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NAMING THE TANGUT CAPITAL: XINGQING/ZHONGQING AND RELATED MATTERS

Ruth W. Dunnell
Kenyon College

There are many unanswered questions, some very basic, in the history of the administrative nomenclature and administrative structure of the Xia state. Even the name of the Xia capital city has prompted speculation and disagreement among scholars. What was the Tangut capital called, when, and by whom? Was there a secondary capital, or a system of regional subcapitals? Some of these questions have been addressed more than once in recent publications; what follows is my own attempt to establish a few facts and raise the level of speculation to more fruitful heights.

Lingzhou (south of present-day Yinchuan and east of the Yellow River) became what may be considered the first official capital after its capture by Li Jiqian in 1002 (Song Xianping 5/Liao Tonghe 20). It was then renamed Xipingfu. Sometime around 1020 (Song Tianxi 4/Liao Kaiqi 9), according to Li Tao, the Tangut monarch Li Deming reestablished the capital on the other side of the Yellow River at the site of Huayianzhen, and named it Zhongzhou.

The move was motivated by strategic considerations. At that time Li Deming was committed to a longterm struggle with the Tsongkha Tibetans, Ganzhou Uighurs, and the Khitan Liao for control of Lingzhou, which the Tanguts did not secure until 1028, end the Gansu Corridor. According to Songshi 485, in the same year that Li Deming moved his capital across the river Khitan troops attacked Lingzhou, and were repelled by a Tangut army. It is not easy to say exactly who controlled Lingzhou, Ganzhou, and Shazhou from about 1016 onward. Presumably some Tibeto-Uighur alliance held sway in Lingzhou in 1020, but considerable tension

1 See, for example, Wang Yinmin and Zhong Kan, "Xi Xia du cheng Xingqinfu chu tan," Xibe shi di li 2(1984), pp. 52-61; and also Niu Dasheng, "Shi lun Xi Xia du cheng Xingqinfu," Ningxia wenwu 1(1986), pp. 32-38. I first wrote this article in the fall of 1987 in Beijing, as a contribution to a special publication honoring China's first Tangut specialist, Wang Jingru, professor emeritus of the Central Nationalities College. Funding from the Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China supported my research visit in Beijing, 1987-88. I wish to thank Professors Fritz Mote and Denis Twitchett for many useful comments made on an earlier draft.

2 See Songshi (Taipei, 1978) 485, p. 13992; Li Tao, Xu zixi tongqian changbian (Taipei, 1961, hereafter Changbian) 96/26a (vol. 7, p. 2234 in the 1985 punctuated edn.). Jinshi (Beijing, 1975) 134, p. 2376, notes that "when Yuanhao first became powerful, he crossed the river to the north, fortified Xingzhou and made it his capital," thus evidently (and mistakenly) attributing the move to Yuanhao rather than Li Deming.
strained this alliance, and the true cause of the Khitan invasion (which is not recorded in the Liaoshì) remains obscure. In any case, the relocation of the Tangut capital in the foothills of the Helan Shan at this time requires no further explanation.

When was Xingzhou upgraded to Xingqingfu? Writing in the early 19th century, Wu Guangcheng (Xi Xia shushì 11/11ab) records that in the fifth month of 1033 (Song Mingdao 2/Liao Chongxi 2) Weiming Yuanhao “raised Xingzhou to the status of a fu and changed its name to Xingqing”. This item does not appear in Songshi 485 or in Li Tao, and Chabianli, which means two sources do not attempt to date precisely Yuanhao’s reforms, assigning them generally to the years 1034-1037. Songshi 485, p. 13994, notes that Yuanhao “continued to reside at Xingzhou, with the [Yellow] River as a barrier and relying on the fastness of the Helan Shan.” In Xi Xia shushì 12/11b, only the phrase “relying on the fastness of the Helan Shan” Li Helanshan wei yu has been retained. In reporting the disposition of troops, Songshi 485, p. 13995, notes that “70,000 troops were stationed to defend Xingzhou Xingqingfu.” This is the first Song shi reference to Xingqingfu. The comparable passage in Changanbian 120/23b reads, “stationed 70,000 troops to defend Xingqingfu.” Again, Songshi 485, p. 13995, notes that “the sixteen bureaus were established at Xingzhou;” Li Tao reports the same (Changanbian 120/23b). It is clear from these notices that sometime in the 1030s a superior capital prefecture was established with the name Xingqingfu, but this name does not seem to have displaced Xingzhou in common usage, and in fact is seldom seen in contemporary sources. We must of course acknowledge Song Chinese bias against using the official Tangut name for the Xia capital as a likely reason for its non-occurrence in Song sources.

