunzi.
that enabled Grinstead to commence work on the identification of Tangut fragments at the British Museum. No doubt Clauson himself, and his unpublished *Skeleton Dictionary of Tangut*, were also important resources.

In his notice about the *General’s Garden*, Grinstead made a number of useful observations with regard to the Tangut text in comparison with its Chinese original, and published a photograph of the final portion of the manuscript. The image showed eleven lines of the manuscript, including the end title, which was, of course, crucial for the identification of the text. Showing his ability to read Tangut, he added Chinese characters next to the Tangut ones, leaving out very few which he apparently was unable to decipher (Fig. 16). Almost forty years later, following a visit to the British Library, Ksenia Kepping did a more detailed analysis of this manuscript and came to the conclusion that the Tangut version was not a word-for-word translation but rather an adaptation composed for Tangut readers.\(^625\) As part of her study, she also identified an indigenous Tangut nomenclature for neighbouring peoples based on the four cardinal directions, although this was not based on this particular manuscript.

![Fig. 16: The last portion of the *General’s Garden* with Grinstead’s Chinese transcriptions.\(^626\) The Chinese characters next to the Tangut are Grinstead’s reading of the text.](image)
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625 Kepping and Gong 2003, 23.
626 Grinstead 1962.
More recently, black and white images of the manuscript were published, enabling scholars to study the manuscript without having to travel to London. Unfortunately the quality of the publication was far from perfect and only allowed a basic reading of the manuscript. Among the features not visible on the reproductions were the red dots that appear next to some characters, the significance of which will be addressed, although not solved, in this chapter. Another detail that could not be properly seen in the published images was the physical boundaries of the original manuscript. While the edges were mostly clear at the bottom part of the manuscript, the edges sometimes disappeared and one was left guessing where they were. At the top part of the manuscript they were mostly invisible and there was no indication whatsoever about the margins. Moreover, the manuscript was presented as not having any backing paper which was certainly not the case by the time the photographs were made. It seems that the editors regarded the backing an intervention that should not be part of the original item and made a deliberate effort to present the manuscript this way. Accordingly, the viewer had no way of knowing how much of the manuscript was missing and where some of its boundaries were. These types of problems were effectively solved when IDP digitised the manuscript and made high quality images accessible through its website.628

Despite the availability of images, the manuscript generated little attention from Tangut specialists, perhaps because they believed that the studies of Grinstead and especially Kepping have treated it adequately and there was not much left to do with it. The manuscript, however, has a lot more to offer. Despite being incomplete, because of the parallel structure of the sentences and phrases, it is possible to reconstruct a larger portion of the text than we currently have. There are also features such as the red dots which may shed additional light on the circumstances of its production and use. Most importantly, its relationship and fidelity to the Chinese original may provide insights into how Chinese texts were translated and what Tangut readership appreciated in them.

---

628 <http://idp.bl.uk/database/oo_scroll_h.a4d?uid=3195930612;recnum=27171;index=3>
6.1 The Chinese text

The Jiangyuan is traditionally attributed to Zhuge Liang, a statesman and strategist of the 3rd century, whose name was immortalised for the general public in the 14th-century novel Sanguo yanyi 三国演義, known in English as Romance of the Three Kingdoms. Zhuge Liang is particularly known for his uncommon intelligence and strategic abilities, which he used to outmanoeuvre his enemies and achieve victory. Although historically he was not always successful in battle, he became an iconic figure symbolising military wisdom. His literary skills played an important role in developing the romantic notion of him as someone who had equal facility with the pen and the sword. While the biography of Zhuge Liang in the 3rd-century official history Sanguo zhi 三國志 includes a list of the works he authored, the Jiangyuan is not among them.

These circumstances have led scholars to the conclusion that the Jiangyuan, also known as Xinshu 心書 (Book of Heart) or Xinshu 新書 (New Book), was a relatively late forgery. The extensive borrowings from other texts on military strategy that appear in this work have also been taken as an indication that the work was collated from other texts with the intent to forge a treatise that could be attributed to Zhuge Liang. The label of forgery in itself was enough to diminish the book’s value and to exclude it from serious scholarly enquiry.

One of the main sources on textual forgeries is Zhang Xincheng’s 張心澄 Weishu tongkao 僞書通考, a study published in 1939 but rooted in the evidential scholarship of the Qing period. It has been called “the most convenient summary of the many aspects and degrees of forgery, misrepresentation and misattribution found in 1,105 titles.” Although archaeological discoveries and recent scholarship have since proven that quite a few texts Zhang Xincheng had considered forgeries were in fact authentic works long pre-dating the time of their alleged forging, the book remains a basic source for locating information related to the authenticity of texts scattered in traditional sources. For the Xinshu, it records the arguments of former scholars, starting with that of the Qing dynasty scholar Yao Jiheng 姚際恆 (1647–1715), who in his Gujin weishu kao 古今偽書考...
briefly stated that even though the *Xinshu* was attributed to Zhuge Liang, it was in fact a forgery.\(^{633}\)

The editors of the monumental *Siku quanshu zongmu tiyao* 四庫全書總目提要, which was completed in 1781, wrote the following assessment of the *Xinshu* (Book of Heart):\(^{634}\)

*Xinshu* 心書, in one juan
A copy selected and submitted by the Governor of Shaanxi 陝西.
Old versions attribute this work to Zhuge Liang. The entire book discusses the ways in which the general should deploy his troops. In Tao Zongyi's 陶宗儀 (?–1396) *Shuofu* 說郛, this text is called *Xinshu* 新書 (New Book). The title was first changed to *Xinshu* (Book of Heart) when Liu Rang 劉讓 of Guanxi 關西 carved it onto woodblocks during the Hongzhi 宏治 reign (1487–1505). He also added the two “Expedition memorials” (chushi biao 出師表) to it. Then during the Jiajing 嘉靖 reign (1521–1567) Zhang Rui 張鉉 of Kui 夔 reprinted it, adding the “Kuimentu” 夔門圖 and keeping Liu Rang’s preface. Later on, the presented scholar (jinshi 進士) Kou Wei 寇韋 from Yunyangxiang 鄖陽鄉 wrote a short postface. They all thought that this was a genuine work written by Zhuge Liang. But examination reveals that most of the fifty sections are appropriated from the *Sunzi* 孫子, to which circuitous and vulgar words are added. It is utterly unworthy to mention it [as a genuine work]! It seems that it was fabricated by an ignorant person and came into being later than the *Jiangyuan*.

Clearly, the editors reveal a markedly negative opinion regarding the literary quality of the *Xinshu*, stating not only that it was forged but also that it was “fabricated by an ignorant person.” But more importantly, they also provide a history of the editions of the work. Thus they claim that initially, in the *Shuofu* it was still called *Xinshu* (New Book), whereas since its Ming woodblock editions the first character in the title was changed from *xin* 新 (“new”) to *xin* 心 (“heart”). It is also apparent that the editors thought that this work was different from the *Jiangyuan*, on which they wrote the following entry:\(^{635}\)

*Jiangyuan*, in one juan
A copy from the Tianyige 天一閣 library of Fan Maozhu's 范懋柱 (1718–1788) family in Zhejiang 浙江.

Old editions of this text claim that it is the work of Zhuge Liang. Formerly, under the Ming it had a preface by assistant censor-in-chief Ning Zhongsheng 宁仲升, saying that it used to be part of the collection of the scholar Zhou Yuan 周源. An examination of this book reveals that it has not been recorded by cataloguers and appears for the first time in You Mao’s 尤袤 catalogue (1127–1194) *Suichutang shumu* 遂初堂書目, also as a work of Zhuge Liang. It
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633 Yao 1933, 43.
634 *Siku quanshu zongmu tiyao* 100, 2049.
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seems to be a forgery from later times. Moreover, the Jingji zhi 經籍志 catalogue written by Jiao Hong 焦竑 (1540–1620) of the Ming dynasty also contains Zhuge Liang’s books such as the Xinshu 心書 (Book of Heart), Liujun jing 六軍鏡, Xinjue 心訣 and Bingji fa 兵機法, all attributed to Zhuge Liang. It seems that starting from the Song dynasty many books on military strategy were attributed to Zhuge Liang, just as from the Ming dynasty many books on magic arts (shushu 術數) were ascribed to Liu Ji 劉基 (1311–1375). These works are discussed on the streets and marketplace, and there is absolutely no need to subject them to a thorough analysis.

Unfortunately, it is unclear what the difference between the Xinshu and Jiangyuan the editors of the Siku quanshu tiyao saw was but it is obvious that these were two different works. Yet in later periods it seems that Xinshu and Jiangyuan were merely two titles of the same work. The discovery of a Tangut translation of the work with the title The General’s Garden corroborates this and at the same time confirms that a title that corresponds to the Chinese Jiangyuan was already in use during the Song period. But what is apparent in the description of these two allegedly different works is that once deemed to be forgeries, they were immediately pushed aside as unworthy of scholarly attention. This implies that part of their criteria for evaluating books was the authentication of authorship, and if a work was not produced by an eminent figure, it had little value.

The editors of the Siku quanshu tiyao were able to trace the Xinshu to the Shuofu, Tao Zongyi’s monumental encyclopaedia. The first printed edition of the Xinshu was done during the Hongzhi reign (1487–1505) and the second, during the Jiajing reign (1522–1567). Even though no copy of the first edition survives, Liu Rang’s preface was transmitted and it allows us to date the first edition to 1489. It seems that before that date the work was transmitted exclusively in handwritten form. Today the earliest surviving edition is a little booklet printed with movable type in 1517, that is, before the alleged second edition. Apparently, the editors of the Siku quanshu tiyao had no knowledge of this book, or for some reason they only counted woodblock-printed editions. The Jiajing edition they refer to as second, must be the one printed in 1564, which indeed preserves Liu Rang’s preface, although this edition was published not by Zhang Rui but Lan Zhang 藍章 (1453–1526). Thus it seems that the compilers of the Siku quanshu tiyao were not entirely accurate in tracing the history of editions for the Xinshu, perhaps because they deemed it unimportant in the first place.
Extant Ming versions of the *Xinshu* I was able to examine in person or through facsimile and digital reproductions are limited to the following items: 636

(i) 1517 print by Han Xifang 韓袭芳

This is a small booklet printed with moveable type, bearing the title *Zhuge Kongming Xinshu* 諸葛孔明心書. The only known copy is currently kept in the Rare Books Department of the Shanghai Library and it has never been reproduced and thus can only be examined in the library. 637 The book is dated to the 12th year of the Zhengde 正德 reign, that is, 1517. The pages are very small, with only 7 lines per half-page and 14 characters per line. A publisher’s colophon immediately after the title line states that it was “printed with copper plates by Han Xifang of Qiongtai, instructor at the Qingyuan school in Zhejiang” 浙江慶元學教諭瓊臺韓襲芳銅版印行. The book is punctuated with black and red circles, which seem to have been put there by different people at different times, as they are often placed next to each other, marking the same divisions. In addition, there are also red vertical “underlines” used for emphasis, as well as red dots and red notes on the top margin of nearly every page. 638 Presumably, the red marks and notes were all done by the same person in the course of using the text. The characters appear crude and give the impression that little attention was paid to producing an aesthetically pleasing design. The same is also true for the page layout, as the ruling is uneven and so are the lines. In all likelihood, the principal aim of the publication was to market it for a wider readership while keeping the costs down.

The publisher Han Xifang was a native of Wenchang county 文昌縣 on Hai-nan 海南 island. At one point, he had served as assistant instructor (xundao 訓導) in Ningdu 宁都, Jiangxi. 639 Since the *Xinshu* he published is a relatively early example of printing with copper types, the publisher has some significance from the point of view of the history of printing. Yet very little is known of him or his

636 The *Zhongguo bingshu tonglan* 中國兵書通覽 (*Xu* 2002, 458) lists a fragmentary copy from 1516 (明正德丙子[1516]年刊本 題武侯心書) in the Library of the Chinese Military Academy but I have not been able to verify this copy.

637 In his book in Chinese printing, Zhang Xiumin (2009, 337) reproduces three pages in color, one with the beginning of the main text and two facing ones with Han Xifang’s preface.

638 There are also occasional corrections, such as changing the printed character 邀 to 邊, an obvious graphic error in the print. In this case the character is corrected in red ink and then, perhaps by a different person, also written on the side in black ink.

639 Shen 2006, 193.
involved in typography. He has included, however, a short preface at the beginning of the book which reads as follows: 640

The Zhuge Wuhou xinshu 諸葛武侯心書 consists of a total of fifty sections (pian 篇). It has a preface at the beginning by Master Zeng 曾公, director of the Directorate for Palace Delicacies, and a postface at the end by Master Shang 商公 of Chun’an 淳安. 641 These two notes already tell the whole story of the book from beginning to the end, what else could I say? In the past, I have served in Ningdu 宁都 in Jiangyou 江右 (i.e. Jiangxi) and this book was very helpful in planning against the contingencies associated with unrest caused by bandits; I greatly benefitted from it. Thus I am re-printing it using printing blocks with moveable sets (yong huotao shuban fanyin 用活套書板翻印), in order to make it available for those who have martial aspirations so that they would be mindful of danger even in peaceful times.

Written at the Zhedong studio 浙東書舍 by Han Xitang, native of Qiong 瓊, on an auspicious day of the 4th month, in the summer of dingchou 丁丑 year, the 12th year of the Zhengde reign (1517).

This short note claims that the true reason for printing the book is because it has been helpful for fighting bandits (koubian 寇變). Not a word is mentioned about the scholarly pedigree of the work or any of the doubts associated with it. Neither is Zhuge Liang evoked as the authority who would provide a convenient selling point for the booklet. Instead, the publisher makes the salient point that the book has proven its worth in combat situations, and this better than anything determines its practical value. By printing it the publisher essentially claims that he is doing a service to society, rather than engaging in a profit-seeking enterprise.

(ii) 1564 edition of Lan Zhang

This is a woodblock printed edition with the title Zhuge Kongming Xinshu 諸葛孔明心書. 642 The book was printed by Shan Kui 單葵 in the 43rd year of the Jiajing 嘉靖 reign (1564). Although the compilation of the book is attributed to Lan Zhang, the actual printing was done long after Lan Zhang’s death, which occurred in 1526. 643 In addition, it also reproduces a preface by Liu Rang from the 3rd year of

640 For the text of the two prefaces, see Shen 1996, 59–60.
641 Master Shang of Chun’an refers to Shang Lu 商_LOOP_ (1414–1486), a native of Chun’an, Zhejiang who had served as senior grand secretary in 1475–1477.
642 A facsimile edition on the basis of the copy kept at the National Central Library in Taipei has been included in the facsimile series Zhongguo zixue mingzhu jicheng 中國子學名著集成 (072).
643 I am in fact uncertain where the date 1564 (Jiajing 43) and the name of Lan Zhang come from. This information is included in the catalogue of the National Central Library in Taiwan and
the Hongzhi 弘治 reign (1489), plus a number of shorter texts attributed to Zhuge Liang. The book closes with a postface written by the scholar Kou Wei 寇韋 and dated to 1538.

Lan Zhang in this edition not only reproduced the text of the Xinshu but assembled a small collection of material related to Zhuge Liang. This enlarged edition was bound in two volumes (ce 冊) and undoubtedly represented a significant improvement over the previous ones. Yet the additional material also had the effect of reinforcing the connection between the text and the historical figure of Zhuge Liang, which had already been pointed out in the prefaces to the previous editions. For we must remember that the text itself does not refer to Zhuge Liang at all and it was only the title (which, as we have seen, was relatively unstable) that made the connection between the text and its alleged author, not counting the publishers’ prefaces.

Liu Rang’s preface confirms that the Xinshu appeared in print already in 1489, which very well may have been the first printed edition, as asserted by editors of the Siku quanshu tiyao in their overview of the book’s history. The preface primarily focuses on Zhuge Liang himself, pointing out that he was a “rare talent in the aid of a ruler” (wang zuocai 王佐才) and that he was absolutely exceptional in this respect. Liu Rang also asserted, quite in contrast with the disdainful assessment of the editors of the Siku quanshu tiyao, that the Xinshu:

[...]

Thus Liu Rang raised no doubts about the authenticity of the book and considered it a genuine work by Zhuge Liang, asserting a conviction that it should be disseminated as widely as possible. This woodblock-print edition had a number of features that imply that it was intended for a general audience rather than an elite readership. These include errors in the section titles and their numbers, as
well as the inconsistency in writing the same characters in both standard and non-standard forms.

(iii) 1572 Korean edition

There is also a Korean edition of Zhuge Liang’s work titled *Ch’ok sŭngsang Chegal Yang munjip* 蜀丞相諸葛亮文集. A copy is currently kept in the Asami collection of Korean books at the University of California, Berkeley. A note at the end records that “Engraving started at Kugansa 國安寺 in the fourth moon of insin 壬申, the sixth year of Yunggyŏng 隆慶, by chief solicitor Priest Sinin 信仁; engravers Kim Ōn 金彥 and Po Ok 寶玉.” Obviously, this printed edition attests to the wide circulation of the book in Korea, where its popularity was related to the local conditions. There are no other titles besides that of the entire book, which claims to be a collection (*munjip* 文集, Ch. *wenji*). Even so, it essentially consists of the 50 sections of the untitled *Xinshu* with 26 additional sections from works attributed to Zhuge Liang, similarly untitled. The only titles are those of the sections, thus there seems to have been an effort to amalgamate different works into a single collection. This arrangement is very similar to a Japanese seven-juan edition titled *Shokatsu Kōmei iden hyōhō chūkai hyōrin* 諸葛孔明異傳兵法註解評林 from 1709, which includes a preface dated to 1598 by the Chinese scholar Zhang Ying 章嬰, a native of Linchuan 臨川. Accordingly, similar compilations integrating a number of texts associated with Zhuge Liang without specifying their original title were popular in the 16th–18th centuries not only in Korea but also in China and Japan.

(iv) 1637 edition of Shan Xun 單恂

This a woodblock-printed book that claims to have been published by Shan Xun (1602–1671) of Huating 華亭 during the last years of the Ming dynasty, in the 11th year of the Chongzhen 崇禎 reign (1637). It is probably no coincidence that the surname of Shan Xun matches that of Shan Kui, who printed the Lan Zhang edition of the book. Considering the rarity of the surname and that both of them are involved in printing the same book, albeit 73 years apart, imply that the two publishers were related and that the business of printing ran in the family. There are 9 lines per page and 20 characters per line. The name of the Jingming studio 淨名
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644 This edition is described in the collection’s catalogue (Fang 1969, 354).
645 Translation from Fang’s catalogue (*ibid.*).
646 On the changes of Zhuge Liang’s perception in Korea, see Mueller-Lee 2007.
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齋 appears at the left bottom margin of every page. The book comprises two juan and an appendix, and contains the works of Zhuge Liang collectively called Zhuge Zhongwuhou ji 諸葛忠武侯集. In this manner the Xinshu is only part of the many different writings in the collection, which essentially follows the example of the Lan Zhang edition where the core text of the Xinshu was augmented with an array of related material. But while Lan Zhang grouped this material around the Xinshu, which also became the title of the whole book, in the Shan Xun edition the focus is not on this particular text but on the author, aiming at producing a collected edition of Zhuge Liang’s writings.

The text of the Xinshu in this volume is annotated with small interlinear characters written in two lines, a format customarily used for commentaries in Chinese books. The commentary makes sporadic references to other editions, revealing the amount of editing work that went into producing this collection. Thus oddly the title of Section 1 is “Jiangyuan” 將苑 (matching the title of the text in some editions) and the commentary mentions that in another version it is called “Bingji” 兵機.

This is how far surviving editions and prefaxes enable us to trace the text of the Jiangyuan. The text, however, was also included in Tao Zongyi’s Shuofu, a large collection of texts with a preface dating to 1370. Unfortunately, this does not allow us to trace back our text any further because surviving copies of the Shuofu date from the 16th century. Considering the complex textual history of the Shuofu, we cannot be sure that our text (called Xinshu [New Book] in surviving copies of the collection) was part of it at all. In any case, the Ming editions and their prefaxes show that the text was in circulation in the 15th century. The discovery of a Tangut translation of the Jiangyuan confirms that it already existed in the Song period. This naturally cannot prove that Zhuge Liang is the real author but it pushes back the trail of evidence by an additional three centuries. Moreover, it corroborates that in the Song period the book was already known by the title Jiangyuan, which is most likely the source of the Tangut title Gja bju rejre tśhji (將軍森林本 Book of the General’s Forest).

In addition, there is fragmentary evidence that the Jiangyuan was part of the Yongle dadian 永樂大典 encyclopaedia compiled during the Yongle period (1403–1424). The surviving part contains several fragments, plus the title which is mentioned as Zhuge Wuhou Jiangyuan 諸葛武侯將苑 (The General’s Garden of Martial Lord Zhuge). This attests that the title Jiangyuan was also used for the
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647 For an extensive bibliographic study of the complex system of the Shuofu in a western language, see Pelliot 1924.
648 Yongle dadian (canjuan) 永樂大典 (殘卷), juan 18207.
Chinese version in the early 15th century, plus that its composition was ascribed to Zhuge Liang. Surprisingly, all of the fragments in the Yongle dadian come from Section 5 of the received text and, when put together, make up the entire section. In view of this strange pattern of survival, it would be unwise to make far-reaching assumptions about the entire text.