A rapid survey of the most important and readily available contemporary (Song-Yuan) materials of external (non-Xia) origin and of Xia materials as well reveals that aside from the instances cited above, the Tangut capital is seldom referred to by name, and when it is, never as Xingqing. In Song sources it is usually called Xingzhou, yatou, or yazheng. In Zheng Gangzhong’s Xi zheng dao li li (1139), we learn that “the Xian state ruler calls Xingzhou yatou...” (Xia guo zhu Xingzhou weih

---

3 Wu Guangcheng, Xi Xia shushì (preface dated 1826; rpt. Taibei, 1968), 10/8ab, explains that the Khitan ruler was punishing Li Deming for refusing passage through Xia to the envoys of the Tsongkha Tibetan Lilitun. Lilitun’s history is too complex to repeat here, but Wu’s explanation is probably over-simplified and fails to account for Khitan action against territory which was presumably not yet under Li Deming’s control. Again according to Songshi 485, p. 13991, Li Deming’s defeat of the Liao force did not sour relations between the Tanguts and Khitans, for the following year the Liao court in conciliation sent a special envoy to entice Li Deming as Da Xia qu Guo Wang.


---


6 Li Xinchuan, Jianyian yi lai Xi nian yao lu, Songshi ziliao cuibian second series (Taipei, 1968) 20/17b-18a, quoting from Zhao Sheng’s (Zhongxing) Yi Shi.

7 Of course the Jinhui was compiled in the early 14th century, but presumably from original documents or copies of them dating to the 12th and 13th centuries, of which many had been preserved following the Jin collapse.

8 See E. I. Khyanov, “Tangutskie istorichni gosudarstvenno-administrativnym apparate Si Sia,” Kratkie soobshcheniya instituta nerodov Azii 69 (1965), p. 210 (hereafter Khyanov 1965). Khyanov’s nian in the title of the code should be corrected to liu. The Tiansheng reign era lasted from 1149 to 1169. All four volumes of Khyanov’s translation of the text are facsimile of text from Have now been published; chapter ten of the code is in volume three. See Khyanov, Isten-i zenov utverzhdeni kodeks deviza tsarsvovani nebesnoe prosvetanie (1169-1169), vol. 3 (Moscow, 1989), pp. 109-111 (translation), 410-414.
law code, Zhongxingfu occurs in the titles of two members of the commission which compiled the code. Thus it would appear that by no later than the mid-12th century the official name of the Tangut capital was Zhongxingfu, not Xingqingfu.

When and under what circumstances was the name of the Tangut capital changed from Xingqingfu to Zhongxingfu? Here we can only speculate. Wu Guangcheng's explanation is well-known: in 1205, to celebrate the withdrawal of Mongolian troops from their first assault on Tangut territory, the name of the capital was changed to the auspicious appellation of Zhongxing, "Mid-Restoration" (Si Xia shushii 39/11a). This account poses several problems, some of which Chen Bingying reviews in his book, Xi Xia wenhua yanjiu. Chen's work came to my attention after I had formed my own analysis of the problem, and confirmed but did not add to it.