Additional information for the dating of the text may come from the assessment of the image of Zhuge Liang during the Tang and Song periods. According to Hoyt Tillman, despite his universal popularity in later periods, during the Tang “Zhuge Liang was not yet as legendary a figure as generally assumed by later generations.” It seems that it was during the Song that he became a celebrated hero and master strategist. Considering that the Jiangyuan was compiled long after Zhuge Liang’s time, it is highly unlikely that it would have been ascribed to him before his image evolved into that of having nearly supernatural powers in military strategy. In contrast, it is only to be expected that a work like the Jiangyuan would have been attributed to someone who was believed to be a master strategist. The Song period, when we begin to witness the development of the popular cult of Zhuge Liang, remarkably coincides with the appearance of the work’s title in book catalogues. It is then perhaps not unreasonable to suppose that the Jiangyuan was composed and ascribed to Zhuge Liang sometime during the Northern Song period, which is also the time when the text reached the Tanguts.

In terms of its structure, the Chinese Jiangyuan consists of 50 short sections, almost all of them headed by a two-character title. In most editions the titles also include the section number, although this is not always the case. Each section talks about a specific strategic principle, such as employing the right people, taking into consideration the features of the terrain, awarding or punishing those who deserve it, etc. In general, the Jiangyuan is written from the point of view of the general, giving advice with regard to matters of leadership. The last four sections deal with the four types of barbarians, describing their characteristics and the way to fight them. When the Tangut text was identified, it became immediately clear that the sequence and numbering of sections of the Chinese text does not match those of the Tangut translation. Based on her reading of the Tangut text, Kepping prepared a table of correspondences between the Chinese and Tangut versions. For the sake of convenience, I shall use the Chinese section num-
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649 Tillman 2002a, 309; see also Henry 1992.
650 Kepping and Gong 2003, 18.
bers to identify sections. Whenever there is a need to differentiate between Chinese and Tangut sections, I will mark the Chinese ones with the capital letter C (e.g. C1, C2...), and the Tangut ones with the capital letter T (e.g. T1, T2...).

6.2 The Tangut manuscript

The Tangut manuscript of the General’s Garden is glued together from four sheets of paper into a roughly 21–22cm wide scroll. According to a comment by Grinstead, it was “a twist of paper when first studied,” which tells us that its current look is the result of a conservation work done in the early 1960s. Probably as a consequence of Grinstead’s interest in the Tangut collection at this time, the conservators of the British Museum flattened and backed the paper, giving back “its original form as a roll.” More than forty decades later we now know that the scroll form was not particularly popular for Tangut manuscripts and we see them much more commonly bound in a butterfly or concertina form. Considering that the only difference between a concertina and a scroll is that they are folded differently, it is not impossible that the manuscript of the General’s Garden used to be a concertina. Although the original folds on fragments of concertina books are usually visible even today, the folds of our manuscript, along with the multitude of other creases, could have been ironed out as part of modern conservation work. An argument against this scenario is that there seems to be no obvious way of dividing the manuscript evenly into separate pages, which would have had to be the case if it was a concertina.

Grinstead’s comment that the manuscript was “a twist of paper” is also confirmed by the fact that it does not contain Stein’s KK numbers which he customarily wrote in pen on the material recovered from Khara-khoto. Instead, it only has the modern pressmark Or.12380/1840 written on the backing paper on the verso. The English title General’s Garden appears in parentheses underneath the pressmark, written in pencil, obviously after Grinstead’s identification of the text, and possibly inscribed by Grinstead himself. Stein marked each item he excavated with a string of letters and numbers which encoded the name of the site, the location within the site and a unique number identifying that particular item.

651 With reference to Chinese and Tangut scrolls which represent a long band of paper aligned horizontally, I am using the term “width” to refer to the dimensions of the paper from top to bottom. Similarly, “length” means the horizontal stretch from left to right.

652 Grinstead 1962, 36.

653 Ibid.
He used these code numbers in his description of the excavation of Khara-khoto in Innermost Asia, where he also provides a preliminary list of the materials obtained from the site.\textsuperscript{654} The manuscript of the General’s Garden, however, is not on the list. Since the manuscript of the General’s Garden bears no such code, it must have been in a shape that precluded Stein from writing on it.\textsuperscript{655}

The four sheets that make up the surviving part of the manuscript are joined together in a way that each sheet is glued atop of the next one, creating a 1–2 cm overlap. In some cases parts of the characters are written across the seam line, as shown in Fig. 17. In the first image the seam line goes through the left side of the characters, whereas in the second image (which is taken from the lower part of the same line in the manuscript) it halves the characters. In either case, it is clear that the paper sheets were joined together before being written on. The slight misalignment of the sheets is due to the fact that the manuscript was taken apart and reassembled in the course of conservation.

\textbf{Fig. 17a+b:} Two close up images of the same line in the manuscript, demonstrating how the characters were written across the seam line where paper sheets had been glued together.

The number of lines per sheet is 29, 33, 34 and 19, respectively. Since the beginning of the manuscript is missing, the first sheet is incomplete, and it is sheets 2

\textsuperscript{654} Stein 1928, v. 1, 462–506.
\textsuperscript{655} We should also mention here that there are still several smaller boxes of such uncatalogued fragments at the British Library, too brittle to be opened and badly in need of conservation. At this moment, the library is actively seeking funds for the conservation and digitisation of these fragments, thus it is likely that they will become available in the near future. It is quite possible that material still holds some surprises for the field.
The Tangut manuscript and 3 that are representative of the number of lines per sheet in the original scoll (i.e. 33–34). The last sheet is complete but has only 19 lines as the text ends halfway through, leaving the remaining portion of the paper empty. The complete sheets (i.e. 2, 3 and 4) are all 65.5 cm long, which is an indication that the rest of them were also of the same size. The number of characters per line cannot be counted because in its current form the manuscript is missing its lower part, rendering all lines incomplete. The top part has no missing texts but the lines begin at the very top of the paper. This horizontal top edge of the paper is very even, suggesting that the top margin may have been trimmed by modern conservators. It is reasonable to assume that in its original form the manuscript would have had top and bottom margins.

The manuscript has no ruling lines, a situation that is not uncommon in Tangut manuscripts. Nevertheless, the lines are even and begin to slant only towards the very end of the manuscript. The characters are written in a careful hand, attesting to the handwriting skill of the copyist, who may very well have been someone involved in copying texts on a regular basis. The neatness of the handwriting style also demonstrates that he was in no hurry to finish the task and that the final product was intended to be something more formal than just a private copy of a book.

In terms of its textual structure, the Tangut translation basically follows our known Chinese editions, as it is arranged into smaller segments, each a few lines long. Each segment is preceded by a short title and a segment number. A typical example of a title that survived almost in its entire length is that of Section T36, written in the manuscript as follows:

 Jury bju dźjɨ sọ ɣạ tśhjiw tsew
 将 行 三 十 六 [第] general action three ten six ORD

Section 36: The general’s actions

The character in square brackets is an ordinal indicator, which is missing because of the physical damage to the manuscript. Nevertheless, the context makes it fairly certain that it stood here originally. The titles are always written in a separate line, towards the bottom, even if the previous section ended midline, leaving some empty space. As a result, most of the line with the title remains empty and this provides a convenient way of segmenting the text. Fig. 18 shows this seg-
mented layout on the part of the manuscript where the individual sections visually stand apart and make the structure of the text transparent. It also lends an air of orderliness to the book and thus may have been an intentional feature.

![Part of the manuscript of the General's Garden (Or.12380/1840) showing its visual segmentation](image)

**Fig. 18:** Part of the manuscript of the General's Garden (Or.12380/1840) showing its visual segmentation. The section titles are written towards the bottom of the empty lines.

The last line of the manuscript contains the title *Gja bjy rej bo tshji* (將軍森林本 Book of the General’s Forest). Obviously, this is the same title as *Jiangyuan*, since the word *yuan* ("grove") is synonymous with the word "forest." The last character in the Tangut title is *tshji* (책), which is commonly used in the sense of "root, basis" but can also mean "book." In his Chinese transcription of the title Grinstead used the word *gen* ("root") but, considering the possible meaning of the title, *ben* ("basis; book") is no doubt a better choice.

**Reconstructing the line length**

As mentioned above, in its current form the manuscript of the General’s Garden is incomplete. The beginning with the first half of the text had been torn off and so was the entire lower part of the scroll. Because of this, there is no immediate way to count the number of characters per line, which in turn makes it difficult to judge the accuracy of the translation, since we do not know how much Tangut text is missing in each line.

The longest number of characters per line in the manuscript is 16 but it is apparent that there used to be more text where the line breaks off. When the con-

---

656 Kychanov 2006, 697.
657 Grinstead 1962.
servators of the British Museum backed the manuscript, they relied on the surviving measures of the manuscript because they had no way of knowing the original ones. As a consequence, the conserved scroll gives the impression that the lines used to be about 17 characters long, even though most of them have only 11–16 characters left. In this way the backing creates the illusion that it reproduces the dimensions of the original scroll while it is simply following the length of the longest surviving lines. The situation is even more confusing when looking at the black and white photographs published in Shanghai, where we cannot see even the edges of the backing against the grey background.

The lines in the original manuscript, however, must have been longer and the entire scroll must have been wider that it is today. Not knowing how much text is missing means that when we compare parallel parts of the Chinese and Tangut texts, we cannot be sure whether something was left out by the Tangut translator or it is only missing from our copy. Fortunately, we can reconstruct the number of characters per line by aligning specific portions of the Tangut text with the Chinese version. That the number of characters per line is more or less consistent throughout the manuscript can be surmised on the basis of other Tangut manuscripts where the length of lines remains relatively stable throughout the entire document. The even hand of our manuscript also corroborates this assumption. The part of the text most suitable for reconstructing the original line length comprises a series of short phrases in Section C34. For the sake of comparison, the text of the Lan Zhang edition from 1564 reads as follows:

主孰聖也？將孰賢也？吏孰能也？糧孰豊也？士卒孰練也？兵容孰整也？戎事孰逸也？形勢孰險也？賓客孰知也？鄰國孰懼也？財貨孰多也？百姓孰安也？

Whose lord is more sagely? Whose general is more virtuous? Whose administrators are more able? Whose provisions are more plentiful? Whose officers and soldiers are better trained? Whose military formation is more orderly? Whose military affairs excel more? Whose terrain is more hazardous? Whose envoys are more knowledgeable? Whom are neighbouring states more afraid of? Whose financial and material means are more abundant? Whose common people are more at peace?658

658 This section ultimately goes back to Chapter 1 of the Sunzi where it appears as follows:

主孰有道？將孰有能？天地得？法令行？兵眾孰強？士卒孰練？賞罰孰明？

Whose lord has the Way? Whose general is more able? Who obtains [the advantages of] heaven and earth? Whose laws and orders are carried out? Whose troops are stronger? Whose rewards and punishments are clearer?
The above portion of text consists of twelve short segments identical in structure: N+孰+A+也. The same structure can be easily identified in the surviving portion of the Tangut translation where it appears as N+競競+A (N+whosoever+A). The particle kjɨ 竞 is a function word which, when used together with ljɨ 竞, forms the relative pronoun ljɨ kjɨ 竞競 (“whosoever”). This is somewhat different from the Chinese original where the individual segments in this sequence are presented as questions.

In the parallel segments, the nouns can consist of one or two syllables, while their desirable qualities are always represented as a single syllable. Accordingly, in the Tangut each segment consists of four or five characters. Based on this knowledge, we can safely reconstruct the structure of the missing Tangut text for segments which are at least fragmentarily preserved in the manuscript (Tab. 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Tangut</th>
<th>Ch. transcr.</th>
<th>Concept pairs</th>
<th>Lan Zhang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[□競競]□</td>
<td>[□孰△]聖</td>
<td>[...] — sagely</td>
<td>主孰聖也</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>競競競競</td>
<td>將孰△善</td>
<td>general — skilled</td>
<td>將孰賢也</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>競競競競</td>
<td>糧孰△有</td>
<td>provisions — existing</td>
<td>吳孰能也</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>競競[競□]</td>
<td>軍孰[△□]</td>
<td>troops — [...]</td>
<td>糧餉孰豐也</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>[□競競□]</td>
<td>[□孰△□]</td>
<td>[...] — [...]</td>
<td>士卒孰練也</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>[□競]競競</td>
<td>[□孰]△能</td>
<td>[...] — able</td>
<td>軍容孰整也</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>競競競競</td>
<td>武器孰△善</td>
<td>weapons — good</td>
<td>戎事孰逸也</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>競競競競</td>
<td>禮孰△緊</td>
<td>etiquette — strict</td>
<td>形勢孰險也</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>競競[競競□]</td>
<td>二軍[孰△□]</td>
<td>two types of troops — [...]</td>
<td>賓客孰知也</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>[□競競]競</td>
<td>[□孰△]懼</td>
<td>[...] — fear</td>
<td>鄰國孰懼也</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>競競競競</td>
<td>買賣孰△厚</td>
<td>commerce — affluent</td>
<td>財貨孰多也</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>競競競競</td>
<td>民民孰△安</td>
<td>people — peaceful</td>
<td>百姓孰安也</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 1: Reconstruction of Tangut segments based on their parallel structure.

In the table, the first column shows the Tangut segments in the order they appear in the manuscript. Missing but structurally reconstructed characters (or their

---

659 For the purpose of this comparison, I disregard the beginning and end of this section, as they do not belong to this set of parallel segments.
square placeholders) are placed in brackets. The second column features a Chinese character-for-character transcription of the Tangut text; the third lists the N + A pairs of the concepts discussed in each Tangut segment; finally the fourth has the Chinese text of the Lan Zhang edition in its original order.

A comparison of the Tangut and Chinese sides shows that segments 1–3 and 10–12 are relatively good matches. That leaves six segments where the match is not immediately apparent. Still, segment 9 begins with the term njɨ̱ gja 銓薑 which literally means “two armies” or “two troops.” I tentatively translated this as “two types of troops” based on the analogy of the Chinese term sanjun 三軍 “three types of troops” which commonly occurs in the Jiangyuan and which is identified in the Liutao with infantry 步, chariots 車 and cavalry 騎. Thus it is possible that the term njɨ̱ gja 銓薑 “two types of troops” corresponds to the “officers and soldiers” 士卒 of segment 5 of the Chinese text, especially since there is no other match for either of these.

Another possible identification is segment 7 which discusses whose weapons (dzju njij 彎薑) are better (ŋạ 豁). The Chinese text of Lan Zhang has no segment matching the Tangut text but a note in the Zhang Shu edition mentions that an earlier version of the text wrote the phrase junrong 軍容 (“military formation”) in segment 6 of the Chinese text as junqi 軍器 (“weapons”). Supposing that the Tangut translator used a Chinese version with a similar variation, we may tentatively connect the Tangut segment 7 that begins with the term dzju njij 彎薑 “weapons” with segment 6 of the Chinese side. Yet this identification is by no means conclusive and there may be other solutions.

It is also apparent that the sequence of the segments is not identical in the two texts. For example, segment 3 in the Tangut version discussing the availability of provisions (śjɨj ljɨ̣ 饑詡) corresponds to segment 4 of the Chinese side. Also, Zhang Shu notes that in one of the texts he consulted, the segment “whom neighbouring states are more afraid of” 鄰國孰懼也 was omitted altogether, which is evidence to the fact that similar variations existed even between Chinese editions of this work. This particular segment, however, is present in the Tangut text, as it is evident from the character kjạ 個 (懼; “to be afraid of”) in segment 10, even if the beginning of that phrase is missing.

Rather than reconstructing each segment in the Tangut translation and identifying its Chinese counterpart, in this place I am more interested in establishing the fact that despite the missing characters of the Tangut version, originally this part also consisted of twelve segments, just like the Chinese version. Based on the available information, we can reconstruct this part of the Tangut manuscript, including the length of lines the following way:
The character zur 嚴 (敕 “edict, decree”) with a little cross sign (†) next to it at the beginning of Line 2 is a scribal mistake and the cross sign on its right side in the manuscript indicates that it should be deleted (Fig. 19). Still, I keep it in the transcription because it occupies a full space and should be counted when calculating the number of characters per line. In the above reconstruction there are two full lines: Lines 2 and 3. Of these, Line 2 has 20 characters, and Line 3 has 19. Knowing that the Tangut nouns in these segments can consist of one or two characters, a feature especially apparent towards the second half of this sequence, we can conjecture that Line 3 probably had an extra character. In particular, this would be the missing noun in the segment □緱賈緱 □孰△懼 “whom [neighbouring states] are more afraid of”). Because the final character of this segment matches the Chinese version we can safely assume that the noun at the beginning of the section probably matches the Chinese word linguo 鄰國 (“neighbouring states”), and this would have also been a compound word written with two characters in the Tangut. Thus Line 3 of the Tangut version probably consisted of 20 characters, just like Line 2. This leads to the conclusion that the Tangut manuscript originally had 20 characters per line.

The translation of these four lines is as follows:

The nature of the error is quite obvious if we compare the mistaken character zur 嚴 (敕 “edict, decree”) with the one immediately after it: bju̱ 將 (將 “general”), as the two differ only in the left side component. That the mistake was caught immediately during the act of copying is suggested by the fact that the correct character was written beneath the mistake in full size, showing no signs of subsequent insertion.

The cross sign is a common deletion mark in Tangut manuscripts, it also occurs several times in this particular manuscript. It slightly differs from the deletion mark used in Chinese manuscripts where the horizontal stroke remained on the right hand side of the vertical line.
provisions who -ever existing troops who -ever
whosessoever’s provisions are more plentiful; whosessoever’s troops are [...];

whosessoever’s [...] are more [...]; whosessoever’s [...] are more able;

weapon weapon who -ever good rules who -ever strict
whosessoever’s weapons are better; whosessoever’s rules are stricter;

whosessoever’s two types of troops are [...]...
Translation vs. adaptation

Fig. 19a+b: The section used for the reconstruction of line lengths and a close up of the deletion mark at the beginning of Line 2.

Proofreading

In the manuscript, red marks appear next to some characters. Section C32 describes the advantageous moves of the general when coming across different
types of weather and terrain. Among them is a phrase which appears “[when there is] wind, fire and darkness” 風火暗昧. The second half of the phrase appearing in the Tangut translation is not “darkness” 暗昧 as in the Chinese editions, but le gjij 青犂, which literally means “misty and gloomy.” Thus while this meaning of the compound word is close in meaning to the Chinese word anmei 暗昧 (“darkness”) which stands in the corresponding place, it nevertheless includes, on account of its first part le 青, the connotation of “mistiness.”

Similar red marks appear in other parts of the manuscript, although their precise meaning is yet to be demonstrated. It is possible that they were placed there by a proofreader who checked the text after its completion, a possibility corroborated by the short colophon at the end of the manuscript, the legible portion of which says:

竃 鉅 炳 炳 鬲 鬲。 鬲 ....

1531 2805 4246 3890 4018 5712 1815
gja bjū rejr bo tśhji dzjwa njar
軍 將 森 林 本 竟 校
army general forest forest book end check

The Book of the General’s Forest. The end. Checked and ....

Unfortunately, the line is damaged further down, concealing the name of the person who checked the manuscript. The last character on this line is only partially visible and Kepping reads it as the word rjar 餌 (“copied”). This is, however, more of a conjecture because the character in question is too damaged to warrant a reliable reading.

Kepping interpreted the penultimate word njar 餌 in the sense of “edited [by]..., i.e. revised and corrected [by]...,” and suggested that because we do not have the word “translated by” in its place, the Tangut version was an adaptation, that is, some of its content was slightly changed during the process of translation. It seems more likely to me, however, that the checking referred to at the end of the manuscript was a process completely separate from the translation. Kepping correctly pointed out that the same word njar 餌 (校 “to check, com-

---

662 This wording is based on the version of the text preserved in the Shuofu.
663 Kepping 2003, 17.
664 Ibid., 21.
Translation vs. adaptation

pare”) was also used in the phrase me njar 仏校 (rendered into English by Kepping as “royally edited”) which appears in translations of the Buddhist Canon, indicating that the translation was checked and corrected by the emperor. Yet this certainly does not mean that the emperor himself put together an adaptation of the Canon for Tangut readers. Instead, the word njar 仏校 (“to check”) in both contexts probably refers to checking a finished copy made by someone else. The fact that the completion of a round of checking is recorded in a colophon shows the importance attached to that particular text. It was not simply a hastily performed rendition but a careful translation which was subsequently also thoroughly checked, presumably against an original version. Maybe on a practical level the concept of wind and mist together may have been seen as problematic. Perhaps this is the reason why this compound word is marked with two small red marks, one next to each character.

If we look at the colophons of Chinese manuscripts found in Dunhuang, the word jiao 校 (“to check”) occurs at the end of official Buddhist sutras commissioned by the Tang court in Chang’an 長安. In that context, we often have a record of three subsequent rounds of jiao before the manuscript is further “carefully examined” 詳閱 by yet several other people. For example, in manuscript Or.8210/S.36, a copy of the Diamond sutra from the 3rd year of the Xianheng 咸亨 reign (672), we see that three rounds of jiao were performed by the the layman Xiao Hui 蕭褘, which was followed by four rounds of “careful examination” by four different high ranking monks from the Taiyuan monastery 太原寺. Xiao Hui is identified in the colophon as a shushou 書手, literally meaning “writing hand,” a term used for lay copyists.665 But the person named in the first line of the colophon as actually having “reverently copied” 礼写 the sutra is someone entirely different. In view of the above, it is evident that what Xiao Hui did three times with the newly copied sutra was checking it for mistakes, that is, proofreading it. The “careful examination” of the eminent monks probably entailed a similar task, only at a higher level of authority and, in practice, possibly with less intervention. This example demonstrates how manuscript colophons often made note of a proofreading act and while such checking may have had other shades of meaning in prefaces of printed books, the Tangut word njar 仏校 in the manuscript of the General’s Garden must have also meant something closer to proofreading. In other words, it would have been connected more with the process of producing this particular manuscript copy, rather than improving the translation.