It would be useful to examine the background to the 1205 affair. Motivation for the Mongolian attack on Xida at this time was probably connected to Temujin's defeat of his former ally, the Kereyid leader To'oril (Ong-khan) in 1203. Tangut-Kereyid contacts, which were quite lively in the latter half of the 12th century, suggest that by the 13th century the Xida state engaged in rather complex and multi-sided relations with their steppe neighbors.11

Following To'oril's demise in 1203, his son Ilkha-Senggum fled to northeastern Tibet after passing through the Tangut outpost of Edzina (facsimile of text) for article 875 enumerating government offices and agencies.

9 See Khañavu, Izmenenii i zarazovanie utverzhdenny kodexa deviz

9 See Khañavu, Izmenenii i zarazovanie utverzhdenny kodexa deviz
tsaarstvovanii nebesnoe protsvetanie (1169-1169), vol. 2 (Moscow, 1987), pp. 12, 247-8. The name Zhongxing also appears in an undated Xida fragment of Zazi, in the Chinese collection from Qara-Qoto in Leningrad, copied by Shi Jinbo during his visit there in January of 1987. Shi believes that this text dates to the late 12th-early 13th centuries. Pieces of the possible Tangut edition of Zazi unearthed in China are far less complete than the Han counterpart in Leningrad.

10 Xi Xia wenhua yanjiu (Ningxia renmin chuban she, 1985), pp. 183-

10 Xi Xia wenhua yanjiu (Ningxia renmin chuban she, 1985), pp. 183-
84.


(Heihui), and from there was chased out to the Tarim Basin and killed by a local chief. Although Tangut authorities apparently refused to harbor this Kereyid fugitive, his flight southward through Xida territory became the pretext for a Mongol raid into Hexi in 1205. Several fortified settlements were plundered and much cattle driven away.12

Why would a Mongol raid into Hexi, evidently at a safe distance from the capital, cause the Tangut emperor to change the name of his city? And if the significance of the event was fully appreciated, it was hardly an occasion for celebration, rather one for sober reflection. If Huangzong (Weiming Chuyou, r. 1194-1206) felt the occasion merited some ritual gesture, wouldn't one expect him to change his reign era name (pian hao) to Zhongxing rather than the name of the capital? In fact, the reign name was changed from Tiangang ("Heavenly Celebration") to Yingtian ("Responsive to Heaven"), following a 1206 coup in Zhongxing which placed Weiming Anquan (Xiangzhong, r. 1206-1211), prince of Zhengyi Commandery (Ganzhou), on the throne.14 That a royal prince with a western power base should usurp the throne at this time alerts us to the possible influence of the steppe in Tangut dynastic politics. It is unlikely, however, that it took the form of a new name for the Xida capital.

Why was Wu Guangcheng unwilling to accept the testimony of the Jinshi and compelled to adopt or invent this tale to explain the name Zhongxing? Is it possible that the extant version of the mid-12th century Tangut law code and the Jin diplomatic records were all altered to reflect the alleged 1205 change of name? This does not seem very plausible to me. If the name Zhongqing had been in use until 1205, how could it have disappeared so quickly and completely from the sources?

Chen Bingying cites one piece of evidence regarding Zhongxing that is significant despite its late date (which Chen did not know or acknowledge at the time he wrote). This is the inscribed stele fragment from Weiming Anhui's tomb, in which the name Zhongxing occurs. Weiming Anhui died sometime in the first half of the 12th century, but it has been shown that this particular stele honoring him was not erected until the reign of Shenzong (Weiming Zunxu, r. 1211-1223).15 But if the name Xingqing had been in use during Weiming Anhui's lifetime, then Xingqing, not Zhongxing, should have been the name inscribed in this memorial stele.

12 Rashid Al-Din, vol. 1, p. 134; Wang Guowei, "Shengwu qin zheng


13 Yuanshi 1, p. 13; Wang Guowei, "Shengwu qinzheng lu jiao zhu," p. 118; Rashid Al-Din, p. 150.

14 Songshi 466, p. 14026, states that the reign name was not changed until the following year (1207), but this is probably an error.