665 Drège 2007, 96.
Based on this interpretation, we can go back and reconsider the partially visible character after the *njar* 猫 (校 “to check”) in the colophon, which Kepping read as *rjar* 踏 (写 “copied”). An analogous note appears at the end of manuscript Inv. No. 5189 in the Kozlov collection. The note comes after a poem, and reads as follows:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>džjwa</td>
<td>njar</td>
<td>lew</td>
<td>lji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>竟</td>
<td>校</td>
<td>同</td>
<td>矣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end</td>
<td>check</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>COP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The end. Proofread.

Here the compound word *njar lew* 猫騰, the two components of which mean “to check” and “same,” evidently mean that the text on the manuscript was checked and brought in accord with an original copy. This is why I translated it using the word “proofread.” The colophon in our *General’s Garden* manuscript seems to have the same phrase and if we check the remains of the last character visible in the line, we can see that the word *lew* 腾 (同 “same”) is in fact a better candidate than the one proposed by Kepping. Accordingly, the part of the colophon in our manuscript which followed the title of the *Jiangyuan* probably said the same thing as the one in Inv. No. 5189, namely, *džjwa njar lew lji* 猫。騰騰騰 (竟。校同矣 “End. Proofread.”), only the last character and half were damaged.

Going back to the word “fog” marked with red dots, the fact that both characters were marked shows that whoever added the dots intended to identify whole words, rather than individual characters. This was not done consistently because there is also the case of the compound word *ɣju ɣwej* 溝壑 “gully, ditch”) earlier in the same section, and here only the second character is marked. Evidently, the scope and nature of these red marks awaits further research. Trivial as they seem, determining what they stand for goes beyond strictly palaeographic considerations and has implications for the function of the manuscript in its original environment.

Such red marks are not infrequent in other Tangut books. The fact that they also appear next to characters in printed texts suggests that sometimes they were

---

666 Nie Hongyin (2012a) points out that this manuscript is dated to 1226 and thus represents the latest dated text among the books found in Khara-khoto.

667 Ibid., 83–84.
added not when the book was produced but when it was used. In his monograph on Tangut book culture, Terentiev-Katansky discusses the red marks of readers, which range from dots and short dashes to longer vertical lines “underlining” from the side) an entire row. In our case there are less than ten of these in the manuscript, some brighter and some fainter, but their significance is not entirely clear. They also appear to have been drawn not by a pen or brush but with some sort of cruder tool, such as a chalk or a slab of red ink.

Finally, we should also point out that the Tangut version does not mention the name of Zhuge Liang. Accordingly, we cannot be sure if the text at this point was connected with him at all. Naturally, there is no way of knowing whether the title at the beginning included his name or this manuscript was copied from a larger collection of works attributed to him. The name of Zhuge Liang was not unknown to the Tanguts, as he is quoted several times in the commentaries of the Tangut Sunzi. But we should keep in mind that the discovery of the Tangut translation in itself does not confirm that the text at that time was attributed to Zhuge Liang.

6.3 Translation discrepancies

A crucial question is how faithful the Tangut translation is to the original Chinese text. While on the surface this may seem like a trivial issue, in reality it is not always very clear what the so-called original Chinese text entails because the surviving editions at times show significant discrepancies. Thus instead of simply comparing a standard edition of the Chinese text with the Tangut, we need to be aware not only of the differences between various editions but also of the possibility that there may have been additional discrepancies in editions that did not survive. Most decisive of these, of course, would be the version used by the Tangut translator, about which we can only speculate on the basis of the Tangut manuscript.

Let us look at some examples. At the very end of Section C26, the Shuofu edition has the phrase “whichever direction he faces, he will know no enemies” 所向者無敵. In this, the word xiang 向 (“to face”) appears in the Lan Zhang edition as dang 當 (“to encounter; to oppose”), which is partly synonymous with the word xiang but has no directional sense. Accordingly, the phrase could rather be

668 Terent’ev-Katanskij 1981, p. 34. I am grateful to Viacheslav Zaytsev for alerting me to this reference.
translated as “whomever he encounters, he will know no enemies.” The difference does not significantly alter the general meaning of the sentence yet helpful for tracing the textual history of the text. The Tangut version in this place has the word *tshew* 轉 (“to turn to; to face”), which matches the meaning of the Chinese word *xiang* (“to face”). This shows that the Chinese version used for the Tangut translation probably had the word *xiang* in this place, affiliating the manuscript with the *Shuofu* edition.

Nevertheless, this section in the Tangut version also shows a number of obvious dissimilarities with the Chinese editions, a fact that is evident even if the larger part of the text is missing or illegible. For example, this section discusses the “configuration” of heaven (*tianshi* 天勢), earth (*dishi* 地勢) and man (*renshi* 人勢). In the part where the text explains the potential of earth, the Tangut version mentions *de so* 德所 which is the Tangut equivalent of the Chinese *yinyang* 陰陽. Yet neither this concept nor anything that could be even loosely linked with it appears in any of the Chinese editions. In fact, the mutilated lower part of the line must have contained some additional text that is not in the Chinese versions because the extant part of the Tangut line accounts for all of the Chinese text.

Towards the end of Section C32, the Zhang Shu edition reads as follows:

飢澇隔水，風大暗昧，利以搏前擒後。

When one is across a ravine and separated by water, or if the wind is strong and it is dark and gloomy, it is advantageous to strike from the front and back at the same time.

In this sentence, the phrase “the wind is strong and it is dark and gloomy” shows some discrepancy between different editions:

Zhang Shu: 風大暗昧 (literally: “wind is great, dark and gloomy”)

*Shuofu*: 風火暗昧 (literally: “wind, fire, dark and gloomy”)

Lan Zhang: 風火暗 (literally: “wind, fire, dark”)

It is clear that variation of the characters 大 (“great”) and 火 (“fire”) reflects a graphic mistake because the two graphs are visually quite similar.669 While the concept of “wind and fire” in the above context makes less sense than “great

---

669 The mixing of these characters was not uncommon in manuscripts. For example, in the Dunhuang manuscript P.2529 from the Pelliot collection in Paris in the line “in the monastery there is a tooth of the great Pratyeka Buddha” 寺有大辟支佛牙 the character 大 is erroneously written as 火, forming a meaningless phrase “fire Pratyeka Buddha” 火辟支佛. The same confusion can also occur in modern scholarship, as Gábor Kósa (2013) discusses the persistent misreading of the phrase 火海 (“sea of fire”) as 大海 (“great sea”) in a Manichaean manuscript (BD00256) from the Dunhuang collection at the NLC.
wind,” this is precisely the variant that appears in the Tangut version of the text, which uses the words .SEVERE (火風 “fire and wind”) and thus matches the Shuofu and Lan Zhang editions, but not that of Zhang Shu. A version of the same sentence is also found in the Chinese Liutao (3/27), where this phrase appears as “when there is strong wind and it rains heavily” 大風甚雨者, and this variant corroborates that the character 火 (“fire”) in the Shuofu and Lan Zhang editions is most likely a mistake.

Indeed, since the phrase “wind and fire” is probably a mistake that crept into the text during the process of its transmission, it is a particularly useful for tracing the history of editions. While it does not occur in Zhang Shu edition, we know that this edition is relatively new and was compiled around the 1830s or 1840s through combining available editions; therefore it is likely that the error of writing “fire” instead of “great” had been introduced to the text much earlier, and Zhang Shu simply corrected this in his edition, perhaps without textual antecedents, simply relying on his philological judgment and the awareness that these characters are often mixed up. The presence of the same erroneous reading in the Tangut version is an indication that this mistake had been introduced into the text before it was translated into Tangut.

The above examples show how the Tangut version can help us reconstruct some of the original Chinese text used for the Tangut translation. At the same time, since we do not have the Chinese edition used by the translator, we should be very careful when judging the quality or nature of the translation. Consider the following case. One of the things Kepping discussed in her article on the General’s Garden is the Tangut translation of a sentence in Section C22. The Chinese sentence reads “now when folly overcomes wisdom, this is going against the current” 乃以愚克智，逆也. Kepping was especially interested in the word 逆 (“to go against the current”), for which the Tangut translator used the word ljo 福 (“good luck, fortune”). We normally find this Tangut word used as a translation for the Chinese words 福, and less frequently 幸, both meaning “good fortune.” Based on the analysis of this Tangut word in other texts, Kepping suggested that it should be understood in this context as “supernatural,” i.e. it is against nature when folly overcomes wisdom. She used this example to show that the Tangut translator did not simply translate the Chinese original but created “an adaptation of the text” for Tangut readers.”

Kepping’s analysis, however, is entirely based on the Zhang Shu edition which is almost the only one where the word 逆 (“to go against the current”)
occurs in this place. In contrast, the same sentence appears in Ming editions as
夫以愚克智，命也 ("now when folly overcomes wisdom, it is fate"). Thus the
word in question is ming 命 ("fate"), which is not that far from the ordinary, non-
mystical meaning of the Tangut word ljo 繹 ("good fortune"), making the sen-
tence read as “now when folly overcomes wisdom, it is [simply a matter of]
luck.” Therefore it seems more likely to me that the Chinese version used for
creating the Tangut translation had the character 命 in this place, as it shows a
simpler and less strained connection with its Tangut counterpart.

These examples demonstrate that by studying the extant Chinese editions of
the text we can significantly enhance our understanding of what the translation
was based on and how faithful it was to the original. While a certain degree of
adaptation is unavoidable, some of the discrepancies with the extant Chinese edi-
tions were simply due to using editions no longer available to us. Having recog-
nized this, to a certain extent we can also use the Tangut text to reconstruct the
Chinese edition used by the Tangut translator. Naturally, doing this solely on the
basis of the Tangut translation is a risky exercise but when we have contending
Chinese readings in different editions and the Tangut text matches one of these,
we are on much safer grounds.

Despite these discrepancies between extant Chinese editions, in the follow-
ing pages I often compare the Tangut translation with the “Chinese text,” as if it
was a concrete, tangible entity. In reality, of course, we do not have the original
text from which the Tangut translation was made and even the surviving editions
of the text, as seen above, at times differ from each other. Yet most of these dif-
ferences are of little consequence for the case at hand, and when they are, I draw
attention to these individually.

---

671 Peng Xiangqian (2009, 94) does not see a contradiction here, noting that the word ming 命
("fate") “is, of course, supernatural.” It is clear from Kepping’s argument, however, that she was
not aware that some Chinese editions had the word ming 命 ("fate") in this place, and she was
hard pressed to explain how the word ni 逆 ("to go against the current") could be linked with the
Tangut word used in this place.

672 The use of ni 逆 in this phrase in the Zhang Shu edition is by no means a defective one, as it
is forms a perfect parallel with the following sentence which says “overcoming folly with wisdom
is as if to go along with the current” 以智克愚，順也. It is quite likely that this reading was chosen by Zhang Shu based on the context.
6.4 The four barbarians

The last four sections of the *Jiangyuan* (C47–C50) deal with the four barbarians, describing their characteristics and the way to fight them. This is a particularly interesting part because from the Chinese point of view the Tanguts were obviously among the four barbarians about whom this section was written. It is also interesting to see how the Tanguts deal with the Sinocentric worldview when translating the text. Do they keep the original structure and simply accept it as a Chinese point of view, or do they alter it to fit their own perspective of their neighbours? A full translation of the Chinese version from Lan Zhang’s 1564 edition is given below:

東夷第四十七
東夷之性，薄禮少義，捍急能鬾，依山塹海，憑以自固。上下和睦，百姓安樂，未可圖也。若上亂下離，則可以行間，間起則隙生，隙生則修文教以來之，固甲兵而擊之，其勢必勝也。

C47. The Eastern Yi
The nature of the Eastern Yi is such that they hold little esteem for rituals (li) and righteousness (yi) but are fierce and good at fighting. They live in the mountains and along dangerous sea [coasts], and rely on [these difficulties of the terrain] to secure themselves. When those above and those below are in harmony, and the ordinary people are content and happy, then any plans against them are futile. But if those above are in chaos and those below turn away from them, then a rift can be created between them, and when such a rift occurs, a gap will be born. Whenever a gap is born, we should cultivate culture and education to attract them, we should strengthen our armour and weapons to attack them, and their power can be surely overcome.

南蠻第四十八
南蠻多種，性不能教，連合朋黨，失意則相攻。居洞依山，或聚或散，西至崑崙，東至洋海，產出奇貨，故人貪而勇戰。春夏多疾疫，利在疾戰，不可久師也。

C48. The Southern Man
There are many types of Southern Man. Their nature is such that they cannot be educated; they join into cliques but then they quarrel and attack each other. They dwell in caves in the mountains, they sometimes gather, sometimes disperse. In the west, their territory extends to the Kunlun Mountain; in the east it reaches the sea. They produce rare and exotic commodities; therefore the people are greedy and fight bravely [over those]. In the spring and summer they often suffer from epidemics. The advantageous thing to do against them is to fight a quick war, as a long campaign cannot be sustained.

西戎第四十九
西戎之性，勇悍好利，或城居，或野處，米糧（糧）少，金貝多，故人勇戰鬾，難敗。自礦石以西，諸戎種繁，地廣形險，俗負強狠，故人多不臣。當候之以外鬾，鬾之以內亂，則可圖矣。
The four barbarians

C49. The Western Rong
The nature of the Western Rong is such that they are fierce but love profit. Some of them live in cities, others dwell in the open; they produce little rice and grains but possess metal and cowries in abundance. Therefore, the people fight bravely and it is hard to defeat them. West of the stone deserts there are many different varieties of Rong barbarians. Their land is wide and the terrain is perilous; their customs are based on strength and violence: thus most of them are subjects of no ruler. We should wait for [an opportunity caused by] an external intrusion, and harass them with internal disorder, then they can be made plans against.

北狄第五十
北狄居無城郭，隨逐水草，勢利則南侵漢境，勢失則北遁陰山，足以自固，足以自衛。飢則捕獸飲乳，寒則寢皮服裘，奔走射獵，以殺為務，未可以道德懷之，未可以兵戎服之。

漢云不與戰，其略有三。漢卒且耕且戰，故疲而怯；虜但牧獵，故逸而勇。以疲敵逸，以怯敵勇，不相鬭也，此其不可戰者一也。

漢長於步，日馳百里；虜長於騎，日乃倍之，漢逐虜則軄糧負甲而隨之，虜逐漢則驅疾騎而運之，運負之勢已殊，走逐之形不等，此其不可戰者二也。

漢戰多步，虜戰多騎，爭奪地形之勢，則騎疾於步，遅疾勢懸，此其不可戰者三也。

不得已，則莫若守邊。守邊之道，揀良將而任之，訓銳士而禦之，廣營田而實之，設烽候而待之，候其虛而乘之，因其眾而取之，所謂資不費而寇自除矣，人不疲而虜自寬矣。

C50. The Northern Di
The Northern Di dwell without city walls, they wander about following the availability of water and pasture land. When the situation is beneficial, they invade the Chinese territories to the south; when the situation is unfavourable, they escape north to the Yinshan mountains where they can secure and defend themselves. When hungry, they capture wild animals and drink milk; when cold, they sleep on skins and wear pelts. They gallop around and hunt with bows; they consider killing as their main duty. They cannot be tamed with moral principles, cannot be subjugated with weapons.

The Han say that they would not fight them and there are three main reasons for this: The Han soldiers now toil the earth, now fight, thus they are fatigued and timid. The barbarians, on the other hand, raise livestock and hunt, thus they are agile and courageous. Opposing the agile with the fatigued, the courageous with the timid is not an equal fight. This is the first reason why they cannot be fought.

The Han are good at marching on foot and can cover a hundred li a day. The barbarians are good at riding on horseback and thus can cover more than twice as much in a day. When the Han are in pursuit of the barbarians, they haul their provisions and carry their armour during the chase. When the barbarians are in pursuit of the Han, they move at great speed and transport things on horseback. Since the efficiency of transporting things on horseback and carrying those on foot is different, the means of pursuit are unequal. This is the second reason why they cannot be fought.
The Han mostly fight on foot, the barbarians mostly fight on horseback. When competing for the advantages of the terrain, riding is faster than walking. The great difference between the efficiency of slowness and speed: this is the third reason why they cannot be fought.

There is no other way to deal with them than guarding the frontier line. The way of guarding the frontier line lies in choosing and employing a good general; training elite officers to resist them; extending the farmlands of military camps and filling those [with soldiers]; erecting beacon towers to expect them (i.e. the enemy); waiting for their vulnerable moments and taking advantage of those; relying on their multitude to overcome them. This is referred to as having the bandits eradicate themselves without expending our resources; having the barbarians console themselves without exhausting our own people.

What we see here are the well-known traditional categories for China’s neighbours, commonly translated into English as Eastern, Southern, Western and Northern Barbarians. The appellations go back to pre-Qin times but in later periods they lost their specificity and became used as generic terms for different non-Chinese ethnicities according to their geographical distribution. Similar descriptions of the types of people living at the four cardinal directions of the Chinese world are known in other sources and these are often found within the framework of the cosmogony of Five Phases and Four Seasons. In terms of wording, individual elements of the description of foreign tribes in the *Jiangyuan* seem to have their roots in the official histories compiled during the mid 7th century (e.g. *Nan shi* 南史, *Bei shi* 北史), with bits and pieces of it occurring as early as the *Shiji*. Yet as a system, it seems most closely resembling the *Tongdian* 通典, the comprehensive encyclopaedia compiled by Du You towards the end of the 8th century. In the section titled “Bianfang” 邊防 (Frontier defence), the *Tongdian* demarcates the world beyond the borders of the Tang empire using the four categories of East-

673 The word *zhong* 眾 (“multitude”) is problematic in this context. Other editions of the text, including some from the Ming dynasty, have in this place 衰 (“decline”) which fits the context perfectly, as it would produce the phrase “relying on their decline to overcome them.”

674 For example, in Chapter 12 of the Han dynasty medical treatise *Huangdi Neijing Suwen* 黃帝內經素問, we see a similar description of the world according to the four cardinal directions and the peoples living there. Only in this case, in order to conform with the Five Phases model, we also have an additional region called Center, where the people do not have to work that hard and, as a result, suffer from illnesses caused by lack of exercise.

675 The *Tongdian* was officially presented to the throne in 801, although Du You had worked on it for over thirty years prior to that, and made minor changes up until his death in 812 (Twitchett 2002, 106–107). Although we know that much of the *Tongdian* came from earlier sources, including the now lost *Zhengdian* 政典 by 8th-century scholar Liu Zhi 劉秩, it is unclear from where Du You adopted his detailed typology of China’s neighbours.
ern Yi, Southern Man, Western Rong, and Northern Di, which match the description at the end of the Jiangyuan. Only in the Tongdian, this serves as the general framework for a much more detailed analysis of various ethnicities. Thus the four sections, into which the Western Rong category is divided, include no fewer than seventy-six peoples and kingdoms, ranging from Kucha and Loulan to Persia and India. The Western Rong is also the category into which the Dangxiang tribes, ancestors of the Tanguts, are grouped. The Northern Di, on the other hand, have fewer categories, although some groups (e.g. the Xiongnu and the Turks) are treated in more detail.

What distinguishes the Jiangyuan from its sources is that, being a text on military strategy, it specifically identifies these foreign tribes as a threat and offers a practical solution how each of them could or should be fought. Yet it does not take long to recognise that the four categories of barbarians around the Chinese domain are not immediately relevant for the Tangut state at the end of the 12th century. They had different neighbours: the Tibetans to the south and southwest, the Jurchens to the east and southeast, the Kara-Khitans to the west, and the Mongols to the north. By the end of the 12th century, the Tanguts did not share a border with the Southern Song state, as the southern frontier region was by that time under Jurchen control. In fact, from the perspective of the Chinese Jiangyuan, the Tanguts would have been understood to belong to the category of Western Barbarians, as is the case with the Dangxiang tribes in the Tongdian. Perhaps this is the reason why the Tangut translation omits three of the four neighbours and includes only the Northern Di. After all, reading about how to fight “neighbours” like the Southern Man in the regions of the modern Yunnan and Guizhou provinces would have been irrelevant for a Tangut audience.