15 See Li Fanwen, Xi Xia yanjiu lunji (Yinchuan, 1983), p. 126-28; and by the same author, Xi Xia lingmu chuzhou canbei cui bian (Beijing: Wenwu chuban she, 1985), pp. 30-31, 76, plate 75, fascimile.
On what occasion in Tangut history would the Xia rulers have reason to change the name of the capital? There are several possibilities, one being the death of the second empress dowager Liang in 1999 and the restoration of Weiming rule under Chongzong (Weiming Qianshun, r. 1186-1192) in the early 12th century. Or the change may have occurred even earlier, in the middle to late 11th century.

Mongolian and Persian chronicles of the 13th century refer to the Tangut capital variously as Erigaya (Secret History) or Iriqai/Iriqgi (Rashid Al-Din). 18 Marco Polo transcribed the name as Egrigaia. If these transcriptions all derive from a Tangut form, as many scholars suppose, what was it? E. I. Kychanov has proposed that -ri- may be a Mongolian inversion of -ri- (since in Mongolian words do not normally begin with 'r'), and perhaps derives from a Tangut word meaning "central," "central residence." 19 Further, according to Kychanov, various Tangut words denoting fortified settlement could be the source of -gei/-kai/-hai, which syllable occurs in a number of Xia place names (e.g. Wulugai/Wulashi/Uragi). 20 What was the relationship between the names Erigaya etc. and Zhongxingfeng?

The two Tangut characters used to write Zhongxing(c) are both defined in the Tangut dictionaries Werhai and Yintong as zu xing (clan names), and thus presumably function to transcribe the Chinese phonemes zhong and xing. 21 It is tempting to suggest that at some point zhong was simply added to the existing Xingzhou to indicate the city's importance as a central place, and the new name substituted for Xingqiu (ful). But then why not use a Tangut word meaning "center"? Perhaps because the Chinese word for "center" was well known (better known than the Tangut) and rich in political symbolism, it was borrowed instead of adding a Tangut word to the Chinese name Xing. Let us consider the relationship between Zhongxing and other prominent places.

So far neither Tangut nor Chinese sources reveals the existence in Xia of a formal system of multiple capitals such as characterized the Bohai, Liao, Jin and Song states. Modern scholars, however, often claim that Xia had an Eastern Capital (Xingzhou) and a Western Capital (Lingzhou). This particular misconception derives from an incorrect notice in the 17th century scholar Gu Zuyu's Du shi fangyu jiyo: when Mongolian troops surrounded Xingzhou in 1217, "the Xia ruler Zunzu fled to the Western Capital. [small print:] The Western Capital was Lingzhou. At that time the Tanguts called Xingzhou the Eastern Capital and Lingzhou the Western Capital." 22 There is no basis for Gu Zuyu's claim; the author has mistakenly misread Xiliang as xiling. Moreover, it hardly makes any sense to locate an Eastern Capital to the northwest, and a Western Capital to the southeast.

The only extant source for the 1217 incident is jinshi 15, p. 134: "Xingding 2, first month...yiyou, the Shaanxi branch secretariat has detained a returned countryman who reports that Great Yuan troops have surrounded the Xia ruler's city, and that Li Zunzu instructed his son to remain and defend the city while he himself left and went to Xiliang." Note that Gu Zuyu has amended chu zou Xiliang to ben xiling: turning, "left and went to Xiliang" into "fled to the Western Capital." This may be significant in trying to figure out what actually happened when the Mongols went to the Xia capital in 1217 (was there really a battle, or just an exchange of hostile words?). But that problem lies beyond the scope of this article.