Before proceeding to the Tangut translation, it is worth pointing out that this last part of the Jiangyuan stands apart from the rest of the text, and instead of discussing theoretical strategic issues of warfare and leadership, it provides a stereotypical and idealized of the peoples living in the four corners of the Chinese world. This sharp contrast with the rest of the text, coupled with its location at the very end of the work, raises the possibility that these four sections are a later addendum to a text that did not originally contain them. Nevertheless, they occur

676 Arguably this description of neighbouring barbarian tribes threatening a central unified domain does not reflect the political conditions of the 3rd century AD when Zhuge Liang lived.
677 The Kara-Khitans (or Qara-Khitans) were descendants of the Khitans who had fled their homeland after the Jurchen conquest of the Liao and established the Western Liao dynasty (1124–1218) in Central Asia. For a detailed study of the Kara-Khitan state, see Biran 2005.
in the earliest surviving Chinese editions, including manuscript copies of the *Shuofu* from the Ming dynasty. Interestingly, a 1646 edition of the *Shuofu* kept at Princeton University Library omits these four sections altogether, ending the text immediately after Section C46. The evident explanation for this is that the description of the barbarians living beyond the borders as the enemies of the state would have felt insulting for the Manchu rulers who by this time have conquered China. As Eric Grinstead puts it, “[t]he rulers of the Ch’ing dynasty, being Manchus—that is, northern non-Chinese—could well have felt themselves included in the general term.”678 In his study of the *Shuofu*, King P’ei-Yuan mentions that from the Qianlong 乾隆 (1735–1796) and Jiaqing 嘉慶 (1796–1821) reign periods, the work in its original form was prohibited because of the numerous references that appeared offensive to the Manchu ancestors.679

There are many similar cases of textual omission due to politico-ethnic sensitivity from the Manchu period. In a study of this phenomenon, Hans van Ess demonstrates how Qing editors changed and omitted references to barbarians in Song or Ming texts because they felt that these were too much resonant with their own identity.680 One such case is the *Siku quanshu* 四庫全書 edition of Hu Anguo’s 胡安國 *Chunqiu zhuan* 春秋傳, in which all references to the Western Rong and Northern Di barbarians were removed.681 To support van Ess’s observation, we can also note that the part on the four barbarians is also missing from the *Shuofu* edition included in the *Siku quanshu*.682

This, of course, does not mean that this last part of the *Jiangyuan* was not transmitted during the Qing. We have a later manuscript in the collection of the Shanghai Library, annotated by the 18th-century scholar Shen Kepei 沈可培 (1737–1799), which has these four sections joined together into a single section

---

678 Grinstead 1962, 36.
679 King 1946, 1.
680 van Ess 2002.
681 Ibid.
682 At the same time, the *Jiangyuan*’s descriptions of the four barbarians appear in the *Siku quanshu* as block quotes in the Ming dynasty encyclopaedia *Tushu bian* 圖書編 (1613). The encyclopaedia quotes the full text of Southern Man, Western Rong and Northern Di sections, separated from each other and inserted into its own categorisation of China’s neighbours. The text, however, omits the section on the Eastern Yi, no doubt because it did not fit its more detailed elaboration of these peoples. Yet the fact that the other three sections appear in the *Siku quanshu* in their full form suggests that the process of censoring out references to the Rong and Di barbarians was either not comprehensive or not thorough.
called “Four Barbarians” 四夷. Therefore, while the arrangement of the rest of the Jiangyuan is fairly consistent throughout the extant editions, the part with the last four sections shows much lesser stability. The Tangut version of the Jiangyuan presents yet another version of this account, even though it does not omit it entirely.

Another example of the way the sensitive issue of barbarians was dealt with during the Manchu dynasty is seen in the version of the Jiangyuan (titled Xinshu [Book of Heart]) preserved in a 1705 edition of the Zhongwu Zhi 忠武誌 by Zhang Penghe 張鵬翮 (1649–1705). Here the term “Eastern Yi” 東夷 is written as 東彝, with the second character replaced with a phonetically equivalent ethnonym that is deprived of negative connotations. 684 While the names for the Western Rong and the Southern Man remain unchanged in the text, the Northern Di appear under the label “Northern Enemies” 北敵, in which the word “enemies” (di 敵) is yet another phonetic substitution of a non-offensive nature. In addition, the larger part of the final section of the original text is omitted in this edition.

We should also consider that during the medieval period and later the names of the four barbarians lost their specificity and were only used as general designations, rather as ethnonyms than for specific groups of foreigners. This is most vividly demonstrated by an undated manuscript copy most likely written in the second half of the 19th century. 685 At the end of this booklet, a note added by a different hand commented on the description of the four barbarians:

行間則隙生，釁之以內亂，候其虛而乘之，因其衰而敢之，此審勢禦外國之最要著也。

If we create a rift between them, a gap will be born. We should harass them with internal disorder, wait for their vulnerable moments and take advantage of those; drive them away

683 Xinshu jiaozhu yi juan 心書校注一卷, Shanghai Library, Dept. of Rare Books, No. 802672-79. This is a concise edition with less than half of the text and no section numbers. It is hard to know whether Shen Kepei only wanted to comment on these parts and consequently left the rest of the text out or he was working from an earlier copy that already had this arrangement.
684 Such a replacement of characters in a text is strongly reminiscent of the practice of imperial name taboos.
685 Xinshu bufen juan 新書不分卷, Shanghai Library, Dept. of Rare Books, No. 863710. The manuscript is undated, but p. 20 has a comment on the top margin written in Manchu. In addition, there is an owner’s seal imprint with the words “Descendant of the Three Generals” 三將軍後人. The library catalogue states that this is a late Qing copy, which might be based on the circumstances of its acquisition, although there is no mention of any of this information in the catalogue. A 19th-century dating is also supported by the fact that this edition is much closer in its wording and textual features to the Zhang Shu edition than to earlier editions.
when they are in decline. These are the very essence of examining the state of affairs and resisting foreign countries.

As a comment on how to fight foreign powers (waiguo 外國), this note dramatically reflects the situation of the last decades of the Qing dynasty, when China was under increasing pressure from the outside. Obviously, Western powers and Japan could not have been equated with the Western Rong and the Eastern Yi, yet the advice in this last part of the Jiangyuan is so generic that a late Qing reader with patriotic sentiments would have had no difficulty in applying these words to his own situation and seeing them as an advice on how to resist foreign aggression.

6.5 The northern neighbours

The Tangut translation also consists of numbered sections but their order and numbers do not match those of the extant Chinese versions. Moreover, while the Chinese text has fifty sections, the Tangut has only thirty-seven, thus there are sections that do not appear in the translation. As the first half of the Tangut manuscript is missing, we only have Sections T20–T37. Not counting these differences, for the most part the Tangut translation follows the Chinese relatively faithfully, without major deviations.

The only part that shows significant discrepancy is the last four sections of the Chinese text (C47–C50), which describe the four barbarians, as the Tangut translation omits the first three of these. The description of the Northern Di appears in the translation as Section T37, which is also the last one. T37 also includes section C46 of the Chinese text. In other words, the last section of the Tangut translation (T37) combines sections C46 and C50 of the Chinese version and leaves out the description of the three barbarians in sections C47, C48 and C49. To show this correlation in a slightly more transparent way, below are the last five sections of the Chinese version:

C46. “Authoritative Orders” 威令
C47. “The Eastern Yi” 東夷
C48. “The Southern Man” 南蠻
C49. “The Western Rong” 西戎
C50. “The Northern Di” 北狄

Of these, only C46 and C50 appear in the Tangut translation, united into section T37, with the title pjụ we rọ yọ șja tsew 教誨箴箴賢[賢] (威儀三十七[第] “37th:
Authoritative demeanour”).686 This title undoubtedly corresponds to the title of C46 of the Chinese text, even if it is not an exact match. In the manuscript, the first three and a half lines of T37 cover the contents of C46 and the rest is the translation of C50.

Below I present a translation and transcription of the Tangut text corresponding to Section C50. The passage in question is the description of the Northern Di, beginning three and half-lines into Section T37 of the Tangut text, which is why the first line in my transcription is indented. The first three lines of the section (i.e. the part I do not translate here) roughly correspond to the Section C46 of the Chinese text, describing how the general or ruler sets an example with his conduct for those below him and if it is not the case, then he would be no different from tyrants such as Jie桀 and Zhou纣. While the Tangut text here follows C46 (as far as we can tell from the mutilated lines), the last third of the Chinese text is clearly left out. Instead, the Tangut text continues seamlessly with the translation of C50, describing the Northern Di barbarians. This sudden change of subject is especially interesting because the Tangut text faithfully follows the Chinese version up to this point. Yet the final section of the Tangut translation presents a text that is structurally different from the extant Chinese versions.

Because the Tangut scroll is missing its lower half, the lines are incomplete. As we have seen above, each line would have had around 20 characters, and the missing characters at the end of lines appear as empty squares (□).687

The lords of the steppes do not find shelter inside city walls [...]

---

686 The suffix tseu 虚 for producing ordinal numbers is missing because of the damage to this part of the manuscript, but it can be reconstructed based on the context.
687 The text presented here is continuous and does not follow the layout (e.g. line length) in the manuscript.
When [...,] they attack the Han state; when it is disadvantageous for them,

they flee far away and hide amidst the mountains and rivers [...]

[...] When hungry, they drink milk; when cold, they wear pelts.

They shoot wild animals in battue hunts, killing life [...]
cannot be subjugated by fighting. There are

three reasons why they cannot be fought [...]

fight, thus they are fatigued and experience much hardship.

The lords of the steppes, [on the other hand,] shoot wild animals, are agile and brave.
... This is the first inadequacy. The Han troops can march on foot a hundred li in one day. [...] more than twice as much. When the Han are in pursuit of the lords of the steppes, they [have to carry] their provisions and weapons.

689 The first character of the word dzji dżwij 風飢 (糧食 “grains, provisions”) is written in the manuscript as lji 糧 (香), producing the awkward and unattested word lji dżwij 風飢 (香糧 “fragrant grains”). It is therefore likely that this is a mistake and that the much more common word dzji dżwij 風飢 (糧食 “grains, provisions”) was intended, and this is how I transcribe it.
...ride in pursuit [of the Han], they reach them swiftly.

When [transporting things] on foot or on horseback, the pace is unequal. This is the second inadequacy.

When competing for environmental advantages, riding is faster than [...]

---

690 Here the phrase liwo ˢʰˡɨ (“environmental advantages”) is somewhat problematic. The Chinese equivalent in this place of the text is “nature of terrain” 地形. Instead of the word “terrain,” the Tangut uses the word liwo (“wind”), presumably to refer to the weather. See also the discussion in the next chapter on the ˢʰˡɨ suffix and its use in translating the phrase “nature of terrain” 地形.
Translation vs. adaptation

 [...] great. This is the third inadequacy why they (i.e. the barbarians) cannot be fought.

 [...] attack; to employ a good general to command the troops;

---

691 The characters used to write the word *khju·wejr* (保守 “guard”) appear in the manuscript in reversed order but this error was corrected by placing a reversal mark between them. I transcribe them here in their correct order as indicated by the correction mark.

692 Because this is the last line of text before the colophon that begins on a new line, we cannot be certain how many characters there were originally in this line. Therefore, I place only a single square box here for the character partially visible on the manuscript.
It is obvious that there are significant differences between this Tangut version and the parallel part of the received Chinese text translated earlier. Among the most conspicuous features of the Tangut text is that the Northern Di barbarians of the Chinese text are described under the label gjiw ·o 玉迩 (廣主 “lords of the wide”). The English translation “lords of the steppes” is suggested by Kepping, whereas Grinstead uses the term “lords of the great plain.” Although both terms basically convey the same meaning, I prefer Kepping’s translation because it seems to fit the context better. In the Tangut term gjiw ·o 玉迩, the word gjiw 玉 is understood to refer to some sort of wideness or broadness, and is usually rendered into Chinese using the words guang 廣 (“broad”) or kuan 寬 (“wide”). In the Tangut dictionary Sea of Characters (Jwɨr njow 蔡搾; Ch. Wenhai 文海, 54.161), this word is explained as signifying the wideness of terrain, which in our text this clearly refers to vast expanses of open terrain without trees or mountains, i.e. the steppe.

Kepping also identifies three other ethnonyms in Tangut ritual songs for the peoples at the other cardinal directions, namely “lords of the West” (i.e. the Tibetans), “lords of the East” (i.e. the Chinese) and “lords of the mountains”, a group that resided to the south of the Tangut domain. While Kepping believes that the “lords of the steppes” in our manuscript provides the “missing indigenous term” for the ethnic group that resided to the north of the Tangut empire, it is perhaps more likely that these terms were not concrete ethnonyms but references to peoples based on their place of residence from the point of view of a centre. I suspect that these terms were used similar to how in English we may use words such as “westerner” or “easterner,” “highlander” or “lowlander,” without the intent to specify actual ethnicities. This is particularly likely if we consider that the neighbours of the Tanguts changed several times in the course of their migrations and subsequent expansion.

A similar term appears in the Tangut text Newly Collected Grains of Gold Placed in the Palm, where the neighbours of the Tanguts are described as follows:

693 Kepping and Gong 2003, 21.
694 Grinstead 1962, 36.
696 The Chinese terms for the four barbarians (i.e. Western Rong, Northern Di, Eastern Yi and Southern Man) by this time also lost their specificity and thus ceased to be used as ethnonyms. Yet the terms in Chinese are not descriptive but ultimately derive from concrete early Chinese ethnonyms. Each of these terms has specific connotations or stereotypes associated with it, precisely as this is described in the Chinese Jiangyuan.
697 For a description and translation of this text, see Kychanov 1969.
The Tanguts march bravely and vigorously,
The Khitans walk in a slow pace,
The Tibetans mostly revere the buddhas and monks,
The Chinese all like vernacular literature,
The Uyghurs drink sour milk,
The “lords of the mountains” love to eat buckwheat.698

The ethnonym ṣīā ·ō 屿迩 (山主 lords of the mountains) in the last line matches the format of the term “lords of the steppes,” as well as the other terms identified by Kepping in the ritual songs. Kychanov raises the possibility that ṣīā ·ō 屿迩 is used phonetically to write the name of a country, namely, Shanshan 鄯善 in the area of Lopnor.699 Considering the above examples, as well as its occurrence of the term in the ritual songs, it seems perhaps more likely that this is a native Tangut term of a descriptive nature, rather than a phonetic transcription. Which people it specifically refers to, however, remains a mystery.

In the Jiangyuan passage above, the lords of the steppes are contrasted with the Han, whose name is written as zar 桀, which in Tangut translations of Chinese texts commonly renders the ethnonym han 漢 (“Han, Chinese”). This means that the translation kept its Sinocentric perspective and the people fighting the lords of the steppes are still the Han, and not the Tanguts. No attempt was made to substitute the Han with the Tanguts in order to make the text truly relevant for native readership, which suggests that the text was regarded not as a manual with concrete instructions on how to defend the Tangut homeland but was kept as a Chinese military treatise, which was relevant only as an example of a particular type of attitude and logic.700

A fundamental question in evaluating the quality and purpose of the translation is to examine how closely it follows the Chinese text. Although we are at a


699 Kychanov 1971, 158.

700 With reference to the translation of military treatises (Sushu 素書, Huangshi gong sanlìē and Liutao) into Manchu, Stephen Durrant (1979, 654–655) pointed out that these would have offered little precise knowledge of concrete strategies for warfare. Instead, he suggested that it was the ostensible authors of these texts that were the subject of interest, as they all “were associated with a rising power on the eve of its conquest, and the Mukden rulers might have gained a particular interest in them by a perceived, and at that time desired, analogy between the earlier pre-conquest powers and themselves.” On this point, see also discussion in next chapter.
disadvantage because more than a third of each line (i.e. the lower part) is missing in the manuscript, it is nevertheless apparent that the Tangut version in general matches the Chinese one. While the translation was not carried out in a rigid word-for-word manner, the content in the two languages can be easily aligned with each other. In some cases the same sense is expressed in more (or fewer) words but there are no fundamental discrepancies. An exception is the very end of Section C50 which offers concrete solutions on how to deal with the Northern Di (i.e. “picking a good general to employ,” etc.). The Tangut version (T37) omits most of this part, of which we can be certain because the end of the manuscript is complete and thus the translation comes to an end here. Based on its content there appears to be no obvious reason why the missing text would have been deemed unnecessary for Tangut readers, yet this portion is present in all Chinese editions.\footnote{701} This, of course, does not prove that these sentences were also part of the edition used by the Tangut translator. In fact, as I suggest in the following section, I am of the opinion that the Chinese text from which the Tangut version was translated probably already had the same arrangement as the Tangut translation and that the extant Chinese version of the text is a later development in the history of the text.

\section*{6.6 Translation vs. adaptation}

We have seen that while the Tangut manuscript maintains the Sinocentric perspective of the original text, it excludes three of the four barbarians, describing only the Northern Di. The translation calls this horse-riding people the lords of the steppes, a term that could have referred to the Mongols who by the beginning of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century had established a significant military presence along the northern border of the Tangut state. Such an identification would have important ramifications for the date of the translation. With no explicit clues to date the manuscript, the possibility of a Mongol threat beyond the northern frontier would suggest an early 13\textsuperscript{th} century dating for the Tangut version, which to some extent would disagree with our current understanding that most secular writings were translated during the 12\textsuperscript{th} century. The lords of the steppes however could have equally referred to the Khitans or Jurchens, and such identification would indicate a much earlier date for the text. There were wars with the Khitans already during the reign Yuanhao, when the Tanguts were greatly outnumbered and had

\footnote{701} Except, of course, the Qing dynasty editions in which this part was censored out altogether.
to withdraw deep into Tangut territories to avoid direct encounters with the enemy. More importantly, the description of Northern Di is present in the Chinese text which would have predated the Mongol period, not to speak of the stereotypical characteristics of these people, which go back to even earlier times. While it is true that the Mongols were also a horse-riding militant nation in the north, throughout Chinese history the northern steppes had been occupied by nomadic tribes who led a similar lifestyle. The descriptive property of the term lords of the steppes also suggests that the Tanguts used this not as a reference to a specific ethnicity but as an umbrella term for nomadic tribes in the north.

As to why the sections describing the other three types of barbarians do not appear in the translation, theoretically it would be possible to argue that this was the only ethnic agglomeration of the original four that fit the Tangut worldview. Despite their geographical location, the Liao and later the Jin states would not have been called Eastern Barbarians (Dong Yi) because they represented high culture from the perspective of the Tanguts who had at one point been in a subordinate position to them, acting as their vassal state. These states occupied territories which for many centuries had been part of the Chinese cultural domain, and effectively acted as heirs to that tradition. Similarly, the Song, who had been adjacent to the Tanguts until the Jurchens pushed them further south, did not fit into the categories of Eastern or Southern Barbarians. The Tibetans to the south and southwest, once again, were not “barbarians” from a Tangut perspective but a civilisation with which the Tanguts shared an important part of their cultural heritage. The cultural dependency and indebtedness of the Tanguts to their neighbours is also demonstrated by the fact that besides the Tangut language, Tibetan and Chinese were both widely used in the Tangut state. This attests not only to the multi-ethnicity of the empire but also to its most principal cultural and political connections. The shared Buddhist background between these states may have also interfered with seeing them as “barbarians,” especially since Buddhism spread to the Tangut empire from China and Tibet.

Therefore, of the four stereotypical barbarians in the Chinese version of the Jiangyuan, it was only the northern neighbours that could not be associated with some form of high culture and a common religious tradition. This was the only group of the four that corresponded to the Tangut geography in which the centre itself was moved from its original Chinese epicentre to the northwest, creating a completely different cultural and geographical layout. Accordingly, while it is tempting to regard the Mongols as the greatest threat to the Tangut domain, this becomes evident only in retrospect, whereas at the time the Jurchens would have probably represented a more formidable military challenge.
Having said that, the discrepancies between the Tangut and Chinese versions in other parts of this text make it possible that the translation followed its source text relatively closely and at least some of the differences can often be attributed to the variation between different versions of the Chinese text. Although we have no access to the version used by the Tangut translator, in many cases the seeming discrepancies can be matched to the wording in one of the early editions of the \textit{jiangyuan}. This is consistent with the phenomenon mentioned on several occasions in this book, namely, that Tangut translators were unlikely to be involved in editing the Chinese text and even when we do not have a Chinese version matching the Tangut text, it may be simply because that version was subsequently lost. The same point is also demonstrated by the fact that there are also examples of Tangut texts evidently translated from Chinese but for which we do not have the Chinese original anymore. From this point of view it is quite possible that the Tangut \textit{General's Garden} followed faithfully a Chinese edition, including the last section devoted to the description of barbarian tribes, and that the form we see in the Tangut manuscript was in fact taken directly from a now lost Chinese version.

The Tangut manuscript is the earliest known version of the \textit{jiangyuan} and it may preserve a form of the text that predates the Ming editions available to us today. Consequently, it is not impossible that originally this last section discussed only the northern barbarians and the four-fold division of China's neighbours according to the four cardinal directions was introduced only later, possibly under the influence of works such as the \textit{Tongdian}. An additional argument in favour of this hypothesis is that in the Tangut manuscript the description of the lords of the steppes does not appear in a separate section by itself but forms part of section T37 (i.e. the last section of the Tangut text), the beginning of which matches in content with C46. The separation of the description of the lords of the steppes from the rest of section T37 may have become necessary when the text was augmented and the four-fold division was created.

The important point here is that the last part of the Tangut version does not simply omit the description of three of the four types of barbarians but uses a framework that does not operate in terms of the four-fold division at all. It is only because of our knowledge of the transmitted version of the Chinese text that it appears as if there was an omission or abridgment. But if we do not try to match the Tangut text with the Chinese one, we will be able to see that the description of the enemy in the Tangut version does not necessarily require three additional categories but works perfectly well by itself.
In light of the above, I suspect that the Tangut translator did not adapt the text for local readership but instead relied on a Chinese version no longer available to us. Likewise, the different sequence of sections in the Tangut manuscript may go back to a Chinese version, as it would be hard to find a plausible explanation for a translator to radically rearrange the original text, especially if it keeps the title also attested in the Chinese context. In this sense, the Tangut *General’s Garden* is an important witness of the early stage of the formation of this text from before it reached the relatively stable form we are familiar with today. This hypothesis, however, can be conclusively proven or refuted only if an early version of the Chinese text comes to light.