Having said the above regarding the supposed existence of an eastern and western capital, I must mention several apparently contradictory items. Two come from section 19, "Di fen bu," of the Xia lexical work (in Chinese), Zazi, as copied by Shi Jinbo from the original manuscript in the Leningrad archives. 23 In this section forty-four names are...
listed; most of them are Xia place names (proper and administrative). Some have never been seen before. Among these is the last entry in the list, dong dufu. What this refers to is unclear. The list is by no means a complete catalogue of Xia place names, nor do we know what principle of selection governed the author’s compilation of it. Some of the names are clearly given in an abbreviated form. The list also includes the entry dudu, evidently a shortened reference to dedu dudu (see paragraph below). Might dudu dufu be an abbreviated reference to a Dong dedu dudu? Chapter ten of the Tiansheng code lists two dedu dudu, one of which has been informally designated as “eastern” (dong dudu, see note 24). Why, in Zazi, should one be written dufu and the other (dong) dufu remains unclear, and at the moment I can offer no further explanation.

More explicit is the Zazi entry, in the same section, of the term xi jing, “western capital.” Yet to what, or where, this refers is still a matter of speculation: Lanzhou? Ganzhou?

Another apparent reference to xi jing occurs in the preface to the Tiansheng code, which lists the names and titles of the 23 members of the commission responsible for compiling the code. Among the attributes of the twenty-first member are the characters xi jing (the Tiansheng word for “west”) and two Tangut characters transliterating the Chinese phonemes jing (jing). Is this meant to be understood as equivalent to the Chinese “governor of the Western Capital”? If so, to what does it refer? Or might this be an abbreviated reference to the Tangut Western Military Commission (xi jing ji shi) (xi; see below), to which this translator was attached? Was it a courtesy title or a duty appointment? Answers to these questions will have to await a careful analysis of administrative nomenclature found in the code, including this list of its compilers.

In the administrative hierarchy of the Xia state, as far as can be determined from published sources, Lanzhou (also commonly called Wuxi) was the seat of the superior prefecture of Xiliangfu, and Lingwu was evidently the seat of the superior prefecture of Dadudufu. Lingwu was a seventh-ranking city in the administrative hierarchy.26 Lanzhou is not listed as such, but Xiliangfu was one of three superior prefectures, the other two being the capital and the special prefecture governing Lingzhou designated Dadudufu.27 All rank-two departments in the administrative hierarchy. Both Lanzhou and Lingzhou were regions of vital economic importance.

Lanzhou had, as well, special ritual and strategic significance for the Tangut ruling house. It was to Lanzhou that Weiming Yuanhao repaired in 1038 after assuming the imperial title, both to make sacrifices to the spirits (xian shen, ancestral? Buddhist?) and to fortify the city against attack by his Tibetan rival, Guiliu.28 It was there also that in 1094 the young emperor Weiming Gianshun (Chengzong, r. 1086-1139) and his mother, empress dowager Liang, conducted a lavish ceremony to celebrate restoration of an imperial Buddhist shrine, the Gontong Stupa of the Hugu Temple.29 Lanzhou was an important center for trade and communication with the Tibetans, Uighurs, Khotanese, and others. At least at the end of the 11th century it was also the seat of the so-called Southern Court (nan yuan [yi] as well as the headquarters of the Right Wing Army (you xiang jian jun [yi]), judging by information in the 1049 Gontong Stupa Stele inscription.30

The nan yuan referred to above is matched in Tangut sources by a bei yu, xi yu, and dong yu. If the Xia state did not exhibit a formal

27 Zhang Jian, Xi Xia jishi benmo (1986). "Xi Xia di xing tu" shows Dadudufu to be coterminous with Lingwu. Dadudufu was established at Lingwu, formerly the headquarters of the Shuofang Commandery, in the mid-8th century, where Tang Suzong ascended the throne in 716 following the outbreak of the An Lushan rebellion. In Xia practice, it appears to have had the special function of governing the vital agricultural region around Lingzhou. The administrative hierarchy in ch. 10 of the Tangut code, however, lists Dadudufu twice, once as a rank 2 department, and again as a rank 4 department. Is this a scribal error, or were there two of these prefectures? There are other repetitions in this listing as well, all of which await further study pending publication of the code.

28 Songshi 485, p. 13995.


30 See note 26 above. The inscription was transcribed by Luo Fucheng in Guoli beijing tushuguan guan kan, (Xi Xia wen zhan hao) 4:3 (1932), pp. 151-177; and by Nishida Tatsu, in his Selk'ga go no kenkyu (Kyoto, 1964-66), vol. 1, pp. 157-176. Compare lines 24 of the Tangut version and 22 of the Chinese text (the lines of text are numbered by Nishida, but not by Luo Fucheng). In the Chinese version the official Hai Majie is named army supervisor (pianjiu lian zhi) of the Right Wing. In the Tangut version he is named army supervisor of the Southern Court (nan yuan), indicating that the jurisdiction of Right Wing and the Southern Court coincided. Was the Right Wing subordinate to the Southern Court? Was the Prince (wang) of the Southern Court also chief commander of the army headquartered there?
multi-capital organizational structure, it definitely did have a subcapital system of regional administration and control in which the Southern, Northern, Eastern, and Western Courts (yuan) were closely associated with the Military Commission, jing lue si (likewise identified in the Tiansheng code as Eastern, Southern, Western, and Northern), and the twelve Army Boards (jia jun si). By the mid-12th century four of the twelve Army Boards had become identified with the four Courts, and to each of the four Courts there were princely titles (wang) attached. Where were the Eastern, Southern, Northern, and Western Courts located, and what were their respective jurisdictions and responsibilities? What powers and privileges did the princes attached to them enjoy?

Publication of the Tiansheng code now should permit these questions to be addressed in a fuller context, if not fully answered. Although I have not yet studied all the relevant data in the code (nor compared the original Tangut text with Kychanov's translation), the data from extant source material do suggest that the four courts were key geopolitical centers in the Xia state which operated as regional organs of government, like the branch secretariats (sheng) of the Yuan. Together with the capital at Zhongxing, they created a system of territorial subdivision and control somewhat analogous (but by no means identical) to the five capitals and their circuits of Khitan administration. Tangut government did not, however, exhibit the dual characteristics of the Khitan Liao administrative system.

There is another problem to be considered here: the Tanguts' alleged use of the term Kalfengfu. Songshi 485, p. 13995, lists Kalfengfu as one of the government agencies established by Weiming Yuanhao. This term does not appear in Fan Han heshi zhang zhong shu, nor in the Tiansheng law code; where the former (28a) has huang cheng si, the latter has Zhongxingfu. To my knowledge (I may have overlooked something), the term Kalfengfu does not appear in any Xia source, most of which, to be sure, date to the 12th century. Shi Jinbo suggests that the Tanguts never established a Kalfengfu and that Song annalists merely translated the Tanguts' term for the Xia capital into the name of the "legitimate" Song capital.

Alternatively, if Weiming Yuanhao adopted the term kalfeng (lit. "opening up the boundaries") to denote the metropolitan prefecture, did it supplant or overlap the name Xingqingfu? Was it later dropped? If the capital was being called Zhongxing by the early 12th century, what would kalfeng refer to in 1150? The title kalfeng yin occurs in Jinshi, 60, p. 1405; it is attached to Su Zhili, a Xia envoy to the Jin court in 1150 (Xia Tiansheng 2/Jin Tiande 2). This appears to be a rare instance, in the uneasy early decades of Xia-Jin relations, in which a Xia envoy to Jin is specifically named. In general, until the accession of Jin Shizong late in 1161, the names and ranks of only Jin envoys to Xia were preserved in Jin records. Thereafter the Jin annals began regularly to record the names and titles of Xia envoys to Jin, and this change can be attributed to Jin Shizong's new policies and efforts to cultivate friendlier relations with Xia. It may be no accident, therefore, that Zhongxingfu appears in place of Kalfeng from that point onward. The 1150 occurrence of kalfeng yin, like its Song predecessor, may have reflected a hostile Jurchen alteration of a Xia title which was later tolerated in Jin Shizong's reformed protocol.

To conclude briefly, I urge that Zhongxingfu be adopted as the preferred name for the capital of the Tangut state of Xia. Moreover, scholars and historians seeking a convenient source for Xia history should beware of the beguiling but flawed narrative of Wu Guangchong, upon whose chatty chronicle Xi Xia researchers have relied too long and too uncritically.

---

31 Recorded in Guile Maosai, Fan Han he shi zhang zhong zu. See also Kychanov 1965 (note 7), pp. 193, 216 for the princely titles; Kychanov 1987 (note 8), p. 370.


33 See Bai Bin, "Lun Xi Xia shi chen di 'fan hao' wenti," Zhongguo minzu shi yanjiu (Beijing, 1987), pp. 454-473.

34 See Shi Jinbo, Xi Xia wenhua (Jilin, 1987), p. 110.
Glossary of Chinese Terms in Text

bei yuan 北院
ban xijing 奔西京
Bohai 海
Changbian: Xu ezhi tongjian changbian 长编：续资治通鉴长编
Chen Bingying 周炯应
Chongsong 宗宗
chu sou Xiliang 出走西凉
ci shen 词神
dadu dufu 大都督府
di fen bu 地分部
dong dadu dufu 東大都督府
dong dufu 东都府
dong yuan 东院
dufu 督府
Dushi fang yu jiaoz 路史方表纪载
Fan Han heshi zhong zhong zhu 史漢合時考中主
Gansu 甘
Gantong Ta 想通塔
Ganzhou 甘州
Gu Zuyu 顧祖禹
Heishui 黑水
Helan Shan 賀蘭山
Hexi 河西
Huaiziyuanzheng 惠遠鎮
huang cheng si 宮城司
Huazong 懿宗
Huguo si 韶國寺
jian jun si 司軍監
Gusiluo 督
Jin 金
Jinshi 金史
jing lue si 情略司
Kaijufu 盖府
kaitai 陝泰
Li Deming 李德明
Li Jiqlan 李繼連
Li Tao 李超
Li Zunxu (see Weiming Zunxu) 李遵獻
Weiming Anhai 至榮安海
Weiming Anquan 至榮安全
Weiming Chunyou 至榮純祐
Weiming Glanshen 至榮範順
Weiming Yuanhao 至榮元昊
Weiming Zunxu 至榮尊顯
Yen hai 景海
Woluogai 魯剌孩
Wo Guangcheng 吴廣成
Wushai 無剌海
Wuwei 武威
xijin lue (shi?) si 西經路(制?)司
xijin 西京
xijin yin 西京尹
Xi Liang 西梁
Xipingfu 西平府
Xi Xia wenhua yuanjia 西夏文化研究
Xi Xia shushu 西夏書籍
xi yuan 西院
xi zheng dao li ji 西征道紀記
Xia 西
Xia guo shu Xingshou wei shi yasen 夏國主興州渭之街頭
Women scarcely appear in the chronicles of traditional China. When they do, they are mentioned principally in supporting roles. They are rarely the focus of the accounts in the histories; in part, by omission, such works accommodated the traditional views of women. Confucian ideology tended to emphasize the accomplishments of men while according women few privileges and rights.

As a result, only a small number of women attained prominent positions or achieved renown in a specific profession. Political decision-making was in the hands of men, and only infrequently did women wield political power. The few women who governed traditional China are accorded harsh, biased treatment in the Chinese chronicles. Chinese histories often portrayed the Princess nee Lu of the Han dynasty, the Empress Wu of the T'ang, and the Empress Dowager Tzu Hsi of the Ch'ing, the most prominent female rulers in the worst possible light. They were represented as

'Such omission has led to the following kinds of stereotypes of women as "down trodden, lacking in legal rights, hobbled by the bindings of her feet, and at the service, body and soul, of her husband and his family." (As cited in R. W. Guisso and Stanley Johansson, eds., *Women in China: Current Directions in Historical Scholarship* (Chico Press: Youngstown, New York, 1981), p. 71.)
